

**THE SOUTHERN**  
**PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW,**

**CONDUCTED BY**

**AN ASSOCIATION OF MINISTERS,**

**IN**

**COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA.**

---

**VOLUME XI.**

---

**COLUMBIA, S. C.:**  
**STEAM-POWER PRESS OF R. W. GIBBES.**

**1859.**

BX  
 8901  
 5688  
 v. 11

## CONTENTS OF VOLUME XI.

### NUMBER I.

ARTICLE	PAGE
I.—THE RELATION OF BAPTIZED CHILDREN TO THE CHURCH, ANONYMOUS, - - - - -	1
II.—REVIEW OF CUMMINGS' THEORY RESPECTING THE CONVERSION OF THE WORLD, BY REV. JOHN G. SHEPPERSON, OTTER BRIDGE, VA., - - -	42
III.—THE TRINITY OF THE GODHEAD THE DOCTRINE OF THE SCRIPTURES, BY THOMAS SMYTH, D. D., CHARLESTON, S. C., - - - - -	68
IV.—THE BURDEN OF EGYPT, BY J. WOOD DAVIDSON, ESQ., WINNSBORO', S. C., - - - - -	91
V.—REVIEW OF REPORTS TO THE LEGISLATURE OF SOUTH CAROLINA ON THE REVIVAL OF THE SLAVE TRADE, BY JOHN B. ADGER, D. D., COLUMBIA, S. C., - - - - -	100
VI.—CORRESPONDENCE: A STANDARD EDITION OF THE ENGLISH BIBLE, BY THOMAS CURTIS, D. D., LIMESTONE SPRINGS, S. C., - - - - -	136
VII.—CRITICAL NOTICES, - - - - -	145

### NUMBER II.

I.—ALEXANDER VON HUMBOLDT, BY PROF. C. S. VENABLE, SOUTH CAROLINA COLLEGE, - - -	153
II.—THE TRINITY OF THE GODHEAD, THE DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES, (CONTINUED,) BY THOS. SMYTH, D. D., CHARLESTON, S. C., - - -	175
III.—DR. WAYLAND ON THE LIMITS OF HUMAN RESPONSIBILITY, ANONYMOUS, - - - - -	194

ARTICLE	PAGE
IV.—POPULAR OBJECTIONS TO SCIENCE, BY PROF. J. R. BLAKE, LAGRANGE COLLEGE, TENN., - -	206
V.—THE MIND OF MAN, THE IMAGE OF GOD, BY JOHN T. L. PRESTON, LEXINGTON, VA., - - -	228
VI.—THE RELIGIOUS AWAKENING OF 1858, BY REV. J. O. LINDSAY, CALHOUN'S MILLS, S. C., - - -	246
VII.—THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF 1858, BY REV. GEORGE HOWE, D. D., COLUMBIA, S. C., - - -	264
VIII.—CRITICAL NOTICES, - - - - -	344
IX.—PERIODICAL LITERATURE, - - - - -	351

## NUMBER III.

I.—SYMMETRY AND BEAUTY OF GOD'S WITNESSING CHURCH, BY S. J. BAIRD, WOODBURY, N. J., -	357
II.—A REASONABLE ANSWER TO THE SKEPTIC, BY REV. W. C. DANA, CHARLESTON, S. C., - - -	386
III.—OUR DOMESTIC MISSIONS—THE TRUE THEORY OF THEIR CONDUCT AND MANAGEMENT, BY REV. G. C. GREGG, SUMTER, S. C., - - - -	402
IV.—HALSEY'S LITERARY ATTRACTIONS OF THE BIBLE, BY J. N. WADDEL, D. D., LAGRANGE COLLEGE, TENNESSEE, - - - - -	419
V.—THE CONVERSION OF THE WORLD, BY REV. J. G. SHEPPERSON, OTTER BRIDGE, VA., - - -	449
VI.—CHRISTIANITY—A DISCIPLINARY ELEMENT IN AN EDUCATION, BY REV. J. A. LYON, D. D., COLUMBUS, MISS., - - - - -	470
VII.—STUART ROBINSON'S CHURCH OF GOD, ANONYMOUS,	480
VIII.—CRITICAL NOTICES, - - - - -	500
IX.—PERIODICAL LITERATURE, - - - - -	509

## NUMBER IV.

I.—THE ASTRONOMICAL ARGUMENT AGAINST CHRISTIANITY, BY REV. THOMAS A. HOYT, ABBEVILLE, S. C., - - - - -	513
--	-----

CONTENTS.

v

ARTICLE	PAGE
II.—THE STATESMAN, BY W. C. MORAGNE, ESQ., EDGEFIELD, S. C., - - - - -	531
III.—THE FULLNESS OF TIME, BY S. J. P. ANDERSON, D. D., ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI, - - - - -	556
IV.—MORALITY OF THE LEGAL PROFESSION, BY ROBERT L. DABNEY, D. D., UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, VIRGINIA, - - - - -	571
V.—THE SUPPORT OF SUPERANNUATED MINISTERS, AND THE INDIGENT FAMILIES OF DECEASED MINISTERS, BY REV. J. L. GIRARDEAU, CHARLESTON, S. C., - - - - -	592
VI.—THE PROPHETIC PERIOD OF 1260 YEARS, BY PROF. E. C. ROCKWELL, DAVIDSON COLLEGE, N. C., - - - - -	609
VII.—THE EARLY PRESBYTERIAN IMMIGRATION INTO SOUTH CAROLINA, BY REV. GEORGE HOWE, D. D., COLUMBIA, S. C., - - - - -	627
VIII.—CRITICAL NOTICES, - - - - -	665
IX.—PERIODICAL LITERATURE, - - - - -	682

# THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XI.—No. 1.

---

APRIL, MDCCCLVIII.

---

ARTICLE I.

## RELATION OF BAPTIZED CHILDREN TO THE CHURCH.

The most important point, perhaps, in the controversy of infant baptism, as it now stands, is the determination of the precise relation sustained to the church by baptized children; and, as consequent upon this, of the benefits accruing to them from their baptism and the church relation into which it brings them. For let the anti-pædo Baptists say what they will and think what they will, the main argument by which, for the most part, they uphold their cause, consists only in making light of and ridiculing the baptism ("rantism," as they are pleased to call it,) of infants as a thing absurd in itself, and that can serve no good or useful purpose. Only let us, therefore, clearly show the true import of infant baptism, and its place in the economy of salvation, together with the many and precious benefits through it conferred upon the subjects of it, and we will have effectually turned aside the edge of the weapon that has always proved most serviceable to our opponents in this cause.

Another, and a much more important end, however, than

the silencing of the anti-pædo Baptists, (even were that possible,) to be gained by a full exposition of the subject before us, is the instruction of parents and church sessions upon the great importance of the rite of baptism in the case of infants, and their direction as to the best way of fulfilling the terms of this covenanting ordinance, so far as themselves are concerned, and of securing the blessings it is intended and calculated to confer.

All we have to say upon the subject thus introduced, may conveniently enough be comprised under the following heads: *first*, the relation of baptized children to the church general; *secondly*, their relation to the particular churches in which the rite is received; *thirdly*, their relation to the privileges of the church; and, *fourthly*, their relation to its discipline. We purpose also, before we conclude, to say something more directly on the benefits of infant baptism, both to the children themselves, and to the church at large.

First, then, we have to determine the relation of baptized children to the Church General or Catholic; which is, we conceive, that they are members of it. And this we would endeavor to illustrate and establish—*first*, from the general opinion of Christians in all ages, upon the subject; and, *secondly*, from the teaching of the Scriptures, direct and indirect, in reference to the matter.

By the Church General or Catholic, in the sense in which it is here taken, is meant the entire body of Christ's professing people throughout the world. This is not actually, and as a whole, an organized church; there being no laws and no officers of government to which all comprised in it are subject. It is, however, plainly one body; and for the organization it should have, as a whole, its several and partial organizations, under the different denominations and national churches of the world, may be considered as making up, though imperfectly. Of this church, then, conceived of as one body and one organization, which it is ideally and according to the will of Christ, and practically to some extent—of this Church General or Church Catholic, we say baptized children are members. And this our assertion may, as was said before, be proved both from the

teaching of Scripture and the common consent of Christians in all ages.

That all the Protestant Churches of the Reformation that have practised infant baptism, (which is for the greater part of the time since the Reformation, the whole of these churches, with but trifling exceptions); and that the Romish Church, through all times and periods of her history, have considered baptized children as church members as much as any body else, is a thing easily made to appear. What other points of difference may, from time to time, have arisen between these various churches, and they are points numerous and important, they have still continued all of one mind and of one heart in making their baptized children members of their churches.

That this is true of the ROMISH CHURCH is plain to all who know any thing of her history or constitution. This church we may consider as having had her first beginnings in the fifth or sixth century, or some time shortly after; and, as continuing to grow more and more Romish, or in other words more and more corrupt, till the sixteenth century, from which time till the present she has protracted her existence in a somewhat modified form, and with great diminution of power and influence. There is one thing, however, in which this church has never changed, but, in reference to which, she has been one and the same church, and has had one and the same opinion; and that is the regarding of her baptized children, or indeed all her children, baptized or unbaptized, as church members. The sacrament of baptism she treats as strictly a church ordinance, and as to be administered only to such as actually are, or are entitled to be church members. The same rite she also regards as a regenerating ordinance, and as procuring forgiveness of sin and introduction into a state of grace and salvation to all to whom it is properly administered. Baptized children, therefore, and all other baptized persons, must needs be, in the estimation of Romanists, members of the visible, as they are members of the invisible church; especially, as with them, the two things are identical. And so they always treat such persons.

It should be observed here, too, that up to the time of the

4      *Relation of Baptized Children to the Church.*

Reformation the Romish Church is to be considered as embracing all the Christians of the western world, with the exception of some few small sects that in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and a little onward, inhabited the northern parts of Italy and southern parts of France. Of these sects, the greater part as the Cathari, the Luciferians, the Runcarians, the Publicans and the like of them, were not only carried away with frantic enthusiasm, but were also downright Manichees, and denied all water baptism whatever, and to any subject. And as to these, we neither know nor care to inquire after their sentiments about the church standing of children. It is different, however, with the Waldenses, who seem to have been from the first a pious, and, in the main, an orthodox people. They, however, with the exception of Peter Bruis and Henry of Clugny, and some few followers of theirs, differed nothing from the Romish Church about either the baptism of infants or their church relationship. (Vide Walls' Hist. of Infant Baptism; vol. II., chap. VII., and the authorities there cited.)

Passing on to the opinion of the different Protestant Churches upon the subject in hand, we may be allowed to refer first to that of our own Church, of the PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH in America, Scotland, and every other country where it exists. And here our work of citation is easy, and may be briefly and sufficiently discharged by referring first, to chapter 25, section 2, of the Confession of Faith, and secondly to the answer to question 62 of the larger catechism. In both of these places we have definitions of the visible Catholic Church; and in both of them, the children of such as profess the true religion are included in that Church, as equally with their parents, members of it. "The visible Church," says the confession, the "visible Church which is also Catholic or universal under the Gospel, (not confined to one nation as before under the law,) consists of all those throughout the world that profess the true religion, together with their children, &c." The other passage referred to is of similar import. "The visible church is a society made up of all such as in all ages and places of the world do profess the true religion, and of their children."

This is all very direct and very express. And with this in



our symbolical books, that any Presbyterian should doubt of the relation of baptized children to the Church Catholic, at least, can be attributed only to one or other of two things, viz : Either that such persons have not read, or that they do not in this matter hold to our standards. For whatever may be any one's individual opinion on this subject, there can be no possible doubt about the view our church takes of it. Nor is there any thing here said of perfect and imperfect church membership ; as if children could be members in one sense and adults members in another and quite a different sense, as seems to be the opinion of some. Our standards attempt no such hair-splitting as this, but make baptized children simply members of the church, as they do *the parents* of these children.

Next of the churches of the reformation would we cite the opinion of the LUTHERAN, the first in years and not least in honor of them all. With this church also, as with all others, baptism is a church ordinance, and is administered only as the initiatory rite of the church, and a means of grace. The Augsburg confession says of both the sacraments together, that they are given, "*non modo ut sint nota professionis inter homines, sed magis ut sint signa et testimonia voluntatis Dei erga nos, &c.*" "Not only to serve as badges of profession among men, but more especially as signs and evidences of God's good will toward us." Here, while the sacraments are, indeed, both of them, as they ought always to be, represented as means of grace more than any thing else, they are also made to be badges of profession, or signs of church membership, as a thing not to be proved or even asserted, but taken for granted as known and allowed of all. Melancthon, too, in his apology for the confession founds the practice of infant baptism on the alleged fact that infants are members of the church. Children, he says, have the promise of salvation ; and as salvation is to be had only in the church, and through means of the sacraments, which are church ordinances, therefore children are in the church. His words cited in full are as follows : "*Certissimum est enim, quod promissio salutis pertinet etiam ad parvulos. Neque vero pertinet ad illos qui sunt extra ecclesiam Christi, ubi nec verbum, nec sacramenta sunt, quia regnum Christi tan-*

*tum cum verbo et sacramentis existet.*" (*Hase Libri symbolici*, p. 156.) Some things it may be there are here which do not sound very orthodox in English. All however, that we adduce the passage to prove is the fact, that with Lutherans baptized children are members of the church. And this, taken as it is from one of their symbolical books it certainly does prove. The argument given for the doctrine may or may not be good ; but the fact of the doctrine being held is clear.

As evidence that the CHURCH OF ENGLAND agrees in regard to the question before us with those other churches whose opinions have been cited, the 27th of the 39 articles is sufficient. Baptism is there defined to be "not only a sign of profession, and mark of difference, whereby Christian men are discerned from others that be not christened : but it is also a sign of regeneration, or new birth, whereby, as by an instrument, they that receive baptism rightly are grafted into the church," &c. Take also the following from the office of baptism : "Seeing now, dearly beloved brethren, that this child is regenerate, and *grafted into the body of Christ's Church*; let us give thanks unto Almighty God for these benefits, and with one accord make our prayers unto him, that this child may lead the rest of his life according to this beginning." To the same purpose, and with equal explicitness, speaks the catechism.

In regard to the other Reformed Churches, it will not be necessary to quote at length from their respective confessions, to prove that they are and always have been of the same mind on the point before us with those whose opinions have been cited at length. Any body who wishes to pursue the inquiry will find the means of doing so in Niemeyer's "Collection of Confessions," or any similar work. There he will meet with abundant evidence that it is not merely the doctrine of this or that Sect or Denomination, but of the Universal Protestant Church from the days of the Reformation till the present (with only the inconsiderable exceptions mentioned above,) that all baptized infants are as truly as baptized adults members of the visible church. So teach in one shape or other the Heidelberg Catechism, the Bohemic and First and Second Helvetic Confessions, the Belgic and Gallican Confessions, the Genevan

Catechism, the Consensus Poloniæ, or Articles of Agreement between the churches of Poland, Russia, Lithuania, &c., and in a word, all the numerous symbols of the various Protestant Churches of Europe from the reformation till the present time.

To the same purpose also have been the decisions of the Puritan Churches in our own country as is shown by Dr. Romeyn, in his able report upon the "disciplining of baptized children," made to the General Assembly in 1812.

That infant baptism now is, and for the last fourteen hundred years at least has been practised by THE GREEK CHURCH, which embraces the Christians of Russia, Turkey, and the East generally, is now allowed by learned and impartial men on all sides, and is susceptible of clear and easy proof did we wish to enter into that matter, which we do not. Nor is it any more doubtful of this Church whether she considers her baptized children church members than it is whether or not she baptizes any children at all: for she administers the sacrament of the Lord's Supper to such children from the time of their baptism, and in all other respects treats them as members of her communion in good and full standing. Whatever the testimony of this Church is worth, therefore, it is altogether on the side of infant baptism and infant church membership. And in estimating the value of such evidence, we should not consider this church only in her present, corrupt and lifeless state, but extend our regards of her also back to that time when she was the strength and glory of Christendom, in which time she assumed the form and adopted the rites she still preserves: and preserves all the better perhaps for the condition of petrified formalism into which she so soon fell, and in which she still continues until, as we hope ere long to see it, the spirit of God shall breathe a new evangelic life into her dry, dead bones.

We now come to the PRIMITIVE CHURCH, the church of the first three or four centuries, and the opinion of that in reference to the question we are treating of. And here, as need is, we will be more particular than heretofore. The piety of the church during this period is, on all hands, allowed to have been sincere, intelligent and earnest, and its religion free from the innumerable and destructive superstitions afterwards intro-

duced through state corruption, and nearer intimacy with heathenism connected with a greater disposition to conciliate it.— And the opinion of a pure and pious church must always be of greatest weight on any such subject as that before us. But there is something else which adds much to the authority of the Primitive Church in the present question derived from its piety, and which makes that authority peculiar. This is its proximity to the times of the Apostles. The Primitive Church trenches upon the Apostolical, and must, in the earlier periods of its history especially, have copied the practices of the latter. And this consideration it is, above all others, that would make us seek carefully into the opinion of this early church about the rights and privileges of infants under the Gospel dispensation. If we are sure that Christians and Christian Churches, in the times we are now upon, regarded and treated the baptized children of professing parents as church members no less than the parents themselves, we may be almost equally sure that the Apostles, and the churches they founded and presided over, did the same. And *vice versa*: if these Christians did not so act towards their baptized children, it is likely the Apostles did not; and we will demand the clearer proof from Scripture that they did before we will believe it. This every body feels, and feels strongly. Speculative opinions are indeed light and airy things, and may change easily and often. But not so with the inherited rites and customs of churches and nations. These are opinions having local habitations and names; and names and habitations they do not easily surrender. But even if they do surrender them it is not without some bustle and noise, and legislative enactments which leave their mark and memory behind. We do therefore set much by the example of the Primitive Church in the matter in hand; and so too must all persons who have not the consciousness within them that that example makes against their own cause. We all make light of the authority that leans in a direction we do not wish: which is the reason why antiquity and precedent are always in bad odor with innovators.

Before proceeding to the direct and immediate evidence that the Primitive Church regarded baptized children as church

members, we will naturally be expected to say something in evidence that children were baptized by this church. Those who deny the one, for the most part deny the other : and it would certainly be a little awkward to go about proving that the Primitive Church regarded her baptized children as within the pale of her communion to persons disbelieving that she had any baptized children at all. And besides, having shown of baptism that it was at this time applied to children, we will be allowed then to argue from the import of the ordinance *in general* to its use and import in the case of children, even though children as a class be not mentioned in the place where such import of the rite is taught. If for instance we should find it taught by ancient authors that baptism always regenerated the subjects of it, and was given of God as a means of so doing, then would we infer of these authors that they considered all persons, young or old, who were duly baptized, to be regenerated. And in like manner if we find it to be the opinion of these same men that baptism, among other ends of it serves, and in the institution of it was intended to serve, as an initiatory rite of the Christian Church, then may we say that all whom such persons baptized they, according to their own notion at least, received into the church ; although no express mention be made that they considered themselves so to do. Whatever, in short, a rite means *in and of itself* and *according to the acknowledged intention of him who established it*, it means always and to all persons to whom it is rightly applied. And to prove that there was infant membership in the primitive or any other church, we have only to prove that infants were then baptized, and that baptism was understood by the church so administering it to imply or constitute church membership. The proof of infant baptism in the Primitive Church does therefore become an essential part of our argument in proof of infant church membership under the same church. And to this we would, therefore, now for a brief space, invite the attention of our readers.

AURELIUS AUGUSTINE, whose name is to this day as widely known almost as that Gospel he so ably expounded and defended, was born in Africa, in the small village of Tagaste, of the inland parts of Numidia, on the 13th of November, 354. His mother,

the well known MONICA, was a Christian, and is distinguished as another Eunice or Lois for the diligence and care with which she trained her son from earliest childhood to the knowledge and obedience of the Divine word. His father, Patricius, was at the time of the son's birth and for many years after, a heathen: and it was no doubt owing to this man's anti-Christianity, linked with his very selfish and imperious disposition, that the child of the devout Monica was not baptized in infancy according to the universal custom of the church at that time. The young Augustine from the first enjoyed good educational advantages, and was, after the 17th year of his age, transferred to the city of Carthage, the literary and religious metropolis in his time of the Northern and Western parts of Africa, there to finish his *curriculum*, under the best teachers of Rhetoric and Logic, which were the great studies of that day. Here, however, unfortunately, his moral by no means kept pace with his intellectual progress, which was very great. He had now no Monica to watch over and direct him, and he soon fell into bad company, and became utterly profligate in his manners, and an adherent also of the boastful Manichæan philosophy, from the stern and baneful bondage of which he recovered not himself until at length, after the lapse of not less than nine or ten years, he was by the light and grace of the Divine Spirit introduced into the glorious liberty of the children of God. This happy event took place in 387, and was brought about by the preaching of the renowned AMBROSE in Milan, whither Augustine had gone to teach Rhetoric, having previously for some time exercised the same profession first in his native village, then in Carthage, where he had himself first learned the art, and afterwards in Rome. Soon after this, we find our young and ardent convert on his way home to his native town: whither having arrived, he quickly sold out his possessions,—both his parents being now dead,—made distribution of the avails to such as were in need, and retired from the world with a few companions of kindred spirit, for the purposes of study and meditation. This seclusion, useful enough in its place and for a time, was put an end to, when in 391 the subject of our narrative was ordained presbyter in the church of Hippo Regius (now Bona)

a seaport town of his native State. Of the same church he afterwards became associate Bishop with Valerius, by whom he had been made presbyter. This was in 395, from which time he went on rapidly growing in usefulness, influence and fame, until previous to his death, which occurred in 430, in the 76th year of his age, he was second to none, perhaps, throughout the entire Christian world, in the esteem in which he was held for learning, piety, and complete and fruitful consecration to the service of his Lord and Master. Nor are there many opinions of contemporary antiquity about men that have been more fully and cordially ratified by posterity than has this. Augustine is to-day, as far as respects the esteem put upon his life and services, and the influence of his name, **THE FATHER OF ALL THE FATHERS.**

Now, than this Augustine, there is perhaps no man of his time, or none but one, we would rather trust to for information in regard to any and all questions of church doctrine and discipline, as then held and practised. If we cannot put confidence in his word and declaration in these matters, in whose can we? He was unquestionably a learned man, and was particularly conversant with the history and antiquities, and all the rites and ceremonies of the church, having written, as all know, accounts of all the heresies that had arisen in the church previously to his own time. And all this learning he knew well how to use with effect against the errorists of his own day, whether Manichæans, Donatists or Pelagians; with all of whom he carried on long and very successful controversies. He was also unusually moderate, candid, and conciliating for a controversialist, and withal devotedly pious and pure. Seldom, indeed, has any man been more abundantly endowed with the attributes which entitle one to credence in the narration of facts, or respect in the enunciation of opinions, than was that Aurelius Augustine of whom we write. Nor can it be well said that there was any other more fully acquainted with the state of affairs in the church at the time he wrote, or the rites and ceremonies then practised, than he was.

What then, we have next to inquire, does Augustine say of infant baptism, and the practice of it in the church of his time?

Or does he say anything on the subject? He says much on the subject, and what, rightly considered, must convince all candid men that at his time, as thenceforward until nearly or quite the reformation, this practice was universal in the church. This learned, candid, truthful Augustine, declares in one place that the entire church had from of old and constantly, and till the time he wrote in, without exception of any sect or party, held that *infants obtained remission of sins by baptism*. And if so, much more did that church hold that *they were to be baptized*. And in another place he asserts that *no council of the church had ever instituted infant baptism, but that always and from the beginning it had been practised by the church*; from which facts he would infer, and we think correctly, that it must have been of Apostolical origin and tradition. And that in truth, it was so, he in another place expressly asserts: "*Consuetudo tamen matris ecclesie in baptizandis parvulis nequaquam spernanda est, neque ullo modo superflua deputanda, nec omnino credenda est nisi apostolica esse traditio*"—"the custom of our mother, the church, in baptizing little children, must by no means be disregarded, nor esteemed to be needless, nor reckoned other than an Apostolical tradition," *i. e.*, a thing introduced first by the Apostles, and from them handed down to the succeeding church. This same Apostolical institution of infant baptism our author also elsewhere bases upon Scripture; as where in his interpretation of 1 Cor. 7: 14, he makes the term "holy" as applied to children either one of whose parents was a believer, mean "*baptized*."

These quotations from Augustine are taken from his books against the Donatists and the Pelagians; neither of which parties (as is sometimes falsely represented) differed from Augustine and the orthodox church as regards either the lawfulness or obligation of infant baptism; but only in that, on the one hand the Donatists recognized not any other baptism than that administered by their own party; and in that the Pelagians, on their part, denied that infant baptism had any respect to original sin, or could be adduced in proof of such a thing. And certainly these quotations do prove the universality of infant baptism at this time; being met, as they are by no rebut-



ting testimony of any kind. Not a man can be mentioned in this period, the close of the fourth and beginning of the fifth century, who opposed infant baptism, unless he be taken from some of those Gnostic sects who denied all water-baptism; nor, we believe, can one sentence be pointed to as written in this period, which makes for the cause of anti-pædo Baptism. We may, therefore, we think, from these repeated, clear and explicit assertions of Augustine, safely conclude that infant baptism was the universal practice of the church in his time. The fact is one he could not have been mistaken about; and yet has he asserted it over and over again, and without hesitation, and as a thing universally known, and which no man would or could deny.

But if these assertions of Augustine needed confirmation, we could give it in abundance from other writers of that time; as **CHRYSOStOM**, the eloquent Patriarch of Constantinople, and **JEROME**, the learned and laborious translator of the Bible, to whom we referred in our remark concerning Augustine, that there was at most but one writer of his time that could be deemed a superior authority to himself in regard to the matter in question. These all bear concurrent testimony with Augustine, not only that the baptism of infants was practised in their time, but also that it was warrantable and obligatory. Jerome, in his letter to **LETA**, makes it a sin in parents not to have their children baptized; and Chrysostom puts baptism now in the place of circumcision before, and makes it capable of being received by "one in infancy, or one in middle age, or one in old age;" in short, by persons in any and every age. And to the same effect with what these writers say, we have also cited in **Wall** \* some canons and enactments of certain councils of Carthage, held from 397 to 400, in which infant baptism is assumed as a thing allowed and practised by all.

But the testimony by which more than any other the averments of Augustine in reference to infant baptism will be borne out, is that of his great adversary, **PELAGIUS**, and *his* immediate associates and disciples. None of these ever denied either the

---

\* *Hist. of Infant Bap.*—part 1, chap. 16.

universality of the practice of infant baptism or its divine origin and obligation; although they were exceedingly hard pressed by the argument drawn from this practice against the doctrines of which they would be the Apostles; and although they had learning enough to have discovered, and boldness enough to have asserted, anything that from any age or any source could have been adduced against the custom. But nothing of this kind did they once attempt. Pelagius, indeed, uses even stronger language than did ever Augustine in his asseverations of the admitted practice of infant baptism, affirming that he had "*never heard, not even of any impious heretic that denied baptism to infants.*" He constructs an argument too from Scripture or attempts to do so, in favor of the giving of baptism to children. And in nothing that we have heard of, was he differed from in this matter by Celestius or Julian. Here is, therefore, the strongest possible confirmation of the opinions we have cited from Augustine. These Pelagians never could and never did answer the argument brought from infant baptism for original sin; but yet they would never deny or question the lawfulness or the Divine appointment of the rite in this use of it. And they *would not* only because they *could not*, the testimony of facts being then too clear and too conclusive against them.

We have said that Augustine is good authority for the universal practice of infant baptism in his own age. But that is not saying enough. He is much more; he is good authority for it ages before his own time. He says it was an Apostolical institution, as we shall find Origen also affirming 200 years before; and who can say that he had not the best warrant for so saying, and which may in part at least be lost to us through the great destruction of books that has since taken place. But, let this be as it may, very certain it is that the practice of infant baptism could not have originated at any time very near the age of Augustine, and he, who was so deeply read in the antiquities of the church never have heard or read of any sect that did not baptize infants. It is hard, *very hard*, to reconcile this ignorance of Augustine and of Pelagius and of so many other distinguished men of the same age, with any theory of

infant baptism that would introduce it after the times of the Apostles. Neander may affirm its rise to have been in the second or third century, and so may Bunsen and others besides, and learned men too. But for our part we can not see why Augustine and Pelagius and Jerome and Chrysostom should not be as good authorities on this subject as any men of the present day. If they were three hundred years from the Apostles, we are six times three hundred; nor certainly have we anything like the same means with them of satisfactorily determining the matter. It may be remarked too that Pelagius had exactly the same temptation with Bunsen to deny the Apostolicality of infant baptism, if we are to judge from the Hippolytus of the latter. But he did not do it, and he did not do it because every man of his time knew, or at least believed to the contrary. And that they all so believed is strange, if in point of fact it were not so. At any rate, and beyond all controversy, the testimony of these men is sufficient to carry us back at least one or two centuries further in quest of the cradle of infant baptism.

From Augustine we may, we hope, now pass on to CYPRIAN without bestowing much attention on the intervening period; which is in all but one century, or a little over that. This we would do, however, not because we are without authorities to cite for this period, but only because we have not time to cite them. They may be seen in Wall, chaps. 7—13, by any who wish to examine them. Among them may be seen the names of Ambrose, Basil the Great, Gregory Nazienzen, Optatus Bishop of Milevi, and finally a decree of the Council of Eliberis held in 305. All these authors, living in all parts of the then Christian world, do either expressly assert the practice of infant baptism in their times, or say something which most plainly implies the existence and prevalence of such a practice. And what is found in them together with what other authorities have previously been quoted do, had we nothing else, make it plain that as infant baptism was universal in the church in the time of Augustine, so it was not, and could not have been, begun to be practised in the time intervening between Augustine and Cyprian.

To Cyprian we therefore now come—THASCIUS CÆCILIVS CYPRIANUS, the renowned bishop of Carthage; born about A. D. 200; converted to Christ in 245; made Presbyter in 246, and bishop in 248; and beheaded for Christ's sake in 258, under the Roman Emperor Valerian, and by order of Galerius Maximus, Pro-consul of Africa. This man is author of several tractates and epistles, which have come down to us, and are much made use of by writers on infant baptism, as well in proof of its great prevalence at the time of Cyprian, as that he himself both approved of and practised it. One of the places most commonly cited for these purposes occurs in our author's book concerning the "Lapsed," ("De Lapsis,") or such persons as under the Decian persecution, in order to save their lives or liberties, sacrificed to idols, or complied with some other outward rite of heathenism, which compliance was taken for a renunciation of their own religion. In aggravating the crime and guilt of these persons, Cyprian, from things before observed, goes on to remark thus: "And that nothing might be wanting to the measure of their wickedness, their little infants also being led or brought in their parents' arms, *lost that which they had obtained presently after they were born.* (Wall, vol. I., pp. 142, 143.

Here there is a plain reference to baptism, and the inward grace by it conveyed to the recipient; for that the outward rite was always attended with inward grace was the universal opinion of these times. And the persons here assumed to have been baptized, are in the original variously styled "infants" (infants) and "parvuli" (little children.) They are also spoken of, some of them at least, as having been carried to the idol temple in the arms of their parents, and to have received their baptism presently after they were born, or "or at their first coming into the world," as Bingham has it—"in primo statim nativitatis exordio." In addition to all which it is obvious to remark, that unless it was at this time the common rule and practice for parents to have their children baptized, Cyprian could not speak as he here does. For how, otherwise, could he assume of these "lapsed" persons that the children they brought to the idol temples had been baptized? This is, therefore, a plain

testimony, not only that Cyprian baptized children, but that it was the custom in his time so to do.

But the passage of Cyprian, most of all in point here, occurs in a letter of his to one Fidus, a country bishop of Africa, who had propounded to Cyprian and a council assembled in Carthage the question whether it was right to baptize children before the eighth day, as was the practice of some; or whether (as this bishop thought) the rule given for the celebration of circumcision should not be allowed to determine the time of the administration of the corresponding Christian ordinance. The council which sat upon this question was held, as is to our purpose to remark, in the year of our Lord 252, and was composed of sixty-six bishops of the neighboring cities of the province of which Carthage was the metropolis. The result of the conference upon Fidus' query, was transmitted to him by Cyprian, as President of the council, in the letter aforementioned, and reads so far forth, as we are concerned with it, as follows:

“But as pertains to the case of infants, of whom you say that they ought not to be baptized within the second or third day after their birth, but that the rule of circumcision of old ought to be followed, and no one baptized and sanctified before the eighth day after he is born; we were all in our council of the opposite opinion. There was not one to agree with you in the course you would prescribe; but we were all, on the contrary, unanimously of the opinion that the mercy and grace of God are to be denied to no born human being. For whereas our Lord says in his Gospel, the son of man came not to destroy but to save the souls of men; as far as in us lies no soul is to be lost. And if the greatest offenders, and such as have beforehand sinned most grievously against God, have when they afterward come to believe, forgiveness of their sins, and no person is kept off from baptism and grace; how much less reason is there to prohibit an infant, who being newly born, has no other sin, save that, as he is descended from Adam according to the flesh, he has from his birth contracted the contagion of the death anciently threatened.”

That here is clear evidence for infant baptism at this time, and so far as this numerous council of bishops is concerned, is

undeniable. Nothing can be here insinuated, as is wont to be done in some other places, about the ambiguity of the documents quoted, or any doubtfulness as to the meaning of the language used. The language is explicit and admits of no perversion; for it is children under eight days old that are mentioned. And the Epistle itself is of unquestioned and unquestionable authenticity. And baptism, too, is by these bishops, both Fidus and those of the council, taken to have come in the place of circumcision; which has always furnished a good argument why it should be administered to infants no less than to adults.

But say the anti-pædo Baptists (and it almost chokes some of them to admit even this much) here it is that infant baptism began; and nowhere have we any evidence of a prior existence of it. So plead Tombes, Gale, Bunsen and others. Bunsen will, indeed, allow that children of six years of age and upwards, were baptized previously to this time, but not *infants*. The baptism of these, Cyprian was, he says, the first to establish as a principle; and that too, (our author is pleased to remark,) "impelled by a fanatical enthusiasm, and assisted by a bad interpretation of the old Testament."

And that the anti-pædo Baptists do show at least a commendable degree of prudence in affirming that infant baptism but took its rise, and was not the common practice, at this time, is evident. For how otherwise could they serve their cause? Cyprian was born but 100 years after the times of the Apostles, and the council in question was held no more than 52 years after the birth of Cyprian, and 152 after the decease of the Apostle John. And if now baptism was at this time prevalent in the church, it must almost have necessarily been of apostolical institution. It certainly was not a thing to have grown up in a day. The church of the two or three first centuries was, by acknowledgment, very pure and pious, and was, besides, in the midst of its many persecutions, and with all its earnest labors in defence and promotion of the Gospel, occupied with other things than the institution of unauthorized and superstitious rites and ceremonies. And had infant baptism been a thing of this description, and not of divine or apostolical origin,

it is hard to see how it could have become prevalent throughout the church in the course of the 150 years that elapsed from the death of the last of the Apostles till this council of Carthage. Their cause is pretty much lost, therefore, if these anti-pædo Baptists must admit that at this time infant baptism was not a new thing, but an old and well-established institution. And that so it was, and had not its beginning with Cyprian or this council of Carthage is, we think, susceptible of the clearest and most conclusive proof. How, indeed, anybody could ever have thought of denying that is a mystery to us.

In proof that infant baptism was common at the time of this council of bishops, no one can fail to have noticed that such is assumed to be the fact both by the council itself and by Fidus, whose inquiry the council were answering. Fidus does not ask the council if infants, at any age at which they could be called infants, may be baptized, but only whether they may be baptized before the eighth day. He takes it for granted that infant baptism will be allowed, and only doubts whether a child should be baptized before he is eight days old. And in the same way with the council. They take all for granted that Fidus does. They confine themselves entirely to the question propounded to them, and say not a word about the institution itself of infant baptism; as if that were a thing the propriety and lawfulness of which it had never entered into the head of any living man to doubt of. And in this they are unanimous—*“universi judicavimus.”* And how this could have happened had infant baptism been then a new thing, and not the universal practice of the church, we are totally unable to comprehend.

Augustine too, it may be remarked here, who knew well of this council, and often himself made use of its decisions in proof of original sin; nevertheless, in a passage we have already quoted, asserted that infant baptism was never instituted by any council of the church, but was practised from the beginning. And in still another place, we have not yet quoted, he says, in reference to the matter in question, that the council had *passed no new decree, but only expressed the opinion that had prevailed in the church from the first.*

But, perhaps, Cyprian was still the sole author of infant

baptism, and had, previously to the meeting of the council of 252, so leavened the minds of all these other bishops, that they were then but the exponents of his opinion. This is, however, utterly untenable. Cyprian had, at this time, been bishop but four years, according to Pearson, and a Christian but six years. And it is simply impossible that he could, in so short a period, whatever had been his diligence, have won over so many bishops, extending, as they must have done, over a very wide territory, unanimously to consent with him in foisting in a new and hitherto unheard of rite into the Christian church; or what is worse, in the perversion of an actually existing institution to a purpose utterly abhorrent to the mind of the whole church. And these bishops, too, were no doubt some of them older persons than Cyprian; and almost all of them are likely to have been Christians and bishops of longer standing than he; and that such men should have taken their cue from Cyprian in the way assumed in the supposition before us, is contrary alike to experience and the best known principles of human nature.

In addition to all this, we may quote as in point here, the remark of Neander (*Church Hist.*—vol. 1, p. 314, *Trans.*) that even “in the Persian Church infant baptism was, in the course of the third century, so generally recognized that the sect founder, Mani, thought he could draw an argument from it in favor of a doctrine which seemed to him necessarily pre-supposed by this application of the rite.” And this we hope Cyprian will not have to bear the blame of. Nor is it long after this time till we find evidence that infant baptism was recognized in other churches than that of Africa, and especially in the Church of Rome and Italy; which was not the one to borrow opinions from Cyprian, whom and his church with him, one of its own Bishops had excommunicated. And it seems to us something passing strange, that if Cyprian had been the introducer of an entirely new and unchristian application of the rite of baptism, not a word should have been said on that subject in the hot and prolonged controversy which in 253, the very year after the holding of the Carthaginian Council, arose between Stephen of Rome and Cyprian on the associated



question of *heretical baptism*. These are puzzles for the curious.

But, what ought to set the matter at rest, we remark that infants were actually baptized in the Church of Carthage before Cyprian was Bishop there, and probably before he was a Christian; even while he was worshipping the gods of his heathen ancestors, teaching rhetoric and law, and composing pleadings for such weak and ambitious advocates as were willing to buy them of him. The evidence of this is as follows: Cyprian became Bishop in 248, or as some will have it in 249; certainly not sooner than the latter part of the year 248. But about the close of 249 commenced the Decian persecution, in fear of which Cyprian left Carthage in January 250, according to Pearson. In 251 Decius was slain in battle, the persecution he had excited ceased, and our Bishop returned to his charge, after an absence of about fourteen months, and commenced that inquiry into the conduct of persons that had "lapsed" or apostatized, of which we have already said something. Now this "lapsing" must have taken place mostly in 250, as the persecution ended early in 251. And consequently it was in 250 that the children spoken of above, and said by Cyprian to have been baptized immediately upon their entrance into the world, ("*in primo statim nativitatis exordio*") were brought to the heathen temples by their apostatizing parents. But some of these children could then walk, and must therefore at this time have been five, six, seven or eight years of age. Only count back five years, however, from 250, and it will bring you to 245 for the time of the baptism of these children, which is a year previous to the conversion of Cyprian. And nobody will, we presume, say that Cyprian had even before his conversion, so much influence in the Christian Church as then to have introduced a new rite into it, or at least essentially modified and perverted an old one: not to say that he was probably otherwise engaged.

It is very plain therefore, we think, from all these considerations, that Cyprian was not the originator of infant baptism, but that both he and the other bishops we have seen to have been associated with him, received it from those who had preceded

them as an old well-established, and universally allowed institution. We are sure there is not a word nor a syllable in this conclusion that is not fully warranted by the premises. But if these sixty-six bishops and the people of their time so regarded infant baptism, its origination must certainly have been of very ancient date. These persons, however, lived only one hundred and fifty years after the times of the Apostles, and were some of them, doubtless, born within seventy or eighty years of those times, and their parents probably within those times, as Wall very justly remarks. And how then could these men have been ignorant of the origin of infant baptism, or supposed it to have been of Apostolical appointment had it not been so? From ourselves back to our fathers is not wont to be considered any great length of time. And why may not *their* information, in matters of so great concern as the rites of the church they belong to, extend even a little back of their infancy?

But besides all here given we have other good reasons for believing that neither Cyprian nor the Council of Carthage, which decided that children might receive the initiatory rite of the Christian Church before the eighth day after their birth, were the first originators of infant baptism, any more than was Peter De Bruis or the renowned Alexander Campbell. Not only is it, as we have seen, a provable thing that if Cyprian first introduced infant baptism into the church, he must have done it before he was a Christian; but, as we shall soon now see, even before he was born, which is more wonderful still. This appears from the writers who flourished before the time of Cyprian, and of whom as next in the order we are travelling in, we would first mention—

ORIGEN, surnamed ADAMANTIUS. This celebrated man whom Jerome, in his Catalogue of Illustrious Men, did not scruple to call the greatest Doctor of the Church since the Apostles, was born in Egypt, in the year of our era 185, of Christian parents. In the year 203, one year after the martyrdom of his father, and when he was himself but 18 years of age, Origen was made master of the celebrated Catechetical School of Alexandria, where he taught with great credit to himself, and so as to extend throughout the Christian world the fame of the institu-

tion he belonged to. He also travelled to Rome, and twice to Athens, and twice also to Arabia, and to Cappadocia in Asia Minor, and to Jerusalem, Antioch and Cæsarea in Palestine, in which latter city he resided a great part of his life. Nor was he only a much travelled man. Few men in any age, and none other in his own age, equalled him in depth and variety of learning. Jerome ascribes to him acquaintance with logic, geometry, arithmetic, music, grammar and rhetoric, and all the opinions of all the philosophers, and says of him that he wrote more than any body else could read. And certainly he did it, as Epiphanius says, he was author of *six thousand volumes*. Nor was this great presbyter less noted for earnest, practical and laborious piety, than he was for his prolific authorship. He died at Tyre in the year 254, and the 70th of his age, probably from injuries sustained in prison during the terrible Decian persecution.

Many passages are quoted from Origen in the Baptist controversy, but three especially which are noticed by everybody who writes on the subject, and of which alone we would here make mention, they being of themselves sufficient for our purpose. The first of these passages occurs in a Homily upon Leviticus. Our author is there treating of original sin, and proves it first from Psalm 51: 5. "Behold I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me;" in which passage David shows us, he remarks, that every soul that is born in the flesh is polluted with the filth of iniquity and sin. His next proof is also a passage of scripture Job, 14: 4, 5, but quoted from the Septuagint, according to which it reads: "But who is free from the pollution of sin? Not one though his life be but of the length of one day."

The next argument adduced is from *infant baptism*, and is thus put, according to Wall's literal rendering of the place: "Besides all this, let it be considered, what is the reason that whereas the baptism of the church is given for the forgiveness of sins, infants also are by the usage of the church baptized: when if there were nothing in infants that wanted forgiveness and mercy, the grace of baptism would be needless to them." Here infant baptism is not only asserted to be right, but to be

a usage of the Church. The custom too, and what is implied in it, is made use of as admitted by all to prove something called in question by some, namely original sin. And this is the strongest assurance we could have that infant baptism was at this time well known and universally practised. Origen argued for original sin from infant baptism as confidently, and according to his own mind as conclusively, as he did from a text of Scripture. And how could he have done this, if either on the one hand he had not believed the institution to have been of Divine appointment, or, on the other hand had supposed that any of his readers would have been of a contrary mind to himself in regard to the authority for it. This author evidently, right or wrong, believed as much in infant baptism as he did in his Bible, and judged too that all his readers, that is to say, all the then Christian world, would do the same.

The next passage from Origen is found in his homily upon the 14th chapter of Luke, and is as follows :

“Infants are baptized for the remission of sins. Of what sins? Or when were they committed? Or what explanation can be given of the use of the laver in the case of infants except that a little before given by us. None is free from pollution; no, not even though his life upon earth have been but of one day’s duration? And infants are baptized for the reason that by the sacrament of baptism the pollution of their birth is removed?”

The remarks made upon the previously cited passage are plainly applicable to this also; than which we neither can desire nor could obtain any better testimony for the prevalence of infant baptism in the time of Origen.

The third of the passages above referred to is closely akin, in the purport of it, to both those already cited, and especially to the first. It is found in his commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. Here again the subject is original sin; which Origen would prove, *first*, from that provision of the law for the purification of women which required that forty days after a child’s birth there be offered for him by his mother a sacrifice of two turtle doves or two young pigeons, the one for a burnt offering and the other for a sin offering. The sin of the child referred to in this latter offering cannot have been, our author remarks,

any actual transgression, and must therefore have been *native pollution*. And then he cites again as proof of the same doctrine, the language of David before given, and after that the custom of infant baptism in the following words: "For this too it was that *the church received from the Apostles, the order to baptize infants also*. For those to whom the Divine mysteries were committed knew that there was undoubtedly in all the pollution of sin, which must be washed away by water and the spirit. And for this cause also the body itself is called the body of sin."

Here not only is the prevalence of infant baptism in the church of Origen's time asserted as before, but it is also expressly said to have been of Divine or Apostolical institution. We need proceed no farther than this with Origen; he can tell us nothing more of infant baptism.

Now, against these clear testimonies from Origen there have at different times been urged by the anti-pædo Baptists two objections, and, so far as we are aware, only two. Of these, the first is, that as we have the passages quoted only in the Latin translations of Rufinus and Jerome, and not in the original Greek, they are worthless for purposes of argument. This objection is urged in the most querulous manner, and to the most unconscionable extent by Dr. Gale, in his "Reflections on Wall's History of Infant Baptism." At the present day, however, the objection is not treated with much respect by learned men, who argue from the passages as if in the "*ipsissima verba*" of the author. This objection, we may therefore pass over, as a mere cavil, which will be taken up only when men are without any thing else to say, and feel that they must say something. A full consideration of the objection may be read by those who wish it, in Wall, vol. 1, chap. 5, and vol. 4, chap. 13.

The other objection mentioned above is found in Bunsen's "Hippolytus and his Age," (vol. 1, p. 114) and is to the effect that the word here used for little children, "*parvuli*," is the same with that used by our Lord when he says—"suffer little children to come unto me," and by Irenæus in a passage where he distinguishes between babes (*infantes*) and boys (*pueri*—*parvuli*?)

In regard to this passage, we would remark, in the first place, that we are unable to comprehend how Origen can be asserted to use the same word with our Lord, when what the one said we have only in *Latin*, and what the other said only in *Greek*. But if he did, that would be with us an argument that he meant infants, properly so called; for the word used by our Lord (*παιδια*) does, frequently in the New Testament, denote infants, and in the particular passage Bunsen refers to can mean nothing else; it being there explained, (compare Luke 18: 15 with 18:16,) by *βρέφη* which means only babes.

That Irenæus does distinguish between *infantes* (infants) and *parvuli* (little children) is plain: but then he is in that place accumulating together all sorts of terms to denote every variety of age and condition. And that the word in question, when standing by itself, as in Origen it does, is used by all the ecclesiastical writers of these ages to denote babes among other little children, and is never taken as a specific term to denote persons of the particular age between six and ten years, it were more pedantic than difficult to show.

But why go to other authors to determine the meaning of this word, when Origen himself, and in the very passages quoted, plainly shows us in what sense he uses it? In one of those passages, the one taken from the Commentary on Romans, he applies this word *parvulus* to a child at the time of his mother's purification, which was but the fortieth or forty-first day of his own life. In the same connection, too, he speaks of this very child as a *nuper editus parvulus*, i. e., a newly born child. And can this be a child of from six to ten years of age? He, moreover, speaks of these children as yet incapable of any sin of their own. Most assuredly, then, Origen does in those very passages in which he speaks of the baptism of children (*parvuli*) use that term to denote *infants*.

The same thing is involved, too, in the tenor of the argument in the passages quoted. Our author is here proving that we all come into the world with sinful natures, and are polluted in soul, though our lives be but of the length of one day. And this he would establish—first, from texts of Scripture; and, secondly, from the Divinely appointed church custom of bap-

tizing children. But, if these children are only "growing up boys," how can the baptism of them prove anything as to the moral state of children in the hour of their birth. Origen plainly assumes that children are, from the first moment after birth, proper subjects for baptism; or if he does not, there is no sense in all he says upon this subject. And Bunsen will, we hope, be too gracious to bring the matter to so bad a pass as this with the man he so much admires and whose praise he elsewhere so eloquently proclaims. But sure it is, that if he does so he will do it against the opinion of all other learned men, so far as we know, who have written on these matters.

Origen was therefore unquestionably a pædo Baptist, and gives us the fullest assurance that in this respect he differed not from the church of his time. He was not only himself a pædo Baptist indeed; but after all his travelling, and with all his vast learning, and his extensive and minute acquaintance with the church of his times, both in its spirit and its practice, he plainly knew of nobody that was not a pædo Baptist that was a Christian, or at least that he thought worth naming or taking any notice of. He believed too, and in talking to others took for granted, that infant baptism was of *Apostolical authority and institution*. And we will be excused, we hope, for believing with him rather than with men of the present day, who with no more learning, have far more prejudice and infinitely inferior means for an authoritative determination of the matter. This man was born but about eighty years after the death of the last of the Apostles, and had as Eusebius informs us, not only a Christian father but Christian *ancestors*. If Origen therefore was not baptized, his father being a Christian, it could have been only because it was not the custom of Christians at that time to have their children baptized. But such he says was the custom, so that he must have been baptized. And if so, Origen's father must have believed in infant baptism, and therefore have been baptized by his father whom Eusebius' words require us to believe to have been also a Christian. And this will take us into Apostolical times. All this shows us at least how easy it was for Origen to have found out or rather how impossible it was for him to have been ignorant, whether

or not infant baptism was practised in the Apostolical Churches. And as he is by all learned and impartial men admitted to have received and regarded infant baptism as of Apostolical origin, his testimony for the practice in the early church even up to the time of the Apostles, is very strong and hard to be got over.

The writer next previous to Origen, who has anything to our present purpose is the Latin writer Tertullian, who was a native of Carthage and born about the year 160. He followed at first the profession of the law, but after his conversion became a presbyter of the church of his native city. His genius was, Mosheim remarks, "great but wild and unchastened, and his piety fervent, but gloomy and austere." About the year 200 or shortly after, he embraced and gave himself up to the dissemination and advocacy of the opinions of the Montanists, a sect that had arisen sometime before in Phrygia and which to a sort of rigid puritanism had added, the wildest fanaticism. They disallowed of second marriages as sinful, repudiated all pleasures, even those of science, and made the mortification of the flesh and the attainment of martyrdom to be "the chief end of man." The founder of the sect from whom also it took its name should, according to his own representations, and the faith of his followers, have been the Paraclete or Comforter promised by Christ; and was to do for the Christian religion what Romanists pretend tradition does, namely, to supplement revelation where it is defective, and explain it where it is difficult or doubtful. About the true bearing and use to be made of what Tertullian has remarked upon infant baptism, learned men have long differed, and do still to some extent differ. On the whole, the representation of the matter given us by the learned Dr. Schaff of Mercersburg, in his "History of the Apostolic Church," will, we think, commend itself to the mind of every candid reader as eminently judicious and impartial. The subject is there introduced after an examination of the Scripture argument for infant baptism and is thus disposed of:

"It is true, a witness has been brought from the end of the second century to overthrow this exegetical conclusion, and to prove a comparatively late introduction of the ordinance in question. We mean *Tertullian*, in his well known attack upon



infant baptism. But this very testimony of Tertullian, which is placed even by such distinguished scholars as Neander, Gieseler, and other pædo Baptist historians, in a distorted posture, and made to furnish unwarrantable inferences, proves most decidedly the *existence* of infant baptism, at that time, as well as of the custom, closely connected with it, of having god-parents (sponsors.) Nay more, Tertullian is aware that the practice of the whole church is against him, and he comes out, though unsuccessfully, as a reformer. Had he been able to appeal to antiquity and to oppose infant baptism as an innovation, he would certainly have taken advantage of this position. But he does not question the Apostolical origin of the ordinance, nor even its propriety and legality. Of an assertion of the invalidity of infant baptism and the necessity of a repetition of the sacrament, there is not the slightest trace either in Tertullian or in any other ancient Christian writer. Tertullian's objections relate solely to its expediency and judiciousness, and arise partly from his notion of the magical operation of the baptismal water, and partly from a kind of Christian policy, which in the third and fourth centuries led many distinguished men, as the Emperors Constantine and Theodosius, the church teachers Gregory of Nazianzen, his brother Cæsarius, and Augustine, while admitting the lawfulness and validity of infant baptism, to put off their own baptism to the age of maturity and strong faith, or even to the death bed; though Augustine at the same time explicitly declares, that he considers this a false view, and that it had been better for him, had he in tender youth been taken under the maternal care of the church. Tertullian holds an early baptism to be dangerous, because, according to his Montanistic notions, a mortal sin committed after baptism excludes for ever from the communion of the church, and probably incurs eternal damnation. On this ground he advises not only children, but even *adults* also, who are yet unmarried and under no vow of chastity, to put off baptism, until they are secure against temptation to gross carnal indulgence. This whole argument of Tertullian then rests on false premises, which were not admitted by the church. It comes before us simply as an individual private opinion against an already prevailing

theory and practice, and goes strongly therefore, to prove the contrary of what it has been often used to prove. All that can with any certainty be deduced from it is, that the baptism of children was not yet at that time *enjoined*, but left to the option of Christian parents. Otherwise Tertullian would hardly have contested it with so much decision. But as he had the spirit of the age against him in this matter, his protest, which, moreover, was inconsistent with some of his own principles, had no influence whatever. It fell without an echo."

In a note the same author remarks that Tertullian would, according to the principles he advocated, have had none baptized but "decrepit and married persons, monks and nuns." This is going a little farther than the Baptists would go; and if their own pet author, Tertullian is good against us he is good against themselves also, though, it is true, not quite to the same extent. In truth, however, he is good against nobody in this matter. What he gives us is only his own private opinion, in which he differed from the church. And, not only from the language of his own protest, but also from Origen, who was contemporary with Tertullian, though somewhat younger, do we know that infant baptism was at this time a received ordinance of the church.

Tertullian is the first of the Latin fathers whose writings have come down to us. Nor even from the Greeks that went before him have we at the present day many remains. Of those of them, however, any of whose writings have survived the devastations of time, even on the rude rafts of barbarous Latin translations, several do so speak of infant baptism as to show that it was in their times the common practice. Among these are Clement of Alexandria, Irenæus Bishop of Lyons, and Justin Martyr, as also one Hermas supposed to have been brother to a Bishop of Rome, and to have written his "pastor" or "shepherd" about the middle or in the early part of the second century.

From the first of these men who taught in the catechetical school of Alexandria about the year 191, and was previously to his conversion a Grecian philosopher, we will quote but one short passage. He is admonishing the Christians, to whom he

writes, to avoid all extravagance, indelicacy and conformity to heathenish customs in their modes of dressing and of ornamenting themselves, and especially advises them to be careful not to allow any idolatrous or lascivious devices on their signets or rings. He then suggests for different persons some such designs as he thought proper, remarking in regard to one particular class of persons thus: "*And if any one be by trade a fisherman, he will do well to think of an Apostle and the children taken out of the water.*" Here the allusion to the baptism of an infant is clear. And if so, it is plain, that infant baptism must have been the common custom of the church in this time of Clement, else he would have given to a whole class of persons no such direction as this. But this Clement must have been born not more than fifty years after the Apostolical century of church history.

The passage we would quote from IRENÆUS reads thus: "For he (Christ) came to save all by his own merit: all, I mean, who through him are *regenerated* unto God; both infants, and little children, and boys, and youths and old men. And therefore he himself passed through every age. For infants he became an infant, sanctifying infants: for little children he became a little child, sanctifying those of that age, and also giving to them an example of piety, justice and obedience. Also for youths, &c.

Now the only difficulty here, (if difficulty it can be called,) is in determining the meaning of the word *regenerated*: For that *Infants* in the proper sense of the word are here said to be *regenerated*, there can be no possible doubt. But that with the writers of this time the term "*regeneration*" was often used to denote *baptism* and nothing else, is plain from the writer we last named, who says expressly that baptism had the name also of regeneration, and who uses the two words interchangeably, and speaks also of Christ having been "*regenerated*" of John in the Jordan. And will any body say that Christ was ever "*regenerated*" in our sense of the word? The words *regenerated* and *baptized* are not, however, always used as synonymous terms in these writers; that Gale proved, and nobody perhaps, ever thought of denying. But that any one ever was, by Iren-

æus or any other writer of the early church, said to be *regenerated* who was not *baptized*, neither Gale nor any other man has proved or can prove. The terms are not indeed altogether equipollent, but the one always does according to the usage of this time suppose the other—*regeneration* always supposes *baptism*. And nobody is *regenerated* who is not *baptized*. When therefore, Irenæus speaks of infants being *regenerated*, he *implies* at least that they were *baptized*. He does, therefore, in the passage quoted, give testimony in favor of pædo Baptism. And such is now, we believe, the opinion of almost all impartial and competent scholars, who have given sufficient attention to the matter to be able to judge of it.

All we have further to say in reference to Irenæus is that he was, as is well known to all, the disciple of Polycarp, who was the disciple of the Apostle John. His testimony therefore in favor of infant baptism must fix it as an institution of Apostolical origin, if testimony is worth any thing in such a case.

The next writer we have to mention, JUSTIN MARTYR, or JUSTIN THE MARTYR, was born about the close of the Apostolical period, and had graduated in all the schools of heathen philosophy, Stoic, Peripatetic, Pythagorean and Platonic, before he became a Christian. The pieces of this writer usually quoted in favor of infant baptism are taken from two books of his, written a little before or a little after the year 150. In one of these passages he speaks of certain Christians of his time, then sixty or seventy years old, who had been made disciples from their childhood, (*οἱ ἐκ παιδῶν ἐμαθητεύθησαν τῷ χριστῷ*). Now this they could have been in no other way than by baptism. And the language here used may be interpreted by that of Mathew, 28 : 19—“Go ye, therefore, and make disciples of (not teach) all nations (by) baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,” &c. In the other passage of Justin he so speaks of baptism and circumcision as to make the former in the New Dispensation to have come in the place of the latter in the Old Dispensation. And this *will imply infant baptism*.

We have also referred to HERMAS as having taught some thing in favor of infant baptism. This he does only indirectly, however, and by inference. He teaches that none, not even

those who had died previously to the coming of Christ, can be saved without baptism; while yet in another place he speaks of all infants as *valued by the Lord and esteemed first of all*. And how these two things can be made consistent with each other except on the supposition that infants are baptized no man can show. This Hermas was most probably born in the Apostolical period: so that back to this period as the only one in which it could have originated, have we traced the institution of infant baptism.

Against all these arguments for the practice of infant baptism in the early church, it is, however, replied by our adversaries that it is strange that infant baptism, if indeed practised in these times, is not more frequently mentioned in contemporary writings. And from the fact that it is not more frequently mentioned in such writings do these persons conclude that the introduction of it was of late date. But if sufficient reference is made to the ordinance by the early Christian writers to enable us to prove its existence in the Church in every period of her history, that ought to be enough. *That* there is, and that is all pædo Baptists wish; and why should anti-pædo Baptists desire more? Besides, any one who will consider how few remains we have of the early literature of the church, as well as the character of these writings and the little opportunity furnished in the discussions they contain for any mention of infant baptism, will not be surprised that it is no more frequently brought forward.

But it is further objected that according even to the writers we quote for infant baptism and others also, baptism ought to be preceded by instruction and examination, and implies self-dedication to God and His service on the part of the recipient; all which, it is alleged, proves infants incapable of baptism. But if we have the same men teaching in one place that infants may and ought to be baptized, and in another place that baptism ought to be preceded or attended by such exercises on the part of the subject as infants are not capable of, may we not, and should we not, reconcile these apparently contradictory statements by supposing that in the latter places the baptism of adults only, and not of infants, is alluded to. In the catechism

of the English Church in answer to the question. "What is required of persons to be baptized?" it is said, "*Repentance*, whereby they forsake sin; and *Faith*, whereby they steadfastly believe the promises of God made to the sacrament." Now, does any one Father of the early church say anything of baptism that would apparently more necessarily confine it to adults, than do these words of the English Catechism? But the English Church did and does, nevertheless, practice infant baptism. Indeed, under the question next following the one we have cited, this church teaches that *infants* should be baptized. And need we expect any greater consistency from the fathers of the Primitive, than from the founders of the English Church in this matter. Or may we not as well conclude from one passage of the English Catechism against another that the church of which this is a symbolical book, does not practise infant baptism as to argue in precisely the same way upon the writings of the early church? This argument is therefore unavailing and worthless. The writings of the early Christians do prove that those Christians did baptize infants, no matter what were their speculations on the nature and requirements of the ordinance in general, and in reference to a very different class of persons.

We do therefore, and we hope with the full concurrence of our readers, conclude that the baptism of infants was practised by the Primitive Church even from the time of the Apostles. And we will now, therefore, proceed to show further that all infants to whom this rite was applied were by the same church regarded as introduced thereby into the fellowship of God's people, and made members of the visible Catholic Church. For proof of this position we may refer first of all to the general import and use of baptism as held by all churches of all ages, and particularly by the church of those first ages with which we have here especially to do. That baptism does, in any case, serve no other purposes than those of a badge of profession and an initiatory rite of the church, we will indeed never admit. But that these purposes among others it *does serve* is very true, and has been, we believe, the opinion of all churches in all times, that ever practised baptism. So teach, as we have

already seen, the Lutheran Symbols, and those also of the English Church. Nor is it different with any church that we know of, pædo Baptist or anti-pædo Baptist. In them all baptism is an initiatory rite, though not that alone; so that all persons that receive it are regarded as church members. And that it was not different with the Primitive Church every thing proves. No one is by the writers of this church recognized as a Christian who is not baptized, while every baptized person is so recognized, as if it were baptism that entitled a person to the name of Christian, or made men to be of the church. Tertullian too in a passage of his works already referred to, says of children carried in their infancy for baptism, "let them be made Christians (baptized) when they can know Christ;" where, although he does discourage the baptism of infants, he yet does plainly consider all baptized persons as *Christians*, and indeed treats it as the object of baptism to make the recipients of it *Christians* and *church members*. And Clement of Alexandria in a passage similar in import to this of Tertullian, speaks of it as a great slander of the Valentinian heretics against the orthodox church, that the baptism of this church did not make all the receivers thereof completely Christians, thereby showing undoubtedly that he regarded such to be the effect and object of all true baptism. Other writers of these times do also speak to the same purpose, so that we are undoubtedly to receive it as the opinion of the early church that all baptized persons are church members. And therefore we believe it to have been the opinion of this same church that *baptized children* were church members. This latter seems to be clearly enough involved in the other. So at least we may take the matter to be, until the contrary is shown, which we are sure it never can be.

Again it seems to have been the common opinion in the early church that baptism under the New took the place of circumcision under the Old Dispensation. And if so, then, as by circumcision under the one economy children were made church members, so would they be by baptism under the other economy. Circumcision was formerly the initiatory rite of the church for all alike, for infants of eight *days*, no less than for men of eighty

and ninety years old. And if under the New Testament church baptism fulfills the same purpose with this circumcision under the Old Testament, it must also initiate into the church all who receive it. Consequently they who baptized children, (as the ancient church always did,) and at the same time taught that baptism came in the place of circumcision, did most clearly signify it to be their mind that infants and all others were by baptism constituted church members.

And that we do not misrepresent the early church in saying baptism was by her assumed to have come in place of circumcision, our readers have already had some evidence; for Justin Martyr in the second century, and Cyprian in the third, and Chrysostom in the fourth, have been above cited in favor of this opinion. And besides these we might cite to the same purpose passages from Origen also, and from Gregory Nazianzen, and Basil the Great and Augustine. The words of Gregory in relation to the matter are very explicit. "*And a ground of this,*" (infant baptism,) says he, "*is circumcision which was given on the eighth day, and was a typical seal, and was practised on those that had no reason.*" Basil declares against all unnecessary delay in baptism, alleging that a Jew never put off circumcision, owing to the threatening that every soul not circumcised on the eight day should be cut off. And shall we, says he, notwithstanding the threatening of the Lord, that no one, except he be born of water and the Spirit shall enter into the kingdom of God,—shall we delay the "*circumcision made without hands in the putting off the flesh, which is performed in baptism.*" Origen's words are that Christ "gives us circumcision by baptism." These authorities, together with those before quoted, are abundantly sufficient to evince the truth of our assertion that the early church did suppose baptism in the Christian to correspond to circumcision in the Jewish Church. And if so, as before stated, then does baptism now, as formerly did circumcision, initiate into the church all who receive it.

Another circumstance that goes strongly to prove that baptized infants were regarded as church members in the time we speak of, is the well known fact that the early church considered all baptized persons to be regenerated or brought into a



Christian state. Augustine says, that he had never heard of any sect which denied that infants were baptized for remission of sins. And neither do we find any of the first writers denying the same. They do all, indeed, without exception, hold that baptism secures the forgiveness of past sins, and a certain impartation of grace, to enable the person baptized to resist future temptations and live to God. This they hold, however, not as if the outward ordinance itself regenerated, which is an invention of much later times, but because they believed that the outward and visible sign was always attended with the inward and invisible grace of the Spirit. In no objectionable sense, then, did these Christians teach that baptism procured regeneration; though they did, unquestionably, teach that. And all who were duly baptized they always regarded as born again, in the sense of John 3:5. And, if so, then must they have regarded them as church members; for the very thing that passage of John teaches is the qualifications necessary for admission into the new church Christ was about to establish; or rather into the church in the new form he was about to give it. Or, it may be the qualifications for heaven, our Savior is there speaking of; so, many have understood the matter. Let it be so. But then, surely they who are fit for heaven and the communion above, ought to be recognized by the church on earth. So that, in any way, those Christians who taught that infants were born again by baptism must have received such infants into church membership.

It was no later in the church either than the middle of the third century, when the custom commenced to be introduced of administering the communion of the Lord's supper, if not to infants indeed, yet to very young children—to such children certainly as could not yet have made any personal profession of faith. And this certainly recognizes these children as church members, that sacrament being never given to any not so regarded.

But again, and lastly, we can quote very clear and explicit language from many of the early writers of the Christian Church for the recognition of all baptized infants as church members. Justin Martyr for instance, in a passage already

recited, speaks of infants being by baptism (for so we must understand him) made *disciples of Christ*; where, by disciples of Christ, he plainly means members of the Church of Christ. And Tertullian where he tells parents who brought their infants for baptism to have them *made Christians*, not *then*, but “when they could know Christ,” plainly enough evinces that it was for the purpose of having them then and in their infancy *made Christians* that these persons would offer their children for baptism. Cyprian, too, calls the church the *mother of baptized infants*; and if *she* is their mother *they* are of her family. The same writer and in the same connexion speaks also of the church being renounced for their infants by such parents as in times of persecution carried these children to idol temples to sacrifice there to false gods. In like manner the council of Eliberis, held in 305, has something to say of the case of such infants as have been by their parents transferred from the Catholic Church to the communion of any heretical sect. It seems, too, from Cyprian’s letter to Fidus that infants at their baptism received the kiss of Christian brotherhood. Infants are further ranked among the “fideles,” or believers by Augustine, and spoken of by Gregory Nazianzen as receiving initiation in their baptism. More to the same purpose might be quoted from these authors. But enough has been given, we presume, to satisfy any of our readers that the church of the period we are now upon did unquestionably recognize all baptized infants to be of the visible body of Christ’s people; or that in case this has not been proved from the ancient writers, it is useless to talk about proving any thing from them. Here, therefore, we will quit this part of our subject.

The argument for infant baptism and church membership, as thus far drawn from the opinion and practice of the past derives its force, as must be obvious to our readers, especially from three considerations. Of these the first is the great and violent improbability of so many men, and of such men as we can cite from, overspreading the entire period of the church’s history from first to last, being totally mistaken about the teaching of Scripture in regard to so important a matter as the proper subjects of baptism, or the ground and import of the ordinance

even when duly administered. But there is difference of opinion in the case, it is replied, and authorities can be quoted on one side as well as the other. Granted. But what does that amount to? There have been differences of opinion in regard to the divinity of Christ and the personality of the Holy Spirit. Nay, men have not been wanting to deny that there ever was a Holy Spirit or a Savior Jesus Christ, or that there is even a God. And it has been denied, too, that there is such a thing as sin in the world, or that man has a conscience, or that he is a responsible being, or that there is any difference between virtue and vice, or to conclude all, that there is any thing in the world, or any world even, external to ourselves. Upon what indeed has there ever been unanimity of opinion among men? Not indeed upon the plainest intuitional truths, or the most common mathematical axioms. There always have been and always will be, men of such strange mental conformation, that what to every body else are the most obvious truisms, appear to their distorted apprehensions the most extravagant paradoxes. There is entire unanimity on nothing, and it is not to be looked for. But we have a great measure of unanimity upon the present question among all who in all ages have paid any attention to it; as general a consent of mankind perhaps as can be expected ever to exist in regard to any point of equal importance, and depending upon moral and not mathematical argument. The whole of the early church, or the whole of it with the most inconsiderable exceptions, agreed together in baptizing their children, and in considering them, when baptized, to be church members. The same, with still greater unanimity, did the church from the fourth till the sixteenth century. Nor since that time have the impugners of infant baptism and infant church membership, compared with the supporters thereof, been anything more than as the mere dust in the balance. Nor have the advocates of infant baptism, with all its consequences, been wanting in any ability to appreciate or any diligence in investigating the testimony in the case. All the objections too, urged even at this day against our tenets on this subject, have, so far as we know, been before the church for the substance of

them at least, for these thousand years or more. And still the vast majority of Christians, learned and unlearned, have persisted in practising infant baptism, and in regarding their children to be by their baptism introduced into the same covenant relation with God as themselves. And this does, to our minds at least, warrant a strong presumption that the thing is of God.

But again the church has the promise of the Spirit to lead her into all truth. And shall we yet suppose that this church for a whole millennium and a half, or nearly that, beginning too *from* or even *in* the time, of the Apostles, lay under mistake in regard to an ordinance, the right observation of which was essential, as Baptists tell us, to the very existence of a church? "Credat Judæus." It is sheer infidelity this, and a denial of God's word. Nor is this an argument, as some might suppose, that could in the sixteenth century have been alleged by a Romanist for the corruptions of Popery. The corruptions of Popery had not existed from the beginning; nor were they defended by Scripture; nor had there ever been a time of their duration that they had not been remonstrated against. And besides, although it be true that any external organization may apostatize and fall, this is not true of the entire body of Christians, if the Bible is not a fabrication. But for what we hold about infant baptism we can allege the unanimous opinion not only of this or that external body of men, but of, for a long time, all Christians in the world, so far as history can give us their opinion. And these are, we think, plainly by the promises of the Divine word secured against any such errors as Baptists accuse us of being guilty of in reference to the question pending between us and them.

The other consideration from which the argument before us derives its strength is the probability that the early church whose opinions upon the subject of infant baptism we have been considering, had the sanction of Apostolical example for these its opinions. The writings of this church that have been preserved to us, do tend strongly, we think conclusively, to prove that infant baptism began to be practised and infant church membership to be believed in, from the very times of the

**Apostles :** and if so, then must there be for these, apostolical authority. Certainly if infant baptism had taken its rise at so late a time as some say, it is passing strange that we have no record of its first beginning. Did it come upon the church, think ye, like the dawning of reason upon the mind of childhood without leaving behind the least recollection either of a time when it was not, or of the time it began to be? That is impossible. The early Christians were very cautious about the introduction of new rites or adoption of new opinions in any quarter; and such things, when they did take place, did not do so without discussion and contentions enough. And yet in all those extremely minute and all but endless catalogues of the errors, heresies and new-fangled notions of the church of the first four centuries given us by Augustine, Epiphanius and others, and in quest of which these indefatigable authors push their investigations back to the days of the Apostles themselves, there is nothing about any difference of opinion at any time in regard to infant baptism. Anti-pædo Baptist writers are surprised that so infrequent mention is made of infant baptism in the first two or three centuries, if indeed, it was practised at that time. But suppose it was not practised during that period, and was contrary to the divine intention in the institution of the ordinance of baptism, and therefore a vile heresy when it did arise; what then are we to think of there being no mention in church history of the time and circumstances of its introduction? Were the watchmen asleep on the walls of Zion when this enemy entered her gates? And even could we get over that, how are we to account for the fact that this enemy, once it had got in, has henceforth, and without a word to the contrary, been treated as a friend, and this alien as a native citizen of the place? Every way, therefore, both by their silence, when they are silent, and by their language when they speak, it is evinced by the early writers of the church that the baptism of infants and the recognition of their church membership (for these things as we have seen go together) were from the beginning of the church, and could have had as their originators none others than the Apostles themselves of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.

The argument for infant membership derived from the church opinion upon the subject, and which alone we have thus far touched upon, is offered to our readers by no means as a substitute, but only as a preparation for the scriptural argument in the case. This latter, however, contrary to our own wishes and to our original intention, we must defer the consideration of till another time.

---

ARTICLE II.

ON THE CONVERSION OF THE WORLD.

(Continued from vol. X., p. 533.)

1. *Apocalyptic Sketches. Lectures on the Book of Revelation. First Series.* By the REV. JOHN CUMMING, D. D., *Minister of the Scotch National Church. Author of Lectures on the Miracles, Parables, DANIEL &c., &c.* Philadelphia: Lindsay and Blackiston. 1854.
2. *Signs of the Times; or Present, Past and Future.* By the REV. JOHN CUMMING, D. D., F. R. S. E. *Author of Lectures on the Apocalyptic, Miracles, DANIEL, Parables, &c.* Philadelphia: Lindsay and Blackiston. 1855.\*

The doctrine of the conversion of the world, as we believe it to be taught in the word of God, has been sufficiently explained. Dr. Cumming holds a very different doctrine. He believes, as we also do, that the present dispensation will be terminated by the visible and glorious appearing of the Lord

---

\* NOTE. The letters L. R. will be employed to refer to the former of these publications; S. T., to the latter.

Jesus ; after which event, the earth will no longer be a place of probation. But he tells us, "I have shown from the signs of the times, that this advent is near at hand, and that it becomes all to make ready for the coming of our blessed Lord," (S. T. page 132.) And again, as to the moral and religious state of the world, he says, "we look therefore, for matters to get worse as the end approaches." (S. T. page 173.)

A comparison of these passages will show that he does not believe that the world is to be converted at all, and were it necessary, quotations to the same effect might easily be multiplied. Let it be carefully observed, then, we confine ourselves to this single point—the conversion of the world—no other matter will be noticed except for its bearing on this.

The discussion of this question does not occupy any large proportion of either of the volumes before us ; in both, however, it is discussed at considerable length ; and, as the latter contains very little about it besides what is likewise contained in the former, we presume that our author has little or nothing to add,—that he regards the subject as exhausted. With this impression on our minds, we are at a loss to account for the fact that he has mentioned but one passage as seeming to authorize, or as being thought by any to authorize the expectation of the conversion of the world. Now, we have exhibited but a very small proportion of the texts which, as we fully believe, warrant that expectation ; and as our limits forbade a larger selection, we have intentionally omitted almost all those passages which are commonly quoted for this purpose ; and yet, on the mere strength of the Scriptures already quoted we hazard the assertion, that to think of destroying the evidence of the doctrine by merely depriving it of the support of the text on which Dr. C. has commented, or indeed of any other single text, is as idle as the dream of the Socinian, who thinks to eliminate the doctrine of the Trinity from the Bible, by merely assailing the genuineness of 1 John 5 : 7. A man might as well attempt to convince us that no such event as the American Revolution ever took place, and that no such man as George Washington ever lived—by merely proving that some one historian of the United States is unworthy of confidence. Take

away this passage, and we have remaining some hundreds more which, we solemnly believe, teach the same doctrine *unequivocally*. What further would result? Simply this: We must change our mode of employing a single term, *millennium*—and we should henceforth possess no definite information as to the *duration* of the reign of righteousness. This is all. Dr. Cumming's interpretation, it is true, applies this passage to a distinct event. Establish it, and the conversion of the world and the reign of the saints, being both future events, not predicted in the same passage, we may not be able to settle their chronological order. This circumstance, assuredly, would not impair the credibility of either.

So far, then, as the doctrine in question is concerned, we could well afford to give up this particular text; but as expounders of the lively oracles, we dare not do so. We are bound to seek, with candor, diligence and prayer, to ascertain the true meaning of every word that the Lord hath spoken, and having found the truth, to hold it fast. In the present instance, therefore, we must endeavor to show the absurdity of what we deem an erroneous interpretation, and to expose the futility of the arguments which are urged in its support; we must, moreover, exhibit what we believe to be the true interpretation, and the reasons on which our belief is founded. And the fulfilment of this task will occupy as much space as we deem it expedient to ask for this article.

Revelation 20 : 1—9. "And I saw an angel come down from Heaven, having the key of the bottomless pit, and a great chain in his hand. And he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the Devil, and Satan, and bound him a thousand years, and cast him into the bottomless pit, and shut him up, and set a seal upon him, that he should deceive the nations no more, till the thousand years should be fulfilled: and after that he must be loosed a little season. *And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them: and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their*



*hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection. Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years. And when the thousand years are expired, Satan shall be loosed out of his prison, and shall go out to deceive the nations which are in the four quarters of the earth, Gog and Magog, to gather them together to battle: the number of whom is as the sand of the sea. And they went up on the breadth of the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city; and fire came down from God out of Heaven, and devoured them."*

We have *italicised* the words which form the immediate subject of our present inquiry. The rest of the passage is quoted for the sake of the connexion, as we shall have frequent occasion to refer to it. As to the general purport of the passage there can be no difficulty, if a satisfactory solution can be given to a single question: Concerning those who were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, we are here told, their souls lived and reigned with Christ. Does this mean a literal resurrection of their bodies? Dr. Cumming holds the affirmative, and we the negative. For his arguments on this point, see L. R., pages 444, 445 and 454, and S. T., pages 133, 134.

He tells us "that invariably, after St. John has stated some great symbol, he introduces a parenthetical explanation of it, which is of necessity literal. Thus, when he sees seven candlesticks, he appends the explanation of it; 'the seven candlesticks,' *i. e.*, the symbols, 'are seven churches.' This statement, they 'are seven churches,' is a literal explanation of the symbol 'seven candlesticks.' So here, when he states that those who had not the mark of the beast shall rise and reign with Christ a thousand years, he adds the explanatory remark exactly parallel with those cases I have quoted. 'This is the first resurrection.' This last expression is not a symbol to be further explained by some literal fulfilment, but is an historical

or explanatory statement of a symbol which literally describes the literal fact."

It is here assumed that the sentence, *This is the first resurrection*, is simply a literal statement substituted for a symbolical representation. If the words will admit of any other rational construction, the argument is destroyed. If they will not fairly admit of this construction, the whole theory under review is destroyed. We think both conditions are fulfilled. The following seems to us to be the true explanation :

The Revelator, having described a glorious event, gives it a name, on the ground of its analogy to another glorious event. Names, thus given, are always figurative. Thus, the work of the Holy Spirit, by which a sinner is made a saint, is, on grounds of analogy, called *a new birth, a new creation, and a resurrection from the dead*. Thus, in this very chapter, the sacred writer, having described, in figurative language, the sufferings of the lost, adds, "*which is the second death*." Future punishment is described by the word *death*, to denote its horrors. On the same principle, the event here described is called *a resurrection*, on account of its analogy to the resurrection of the just—of which it will be a pledge, and which it will resemble, in being, a glorious work of God, and an occasion of joy at present inconceivable.

Now, if this interpretation is at all admissible, Dr. C.'s argument is inconclusive. If it is as well supported as his, then his argument is utterly annihilated. But we think that even more than this is true. We think the interpretation we have proposed will commend itself to the reflecting and unprejudiced reader, as evidently correct; and we expect to show that the other is utterly inadmissible. The expression "*This is the first resurrection*," we are told, is the explanation of a prophetic symbol, like the sentence "*The seven candlesticks are the seven churches*." In this latter case, the design is to represent Christ's care of his churches, and the symbol is altogether appropriate. Taken from a subject of a class entirely different from the one intended to be illustrated, it could not be understood without an explanation; but as soon as the

explanation is reflected on, the analogy is perceived to be most striking and beautiful. But how is it in the passage under consideration? Where is the symbol? According to our author, every thing in the sentence referred to is literal, except a single word. The word *souls* is the exception; it is used in the sense of *persons*—the special reference being to the *bodies* of those concerned. And this is a prophetic symbol, requiring a formal explanation. It so happens that the word *souls* is frequently used in this sense both in the Old Testament and in the New. The use of the same term in the same sense is perfectly familiar wherever the English language is spoken; and, we presume, the corresponding terms are used in the same manner in all languages. But it is certainly a wonderful discovery that this familiar mode of speech involves a prophetic symbol, and requires a formal explanation. Luke, we believe, lived and died before the dawn of the nineteenth century; and never enjoyed the advantages of that marvellous illumination of which Doctors can now boast. He seems to have been quite unconscious of employing a prophetic symbol—he evidently felt no fear of being misunderstood, and saw no need for adding any explanation, when he said, “*And we were in all in the ship, two hundred three score and sixteen souls.*” We are persuaded that no man possessing common sense and a tolerable knowledge of the language in which he spoke, ever first used the word in this sense, and, afterwards, had occasion to add an explanation. Should such a case occur, it would certainly be regarded, not as the explanation of a prophetic symbol, but merely as the correction of a ridiculous blunder. We repeat the use of the word *soul* in a sense so large as necessarily to include the body, is always perfectly perspicuous; it never requires an explanation. That this condition is not fulfilled in the present instance is obvious—is admitted in the very allegation that a formal explanation is afterwards added. This is conclusive; unless we are prepared to charge the Revelator with worse than childish blundering, we cannot admit that the clause under consideration is any such explanation as Dr. C. imagines.

He argues that, since the death of these martyrs is literal,

their resurrection is necessarily so. Now, we are unable to discover, in the passage itself, even a plausible foundation for this argument; nor do we perceive with what consistency it is urged by our author. The evident design of the passage is to comfort the martyrs under their sufferings for Jesus. Hence, it is not strange that their martyrdom should be alluded to in literal terms, but the consolation administered in figurative language. Many similar instances of the mingling of the literal with the figurative may easily be found in the Scripture. Thus, for example, our Saviour says, "He that loveth his life shall lose it; and he that hateth his life in this world shall keep it unto life eternal."—John 12:24. Here the temporal life of the body and eternal happiness in heaven, are apparently identified. But what are the words of which Dr. C. contends for a literal and we for a figurative interpretation? Concerning those who were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, John tells us that their *souls* lived and reigned with Christ. Dr. Cumming tells us, this relates to the resurrection of their bodies. Now, we ask, is this the literal meaning of the words? If you were to say, concerning any person, "He has been slain, but *his soul* lives with Christ," would the literal meaning of the declaration be that his body had been raised from the dead? We go further, and ask, would such an idea be implied in the declaration, understood in the most natural and obvious sense? Every one must perceive that, if the latter part of this sentence is to be understood literally, it refers to the happy state of saints while their bodies are dead, and can refer to nothing else. But Dr. Cumming does not believe this to be the thing meant, nor do we. He then, like ourselves, makes one part of this sentence figurative and the other literal. The next sentence but one reads, "*This is the first resurrection.*" This, it is true, Dr. C. understands as literal and we as figurative. But here it is evident the distance would be sufficient to destroy his argument, even if it were sound in other respects. No one, we imagine, is ever surprised to find, within the compass of three sentences, a change of figure, or a transition from the literal style to the figurative, or from the figurative to the literal. Now, from the fact that the subject of the first sentence is literal, and the

predicate figurative, does it follow that the same figure may not be retained through several successive sentences. If, indeed, it were manifest from the language employed by the Revelator, that the life of which he speaks is the precise opposite of the death suffered by the martyrs, then it might be conclusively argued that, since the latter is bodily and literal, so also is the former. On any other supposition, the argument is wholly nugatory. Now, this position, so essential to his argument, our author has not ventured even to assert; and had he done so, the common sense of every attentive reader of the passage would at once have contradicted him. On mere inspection, it is evident that decapitation is here connected, not with the *predicate* but with the *subject* of the proposition; in other words, it is mentioned simply for the purpose of identifying the persons to whom the paragraph chiefly refers. Now, it is a new law of interpretation, that if the subject is literal, the predicate cannot possibly be figurative; that if the persons spoken of be described in literal language, whatever is said of them must be understood in a literal sense. But if this be not an inviolable law, the argument we are considering is of no force.

And yet, this very principle, which lies at the foundation of the Doctor's argument, will, if consistently applied, destroy the very conclusion in behalf of which it is invoked. The position which he is laboring to establish, be it remembered, is that this passage relates to the literal and bodily resurrection of the saints. Now, if this be true, the declaration, *this is the first resurrection*, is, of course, literal, and so he understands it. Now, considering the sentence in its connexion, and supposing this to be its sense, there seems to be no conceivable reason for its introduction, except the explanation of a symbol. And this is, in fact, the purpose recognized by our author. What symbol? The connexion points to the living and reigning of those who were beheaded; and this too is the view adopted by our author. But according to him, this phrase, "they lived and reigned," must be literal, because it relates to those whose literal death is mentioned in the same connexion; this conclusion with the reason here assigned for it, must be sustained, or the argument

we are considering is abandoned. But the same phrase, "*they lived and reigned,*" must, likewise, be figurative and symbolical; otherwise the argument for the literal interpretation of the sentence, "*this is the first resurrection,*"—namely, that it is the explanation of a symbol—is destroyed; and on supposition that it is to be understood literally, no apparent reason will remain, why it should have been introduced at all. Thus, Dr. Cumming assumes contradictory positions in support of the same conclusion. He makes the same expression both symbolical and literal. Make it symbolical, and you destroy one of his main arguments; make it literal, and you not only destroy another of his arguments, but you absolutely overthrow the very conclusion which he is laboring to establish.

In support of his interpretation of the phrase, *the first resurrection*, he argues from other Scriptures that, in point of time, the resurrection of the just will precede that of the wicked. On this point, we at present express no opinion. So far as the present discussion is concerned, we admit it. Suppose the resurrection of the just will take place before that of the wicked—what then? It follows not that, between these two events, there will be an interval of a thousand years, either literal or prophetic. It follows not, that no such event as the conversion of the world will ever take place. It follows not, that this glorious event may not, in allusion to another glorious event, be called *the first resurrection*. The only advantage which Dr. C.'s cause can possibly derive from the establishment of this position, is a proof that there are some texts which his interpretation of this passage does not contradict—it recognizes one truth which is elsewhere taught in the word of God. It will hardly be thought a safe inference, that this is the precise truth taught in this particular passage.

The next argument we give in our author's own words. It is as follows: "He, (Dr. Whitby,) says this resurrection means the resurrection of the *spirit*, that is, fearlessness of death—fixed constancy—and victory over persecution of the martyrs. This seems unnatural, if we suppose, as he does, the previous existence of a Millennium of perfect happiness and unsuspended peace. How shall there be martyrs during the Millennium,

when there will be *no murderers?* How shall any one manifest the spirit of a martyr when there can be none to manifest the spirit or conduct of murderers? How shall any one suffer pain when there is no one to inflict it? We are forced to conclude that the resurrection of the martyrs signifies, not that men will be raised up who should have the spirit but not die the death of martyrs, but that it implies the literal resurrection of those among others that died and sealed their testimony with their blood." (L. R. page 445.)

We might omit to notice this argument, as it consists entirely of an objection against a particular interpretation, and has no conceivable application to the one which we adopt. But we think it right to observe that the objection itself is utterly nugatory and worthless. In all ages, the opinion has prevailed among the people of God, that the martyrs, as a class, are distinguished from other saints, by superior attainments in piety. Hence, eminent saints may be described as having the spirit of martyrs, even although they may never be called to suffer persecution. If Dr. C.'s objection is to prevail, we must charge the beloved disciple with uttering nonsense, when, referring to the Redeemer, he said, "He that saith he abideth in him, ought himself also so to walk, even as he walked;" for, of the followers of Christ, comparatively few are called to the official work of preaching the gospel; none in modern times are called to work miracles; and none, in any age, ever have been, or ever will be, required to make satisfaction for sin. On these principles, it cannot be true that, "*If any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of His.*"

But Dr. Cummings tells us, "It is said that the rest of the dead live not until the thousand years are finished. This is universally conceded to be literal, but the first resurrection is part of it; therefore these resurrections must both be literal." (S. T., page 134.)

*Universally conceded!*—No; not quite. We, at least, make no such concession. We think it will hereafter appear that we have good reasons for refusing. No doubt the *general resurrection* will take place at a period long subsequent to that about which we are now inquiring; but we utterly deny that the

general resurrection is the precise event here described as "*the living again of the rest of the dead.*"

Having examined the arguments by which Dr. Cumming endeavors to sustain his interpretation, we next proceed to state our objections to the interpretation itself. But here let the precise point in question be carefully observed. As to the precise import of some particular expressions, there may be differences of opinion among those who agree as to the leading idea, the general purport of the passage. There is a single question, the decision of which, though it may not perhaps decide every particular point, will certainly fix the *general* purport; and that question we hope now to settle. *The reign of the martyrs, here mentioned, does it pre-suppose their literal and bodily resurrection, or does it refer to a state of things which is to take place among mortal men?* One or the other of these views, it is evident, must be correct. We hold the latter, and propose to establish it by disproving the former. Our objections, then, to the view here opposed are, that it does not accord with the language of the passage itself; that it does not accord with what precedes; and that it does not accord with what follows.

In examining the language of the passage itself, we observe, in the first place, it is not said of any but the martyrs: "they lived and reigned with Christ." Other particulars besides their martyrdom, it is true, are introduced into the description; but it is obvious that all these particulars belong to the same persons. No mention is made of any other class of saints. This is so evident, that some who supposed a bodily resurrection to be the thing intended, have inferred that the martyrs will rise before the other saints. And, indeed, it is quite apparent that if, in this instance, the premises be admitted, the inference, though perhaps not absolutely unavoidable, will be quite natural. But we are not aware that this conclusion has any advocate at the present day. Dr. Cumming, at any rate, is of a different opinion. He believes this passage to refer to "the resurrection of the just;" that is, of all the pious dead. Now, we ask, on this hypothesis, why are the martyrs, and they *only*, mentioned as the subjects of it? It is true that, sometimes, the resurrection is mentioned in connection with some things which are peculiar



to those who are called to suffer violent persecution for Christ's sake ; and this circumstance will sufficiently explain why other classes of saints are not mentioned. But the passage before us, if it refers to a bodily resurrection at all, is, simply, a general assertion of the doctrine of the resurrection of the just, and this is the light in which it is regarded by Dr. C. Now, it is obvious that in the particular here specified, the language differs from what might naturally be expected, if this were really the thing intended : and that it strongly suggests a different idea. We do not, indeed, undertake to say that this circumstance, if taken alone, would be decisive ; but we say that it has a *real tendency* to disprove the hypothesis against which we are contending, and ought to be combined with other considerations which have the same tendency.

But, in the second place, we notice a circumstance which we deem absolutely decisive. The revelator says that he saw the *souls* of them that were beheaded, &c. ; and they, (*the souls*,) lived and reigned with Christ. Now, no sensible man ever described a bodily resurrection in this manner. This, indeed, is so obvious, that were not the denial before us, we should think argument quite unnecessary. And even now, we must omit much that seems to us pertinent, lest we should be charged with wasting the time, and insulting the understandings of our readers. It is true that the word *soul* is sometimes used in a sense so comprehensive as to include the body, and even where the direct reference is to the body ; but in all such cases the possession of bodily life by the persons spoken of, is either necessarily implied in the statement, or presumed to be already known. Among Christians, who believe in a conscious existence between death and the resurrection, it is quite common to say of their departed friends, "They are dead, but their souls live with Christ ;" but, we think, no occurrence of such an expression, except the solitary one now before us, was ever supposed by any sane man to relate to a bodily resurrection ; and we are quite sure no sane man ever used such an expression, when he meant to convey that idea. Now, John says that *the souls* of them that were beheaded lived and reigned ; and the question to be decided is, simply, whether this is an assertion

of a bodily resurrection. And our suggestion is, that the mention of their death forbids that the word *souls* should be understood as including their bodies.

But let us hear Dr. Cumming. He expresses himself as follows: 'But an objection to this interpretation of ours is deduced from the words, "I saw the *souls* of them that were beheaded;" from which it is argued that as *souls* are spoken of it cannot mean persons; but every reader of the Bible cannot but know that the "soul" is frequently used to describe the whole man. "*Soul*, take thine ease," is an instance of this—and in the 6th chapter of this book it is said that "the *souls* of those that were beneath the altar cried, How long?"' (L. R. page 445.)

Now, let our position be distinctly understood. It is this: when the death of any person or persons is mentioned, an express or implied statement, in the same connexion, that their *souls* live, is not an assertion of their bodily resurrection. We ask, then, which of the texts here referred to, is inconsistent with this position? A man proposed to say to his soul, "Soul, take thine ease." Is it stated that this man had already suffered bodily death? Are we to conclude from the ascription of this language to him, that he had already experienced, or that he experienced at the moment of uttering it, a resurrection from the state of bodily death? If the true answer to these questions be in the negative, the reference to this passage is wholly irrelevant. And, as to the other passage: it is stated that the *souls* under the altar cried, how long? We need not attempt to expound the passage at present. The whole question which affects our present argument is whether it is necessarily implied that those who uttered the cry, experienced, either previously or at the time of uttering it, a bodily resurrection. This, we do not suppose that Dr. C. himself would affirm. But if not, the reference is irrelevant.

But we will go a step further. In the passage under consideration, the word *soul* might have been omitted without any injury to the grammatical completeness of the sentence. We should then read. "And I saw them that were beheaded, &c., and they lived and reigned with Christ." Now, even this would

by no means imply a bodily resurrection. Similar expressions are used, both in Scripture and by Christians generally, without conveying, or even suggesting that idea. Thus our Savior says: "The beggar died, and was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom." No one refers this to a bodily resurrection. Still, it cannot be denied that, in the passage we are considering, the introduction of the word *souls* furnishes additional evidence against the idea of a reference to a bodily resurrection; and this is obviously its whole effect; and therefore its only assignable purpose. We perceive, then, first, that even without the word *souls*, this passage could not reasonably be supposed to refer to a bodily resurrection; and, secondly, that this word is introduced for the express purpose of guarding it against such a misconception.

In the third place, we ask attention to the words, "*This is the first resurrection.*" We shall attempt to prove that a name is here given to the event described, on the ground of its analogy to a literal resurrection; whence it follows that the event is not itself a literal resurrection. It must be obvious to every one who reads the passage with attention, that if this be not the true construction, these words are merely an explanation of what goes before. Let us see, then, whether they are such an explanation. We beg pardon for returning to a point on which something has already been said, when we remark that they certainly are not the explanation of symbolical language previously employed. Symbols, it is admitted, are sometimes employed for the purpose of investing a subject with a degree of obscurity, till the proper time for its elucidation arrives. But this remark does not apply here; since the supposed symbolical language is immediately followed by the supposed explanation. Symbols are, universally, illustrations founded on analogy; and always pre-suppose that the subject from which the illustration is drawn is more accessible and familiar to the party addressed, than the subject to which the illustration is applied. Now, if the expression before us is the explanation of a symbol, the symbolical language explained is evidently that which we have just been considering; and the symbol of the resurrection is, the state of departed spirits. Now, this

cannot be. It is utterly impossible that any living man should have his conceptions of the resurrection, in any degree, aided, by being told that it is analogous to the state of departed spirits; because the latter subject is in no sense more accessible to mortals than the former.

This, then, is not the explanation of a symbol; and if it is an explanation of what goes before, the need of it arises solely out of the well known and incurable imperfection of human language. On this supposition, the preceding description was intended by the sacred writer to be, as far as it goes, perfectly appropriate to express the idea of a bodily resurrection; but we have seen that the language actually employed is such as no sane man could deliberately adopt for that purpose. But one alternative remains. The sentence, *this is the first resurrection*, not being an explanation of what goes before, we are compelled to conclude that a name is here given to the event described, on the ground of its analogy to a literal resurrection; and, therefore, the event itself is not a literal resurrection.

Thus, a careful examination of the language of the passage under discussion, yields the following results: one reasonable presumption, and two decisive proofs, that the reference is not to a bodily resurrection; and no support for that hypothesis, except what is obtained by forcing a literal construction on a phrase which the connexion absolutely requires to be understood figuratively.

2. Let us now attend to the connexion of this passage with the paragraph which immediately precedes it. The reader is requested to examine, carefully, Rev. 20: 1—3. Here we are told that Satan is to be imprisoned for a thousand years, that during that period he may not deceive the nations, as he has hitherto done; at its expiration, "he must be loosed a little season." From the connexion of the two paragraphs, it is sufficiently evident—and indeed, we think it has not been denied—that the thousand years of Satan's imprisonment are identical with the thousand years of the reign of the martyrs. If, then, this passage teaches that the nations are to be freed from the delusions of the Devil, *while in their mortal state*, then, it is true, as we maintain it to be, that the reign of the

martyrs relates to a state of things which is to take place among mortals. The necessary connexion of this conclusion with the condition here mentioned, has not been denied within our knowledge; and we suppose it will not be denied. Hence, on the hypothesis against which we are contending, the paragraph now under consideration can mean nothing more than that saints, after their resurrection, will, *for a limited time*, be exempt from all liability to be deceived by the Devil. Dr. Cumming tells us, he "shall be chained, or fettered, or repressed from infecting the earth." (L. R. page 440.) If this means anything more than is implied in the statement that he shall "not deceive the nations," it is unauthorized. But, at present, we need not insist on this.

We observe, then, that this imprisonment of Satan is not perpetual. The angel "bound him *a thousand years*." He is not to deceive the nations any more till the thousand years be fulfilled; "*and after that he must be loosed a little season*." Now, surely no Christian will admit that saints after their resurrection, will ever be exposed to the delusions of Satan—and we must think that, but for the indispensable requirements of an absurd system, no Christian would ever imagine that saints after their resurrection would ever be annoyed or assailed by the Devil in any way—directly or indirectly. But this idea is confessedly inseparable from the view which refers the passage before us to the state of things which is to be introduced by the resurrection of the just. This, then, is our first objection to that view. We utterly deny that saints *after their resurrection* will ever again be liable to either Satanic delusions or Satanic assaults; and if they will not, this decides the whole question we are arguing. But we shall have occasion for a distinct examination of this point hereafter.

To proceed: The angel cast Satan into the bottomless pit, "that he should deceive the nations no more," &c. It is, of course, implied that he has deceived the nations hitherto; and the state of things here described, is to be introduced by the deliverance of *the nations* from his delusions. Now, of whom are the nations composed that are then to be delivered? Of the people who shall then be found alive and unconverted? If

so, here is the very doctrine we are advocating—the conversion of the world. But this is not Dr. Cumming's view. No one, we imagine, will admit this view, and still maintain that the thousand years here mentioned are subsequent to the resurrection of the just. We ask again: Of whom will these undeceived nations be composed? Of saints risen from the dead? And is it *then, at the resurrection*, that they are to be freed from Satanic delusions? To answer in the affirmative, is to say that those who are absent from the body and present with the Lord, are still subject to Satanic delusions. Of whom, then? The only remaining answer, admissible on the hypothesis we are considering, is—Of the saints who shall then be found alive. But these will certainly be very few in comparison with the whole number of saints. And unless the world shall be previously converted, they will be a very small proportion of the whole number of human beings who shall then be found alive. With what propriety, then, can they be described as *the nations?*

Our first objection to Dr. Cumming's view of this paragraph was, that it implies that the happiness of the saints, even after their glorious resurrection, will be liable to interruption; and, indeed, that it will be actually interrupted. Our second is, that it excludes the possibility of a reasonable answer to the question, Who are the nations that Satan shall deceive no more for a thousand years?

We will now mention a third: It imposes on the paragraph a sense which its terms will not bear. It would be utterly contrary to Scripture to describe any pious man as one who is deceived by the Devil. Such language might perhaps be tolerable, if the connexion proved an exclusive reference to one or more specified errors; but applied without qualification, it would be shocking in the extreme. According to Scripture, an unconverted man is one who walks in darkness—a child of the father of lies—one whom Satan has blinded, deceived, enslaved. A Christian, on the other hand, is one who walks in the light—one who walks in the truth—one who knows the truth, and whom the truth has made free. Conversion is the transition from the former to the latter of these states. Accord-

ingly, the sacred writers frequently employ the word *deceived*, and similar terms, without qualification, to describe a religious state; but these terms, when so used, invariably imply that the persons described are unconverted, or totally destitute of holiness. When Satan is mentioned as the deceiver, this idea is, of course, exhibited yet more forcibly; and when a person, formerly in this condition is undeceived, he is converted. The representation can mean nothing more, nothing less.

In confirmation of this statement, it will suffice to mention the following Scriptures: "Evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, *deceiving, and being deceived.*" (2 Tim. 3: 13.) "For we ourselves were sometimes foolish, disobedient, *deceived*, serving divers lusts and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hateful, and hating one another. (Titus 3: 3.) "To open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God,"—who does not perceive that this is the same as, *to free them from the dominion of Satan, by freeing them from his delusions?*—"that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified, by faith that is in me." (Acts 26: 18.)

When, therefore, it is stated, either directly or by implication, that any one was formerly deceived by Satan, but is now undeceived, the meaning is, *that he is converted*; and it can be nothing else. And this settles the meaning of the language we are now considering. When we are told that Satan shall be bound, that he may deceive the nations no more for a thousand years—the meaning is, that during the period signified by this last phrase, the nations shall be and continue in a converted state—Satan, the dethroned prince of this world, shall not be permitted, to any considerable extent, to disturb the tranquillity of the Redeemer's universal kingdom. And that the nations are here regarded as still in their mortal state, is evident; for the paragraph conveys not the remotest allusion to either death or the resurrection. Moreover, conversion takes place only in this life. Thus, it is evident, that the undeceiving of the nations relates to what is to take place among mortal men. And, this being proved, it follows from the connexion of the two paragraphs, that the same is true of the reign of the martyrs.

3. The position against which we are arguing, let it be remembered, is, that the reign of the martyrs will be preceded by the resurrection of the just; and we now appeal to the paragraph immediately following the one in which that reign is described. Rev. 20: 7—10. Here it is evident that, after the close of the period in question, the saints will be attacked by innumerable enemies, required to exert themselves to their utmost in their own defence, and preserved from destruction by nothing short of the miraculous interposition of God. Of course, according to the system we are opposing, this attack is to be made on the saints *after their resurrection*. But let us hear Dr. Cumming:

“I suppose, then, that ‘the rest of the dead,’ that is, the unconverted, are raised from their graves just at the moment that the thousand years are completely closed; and that, ‘the rest of the dead,’ raised in their bodies, are those enemies who will make war on the saints in their resurrection bodies; the unjust shall arise as well as the just; the one shall have their bodies restored as well as the other, the imprimatur of eternity shall be stamped upon the one, the imprimatur of eternity shall be stamped upon the other—the one an eternal capacity of woe, the other of bliss. I suppose—and I believe it is the true solution of the difficulty—that the enemies that come from the four corners of the earth are just ‘the rest of the dead,’ raised at the close of the Millennium, and then and there, with all their vices unextirpated, their natures unregenerated, their hearts in the gall of bitterness, they shall be headed by the arch-angel’s energy and the arch-fiend’s hate, and shall make one last, dying and desperate attack on the saints of God that dwell in the new Jerusalem, and there magnify and worship the Lamb.” (L. R., p. 458.)

Did our limits permit, we think it would be very easy to show that the difficulty which this extraordinary theory is intended to solve, is wholly imaginary, except as connected with Dr. Cumming’s own system. But let us examine the theory. Concerning the enemies who make this attack, the Revelator says, “Fire came down from God out of heaven and devoured them.” Now if, as Dr. C. supposes, these are the



wicked after their resurrection, it follows that the wicked are to suffer bodily death twice; and, of course, that they must either experience two literal and bodily resurrections or remain for ever in a disembodied state. And here we may mention a circumstance which our author seems to have overlooked. The general resurrection is expressly assigned by the Revelator to a later period than the one now in question. Having given a general description of the last judgment, in verses 11 and 12, he adds, in verse 13, an emphatic assertion of its universality; in which connexion he mentions the resurrection: "And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them; and they were judged, every man, according to their works."

But there is another particular of still greater importance to the present discussion. As we have already seen, Dr. Cumming asserts—and the assertion is absolutely indispensable to his system—that the attack in question is to be made on the saints in their resurrection bodies. It is to be made, according to him, a thousand years—either literal or prophetic—after their resurrection. Now, on this point, he is directly contradicted by Paul. The resurrection of the dead is the destruction of death. To state this proposition is to prove it. But further proof is furnished by the following words: "So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, death is swallowed up in victory." 1 Cor., 15: 54. Now, is it foretold, in the passage before us, that the saints are to be assailed by innumerable enemies, and those enemies are to be destroyed. All this, according to Dr. C., is to take place long after their death, and after the destruction of death; but, in the discourse from which we last quoted, Paul distinctly declares that death is the last enemy that shall assail the saints, and the last of their enemies that shall be destroyed. "For he (Christ) must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet. *The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death.*" (1 Cor. 15: 25, 26.) Now, how this explicit declaration is to be reconciled with the doctrine that, long after the death of the saints—long after death is destroyed by their

resurrection, a countless multitude of foes shall rise against them and their Lord, and be destroyed—it is not for us to explain. We think it is now apparent that the war, here described, must take place before the resurrection of the just; but the war, as all confess, takes place *after the reign of the martyrs*. Of course, then, the reign of the martyrs takes place before the resurrection of the just, and among mortal men.

If we have succeeded in establishing this position, it will hardly be denied that the reign of the martyrs implies the prevalence of peace and holiness throughout the world. But, this general view being admitted, there are still several interpretations of the passage, distinguished from one another by *shades* of difference. We shall, therefore, proceed to state the interpretation which we prefer, and to assign the reasons of our preference.

When it is said, concerning the martyrs, “They lived and reigned with Christ,” the reference, as we think, is to their influence. So far as human instrumentality is concerned, the happy state of things here described is the result, *mainly*, of their prayers and example, their labors and sufferings. We adopt this interpretation, because we deem it consistent with the evident design, and with the language of the passage, with the connexion in which it stands, and with the analogy of faith; and we know of no other to which all these recommendations apply with equal force.

To begin with the first of these: It is already apparent that the general subject is the future prosperity of the Redeemer’s kingdom. Now, why are martyrs mentioned in such a connexion? The obvious answer is, To comfort them under their sufferings. Let any man read the passage, and judge for himself whether it does not bear evident marks of this design. For what other purpose should promises be made to martyrs *as such*? We think, then, they are comforted by being told, not merely that the cause of Christ shall prosper to a most wonderful extent, but that it shall so prosper, *mainly*, through their instrumentality, and especially through the instrumentality of their sufferings. No suggestion, it is evident, could be better adapted to the end in view.

And now, as to the language of the passage, we think this is not only an admissible construction, but the most natural construction. To speak of a dead man as still living by his influence, is a figure at once natural and obvious, appropriate and forcible. A figure sufficiently similar for all the purposes of illustration is used by Paul, in Heb. 11 : 4. To describe the permanent influence of Abel's exemplary faith, he tells us, "By it he, being dead, yet speaketh." They not only "lived," but "reigned." If it were said concerning a deceased ruler, "Though dead, he still governs his country," no one would doubt about the meaning; and no one would deem the figure inappropriate, provided the case were strong enough to justify its application. In this sense, then, the martyrs are to rule the world—not as the rivals of Christ, but as rulers under him. They are to "reign with Christ." It is easy to see why the other saints are not mentioned in this connexion. All of them are to *live*, in the sense here intended; but all of them are not to *reign*. The influence of every one of them is to contribute to the holiness of that period, as the influence of every good citizen contributes to the prosperity of his country. But as there is a difference between the influence of a good public ruler, and of a good private citizen; even so, there will be a difference between the influence of the martyrs and that of other saints. This is called the *first* resurrection, in contradistinction from the literal resurrection of the just, of which it is at once the type and the pledge. And they who have part in it are declared to be "blessed and holy." They have a blessedness which is common to them with all the saints; for, "on such the second death hath no power;" and they have an additional blessedness which is peculiar to themselves; for "they shall reign with Christ a thousand years." In other words, they "turn many to righteousness," and "shall shine as stars for ever and ever." And as this event is called a resurrection, their *souls* are mentioned to prevent us from mistaking it for a literal resurrection. "*The rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished.*" Till then, their influence will be, in a qualified sense, dead—not sufficiently powerful to deserve notice in a general view of the state of the

world. But we have no reason to think that moral influence can ever be utterly annihilated. The wicked are to live again. Their influence will be felt in the revival of wickedness, when "*Satan shall be loosed out of his prison.*" It seems to us, therefore, that the interpretation which we have ventured to propose accords both with the language of the passage itself, and with its evident design.

We now ask attention to Rev. 19 : 11—21. Our suggestion is, that the conquest here described is the work of the Redeemer in converting the nations. The extension of his kingdom is described in military style, and his converts are represented as slain with his sword. This view certainly accords with Scripture usage.

Scarcely any part of the Old Testament relates more unequivocally to the Messiah than Psalm 45. In verses 3—5, the extension of his kingdom is thus prayed for and predicted. "Gird thy sword upon thy thigh, O most mighty, with thy glory and thy majesty. And in thy majesty ride prosperously because of truth and meekness and righteousness: and thy right hand shall teach thee terrible things. Thine arrows are sharp in the heart of the king's enemies, whereby the people fall under thee." We think it requires no argument to prove that those who are here represented as pierced by his arrows, and falling slain under him, are his converts. In Psalm 110, Christ is declared to be "a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek"—at once a king and a priest—and in verses 5 and 6, the Father is thus addressed: "The Lord at thy right hand shall strike through kings in the day of his wrath. He shall judge"—or execute the office of king—"among the heathen; He shall fill the places with the dead bodies; He shall wound the heads over many countries." This evidently relates to his spiritual conquests—the extension of his kingdom of righteousness; and the idea of innumerable converts is represented by the dead bodies filling the places.

In the same manner we understand the paragraph now before us. And omitting much that might be said in confirmation of this view, we think it sufficient to notice the following words: And the beast was taken, and with him the false prophet that

wrought miracles before him, with which he deceived them that had received the mark of the beast, and them that worshipped his image. These both were cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone. And the remnant were slain with the sword of him that sat upon the horse, which sword proceeded out of his mouth; and all the fowls were filled with their flesh.”—(Verses 20 and 21.) By the sword which proceeds out of the mouth of the Redeemer, is meant, the sword of the Spirit—the word of God. To be slain with that sword, is to be converted; and to convey a strong idea of the number of converts, the fowls are represented as filled with the flesh of the slain. Accordingly, the distinction is broadly marked, between those who are thus slain, and those who are sent to hell. The beast and the false prophet are cast *alive* into the lake of fire burning with brimstone. The incorrigible adherents of soul-destroying error will experience no such change as that represented by being slain with the Redeemer’s sword. They will not be converted, but sent to perdition. “And *the remnant* were slain with the sword of him that sat upon the horse”—converted *by his grace*, through the instrumentality of the gospel.

Let us now review the four paragraphs on which we have been commenting. If we understood them correctly, the first, (Rev. 19: 11—21,) is a symbolical prediction of the conversion of the world. If so, the first question that arises, is—How long will the prevalence of piety, thus introduced, continue without serious abatement or disturbance? The next paragraph, (Rev. 20: 1—3,) answers this question, in terms evidently suggested by the original promise, that the seed of the woman should bruise the head of the serpent. We next inquire, what class of men shall be chiefly instrumental in fulfilling this prophecy? The third paragraph, (Rev. 20: 4—6,) answers, The martyrs—sufferers for Jesus and his gospel. We inquire, finally, will this prosperous state of things continue till the last judgment? The fourth paragraph, (Rev. 20: 7—10,) answers, No; there will intervene a period—comparatively short, however—of wide-spread, intense and outrageous wickedness, which will draw down the awful vengeance of the

Almighty. We here perceive that the subject is regularly developed, the arrangement perfectly natural and obvious, and the connexion of the several paragraphs so strict, that, if we have understood any one of them correctly, it can hardly be doubted that we have understood them all correctly.

And now, as to the symbolical representation. In the first paragraph, we behold the world re-conquered by Christ, its rightful sovereign, from Satan, a tyrant and a usurper. After such a conquest, the next thing we naturally expect to hear is that the dethroned prince is arrested, and either imprisoned or put to death. Accordingly, we find him, in the next paragraph, arrested, and imprisoned for a thousand years. The next topic that naturally claims attention is, the government established in consequence of this revolution. This is described in the third paragraph. Christ reigns supreme, and his martyrs are the chief rulers under him. The last question is, whether any attempt will ever be made to effect a counter-revolution; and if so, with what result? The fourth paragraph contains the answer: After a long time, the dethroned prince will escape from prison, excite an extensive rebellion, and make a vigorous, but unsuccessful effort to regain his lost dominion. Thus the consistency and propriety of the representation are perfectly preserved throughout this whole series of paragraphs.

We formerly saw that our view of the passage primarily in question, accords entirely with its language and design. We have now examined the context; and we find that, according to the same view, the most natural arrangement, an entire continuity of thought, and the utmost consistency and propriety of symbolical representation, run through the whole connexion. We think all this never was true of an erroneous interpretation.

The analogy of faith is the only remaining test. This passage, as we understand it, implies that the world is to be converted. But, we think, it has been shown that it admits of no rational interpretation which will not make it support that doctrine; and that the same doctrine is abundantly taught in other parts of the word of God. We now add, that it answers two of the most common and plausible objections, both of which are urged by Dr. Cumming. They are, that the second advent of the

Redeemer will take place suddenly, and at a time of prevailing wickedness.

Now, let it be observed, both of these objections assume, that the reign of the martyrs—if it implies the conversion of the world—is to continue till the second coming of Christ—till the day of judgment. And this assumption is directly contradicted by the passage before us. We are here told that, between the reign of the martyrs and the day of judgment, Satan is to be loosed—there is to be an extensive and terrible revival of wickedness; and of its duration we have no information but this, that it will be short in comparison with a thousand prophetic years. Now, this presents to our minds nothing incredible. “One generation passeth away, and another generation cometh;” hence, it is quite conceivable that, after piety shall have prevailed throughout the world for many generations, there may come a time of abounding iniquity, and it is not at all inconsistent with the doctrine we are advocating, that the coming of Christ may take place at such a time, and may take place suddenly.

Finally. This passage teaches, if we understand it correctly, that Christian martyrdom is to hold a prominent place among the means of the extension of the Redeemer’s kingdom. Experience teaches the same truth; and on this ground it has long been established as an unquestionable maxim, that “the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the church.” The Psalmist recognizes this doctrine, when he says, “Surely the wrath of man shall praise thee.” Paul teaches it, when he says to the Philippians, “My bonds in Christ are manifest in all the palace, and in all other places,”—and to the Colossians, “I now rejoice in my sufferings for you, and fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh *for his body’s sake, which is the church*—and to Timothy, “I endure all things for the elect’s sakes, that they may also obtain the salvation which is in Christ Jesus, with eternal glory.” This, then, being a true and scriptural doctrine, we think it has already been made apparent, from the language, connexion, and design of the passage before us, that it is taught here.

We have dwelt on this passage at great length. It has at-

tracted much attention from divines and commentators of all classes. It is intimately connected with our general subject, and has been made exceedingly prominent by the opposers of the doctrine which we are endeavoring to advocate. We confess, too, that we are pleased with an opportunity of submitting our views for the consideration of fathers and brethren in the ministry, who are more skilful than ourselves, in the interpretation of God's Holy Word. Every ray of new light will be most thankfully received, no matter from what quarter it comes—no matter whether it tends to confirm, or to invalidate the views which we have been led to adopt. In one article more, we hope to finish this protracted discussion.

---

THE TRINITY OF THE GODHEAD, THE DOCTRINE OF  
THE SCRIPTURES.

*Presumption that the Scriptures will teach it.*

In former essays on the subject of the Trinity, it has been shewn that any a priori or abstract determination of the nature and mode of subsistence in the Godhead is beyond the powers and the province of reason; that reason unaided and untaught (directly or indirectly), by revelation, cannot even arrive at the knowledge of an infinite, eternal and spiritual God, much less at any conclusion as to the nature of God;\* and that even educated reason, aided by all the light and stimulus of traditionary or written revelation, and even at the present time, with all the experience of ages, and all the advancement of learning and science, and the diffused knowledge of the Scriptures, cannot settle down upon the doctrine of a personal God, or of the absolute personal unity of God, or of there

---

\* See Butler's Analogy, Part 1, Ch. VI. and Pt. 2, Ch. VII.



being only one God. It has been shewn that, on the contrary, the doctrine of a personal absolute unity of the Godhead never has been the creed of philosophy or the dogma of any religion, and that many reasons would render it impossible for reason to obviate objections to such a scheme, and to give it a certain authentication.\*

It has been further shewn that the general impression, that the Scriptures very fully and explicitly teach the personal unity of the Godhead, that is of the Divine nature, is without any foundation in fact. The Scriptures every where, and in every possible way, teach, or rather assume as an indubitable fact, that God is one in opposition to all polytheistic idolatries, and that the Nature—the Godhead—the Essence of the Deity cannot possibly be divided. But the Scriptures nowhere teach that this Godhead is personally, absolutely, or metaphysically one person, or that in the unity of one Godhead there are not three persons or subsistences, one and the same in nature and essence, and yet so distinct in personal attributes as to be capable of personal and distinct offices. On the contrary we have shewn that the didactic statements of Scripture on the unity of God, beyond the general declaration that he is “ONE GOD,” are *very few*, and are so worded as to imply necessarily a plurality of persons in the unity of nature in that one God.

While reason unassisted is incompetent to discover, or to prove to conviction and certainty any thing pertaining to the nature of the Godhead yet it was shewn that nevertheless the doctrine of a trinity of persons in the one Godhead—when once miraculously taught by Divine inspiration—has not been found unreasonable by the great majority of mankind. Traces of an original doctrine of the Trinity, handed down by tradition, have been found among ancient philosophers, and most religions of mankind, proving the original communication of this doctrine to mankind originally, and also its congeniality to the reason of the wisest philosophers.

---

\* See Bayle's Dictionary, Art. Manichean, Paulicians, Zoroaster, Marcionite, &c.

*The Trinity of the Godhead.*

Or where above the glassy sea  
 Stands everlastingly,  
 Some drops in secret reach the cells  
 Of subterranean wells,  
 And bear to every clime of earth  
 The traces of their birth.

Or that the four-fold streams below  
 From ancient Eden flow,  
 And as they gather stains abroad  
 Diverging on their road,  
 Yet still retain beneath all skies  
 Something of Paradise.

Indeed, so far is this doctrine from being absurd and unreasonable, that our minds almost instinctively require in their conceptions of an infinitely happy and eternal God, some social character, and hence learned men have framed arguments designed to prove from the very conception of an infinite God a triunity of persons in his single Godhead, and in confirmation of such views multiplied analogies have been pointed out in nature as indicative of the Triunity of nature's God.\*

The presumption which is thus raised in favor of the doctrine of the Triunity of God is greatly enhanced by the views entertained by the most ancient Jewish writers as derived by them from the Old Testament theology, and by the trinitarian creed of the Christian Church from the very beginning, through every age, in every country, and in all its divisions, sects and controversies, to the present time, with but partial or temporary exceptions. While differing on many points, and separated by the most impassable gulfs of space, time and sectarian opposition, nevertheless, the Eastern and Western, the Nestorian, the Armenian, the Syrian, the Waldensian, the Reformed as well as the Romish, Prelatical and Presbyterian, Baptist, Methodist, and all the other divisions of Evangelical Christendom, British,

---

\* It is most true of that ever blessed Trinity *Satis amplum alter alteri theatrum sumus*. God had from eternity a society perfectly like himself, "the CHARACTER of his person, Heb. 1, 3, and one spirit proceeding from both, and there is nothing can add any thing to those and their happiness." Leighton on 1 Peter, who has frequent similar observations.

European or American—ALL agree in holding forth the doctrine of the Trinity as a fundamental doctrine of Scripture, and as the very foundation of the whole scheme of Christianity.

The result of these inquiries is two-fold. In the first place they teach us that reason is altogether incapable of either ascertaining or proving any thing regarding the nature and mode of existence of God, and that any such proof and conviction must be founded upon the express revelation of God himself. "What saith the Scriptures?" is the only legitimate inquiry, and the plain teaching of Scripture the only standard of opinion, and the only adequate ground for unwavering conviction. "No man" says the Divine oracle, "knoweth the Father save the Son, and he to whom the Son shall reveal him." But while this is true of "man," and of all finite minds, there is another person capable of this infinite knowledge; for, as the same oracle teaches, "the Spirit also searcheth the deep things of God." Without Him also no man can comprehend the full nature of the Son, since "no man calleth Jesus, Lord, but by the Holy Ghost."

Now, the Scriptures are the revelation made to man by Christ through the Holy Ghost, according to his promise made to his disciples, that the Holy Spirit should "teach them all things." "All Scripture was given by inspiration—holy men of old having spoken in them as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." And hence, it is manifest, that in order to know anything with infallible certainty of the nature of God, we must have recourse to that word which alone is profitable for doctrine, for instruction, for reproof; and which, alone, is able thoroughly to furnish the man of God for every good work.

The second important conclusion, from our preceding inquiries, is, that, in coming to the Scriptures to ascertain their teaching on the nature of God, we do so with an *a priori* presumption, leading us to expect in them the doctrine of a triunity in "the eternal Godhead." This is a very essential point in the argument. The whole strength of Unitarianism lies in the supposed unreasonableness of the doctrine of the Trinity, and its acknowledged incomprehensibility and superhuman character; and, in the presumption which is thereby created in many

minds against its being possibly the doctrine of the word of God. Any interpretation, it is said, is, therefore, to be given to the Scriptures, any critical conjectures are to be adopted, and any theories of inspiration and of the canonicity of the books of the Bible are to be received, which may be necessary to explain the Bible, in consistency with the rejection of the doctrine of the Trinity. This, it is said, cannot be the teaching of Scripture; and, therefore, Scripture must be so interpreted as not to teach it.\*

This course is, therefore, pursued in every possible way by Unitarians and Rationalists. They cannot explain the unity of God, as taught by themselves, or make it any more comprehensible than the doctrine of the Triunity of God. Reason can comprehend just as much of the latter as of the former, and just as little of the former as of the latter, and nothing of either. Both are far above out of its sight, and the proof of either and the belief of either as an incomprehensible but incontrovertible fact, can only be founded on the revelation of God himself.

Now, it is generally admitted, even by Rationalists and Infidels, that the proofs of the doctrine of a Triunity in the Godhead—of which the Scriptures are full—if taken in their plain, literal and obvious meaning, cannot be eluded by any approved rules of language or criticism; and, therefore, as Waterland remarks, “the last resort of our opposers, commonly, is to some philosophical principle—some pretended reason, drawn from the supposed nature of the thing, rather than from the Scripture style, or from the force of Scripture expressions.”

Another, and yet more affecting consideration is, that Unitarians, in eluding the Scripture proofs of the divinity of God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, “have,” as Waterland says, “scarce left themselves any for the divinity even of God the Father; indeed, none but which, by the same artificial way of eluding, may be evaded and frustrated as well as the other. This is a consideration of great weight, which has been pressed upon them over and over, and has never yet received a satis-

---

\* Such assertions we have previously quoted.

**factory answer. So it remains as a standing evidence of the glaring force of our Scripture proofs, and will ever remain so."**

Our object in previous discussions of the doctrine of the Trinity has been to remove even the appearance of such a presumption in favor of Unitarianism and to build up a strong and irrefragable presumption in favor of the doctrine of the Trinity. The Bible is undoubtedly susceptible of interpretations which shall convey very opposite doctrines on the subject of the Trinity. We have, therefore, constructed in our previous articles, a presumptive argument composed of many cumulating proofs, to shew that the doctrine of the Trinity may reasonably be looked for in the Scriptures, and that the interpretation which fairly and literally brings out this doctrine is, therefore, to be regarded as the true teaching of the word of God.

We propose, therefore, to direct the attention of our readers in the present article, to a general outline of what the Scriptures teach, concerning the nature of God, without attempting any critical analysis of the passages adduced. This would be of course impossible. And in view of what we have said it is unnecessary, since our argument depends upon the general language and mode of representing the Deity, adopted by God in the Scriptures, understood in their plain and obvious sense, and not upon any refined explanations which it would require as much learning and ingenuity to understand, as to originate. The Bible being a revelation made by God to all men, for the benefit of all, and which all are required to understand, we must presume that the Holy Spirit moved holy men of God to use that language which will most clearly and unequivocally convey the meaning which he designed should be given.

*I. The Scriptures teach the Unity of God—necessity of this truth to His Personality and Trinity.*

I. And in entering upon this outline of the Scripture teaching on the nature of God, it is important to remark that, in the first place, the Scriptures every where represent God as one in his nature—essence—or Godhead. They every where declare

that God is one, besides whom there is none else. All other Gods—the idols of the human mind—are “nothing in the world.” In contrariety to the belief of all idolators, we are taught that the essence of God cannot be divided, separated or multiplied. Idolatry, or a multitude of Gods, whether the number be three or three millions—each partaking in a greater or less degree of the Divine nature, is not only unscriptural but is an impossibility, an absurdity and a contradiction in terms. God, by the very definition of his nature, is infinite, and therefore exclusive of all other Gods, since there cannot be more than one infinite, and no finite or created beings can be infinite.

The theory of Arius, of Socinus, of Milton (considered as the author of the Treatise of Christian doctrine ascribed to him)—and of Clarke and others, that Christ is God and yet the Son of God, in the sense of having been created by God and made a partaker of God’s infinite, eternal, and unchangeable Godhead, is at once, therefore, impossible, absurd, contradictory and blasphemous. The same theorists represent the Holy Ghost as also a created and yet Divine Being. They thus represent that there are three Gods—three Godheads, three Divine natures—and yet that two of them are created, and therefore finite beings of whose existence there was a commencement, and of whose existence there may, therefore, be an end, since He who created can destroy. This theory plainly overthrows the only Godhead known to Scripture—“the eternal Godhead.” Instead of one God it makes three. It is a tritheistic polytheism and Christianity heathenized.

It is all important, therefore, to maintain the Scriptural doctrine of the unity of God, against the tritheistic doctrine of Unitarianism, and the metaphysical theism of Sabellianism. Between these two points the pendulum of rationalizing Unitarianism must ever vibrate. These are the horns of its awful dilemma—three Gods which are no Gods, or three metaphysical nonentities. When it goes beyond these boundaries, the only result which is possible is the result which has been invariable—the utter denial of the Divine or Superhuman character of Christ, the annihilation of the Holy Ghost, or, more commonly, a blank scepticism, which rejecting the Bible as an inspired

revelation, seeks in it only the theologies of gifted or visionary men.

Let us then hold fast and firmly to the revealed doctrine that God is one, and that his Godhead is one, infinite, unchangeable, eternal and indivisible. This is the very foundation and fountain of the doctrine of the Trinity. There can be no triunity in the Godhead if there is not in it a unity. Unitarians allow themselves to remain so ignorant of what the doctrine of the Trinity really teaches, as to imagine that it denies the unity of God. Their writings therefore are full of proof from Scripture that there is only one God, and a Mr. Wilson has filled an octavo volume with a digested analysis of the Scripture proof of the unity of God. What that unity is, however, neither Mr. Wilson nor any other Unitarian attempts to tell us, and for the simple reason that they could not if they would. That the Scriptures ever speak of the Father as this God, and of the Son as this God, and of the Spirit as this God, they are careful in all their digests not to tell us; and all the multiplied proofs that these three persons are, each and severally, this God, and yet distinct as persons and in their personal offices and works,—all this they utterly ignore. Let us then all the more carefully accept and rejoice in all the proofs from the Scripture of the unity of God, since it is only on this absolute unity of the Divine Godhead we can rest the triunity of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, in that one “eternal Godhead;” and since it is only in this indubitable truth, as every where assumed and taken for granted in Scripture, we find a refuge from the gloomy polytheisms of Unitarian tritheisms—that is, from a trinity of Gods instead of a Triune God.

The doctrine of the absolute unity of the Divine nature, essence or Godhead, is also to be clearly understood and firmly believed, not only as a preservative against Unitarian rationalism or polytheism, but also against that pantheism into which such rationalism often runs. These are the Scylla and Charybdis which frown terribly on either side in all inquiries into the nature of the Deity. In truth the channel between them is very narrow. Discarding the chart of Divine revelation, and giving the sails to the wind, and the helm to the currents of vain philosophy, we are as likely to drive against the one as the

other, and in the strong current of Neology soon find ourselves whirling in madness and despair in the pantheistic whirlpool of atheistic unbelief.

Pantheism represents every thing as an emanation from, and a component part of the Divine essence, and thus instead of one "eternal Godhead," or of three Godheads, creates indefinite millions of Godheads—millions of whom are destitute of life, sense or reason—which is ineffably absurd.

This theory is contrary also to the unalterable conviction of every rational being to whom the Ego,—the I,—that is, he himself is a simple, separate, conscious, independent, free and responsible being.

And again as this theory only makes God the sum total of all the finite objects in the created universe, it can only lead to the supposition of an indefinitely great, but still a limited sum total of objective realities. But from the very necessity of our nature we are constrained to seek a cause for every effect. This Pantheistic God—this sum total of the visible and of the conceivable universe—must therefore have had an originating cause adequate to the production of all the spiritual, animate and inanimate objects, laws and systems of which it is composed. That is to say the God of pantheism—the sum total of all existences—is itself in effect, an effect, too limited by laws, and limited in its nature; and an effect therefore which requires for its existence and continuance the God of the Bible—"the eternal power and Godhead."

The unity of the Godhead is, therefore, a fundamental truth, and necessary to be intelligently and believingly held as the only preservative against the idolatry—the tritheistic idolatry of Unitarianism; and against the pantheistic transcendentalism of a philosophy, falsely so called, which, rejecting Scripture, rejects also the primary intuitive beliefs of the human mind.

II.—*Scripture teaches that the Unity of the Godhead admits a plurality of persons.*

II. But, we proceed to remark in the second place, that while it is true that Scripture, every where, assumes and asserts the absolute unity of the Divine nature; it also, every where,



assumes or implies that this unity admits of distinctions, and is not an absolute or personal unity.

The entire language of Scripture is based upon the assumption that there is, in the one eternal Godhead, a three-fold distinction; so that, without ceasing to be one, these three are, nevertheless, distinct.

What these distinctions are, Scripture does not attempt to teach, nor is it possible for man to comprehend. They are revealed only so far as they are necessary for our knowledge of duty, and our comfort, and joy in believing;—as facts rather than doctrines—facts which are to be received on the testimony and authority of God, and not as the conclusions or convictions of our own reason. What Scripture teaches and requires to be believed is not the mode of this divine existence, as one Godhead with a three-fold distinction, but the simple fact that such distinctions exist, and that they lie at the foundation of our faith and hope and joy; of our relations to God and of our obligations and duties towards him.

This is what Scripture teaches and requires as to the nature of God as one Godhead, and yet a triunity of distinct subsistences. And this is all that Scripture teaches and requires. And if it is said that the mind cannot believe God to be in Godhead one, and yet in distinct subsistences three, because we cannot understand how in one sense, and in one way, God is one, while in another sense and another way God is three, we reply that the difficulty lies not in the mind but in the will, in the pride of a self exalting and presumptuous reason. It is just as easy and as rational to believe that in the Divine unity there exist three-fold distinctions—*if God so instruct us*—as to believe otherwise. We know nothing, and can know nothing, on the subject. What God is—what the unity of God is—is infinitely beyond our comprehension. Unitarians, we repeat, cannot even define or determine any thing about their own alleged unity of God, and we determine nothing about our affirmed triunity of God. We believe that God is one, because Scripture every where affirms it; and we believe that in this one Godhead there is a triunity of distinctions for the same, and only for the same reason.

We do not say God *must* be three in one, that is, a *Triunity*, although we have been led by many presumptive reasons to expect God's own word will declare that He is so. We do not say that Scripture *must* teach this doctrine, or that otherwise it must either be rejected or emasculated of all Divine authority and power, and turned into a myth, or the mere vehicle of religious experience. This is what Unitarianism does. It does not ask "What does God say?" It dogmatically affirms what God *must* say, or else say nothing at all,—what they will believe or believe nothing,—what Scripture must write or be discarded as incredible, and impeached as a traitor.

We come to this inquiry as one of infinite moment. The doctrine is not one of speculation—a theory, or an abstract creed. It belongs to those practical matters on which our condition compels us to make up our minds one way or the other. It is the basis of those relations between the persons of the Godhead and between those persons and the sinful race of men, on which the whole scheme of redemption, the doctrines of grace, the hopes of salvation, the joys of pardon, the comforts of piety, the assurance of heaven, and all the activities and duties of the Divine life are made to depend. And it is because the doctrine of the Trinity involves all the doctrines and duties of Evangelical Christianity, that Unitarianism rejects the doctrine and rejects whatever in the inspiration and authority of Scripture requires that doctrine to be believed.

The Scriptures then, we affirm, are written so as to represent God as one, and yet at the same time not absolutely, metaphysically, that is, personally, one. They speak every where of one God, and yet every where of distinctions in this one Godhead—of three who are each God.

#### *Plural Titles of God, and other Plural Forms.*

The proof offered for this position is not drawn from a few texts or phrases, but is found embodied in the general phraseology of Scripture.

Of this fact we have already given what we consider irresistible evidence in the constant employment in Scripture as a title

for God, of a plural name. We allude to the term Elohim. This is the title employed to designate God absolute; the God whom no man hath seen at any time; the Creator of the universe; Him who infolds in his being all the attributes and all the persons of the Godhead. This is the title of the one God in contrast with all polytheistic ideas.

Wherever in our English Bibles the word God is found, there in the original the term Elohim is used.

Now this term Elohim is a plural noun. It has a singular *Eloah*, which was known to the sacred penmen, and employed by them about seventy times, and also translated by the word, God. Now, the use of the plural form Elohim, instead of the singular form Eloah, in the great majority of cases, and the use of the singular often enough to prove that it was familiar and well recognized by the inspired penmen, indicates clearly some important purpose, and has been generally considered both by the ancient Jewish and Christian Church as referring to the mysterious plurality of the Divine nature—that is of God in his absolute, unknown and unrelated character. \*

This term appears every where as the subject or nominative of verbs in the singular, as if necessarily to indicate the existence of distinct personalities infolded in it.

The term Jehovah is a name of relation, growing out of the Divine promise of a Divine Saviour, and of salvation through Him. It is, therefore, singular; is only used in a singular form; is unquestionably attributed to Christ; and well represents the person, character and work of Him who was to come; who assumed this name to himself and proclaimed it as his memorial name. \*

These terms, Elohim and Jehovah, are also conjoined—the one in the singular and the other in the plural—and God is thus very frequently and emphatically called “Jehovah Elohim,” or, “Elohim Jehovah;” that is, God, in the person of Jehovah,—he who was to come,—the Messiah—the Sent—he who was and is, and is to come.

This form of representing God as plural by the word Elohim

---

\* See *Yahveh Christ*, 1857; a work very much underrated by some.

is repeated no less than eight times in the earliest chapters in the Bible, which is very remarkable in so concise a history written by God's dictation for the instruction, primarily, of his people soon after their deliverance from idolatrous Egypt, and with a special view of instructing them in the true knowledge of the only living and true God, and of preserving them from all idolatrous and polytheistic errors.

The predominant use of the word Elohim Gods and of the combined terms Jehovah Elohim, that is the Lord thy Gods; their use in the Decalogue itself; and their employment no less than one hundred times in the law alone, is perfectly inexplicable except upon the supposition that there is in the unity of the Divine nature a plurality of Divine persons. This Bible in which these titles of God occur is, we assume God's word, and the oldest of all cosmogonies, of all theologies, and indeed of all books; God "the Holy Ghost, who moved holy men of old to speak its words" had the selection of the language, the words, and the forms and of speech. His use of them *originated and established* forms of speech which had no previous existence, and which were best adapted to express the nature of the Divine existence, and to teach whether God is ONLY ONE—a unicity incapable of any plurality, (a meaning indicated by the Hebrew word יהוה *yahid*;) or whether God is ONE ONLY, that is one in opposition to polytheistic Gods while admitting in the unity of the Godhead a plurality of persons (a meaning which is conveyed by the Hebrew term אחד *ehad* that is *one*—a word which represents any thing numerically one, though a compound of more than one.) The selection by God therefore of the term Elohim instead of Eloah; his introduction of the new memorial name *Jehovah* when he became related to his people as their promised incarnate Saviour, and present visible king and deliverer; the frequent combination of these two names in one, that is, the plural with the singular, the absolute with the relative, and the essential with the personal; the plural form of speaking of his own creative and other consultations and acts; other plural descriptions of his nature to which we will refer; and the use of the term *ehad*, and not of the term *yahid* in defining his unity; these we think are the most conclusive of

all possible proofs that God has employed language so as most emphatically to teach us that while he is one in his essence, he is plural in his persons.

For it must be borne in mind, and duly considered, that this is not of another person respecting God, but that it is the language of God respecting himself, and it is language which God employed even when most peremptorily inculcating the doctrine of his unity, and that too under the most fearful sanctions. "Ye cannot," says Joshua, "serve the Lord for he is the holy Gods." (Ch. 24 : 19.) "Remember thy CREATORS in the days of thy youth." (Eccles. 12 : 1.) "Hear, oh Israel, the Jehovah thy Gods is one Jehovah"—*ehad*, that is, one, and not *yahid*, only one, (Deut. 6 : 4.) "For thy MAKERS ARE thy husbands, the Lord of Hosts is his name." (Is. 54 : 5.) We read also in Prov. 9 : 10, of "the holy ones," and in Eccles. 5 : 8, of the "high ones." "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom, and the knowledge of the HOLIES is understanding." Prov. 9 : 10. "If I be MASTERS where is my fear." Mal. 1 : 6. "What nation is so great, whose Elohim ARE near to it." Deut. 4 : 7. "And it came to pass when THE GODS caused me to wander from my father's house." Gen. 20 : 13. "Because there appeared with him THE GODS." Gen. 35 : 7. "Even like Israel whom THE GODS WENT to redeem." 2 Sam. 7 : 23. Thus also in Levit. 9 : 4, God says: "Turn ye not unto idols, nor make to yourselves molten gods. I am the Lord (Jehovah) your Gods, (Elohim.)" This compound of the singular and the plural title is also used as the reason for the commands with which it is associated, several times within the compass of two chapters, and very frequently throughout the books of the Law. "Thou shalt fear thy Elohim for I am Jehovah, thy Elohim." Lev. 25 : 17. "I am Jehovah your Elohim that brought you forth out of the land of Egypt to give you the land of Canaan and to be your Elohim." Lev. 26 : 38. Such is the manner in which God is described throughout the Old Testament. Thus in Solomon's dedication of the temple, (1st Kings 8 : 59, 60.) "And let these my words wherewith I have made supplication before Jehovah be nigh unto Jehovah our Elohim, \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* that all the people of the earth may know that Jehovah is Elohim, and that there is none else.”

Now, these and similar expressions are not mistakes. They are not accidental or unintentional. They are God's words, written by God's penmen, at God's dictation, in God's own chosen language, and without any necessity in the poverty or weakness of that language.\* And they were spoken to God's own people, whom he had commanded on peril of death to have no other Gods than Jehovah Elohim, the one God.

But we would further remark that the plural title of God, that is, *Elohim*—is generally joined with singular verbs, pronouns and adjectives, as in the very first sentence of the Bible—*Elohim, the Gods—bara, created*. And this also is the ordinary construction throughout the whole of the Hebrew Bible. Now this plural title, according to one derivation to which it may be traced, signifies the Almighty or the Almighty powers. There is here, therefore, in the very title of the Creator, and in the very first sentence of Revelation, the unfolding of the plural personality and Divine unity of God—of that great and solemn name which with its infolded attributes stands in an opening revelation, at the head of the universe—a name of power, of distance and of mystery.

*God ascribes creation to three persons. “Let us make man.”—  
Gen. 1: 26.*

But, that this is no forced or fanciful inference, (whatever derivation of *Elohim* is adopted), will be made evident from the fact that in speaking of creation which is assuredly the very highest proof of absolute Divinity, the Scriptures do not ascribe it exclusively to God the Father, nor to God the Son, nor to God the Holy Ghost, but to each of these. The Father is therefore, declared to have been the Creator in Eph. 3: 9. The Son is expressly declared to have been the Creator in many

---

\* In the sphere of religious ideas the Hebrew language showed an expansive capacity of expression.—*Dr. Davidson in his edition of Horne's introduction, Vol. 2, p. 9.*

passages, as in Heb. 8: 10; Col. 1: 16. The Holy Spirit is also introduced as the Creator, in the very second verse of this opening chapter of Revelation in connection with, or as one of the Elohim, and elsewhere in the Bible. Gen. 1: 2. Ps. 33: 6; and 104: 30. Job 26: 13; and 33: 4. This then is to be regarded as the Scriptural explanation of the term Elohim, and its marvellous and otherwise inexplicable construction.

Observe, also, that God, that is Elohim, *created*, (where we have reference to the invisible God, the Father); God *said* (where we have as distinct reference to the Son, who alone has ever been heard or seen by men); and the Spirit of God *moved* (where we have the Holy Ghost); and thus does Isaiah speak of "God, the Lord, he that created the heavens, and THEY that stretched them out," (Is. 42: 5); and Paul says "of him" (the Father) and "through him" (the Son) and "to him" (the Holy Spirit) "are all things." (Rom. 11: 36.) "By his WISDOM," says the ancient Jewish Targum, "God created." "The Lord," says Solomon, "by wisdom hath founded the earth, by UNDERSTANDING hath he established the heavens." Prov. 3: 1.

But let us dwell further on God's own very carefully worded account of the creation, and particularly of the creation of man. "And God said let us make man in our image, after our likeness." This plural form of statement, is required by the original Hebrew, about the correctness of which there is no question.

Now, you will observe that the plurality here is in accordance with the plurality implied in the title of God, absolutely and impersonally considered, which is employed throughout this chapter—with the manifestation of one person in this plurality, speaking and executing the Divine will, "The Word of the Lord by whom the heavens were made," (Ps. 133: 6; and John 1: 3);—and with the declaration that "the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters."

Observe further, that the plural nature of Elohim here is conveyed in the form of mutual consultation and address; by the use of plural personal pronouns indicating real presence and individual separate action and yet mutual power, authority, and glorious personality.

Observe further, that we have here a complicated design, evinced by the use of language in varied forms, so as to convey, by different methods, the same meaning of a plurality of Divine persons in the Elohim or absolute and impersonal Godhead.

Observe still further, that this is God's own statement of his own nature, and of his own otherwise inscrutable councils, among different persons, and recorded in his own selected words, which "holy men spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." This idea, which is *fundamental* to any argument from the language of Scripture, and which really originates and authenticates the idioms of Scripture, we repeat again and again, because it has been so much overlooked.

Now, what are we to understand by these combined declarations? They occur, be it further remembered, not only in words inspired by God, but also in that language which God chose as the medium of revelation, and which, as some think, he *originated* as a sacred language for the very purpose of conveying his word and will, and whose idioms, therefore, are either by his special selection or sanction. God employed them, not because they existed or were in common use, but they exist and are established in their use, because God has employed and thereby has authorized, perpetuated and stereotyped them. They never existed, so far as is known, before his using them. They are not found in any other primitive language, nor in any other modern language. They are not the ordinary idioms even of the Hebrew language, which knows nothing of a plural of majesty, as it is called, and in which this plural form of personal address is never used by the people in addressing God, or in addressing their princes, or kings, or each other. On the contrary they always addressed God in the singular as "thou God," and they always addressed their princes and rulers in the same form. And to this method of address there is no exception. God alone, in speaking of himself and in revealing himself, speaks of himself by a plural name, and in plural personal pronouns.

That, in doing so, God could refer to angels as his counsel, or to any creatures, is blasphemous; is contradicted by the accounts given of the persons actually referred to, both in the



context and in other parts of Scripture; and by the declaration, that no creature (as is, indeed, self-evident,) either did, or possibly could, be present in the beginning, while uncreated to assist in creating ALL created things, themselves included.\*

These subterfuges of modern Jews to escape the force of these expressions are, therefore, mere "refuges of lies." They are, in themselves, houses of clay, built upon the sand. They are, also, useless. They explain nothing. They leave the whole difficulty unrelieved. The declarations of God, concerning himself, in language chosen by himself, in preference to other forms which he might have used, are still plain and palpably before us, and incapable of being explained away.

Unitarians, finding these subterfuges of their Jewish friends untenable, have taken refuge in the no less preposterous supposition that this is only a dramatic form of speaking. For, says Dr. Smith, "Would it not have been equally dramatic had the inspired authors written, *I will make, I will go down, I will confound?* That which these speeches possess, 'more than the dramatic form,' is *the whole* of the subject to be considered. A more gross instance of the *non causa pro causa* it would be difficult to find. Neither do we suppose that the Deity actually made use of vocal speech in the exercise of his creative energy, or on the other occasions referred to. But this is foreign to the question, which is plainly and only, why is the *plural* title, and pronoun, and other forms of speech used, when the singular was required by the subject, and would have been not only equally 'dramatic,' but more terse and vigorous and striking."

A further observation on the last remarkable passage ("let us make man, &c.,") will greatly strengthen the conclusion arrived at, and that is, that it is not singular, but is one of several similar ones. It is not, therefore, accidental, but designed; not a possible mistake, but a very pointed and emphatic didactic statement. Thus when our first parents sinned the Jehovah Elohim said: "Behold the man is become as one of us." Gen. 3: 22. Here the plural is very striking, being put in a numerical form—as ONE of us. Again, in Gen. 11:

---

\* See the passage in Isaiah, quoted before, and Oxlee, vol. 1, p. 96-108.

7—God, in speaking of himself, says: “Let us go down and there confound their language.” This is and must be the language of the Trinity; and then it is added: “So Jehovah—that is Christ, the Son—scattered them abroad from thence.” And once more when the prophet Isaiah saw in vision the glory of the Lord, and heard the Seraphims cry Holy! holy! holy! is Jehovah of Hosts,” he adds: “Also I heard the voice of Jehovah”—the Word speaking in name of the Trinity, “saying whom shall I send and who will go for us.” Is. 6: 3 and 8.

Let it also be further observed that this most emphatic form of speaking of himself is employed by God without any necessity of language, and not generally, but on those occasions merely when it would have been most important to affirm his absolute personal unity, or to indicate his certain triunity. Had God said “I will make man in *MY* image after *MY* likeness,” the expression would have been good Hebrew, and would have avoided all implication of plurality, and all possible misrepresentation supposing such plurality not to exist. And had God thus worded this important statement of the creation of man in the first person singular, instead of the plural; had he employed for his name *Eloah* singular and not *Elohim* plural; and had he avoided all reference to the SPIRIT of God, he would have worded it as Unitarians and modern Jews would word it. But instead of doing this God has worded it just as Trinitarians would naturally express it.

Another observation confirmatory of our view of the *intended*, as well as *actual* significancy of this passage, is the employment by God as designative of His own nature of several titles, having a plural form, and all of which might either have been omitted or put in a singular form. Such are the titles of *Adonai, my Lords*; *Sebaoth, hosts*; and *Shaddai, Almightyies*. God thus multiplies the evidences of a mysterious plurality in his Divine nature by employing these plural titles, besides using the designation *Elohim, more than three thousand times* in the Old Testament, while its singular form *Eloah* is also occasionally employed to prove that it exists, and yet *only fifty seven times*, to prove that it is purposely rejected as the *general* desig-

nation of the Deity; and to make this designed purpose in the preference given to the plural form of Elohim more manifest, it must be mentioned that it is not only construed, as it most commonly is with singular verbs and adjectives, but is also sometimes connected with plural verbs and adjectives, and is therefore so employed as to designate either God in his absolute impersonality, or God in his personal manifestation as Jehovah. Thus, when it is said, Gen. 20: 13, "And it came to pass when the Gods (Elohim) caused me to wander," it is, literally rendered, "Elohim (Gods) *they* caused me to wander." Again in Gen. 35: 7, it is said, literally: "Because there appeared unto him the Gods. And so also in Deut. 4: 7, "For what nation is so great who hath Gods who are so nigh." So, again, Josh. 24: 19, literally rendered, is, "Ye cannot serve Jehovah for he *is* Gods who are *holy ones*."

*"In our image"—Man, a triune emblem or image of God.*

But there is still more in the statement of God, concerning his creation of man, which renders it pregnant with instruction on the nature of God. "Let us, says God in this important passage, (which is a revelation by the Holy Ghost of the secret counsel of the Divine Godhead, from before the foundation of the world, and 'the beginning' of all things,) let us make man **IN OUR IMAGE** after our likeness. So God created man **IN HIS OWN IMAGE**, in the image of God created he them." **ELOHIM**—not angels—created man, and man was created, not in the image or likeness of angels, but of **ELOHIM**. **ELOHIM** said, (not to the earth, as some Rabbis would absurdly suggest, for it was not a speaking *a surdo ad surdum*,) but to the plurality of his own infinitely perfect nature, let us make man **IN OUR IMAGE**," and not in the image or likeness of any thing created.

This **IMAGE** is most commonly represented as consisting in a trinity of spiritual endowments—knowledge, righteousness and true holiness, and, therefore, as the likeness of God in his moral nature, and not in his essential nature; and as that likeness which, by the fall, man has lost, and to which, by redemption, man is restored.

Now, this is true, but it is only part of the truth here taught. Man was created after the image of God's moral nature, and this likeness man has lost; so that now, morally, man is born "in the likeness of sinful flesh;" that is, of Adam fallen, corrupted and condemned—"IN HIS OWN LIKENESS after HIS IMAGE." Gen. 5: 3. But man was also created so as to be an image, likeness and living emblem of God in HIS mysterious and incomprehensible three-fold nature; and is, therefore, a being who consists of one nature, uniting, in its composition, three distinct and separate subsistences; each of which is mysterious and incomprehensible; and all of which, in their nature, union, mode of operation and influence, are equally incomprehensible and past finding out. The body is a separate organism—existing, acting and governed by its own chemical laws. Animal life is distinct from physical organization, and separate and separable from it, and like it unknown, except in its results. And the spiritual life is an unknown, unsearchable and mysterious subsistence, entirely separate, distinct and different from both. Each of these is necessary to constitute the compound nature of man; and yet, no one of them makes a man. Neither would all three, separately and uncompounded, constitute a man. Man is a being composed of these three separate subsistences united into one. Man is a triunity—a trinity.

This representation may seem puerile and unphilosophical, and even absurd to some. But our present question is not with its philosophical character, but with its Scriptural authority. We do not originate a supposition for the sake of adding strength to a doctrinal theory—we only employ one Scriptural statement to illustrate another to which it necessarily refers, and of which it would seem to be an intended explanation, and while the statement is in itself simple, and in its facts obvious and undeniable, yet it is in its important bearing on the fundamental doctrine of God's nature we now employ it.

God declares that man was made in his image and likeness, even as men are now said to be born in the likeness and image of Adam; and both must refer to nature, as well as to character, and attributes; and as Scripture most explicitly, and on several occasions, defines the nature of man as a triunity of body, soul

or life, and spirit,\* we are led to conclude that there is an analogy in the threefold nature of God—an analogy of course not perfect, but still real. Man, therefore, was so made as to represent in the mysterious and incomprehensible triunity of his nature, the infinitely more incomprehensible triunity of the Divine nature. The body is human, the life is human, and the soul is human, and yet these are not three human beings, but one human being,† and so man was created in the image or likeness of Elohim, of whom it is true that the Father is God, the Son is God, the Spirit is God, and yet these are not three Gods, but one God.

We do not attempt to draw out any points in this analogy, though some are striking. We confine ourselves to the fact that according to Scripture, there is in man a triunity of mysterious, incomprehensible personalities or separate active agencies, united in one nature, and that God intended, and did actually make man so as to be an image or likeness of his own incomprehensible nature.

Now, that the reference was made to what is still characteristic of man, and therefore to his present nature and not to his original, spiritual and perfect nature exclusively, is also clearly affirmed in Scripture. The reason given for requiring the penalty of death to be inflicted on whosoever sheddeth man's blood is, "for in the image of God made he man." Gen. 9: 6. Man, therefore, is still "the image or likeness of God." The Apostle James in speaking of the tongue, (3: 9,) says, "therewith bless we God, even the Father, and therewith curse we men who are made after the similitude of God." The Apostle Paul also gives it as a reason why men ought not to cover the head, "forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God." And in the

---

\*Thess. 5: 28. Heb. 4: 12. Rom. 12: 1, and several passages in the Old Testament.

† "Every man in his physical nature is an individual single agent."

"Thus the body is a system or constitution."

Man's conscious nature is three-fold—sensational, intellectual and moral. *The Mystery of Evil and God.* Page 18.

So Coleridge, Hengstenberg and Olshausen.

genealogy of Luke, ch. 3: 38; after tracing it up to Seth, he says of him that he "was the son of Adam, who was the son of God." Adam was the son or image of God, in the construction of his nature, and not merely in his character, just as every other son bears in his nature and constitution the image or likeness of his father. The same image, in some essential form in which Adam was made in the likeness and as a representation of God, is, therefore characteristic of every human being.

This image, can not be limited to man's soul and to its spiritual attributes, otherwise angels as well as men would be represented as participating in it, which, however, they are never said to do. Their nature on the contrary is distinguished from that of man, and Christ is therefore said to have passed by the nature of angels, and to have taken that of men. This image and likeness must, therefore, be found in what is peculiarly human and not angelic, that is, it must be found in his whole compound nature, and not in his spiritual merely.

Neither is this "image" what is characteristic of men collectively, or generically, but of men, individually and personally, that is, every man, as the preceding quotations prove; and therefore, it must be found in those constitutional elements which are common to every man, that is in his compound triune nature.

Again this image of God is that which Christ, in assuming human nature, took upon himself, "the fashion of a man," the likeness of men. In Christ this image or likeness was again perfect and complete in body, soul and spirit, that "he might become the first-born among many brethren" in the family of redeemed men. Now, it is to this perfected and immaculate "image of his Son" all true believers are "to be conformed," being "changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord," so that as we have borne (in consequence of the fall) the corrupted image of the earthly Adam, we may also by redemption "bear the image of the heavenly." And this image to which we shall by Divine grace be restored is not merely spiritual, nor merely living and active, but also in addition to these, corporeal, for "Christ shall change

our vile body so that it may be likened unto his glorious body.”\*

(*To be continued.*)

---

ARTICLE IV.

THE BURDEN OF EGYPT.

The connection between science and revelation, or any point in that connection, is, we claim, a legitimate theme for free discussion. True science and genuine revelation can never differ, at least can never conflict. It is the more grateful, accordingly, to seize upon points where they have seemed to be at issue and may be reconciled; as well as to indicate avenues through which their truths may visibly approach each other. The number of such points is rapidly increasing; and

---

\* Another analogy has been beautifully pointed out between the union and love of man, Adam and Eve, and of that ineffable union and communion, and love between the persons of the ever blessed Trinity, “Of all relations, marriage is the most *intimate*: for in it two become one. Adam was *one* in no high or happy sense as he stood lonely amid the beauties and bounties of Paradise, and found no “help meet for him” among the creatures around. But a deep sleep fell upon him; and during that sleep he became two, that so he might become one again, by a better and more perfect oneness; a oneness more like the oneness of God, in whose image he was made. That Divine image was less perfect in him while he was alone. For “God is love;” and Adam had none whom he could love as an equal, till Eve was at his side. But then, he had one to love who was himself, and yet not himself; “bone of his bone, and flesh of his flesh;” taken out of himself—of one nature and substance with himself; yet a distinct *person*. And so, in man, as he stood *complete, male and female*, there was a faint type of that love which is eternally interchanged among the Three Persons of the one Godhead. And so, by being severed and united again, man became more like his Maker. So perfect was the oneness of Eve with Adam, that Adam, in loving his wife, loved himself: not his *own person*, but another *person* who was yet himself. And that was the highest perfection of human love, and the nearest approach that it could make to the love that is eternally in God.”

the number of those which the believer must for the present, while he admits them passively, lay aside among the solemn mysteries of God, is in the same ratio and from the same causes decreasing. Let us notice one of the former points.

We feel free to challenge the attention of clerical objectors to the science of Geology. Ministers who cavil at the claims—or, as they phrase it, the pretensions—of Geology should rather rejoice to see this science assume its proper position as the co-ordinate of genuine Theology; for thus only can they free themselves of an opponent which, as an opponent, and so long as kept in an attitude of antagonism, is likely to prove a formidable foe. We submit the following suggestions, trusting that to those theologians, who hold Geology in light esteem, they may indicate its possible importance, and that to those Geologists, who respect Science only, they may be in like manner suggestive of the claims of Revelation. They are submitted also to consistent Geologists, who may find them of some general interest. It will be perceived that we use the titles, Theologist and Geologist, in a low sense, as signifying those persons conversant with Theology and with Geology, only in special treatises on those sciences, and therefore lacking a comprehensive acquaintance with them.

The winds are regarded as a not inconsiderable agent in geological changes; and the history of their influence both as mechanical and chemical operatives in the universal law of change, fully sustains their claim to importance. The encroaching dunes of Biscay in France, of Cornwall in England, and of Cape Cod in the United States, are sufficient to illustrate what, as a mechanical agent, a breeze can do; and every wave that lashes and dies upon the breakers of every ocean and sea is iterative of the same unostentatious but irresistible truth. As a chemical agent the atmosphere contains one ingredient—carbonic acid—in minute quantities however, which unites readily with the cement of eternal granite itself. The union destroys the adhesive quality of the cement; and the granite crumbles to dust. This phenomenon lies at the threshold of Agricultural Chemistry. Every breeze, then, that kisses the granite hill disintegrates some portion of that hill. Every



wind that blows does something towards carrying on the "never-ending, still beginning" change.

Upon Halley's theory of the trade winds, Maury, in his Physical Geography of the Sea, erects a superstructural hypothesis, according to which his "Calms of Cancer" are a zone of variable width extending around the earth in the region of the parallel of 30 deg. North. Within this zone, local causes are permitted to determine the direction of prevailing winds in any given locality. South of this zone, as far as to the vicinity of the equator, the N. E. trade winds prevail, determined in that direction by a due southward mechanical impetus—but modified and westwardly diverted by the diurnal rotation of the earth. Both these points are to be remembered. 1. The calms or local winds region of 30 deg. North; and 2. The N. E. trade winds South of that line, especially about 20 deg. North.

Maury's Calms of Cancer embrace that portion of Egypt about Alexandria, Suez, Cairo, and the pyramids of Djiza. This region is known as the district of Bahari. The prevailing winds here are West—that is *from* the West. These are they to which Dr. Hitchcock refers when illustrating the effects of winds in transporting destructive dunes. He says: "The westerly winds have brought in the sands from the Libyan desert, and all the west side of the Nile, with the exception of a few sheltered spots, has been converted into an arid waste." The cause of this direction doubtless is the preponderance of *desert-power* of the Arabian over the Libyan desert. It will be observed in this connection that the latter is separated from the Zahara, or great desert proper, of North Africa, by a continuous line of oases—Bilmah, Tibesti, Fezzan, and Sockna, and, in closer proximity to Bahari in the Calms zone itself, the partially fertile district of Barca. By desert-power we mean the heat generating and vacuum-producing power, conditioned by the kind, and measured by the extent of the given kind of surface. The effect of the sun's shining on a sandy surface, within the tropics more directly, is to heat, and in heating to expand, and in expanding to force upwards the atmosphere of that surface; producing thereby a partial vacuum, to fill which currents of air

spring up from all points of the compass towards the vacant space. The laws which determine this process are of the most elementary character. The heat, accordingly, of the Arabian desert produces a constant west wind from the Libyan desert, across the lower Nile, within the Calms region, towards Suez and Akaba. This is the Bahari west wind. Now, whether it is owing to the cause I have suggested or not, is, to the matter in hand, entirely immaterial; because the facts of the prevailing wind and its direction rest upon the observation of travellers. We merely suggest how the phenomena may be produced. The same observation testifies that the visible height of the pyramids and of the Sphynx is annually diminishing by reason of the drifting sands of the desert, day to day and grain by grain, deposited by the west winds from Libya. Our sources of information respecting Egypt, in common with the Holy Land and the Orient generally, are quite numerous, and many are of the first character. The scientific results of Napoleon's expedition by his accompanying corps of *savans*, embodied in his splendid publication, *Description de l'Egypte*, are perhaps the most complete and comprehensive. We have, besides this, the works of Denon, (who also accompanied the Emperor,) Jomard, Hamilton, Letronne, Miot, Wilkinson, Russel and White; and travels almost numberless, as those of Leigh, Belzoni, Norden, Clarke, Shaw, Pococke; and later, Stephens, Taylor, etc., etc.

Fix your attention again, for a moment, distinctly upon the other point on the Nile, about latitude 20 deg. North, ten degrees South of Suez, in the vicinity of New Dungola, in Nubia. Here, you will remember, the N. E. trade-winds obtain; and here the Nubian Desert lies *east* of the Nile.

One who has any acquaintance with the winds as an agent in geological changes, with the ever-moving dust-clouds of desert regions—borne upon the strength of every constant wind, dashed irregularly up by every whirlwind, and impelled onward to greater or less distance by every gust—will perceive at once the geological effect of these two winds from these two deserts—that is, the Bahari west wind, across the mouths of the Nile, and the N. E. trade-winds from the desert of Nubia,

across the river, farther up. Their tendency is the same—first, to elevate the *vicinity* to the height of the river, which flows in much of its course as do the Po, the Mississippi and many others, upon an alluvial elevation, built by the stream itself; at the same time, to destroy its fertility by covering the alluvium; then, to dam up and absorb the waters themselves; and, ultimately, to force the remaining current (for these causes do not operate to destroy the fountains of the Nile) into another channel. This new channel will turn to the right—to the east, that is to say—somewhere about El Makkarif, or lower, perhaps, near Abu Hammed, and thence into the Red Sea, in the vicinity of Salaka. At the same time, we may incidentally remark, the same N. E. trade-winds, across central Arabia, will be making sandy encroachments upon the eastern shore of the Red Sea.

Turn now to the Burden of Egypt, given by Isaiah in the XIX chapter of his prophecy, from the fifth to the eleventh verse, and the fifteenth verse; and it becomes at once apparent, that for Egypt, the prospective of prophecy and of science are the same. In Keith, on the Prophecies, a popular, though unfortunately imperfect, because hastily prepared work, the author in contending for the literal interpretation of prophecy leaves the question in its proper attitude; for, without this, much of the prophetic books of the Bible loses its pertinency, and sinks into mere matter of style. And the spirit that would evade an apparent immediate difficulty, for such a consideration, is taking a bold step towards the absolute unliteralness and metaphorical speculations of Straus and Feuerbach. But all this is a matter for our friends, the theologians. It is ours here to inquire into the harmony between the revealed Word and the prophetic Voice of science, as heard in the winds of the desert, and seen written upon the face of its vagrant dunes. This Word and this Voice *do* harmonize in their minutest signification and their most inessential detail; else, at least one is false.

Let us examine this Burden of Egypt somewhat circumstantially. The loose and general way in which the common or King James' version corresponds with that of the Septua-

gint or Alexandrian Greek\* renders a collation of the two worthy our attention. The numbered readings are the common version. We commence with the geological specifications in the fifth verse.

"5. And the waters shall fail from the sea, and the river shall be wasted and dried up." The Septuagint has it—we give in close metaphor—“And the Egyptians shall drink the water along the sea, and the river shall depart and shall be dried up.” The indrifting of sand, however slow, if inevitably continuous—and who shall say to the desert winds, Be still?—will not only elevate the whole district of Bahari above the flow of the waters of both sea and river but, as an ever-thirsty absorbent, would absorb them even if they should not be mechanically forced away. The deflection of the river will be effected by sands brought by the N. E. trade-winds sweeping across the Nubian desert above, about latitude 20 deg. North. The operations at these two points are synchronous, and now progressing. Near the head of the gulf of Suez—its Northern extremity—the waters are several feet lower than formerly, according to Niebuhr who examined the locality very thoroughly with the light of much learning and acumen. His observations were made with reference to an entirely different question—the *locale* of the passage of the Israelites—and hence are not open to suspicion when used on this point.

"6—7. And they shall turn the rivers far away, and the brooks of defence shall be emptied and dried up; the reeds and flags shall wither. The paper-reeds by the brooks, by the mouth of the brooks, and everything sown by the brooks, shall wither, be driven away, and be no more." The Greek says, “And the rivers and the canals—*αι διώρυχες*, trenches or ditches

---

\* The Septuagint, when discreetly used, is an important help in the criticism and interpretation of the Hebrew Scriptures. Yet, as a translation, it is of very unequal value. Many parts of it were translated by incompetent or unfaithful men. They sometimes mistook the sense of the original, or invented glosses, and paraphrased loosely instead of translating strictly. The text, too, is in need of a careful revision. As a version it is far inferior, as a whole, to the admirable one made under King James' patronage, and far less worthy of general confidence.—[EDITORS S. P. B.]

dug for irrigating purposes—of the river shall disappear; and every collection of water shall fail, even in every marsh of cane and papyrus, and the verdure round about the river, and everything scattered—or, sown—through the river, *blasted by the winds*, shall pine away.” The italics are worthy of note. The prophet had before said,—verse 1,—“The Lord rideth upon a swift cloud, and shall come into Egypt; and the *idols*. (The Sphynx and the Pyramids?) of Egypt shall be moved at his presence.” To return—the departure of the river and the disappearance of the artificial trenches are but consequences of the continuance of existing causes, already mentioned. The marshes must cease, by changing character, with the departure of the waters; and the cane and papyrus or paper-reed being aquatic growths fail whenever their localities fail of water.

“8. The fishers also shall mourn, and all they that cast angle into the brooks shall lament, and they that spread nets upon the waters shall languish.” The Greek version is substantially the same. “The fishers shall mourn, and mourn also shall those casting the angle into the river, and those casting the seine and the net shall grieve.” When their resorts shall have become an arid, sterile, and sultry sand plain, the fisher’s occupation will be gone.

“9—10. Moreover they that work in fine flax, and they that weave net works, shall be confounded. And they shall be broken in the purposes thereof, all that make sluices and ponds for fish.” The Greek,—“And confusion shall seize those working in fine linen and those working in flax. They shall do these things in sadness. And all those making beer—*ποιοῦντες τὸν ζῆσον*—shall sorrow and fret their souls.” The special use of flax may have been—and the interpolation, if such it be, in the English version was suggested by that idea—to prepare nets, seines, and the *et cetera* of fishing tackle; but the general use of these materials was the same as that in other nations, namely, the manufacture of clothing, tents, cordage, etc. To the present point this is immaterial. The producers and manufacturers of these as commodities were thrown out of employment by the declining fertility of the river lands.

We pass to a consideration of the other statement. Beer—a species of barley beer—was an Egyptian, and to a considerable extent a national drink; and its specification here is worthy of note for that reason, though it does not occur in King James' version. The Septuagint translation, besides, was prepared in Alexandria, most probably for the use of the resident Jews of that city; and those things relating to that country, accordingly, are more accurately given in that version. Later, one Zosimus, an Egyptian, wrote in Greek a treatise on beer making—*De Zythorum Confectione*—a respectable octavo which was first published, we believe, in 1814. But the breweries must be closed. The pilgrim sands must close them; and they have ever since been closing them, as grain by grain of comminuted earth drops upon the treasured gift of the Nile. The breweries must be closed; the fisheries abandoned; the factors of linen lament their declining trade; the marshes and ditches and bogs become dry; the river turn from its course; the sea itself retire (it is now retiring) before the on-pouring tide of dust; and the whole land be conquered by the literally innumerable host of invading particles. The pyramids must pass away, downwards; the Sphynx gaze no longer across the rising plain; the Pillar of On disappear forever; the magnificent ruins of hundred-gated cities sink beyond the view and visitation of meditative Volneys; and Egypt's self become, like Libya of old, an *arida nutrix leonum*.

The fifteenth verse of this chapter points to these things—“Neither shall there be any work for Egypt, which the head or tail, branch or rush, may do.” According to the Septuagint—“And there shall not be to the Egyptians any thing which shall make (or have) head and tail, beginning and end.” General inefficiency and confusion of things seems to be the idea—Egypt desolate.

Such is the Burden of Egypt, and such the consummation to be wrought by natural agencies; such the end, foreseen in the beginning by the eye of the Eternal, and given to men twenty-five hundred years ago.—Egypt desolate. Such is a problem for the powers of nature in the future; but not the only problem. Egypt shall not be desolate forever. Even this apparently

eternal seal upon her destiny is to be broken. "And the Lord shall smite Egypt; he shall smite *and heal it.* \* \* \* \* In *that day* shall there be a highway out of Egypt to Assyria. \* \* \* \* In *that day* shall Israel be the third with Egypt and with Assyria." That day, however distant it be, will yet arrive. How, is not yet dreamed of in our philosophy. When? It will be in the distant coming time, "when the *desert* shall rejoice, and blossom as the rose."

Back, in the early dawn of the earth's day—some millions of years ago—when towering forests of tropical trees, of stupendous magnitude, were growing up rapidly, and being as rapidly disorganized, forming immense masses of decaying vegetable matter—dark, offensive and pestilential—back in that early time, we say, human reason would have staggered under the proposition that all that decay and death was one of the wisest material provisions of a benevolent Deity for the future use and wants of man, whose creation even, at that time, lay millions of years in the future. The proposition, however incredible, was true. The extensive coal deposits were formed in that way—coal, the great substantial agent and blessing of modern civilization. Remove it now and productive industry would be paralyzed. Human reason is now equally unable to bear the ponderous truth that in the wide and now utterly worthless waste of Zaharan sand,—sterile, desolate, and dead,—there is some wise, though to us unseen, prospective provision of Deity which is to prove the mainspring to some future and higher civilization. A confident reliance on the omni-benevolence and omniscience of Deity is all that is needed to give us a reason and a hope. He has never done anything in vain. Egypt's desolation will be but a step in the advancement of some mighty purpose in this yet mighty future. We have no philosophy to tell *how* this removal of Egypt's Burden will be effected; but we have a philosophy to tell that it *will be done*, and that it will be done in His appointed time.

## ARTICLE V.

## e/ THE REVIVAL OF THE SLAVE TRADE.

by John Bailey Adger

*Reports of the Committee to whom was referred the Message of Gov. JAMES H. ADAMS, relating to Slavery and the Slave Trade.* Ordered to lie upon the table and be printed together for distribution. Columbia, S. C. Steam power press Carolina Times. 1857; pp. 88. 8 vo.

The history of opinions relating to African Slavery and the African Slave Trade, is very remarkable. About four centuries ago this trade was commenced by the Portuguese. In 1481 they erected their first fort at D'Elmina. Gradually, the English, Dutch, Danes, French and our own New Englanders, rivalled the Portuguese in their zeal for this traffic. About ninety years ago the Rev. Mr. Searle, a native of Connecticut, a student of Divinity under the great and venerable Jonathan Edwards, and a man of note in his day,—for a time a pastor in the neighborhood of Boston, and subsequently, till his death, in Vermont,—preached publicly in justification of the slave trade. We may consider this *the First Chapter* of the history of opinions in respect to this subject, embracing a period of about three hundred years, during which the traffic, afterwards so odious, had established itself firmly in the respect of most Christian nations. All along, however, from the beginning, there had not been wanting individuals who objected to it as inhuman. In New England itself, no doubt, some such were to be found; and about the time when Mr. Searle publicly advocated the traffic, such persons in Old England began to make their voices heard. Pope, Thomson, Shenstone and Cowper, among the Poets, and Warburton, Baxter, Whitfield, Wesley, and others among Divines, uttered their condemnation of the trade. Granville Sharp began his public efforts in 1765. The Quakers, in England, had uttered their censure as early as 1727; in America, they had, indeed, done this long before—viz.,



in 1696. It was not, however, until about 1787 that Clarkson and Wilberforce began their earnest, determined and combined efforts.

That very year, the General Assembly of South Carolina, anticipating the action of Congress and of Great Britain by twenty years, forbade the introduction of any more slaves into this State, under the penalty of forfeiture of the slave and an additional fine of £100. After the severest struggles, and with infinite difficulty, Clarkson and Wilberforce and their coadjutors, succeeded in persuading the British Parliament to abolish the slave trade, Congress having passed a similar act a short time before. In France, the wildest radicalism—the most desperate assertions of universal liberty, equality and fraternity—the most reckless denial of all authority, human and Divine—began about this time to shew themselves, as the results both of that profligacy of the nobles, that rapacity of the courtiers, those disputes and vices of the clergy which had sapped the foundations of social order; and of those arguments, and that ridicule, by which able and eloquent writers had, for some time, been assailing all the ancient establishments, both of Church and State, and laboring to introduce, as they hoped, a better condition of affairs. Yet, France did not then, nor for a long time, apply her new opinions to the question before us. Not till Bonaparte returned from Elba did the French abolish the slave trade.

We may consider this event as terminating *Chapter the Second* of this remarkable history. From a general advocacy of the traffic, and a general participation in it, opinions have so far worked round as that all the chief maritime powers have declared the trade to be piratical. Henceforward we see them united in efforts to put it down. England, pre-eminently zealous against the traffic, (with how much honest unselfishness it is hard to determine,) declares publicly that her aim is not only to put down this trade, but to abolish slavery all over the world. She does actually abolish it in her West India possessions.. And there arises and is carried on in connection with these movements of the governments, (and in fact as partly producing them,) a most excited and furious anti-slavery

crusade in England. This crusade, our Northern States, gradually are led to engage in with a fury even surpassing that of the English; and the whole civilized world is "agitated" with a view to a universal emancipation of the African slave. But there arises out of all this agitation a counter result! There is developed in the slaveholding States of this country a complete revolution of sentiment. From a state of doubt and anxiety in regard to their position, that was very general among the religious and intelligent classes of the community, they pass, by a careful examination of the Scriptures, to a calm and quiet conviction that their slaveholding is not condemned by the Christian religion. In the meanwhile, England perceives the ruinous error of her West India policy; and France also discovers that a fresh supply of African labor is a great necessity to her colonies; and both together with our own Government, despair of being able to put down the slave trade by their combined fleets. And *Chapter Third* of the History, which we have been endeavoring to trace, is closing now, with an open and determined resort on the part of France to the African coast for *slaves* under the name of *apprentices*; with feeble objections by England to the course of her "faithful ally," preparatory, it would seem, to her engaging as a partner in the same business; and with a frank and manly avowal, amongst ourselves, of the necessity and rightfulness of re-opening the slave trade, (which certainly makes conspicuous the upright and honest spirit of the Southern slaveholder,) as well as with some actual steps towards this end on the part of some of the South-Western States!

Before proceeding to a review of the very able, though not perfectly thorough discussion of the question of re-opening the slave trade, which is presented in the Majority and Minority Reports, named at the head of this article, we must refer again to that "complete revolution of sentiment," which has taken place in these slaveholding States; and to that "calm and quiet conviction," in which we have asserted that the conscience of the most scrupulous appears to have found repose. That sentiment, so calm and quiet because so deep and settled, is the most important feature perhaps in the present attitude of the

South regarding this whole matter of slavery. Extending, as we judge it does, to men of every religious creed, and uniting, as we judge it does, the whole body in every church in all this fair, broad Southern land, it constitutes an element of prodigious strength in every possible aspect. It prepares the whole people to stand as one man. It is a conviction that will make patriots, and if need were, martyrs. There is no earthly power that can overcome a whole people when animated by such convictions!

But what is this conviction of which we speak? What is the position of the South? We apprehend it is often misconceived both here and at the North. *There*, if we mistake not, it is often understood that the South maintains slavery to be essential to the best form of social organization; to be the form which God has ordained as the best form; and that therefore the South desires out of pure love and blind reverence for the institution, to propagate it every where. And *here* too, if we mistake not, some regard this conception, not only as the prevalent but the only true view of the case. Slavery is the best form of society, and God has ordained slavery, especially the slavery of the African race, and therefore it is even impious not to enslave them. Now, it appears to us, that this is not the ground upon which the South is standing up with a unanimous and profound conviction that they never can give back one inch. Whether slavery be or be not the best form of society in general; whether we ought or ought not to make positive efforts to extend it over or amongst people where it is not already, this is a question which, we judge, that our Southern people do not claim to have investigated, much less decided. The South, and especially the great Carolina statesman's late immediate constituents, are often charged with delighting in "abstractions." But this certainly is one "abstraction" which we have not agreed either to receive or reject. It may have occurred to many of us a thousand times, that equal rights to equal things for all men, is neither a possible nor a desirable form of the social state; that all communities have actually to use the involuntary labor of most classes of their people; that capital and labor are constantly carrying on their mutual strug-

gle in every country; and that in our Northern States there are likely to arise some very peculiar embarrassments and dangers to the peace and safety of society, as soon as capital and labor have both grown somewhat bigger and stronger, and the war between these now infant giants shall have begun to be carried on in earnest; but certainly we have not undertaken to decide how these States should regulate these affairs of their own. The South never has meddled with such questions, because not pertaining to her. We are not a meddling, impertinent people, given either to asking questions or volunteering advice about other men's affairs. We have no theories of government to propagate abroad. As to the whole matter of slavery we have all along been *on the defensive*. The only questions which we have endeavored to settle are such as concern ourselves, and our own duties and rights. Accordingly the position of the South, as we understand it, is, that whatever may be true in hypothetical cases, the actual case before us is a clear one. Whatever may be true or false of other nations generally,—whatever of other Africans,—as concerns those Africans who live amongst us, they are justly held by us in bondage. Towards them we have duties, over them we have rights. The existing relation between the white and the black man in these Southern States is a necessary, and a just, and a good relation. It is the best form of society possible amongst us. It is good not only for us, but good for them. Evils, and some of them great ones, evils to us and evils to them, are no doubt connected incidentally with the relation, (and what human relation is without incidental evils?) but the relation itself, is the very best possible for both the races, thus strangely brought together in God's mysterious Providence. Existing as they do in the midst of us, the end of this relation would necessarily be the end of all their wonderful progress—the beginning of their retrogression, very rapidly, into the barbarism out of which we have been God's agents in partly reclaiming them; and existing as they do in the midst of us, the end of this relation would be the end of all ability on our and their part to dwell peaceably together. Therefore the relation is good. And born under it, we and they both like it; and

under it, all things taken into view, we and they constitute together, perhaps, the happiest people in the whole world! Such we conceive to be the position which the South takes. And to that portion of our Northern brethren who have so much desire to teach us how unfortunate and miserable our lot is, and also how sinful is the relation of master and slave, we say, you neither know the facts nor comprehend the principles of the case. It is you that need instruction, concerning every part of the subject. And there are thousands of you, whom a single winter spent at the South, would be sufficient to emancipate from the thralldom of your prejudices and your erroneous conceptions. What judgment will history pass on men, who suffered themselves to be deceived by misrepresentations about things not three days' journey from their own homes? These deceived thousands are victims to those systematic efforts for manufacturing public sentiment, which have been carried on by the self-confident reformers of society at the North, during twenty-five years past, and under the influence of which the younger men of the present generation there have been educated. But there are thousands of these deceived people, whom a journey of three days might undeceive! No such short and simple process, however, would suffice for purging the vision of the authors of this system of misrepresentation and delusion. Theirs is the total blindness of a dogmatizing fanaticism.\*

As religious editors, we have no apology to offer for discussing in our pages, a question which in several important aspects is manifestly a religious as well as a political question. That the question has been raised, we very much regret, because

---

\* To those in England who sympathized with the ferocious and disorganizing principles of infidel France at the Revolution, Burke gives the name of "new fanatics of popular arbitrary power." "Extraordinary questions of law," (like the *dethroning*, or as they called it the *cashiering* of a King,) "which are always pre-eminently questions of dispositions, of means, of probable consequences, rather than of positive rights," these men settled without any difficulty, for being blinded by their fanaticism they saw no difficulty. Not one of them doubted but that "nature had qualified him to administer in extremities this critical, ambiguous, bitter potion (of Revolution) to a distempered State."

while its discussion cannot be expected to answer the practical end it contemplates, it will certainly divide public opinion amongst us, and this division must tend to alienate from one another, those who ought to stand shoulder to shoulder. Why then, it may be asked, do you agitate the question, if you apprehend such consequences from the very discussion? We answer, because the discussion is begun, and upon one side is going on continually; and because we would see our Southern people not abandoning their now impregnable position for one which they cannot hold. We have the highest respect for the majority of the committee. Their report is able. Their motives are pure and patriotic. But we fear that, for uncertain results and doubtful advantages, they are relinquishing the most valuable fruits of our past victories in this mighty conflict with the whole civilized world; as well as, the most indispensable necessities for further conquests by us, in the struggles which remain. We stand already on a very high vantage ground. Our position is one that has proved, to us and to the world of our assailants, its impregnable strength. The South must not forsake that position. We feel impelled, as her sons, to speak to our mother! We shall strive, on our part, in speaking, not to wound the feelings of one of her children.

The occasion of these reports was furnished by certain suggestions to the Legislature of South Carolina, contained in Gov. Adams' Message, December, 1857. The late Governor's argument for the re-opening of the trade, as quoted by the majority of the Committee, is, briefly, that the demand for cotton is greater than the South can meet, not for want of land, but labor; and that the immediate consequence must be a still higher price for cotton, by which the growth of the article in other countries will certainly be so much stimulated as finally to furnish a foreign supply of it, and in time to destroy our now partial monopoly. England and France are already making systematic efforts to produce cotton in the East Indies and in Algeria. The present high price of the article helps them to succeed in these efforts. The true policy of these Southern States is to have the price reduced. We must make up for this reduction by making larger crops. To do this, we

want more labor; and to be able to get more labor, we must cheapen labor by getting more slaves from Africa. To the objection that this would be *wrong*, Gov. Adams replies that slavery has benefited those now here, and would benefit those to be brought. To the objection that opening this trade will lessen the value of slaves, and ultimately destroy the institution, he replies by asserting that unrestricted immigration has not diminished the value of labor in the North West. He maintains that the Act of Congress, which declares the slave trade piracy, is a brand upon us that ought to be removed; for, if the slave trade be piracy, then our slaves must be plunder. And, accordingly, he urges the State to withdraw her assent to this act, which is, in fact, a direct condemnation of ourselves. He regards more slaves to be necessary to a restoration of the South to an equality of power in the general government, as well as to the full development of our peculiar form of society; and, therefore, considers that we are bound by a most sacred obligation to give that form of society the means of expansion, and to press it forward to a perpetuity of progress.

Reporting favorably to the Legislature upon these views and suggestions of his late Excellency, the majority succinctly review the whole course of British policy on this subject; the vastness of England's former colonial resources for procuring a supply of those tropical productions, which are the great demand of the age; her now acknowledged error in ruining her West India Islands; the failure of her "apprentice" system for the manumitted slaves, and also of her "free emigrant" and "coolie" system; and the now, more than ever, manifest failure of her gigantic efforts to obtain cotton in the East Indies.\* They maintain, that failing to obtain any actual release from the dilemma into which she has fallen, England now seeks a comparative result. She would embarrass, jeopardize and cripple us, who have not followed her example; have not abol-

---

\* The gentlemen of the majority appear to differ from Gov. Adams upon the question of fact, regarding the past success and the probable future success of Great Britain in growing cotton in the East Indies.

ished slavery ; and so are continuing to supply commerce with the products which civilization demands as the necessaries of life. Brazil and Cuba she also includes in her crusade against slavery, which is simply a scheme for self-compensation for injuries she has done to herself. If she can succeed in abolishing slavery in these three countries, but especially amongst us, then will all other countries be reduced to the same *relative productive capacity* with herself.

In tracing the history of British efforts to procure the abolition of slavery by these, the only three slaveholding powers of America, the Majority's Report dwells upon the grounds which England certainly had, at the time she abolished the institution in her colonies, to believe that her example would be followed in this country. The hope was reasonable. Confined then to but a few States; debarred from increase by importation; unpopular at home; denounced abroad; who could have foreseen that in a single generation, slavery would live down all these obstacles to its progress? The reasonable hope of the British was blasted. Shortly and unexpectedly, but by some mighty impulse, the tide of abolition was checked in the border States of Virginia and Kentucky; and slavery in these Southern States is now vindicating the majesty of its power in the very necessities of all mankind.

But not only did the original slave States continue to be such, but Florida and Louisiana added four to their number. Texas also, notwithstanding all the earnest and artful efforts of England to make out of her a rival cotton producing country at our very door, which should use free and not slave labor; preferred to hearken to nature's voice, and the cry of the blood in her own veins, and joined herself to her sister States. This *last direct* effort of Great Britain to embarrass slavery amongst us having failed, she has ever since been resorting to indirect means. She is stimulating the blind fury of Northern Abolitionists. Our domestic and our foreign foes are in league together. And both by treaty stipulations with this foreign nation, and by legislative enactments on the part of our own government at home, is it attempted to undermine and overthrow our Southern institutions; as well as by a domestic



popular agitation which has long been stirring up all the evil passions of the nation, and filling the country with discord and dissension. Thus the most powerful maritime nation of Europe, has been for half a century, and still is striving to ruin us; while, at home, the section that is conducting in a like spirit towards us, is soon to have the complete control of this government! What then shall the South, the whole united South do? The report answers, that they must shape their course, so as to convert our enemies into friends, through a double conviction of their own interests and our rights.

It then proceeds to shew that slavery became popular at the South when the culture of cotton, rice, tobacco, sugar, hemp, &c., became profitable; but that it became also, at the same time beneficial through these productions, both to the North and to Great Britain. Slavery thus depends on commerce and manufactures, and commerce and manufactures, in their turn, depend on slavery. For the rescue of slavery then from its impending dangers, the ways and means of supplying the steadily increasing demand for cotton, claim our earnest consideration. The abolition of slavery, hitherto, has been prevented by the necessity of its fruits. If it should not continue to make itself necessary hereafter, it must be abolished. Now, if the demand for cotton increases and slavery cannot proportionably multiply its hands and arms, so as to furnish the needed supply of this article, mankind will be forced to find a supply elsewhere, and slavery will thus become less and less a necessity. Our present partial monopoly of the cotton trade, therefore calls for a more abundant, and thus a cheaper supply of labor, and this necessitates the re-opening of the slave trade.

The report then takes up a discussion of the question, whether the true interests, *first* of South Carolina, and then *secondly*, of the whole South, and then *thirdly*, of the whole world, demand an increase of slaves in these States. It is urged that in this State alone, we have 5,000,000 acres of good land not in cultivation, of which, 1,300,000 acres are rich, but unreclaimed swamp and river-bottom, lying in the malarious section of the State, where no agricultural labor but that of the

negro ever can subsist. But instead of our having the requisite amount of negro labor for the cultivation of these rich lands, not less than 130,000 negroes have been removed to the west since 1820. Dividing the sixty years of the United States census into two equal periods of thirty years, our slave population increased during the former 140 per. cent., but during the latter period only 49 per cent.;—while the increase in the south western States has been from 300 to 900 per cent. But the majority insist, that even looking at the South as a whole, there is not, now, a supply of the labor, and there is not the natural prospect of a supply, hereafter, of the labor which is required. But if South Carolina, and if the whole South, need an increase of slaves, so does all the world need that this supply be furnished. Why should all the world be required to pay us fifteen cents per pound for cotton, when with abundance of cheap labor we could profitably to ourselves, raise it for them at ten cents? Is it worth while for the world to shut Africa out of its only sphere of usefulness, simply, that *they* may be compelled to pay us five cents more for every pound of cotton, making in a crop of three and a half millions of bales, a difference of \$78,000,000? And then the report dwells on the well known tremendous consequences which agitate England, whenever her manufactories have to work “short time;” and asks, what will be the effects on England and the North, when “short time” shall be made a permanent necessity by reason of the increased price of cotton? Shall Africa be left in her barbarism and all to ruin Europe and America?

A mere glance is taken in this Report at the leading object of Northern policy, which is to settle our Territories as hireling States and to bring them, as such, into this Union, more rapidly than the South can introduce slave States. They have a smaller original area and a larger original population, and besides, they receive, annually, from four to five hundred thousand European emigrants to swell their numbers, while we have not received for fifty years a single negro! And if in the existing struggle, this advantage is to be preserved by our own consent and co-operation, the Report says, it would be wise

for us to enter into a calculation of the number of our days, and to bespeak from some chosen historian a becoming record of our decay and subjugation.

The remainder of this able report is occupied in urging that this State should exert its influence with Congress, through its Senators and Representatives, for the repeal of all acts prohibiting the slave trade, and of all treaty stipulations whatever on the subject: because, we do by our own acquiescence in those acts, denounce ourselves as pirates, since time cannot sanctify wrong, and since if the slave trade is piracy then slaves are plunder;—because again, these treaty stipulations are unjust to the South as taking away from her the ability to use the new territories acquired by this government; and as at the same time helping to stigmatize and hold us up to the execration of mankind;—and because, also, these treaties do constitute one of those entangling alliances with a foreign nation against which the Father of his country has warned us.

There is also, in the concluding part of this Report, an incidental and very brief reference to *four* objections to the slave trade, viz: the general inhumanity and injustice of it; the sufferings it involves in the involuntary separation of the negro from his relatives; the sufferings it involves in the horrors of the passage across the Atlantic, and the sufferings it involves in the interior wars which it occasions. The *third* of these is the only one which we understand the Report to admit as having any real force. The others are referred to as “alleged” or “supposed.” This *third* one, the sufferings of the passage, it is said, could all be reduced by proper arrangements to the mere ordinary inconvenience of the sea voyage to which emigrants from Europe are all subjected.

We have thus, as briefly as possible, and we think in the spirit of candor and fairness, stated the contents of the Majority’s Report. Before proceeding to a statement of the contents and scope of the Minority’s argument, we take occasion here to remark that while we admit the eloquence and force with which many of these views are put forth, yet we are constrained to regard the Report as a signal failure, viewed simply as the discussion of a great question of State policy. It seems to us

that the whole argument lacks the quality of practical wisdom. It theorizes too much. Take, for example, the long and minute explanation of the British scheme respecting us. They have ruined their own Islands, and now they go round about continually in all manner of circuitous ways with a view to reducing these slaveholding States to the same *relative productive capacity* with their Islands. Not being able to procure any actual release from the dilemma into which she brought herself by abolishing slavery in the West Indies, she now seeks this comparative result. This is the key to her policy. Now, we say this whole theory is as *circuitous* as is the policy it charges on England! The simple explanation of all Great Britain has done or would do regarding us, is just this: She acts from the instinct of British abolition sentiment and from the instinct of British commercial jealousy. She is mad with fanaticism about African Slavery; but there is a method in her madness. She wants cotton, free grown if she can get it; but, any how and by any means, cheap; and to get it cheap she must have more markets for it than one. How can this Report maintain both that cotton is the great necessity of the world, and yet that England, who is at once the mistress and the merchant for a very great part of the world, is actually desirous to destroy our capacity to produce the article?—

We submit also, that the same lack of practical good sense appears to characterize the plan suggested for preventing the world from finding out a substitute for slavery as its cotton producer. The Report seems to imply that if the price can only be kept from rising too high, the world will leave to us the business of growing its cotton, but that otherwise a substitute will be summoned to take our place. Can the British government, or can the French government (for these constitute *the world* in regard to this matter) do any thing more that they are not now already doing for the supply of this substitute? Are they now so content with their condition of dependence upon our market for cotton, that if we will but open the slave trade again and so cheapen cotton somewhat, they will no longer seek to raise cotton in the East Indies or Algeria? If we get rich whenever short-staple cotton is worth ten cents,

will they not think it might be, even at that price, profitable to their subjects?

But it is with the utmost gravity, that the authors of this report set forth this plan. It is presented not simply in the light in which we have just been considering it, but as the distinct and definite answer to "the great question, What is to be done?"—to the "great question, What measures should be taken by the South to rescue slavery from its impending dangers?" (See pp. 17 and 18.) Now, inasmuch as a great issue is "presented to the South and the South alone,"—the issue made with us by "the most powerful maritime nation of Europe, leagued with that section of the United States which is soon to have the government in its own hands," (see p. 17);—this great issue being made with the South respecting the continuance of slavery, do these gentlemen seriously mean to say, as wise and practical men, that they consider "the only rescue for slavery from its impending dangers" is to seek to re-open the slave trade? They do say it, if we have not totally misapprehended the meaning of their language. Now, for ourselves, we are not men of war, but of peace. Yet looking forth from our quiet retreat upon the turmoil with which this controversy has filled the country, and regarding the real issue that is before us in the light of all history; we say, that no such scheme as this can rescue slavery from its dangers, and that, in our poor judgment, nothing can hinder this controversy from being finally referred to the "bloody arbitrament of the sword," except, in the mercy of God to our country and the human race, there should be brought about a great change of moral sentiments and opinions at the North.

This leads us to remark, that by far the greatest fault we have to find with the Report applies to its general *tone* in regard to the moral and religious aspects of the question. Not only does it make light of all objections to the slave trade on such grounds as its inhumanity and injustice, speaking of the cruel wars of the interior, and the forced separation of the captives from children or parents as "supposed evils," (p. 41.) but it broadly asserts that "it is now conceded throughout the Southern States that the slave trade does not violate the prin-

ciples either of humanity or justice." (P. 39.) It also affirms that "No element of morals or religion enters into the question whether South Carolina needs a further importation of slaves from Africa. It stands recorded in our statutes, that we have no scruples of this sort. And the undivided opinion of South Carolina is that the importation of negroes from Africa, and their being made to cultivate our soil under the equitable laws which control and protect our commonwealth, would violate no law of God nor any principle of justice." (P. 20.) We regret, exceedingly, that the majority should have been led in the earnestness of argument and in their patriotic zeal, to make such strong statements. That they are far too strong is sufficiently manifest in the history of these very Reports. Their being laid on the table, without discussion, and ordered to be printed together for distribution, shews that there was *something* in them, respecting which the opinion of South Carolina was not undivided. One part certainly of that "something" is this very point of the immorality of the slave trade. Our people do, undoubtedly, make the distinction which Gov. Adams and the majority repudiate, between slavery and the slave trade. As respects even the *former*, public sentiment amongst us is better than some of our laws, and makes some of these laws a *dead letter*, because they were suitable only to the barbarous character of our slave population at the time they were made. But as respects *the latter*, public sentiment amongst us regards certain features, which appear to be inseparable from it, with horror. Those "wars, to which the trade undoubtedly gives rise in Africa," and also those "involuntary separations of the negro from his relatives," are not estimated as mere "supposed" evils. Those "involuntary separations," when they occur amongst our slaves here, our community does not regard with any thing like indifference. There is not one member of this Majority, we are sure, who so regards them; or, who would for any reason short of imperious necessity or else flagrant crime, consent to such a separation amongst his own slaves! And though we all know that our slavery has made the negro, in respect to his social feelings, a very far superior being to what the negro is in Africa; still, we all know and we

all feel, that there, also, he is a man, and that though a very degraded savage, the mother, at least, loves her child!

We object, therefore, very strenuously, to there being ascribed to South Carolina any such attitude on these moral questions, because it is both unjust to the State and injurious to us in our battle with the world. Let it never be forgotten for a moment, that although it may terminate in an appeal to force, this has been from the first and still is a *moral* conflict. We lose strength whenever we abandon the ground of justice and of truth. The South cannot afford in such a struggle as this, to lose the approbation of the King of nations and the support of His Word against all her foes. We feel sure that the gentlemen of this Majority do not really entertain the sentiments which these portions of their Report would seem to imply. We feel equally sure that the respected writer of it has not intentionally given to his eloquent production that air it wears, of coldly and carelessly determining grave questions of humanity and of justice upon mere grounds (and those doubtful grounds at best) of State policy; that air it wears of representing Dollars and Cents, or any other material interests to be the great interests of society amongst us! He knows as well and doubtless feels as sensibly as we do, that great as is the value to the South of her partial monopoly of the cotton trade, great as is the value to her of her present enviable (and we think envied) condition of prosperity and peace in all her borders and amongst all classes of her people; yet, she has a higher and nobler and more valuable interest to preserve—namely, her interest in honor and duty and truth.

The Report of the Minority begins by stating the stand point from which in the judgment of the writer, (J. Johnston Pettigrew, Esq.,) the recommendations of Gov. Adams were to be viewed. Had he been considering them as a member of the King's council for Ashanti or Dahomey; looking at the degradation of the miserable Africans there, as compared with their four millions of enslaved descendants here, robust, fed, clothed, cared for when sick and aged, instructed in the elements of religion and surrounded on all sides by the enlightenment of an advancing civilization; he might, as a friend of Africa, have

advocated the revival of the slave trade. But objects nearer home have profounder claims upon his sympathy. He views the subject as a legislator of South Carolina bound to legislate for her good, and not that of the African Continent. Looking at the subject from this point of view, he finds it necessary first to remove certain obstacles to a clear vision, which under the guise of arguments stand in the way of our true perception of our interest and duty. It is the more necessary to get rid of these illusions, because our habit of repelling with indignation the impertinent attacks of our enemies, renders it difficult for us to regard any question connected with slavery in that light of impartial and dispassionate reason, which and which alone the emergency demands. *The first* of these is the opinions on one branch or on another of this whole question of slavery which the outside world may entertain. Their information is not correct; their judgment not impartial. Neither the Absolutists nor the Democrats of Europe,—neither the fanatics of England nor those of the North, should have any influence upon us, when for one or for another reason they denounce us and our institutions. And very necessary is it for us now, not to follow the false lights which England and France are holding out to us in respect to the slave trade. The lesson we should learn from the vices and the crimes of our enemies is not that of imitation. Never was any system entertained by enlightened nations so disgraceful to humanity and so devoid of any mitigating features, as their system of Coolie and Apprenticed traffic. Even in its most barbarous days, the slave trade had some redeeming features; there was room to hope for eventual good. But this traffic is worse than the worst West India Slavery, for the hirer of these apprentices is not restrained either by the kindness which every man naturally feels to his own family, black and white, or by that impulse which always prompts a man to preserve his own property. For the first time in the history of the world, a system has been devised which encourages the master to work his slaves to death in a specific number of years. Far from following their example, the conduct of these Abolitionists should rouse in us only a horror of their systematic cruelty and their hollow hypocrisy.



The *second fallacious idea*, which the Minority brush out of their way, is the idea suggested by Gov. Adams that the epithet piracy, applied to the slave trade, stigmatizes our property in slaves as plunder. The distinction is a broad one between *malum in se*, and *malum prohibitum*. That law of nations which makes the slave trade piracy has no reference, and can in no way apply to our slaves. Washington and the other great Southrons of his day were equally removed from the two extremes of stigmatizing their own property as plunder, and of ascending the same platform with the heroes of the middle passage. The fraud and violence which there may have been in the inception of our title to this property no more vitiates that title, than is the title to perhaps every particular acre of land in Europe vitiated by the tears of despoiled widows and orphans which have bedewed some one or other of its links. To impugn the title to these acres, in the present possessor, is to fall into the slough of socialism. There is little reason, therefore, for this sensitiveness on our part at the epithet of piracy which our fathers affixed to the slave trade.

A *third idea* calculated to influence the question upon other grounds than its merits is, that if the trade were now open we would be unwilling to close it, and therefore it should be re-opened. The report controverts the premise of this argument. The considerations unfavorable to this traffic which put an end to it amongst us in 1787, would probably prevail now to put it down. But granting the premise the conclusion does not follow. Governments are, with reason, chary of meddling with labor, the most delicate of all questions they have to touch. If the trade were in operation we might hesitate to revolutionize our system. Our ancestors however did cautiously close the trade. South Carolina anticipated the action of Congress by twenty years. Every member of Congress from this State voted for the measure, save one, and he differed on a point of detail. The proper inference to draw from their conduct would be to leave our system of labor in its present flourishing and prosperous condition.

The main question is now before us—Will the re-opening of the Slave Trade benefit South Carolina?

The *first argument*, considered by the Minority, is the one

detailed pretty fully above, regarding the necessity of cheapening the price of cotton. The report admits that the re-opening of this trade would cheapen laborers, but denies that this is the same thing as to cheapen labor and so cheapen cotton. The increase of labor would not be proportionate to the increase of laborers, because of the manifest inferiority of what would be imported. Not only the specified number, deemed necessary to be added to our laborers, must be imported, but an additional number to give the additional amount of labor demanded. Add to this a still further additional number to compensate for the deterioration in character and efficiency, on the part of our own educated and civilized negroes, to be certainly produced by the introduction amongst them of many thousands of idle, slovenly, insubordinate barbarians. The nett profits of this deteriorated slave labor would therefore be less than of slave labor as at present amongst us;—for, a plantation of slaves would eat, drink and wear as much after, as before the revival of the slave trade, and the cost of medical advice would be as great as ever. The actual running expense, then of growing a certain amount of cotton would be greater, and the nett profits (which are all that benefit a people who produce to export) would be two degrees less. Thus, the re-opening of the slave trade would not cheapen cotton. But it would reduce the value of our slaves, according to the plain and fundamental doctrine of political economy, that when a certain quantity of any article is in the market, the natural effect of introducing an additional quantity of the same is to diminish its previous value. Thus, if to the 400,000 slaves which we now have in this State 100,000 more from Africa were added, the loss in market value of the 400,000 would be many hundreds of thousands of dollars. And then as soon as the demand for labor should be supplied, there would inevitably ensue an instantaneous and a vast depression, till the extreme point were reached where capital invested in the trade would yield no greater return than if invested in any other branch of commerce. The report then discusses at some length the question who would benefit by cheap cotton; shews that the price of our great staples is not much higher than we may reasonably demand, the price of every thing else in the

commercial world having risen also through a combination of causes, some real, some fictitious and transitory;—that the increase of a few cents in the pound is a matter of no great importance to the manufacturer, the prime cost of the article being only a small portion of the price he imposes on his customers for the manufactured goods;—that the objection to slave-cotton with the vast majority of Europe is really from their apprehensions as to the stability of slavery, their prevalent idea being that Southern society slumbers on a volcano;—that England and France can never deprive us of our monopoly;—and that not only is no great evil impending over us which a reduction in the price of cotton could avert, but that if the price were reduced it would be the British manufacturer alone who would reap the benefit.

The *second argument* is, that we suffer under a deficiency of negro labor, by reason of the transfer of our slaves to the West. The Report denies that any such ruinous consequences appear as are ascribed to this cause. Instead of mansions crumbling and plantations gone to ruin from want of labor, every where prosperity is visible, every where lands have risen in value, every where wealth is accumulating; and were it not for the drafts on our resources by *summer-absenteeism*, the invested capital would be immense. But admit the statement—does the slave trade offer a remedy? Our agricultural staples are Rice, Sea Island Cotton and Upland Cotton. The two first are necessarily confined to a small territory, and constitute a real monopoly. The cost of labor is a small item—the consumer pays for it, not the producer. The idea, then, of moving elsewhere to cultivate these two staples is preposterous. As to the third staple, viz.: Upland Cotton, the Report shews that three elements enter into price. 1. The passive element, land, &c. 2. The active element, labor, &c. 3. Transportation; but, that only one of these can be concerned in causing the transfer of our labor to the West. That one is the greater productiveness of some of the lands there. Now, will the revival of the slave trade afford us any remedy for this? It would not. Time is the sure remedy, for it will work the two-fold operation of raising the price of lands in the West, and of wearing them

out. It should be the ambition of our statesmen, however, to apply another remedy, and that is the adoption of measures for rendering some one or all three of the elements of price more efficient at home. Improve the soil, improve the slave, improve the means of transportation—these constitute the remedy suggested by the Minority.

*The third argument* is, that to re-open the trade will be for the advantage of the poor non-slaveholder. This is, of all arguments, the weakest. The poor man, who holds no slaves, has no source of wealth but his own labor; and the effect of this trade, it is maintained, will be to cheapen labor. If it cheapen the labor that is to be bought, it will also, in like proportion, cheapen the labor that is to buy. It would be hard to shew how this can benefit the poor man that holds no slaves.

These are all the arguments for re-opening the trade. Let us now consider objections to this scheme.

The *first objection* arises from the number of Africans it will require. The end proposed is to reduce the price of slave staples, say to one-half. Then you must double the amount of labor, which is now, say four millions slaves, by importing four millions of negroes from Africa. But, you must add something to make up for their want of efficiency. Three American negroes are certainly equal to four Africans; the number, then, to be imported will be four-thirds of four millions. But the value of our four millions will be reduced by contamination at least one-fourth, which will require an additional importation of four-thirds of one million—making the whole number required, in order to double our labor, equal to four-thirds of four millions added to four-thirds of one million. But labor is but one element of price. To reduce the price of slave produce, the slave trade must affect the cost also of land and transportation. Now, allow that land and transportation contribute two-fifths to price, and leave for labor the other three-fifths. The reduction upon this two-fifths of the price, (which two-fifths equal, of course, two-thirds of the labor element,) will call for an additional importation of two-thirds of four millions of American slaves, equal to four-thirds of two-thirds of four millions of African slaves. The grand total, therefore, of importation to

accomplish a reduction of one-half in the price of slave staples will thus be four-thirds of four millions *plus* four-thirds of one million, *plus* four-thirds of two-thirds of four millions, equal to ten and two-ninths millions! Those who are surprised at the result must remember that political problems involve more than one condition, and are not to be solved by simple arithmetic. The calculus would be a much more suitable instrument for investigation. The project, of course, never could go so far. Long before it could reach this point the market of slaves would be glutted; slave labor worthless—nay, an incubus; cotton down to five or six cents; the English manufacturer bloated with wealth; the planter not able to buy provisions or clothing for his slaves!

The *second objection* is derived from the character of the population with which it is proposed to fill the land. So far from being that paragon of all virtues which Abolitionists, in their cant, represent the African in his native land to be, he is rather a sanguinary barbarian, with whom polygamy, theft, violence and deceit, are virtues. Such is the population which, chattering a foreign tongue, is to be distributed in millions throughout the land!

The Report proceeds to consider the effect of this importation *upon our present slaves*, not in the economical point of view before looked at, but in the moral aspect, which does also so directly influence their pecuniary value. We have a succinct, but clear statement of the powerful operation of our civilization and of our Christianity upon this Barbarian race, during the half century which has elapsed since the slave trade ceased to bring in its "New Negroes." The American Negro is hardly recognizable as the same being he was. Labor is no longer so repugnant to his disposition as to require the constant terror of the lash to impel him to undertake it. He feels an interest in the soil he cultivates, and recognises the solidarity uniting himself and his master. Whenever kindly treated, he is attached to the family; is proud of his young master and mistress; and there are none to greet them with a warmer welcome, or a face beaming with more joy, when they return home at their school vacations, than the old servants of the household. He is unac-

quainted alike with the pleasures and the pains of freedom; and in most cases sees nothing either to envy or to respect in those of his own color whom he sees in that position. He regards the white man as belonging to a superior order of beings. Obedience to the white man has become a part of his nature,—he obeys not from fear but education. His moral nature is instructed. He is no longer a mere work-animal. He knows the difference between right and wrong, and that although a slave he is still a responsible moral agent. Into the midst of this people whose moral as well as physical guardians we are, it is proposed to introduce a class of creatures who will do, not what they are commanded, but what they are forced to do; who recognize no duties; who have never heard of laws; to whom industry is unknown; who are yet to learn that treachery and bloodshedding are wrong; who have been torn from their native land, and transferred to a strange soil and climate, to obey the behests of a strange master! What must be the effect upon our slaves? Those who anticipate only the elevation of the new slaves, forget, how evil communications corrupt faster and more easily than good examples improve. The great improvement we have, under Providence, been the means of effecting, is due very much, to the fact that the slave trade never did flourish much in this country, and has for many years past been suppressed. Re-open this flood gate of impurity, and all that we have accomplished in half a century would be lost and the cheapest defence of our institution sacrificed to a mere experiment.

The effect of this importation *upon masters* and upon *the State at large* are described with so much force and eloquence, and the views expressed, do so justly and completely reflect the feelings which every citizen of South Carolina finds in his own breast, that we cannot deny ourselves the pleasure of laying them in full before our readers.

“As masters we would have still less reason to be gratified with the result. In the present condition of South Carolina, agricultural life is preferred by the great majority of her citizens, and is recommended by many other considerations than mere pecuniary interest. They are loth to yield up or desert the homes of their forefathers. They find

that their natural feelings of independence are gratified, by treading habitually their own grounds; that their children grow up in a pure atmosphere, far from the temptations of city life. The Commonwealth, too, derives an advantage in the possession of a hardy, self-reliant, refined and educated body of citizens, who are, perhaps, more warmly attached to her soil, from owning it, and directly superintending its cultivation. But, to the existence of this class of population, the certainty of security to isolated families is an absolute requisite. Hence, it exists only in countries such as England and the United States, which have generally been free from the curse of foreign invasion and internal violence, while in France, Spain, etc., it is unknown, with the occasional exception of some feudal Baron, who still keeps up an army of retainers, sufficient to ensure his castle against surprise. One of the charms of plantation life consists in the pleasant intercourse between master and slave; characterized, as it generally is, by kindness of feeling on both sides. The introduction of half a million raw Africans, such as have been described, would quickly alter this state of things. The idea of leaving one's family, even for a day, amid a mass of barbarians—vicious, unruly, discontented, accustomed to the rule of force, speaking a different language, and never having learned to regard their master as their friend—would be revolting to human nature. We should gradually come to live as in the West Indies and Europe; proprietors would cluster in cities and villages, paying only occasional visits to their property; plantations would soon be held in copartnership, as investments, and the only interest felt would be in the factor's balance. The owner would cease to disturb himself about the moral or physical condition of his slave. How could he sympathize with creatures with whom he could not even converse? How could he expose his children to a gang of savages, accustomed to poison or to murder; or, if he had been so unlucky as to purchase out of a nation of that description—to cannibalism? If perchance his servants were to die from cruelty, or overwork, in his absence, the slave trade would offer a cheap substitute, and there would be no neighborhood of gentlemen to brand him with public opinion. We should soon be driven to all those appliances which are necessary where force is acknowledged to be the only lever of government. That such a change would take place cannot be doubted. To pronounce it desirable would be to offer a senseless indignity to every owner of a plantation; for though, in argument with strangers, we frequently treat the bond between master and slave—ensuring protection to the one and obedience to the other—as merely pecuniary; yet, we confess to ourselves, that this mode of defending the institution is forced upon us by the necessity of selecting such considerations as will be appreciated by our opponents; while every slaveholder would be indignant at the thought that those by whom he had been surrounded from his youth have no other claim upon him than his horse or his ox. The injurious effect of the Slave Trade, under this aspect, would be more severely felt in the parishes than in the hill country—owing to the great

preponderance of the slave population, which always has existed there, and from the nature of the climate, always will exist.

“If the relation of individual owners towards their slaves would be affected, not less would be the change in the relation of society to the subject masses in its bosom. It is a universal opinion abroad, that we retain our authority through the ignorance of our slaves as to their real strength; exactly the reverse is the case: we hold it undisputed—because of their *knowledge* of their real strength. An ignorant man is controlled only by the visible exhibition of power; it requires education—and a considerable degree of education—to enable him to comprehend obedience to the law, as such; to enable him to see, in the sheriff, not an individual man, nor the leader of an armed *posse*, but the representative of the latent force of a whole society. This is an idea inculcated by knowledge—not ignorance. Prussia is a striking instance of the power of education, in causing a nation of brave men to submit to an unlimited military despotism. Were our slaves ignorant savages, we should, indeed, hold our individual lives by sufferance. Visible power and authority they would respect and nothing else; hence, it would be necessary to render power visible—unseen, it would be despised. Moreover, nations, as well as individuals, can be educated to obedience, and the opposite. An African, whose ancestors have delighted his youth with tales of war and resistance to control, grows up with this sentiment strong in his breast; the American slave, who has never heard, save of peaceable submission, is naturally inclined to submit. Some nations, by being often conquered, have been thus rendered permanent cowards, and flee at the sight of soldier or a policeman. We suck in rebellion or obedience with our mother’s milk. The Americans afford an illustration of this principle. Perhaps no nation on the globe is more high tempered, restless, excitable and violent in resistance to illegitimate authority, than the inhabitants of these Southern States; yet, none submit with more cheerfulness and alacrity to the commands of the law, however disagreeable. The American General at the head of a conquering army in Mexico, with a prostrate nation at his feet, was ordered to lay down his command and appear before a court martial; he unhesitatingly obeyed the mandate. Mexicans were unable to comprehend such conduct; an American would have been incapable of comprehending any other; the one had been educated to law, the other to anarchy. Our slaves have been subjected to the same influence as ourselves,—they obey, without question, the law of their position; and as a remarkable consequence there has not been a commotion in the slave population of this, the most decidedly slave State in the Union, since the suppression of the trade, with the single exception of 1822, which was entirely owing to emissaries from the West Indies; and was, moreover, much exaggerated in the reports of the time. Nor is it probable that another will ever take place. A partial outbreak they, of course, will not make; and the same knowledge which would fit them for a general insurrection, will



most effectually deter them, by showing its utter futility. With the introduction of savages, a new night would descend; the very ignorance by which they would be incapacitated for a grand scheme, would urge them to outrages, individual and concerted, of a minor character, for which an unknown tongue would afford convenient means of concealment. Thefts, murders, plantation riots, would be the order of the day, until the old West India system was introduced, to which we should soon be driven.

“Such would be the natural effect of the realization of this project upon slaves, slaveholders and the community at large. Experience corroborates these deductions. The awful character of Roman slavery, where the bond of duty was not correlative, and where it was consequently not considered improper to expose such slaves as had outlived the period of actual labor, to starve on an island in the Tiber, is well known; and it is also well known that its worst features were developed by the wars of the Republic, which, by reducing whole nations of barbarians to captivity, produced effects similar to those of the modern slave trade. But it is useless to investigate a system, which in its practical operation, has so little similarity to our own. The West India system, in its origin and general features, offers many more points of contact, yet we know that, there, the slave was considered a mere instrument of labor; that the problem was at a given price, to extort from him the greatest amount of work; that the average length of his life, was seven years, at the end of which his place was supplied by another African; that the idea of any other than a mere economical relation between the master and the slave never entered into the brain of either—the negro exchanged an African for a West Indian master, whether the change was beneficial depended upon circumstances; that one desideratum was to prevent his killing himself or his master, being from his barbarous nature, prone to do both; that the means of control were suited to the nature of the authority; chains, cart-whips, swords, barracons were in ordinary use on every plantation. Certainly there was an essential difference between their system and ours.

Nor is the history of Carolina devoid of the teachings of experience to those who are willing to be taught. One peculiarity of the ante-revolutionary system, was the great apprehension manifested of certain offences, which now rarely occur; or if so, are not attended with serious consequences. Runaways seem to have been, as in the West Indies, great objects of dread; every variety of punishment was invented to deter them,—and perhaps not without reason, as contemporaneous narratives shew them to have filled the woods, and to have been of the most desperate character, recognizable only by the brand of their owner burnt in upon them. Another was the continual fear of insurrection, for which there was ample justification. Another, was the cruel corporeal nature of the punishments prescribed. A glance at the statute book will bring these facts into relief.” (Pp. 25, 26, 27, 28.)

The Report then proceeds to some detail of the various Acts

of Assembly in 1690, in 1712, in 1751, etc., etc., for the punishment of negro crimes. The punishments were such as splitting the nose, cutting off the ear, branding, gelding, cutting off one leg, &c., &c. All these were very different from what are now inflicted upon slaves, or what were then inflicted upon the whites; in the one case the appeal being to the body, in the other to the moral nature. But what is the cause of this difference? Doubtless some portion of it is due to the progress of the age. But the main cause of difference is not this; our ancestors were not so much more cruel than ourselves. On the contrary, these punishments were at that time so revolting to their general feelings, that legislative wisdom was compelled to impose in these very statutes, heavy penalties upon the masters who did not thus punish runaways, rebels and other criminals, in order to provide for the security of the State. What, then, is the chief cause of all this amelioration of our discipline? The Acts, referred to, make the answer plain. "Forasmuch as the negroes are of barbarous, wild and savage natures, prone and inclined to rapine and inhumanity, laws and orders should in this province be made for the good regulating and ordering of them, Be it therefore, &c., &c." Here we have the mystery revealed. Accustomed, as the African was, to obey only the visible manifestations of brute force, it was necessary to appeal to his physical senses. What did he know of duty? What did he care for a rebuke addressed to his moral feelings? He must see his blood flow.

The next point discussed is the effect of this importation upon the *increase of the slave population*. To the British West Indies not far from 200,000,000 Africans were carried; after 178 years not more than 780,993 remained! To St. Domingo, from 1680 to 1776, there were carried 800,000 negroes; at the latter date only 290,800 remained! In Cuba competent authorities estimate the annual decrease now to be from five to ten per cent. Thus, in climates similar to their own, and surrounded by tropical abundance, despite the constant fresh supply, this African population has decreased at the rate of hundreds per cent. in a century! In the United States a gratifying difference meets our view. The whole number im-

ported was about 400,000; now they number about 4,000,000! Now, why should the slave population decrease in a country and climate like their own, and increase in one that is very different? There must be some radical difference in the two systems—that difference is, that amongst us, the slave trade never existed to any great extent, and was suppressed almost entirely from the year 1790, while in the West Indies it flourished without limitations. The Report says well:

“There also the various considerations, already alluded to, debarred the African from the benefit of his master’s solicitude, while his cheapness deprived him of any hold upon the inferior motives. His original vices were not eradicated, they were merely accommodated to the new society, in which he was placed; polygamy became promiscuous concubinage; brutal debaucheries undermined his health, and continued labor completed the work of ruin. In America, the promptings of nature and self-interest alike contributed to produce the opposite result. Surrounded in his manhood by the descendants of those who had cultivated the paternal acres in his youth, it was impossible for the American planter to be indifferent to their welfare; the kind feelings of early days were exchanged on the one hand for the respectful attachment and obedience of age, and on the other for a benevolent superintendence—nature revolted at treating one in such a connection as a mere instrument of toil. The ties of marriage were acknowledged and respected; the claims of helpless youth and feeble old age recognized, and not only moral, but physical wants supplied; if the cares of a parent sometimes failed, those of a master were ever present. Hence this rapid increase, which would be impossible under the grinding rule of a tyranny; the fact is at once the consequence and proof of the kindest treatment. Nor is the continuance of this state of the case dependant upon virtue alone, from the influence of which a considerable portion of mankind would be exempt, for the dictates of worldly advantage counsel the same course to those who are devoid of the finer sensibilities; ill treatment is sure to be followed by a loss, for which there is no slave trade to afford a cheap compensation. Both classes of owners are thus urged by the motives respectively most congenial to their natures to adopt the same course. Revive the slave trade, and all this will vanish; we shall again find it necessary to prescribe by statute the manner of feeding slaves, lest they be compelled from want of nourishment to seek refuge and subsistence in the forest.” Pp. 32, 33.

Next, there is presented in this Report a brief sketch of the early legislation of this State upon this question, from 1698 down to 1803, from which the following conclusions are drawn: *First*, that the idea of the injurious tendency of the importation

of Barbarism did not originate with modern Abolitionists, nor was forced upon the reluctant South as a stigma. It was recognized in Carolina as far back as 1714, and it grew out of the recognition by the sterling citizens of that day, in their eminent wisdom, of the difference between a system of civilized and of barbarian slavery. To the wise and patriotic legislation of these great historical Carolinians of 1789 and 1791, is due the present felicitous condition of our laboring population.

*Secondly*, this sketch discloses that the Barbarians themselves were not the only barbarous things introduced amongst us by the slave trade. It was accompanied by all manner of horrid diseases, plague, spotted fever, Sian distemper, and Guinea fever, which, like sharks, followed in the wake of the slaves from the Bight of Benin to the Bay of Havanna and the harbors of our own coast.

The Report concludes with a glance at the consequences to be apprehended from the mere agitation of this question. "It is undeniable that a large majority of the people of the South is opposed to the proposition, and that if put to the vote in this State to-morrow, it could not obtain one-tenth of the suffrages." Why sow dissension amongst ourselves upon a measure of hopeless execution and at best of doubtful policy? We must not suffer our judgment or our policy to be warped by a spirit of resistance, however natural and justifiable, to the impertinent assaults of our enemies. Combativeness is a quality capital in action, but in council most useless, nay injurious. In taking a false position we voluntarily move down from our strong hold and offer our foes an advantage. In all affairs, truth must eventually prevail. And more particularly would it be unfortunate for the South to take a false step, since all the propositions she has hitherto advanced have been sustained by the returning good sense of the American people; and since, the fight being moral as well as political, we must on every account continue to keep in the right. As to the mere repeal of existing statutes and treaty stipulations, why should this State strive to procure their repeal? The slave trade never was carried on by our citizens. Previously to 1808 it was conducted, mostly by New England men or New England capital,

managed by agencies in Charleston. Since that period it has had a clandestine existence only at the North. Why should South Carolina volunteer to throw her mantle round parties to a traffic, in which our people either through moral repugnance or through proud scorn of such an occupation, never have been and are not now engaged? Can we refrain from blushing at the mere suggestion, and shrinking in horror at the thought of such contamination! Never! Let our State preserve in jealous purity the high character which has been handed down to her from former generations; and if these men need an advocate let them seek him amongst those who were born upon the same soil and nurtured under the same influences!

Comparing these two Reports together, in the impartial and not invidious discharge of our duty as censors of the press, we would say that the latter appears to be more thorough; less forced and constrained in its manner and spirit by the outside influences that assail us; and makes its appeal less to mere prejudices. We wish this Report had more thoroughly handled the *non sequitur* of Gov. Adams, that if the slave trade be piracy, then our slaves are plunder. His Excellency should not have been so lightly given over to the favor of Abolitionists by getting, however undesignedly, upon their ground. The Report might well have dwelt more upon the Agrarian consequences, that would logically follow the adoption of the principle involved in this statement. Is it so that no man's property now is any thing better than plunder, if so be that in any remote age some holder of it got it by fraud? Who knows that he ever owned a dollar which may not often have passed through the hands of thieves into those of honest men? And who does not know that if the statement be just, then there is no good title to one foot of land on this wide continent? Did it not all or nearly all come dishonestly into the hands of the white man? Our slaves plunder because the slave trade was piracy, forsooth! As well might you call Queen Victoria a pirate because her predecessors on the English throne were, some, descendants and, all, inheritors of William the Conqueror, himself a descendant and an heir of that famous Norwegian pirate Rollo, afterwards

Robert, Duke of Normandy! We could also wish that this Report had taken up the objection to re-opening this trade based upon the certainty that in process of time our rapidly increasing negro population must furnish all the labor that we need, and that a redundancy of population (the curse of some parts of Europe) is a thing to be feared not coveted. But not to dwell on these points, while we gladly award to this Report the merit of a high tone as to the moral bearings of the question, we yet must express our regret that its author did not more fully develop these bearings. There lies the strength of his cause, and for that reason and also for the honor of our Legislature through its Committee, we could desire to have seen these high principles more formally and thoroughly vindicated.

It is no needless work we have endeavored to perform in bringing before our readers the contents of these two Reports. Of all men in the world, the Southern people ought to be, and to keep themselves, the best acquainted with every question concerning the negroes. Leaving out of view all the personal and selfish reasons which require us to know the whole case of this part of our social fabric, our very feelings demand the investigation of whatsoever relates to them. The true and real friends of the negro are, with a few scattered exceptions, to be found only herein the Southern States, where exist the best four millions of blacks on the face of the earth, and where exist also, in a real friendship with them, those who have been the playmates in boyhood of these four millions. We have been educated to a tolerance of them, such as our Northern brethren know they have not, and such as would not be found for them *as a class* among that proud, haughty, reserved English nation, where no class associates at all with the class below it. The outside world, ignorant of the true character and condition of the negro, has been running wild about his freedom for a considerable period, and now they are beginning to swing round again to the very opposite opinions. A new and *Fourth Chapter* in the history of opinions on this subject seems to be now opening, amongst all these *far-off friends* of the slave, whose benevolence for him has always been so cheap. Our readers ought to

know the signs of this coming change, and they ought to be warnings to them. We submit a few of them here:

A *Brochure* of five and fifty pages, written by a New York merchant, has just been published by D. Appleton & Co., dwelling on the "necessity of certain staple articles of commerce (which only the labor of the negro can produce) not only to the wants of men but to the furtherance of human progress and civilization." This writer but echoes the cry of many others both at our Northern and in the European centres of commerce, that "the world must have cotton and sugar." The *London Times* (that fickle, inconstant weather-cock of British national feelings) lately uttering its condemnation of the emancipation of the West India negroes says, "They have become free but also brutalized—free but not industrious. The West Indies are ruined. Immense tracts of the most productive soil in the world are left uncultivated for the want of labor, and other nations are making fortunes over the heads of British colonists. The emancipated negro will do no work at all. His needs are small and his exertions are small too. The climate enables him to dispense with refinements of shelter or apparel; almost spontaneously the soil provides him with sustenance, and vagrancy and indolence leave him at least as much like a beast as ever."

"To complete the force of this case, while fertile estates are lying untilled for want of labor, and European manufacturers are anxiously looking for the cotton which such labor would supply, an inexhaustible store of the agency required is left unemployed and useless in other lands. But our embarrassment arises from the fact that if once blacks were known to be wanted and to be saleable on the coast for some sort of price, they would forthwith be kidnapped for consignment by their own chief! By transporting Africans from their own country to the West Indies we could benefit all parties together—the colonist, the laborer and the European consumer of tropical produce, but we are afraid to show our desire for such supplies lest man-stealing should be commenced anew. If we could but surmount this difficulty we should be not only restoring the prosperity of our own colonies with advantages even to the

blacks themselves, but we should probably be going far to suppress the slave trade as it survives. That free labor can beat slave labor is undoubtedly true, but unfortunately the free labor is not forthcoming, and slave labor wins in default of opposition."

It is easy to see what the true meaning is of this cautious language. This is the way the London *Times* generally prepares to swing round to some new direction. It is trying, as sailors often do, to catch the breeze before it fully makes itself felt. It anticipates the adoption ere long of a new policy in England, who needs more African labor as much as France does, and is no more proof against selfish considerations.

From this glance at New York and London opinions let us look at those now held in Paris. France is not only thinking or talking about the matter, but acting. Lord Clarendon, in the House of Lords, denounced what she is doing as in fact the slave trade. The *Constitutionnel*, in three editorial columns, gave a semi-official reply. "The government had authorized French merchants to buy, on the coast of Africa, ten thousand slaves, but it had a functionary of the State in charge of the affair, and the negroes were set free; and after the term of the engagement as hired servants was over, should all, if they wished, be sent back to Africa. Our government, it continues, has recognized the immigration as alike useful and moral. Our enterprise is the very opposite of the slave trade. The code of British Abolitionists is not law for France. It is not by our fault that slavery and barbarism pervade Africa; we must take the social state of the native population as it is. In pursuing our own interests we act in a way to meliorate the lot of those who contract engagements with us; we christianize and we civilize." Every one of these sentences is pregnant with meaning. We commend to the examination of our readers these carefully deliberated words of France to England, in all their various important bearings. They are designed to settle several points, and, of course, *they are settled*, by imperial authority. Louis Napoleon constitutes himself a judge of morals above any dictation of England, and is practically carrying out his philanthropic plans for the benefit of Africa.



Not one of the ten thousand is to be forced to emigrate, and, every one of them has the word of Napoleon for it, that he will be sent back after a term of years to his old home! Meanwhile this contract between the savage African and the French Emperor, wherein the African acts so voluntarily and freely, is made through the chief whose slave that African is, and who has the absolute power of life and death over him! And if, in the progress of these benevolent negotiations of the French court with the courts of Ashanti or Dahomey, it should turn out that under the stimulus of the French silver which buys these slaves to set them free, the native wars that fed the old fashioned slave trade should break out anew, and the whole interior bleed again, why (says the philosophic, as well as philanthropic Louis, with a shrug of his shoulders) what is that to us, we must take the social state of the native population as it is!

Such are the indications of changing opinions outside of us. We regret to notice, to some slight extent, a corresponding movement at home. In this State we are persuaded there are few who would consent to any such proceedings. In the South-West, it is said, there have been already some actual importations. The *New Orleans Delta* says the trade is already opened, and that on some plantations negroes "recently imported from Africa are at their daily work." There has been some discussion of the question in the Legislatures of Mississippi and Louisiana, but we believe no action yet taken. The *New Orleans Delta* states that Henry Hughes and his party, in the Mississippi House of Representatives, "urge the labor immigration movement; not opening the slave trade, but legalizing the operations now already begun to be carried on." The same paper also gives rules and directions for the conduct of the business expeditiously, secretly, safely and profitably. The profits of the business are stated to be enormous.

In the name of the Southern people, especially of the religious class at the South, and still more especially of Southern Presbyterians, we raise our voice of protest against the re-opening amongst us of the African slave trade, whether openly or in disguise. And having brought to the notice of our readers the

total change of attitude assumed and being assumed by Abolitionists, we call on all true Southern men to abjure all present and future, as we have all past alliance, with their views and practices. We call on the press of the South to speak out and repudiate the doctrine of man-stealing. We call upon our fellow citizens, and most particularly our fellow Christians of the South-West, not to tarnish their honor and ours by following the base lead of France, or of England; and not to set Christianity and the Bible against the South. The New Orleans *Picayune* we are glad to observe, is protesting on the part of "five-sixths of that city against this revival of the slave trade by indirection, and this bringing into Louisiana gangs of pagan laborers fresh from the bloody and barbarous wars of the African coast." It objects not so much upon any humanitarian ground on behalf of the imported negro, since it will tend to his advantage; but "upon every ground of expediency and principle, and upon considerations of the interests and honor of the State." It objects, as it ought to object, distinctly on the ground of those "means of bringing about this transfer of the African to our shores which are abhorrent to every feeling of what is *right* and merciful; means which make the slave trade a horror to many who conscientiously uphold the institution of slavery as it exists among ourselves." It states that the French Government does not disguise the fact that it deals in slaves. It well says "there is no such thing to be had on the African coast as a negro willing to contract and able to contract understandingly for a free laborer. The whole country is a drive for the chiefs who monopolize the traffic, and whom the new French market has incited to new wars for the purpose of getting captives." This journal, to its honor, also says, "if the design really be to bring in free emigrants from Africa, such proceedings are contrary to all the laws of the State which have aimed to hinder the increase of free blacks. But if the contract is to be made a device, by which the slave trade is to be covertly practised under authority of the State of Louisiana, then the scheme is not worthy of the manliness and honesty which ought to pervade the legislation of a sovereign State."

In conclusion we have only to say that it is idle to deny the

cruelty of the slave trade, and the equal cruelty of the apprentice trade as it operates in Africa itself. There are too many witnesses to this cruelty for any man to contradict. Mr. Bowen, the Baptist Missionary from Georgia, resident seven years in Africa, and now on a visit home, says: "Forty years ago the Egba kingdom contained more than 100 towns, some of which were six or eight miles in circuit. In 1850 but one of these towns remained. All the rest had been swept away as a crop for the slave trade. The new system affords a safer passage across the Atlantic, but the "apprentices" are collected by the same system of destructive wars which have already depopulated some of the finest districts of Africa. No sooner was it known that apprentices would be bought, than the chiefs in different places began to *make war upon their weaker neighbors*. My last advices from Africa told of famishing sieges and bloody battles to supply the French ships with emigrants." Is it possible that any portion of our Southern people will stoop, like the French Emperor, to make themselves allies of those barbarian chiefs in Africa, who were ready to make war on their weaker neighbors as soon as they could get money by it? Shall we for cotton, and those chiefs for gold and silver, become partners in this business? Suppose it does benefit many of these negroes and their descendants—have we any right to employ those chiefs to kill other negroes in getting these, and to get these by capturing whole villages? And shall we aim to do this bloody work under a false pretence? The bare suggestion is insulting. We may be sure our countrymen of the South-West, if they have only time to understand the case, will decide it rightly. Mississippi and Louisiana will not covet a prosperity which shall be the fruit of crimes like this. They will not forget that States have a being as well as individuals, and therefore a responsibility for all their acts. They will not forget that there is such a thing as national honor and justice. They will not bring upon themselves, and indirectly upon their sisters of the South, the reproach of history and the frown of God.

## ARTICLE VI.

## DR. CURTIS ON A STANDARD ENGLISH BIBLE.

LIMESTONE SPRINGS, March 1, 1858.

*To the Revd. The Editors of the Southern Presbyterian Review:*

DEAR SIRS AND BRETHREN: I have observed with considerable interest, the movement made in your last General Assembly, on the subject of the American Bible Society's Revision of the English Scriptures. That movement has accomplished something. It has asserted a principle all-important to preserving the integrity of the Text of the English Bible, and originated a discussion which with its lesser evils (for little and one-sided minds) may and should result in far greater good. The exact results are, I believe, at present unascertained, or what, precisely, the revision now proposed by the Bible Society will effect.

It is just at this juncture, I have thought that all who love our venerable version, and can contribute any modicum of information as to its true history and *status*, should feel themselves called upon to do this. Its true and complete history alone can give us its exact state.

And, obviously, this is not a mere American question. While in a near future the United States may be instrumental in a far larger diffusion of the English Scriptures than the mother country (and for that reason should be even more clear and careful than she, as to what are to be deemed, and distributed for, those Scriptures), our version is the transmission to us of near two centuries and a half; and but a little over a quarter of a century has it been for public diffusion in American hands. For over two centuries was it committed to the authorized presses of England.

Questions of moment, therefore, as to its purity will be connected with the conduct of those who have had these presses in charge. Have any, and if any, what, unauthorized alterations been made in this quarter?

It is to this point that I more particularly address myself. We deal in large and just commendations of the version of King James. We collect numerous and various testimonies eulogistic of its general faithfulness, simplicity and noble diction (as in your last number of the Southern Presbyterian Review) and we repel the pretensions of the half-learned advocates of new versions, on the ground of their incompetency to come after the men of the King. But have all such pretensions been repelled in times past? In other words, if the American Bible Society go back to the version of the English authorized presses at the period of its own foundation, will it go back to King James' version? And if, from whatever cause it do not, ought it to deal in the said commendations, and assume the honor of circulating that version exclusively any longer? The all-important principle to which I have alluded in the beginning of this letter is, that Bible Societies are to be regarded simply as distributors,—or, as in the case of the American Bible Society—printers and distributors of a given version. With regard to the English Scriptures, both the British and Foreign and the American Society have interwoven it with their respective constitutions, that it shall be the authorized, received, or common version only, meaning thereby that of King James—the former, or British society, always *buying* of the authorized printers of that version, and never themselves printing the sacred Scriptures.

Dr. Breckenridge, and the members of the General Assembly holding with him, very consistently urge this principle to a certain extent. I can scarcely doubt they would have urged it further, had they been perfectly acquainted with the historical facts underlying their case. It must be further urged for the American Bible Society to be consistent with its own profession of adherence to King James' Version; but here will occur a trial of the moral courage and final consistency of the Society, for which its best friends may not be prepared.

Substantially, the Report of the Committee of Nine concedes all that Dr. Breckenridge and his friends contended for. They would go back to the Common Version as it existed, (or is supposed to have existed,) in 1816. The differences, more

numerous and material than they suppose, between the copies issued by the English authorized presses at that time, they would attempt to reconcile by a collation of several such copies, "reference also being had to the original editions of the translations printed in 1611." Now, the very terms of this advice indicate an insufficient acquaintance with the state of the version in 1816. What, if in addition to their differences with each other, all the copies of the version, at that time current in England, were in a state of far greater discrepancy with the only really authorized version of King James, (that of 1611,) than between themselves? Such, however, was the fact. The incidental kind of reference to that edition, which the committee recommend, will not, therefore, meet the demands of the case. It seems to be advised only on the supposition of a few occasional discrepancies among the 1816 editions. *Then*, that of 1611 is to be umpire. But who made the modern English editions arbitrators here, or where *they differ at all critically* with the edition of 1611, of any authority whatever? Let wise men ponder this question. Fully as much difference exists between the Common English Versions of 1816 and that of 1611, as between any of the former and the late revision of the American Bible Society. A just and intelligent zeal, therefore, which would, on principle, repudiate the latter, cannot certainly be content with this. For the true principle in the case is not conformity to Queen Victoria's, any of the King Georges', or King William's Versions, but to King James'.

Permit me, brethren, to insist that where any modern editions *differ at all, critically*, from that of King James, the only correct course, the only true development of the principle contended for by Dr. Breckenridge in the General Assembly is, to abandon all such differences and adhere to the original edition. In England, there never has been given any legal or moral authority to make critical alterations in that edition. I am not speaking of either typographical or orthographical adaptations to modern usage. A few of these would seem to be allowable and sometimes necessary. They may come within the sphere of a modern printer's undertaking.

But the duty was in God's providence imposed upon your

present correspondent some 25 years since, to ascertain beyond dispute, this singular fact—That neither any Convocation of the Church of England; any order of the King as Head of the Church, in Council; nor any act or action of Parliament since King James' time, had empowered the legal Printers of the Bible there to touch the Criticism of the version of 1611. But that nevertheless, touched and retouched it has been, and that extensively, both at Cambridge, at Oxford, and by the King's Printers.

Access was at that time obtained to the first authorities in Church and State—the late Bishop of London and late Archbishop of Canterbury, the Delegates and Syndics of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, the King's Printer, and a Committee of the House of Commons, which sat upon the question of the manner in which he had discharged his duties. Your correspondent was examined at considerable length before that Committee, the uncontroverted issue of the enquiry being, that not a shadow of authority or authorized sanction had been given to the many critical alterations that were shown to have been made.\*

It is to this enquiry and its consequences that allusion is made in the introductory paragraph of the pamphlet published by the Revising Committee of the American Bible Society in 1851—p. 11.

Those "consequences" were important as establishing these facts. 1st. The one above mentioned, that no authority to alter King James' version could anywhere be found. 2d. That in the absence of this no pretence of improvement in the altera-

---

\* It is worthy of remark, perhaps, that in the very year (1816) of the foundation of the American Bible Society, the King's Printer of Scotland issued an edition of the authorized version (quoted by Dr. Lee, examined with me, by the Committee of the House of Commons) deformed by such blunders as Luke VI. 28—"And Him that taketh away thy cloak, forbid to (for forbid not to) take away thy coat also:" and in Cor. XIV: 40—"Let all tongues" for "let all things" be done decently and in order! And three years later (1819) the King's printer of England gave the text, 1 Cor. VIII: 8—"To us three is but one God," for "To us there is but one God." Yet these are the years, to the editions of which the American Bible Society is recommended to conform. The recommendation must clearly have been made in ignorance of such facts.

tions made was admissible. It was altering a public document of the last importance by private hands. 3d. That the alterations exhibited were so numerous as, first to stop the press at Cambridge from printing Bibles, until further investigation, and a more correct Modern Standard could be made. 4th. That on the Investigation proceeding, and formal steps being taken toward producing such a standard, the alterations were found to be both so extensive and so startling, that University and Church pride forbade them to be withdrawn. And here this important business closed.

You are aware that in England a monopoly of printing the Bible and the book of Common Prayer, is legally secured to the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and the King's Printers for England, Scotland and Ireland.

When the Bishop of London, the late learned and excellent Dr. Bloomfield, was first approached upon this subject, and asked, whether the intention of this monopoly was not to secure an accurate transmission of the authorized version, he replied without hesitation: "Certainly, and unless this has been accomplished there can be no pretension for continuing it;" and the Bishop volunteered to introduce the matter both to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and an influential friend (the present Bishop of Ely) at Cambridge. This led to your correspondent's visiting Cambridge and Oxford and the King's Printer on the business; and to his temporary appointment, at Cambridge, in conjunction with the late Dr. Lee, Professor of Hebrew, and the present Bishop of Ely, then Regius Professor of Divinity, to superintend a new edition of the English Scriptures in conformity to the version of King James. The appointment was rescinded in the way above alluded to; the retraction of unauthorized alterations would become so obvious and so great, that the Universities shrunk from it, and concurred in allowing them to remain untouched.

Such then is the condition of all the Modern Bibles that you obtain either of the Universities or King's Printers of England—full of unauthorized alterations of King James' Version.

And now the question recurs, (your General Assembly has awakened it, at least, very powerfully in my mind,) **Are we**



in America bound to the cars of these Modern men, and their alterations, as they feel bound to them and each other? Does not our Constitution of the American Bible Society mean that we circulate King James' English Version and that only? Did not the fathers and founders of our society intend to restrict themselves to this in the solemn pledge of the Constitution to circulate only the received version?

If they were but partially informed of critical alterations made in King James' Version, would they not, on numerous alterations of the kind being established, have said to a man, We shall abide by the version of the known forty-seven men of King James' reign? Throughout the history of the society we have contended earnestly for the integrity of the version, (on one occasion particularly with the Baptists, requiring its spirit, on certain moot points, to be conformed to, even in Foreign Versions,) and to this day do we not feel that its intrinsic excellencies form one great bond of Protestant Union among American Christians, and the only real Bible Union among us?

Allow me to add, that the importance of the English alterations referred to, was not suffered to rest before the world, on any individual opinion. When the Universities refused to recede, other of the ablest Divines and critics of England were called upon to consider the matter; and from a copy of their joint letter to each of the Universities now before me (finally corrected by Dr. Pye. Smith,) I beg that the weight of the following extract may be well considered. Although the signers complained that the business was prematurely \* brought before the public, this is a verdict they never attempted to reconsider, a judgment never reversed.

“We respectfully submit to you the fact that the Modern Bibles issued from the press of your University abound in deviations from the Authorized Version of King James.

“Some of these are clearly typographical errors, others (and it is to these that our attention has been more particularly directed) are as evidently intentional departures from King James'

---

\* In fact, I considered the Universities were trifling with the question; and was on the eve of emigration to this country.

Bible, with a view to improve the version. Alterations of the latter class are found to a very serious amount. One of our number has pointed out in the book of Genesis alone upwards of 800; in the Psalms 600; in the Gospel of St. Matthew 416; in about a fourth part of the Bible, 2,931—not including minute alterations of the punctuation, nor matters of orthography. We would particularize instances of discrepancy, but they are so obvious on an inspection of any of the editions of 1611 (in comparison with the more modern editions) that the university, we are persuaded, must at once perceive the general truth of our statement.

Signed by

J. BENNETT, D. D.  
 J. BLACKBURN.  
 GEORGE COLLISON.  
 F. A. FOX, L. L. D.  
 THOMAS CURTIS.  
 J. FLETCHER, D. D.  
 E. HENDERSON.  
 J. PYE SMITH, D. D.  
 J. TOWNLEY, D. D.  
 R. WINTER, D. D.

Afterwards, a sub-committee, at the head of which was Dr. Henderson, says: ‘These alterations, so far from being an improvement of our vernacular translation, *greatly deteriorate it,*’ and that “those who have made these alterations have discovered a great want of critical taste, unnecessarily exposed the sacred text to the scoff of infidels, and thrown such stumbling blocks in the way of the unlearned, as are greatly calculated to perplex their minds, and unsettle their confidence in the text of Scripture.”

On the whole, dear brethren, I venture to call for a thorough, manly, and Christian dealing with this business. Cambridge in 1638, under the primacy of the arbitrary Laud made its various and thousands of alterations (including italics); Oxford in 1769, by the unchecked hand of Dr. Blaney, its thousands more; while the King’s printer, seldom a scholar of ordinary repute,

has sold again and again his right of printing Bibles, to printers and booksellers, and has issued directly or indirectly whole editions of a worse character than those of either University. "Let us ask for the old paths." In this particular case, this pledged course of ours, I contend that nothing is good, which is *critically new*; nothing honest that involves a critical departure from that course, namely, the circulation of the unaltered translation of King James' Bible. The Bible Society, in my humble judgment should appoint a new committee of the scholars of different denominations to collate simply a modern Bible having references and marginal readings, with the version of 1611 and its references and marginal readings, rejecting all but typographical mistakes, or entirely obsolete spelling.\* I would have them scholars merely to distinguish what is typographical, and obsolete in orthography, from what is critical; not, therefore, to do any thing as critics, however respectable and competent as such, but to see that nothing is done in that line, or under that pretension. And thus would I restore "the good way" of our forefathers of the 17th century; realize in fact, to the world, our frequent and loud pretensions of "walking" in that way, and so find in this momentous and much agitated matter, "rest for our souls."

I remain, Dear Sirs, and Brethren,  
Your fellow-servant in the Gospel,  
THOS. CURTIS.

P. S. I should perhaps add that Dr. Turton (the Regius Professor above adverted to, now Bishop of Ely), published in 1832-'3 in vindication of the Universities, a learned examination of the list of alterations they had made, but his whole tract was predicated on the principle that most of their alterations were improvements, and was therefore regarded by uninterested parties as wholly aside from the question of the Authority for such alterations.

Who has ever proposed alterations of any kind, but under

---

\* The high character of our correspondent, both as a Christian minister and a scholar, is perfectly well known to many of our readers. We happen, still

the name (generally with the honest conviction perhaps) of their being improvements. In England, not many years before the period alluded to, we had an 'Improved version of the New Testament' from the Unitarian press, which printed the whole of the first two chapters of St. Matthews' Gospel in Italics, as a mark of their being of doubtful authority.

---

further, to know that he is yet in possession of very extensive manuscript tables of various readings, prepared by him for the Universities when engaged, by their appointment, with two other eminent scholars, in collating the English Bible. He is, perhaps, the only man living that ever did perform such a work of collation on such a scale. The results of it all, to himself are, as the reader will perceive, a profound conviction, not only that no tinkering with the version should be allowed to any committees or sub-committees of the Bible Society, but also that supposing the Constitution to allow of any tampering with the version, there was no possibility of any good from a collation made on the absurd plan adopted by the late Committee of Versions of the American Bible Society, and carried into execution by their Collator and Sub-Committee.

It appears to us that Dr. Curtis' principle is the true one, and that the recommendation of the Committee of Nine will prove to be just in so far impracticable and insufficient as it recommends the collation of *several different copies* of the editions in use in 1816 with *only occasional* reference to the version of 1611. The more editions you use, which are all secondary, that is, derived from one original, the more mistakes and variations you must expect to find. And if it be the translation of King James we want, (excepting, of course, its antiquated spelling and its few typographical errors,) why not go at once to the old version itself? Why not, as Dr. Curtis says, simply collate a modern Bible, having references and marginal readings with the version of 1611, and its references and marginal readings? The Constitution binds the Society to print and circulate the version now in common use, and every one of their editions professes, on its title page, to be King James' Version. But there is some confusion in all the secondary editions, and Dr. Curtis proposes to go back then to the original one, excepting the entirely obsolete spelling and the known typographical errors. This would be carrying out the very intention of the Constitution, and be the most exact opposite of the plan of corrections undertaken by the late Committee of Versions.

—[Eds. S. P. R.]

## ARTICLE VII.

## CRITICAL NOTICES.

- 1 *Annals of the American Pulpit; or commemorative notices of distinguished American Clergymen of various Denominations, from the early Settlement of the Country to the close of the year Eighteen Hundred and Fifty-Five, with historical Introductions.* By WILLIAM B. SPRAGUE, D. D. VOLUMES III. AND IV. New York: Robert Carter and Brothers, 530 Broadway. 1858; pp. 632, 833, 8vo.

The two first volumes of this work of Dr. Sprague were noticed in our number for last July. Those were devoted to the Ministers of the Congregational Church. In these are embalmed the memories of such Presbyterian pastors as have been the most eminent for their activity and influence from the first settlement of this new country till the present time. There have been some among them of great talent and learning; and those not so eminently endowed, have had the rich gifts of grace, have been eminently useful, and have held forth the high and saving truths of the gospel without fear or favor among their fellow men. The earliest of them laid the foundations of the Church in this new continent, and ministered consolation to a people suffering under great hardships, in a savage wilderness. Others of them inspired their people with courage and fortitude, and some took up the weapons of carnal warfare, or more true to their sacred calling, accompanied their neighbors and friends to the tented field in their ecclesiastical character, during the natal period of our country's liberties. Others were the educators of the men of this and a past generation, or founded those institutions which still exist and are contributing so largely to the intelligence of our people. In these volumes of Dr. Sprague may be found the biographies of 254 Presbyterian Clergymen who died previous to 1855, and incidental notices of 250 more, mentioned either in the text or notes. Dr. Sprague has been assisted in his labors by 257 persons, among

whom are many of our eminent divines, who have contributed original letters, giving their own impressions respecting the subjects of the several memoirs. These add greatly to the value of the work. The whole undertaking has cost the accomplished author a vast amount of labor, continued through many years, and has been attended with great expense. We hope and believe that the volumes will meet with an extensive sale and be received with favor by an appreciating public.

- 
2. *A Manual of the Chaldee Language; containing a Chaldee Grammar, chiefly from the German of Professor G. B. Winer; A Chrestomathy, consisting of Selections from the Targums, and including notes on the Biblical Chaldee; and a vocabulary, adapted to the Chrestomathy. With an appendix on the Rabbinic and Samaritan Dialects.* By ELLIAS RIGGS, D. D. Second edition revised. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph, 683 Broadway. London: Sampson, Low & Son. 1858; pp. 152; 8vo.

The first edition of this grammar was published by Dr. Riggs in 1832. Soon after this Dr. Riggs went to the East, and was employed as a missionary under the care of the American Board, residing at Argos, Smyrna and Constantinople, and bestowing his labors principally upon the work of translation. He superintended the publication of the Old and New Testament in modern Greek, translated the Old Testament into the Armenian, and revised the New Testament previously translated by Dr. Adger, perfecting himself, at the same time, in the languages of the Eastern world, and in that accurate scholarship which all acquainted with him and able to appreciate his acquisitions give him the credit of possessing. During his absence from his native shores a second and enlarged edition of Professor Winer's Grammar appeared, (Leipzig, 1842,) which was translated by Professor H. B. Hackett, D. D., of the Newton Theological Seminary, and published at Andover, in 1845.

This, however, did not supersede, in Dr. Riggs' view, as it does not in ours, the earlier edition prepared by him.

"Revisiting my native land," he says, "after an absence of twenty-four years in the foreign missionary service in Greece and Turkey, it seemed to me due to the cause of Biblical literature that I should revise and re-edit the Chaldee Manual. This, with the full concurrence and approbation of Professor Hackett, I have undertaken, availing myself of whatever seemed to be improvements in Professor Winer's second edition, and incorporating numerous manuscript notes of my own. To the brief view of the Rabbinic dialect in the Appendix has been added a similar view of the Samaritan. The former is a Chaldaizing Hebrew, the latter a Hebraizing Chaldee.

"I trust that it will be found that the work has been decidedly enhanced in value, although somewhat diminished in size, by the omission from the Chrestomathy of the text of the Biblical Chaldee. The notes are preserved, and in the first edition the text also was printed for convenience of reference; but as every student has it already in his Hebrew Bible it was thought that his interest would be best consulted by omitting it here, and thus diminishing the size of the book, and consequently its price.

"This edition will be issued simultaneously in this country and in Great Britain. It is offered to the lovers of Biblical and Oriental study in both countries, with a prayer to the Author of the Scriptures, that He would condescend to employ it as a means of furthering in these highly favored lands the critical study of the Sacred Volume."

The grammar Dr. Riggs has thus given is almost a re-print of his first edition. A few judicious changes alone we notice in the body of the text. On p. 65 he adheres to the explanation given in the first edition of  $\text{ב}$  with the future, when used in an Optative, Imperative, or Subjunctive sense; supposing it to be the conjunction *that*,  $\text{וְ}$ , taking the place of the  $\text{ו}$  preformative and modifying the sense; instead of being as Winer in his second edition thinks, an unusual preformative of the future tense. He suggests that this idiomatic use of  $\text{ב}$  may be the basis of the  $\text{ב}$  preformative of the future in the Talmudic.

The extracts from the Targums, with the accompanying notes, the notes on the Chaldee portions of Ezra and Daniel, and the vocabulary, make this the most convenient book a beginner can have to initiate him into the Chaldee forms. Every thing necessary for his first studies is in a thin volume held in one hand, and the convenience of reference is greatly promoted in

this edition by the notes being printed immediately beneath the text and on the same page with it.

To the brief view of the Rabbinic dialect, given in the appendix, there is added a very brief one of the Samaritan also.

The student of Theology is now left without any excuse for failing to acquaint himself with, at least, that small portion of the Chaldee writing which is included in the sacred canon. This being mastered, the way is open to the Chaldee of the Targums, and without any great labor to other dialects of the Shemitic stock.

---

3. *The Gospels, written in the Negro Patois of English with Arabic Characters. By a Mandingo slave in Georgia.*

At a regular meeting of the Ethnological Society of New York, on the 13th of October, 1857, a paper bearing the above title was read by W. B. Hodgson, Esq., of Savannah, in explanation of a manuscript in Arabic characters submitted by him to that society. The writer was a Mandingo slave, by the name of London, owned by Mr. Maxwell of Savannah. Besides these chapters of the Gospel, he wrote a book of hymns in Arabic letters, which has not been preserved. "The manuscript of London is remarkable," says Mr. Hodgson "in the use of the vowel points—*harcat* of the Arabic grammar. I infer that as London was accustomed to use them in making copies from the Koran, with the same reverential sentiment, he used the vowel points, in copying the Bible of his adopted religion. Not having been instructed in English Grammar and Analysis, he could only write the words as their sounds affected his ear. Thus his vocalization was on this wise:—*First chapter of John.*

*Fas chapta ob jon.  
Inde beginnen wasde wad;  
ande Wad waswid Gad,  
ande wad was Gad."*

"When this manuscript was first submitted to me," says Mr. Hodgson, "I naturally looked for Arabic words, to be expressed by the



letters. I could detect none; and I abandoned the interpretation. When, however, the characters and vowels had been carefully turned into Roman letters, I discovered by sound what the eye had failed to perceive.

"In a similar case, the same difficulty occurred to the eminent Orientalist, the Baron de Sacy. His memoir on the subject may be found in the fourth volume of "notices et extraits des MSS. dans la Bibliothèque Impériale." An Arabic MS. had been sent to him at Paris, from Madrid. He failed to discover a single Arabic word; and consequently he could but offer a conjecture. This was, that the book was written in the language of the Hovas of Madagascar. Subsequently, by a process similar to my own, it was found that the language of the book was Spanish, and had been written by a *Christiano nuevo*, or converted Moor.

"The pride of history may not descend to notice the fact, that a feeble wave of Mohammedanism and Koranic letters once reached these shores, from Africa, bearing with it some humble captives, and then sunk in the moving sands. It is but little known, and may never be recorded, that Mohammedan Moors from Spain were the architects of San Juan de Ulloa, at Vera Cruz, and that an Arabic inscription, attesting this fact, still existed on the walls of that proud fortress, not many years ago."

So the Moors in Spain wrote the Spanish with Arabic characters, and several examples of native Africans in slavery in this country, are mentioned by Mr. Hodgson, some of whom have been known to ourselves, who read and wrote the Arabic, and sometimes English words in Arabic letters.

The negro tribes of Africa within the parallels of 20 degrees and 10 degrees north latitude, are Mahommedans and are taught Arabic letters. In the southern part of this continent, and to within 10 degrees of the Equator, the extreme northern point of Dr. Livingston's explorations, the whole population, except so far as under missionary influence, are gree-gree worshippers, are pagans. "At Illorin, the Baptist Missionary, Mr. Bowen, was asked by the Chief for his *Endjil* or Gospel. Dr. Barth was asked for his. In all the wide Mussulman region above 10 degrees north, the names of Moses, David and Christ—Mousa, Daoud and Issa—are as familiar as that of Mohammed. The three books, Pentateuch, Psalms, and Gospels—Tourat, Zabour and Endjil—are equally well known." As one of the modes of making the Christian religion known in the heart of Africa, Mr. Hodgson suggests *the translation of the Bible into African languages with Arabic letters*. "A strange alphabet

is always repulsive ; and the Roman letters are peculiarly so to an Oriental eye. The teacher of the Koran had ten centuries start of the Christian teacher, and has familiarized Central Africa, with the Oriental letters and mode of writing, through the wants of commerce, the service of the Mosque, and the teaching of schools."

---

4. *Slavery and the Remedy, or Principles and Suggestions for a Remedial Code.* By SAMUEL NOTT. New York: D. Appleton & Co. Boston: Crocker & Brewster, 1857. 8vo. pp. 137.

This treatise contains many sensible things and many that are not sensible. Considering the prevailing fanaticism of the region where its author dwells, the acquaintance it displays with the real principles of the case, is remarkable. The very first sentence however contains "the admission that slavery is an evil." There are evils, doubtless, connected with slavery; many of them great evils. But we recommend to this sagacious writer to reconsider this point. Is he sure that *the relation* in which these races now stand towards each other, seeing that they are here together, and that they are what they are, is *an evil*. Suppose it destroyed and the inevitable consequences of the destruction of it actually realized before his eyes, would he not be willing to have it restored just as it now is, in order to get rid of those consequences?

---

5. *Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction to the Governor of Kentucky, for the year 1856.* Frankfort, Kentucky: A. S. Hodges, Public Printer. 1857; 8vo. pp. 189.

This Report is a year old, but its statements are of permanent value and interest. Kentucky has, during ten years, greatly enlarged her expenditures for universal education. In 1846 the amount was only \$9,002 20; in 1856 it was \$291,630; and this appears to have been the result of a direct vote of the

people for self-taxation to this end. We glean the following facts respecting the other slave States: Virginia has no organized system of public schools. North Carolina has recently initiated a system with about 2,000 schools and 10,000 children, at a cost of about \$50,000. Georgia has a school fund of \$23,086. Mississippi has no organized system. Louisiana appropriates \$200,000 for 741 schools, containing 7,949 children. Tennessee has a school fund of more than one million and a half, and has, with much zeal, commenced a system of State education. Missouri appropriates annually \$140,000 for free schools. Alabama, Florida, Arkansas and Texas, are not known to have made any attempts to organize free schools.

This report states that South Carolina supports about 1,023 common schools, attended by 9,022 children, at an annual cost of about \$40,500. There must be some error here. The returns of Commissioners of Free Schools, to our last Legislature, reported 1,478 teachers, 1,465 schools, 19,356 scholars, 809,280 days of instruction, and \$87,462 19 amount expended.

---

6. *An Introduction to the Study of Philosophy, with an Outline Treatise on Logic.* By REV. E. V. GERHART, D. D., President of Franklin and Marshall College. *I am the Truth. Christ.* Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston. 1858; 12mo. pp. 359.

Of the author of this little volume, we know nothing beyond what is stated on the title page, and is contained in the terms of its dedication to the memory of Frederick Augustus Rauch, whose spirit and principles obviously animate the work. The book is very neatly printed, and if the contents corresponded in intrinsic excellence to the beauty and finish of the mechanical execution, we should have an addition to our literature which every scholar would acknowledge without reluctance. The outline treatise on logic is strictly what it professes to be, and we are happy to say, that it is quite clear and judicious. It contains only elements, but they are presented

in a form which any understanding can appreciate. Of the introduction to Philosophy we cannot speak very favourably. The fundamental principle that knowledge begins in generals—or that the process of inquiry is from the whole to the parts, is in palpable contradiction to the method of nature—and the idea that the Incarnation of the Saviour is the philosophical solution of the great problems of Ontology, is one that it is enough to enunciate to an American or an English mind to set it in its proper light. The book is written in a good spirit; is, upon the whole, free from obscurities of expression—but we cannot commend the depth or soundness of its doctrines. Still there are some truths, touching the relations of Philosophy to Theology, which the author has happily illustrated, and his precise statement of the dependence of the laws of thought upon the conditions of existence, prepares the way for a solid science of being. To those who wish to become acquainted with one type of German Philosophy, the work is a very valuable hand book.

---

7. *The City of the Great King: or, Jerusalem as it was, as it is, and as it is to be.* By J. T. BARCLAY, M. D., *Missionary to Jerusalem.* Philadelphia: James Challen & Sons. 1858; pp. 627, 8vo.

We have received this beautiful and richly illustrated volume just as our last form is making up. From the favorable notices of others, and its inviting appearance, we promise ourselves a rich treat in its perusal. At present we can only chronicle its publication, and reserve a more full statement of its character and merits for a future number.

The reader is requested to correct the following errata which occurred in the number for January, 1858 :

Page 549, line 20, for  $B \times C \times D \times E \times F$  read  $B + C + D + E + F$ .

- |        |       |   |                                |
|--------|-------|---|--------------------------------|
| “ 559, | “ 39, | <i>dele</i> “in” and insert it in line below. |                                |
| “ 577, | “ 27, | <i>for</i> energies                           | <i>read</i> congeries.         |
| “ 579, | “ 15, | “ material                                    | “ natural.                     |
| “ 583, | “ 14, | “ moral                                       | “ normal.                      |
| “ 585, | “ 11, | “ creative                                    | “ creature.                    |
| “ 588, | “ 36, | “ Edwards                                     | “ Emmons.                      |
| “ 589, | “ 18, | “ privitive                                   | “ punitive.                    |
| “ “    | “ 30, | “ puritive                                    | “ privative.                   |
| “ 590, | “ 6,  | “ frightful                                   | “ fruitful.                    |
| “ 595, | “ 4,  | “ depth                                       | “ strength.                    |
| “ 596, | “ 29, | “ enriches                                    | “ underlies.                   |
| “ 597, | “ 30, | “ therein                                     | “ believer.                    |
| “ “    | “ 53, | <i>after</i> objective                        | “ letter for Dr. B.’s purpose. |
| “ 598, | “ 30, | <i>for</i> truth                              | “ birth.                       |
| “ 639, | “ 33, | “ with truth                                  | “ into them.                   |



THE SOUTHERN  
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XI.—No. II.

---

JULY, MDCCCLVIII.

---

ARTICLE I.

ALEXANDER VON HUMBOLDT.

*Life of Alexander Von Humboldt, translated from the German of Professor Klencke.* By JULIETTE BAUER. London, 1852.  
*Works of Alexander Von Humboldt.* 1800-1858.

Among the counsellors near the person of Frederic the Great of Prussia, in the latter part of his reign, was the Baron Von Humboldt, an officer of high rank, possessing much of the confidence of his great master. The baroness was of the family of Colomb, which had fled from Burgundy upon the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, to take refuge in Protestant Prussia. The fruits of this union of the Prussian and Huguenot families were two sons, William and Alexander, (born in the years 1767 and 1769,) whose names will long reflect lustre on that noble race which, for conscience sake, left the sunny plains and vine-clad hills of their beloved France to seek new homes in foreign lands. Of Alexander Von Humboldt, his labors, his travels, and his researches, we propose to give a short sketch. Fontenelle, in his celebrated eulogy of Newton, makes little reference to his youth, but passes it by with the sentence: "It

is not granted to mortal eye to see the Nile at its source, ere it has gathered strength to run its mighty race." Still, it is both pleasant and profitable to trace the early buddings of genius; to know the particular circumstances, however trivial, which may have led to its development; to see how often direction is given to the most powerful intellects by the fortuitous circumstances which surround the early career of men.

Humboldt, reared in the home of luxury, was provided from early boyhood with the best instructors of his day. Fortunately for science he was born after the educational reform had commenced in the schools and universities of Germany, which placed the study of nature in its proper position as a co-ordinate branch of education with the study of the ancient languages and their literature. The instructor of his youth was strongly impressed with those ideas of educational reform, and imbued with a spirit of earnest investigation in the field of natural science. It is also worthy of record that this same instructor was a great lover of travellers' legends, and stories of adventures in far-off countries, and was the editor of a translation of Robinson Crusoe. The youthful mind of the future explorer was thus filled with images of those marvellous regions visited by bold voyagers. From school he entered upon his university career in Frankfort-on-the-Oder, and went thence to the University of Göttingen, then the most flourishing of the universities of Germany. Here the coloring of the early pictures of his imagination was heightened, and that undefined longing of youth to wander in distant lands was rendered more ardent by friendship and association with George Forster, who had accompanied Capt. Cook in his voyage around the world as natural historian of the expedition. Forster, whose name is not unknown to science, was a high-souled man, of liberal, enlarged views. Through a long period he exerted great influence upon the mind and character of young Humboldt.

To sum up the circumstances which surrounded his youth, the young nobleman enjoyed all the advantages of culture which the best instructors and the most liberal universities of a learned people could bestow; was thrown in contact with men of intellect and high cultivation, the visitors of his early



home, the old castle of Tegel, a few miles from the capital; enjoyed intimate communion with men of science—Heim, Heyne, Blumenbach and others—and, at the same time, cultivated with assiduity the languages and literature of those two nations which have played such an important part in the education of mankind in centuries past, and seem destined to influence immediately the mental development of all succeeding generations.

With a thorough preparatory education in almost every department of human learning; with a love of accurate and minute observation of the phenomena of nature, combined with an extraordinary talent for the investigation of the inner relations and controlling laws of these phenomena; with powers of intellectual endurance and mental labor which no array of facts, however chaotic, could appall or dismay; endowed by birth with high position and ample fortune, he came before the threshold of active manhood at a period when the human mind was just setting out on that tumultuous march which seems now hurrying it onward to the very limits of human knowledge. The time was propitious, his opportunities unsurpassed, the inward voice of his genius told him of his great mission—and well and faithfully has he accomplished it. When Humboldt entered upon his career, science, in every department, was struggling with the birth of new discoveries. Men were discarding old theories, and abandoning long received opinions. The world was ripe for revolution in the most extended sense of the term, and the upturning of the foundations of society, which shook to their centres the governmental systems of Europe, found its analogy in the revolutions of the scientific world. A glance at the state of science in its several branches in the latter part of the eighteenth century, will enable us to view from a proper stand point that mighty progress with which the labors of Humboldt have been so intimately connected, and to which they have so much contributed in the last seventy years. To commence with the experimental sciences,—the middle of the century was the period of the revival of observations and experiments in frictional electricity. Franklin and his contemporaries had gathered the various facts under

their respective hypotheses. The Leyden Phial had been invented, and had served to shock and amuse the soldier and philosopher, the courtier and maiden, who thronged to witness the celestial fire spring forth from nature's reservoir at the touch of the magician's wand. The great Franklin had proved the identity of the electric spark and the lightning's flash, and had already won worthily one-half the proud tribute, "*Eripuit cælis fulmen, sceptrumque tyrannis.*" The mathematical theory of electricity had been pushed with some vigor by Coulomb, but the science had become almost stationary; and it was not until towards the close of the century that the world prepared itself for new victories in this field. The few prominent facts of magnetism were known and discussed a century before, and in the excitement of the new experiments in electricity the laws of magnetic attractions and repulsions were more fully studied, and the facts evolved gathered up in the hypothesis of Epinus and others, analogous to the fluid theories of electricity. Later, Coulomb and others pushed these theories to greater perfection, and, at the period of which we write, the world was on the verge of the discoveries which have since so startled the nations in the astounding exhibitions of animal, voltaic and magnetic electricity. In the science of heat there was a rapid and constant accumulation of facts and improvement of hypotheses. Fourier was at the commencement of his investigations, and wielded with the strength of a giant the powerful weapon of the infinitesimal calculus. The subject of terrestrial heat was now approached with ardor, and with some hope of arriving at more accurate knowledge.

In Chemistry, the discoveries of Black, Cavendish and Priestley, having paved the way, the time-honored phlogiston theory was about yielding to that revolution of which Lavoisier was the great leader—a revolution second only in its importance and results to Newton's discovery of gravitation,—which placed the science of chemistry on the stable basis of true hypothesis, and gave it an onward movement which gathers strength with the lapse of years. To quote the words of Cuvier: "Till Lavoisier appeared, the particular phenomena of chemistry might be compared to a labyrinth of which the

deep and winding paths had been trod by several laborious travellers; but their points of union, their relation to one another and to the system, could only be perceived by the genius which was able to rise above the edifice, and with an eagle's eye to catch the plan of the whole."

In the science of Optics, the war so long carried on between the advocates of the emission and undulatory theories of light, had apparently given the victory to the former or Newtonian hypothesis; but the way was clearing up for the experiments and discoveries of Fresnel in France, and Young in England, which a few years later caused the almost universal reception of the beautiful hypothesis of the undulations of an all-pervading ether—an hypothesis which, in a modified form, plays an important part in all the attempts at a proper physical conception of the secondary causes of the phenomena of Electricity, Magnetism and Heat, as well as Light. Astronomy, the beloved of the ancients—the model of the exact sciences—based firmly on Newton's grand generalization, which earlier in the century had received new verifications from the splendid labors of Clairant, D'Alembert, Euler and Lagrange—now rushed on to new victories in the fields of infinite space. The young giant Laplace, was just entering on his career. The elder Herschel, with his monster telescope, added a new planet to our system, new satellites to the planets, and revealed suns and worlds and systems, which showed by their revolutions the existence of the law of gravitation beyond the narrow limits of our solar system, enabling men now to speak of the one universal law impressed by the Almighty on the whole material world. Astronomers and physicists now weighed the earth with a mountain, and basing themselves upon this result, went forth into planetary space armed with a colossal balance, to determine the density of the sun and his satellites. The patient watcher of the heavens recurring back to a long series of recorded observations, became now convinced that our little system was not isolated and stationary in space, but was hurrying onward with fearful rapidity in obedience to some unknown law, which linked it as a constituent member to the great family of the skies. In the department of Natural History,

the great Linnæan reformation of the science of botany had just preceded this era, and the introduction of a more perfect system had given great incitement to the renewed study of the organic world in both its animal and vegetable forms. In the re-awakened zeal voyages were planned to study anew the Fauna and Flora of lands already visited by the earlier Botanists and Zoologists. Men of old and established reputation, as well as the young and ambitious student, entered with ardor upon the completion of the edifice so nobly projected. Some of the greatest intellects of the period of which we write turned their attention to investigations in vegetable and animal physiology. That beautiful generalization, the doctrine of morphology which had been gradually becoming more apparent in the speculations of Naturalists, was announced by Goëthe in 1790. Gifted with the love of beauty in form and in symmetry, the great poet felt that there must be a law, deep and hidden perhaps, but a law to which the thronged variety of vegetable beauty around us pointed. In its announcement he gave, as he expresses it, "the germ of an idea, from which might grow a tree of physiology fit to overshadow the world."

In this hasty review we must not pass by the sister science of Geology, which, in spite of prejudice and learned ignorance, now ranks proudly among the exact sciences. At the period however of which we speak, Geology was an incongruous mass of contradictory hypotheses. Fierce was the war between the Neptunians and the Plutonians. And Arago has well said of these early Geologists what Cicero said of the augurs, "it was wondrous how they could look each other in the face without laughing." But it was necessary, when the knowledge of nature was seeking the basis of true hypothesis in every branch, that the science which embraces all these departments in its broad domain, should still be in the region of vague conjecture. The complex could not be perfected until the simple was more thoroughly understood. But the day of Cuvier and his compeers was at hand—the day of thorough investigations in comparative Anatomy and fossil Geology—the day of Humboldt with his researches into the great forces at work on the surface and in the bosom of the earth—the day of a host of laborers

in the same fruitful fields. And these crude theories of the period just preceding them, are but the index of the ever-abiding deep desire of the soul which seeks to understand even in the most limited state of our knowledge, the great complex unit as it exists in the design of an all-wise, all-powerful Creator. This aspiration is the key of the life of Alexander Von Humboldt, with him not to be realized by vague imaginings, but by that close and laborious research which holds the minute to be contemptible only when the great is to be neglected.

Geography was not yet a science. Some few attempts at generalizations on the forms of continents, their relative elevation, the distribution of land and water, had been made by Forster, Steffens and others. But Ritter had not yet brought in the great historic element, and it was reserved for Humboldt himself to make all the sciences render tribute to the knowledge of the earth and the races which inhabit it. In this rapid and imperfect glance at the great points of the picture of the intellectual activity seen in every department of science in the remarkable period before us, we have endeavored to exhibit it as the period of the evolution of great and general laws, of great impulse towards the universal in the study of nature; towards the investigation of those links which show us unity in variety, which bind, apparently, isolated and incongruous facts in one grand and harmonious whole. Such was the state of science when this noble youth of twenty years entered with ardor upon the study of nature. Nor was the state of the German mind and literature at this time without its influence on his mind and his career. It was the storm and pressure period of German literature, when a whole nation seemed to give itself up to enthusiastic aspirations for the infinite and unattainable. The conviction of the unsatisfying nature of the circle of knowledge of external appearances,—the sighing for some revelation of the hidden, the secret, the mysterious, everywhere at work,—the deep cultivation of the æsthetic feeling in nature and art were its characteristics. The two brothers Humboldt were thrown in constant contact and intimate intercourse with Goëthe and Schiller, the two great representatives of the German mind at that time.

In 1791, Alexander having finished his studies in the University of Göttingen, attracted by the reputation of the Geologist Werner, went to the mining school of Freiburg in Saxony, in order to pursue the study of the natural sciences in their bearing on Geognosy. Thence he went as Master of Mines into one of the Prussian provinces, where he devoted his time to the perfection of his practical knowledge of the components of the earth's surface, publishing treatises on various subjects in botany and geology. In these years he made a botanical tour into Italy, and hearing of the singular discoveries of Galvani, the Bologna doctor, in a new development of the electrical force, he reviewed the investigation for himself, thus verifying the remark of Schiller, "this young Humboldt measures every thing," and gave to the world the results of his experiments in a treatise. But these varied employments seemed only to increase the ardor of his desire for extended investigations in foreign lands. He sighs constantly for a transatlantic voyage. Says he: "I have from my earliest youth felt a burning desire to travel in distant lands unexplored by Europeans."

A few years later he is in Paris, waiting anxiously for the outset of some of those great expeditions into Egypt, and other parts of the world, planned by the French Republic for extending the bounds of knowledge. Meantime he is ever busy, ever active in the field of original investigation, laboring with Gay Lussac in the confirmation of the Lavoisierian hypothesis and the accurate determination of the composition of the atmosphere; making practical attainments in astronomical measurements, and availing himself of the treasures of Natural History in the Parisian collections. The plan of the Egyptian expedition having been laid aside after the battle of Aboukir Bay, he went with his ardent young friend, the accomplished naturalist Bouplaud, to Marseilles, in order to join an expedition to the South Sea. Again disappointed, but nothing daunted, the travellers crossed the Pyrenees into Spain, where Humboldt, like Columbus of old, laid his plans before the Court of that once glorious people; and like Columbus, too, he met with encouragement and approbation, and obtained the royal seal for free

access into the South American dominions. Meeting again with delays, he devoted his forced leisure to observations of the geological structure of the peninsula and its climatic relations. At length he found a captain bold enough to run the gauntlet of an English fleet which blockaded Corunna, and soon set sail on his voyage of discovery. On the sea he commenced at once his observations of all the phenomena around him. The atmosphere with its varying hue, the ocean with its current and its changing tint, the bird that followed the ship, the meteor shooting across the sky at night, the southern constellations coming into view, were all alike objects of study for one to whom all the appearances around us were but the links of a chain of universal causes and effects, and the most insignificant fact often afforded the clue to the greatest mystery.

Touching at the Canary Islands, that rich field explored afterwards by his friend Von Buch, he ascended the peak of Teneriffe and made at once a step in a great generalization by noting the unchanging nature of inorganic formations in different parts of the earth as contrasted with the ever-varying beauty of the organic world. He recorded, too, his observation of the circles of vegetation in ascending from the base to the summit of the mountain, a subject afterwards beautifully developed in some of the works based upon his studies in South America. Here, too, on this extinct volcano, he reflected upon the great destroying and re-constructing forces of nature. The traces which the terrible element had left upon the mountain sides and in its crater, were to him the beginning of the solution of a great mystery in the past history of our planet. Arrived at Corunna, on the coast of Venezuela, he plunged into the interior, and entered enthusiastically upon the study of nature in its magnificent and gorgeous tropical developments, and in the terrible exhibitions of the volcano and earthquake. We will not follow him minutely in his explorations of these equinoctial regions. During the years spent on the New Continent, he made constantly and unceasingly, extensive and minute observations of every object which presented itself in the realms of nature. From the pebble to the mountain mass, from the lichen to the palm tree, from the insect to the fierce animal of prey, from

the worm to the alligator, from the fire-fly's flash to the scintillating stars of heaven beaming on him in quiet beauty from the tropical sky, from the monkey and his social habits, to man, his language, his monuments and his political relations,—all the works of the Creator were subjects of contemplation to the great interpreter of nature. He was every where the laborious, minute, untiring observer; in the volcanic vales of Caraccas; wandering on the *llanos* of the Orinoco and Amazon; making his way on streams whose existence had been doubted; ascending the Orinoco to its cataracts; exploring its branches; proving its connexion with the Amazon; studying musty documents in the archives of the mission-house; undeterred by dangers or privations, he overcame all difficulties with the indomitable perseverance of one who felt his mission, and obeyed the true impulse of his genius. From these explorations in Guiana and Venezuela, he returned to Havana for a season, coasted along the island of Cuba, and then set sail for Carthagena, in order to cross the Continent to meet the French expedition to the South Sea, on the other side, and complete his researches in company with the distinguished savans who composed it. Arrived again on the Continent, he explored the river Magdalen and the bordering regions. Giving up all hope of meeting with the French savans, he entered Ecuador, spent many months upon the plateau about Quito; ascended and measured the volcanoes of Pichincha, Antisana and Cotopaxi; attempted the summit of Chimborazo, crossed the Andes into Peru; observed in Lima the transit of Mercury across the sun's disc; mapped accurately the unexplored regions of the Amazon; ascertained the position of the magnetic equator; investigated the cold ocean current which washes the coast of the continent near Callao. He set sail thence for Acapulco, on the coast of Mexico, and there breathing awhile in order to arrange his manuscripts and collections, he descended into the Valley of Mexico and visited many points of geognostic interest; made astronomical and barometric measurements in different provinces; determined the relative position of the chief points by a vertical triangulation, which made the great mountain heights the base lines. He pursued his favorite geognostic studies in



the mines of Guanaxuato, and on the plains of Jorallo, with their two thousand craters yet smoking with an eruption of fifty years before; ascertained the heights of Popocatepetl and Orizaba, and visited the pyramidal monuments of the Tulleks on the eastern side of the Cordilleras. He once more set sail for Havanna, whence he visited the United States, spending some months in the study of the political and social relations of this great Republic, upon which the hopes of the philosophers of all the world were fixed.

In 1804, five years after setting out on his arduous undertaking, he landed at Bourdeaux with his faithful friend and constant companion, Bouplaud. The two travellers went at once to Paris, where they were hailed with great enthusiasm. They at once commenced the preparation and publication of the immense mass of materials for scientific study which they had collected. As these treasures were gradually given to the nations, the results of the activity and liberality of one man—for Humboldt was in every respect the guiding spirit of the expedition—the whole scientific world rang with the praises of the undertaking. Cuvier, Gay Lussac, Arago, Oltmann and others, actively assisted in the arrangement and preparation of the materials. A few years later Delambre, in the *Compte Rendu* of the Institute to the Emperor Napoleon, after giving an account of expeditions sent out by different governments, at great expense, thus speaks of the South American exploration: "Lastly, to terminate this sketch with an expedition which contains in it every kind of merit, Humboldt has executed at his own expense an enterprise that would have done honor to a nation. Accompanied only by his friend Bouplaud, he has plunged into the American wilderness; he has brought back with him 6,000 new plants, with their descriptions; has determined the geographical position of several hundred points; has ascended and measured the highest volcanoes of the Andes. He has created the geography of plants, assigned the limits of vegetation and eternal snow; observed the phenomena of the electric fish and the magnetic needle; has presented the lovers of antiquity with much valuable information concerning the aborigines of Mexico and South America, their language, their

history and their monuments." This is but a faint outline of what was really accomplished by the prince of scientific discoverers.

The departments of human knowledge enriched by his labors on the Continent, may best be known from a list of his works, the immediate results of those labors. These works, which were appearing during a period of twenty years after his return, are as follows:—View of the Cordilleras and the Aborigines of America; Political Treatise on Mexico; Political Treatise on Cuba; Collection of observations of Zoology and Comparative Anatomy, made in a voyage to the Tropics; Treatise on the Geography of Plants; Tableau of the Equinoctial Plants from the seaboard to the height of 15,000 feet; Treatise on the position of the Rocky Strata in the two hemispheres; Treatise on Isothermal lines and the distribution of temperature on the earth; A discussion of the doctrine of Climate. Under Bouplaud's superintendence were issued several works on the discoveries in descriptive botany. With the aid of Oltmann, the astronomical observations, the accurate determination of seven hundred geographical localities, were published.\* The above works were distinct portions of one gigantic work, Voyage to the Equinoctial regions of the New Continent. His philological treasures he placed in the hands of his brother, who had made comparative philology his special study. Nor must we omit an important work, "The Critical Examination of the History of the Geography of the New Continent," commenced at this period. The enterprise thus accomplished by the indefatigable energy of one master intellect, whose grand and comprehensive view embraced all nature in its contemplation, was truly worthy of a great nation. We could not give a proper view of the poetic side of Humboldt's character, if we omitted a notice of his "Aspects of Nature in different Lands," which appeared at this period of his labors. It is here we find displayed that

---

\* To test the accuracy of the instruments on which our explorer relied for the determination of these localities, he determined by their means the latitude of Paris on their return, and found it to agree closely with that determined by other astronomers.

deep æsthetic feeling—that enthusiastic appreciation of the sublime and beautiful in nature—that love of quiet contemplation far removed from the turmoil of the political world, which are his striking characteristics. In a pious dedication to his brother, who was in affliction, he writes:

“Throughout the entire work I have sought to indicate the unflinching influence of external nature on the feelings, the moral dispositions, and the destinies of man. To minds oppressed with the cares or the sorrows of life, the soothing influence of the contemplation of nature is peculiarly precious, and to such these pages are especially dedicated. May they, escaping from the stormy waves of life, follow me in spirit with willing footsteps to the recesses of the primeval forests, over the boundless surface of the Steppes, and to the higher ridges of the Andes. To them is addressed the poet's voice:—‘On the mountains is freedom, the dank breath of the vault reaches not thither into the pure air of heaven. The world is perfect where man comes not with his crimes.’”

In an edition of thirty years later, in his eightieth year, he wishes “to oppose the dogmatic half-knowledge and arrogant scepticism which have long too much prevailed in what are called the higher circles of society.”

In the midst of the fierce wars which deluged Europe with blood, wandering back in memory to the boundless Steppe, he tells us:

“But, as in the Steppe tigers and crocodiles fight with horses and cattle, so in the forests, on its borders, in the wilderness of Guiana, man is ever armed against man. Some tribes drink with insatiable thirst the blood of their enemies; others, apparently weaponless, and yet prepared for murder, kill with a poisoned thumb-nail. Thus man, in the lowest stages of almost animal rudeness, as well as in the apparent brilliancy of our higher cultivation, prepares for himself and his fellow-man increased toil and danger. The traveller wandering over the wide globe by sea and land, as well as the historic inquirer searching the records of past ages, finds everywhere the same saddening spectacle of man at variance with man. He, therefore who, amidst the unreconciled discord of nations is seeking for intellectual calm, gladly turns to contemplate the silent life of vegetation, and the hidden activities of forces and powers operating in the sanctuary of nature; or, obedient to the inborn impulse which for thousands of years has glowed in the human breast, gazes upwards in meditative contemplation of those celestial orbs which are pursuing in undisturbed harmony their ancient unchanging course.”

At the burial cave of the brave Atures, who had retreated before the cannibal tribes pressing on them, to the granite

rocks which rear themselves 8,000 feet high around the cataracts of the Orinoco—a melancholy refuge, where the tribe and language finally perished :

“We turned our steps in a thoughtful and melancholy mood from this burying place of a race deceased. It was one of those clear, cool nights, so frequent in the tropics ; the moon, encircled with rings, stood high in the zenith, illuminating the margin of the mist which lay with well-defined cloud-like outlines on the surface of the foaming river. Countless insects poured their red phosphoric light on the herb-covered ground, which glowed with living fire as if the starry canopy of heaven had sunk down upon the turf. Climbing bignonias, fragrant vanillas and yellow-flowering banisterias, adorned the entrance of the cave, and the summit of the palms rustled over the graves. Thus perish the generations of men ; thus do the name and traces of nations fade and disappear ; yet, when each blossom of man’s intellect withers—when, in the storms of time, the memories of his art moulder and decay, an over new life springs forth from the bosom of the earth. Maternal nature unfolds unceasingly her gems, her flowers, her fruits, regardless though man, with his passions and his crimes, treads under foot her ripening harvest.”

Speaking of the current formed by the waters of the Orinoco between the main land and the Island of Trinidad, he makes the following allusion to the great discoverer of our Continent, and one of his grand generalizations :

“The aspect of this region first convinced the great discoverer of the New World of the existence of an American Continent. Familiar with nature, he inferred that so immense a body of fresh water could only be collected in a long course, and that the land which supplied it must be a continent not an island. As according to Arrian, the companions of Alexander, after crossing the snow-covered Paropanisus, on reaching the Indus, imagined from the presence of crocodiles that they recognized in that river a branch of the Nile, so Columbus, unaware of the similarity of physiognomy which characterizes the various productions of the climate of Palms, readily supposed this New Continent to be the eastern coast of the far projecting Continent of Asia. The mild coolness of the evening air—the ethereal purity of the starry firmament—the balsamic fragrance of the flowers wafted to him by the land breeze—all led him to think that he had approached the garden of Eden, the sacred dwelling place of the first parents of the human race. The Orinoco appeared to him one of the four rivers descending from Paradise to divide and water the earth, newly decked with vegetation. The creative imagination of the poet exists in the discoverer as in every form of human greatness.”

But we will not continue quotations. In all the discussions

and descriptions of this delightful volume, whether tracing the physiognomy of the vegetable world—discussing the influence of physical causes on the destinies of nations—depicting the structure of the great outlets of the central fires of the earth—or treating of the vital force in the little gem the “Rhodian Genius”—he is the poet, philosopher and discoverer.

The period of the preparation of his works spent by Humboldt in Paris, was one of great activity and progress in science. It was the epoch of Laplace and Biot, of Fresnel, Gay Lussac, Berthollett, of Cuvier, Arago, Ampere, and a host of others, when men were working wonders, especially in the sciences of Optics, Chemistry, Electricity and Magnetism. Even amidst his great labors, ever ardent in the search of truth, he at once plunged into investigations in the different branches of science—contemplating them in their bearing upon the knowledge of the earth—striving to see the harmony of universal law in the tremendous array of striking isolated results developed with startling rapidity. The great man placed himself among the vanguard of this progress. He formed “a power” in this great scientific centre of which France proudly boasted, for whom the Germans felt that veneration with which their ancestors looked upon the fabled Norse Gods.

William Von Humboldt, the brother, who in these years had attained high rank in the circles of literature and politics, as the peer and associate of Goëthe, Wolfe and Schiller, was called to the post of Minister of Public Instruction of the Kingdom of Prussia, in 1809. He entered with ardor upon the subject of the establishment of a great University in the city of Berlin, in order to revive the sinking national energies of the Prussian people. He gathered around him Wolf, Schleiermacher and others, as counsellors, and soon proposed the plan of the University, with all its details, for the approbation of the King. It received the royal assent, and was established in 1810, under the most splendid auspices, with Fichte, Savigny, Niebuhr, Gauss, Böckh and Schleiermacher, in the professional corps. Alexander was to be added to the list; but neither for this post nor for that of Minister of Public Instruction, subsequently offered, would he break the ties which bound him to Paris and his

collaborators. From this time to 1826, he lived chiefly in the French capital, pursuing his literary and scientific labors, planning new expeditions—perfecting himself in the Persian language and the geography of Asia, preparatory to an exploration of that Continent, which for years he held in contemplation, but the realization of which was prevented by the political strifes which constantly agitated Europe.

In 1826, he yielded to the solicitations of the King of Prussia, and removed to Berlin, where in the succeeding year he repeated a course of lectures (first delivered in Paris) on the subject of Physical Cosmography, amidst the greatest enthusiasm of the learned and the multitude. Those lectures form the basis of his *Cosmos*.

At this time the Emperor Nicholas of Russia, with that liberality of which the great autocrat was so capable, made Humboldt the munificent offer of an expedition into the Russian Asiatic dominions, at the sole cost of the government, with the injunction to consider the advantages likely to accrue therefrom in the development of the material interests of the Empire, as second in importance to the advancement of science. He at once commenced his preparations for the great journey, and in the following year set out, accompanied by Rose, the mineralogist, and Ehrenberg, the naturalist, across the Ural mountains for the heart of Central Asia. He explored the connection of its extensive steppes and deserts, determined geographical localities, made observations in climatology and the magnetism of the earth; studied the formation of its mountain chains—the structure of its great volcanic regions—pushed his researches across the Altai mountains into the Tartar regions of the Chinese empire—explored the great mineral resources of the Russian empire—analysed the waters and measured the depression of its great inland sea. In short, that which Humboldt of thirty years accomplished on the Continents of North and South America, Humboldt of sixty years accomplished in Central Asia with undiminished activity, energy and industry, and aided by the improvements in every department of the investigation of nature, with greater comprehensive power. In the short space of eight months, he travelled several thou-

sand miles through a wild and difficult region, exploring thoroughly a vast territory. The materials collected in this expedition formed the subject of several works on Central Asia, which appeared in the *lustrum* succeeding the Russian journey, accompanied by treatises upon Terrestrial Heat and Terrestrial Magnetism, based upon his researches in both continents, and upon new facts developed in the laboratories of science. One would think that the labors entailed on him in the preparation of these works were enough for the full occupation of his energies. But he occupied himself in completing investigations commenced in former years, in finishing works begun and laid aside, among others, that noble contribution to the History of Geography and tribute to the memory of Columbus, "Critical examinations of the history of the knowledge of the New Continent." He, at the same time, kept up a constant correspondence with scientific societies, individual explorers, and men of influence of neighboring nations, who were willing to do aught for the advancement of the knowledge of the globe. As an instance of the extended influence which he exerted in instituting observations and inciting to activity of research, we will refer to the subject of Terrestrial Magnetism. After his return from Asia, at his urgent request, the Imperial Academy of Russia had formed a chain of stations for magnetic observations throughout that vast empire, from the Crimea and Finland to Nertschinsk in Siberia, and Sitka in Russian America, and one in the Celestial Empire at Peking itself. The observers at these posts reported constantly to the chief observatory in St. Petersburg. To these were added, by men of science and associations enlisted in the cause, stations at the chief capitals, and astronomical observatories of Western Europe. Subsequently, at Humboldt's suggestion to the President of the Royal Society of Great Britain, the British government established magnetic observatories at Toronto, St. Helena, the Cape of Good Hope and Van Dieman's Land, and gave instruction to Sir James Ross to make observations in his expedition to the Antarctic regions. To these were added, by the East India Company, stations on the Himalaya mountains, at Madras, Bombay and Singapore; by the French government in

Algiers; by the United States at Washington, Cambridge and Philadelphia; by the Pasha of Egypt at Cairo, and even by the King of Oude in Lucknow. At all these stations are observed the variations of the needle, its inclination to the horizon, and the intensity of the magnetic force, the same plan being followed at all the stations by simultaneous observations with instruments of equal perfection. Thus did one commanding mind circle the earth with observatories. Whewell has well said: "Such a scheme, combining world-wide extent with the singleness of action of an individual mind, is hitherto without parallel." The materials thus collected have been the basis of treatises by more than one great theorist—among whom stands pre-eminent the German astronomer and mathematician Gauss.

Nor did these labors of Humboldt interfere with the duties of that beautiful friendship between himself and his brother who, in his waning health, was ceaselessly laboring to complete his great work on the languages of the Indian Archipelago, and his researches in comparative philology, made partly on the data collected for him, by Alexander, in his travels. William Von Humboldt died in 1835 leaving the reputation of a great statesman and diplomatist, and one of the first of modern philologists and literati, excelled by few men in the accuracy and broad range of his investigations. As his literary executor, Humboldt now added to his labors the preparation of his works for publication. Twelve years after the first publication of his researches in Central Asia, he composed a new work upon the subject of his explorations on that continent, bringing to bear on it, not only the results of the observations at the points established by the Russian Government, and the ever-new developments of science, but also historic aids drawn for him by the great scholars of the day from the Oriental languages. On the death of Frederic William III, he became at once the intimate companion and counsellor of the art and science-loving successor of that monarch, and has continued to this time an honored inmate of the palace—the sovereign subject of the Prussian court—laboring constantly in literature and science; devoting much of his time to the last grand and noble conception to which the researches and studies of his life have ever



pointed—the ‘Cosmos,’ a work commenced in 1828, but interrupted by the expedition to Russian Asia. Of this crowning work of his life the judgment of more competent critics than ourselves has gone forth.

At all epochs of intellectual activity to conceive the idea and to give expression to the conception of the great unit—the universe—the harmony of the mysterious and complex phenomena which surrounds us, has filled the imagination and formed the ardent aspiration of man. And though in the past, when the knowledge of external nature was very limited, these conceptions were but shadowy conjectures, still, by the fixed laws of human thought, some of the wildest dreams of the ancient philosophers, and the apparently absurdest vagaries of the middle ages, have been but prophecies foreshadowing the noblest discoveries of the present century. The universe as the expression of law—this law as the expression of the will of the great God who formed and fashioned it, is the great central truth which must lend power and inspiration to the truly scientific inquirer in every department of knowledge—a truth on which every discovery which man can make in the realms of nature or of thought, must throw new light. But with all that science has accomplished and will accomplish, there is a limit to mere human knowledge which will ever prevent us from realizing this noble conception in all its beauty and awful grandeur.

But it was a noble ambition to aspire to represent this Cosmos, this order, harmony, grace and beauty of the universe in a few grand pencillings, whose touches should blend and unite in one magnificent picture of God’s creation: commencing with the few simpler relations which constitute our knowledge of the remotest nebulæ and suns—to come down to *our* solar world and the beautiful harmonies of the relations among its members—to take up then the study of the earth in all its complex phenomena; the forces unceasingly at work in its interior and on its surface; the gaseous envelope which surrounds it; the winds that sweep over its bosom; its oceans with their currents; its continents with their inland seas and intersecting rivers; its plains and mighty mountain chains; its

deserts and its rich savannahs; the extinct races of plants which have floated on the seas, or beautified the continents of ages that are past; the races of animals which filled those seas with moving life or wandered over those continents and peopled their rivers; the living races which have sprung up on this great burial-place of those which have gone before—and, pre-eminent among these races, the tribes of the human family! But why attempt a meagre and imperfect outline of the endeavor? No man was ever better fitted than Alexander Von Humboldt, by the genius which God gave him, as well as by his gigantic attainments in every department of knowledge, the fruits of untiring activity, energy and patience—no man was ever better fitted than he who thus combined the most laborious and infinitesimal accuracy with the highest power of imaginative eloquence to conceive and perform the task with any hope of success. His great soul had been for more than half a century in close communion with nature. He had said to her in his youth “Thou art my goddess, to thy laws my services are bound.” In the solitudes of the primeval forests of America—in the tropical night the stars of heaven shedding upon him their “mild and planetary radiance”—in the craters of the great volcanoes of the Andes and Cordilleras—on the earth trembling beneath his feet at Caraccas and surging like the waves of an agitated sea—on the mighty Amazon and Orinoco—on the islands of the Atlantic—in the steppes of bleak Siberia—on the lofty Ural and Altai chains—in the great scientific centre of the world where the impatient intellect of man, armed with instrumental power, was each moment forcing some new secret from the reluctant bosom of nature—he had studied the glorious laws, the golden links which bind this fabric of the world together. He had contemplated nature in her grandest and most striking exhibitions—had observed her in the minutest displays of power and design—had questioned her concerning her profoundest mysteries—and she, so prodigal to him at his birth, had not been coy in her answers. Truly no one among all the great lights who have shed their lustre upon this 19th century could soar with more glorious sweep towards the regions of the unattainable.

We would speak, did the space permit, of Humboldt's influence in the impulse and direction which the German mind has taken in the vibration from metaphysical to physical studies. We would speak of his high character, his noble, fearless, genial nature, his ardent love of truth so far above the mere desire for personal fame—of his freedom from those petty strifes concerning priority of discovery which have disgraced so many men of science—and which cause us to pity greatness, even in reading the biographies of Newton, Leibnitz and Laplace. We would speak of the warm friendship and confidence which marked his intercourse with his great contemporaries, upon the grave of many of whom it has been his lot to throw a chaplet woven from the “immortelle” of a deep, touching and simple pathos. We would especially make mention of the science of comparative physical geography which the world owes to Humboldt and Ritter; the former having built an edifice of fair proportions, founded on his own explorations and historical investigations, the latter adding to it from the vast treasures of his learning many a noble generalization;—a science, a knowledge of which is essential to the proper study of history, not only from the influence of the forms of continents upon the character of the civilization of the people which inhabit them, and of the directions of the great mountain chains and intersecting rivers upon the migrations of the tribes of the human family, but from the influence too of external nature itself upon the character and intellect of man and the destinies of nations; a science apart from all practical, incidental considerations worthy the study of every thoughtful mind. For, in the language of Brewster, “To live upon a world so wonderfully made without desiring to know its form, its structure, its purpose—to eat the ambrosia of its gardens and drink the nectar of its vineyards without inquiring where, or how, or why they grew—to toil for its gold and silver, and to appropriate its coal and its iron without studying their nature and their origin—to tremble under its earthquakes and stand aghast before its volcanoes ignorant of their powers and their nature—to see and handle the gigantic remains of vegetable and animal life without understanding when and how

they perished—to tread the mountain range unconscious that it is sometimes composed wholly of the indestructible, flinty relics of living creatures—to neglect such pursuits as these would be unworthy of the life and reason with which we have been endowed. He ‘who breaketh the cedars of Lebanon’—‘who shaketh the wilderness’—who ‘divideth the flames of fire’—who ‘causeth the hinds to calve’—and ‘maketh bare the forest’ has imperatively required it from his worshippers ‘that, in his temple, every one should speak of his glory.’”

But we pause. The sage of eighty-nine years is still steadily engaged in his literary labors. In the notices of the sittings of the Imperial Academy of France, January, 1858, we read the following: “The perpetual Secretary presents a new volume of the *Cosmos*, in the name of the author, with a few autographic lines on its pages, assuring the Academy of his well-known, long-cherished affection.” But, though endowed by his Creator with such endurance of strength in body and mind, he too must soon obey the decree of Omnipotence, and surrender his immortal spirit back to the God who gave it him. We should think, that when the moment comes—may it long be delayed—when, full of years and honors he shall be called away, Nature herself would toll his funeral bell, as in the equinoctial regions where he loved so much to linger, with the mighty billows of the earth she sometimes tolls the cathedral bell to announce to distant vales the doom of a devoted city! Perhaps it may be vouchsafed to her to sustain him yet for years. And, then, the electric wires lying buried in the caves of old ocean,—the combined and crowning practical result of the knowledge of that secret force discovered, in a few singular phenomena, by Galvani, and investigated by Humboldt himself more than sixty years ago, and of that knowledge of the ocean and its currents to the pursuit of which he gave such impulse—will tremble with the sad announcement, from the old world to the new, “The great Humboldt is no more!”—And, in the halls of science, in the hut of the backwoodsman, in the city of the Montezumas, on the slopes of the Andes, along the shores of the Amazon, it will be repeated in sadness, “The great Humboldt is no more!”

ARTICLE II.

THE TRINITY OF THE GODHEAD, THE DOCTRINE  
OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

(CONTINUED.)

*Design and strength of these plural forms—Ancient interpretations of Gen. 1: 26—Pagan, Jewish, and by the primitive Fathers.*

From all that we have advanced, and from the fact that the image and likeness in which man was created was essential to his whole nature, and to what constitutes his peculiar nature as man, (that is the mysterious compound of body, soul and spirit which renders that nature a living tri-unity,) we must conclude that man was intended to be a living emblem, analogy, or image of the tri-unity of the ineffable Elohim by whom he was created, and who has recorded the purpose and the plan of his formation in the words under consideration. "And Elohim (that God who is, at the same time, *'the Gods,'*) said let us make man in OUR image, after OUR likeness. So Elohim created man in HIS OWN image, in the image of Elohim created he him." In this Elohim Creator we find three distinct subsistences, each spoken of as Creator, and yet only one God. And, in man, we find a body which is complete and distinct in itself, a living soul which is distinct and separate from that body, and a spirit which is distinct and separate from both, and yet, in man, these three subsistences, in order to constitute man, must be combined in one inseparable and undivided, triune, compound nature. And as in this Elohim God the Father is invisible, and the Holy Ghost is invisible, and the Son alone has been visible and perceptible by the senses of man, so also in this tri-unity of man, the soul is invisible, and the life is invisible, and only the body is cognizable by the senses.

We have dwelt long on this declaration of God because it is

so prominent and emphatic; because it is so evidently designed to awaken deep consideration; because it is the earliest annunciation in human language of man's creation, of the nature of the Creator, and of man his creature; because it is itself the original form of expression imparted by God the Holy Ghost to holy men of God, who spake as they were moved by him, and is not, therefore, a mere idiomatic, or dramatic, or unmeaning form of human speech; because it is associated with other similar and as emphatic statements, and with the whole phraseology of the Old Testament respecting the God of Israel in distinction from the invisible Elohim and the invisible Holy Spirit; and because it has attracted the deep and solemn consideration of both the ancient Jewish and Christian churches.

Any one of the considerations we have advanced might, in itself, appear trivial, or at least insufficient to sustain our conclusion. But they all go together. They all arise from the plain, unambiguous words of the passage, and they are all scriptural, and according to the analogy or proportion of faith. And even should any one, or several of them, be regarded as doubtful, any one of them will prove that God, by his own mouth, has led us to believe that His name and nature are inconsistent with an absolute, personal unity, and that they are consistent with a personal plurality.

The glosses of modern Jewish Rabbis have, as we have elsewhere shown, been refuted by earlier and abler Rabbis than they, and by their most ancient and most sacred books. The perplexity felt by the Jews of the middle ages appears by their inventing this childish story: "Rabbi Samuel Bar Nachman said that Moses when, in writing the law, he was come to the place where he was, by Divine dictation, to write, *Let us make man*, paused, and replied to God: *Lord of the world, why dost thou afford an occasion for error, with respect to thy most simple unity?* But that the Lord answered: *Moses, write thou so; and he that desires to err, let him err.*"\* Indeed the interpretation we have given seems to have been preserved in the very earliest traditionary cosmogonies of the heathen world, as

---

\* See Smith's Testimony, Vol. I., p. 527, and the authorities quoted.

we have also shown. Orpheus almost paraphrases the words when he says, "all things were made by one Godhead of three names." Philo, in the first century, considered these expressions of God as "manifesting a plurality—the expression, one of us being put," he says, "to signify not one, but many."\* Philo may well be put against all modern Jewish interpreters, and Orpheus may well stop the mouth of all modern Unitarian expositors, since these pagan traditionary records of a Trinity as distinct, and not more disfigured, than their records of primitive sacrifice, of the temptation, fall and seduction of man by a serpent, of the deluge, &c.,—prove either that the doctrine of the Trinity was the original revelation of God concerning his own nature, or that it is the necessary conclusion of the human mind reasoning upon the nature of God.

As a further confutation of all such modern Jewish or Unitarian interpretations of these declarations of God concerning his plurality, we would, before passing, refer to the invariable exposition given of them by the primitive fathers.

We begin with the epistle of St. Barnabas, who says, "And the Lord took upon him to suffer for our souls, though He was Lord of the whole earth, to whom God said before the foundation of the world, Let us make man after our image and likeness."

Hermas, in his Pastor, says, "The Son of God is more ancient than all the creatures, for that he was present with his Father in council about producing the creatures."

Tertullian says, "If you still take offence at the number of the Trinity, as if it was not connected in simple unity, I ask how does one individual Being speak in the plural number? *Let us make man, &c.*, when he ought to have said, *I will make man, &c.*, as being one and singular. So also in what follows: *Behold Adam is become as one of us*, (Gen. 3: 22.) He deceives us, or is amusing himself by speaking in the plural, when he is one, and alone and singular. Or was he speaking to the angels, as the Jews explain it, because they also do not acknowledge the Son? Or because he was himself Father, Son

---

\* Ed. Mangey Tom. 1: p. 430–431. See also Oxlee 1: p. 93–103.

and Spirit, did he therefore make himself plural, and speak plurally to himself? The fact is, that He used the plural expressions, *Let us make*, and *our*, and *to us*, because the Son, a second person, His Word, was united to him, and the Spirit, a third person, in the Word. For with whom did He make man, and to whom did He make him like? It was with his Son, who was to put on the human nature, and with the Spirit, who was to sanctify man, that He conversed as with ministers and witnesses, by the unity of the Trinity. Again the following words distinguish between the persons: "*And God made man, in the image of God made he him.*"

"Well, therefore," says Origen, in his reply to Celsus, "do we censure the Jews for not deeming him to be God, who is by the prophets so often testified of, as being THE GREAT POWER AND GOD, according to the God and the Father of all things. For we assert, that in the Mosaic Cosmogony, the Father addressed to him the command: Let there be light, and let there be a firmament, and whatsoever other things God commanded to be made. He, moreover, said to him: Let us make man after our image and our likeness; and the Word, having received these commands, did all the things which the Father enjoined him."\*

Such passages might be multiplied from these writers, and from Irenæus and Clemens. This interpretation may be regarded as universal and established among the primitive writers.

Whitby owns that "all the fathers, from the Apostles' times, were of opinion that God the Father, in the creation, spake to his Son and Spirit, or at least to the Son, in a way of consultation about making man."

Mr. Faber gives the views of all the apostolic fathers and of the Council at Antioch, in corroboration of the Trinitarian exposition of this passage.†

---

\* Orig. cont., Cels. lib. I., p. 54.

† See Faber on the Trinity, vol. I., p. 311; also p. 42-48; also a *Catena Patrum* in Suiceri Thesaurus Tom. II., p. 1299, &c.; also Burton Testim. to Trinity, p. 46, 75, 119.



*The Visible and the Invisible God and Holy Spirit of the Old and New Testament.*

Another line of general proof that in the Old Testament God is revealed as One, and yet as more than One,—and proof too which, like the preceding, is based not upon any particular passage, but upon the general language and teaching of the Scriptures,—is the unequivocal recognition of a visible and an invisible God; a God seen and a God unseen; a God capable of appearing in human form, of speaking with human voice, of talking face to face with human beings, of regulating human affairs, of leading human armies, of wrestling and eating with human beings, of dwelling locally in human temples made with hands, and of becoming the king and covenant God of a chosen nation,—and yet, at the same time, of being a God infinitely removed from all such manifestations, whom no man hath seen at any time, or can see and live. This visible God of Israel, the Jehovah of the Old Testament, is also identified with the Lord of the New. He walked with Adam and Eve in the garden; called, condemned and sentenced them; communicated visibly and audibly with Cain; appeared to Abraham as he sat in his tent door, and reasoned with him and made known to him his plans; “went up from” Abraham and Jacob; descended and revealed himself to Moses; spake to Moses, mouth to mouth and face to face; “knew him face to face;” spake unto Joshua; called the child Samuel; and was, in the conclusion of the Old Testament, foretold as “the Lord or Jehovah whom ye seek,” and who “should suddenly come to his temple” as Christ the Lord did come at the time and in the manner so specifically determined.

This same Jehovah is also represented as manifesting himself at sundry times in dreams, visions and appearances;—to Moses in the wilderness, and to Moses and the elders of Israel, when it is declared “they saw the God of Israel;”—in “the glory of Jehovah,” the bright cloud that rested on the mercy seat; in the “glory of the Lord” which filled the tabernacle and the temple at Jerusalem, and which spoke to Elijah; and which in the new economy was manifested to the three disciples on the

mount of transfiguration, and to Saul on his way to Damascus. All these things receive their explanation in the declaration: "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him."

The God of Israel also manifested himself in emblematical visions. This he did to Jacob, to Isaiah, to Daniel, to Ezekiel, and, under the new economy, to the Apostle John—between whose visions, and those of the prophets, there is an almost perfect and wondrous similarity; thus identifying "the Word made flesh and tabernacling among men," with the God of Israel, the Jehovah, the personal God, he who was, and is, and is to come,—the "God who was to be, and who was, manifest in the flesh."

The expressions "the Spirit of God," "Spirit of the Lord," "Holy Spirit," "My Spirit," are also of frequent occurrence in the Law and the Prophets, and especially in all that relates to the future glories of Zion, and of Israel. This Spirit is said to be "upon those" to whom He is imparted; to be poured out; to be taken from Moses, upon whom it was, and "put upon" the elders; "when the Spirit rested upon them, (it is said,) they prophesied and did not cease." By this Spirit men "were filled with the Spirit of Wisdom." "The Spirit of Jehovah will come upon thee, and thou shalt prophesy." "The Spirit of the Lord clothed Gideon," "departed from Saul," and is in every way spoken of as God, and yet not as an attribute, or will, or power of God, but as a distinct, personal agent.

*Objection from Deut. 6: 4.*

But it may be said that, in Deut. 6: 4, God once for all made this matter plain by teaching his people his real nature and his absolute, personal and indistinguishable unity. "Hear O Israel, Jehovah, our Elohim, Jehovah one" is the literal rendering of the passage. But, as has been fully shewn, this passage is itself so framed as to confirm all our conclusions from the general language and teaching of the Old Testament. The Jews in their prayer-book and creed have been obliged to pervert and absolutely to contradict this passage in order to make God a *yahiduth*, as they term it, that is, an absolute

and undistinguishable, personal unity. God, however, does not call himself a *yahiduth*, but an *ahiduth*, that is, a compound unity. He says, the God of Israel is ONE אֶחָד (*ehad*), not *only one* יְהִיד (yahid). He does not use the term *yahid* which he employs, when he speaks of bitterness and mourning for “an *only son*,” (Zech. 12: 10); and of Isaac as Abraham’s “*only son*.” Throughout the whole Bible the term *yahid*, *only one*, is never used with reference to God. The term which God does use is *ehad*, which means one in more than one; as in Ezek. 38: 19, where it is said of the stick of Joseph and the sticks of the other tribes of Israel, when “put with him, even with the stick of Judah,” that God will “make them *one stick*, and they shall be *one* in mine hand,” that is, a compound unity. The sticks when combined become *ehad*, and not *yahid*. And so “Jehovah, our Elohim,” is ONE (*ehad*), not *yahid*, and is, therefore, an *ahiduth*, and not as the Jews falsely teach, a *yahiduth*.

Besides God here employs a three-fold designation to indicate the nature of his unity. Jehovah, which is singular, Elohim, which is plural, and Jehovah again. “Jehovah, Elohim, Jehovah, these three (it is said) are one.” And in the Zochar—the most ancient and sacred book of the Jews—this mystery of this passage is distinctly stated, and the heresy of modern Jews, therefore, condemned. And, as if to make the meaning of this passage unquestionable, God in his law required that this triplicity of names in the one God of Israel should be employed as we have seen in their constant benediction, and declares himself to be “Jehovah, your Elohim, which brought you out of the land of Egypt, to be your Elohim; I am Jehovah, your Elohim.” Num. 6: 24–26, and 15: 41. Examine also the remarkable manner in which God expresses his jealousy, and yet uses these combined titles in this very connection. See Deut. 6: 13–15, and ch. 7: v. 6.

*Strength of these arguments in view of God's hatred of idolatry, and the tendency to it. The Golden Calf.*

Such, then, is God's own declaration and definition of his unity. The thoughts, the words, the arrangement, the form of

expression are his own, given by inspiration, and spoken by holy men of God as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. They are, therefore, significant. They mean what they express; all that they express, and nothing short of what they express. They were given, too, by a God who is jealous of his glory and of the rightful and exclusive worship of his creatures. And they were given to his chosen people redeemed by his power, whom he had set apart and consecrated to his especial honor as the representatives and witnesses of his truth. These forms of expression were also employed in a language full of grace and propriety, and affluent in Divine titles of singular formation. And they were employed, also, in view of a constant tendency on the part of the Jewish people to relapse into idolatry.

This proclivity to idolatry, manifested through such a length of time, is very inexplicable, on the supposition that the Hebrew Scriptures contained nothing but what explicitly taught the absolute personal unity of God. But it is easy to conceive how the constant use of plural titles and other forms of plural representation might give colorable pretext for polytheistic views. Of this we have a very remarkable illustration in the account given of the golden calf. "Up," said the murmuring people, who knew not what had become of Moses in the Mount, "up, make us Gods which shall go before us." Have we not here the intrepertation given by the earliest Jewish people, including Aaron himself, and all intelligent men among them, of the plural representation of the God of Israel given in the term Elohim, and in the other forms of expression we have referred to? There was, we presume, no intention to deny, or apostatize from their Elohim. But, contrary to his second commandment, they desired to have some visible representation, or emblem of Him, through the medium of which they might worship Him. All the people said of the golden calf, (Exod. 3: 2, 4, 5): "These be the Gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt." And when Aaron saw it he built an altar before it and made proclamation and said: "Tomorrow is a feast unto THE LORD." This image, therefore, was made to represent God, and to represent him as plural and not singular, and is apparently an unequivocal proof, that the

teaching of God concerning himself conveyed to the minds of the earliest Israelites the same expression of a mysterious plurality in the One Elohim that it does to our minds. And the fact that, in view of this understanding, these forms of instruction were introduced and permanently established, is also, we think, a demonstration that, in fact, God is a tri-unity; that it is only as such he can become known and related to men, and become their Redeemer and Sanctifier; and that therefore this mystery of godliness must be distinctly promulgated, however it might be perverted by the corrupt and idolatrous spirit of depraved men, seduced by the evil influence of the great apostate.

Now as these forms of speech were adopted by God, and oftentimes in connection with the most earnest protests, prohibitions and denunciations of polytheism; and when we can easily conceive that on the basis of Unitarianism their use would have been most dangerous; and when we know that they did prove, in fact, plausible pretexts for idolatry, we must conclude that they were used with a fixed and All-wise design to intimate a plurality in the nature of the one God. The constant tendency of the Israelites to confound the plurality of persons in the one God with several Gods, and therefore to relapse into idolatry, is conclusive proof that the Old Testament, so far from teaching the absolute personal unity of God, required all the explicit revelation afforded by the actual manifestation of the Son of God as the revealer of God, and by the dispensation of the Holy Ghost, to restrict, preserve and authenticate the Unity in the Tri-unity of God.\*

*The Three-fold Benediction.*

Before we pass on to notice another evidence of plural distinctions in the Divine nature, we will more particularly advert to the triple form of benediction enjoined in the Old Testament. See Num. 6: 24, 25, 26, 27. "The exact triplicity of this Divinely prescribed formula," says Dr. Smith, "and the correspondence, in the significance of the very terms with the

---

\* See Bishop Hinds' *Three Temples*.

apostolic benediction, (2 Cor. 12 : 14,) may be considered as an allusion to a Trinity of subsistences in the Divine Being. The first member of the Mosaic formula expresses the benevolent and efficient 'love of God,' the Father of mercies and Fountain of all good. The second well comports with the redeeming and reconciling 'grace of our Lord Jesus Christ.' And the last is appropriate to the purity, consolation and joy which are received from the 'communion of the Holy Spirit.' It is also worthy of being observed, that this is called PUTTING THE NAME of God upon his people; a phrase remarkably conformable to that of the initiatory institution of the Christian religion, 'baptizing into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit;' also, to what is found in Isaiah 6: 5, where we have a three-fold form of adoration, "Holy! holy! holy! Jehovah of Hosts!" followed by the same remarkable use of the plural pronoun, "whom shall I (the Father) send, and who will go for us (the Triune Elohim)."

That some great mystery was contained in this form of triple benediction has been, as Rabbi Menachem testifies, the belief of the Jews. He refers to the three variations of the accents. There is also a tradition that, in pronouncing this benediction, the high priest lifted up his hands so that his three fingers were made to represent a Trinity of some kind. And it is known that Petrus Alphonsi, an eminent Jewish convert of the 12th century, wrote a treatise in which he applies this passage to prove that there are three persons to whom the incommunicable name of Jehovah is applied. Does not this proof, therefore, seem to amount to a demonstration when we find a similar form of benediction in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, enjoined in the New Testament?

*Summary and design of these proofs.*

Let the true bearing of these numerous and various forms of speech, indicative of some plural distinctions in the Godhead, be borne in mind. We do not bring them forward as direct, plain and positive proofs of the Trinity of the Godhead. That is not our present object. We produce them rather as disproofs of the assertion that the Scriptures inculcate the doc-

trine of an absolute personal unity of God. We refer to them as in accordance with the presumption that the Scriptures will be found so worded as to imply, rather than didactically teach, the doctrine of a Trinity; that its language will be framed on the supposition, that the doctrine is taken for granted as a necessary truth, and assumed—like that of the immortality of the soul and God's existence—rather than proved. And we adduce them as positive proofs that the Scriptures do teach us that in the unity of God there is a plurality of some kind.

These proofs have been drawn thus far from the very earliest books, and from the most fundamental forms of expression found in the Bible; from its most didactic and legislative records; and from the very portions of Scripture in which denunciations against idolatry are the most fearful. And then, too, the forms of expression referred to were not necessary. They were used purposely while others of a different purport were rejected. God says *Elohim Gods* created, when he might have said, *Eloah God* created. And God says in the very table of the law: "Hear, O Israel, Jehovah thy Elohim is one (not *only* one nor absolutely one) Jehovah." And God says *Elohim* (plural), *bara, created*, (in the singular), when he might have used a plural form or a singular form in both. Such expressions occur not once nor twice, but often; and in subsequent references to the creation, the same plurality is attributed to the Creator, even while idolatry was denounced and punished: "Thy makers are thy husband—the Lord, that is, Jehovah of Hosts is his name;" and, "Remember thy creators." Is. 54: 5; and Eccles. 12: 1.

*Proofs from later books of Scripture.*

Proceeding, however, to the later books of Hebrew Scripture, we find these distinctions in the Deity more apparent. We can only specify a few cases. Thus, in Isaiah 63: 9–10, it is written: "In all their affliction he was afflicted, and the angel of his presence saved them. . . . But they rebelled and vexed his Holy Spirit," &c. There is in this passage distinct mention of God the Father, of the angel of his presence, who is elsewhere identified with Christ the Son of God, and of the Holy Spirit.

In like manner, in Isaiah 48: 16, it is said—"Draw near to me, hearken ye to this: from the beginning I have not spoken in concealment; from the time of its being I was there, and now the Lord (Adonai) Jehovah hath sent me and His Spirit." The mutual illustration of this passage, and many in the New Testament, cannot but occur to the recollection of the serious reader. In prophecy the Messiah declares, "THE LORD JEHOVAH hath sent ME and HIS SPIRIT;" and, when actually sojourning with men, he says: "I came forth from the Father, and I have come into the world;—THE COMFORTER whom I will send to you from the Father, THE SPIRIT of truth, who proceedeth from the Father, He shall testify concerning me." Here the plural Jehovah—He who is one and yet plural, is said to send Him who is "the first and the last," the Creator; and also to send "His Spirit," three distinct persons being plainly introduced.

Another very striking and very incontrovertible declaration of a plurality of distinctions in the Divine nature, is found in Proverbs 30: 4—"Who hath ascended up into heaven or descended? Who hath gathered the wind in his fists? Who hath bound the waters in a garment? Who hath established all the ends of the earth? What is his name, and what is his son's name, if thou canst tell?"

The meaning of this passage will be apparent by remembering that the angel who appeared to Manoah, and his wife said his name was "Secret"—not a secret—but "Wonderful" as the term might be translated, which is the very name given among others to Christ by Isaiah (9: 6), when he declared that his name (that is the Messiah's, as every Jewish and all other commentators must admit) shall be so called. "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulder; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The Mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace!"

Again, in Isaiah 61: 1, we read, "The *Spirit* of the *Lord God* is upon me; because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek; he hath sent me to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the



opening of the prison to them that are bound." Here the speaker is evidently the promised Messiah, who was to be sent for the redemption and salvation of his people; but then mark, in the eighth verse he speaks of himself as God, by saying, "For I the Lord love judgment, I hate robbery for burnt offering; and I will direct their work in truth, and I will make an everlasting covenant with them." Now, it is this Lord who said, in the first verse, "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me." Here, then, is the *Spirit*, and the *Lord God*, and the *Lord* on whom the Spirit is.

These passages might be multiplied, but it is needless, as they must occur to the mind of every student of the Word of God, who will also remember how often the Angel of the Lord is spoken of as the Lord himself, and the Spirit of the Lord not as a mere power or emanation of the Deity, but as a Divine Person. Thus, for instance, when it is said, in Job 33: 4, "The Spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty hath given me life." Or when we read, in Isaiah 40: 13, "Who hath directed the Spirit of the Lord, or being his counsellor hath taught Him?"

*Concluding summary of proof for distinctions in God from the Old Testament; and the alternative.*

Presuming,—and we have seen that we are led by many considerations to presume,—that the Deity is a tri-unity of persons, and not a personal unity, we find that the Old Testament is written in accordance with such a presumption. It does not formally state the doctrine of the Trinity. It does not present it in a categorical proposition. It seems to assume and take it for granted, and to use language which pre-supposes it and is adapted to it. And if it is objected that a doctrine so fundamental would, if true, be very clearly and unequivocally defined, in a revelation given by God, we reply that this objection would apply as forcibly to the doctrine of the Divine existence, and, supposing it to be the true doctrine, to the absolute, personal unity of God. The objection, therefore, refutes itself, since it requires that if God is in his nature a per-

sonal unity incapable of any distinction of persons, he would in his revelation of himself so fully state and define this unity as to leave no possible ground for ambiguity or doubt. But this, we have seen, he has not done. The very contrary, we have seen, has been done. Even in proclaiming the unity of his Godhead in opposition to all polytheistic notions; and even while commanding that no other Gods shall be worshipped; and even while denouncing his indignation against such, as a jealous God; he nevertheless uses language which implies, if it does not affirm, a plurality,—a Trinity,—in that ineffable unity. This form of language is, we have seen, inwrought into the very texture, the weft and woof of revelation. It originates idioms peculiar to the sacred language—not only not found in any other, but of which others are incapable; and adopts forms of personal address for which no parallel is found in any contemporaneous or early writings. God is spoken of as one, and yet under three distinct names or persons; as singular and yet plural; as invisible and yet visible; as spiritual and yet human; as infinitely distant, unapproachable and incomprehensible, and yet as present with, speaking, acting and ruling among the children of men; as unspeakably removed from any thoughts or feelings of humanity, and yet as susceptible of all the feelings and affections of the human heart. We have thus, throughout the Old Testament, a Jehovah invisible and a Jehovah visible, who, under the character of the Angel, the Angel of the Covenant, the Angel of Jehovah's presence, the Messenger, the Messiah, &c., is the living, reigning and ruling Jehovah of God's people—the God of Israel.

Now, suppose God to be a Tri-unity, in whose invisible, incomprehensible and unapproachable Godhead, of which the Father is the representative, there are three distinct subsistences called Father, Son and Spirit, all equally God, and yet distinctive in personal offices;—and is not the Old Testament written so as to imply this truth of the Trinity, to assume it, and to speak in accordance with it? Our presumption is, therefore, met. It is in these early records, and in even a clearer and fuller oral communication of this doctrine which may have early been

given and always co-existed, we find the origin and the only satisfactory origin of the various traditionary forms of the doctrine of a Trinity throughout the pagan world:

Where didst thou glean that strange mysterious tale,  
Thou solemn bard, or seer, or sage divine,  
Or priest of Heathen wisdom? In what vale  
Of shadowy death, or subterranean mine,  
Chaldee or Ind,—or in Egyptian shrine  
'Neath some dark pyramid,—or on the shore  
Of dim Oblivion left in its decline,  
Some fragment old of Babylonian lore;—  
Where didst thou gain that myth of days that went before?

Much changed, much fraught with error, which thus fell  
Like some stray scatter'd fragments on the strand;—  
Methinks if we could all the meaning tell,  
It bears the mark of some unearthly hand,  
On which with awe we gaze, yet cannot understand.

But, on the other hand, suppose Unitarianism in its form of Arianism, Tritheism, Sabellianism, Manotheism, Socinianism, or Rationalism, to be the true doctrine of God's nature, and then we find the Bible worded so as constantly to mislead; so as to originate universal traditionary heresies; so as to foster and promote polytheistic errors; and so as to lead the great body of the ancient Jews and of the Christian church in all ages, in all countries, and in all its opposite and opposing sects, to adopt as a fundamental doctrine of Scripture the doctrine of the Trinity! Against all this violence of presumption we are required to believe as Scriptural a dogma with which Scripture, fairly interpreted, is perfectly incompatible; to believe as reasonable a dogma which the reason of Plato and the reason of humanity in almost all ages has repudiated; and to receive as comprehensible and plain a theory which involves the infinite, the incomprehensible and unknown; a theory which makes man the measure of his Maker, and what we see and know the standard of what is invisible and past our finding out; and a theory which, in glaring contradiction to its own premises, makes the eternal fountain of sociality in all the creatures of his formation, Himself the only Being in the universe who, throughout an endless duration, is incapable of either exemplifying or of en-

joying in ineffable and Divine communion, the most essential happiness of his creatures! Unitarianism, in short, makes that a matter of knowledge which can only possibly be a matter of belief; founds upon experience what can be known only by testimony; and rests upon the experience of *Man* what can only possibly be known to the experience of *God*, and what can only possibly be communicated by God's revelation of himself. The nature of God as a Trinity, if so revealed as a fact by God, is just as reasonable to be believed, and is just as easy to be comprehended, as would be the fact, provided God revealed it that the nature of God is an impersonal unity; both being facts of whose certainty we can be made infallibly assured only by God's own word.

*Proofs of distinctions in the one God from the New Testament.*

Such are some of the evidences of a distinction in the unity of God as intimated in the Old Testament, in accordance with the gradual development of Divine truth. In the New Testament the passages from which this distinction is drawn are very numerous. We can only call attention to a few.

When Jesus Christ was praying among the people, after he had been baptized in the river Jordan, "the heavens were opened, and THE SPIRIT OF GOD descended in a bodily shape like a dove, lighting upon HIM (Christ); and a voice came from heaven, which said, THOU art MY beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." Here we have three persons most clearly distinguished, viz: God the FATHER, who by a voice from heaven declared Christ to be his beloved Son, and publicly sealed his appointment to the mediatorial office; CHRIST, on whom the SPIRIT OF GOD descended, and who then entered upon that office; and the HOLY SPIRIT who descended visibly under the emblematic representation of a dove and lighted upon Christ, through Him to be communicated to all his true disciples. Here, therefore, the three persons in the Sacred Trinity evidently acted, according to the offices sustained by them in the great work of man's salvation.

But the appointed form of Christian baptism is yet more conclusive. When our Lord instituted that sacrament, he said

to his apostles, "Go ye, 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**."

As we will reserve this all-important baptismal commission—the constitutional charter and Divine warrant of the Church, its ordinances and its doctrines—for a separate and full discussion, we will only at present offer two observations respecting it. Schleusner, in his Lexicon says, that the most remarkable passage in the New Testament in which "Holy Spirit" is expressive of a person, and which alone is sufficient to prove that the Holy Spirit is different from the Father and the Son, in the same manner as they differ from each other is, in Matt. 28: 19, where the Apostles are commanded to baptize in the name of the Holy Spirit, as well as of the Father and the Son." We are baptized into **ONE** name, and yet by their own united agency into the worship and service of **THREE** persons, who are, nevertheless, the one God of Christians. Bishop Burgess remarks: "The many passages which record the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost in the same sentence, are all analogous to the baptismal commission, in the proof which they afford of the distinct personality, and the Divinity, of the three Divine persons, Father, Son and Holy Ghost."

But to proceed. The Apostle teaches us in 1 Cor. 12: 4-6, "that there are diversities of gifts," that is of spiritual gifts, "but the same **SPIRIT**," by whose Divine and extraordinary influence these are imparted. "And there are diversities of administrations," or offices in the Church of Christ, "but the same **LORD**;" meaning the Lord Jesus Christ, who appointed them all. "And there are diversities of operations," or extraordinary working of miracles, "but it is the same God which worketh all in all;" meaning God the Father, the fountain of all goodness and power, and the immediate dispenser of every good and perfect gift. Here, then, we are taught that, in the one Divine essence or nature, there is Father, Lord and Spirit, so that we have here a Trinity in unity, and a unity in Trinity.

Again, in the form of apostolic benediction, (2 Cor. 13-14,)—"The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all—

Amen,"—the separate, and yet united power of the three persons is most emphatically taught. There is here a plain reference to the one name or Nature, and to the three Persons by whom Christians are blessed with all spiritual blessings. To each is ascribed the same personal attributes and power, and yet to each is ascribed also a diversity of operation and communicated grace.

Again, we find in the first epistle of John 5: 7, it is said, "For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one." Although quoted once probably by Tertullian, and twice certainly by Cyprian, and although its subsequent omission and adulteration may be satisfactorily accounted for, as they are by Jerome, yet we will not dwell upon this passage. The similarity of this passage to other portions of Scripture is, however, very striking. Thus our Saviour says, John 8: 17-18, "The testimony of two men is true: I am ONE that bear witness of MYSELF; and the FATHER that sent me beareth witness of ME." 1 John 5: 6. "It is the SPIRIT that beareth witness." Our Saviour has also mentioned, upon another occasion, a plurality of witnesses in heaven—"WE speak (says he) that WE do know, and testify that WE have SEEN, and ye receive not OUR witness!"

The Apostle Paul, in Eph. 4: 4-6, says that there is ONE SPIRIT—ONE LORD—and ONE GOD and FATHER of ALL, who is above or over all, and through all and in you all."

Our Lord Jesus Christ while on earth, in comforting his disciples, said, "I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever: even the Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him; but ye know him, for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you. I will not leave you comfortless, I will come to you. If a man love me he will keep my words, and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him." Now, in this passage, we have a distinct reference—as to Divine persons carrying out the scheme of the Gospel—to the Father, Christ, and the Spirit; and to each as acting separately, and yet unitedly, in the work of man's salvation.

The Apostle Peter speaks of the “elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience, and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus,” and thus associates these three equally and essentially in the plan of salvation, ascribing election to the Father, sanctification to the Spirit, and redemption to the Son. A Trinity is thus represented as concurring and giving security and glory to the Christian. And yet, while these work equally in all believers, they are represented as working distinctively according to their respective persons and relative official offices. A similar distinction of the three persons in the Trinity, and of their separate and distinct offices in the work of human salvation, is made by the Apostle Paul in Eph. 1: v. 3-14.

And this distinction both of person and office, in the unity of the common work of human redemption, is very forcibly inculcated by our Divine Redeemer while upon earth, when he declared that Peter was led to confess that he was the Son of God, by the teaching of the Father through the influence of the Holy Ghost, without whom no man can call Jesus Lord. See Matt. 16: 16, and 1 Cor. 12: 3.

But it would be an endless task to present all the indications of the plural distinctions in the Deity which are found in the word of God. They pervade its whole language. They give character to its whole spirit and teaching, and enter into all its doctrinal and didactic, its practical and consolatory statements. Even Sabellius, therefore, the ancient Arians, and all the early Unitarians, admit that “the Father, Son and Spirit, indicate some distinction in God.” Dr. Samuel Clarke, the author of “The Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity,” and who is generally claimed by Unitarians as an advocate of their opinions, gives the following summary of the language of Scripture respecting the three persons of the Trinity. The three persons, says he, are styled, *once*—He which is, and which was, and which is to come—the seven spirits which are before the throne—and Jesus Christ, the faithful witness: *once*—the Father, the Son, and Holy Ghost: *once*—the Father, the Son, and the Spirit: *once*—the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: *twice*—the Father, Jesus, the Spirit: *twice*—the Father, Jesus, the Holy

Ghost: *once*—the Father, Christ, the Spirit: *once*—the Father, Jesus Christ, the Spirit: *once*—the Father, the Lord, the Spirit: *once*—God the Father, Jesus Christ, the Spirit: *once*—He that raised up Jesus from the dead, Jesus, the Spirit: *once*—the living God, Christ, the Spirit: *once*—the living God, Christ, the Eternal Spirit: *four* times—God, Jesus, the Spirit: *once*—God, the Son of God, the Holy Ghost: *five* times—God, Jesus, the Holy Ghost: *once*—God, Jesus Christ the Son of God, the Spirit of Holiness: *once*—God, Christ, the Holy Ghost: *five* times—God, Christ, the Spirit: *four* times—God, Jesus Christ, the Holy Ghost: *five* times—God, Jesus Christ, the Spirit: *four* times—God, the Lord, the Spirit: *twice*—God, his Son, the Spirit: *once*—God, the Lord, the Holy Ghost: *once*—God, Christ, the Eternal Spirit.\*

Our second position therefore is, we think, undeniably established, namely: That while the Scriptures every where imply and take for granted that God is, in his essential nature, only One, they teach that he is nevertheless so One as to be capable of being distinguished and of acting in Three separate and independent "forms of God."

---

ARTICLE III.

DR. WAYLAND ON THE LIMITATIONS OF HUMAN RESPONSIBILITY.

The fact that he is a responsible being is the chief characteristic and distinction of man. A sense of responsibility, that is, of holding every power, and faculty, and influence, and office, and relation to his God and to his fellow men, under a solemn trust, to be here and hereafter accounted for—this is the loftiest attribute of man.

But it is equally plain that this is man's most fearful prerogative; constituting him at once a sovereign, and a subject; a

---

\* See the Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity, pp. 383, 4.



judge and a law unto himself; Heaven's counsel and a prisoner at Heaven's bar; under paramount obligations to determine and to execute what is right, and yet under the pressure of innumerable impulses to choose the wrong and to employ the whole force of his compound nature in accomplishing the wicked or malign or fanatical purposes of the heart.

Thus gifted, and sailing amid such hidden rocks and quicksands, and between the ever-near and frowning precipices and tempestuous breakers of Scylla and Charybdis, man finds his strength in his danger, and is nerved—by the sublime consciousness of responsibility—to venture, to do; and to endure, what otherwise he would leave unattempted, and to hold on in unflinching tenacity of resolution until his voyage is complete and his warfare is ended.

It is also from this inner shrine that man ever hears the dulcet sounds of sweet applauding conscience, soothing his fears, calming his every perturbation, and lifting his eye to that heaven of hope and happiness, where angel voices are cheering him amid the conflict and the sore trials of his lot.

But not seldom does this friend become man's foe, this angel a demon, this peace strife, this defender a deceiver, and this consolation a torment.

It is, therefore, of unspeakable importance to every one of us, to ascertain the nature and extent of this responsibility; and to know when, and for what, we are responsible, and when, and for what, we are not. For, as to imagine that we are responsible for every evil and for every good would imply an infinite absurdity, so would it also impose a yoke which it would be an intolerable burden for man to attempt to bear.

There are therefore, and there must be, limitations by which the sphere of every man is providentially bounded, and within which he is permitted to walk and to work, not troubled with the great sea of illimitable action which outlies his personal accountability.

Not to assume responsibility, and not to trespass under its controlling impulse, in this outlying territory, are duties just as positive and plain as to meet all just demands within it. To go beyond is just as palpably *sin* as to sit down in idleness

within the proper sphere of duty. There is, in all cases, a thing to be done, and a thing to be left undone.

Happy, then, is that man who is taught of God to ascertain what *to him* is really a matter of responsibility, and what is not; who condemneth not himself in that thing which he allows; and who not being convinced that this or that action or refusal to act, is sin, safely and securely performs it, or leaves it undone. And miserable, most miserable, are they "whose conscience being weak is defiled" by scrupulous anxiety, concerning that which, so far as their responsibility and duty are concerned, is to them as "nothing in the world."

Now, in this free country, where so many make free to think and act for every body in every matter, if we desire to live peaceably with ourselves, with others, and with God, and while doing good not to be found doing equal or greater harm, it is highly important for each one to find out what is, and what is not, the work which Christ has sent him into this world to do, so that in the best sense each may "mind his own things" and avoid busying himself with other men's matters, and kindling the fire of strife in the houses of his social, civil and national blood relations. In a world of sin is he accountable for its removal? In a country but partially governed by Christian principles is he responsible for all the evils of its imperfect government, laws, social institutions, usages and habits? Bound "for conscience' sake," and as to God, to obey the laws and submit to every ordinance of man, and to live a quiet and peaceable life, is he at the same time compelled to refuse such submission, to resist such laws, and to foster variance and strife under the responsibility of a higher and holier law? Because he cannot do all the good he knows to be most desirable, is he, therefore, not to do what he can? And as he cannot do much alone, and cannot unite with others for associated efforts and combined influence without agreeing to act upon certain principles, and for some specific object in which they agree, *leaving all other principles and all other objects for separate action* individually, or in some other association formed on different principles, and for different purposes—is he, therefore, to oppose all societies unless they will agree to do all the good (even if

they should do also as much, or even greater harm), which he feels ought to be done ?

These are questions which come home to us all in this age and country. But they come home especially to those who have been led, by the Providence of God, to locate and live where many things exist most foreign to their early prejudices and to what once seemed intuitive and conscientious convictions.

No man can, in such circumstances, attain to a just knowledge of his duty, or stand in his lot serving his generation according to the will of God, with quietness, assurance and success, except by finding out *the limits* as well as *the extent* of his responsibility. Without this knowledge many a man has excluded himself, or has been excluded from fields of happiness and usefulness, or has labored in vain and spent his strength in unhappy and unavailing toil.

In arriving at clear and settled views on these points, much assistance may be derived from a work, by Dr. Wayland, *On the Limitations of Human Responsibility*. It has long been out of print. And, indeed, it has been so completely removed from public reach that the most anxious search in New York, Philadelphia and elsewhere, has failed to secure a single copy. It will therefore, we think, be very timely and serviceable to present the substance of this work on some of the topics it discusses, in order to prove that the principles which are essential to national union, and to evangelical and ecclesiastical association, are such as commend themselves instinctively to every candid mind, as they did also to Dr. Wayland himself, before his vision was blinded by partizan controversy and sectional antipathy.

Conscience is, and ought to be, Dr. Wayland very properly assumes, supreme in the human breast. It is the highest authority *within* man and ultimately *to* man. It is to man the voice of God. It says thou *shalt*, thou *must*. It is imperative and sovereign. It admits of no equal, and no interference. It compels the whole energy of the whole man to carry out its commands, regardless of consequences, and indifferent to sacrifices.

“But it must be remembered (says this writer) that the

question yet remains, has conscience really commanded?—what is, and what is not, my duty?” And as it is granted that we are bound to exert our whole power, without regard to consequences, in the performance of our duty; if we would avoid employing our whole power wrongfully, it behooves us, *first of all*, to investigate the question—what *is* our duty?—with all the care of which we are capable, since otherwise we must act with our whole power, without knowing whether we are using or abusing the highest faculty with which our Creator has endowed us.

Conscience having been given to man, therefore, to enable him to understand the obligations resulting from his relations to the Deity, “it follows that nothing is my duty which God has not commanded.” “We may,” says Dr. Wayland,\* “plead his authority for the doing of anything which he has enjoined, but we can plead it for nothing else. And the more sincere a man is in his desire to obey all the commands of God, and to act in every respect precisely as God has ordained, the more careful will he be to know exactly and definitely what is the will of God, and to plead the authority of God for nothing whatsoever, for which he cannot clearly show that God has made himself responsible.”

“It is, indeed, very strange (as Dr. Wayland remarks) that this important subject has not been more discussed,” since the events of the present time are seen specially to call for such a discussion. “Almost every attempt made for the purpose of binding men together in masses, and thus of subjecting them to the dominion of leaders, is made under the solemn sanctions of moral obligation. Men plead the authority of God *whilst they violate law*, and whilst they sustain law against this very violation; whilst they infringe upon the rights of their neighbor, and whilst they defend the rights of their neighbor against infringement; whilst the individual takes the power of society into his own hands, and whilst society punishes him for the transgression.” “We therefore repeat, that whenever we plead, in any particular case, that a special command of God

---

\* Limitations of Human Responsibility. Section I., page 15.

overrules every other consideration, we are under a correspondent moral obligation in the first place, to show that God has made *us* responsible for the doing of *that particular thing*; because this recklessness of consequences can be justified on no other ground than that of an express injunction."

To every thoughtful man, therefore, the question in every case of proposed or continued action is, "Am I held responsible for the result which I wish to accomplish?"\*

"Although a particular good be desirable, a man may justly doubt *whether he be called upon* to effect it; and again, although **HE** be called upon to effect it, he may properly inquire to which of the relations he sustains, this responsibility attaches. Thus, suppose a social evil to exist—for example, the sale of lottery tickets—if I have never had any thing to do with the system; if I have never sanctioned it; if I have communicated to my fellow men all the light which I possess on the subject, and if God has given me no power to administer a remedy for the evil, *I am in no manner responsible for the evil which it produces.*" "The notion of responsibility always involves the relation between a superior and an inferior. If I am responsible for any act to another, he has the *right to command*, and it is my *duty to obey*. And yet more, it not only supposes that this relation exists, in general, but that in this particular instance, the will of the one party has been made known to the other."

"In all moral questions, the being to whom we are ultimately responsible is the Creator. We owe to him our whole service, whether of body, or soul, or spirit. In saying this, however, I do not mean to deny that we are under moral obligations to our fellow-men, both as individuals and as societies. But, inasmuch as these obligations are required by God as well as by man, they are also included in our duties to the Creator." "Now, if God stands to us in the relation of a 'governor over servants,' as it is expressed by Bishop Butler, it follows that the right of directing our service rests exclusively in him. He has the right of appointing the duties which he requires us to

---

\* Section 2d, p. 18.

discharge as men in general, and also to prescribe what portion of these duties shall devolve upon each one of us as individuals in particular.”

“From this it of necessity follows, that our responsibility to the Creator is a responsibility to obey his commands, to do the very thing that he has told us, *and to do nothing either more or less, or different* from, what he has told us. To assume any other principle, would be to usurp the prerogative of the Creator, and to assume that instead of being subjects, we were ourselves the governors of this universe.”

“In so far as our relations to God are *essentially* concerned, his commands have respect simply to *tempers of mind*. In these our intercourse is held directly with the Father of our spirits, and inasmuch as they interfere with no other being, with them no other being has any right to interfere.”

“The embodying of these tempers in action is a different thing. The temper is the *essence*, the act is the *accident*. True, the temper cannot exist without correspondent action, *if the act be in our power*, taking the word *power* in its full import. But the act is not always in our power, and then it (that is *the act*, as Dr. W. proceeds to illustrate), is not necessary to the fulfillment of the obligation.”

“Thus, while we are bound to exercise the proper temper of mind, we are bound also to manifest it, precisely *in the way* which God has appointed, or even not to manifest it in outward acts at all, if he shall so direct. Thus we see, that whilst our responsibility for the *temper of mind* is *unlimited and universal*, our responsibility for the *outward act* is *limited and special*; and it is to be determined by *some other* manifestation of the Divine will, *aside from* that which requires the temper of mind itself.”\*

“We say, then, that while the command of God is limited and unrestricted, so far as it respects obligation to a particular temper of mind, when we come to decide upon any particular action which that temper of mind involves, and which, under ordinary circumstances, is its appropriate fruit, the circum-

---

\* The italics are almost invariably, as here, Dr. Wayland's own.

stances under which the Providence of God has placed the individual actor, are as much to be taken into consideration as the original command itself."

This, it is urged, is a plea made by every man in defence of his conduct. But what every man does not do, is to remember, that "the will of God is revealed in his providence and by his word, and not left to the *capricious impulses* of every individual." God is to be the interpreter of his own will and not "every one of us to be subjects to the interpretation of every other one who claims authority over conscience. The former is the doctrine of Protestantism, the latter of Romanism. The difference between the Romanism of St. Peter's and the Romanism of *fanaticism* is, that the former is the despotism of one, the latter the despotism of many. In principle they are the same, one and indivisible."

Dr. Wayland proceeds to shew that duty is further limited by the want of physical power to perform it. "Man is in general responsible not for the *result*, but for the *use of those means* which are the best known antecedents to that result."

"If I mistake not, there has sometimes arisen theological error, from a mistake on this point. Men seem to have supposed that they were responsible for men's *conversion*, and not *solely* for *employing those means which God has appointed for their conversion*. Hence, supposing that they would be held guilty *if men were not converted*, they have considered themselves at liberty to use any means which seemed to them most likely to produce the result; and to enjoin as general, and as obligatory upon all, means which they suppose to have been beneficial in particular instances."

Man therefore, Dr. Wayland concludes, is not responsible for doing "what is *beyond the limit*" of his ability, or beyond "the *kind* of ability committed to him."

But more than this, even when the good to be done is within our ability to perform, "it does not by necessity follow that we are responsible for the performance of it," for "our responsibility is limited by the respect which we owe to the rights of our fellow men. God has created us under obligations both to himself and to our fellow men. The one obligation is as truly

binding upon us as the other. Both are sustained by the same authority.”\*

God, therefore, has made it sometimes impossible for us to accomplish “a specified good without violating the rights of the party whom we intend to benefit.”

Of this Dr. W. gives illustrations from the history of the Temperance question, to which we might add many very similar ones from that of some other questions. We must not infringe on the personal liberty of a man, or otherwise violate his rights, with a view even of doing him good. “These,” says Dr. W., “it may be said are glaring cases. I acknowledge them to be so. They seem ‘glaring,’ however, because the rights which we suppose to be infringed are *tangible* and *visible*; and are infringed by the exertion of physical force. But, it is to be SPECIALLY remarked, that the limitation of our responsibility, in these cases, does not depend upon the fact, that we infringe, by physical power, *visible* and *tangible* rights, but simply and absolutely upon the fact, that we *infringe rights*. A right to what is *immaterial*, is as truly a right, as to what is *material*.” “If then, anything whatever, which under other circumstances would be a duty, cannot be done without violating the rights, how small or insignificant soever, of a fellow-creature, that thing ceases to be a duty. It may be the duty of others, but not of us; or if of us, yet not at this time or in this manner; and though the thing remain undone, we are guiltless. We are not held responsible for the result.”

Dr. W. proceeds to mention another limitation to which we call special attention.† “Our responsibility is frequently limited by innocent obligations, which we have previously contracted. The very constitution under which God has formed us, renders it necessary that we bind ourselves by moral obligations in regard to our future conduct. Of this fact, the very existence of society itself is an illustration.” “The same principle is illustrated every hour of the day, in the life of every man.”

“Now, these obligations to the government and laws of the

---

\* Section 3d, page 32, &c.

† See page 36, 41.



land, by which every citizen is bound, being all innocent and moral obligations, they are of course strictly binding. The law of God which enjoins it upon us 'not to lie one unto another,' enjoins that those obligations be fulfilled to the spirit and to the letter. Wherever, therefore, the fulfilment of a promise which we have innocently made, comes into collision with a general command, the specific obligation takes precedence, and the obligation to obey the other command ceases."

Another limitation to our responsibility, and a very solemn consideration it is, is when the good to be done "cannot be performed without using our power for other purposes than those for which it was committed to us." How could civil government, as Dr. W. points out, exist, "unless there were legislators, judges, jurymen, executive officers, sheriffs, constables and justices? But the very conception of such offices involves the idea, that the persons holding them have the power to do what other men have not the power to do." "This is obvious, in so far as civil society is concerned. But the same principle applies *with precisely the same effect wherever men are united in any form of social organization.* Every society must have its officers. But every office imposes a particular duty, and confers a correspondent power."

Let the reader mark well the qualification which Dr. Wayland himself affirms is "essential to be remembered" in judging of the course to be pursued by such officers as those of the Tract Society, the Sunday School Union, the Bible Society, &c., and that is, "that this power is always conferred for a *particular and specified\** purpose. Beyond the limits of that particular and specified purpose, the officer has no more power than any other man. If he use that power for any other purpose besides that for which it was conferred, he tramples upon the rights of his fellow men, and is precisely in the case of him who usurps a power, unsupported and unsustained by any office whatever." "But suppose that some act of charity, or some deed of philanthropy, can be accomplished only by using official power, for purposes different from those for which it was

---

\* Dr. Wayland's italics.

conferred, may I not use it rightfully to promote purposes so holy? The answer is obvious. If I have no right to use it *except for one* purpose, I have no right to use it for *any other* purpose, whether holy or unholy. I have no more right to steal for purposes of charity, than to steal for purposes of avarice. I have no more right to be false to my official trust for the purpose of saving men's souls, than for the purpose of ruining them. The man who would ask me thus to violate my official trust for the sake of accomplishing any purpose for which that trust was not committed, must be either a simpleton or a knave. And if I listened for a moment to his suggestions, I must be either a simpleton or a knave myself."

But, again, "our responsibility ceases when a particular good cannot be accomplished without the presentation of wrong motives to another. The question to be considered here is this; have I a right, for any purpose whatever, to present to another man a wrong motive; or, in other words, have I a right to tempt him to do that which violates the law of God and injures his own soul?"

This question Dr. W. unhesitatingly answers by declaring, that "although, then, an object to be accomplished be ever so desirable, yet if it cannot be accomplished without presenting evil motives before our fellow men, that object must be left undone. Should it never be accomplished, we are not responsible."

"I add in the last place, that our responsibility for the performance of *one* duty, may be limited by the more urgent claims of *another* duty of the same character. This may be easily illustrated by the case of benevolence. We are commanded to promote the physical, intellectual and moral happiness of our fellow men. We are also commanded to do this for all men, and to do it all times. But we are neither omnipotent nor omnipresent."

"But, to all this," says Dr. Wayland, "it may be objected that if this be so, if we are obliged to examine all these limitations, we shall be responsible for very little, and thus, that the obligations to benevolence will be seriously diminished. To this I beg leave to answer briefly as follows :

“First. The real question to be considered here is, what is the truth? If what I have said be true, it will be true, notwithstanding any objections that may be urged against it.”

“Secondly. The subject here discussed has nothing whatever to do with the question of the *amount* of our responsibility. This is to be decided by the extent of our faculties. We are bound to use them all, at all times, with all their power, precisely as God shall appoint. We have to do here with entirely another subject, the *objects* towards which the exertion of our faculties shall be directed.”

“Thirdly. If it should still be said, that these principles would confine every man down to a very few forms of benevolence, since there are but very few in which he can act without interfering with some or other of the duties to which I have alluded, I ask, what then? IF GOD HAVE SO ORDAINED, why should we not be satisfied? On *earth*, we all court more responsibility; I fear at *the day of account* we shall all ascertain that we have been entrusted with responsibility enough.”

Dr. W. very strikingly remarks: “I am of the opinion that the carrying out of these principles into action would practically rather widen than narrow the range of duties for which a man would discover himself to be responsible. So far as I have seen, whenever a man begins by neglecting the *limits* of responsibility which God has affixed, and by assuming that every one is responsible for *every thing*, he ends by holding himself and every one else responsible for *only one thing*. All questions of duty seem to him resolvable into one. All the commandments of God are concentrated into one precept.”

In conclusion, Dr. W. says,\* “If it be said that men may abuse these principles to shelter themselves from the responsibility which properly belongs to them, the answer is easy. We have only to ask, are these principles according to the will of God? If so, we are not responsible for the result. He knew when he promulgated his will, that it would be liable to abuse from the perversity of man. The responsibility for this

---

\* Page 53.

rests neither with him nor with us, but with the man who abuses it. And, besides, if the perfect will of God be liable to this abuse, can it be supposed that we shall be able to originate a better rule of duty, or one which shall be less liable to abuse?"

---

ARTICLE IV.

POPULAR OBJECTIONS TO SCIENCE.

The field spread out before us is wide. It will not be expected that we attempt, within the limits of a single address,\* to trace each of the almost innumerable phases of popular prejudice, modified indefinitely as they must be by the peculiar complexion of each mind in which they exist; but our aim shall be to hold up prominently before you a few of the chief of those objections to science, behind which, like a mountain barrier, the popular mind entrenches itself to the great detriment of all progress, moral, social or physical.

Science, then, stands arraigned at the bar of public opinion; the charges preferred naturally divide themselves into two classes—the one against the minuter details of science—the other against the conclusions and tendencies of science. The first is that urged by the unscientific generally, and may be called the Objection of the World; the second is felt more by the unreflecting religious part of community, and may be denominated the Objection of the Church. We shall consider these charges separately; and first, the Objection of the World. It alleges against the purely scientific that it is unprofitable and useless. What advantage? what good? is the demand it makes respecting all the minuter details of science. Nor is the

---

\* This address was delivered before the Young Men's Christian Association, June 30, 1857, at Abbeville C. H., S. C.

existence of this objection merely imaginary—a fancied attitude of the public mind, which yields in its practical workings no corresponding fruit. Its legitimate results are seen in the worn and wasted fields of the farmer—in the frequent popularity of the uninformed in the healing art—in the ridicule that often attaches to scientific operations in all the departments of labor. The paucity of scientific men in every community demonstrates the indifference of the masses to a knowledge of the principles of science, though absolutely dependent on those principles for every possible result they obtain. It is unprofitable, think they, to waste time upon such trifles, when the light that comes up from the experience of the past is sufficient to enable the doctor to poultice and bleed and amputate, or the farmer to sow and plough and reap. Why waste the energies and faculties of the most gifted intellects of the age in useless attempts to unravel the mysteries of the organism of some microscopic bug or loathsome worm? asks one objector. What advantage to man, created in the image of his God, with powers suited to his immortal nature, to descend from his lofty eminence to commune with a monad, to become a fellow to the grasshopper? asks another.

Such is the tone of that very general public sentiment, which indulges a sort of sympathetic compassion for the deluded devotee of science, who can sit for months together amid the smoke of furnaces, or the solitude of his studio, pouring out his life over some infinitesimal atom of dead matter, or the functions of some minute organic cell.

To this whole charge we might in the beginning properly demur, that it is preferred under a false apprehension of what *is profitable and useful*. It proceeds upon the assumption, that nothing is valuable which does not yield a pecuniary profit: it overlooks the fact that man is a compound being, made up of mind as well as matter, and that, in all questions touching the utility of things, the spiritual necessities of the one must be considered, as well as the material wants of the other. Man is not, as the objection implies, a simple agglomeration of flesh and blood and bone, needing only food and raiment; but he has also a spiritual nature with inward appetites and aspirations,

which are confessedly superior to all that is merely animal and material about him. This we might assume as an axiom; for there are admitted truths in every department of human inquiry, moral, intellectual or physical, which, as first principles, constitute the starting point of all after progress; and the moralist, tracing backward and upward the elements of man's nature, and searching the secret springs of his moral constitution, till all is resolved into that great fountain of light and truth, the Being and Nature of God himself, is dependent upon these no less than the physicist assuming the essential properties of matter, or the axioms of his mathematics. As such a starting point, in our present inquiry, we may surely assume the great superiority, in man, of the intellectual and spiritual over the sensual and material part of his nature; for any man with the least degree of cultivation, or the slightest relish for the beautiful, even if not familiarized with all the charms of nature, or the riches of philosophy, would as soon doubt any of the dictates of his own consciousness, as that the feeling, thinking principle of his nature is superior to the gross inert matter that encases it. Every one must be conscious of an urgent longing appetite that no appliances to his material nature can possibly satisfy—of an inner glowing fire that must be fed with richer oil than earth affords—of an earnest spiritual aspiration that lifts him above the brutes that perish. The dull eye of the ox, as he browses upon the green herbage of the meadow, sees no beauty in the painted landscape—the eagle, that from his eyrie breasts the storm, and soars above the regions where the lightning and thunder make their home, cannot luxuriate in the sublimity of the wild scene spread out beneath him. There is an inner principle—a higher law than that of optics necessary to quicken that dull eye of the ox with intellectual fire, and stir the eagle with rapturous emotion. That higher law man possesses, and it lifts him above the things that are purely of the “earth earthy”—that inner life assimilates him to his God, and is infinitely above all that is simply material.

Such being the admitted superiority of the intellectual over the material part of man's nature, must not those pursuits

which minister mainly to the requirements of the one, be more useful and important than those that pander to the appetites of the other? And must not that be a higher order of utility that nourishes and develops the spiritual life, than that which administers to the perishing body? Self-evident as these truths seem to be when the question is directly put to us, the objection to science under consideration illustrates how little in this age of material progress, abstract truth influences the mass of mankind in the maxims and opinions which give direction to practical life. Though this superiority of man's spiritual over his material nature be indeed a matter of consciousness, the requisition of the age, that demands in its grossest sense, utility from every thing—that all the energies of both mind and body, be like so much invested stock, which, if not yielding a pecuniary dividend, is therefore unprofitable and lost to the world—proves that the public mind practically ignores this great principle, and tends virtually to circumscribe the whole arithmetic of human life within the narrow compass of “loss and gain.” It is inconsistent with this admitted truth of our being, that every department of science which does not render an immediate pecuniary equivalent for the labor expended upon it, should be condemned as unprofitable in the great work of man's progression. It is inconsistent with that liberal spirit which would lift man's feelings and pursuits to an elevation comporting with the true dignity of his nature, that he should be confronted with an insulting inquiry for the profits of his toil, however sublime may have been the creations of his fancy, or profound the reach of his intellect in his struggles after truth: And certainly, if such a mercenary tone in public sentiment be not a libel on the aspirations of man's better nature, the immortal spirit, that celestial light which glows within him, is utterly eclipsed, and like the lightning's bolt, has not only plunged earthward from the skies, but is quenched forever. The mind, like a pinioned bird, struggles against these tendencies of the age, and would lift itself into a purer upper air: it sighs for loftier contemplations suited to its vast capacities and immortal nature, but is bound down by the gravitating force of flesh and blood; for the developments of

our intellectual, are not more intimately connected with, and trammelled by, the developments of our physical nature, than are the aspirations and aims of the one, perverted by the grossness and sensuality of the other. If we would give to the spiritual its due ascendancy over the material—if we would lift all that is God-like in man heavenward—we must rebuke the mad, mercenary spirit of the world around us, and stifle the cry that persecutes the man who pursues truth wherever it may be found, for its own sake and the love of it, though he may not possess the wonderful alchemy that turns it into gold. This unhallowed worship of mammon which, from the beginning, was the “root of all evil,” and still is the withering curse of the earth, must be suppressed, and truth—*truth* for its own sake—enthroned before the people, and men from all the walks of life, the high and the low, stimulated by a generous rivalry to bring up their gifts, both great and small, to the altar.

Let not science, then, be met at the threshold with the insulting inquiry—“*cui bono?*” It cannot be unworthy of man to inspect the smallest thing his God has made. The chemist who has toiled upon a single atom for years amid the dank vapors of his laboratory, teasing nature with his crucibles and retorts to deliver up her secrets, though grappling with but an *atom* of invisible matter, is as fully meeting the behests of a rational existence as he who, though clutching solid bars of gold, only toils for the “yellow dust,” and passes from the stage of action leaving no man better or wiser from his having lived. The physiologist who struggles with the mysteries of organic being, studying year after year the developments of embryonic life, pouring over microscopic cells and vesicles too small for the unaided vision of man, and thus growing in knowledge of the wonderful wisdom and goodness of God; or the astronomer who lifts his contemplation to the heavens, and spends a lifetime of toil and privation amid the vast cycles of its suns and systems, or inspecting the “star dust” of its nebulae in the often unsatisfied hope of adding a single second, with more accuracy, to his calculations—is surely, when thus communing with the works and ways of Him who ruleth over all, better filling up the measure of an immortal nature, than



his fellow whose communion is with the clod, which to him is but a *clod*. He has sadly misjudged who supposes that the highest ends and aims of life relate to the appetites and pleasures of the body. He is grossly blinded, indeed, whose sightless eyeballs cannot, even in this enlightened age, detect any traces of value in the details of science unless, forsooth, its hue be a golden one. His must be a jaundiced eye who sees yellow in everything.

But it is not strange that the public mind, engrossed with the mercenary views of the day, should be subject to obliquities; for the mind, like the eye, is insensible to impressions from one source, when it is too intensely operated upon by those from another, or if sensible, the impressions are strange and unnatural. Make an experiment: Place upon a white surface a common red wafer well illuminated—fix your eye for a while intently upon it—then turn quietly to the plain white surface on which it rests and you will find still distinctly visible upon your retina the image of the wafer, but that image is *blue*. Turn, in like manner, your mental vision upon glittering gold—intensify your feelings—stir up all the energies of your soul with longing desire, and then if, for a moment, you turn aside to other things, the mind still retains the stamp of the guinea, and all other objects become tinged with strange discolorations; or, to change the figure, attention too exclusive and engrossing, if directed to the smallest object around us, will shut out all that is ennobling and grand from the mental as it does from the natural view. The small disk of a single dollar placed before the eye, blots out the whole of the star-bespangled sky above, and all the green beauties of the earth beneath you. So with the mental vision.

But not only does the popular objection to science, that its votaries are unproductive laborers, overlook the highest and noblest ends of human existence, but it also overlooks the most patent facts in the history of the case. The history of science abundantly illustrates that it is not without profit even in what it might please the popular mind to regard its most drivelling pursuits. Take an example: A little more than 2,400 years ago, there lived at Miletus, in Ionia, an old philosopher, regarded

no doubt by the populace as a man, though of vigorous intellect and singular sagacity, yet odd enough in his tastes and pursuits. He had travelled over Crete, Egypt, and Phœnicia, for the gratification of his peculiar tastes, and having returned he had no doubt already attracted the sincere commiseration of the people by his strange infatuation with curious curves and diagrams, and his foolish love for the stars. To them he was a moon-struck man.

But when they saw him turn from the contemplation of the heavens, a scene in which even they could but feel some interest, to sit for days together rubbing with philosophic patience a little amber stone, that he might see the curious attractions and repulsions it exerted upon the little straws in his hand, no doubt they poured out from their hearts, if the deeper current of contempt for his folly did not arrest it, a full gushing tide of sympathy for the poor deluded man, who could thus waste his strength upon the invisible qualities of things, too insignificant ever to be brought within the compass of human wants. Such at least would be the reasoning of the utilitarian spirit of this nineteenth century; scarcely could it have been better two thousand years ago.

Now, change the scene. Transport this scoffing populace, as they thus stand by the old philosopher, along the tract of time, in its onward course through the long vista of coming centuries, down to the present. Point them to the splendid practical results that have followed this small beginning of electrical science. Let them see the wonder-working telegraph, operating through the agency of these same repulsions and attractions, almost annihilating time and space, and bringing all the kindreds of the earth into the closest fellowship. Show them the lightning rod, by which our own Franklin, more potent than the greatest of their gods, has disarmed the clouds of their terrors, and wrested from the "red right hand" of Jupiter himself, that thunderbolt with which he shook the earth and ruled the nations in terror. Or, go with them into some humble laboratory of science, where the little child is taught to sport unharmed with the lightning's "fiery wing," at which they have been accustomed to look with awe and trembling, as the

avenging rod of an incensed deity. Then as astonished and confounded, they stand and contemplate this broad stream of light and truth, stricken out by the wand of science from that small rock by which they stood and scoffed twenty-four centuries ago, ask them again if science be unprofitable. How would their illiberal and time-serving spirit be rebuked, for sneering at the labors of the immortal Milesian as unproductive, because their dull souls could neither appreciate his philosophy nor anticipate the grand practical results of which it was the precursor.

True, Thales had incorrect views of the nature of the powers exhibited in the fossil gum before him, when he ascribed its curious phenomena to the workings of a living spirit within ; but could he have seen the true character of these electrical principles as they have been developed by the 19th century, not only giving energy and motive power to dead matter, but associated with and pervading all the functions of organic nature, he would not have deemed it beyond the limits of a legitimate philosophy to ascribe to this wonderful agent, not life itself, but the relation of a proximate cause to many of the most mysterious phenomena of life.

Take another example. It is said that the accidental circumstance of a gentleman having thrown into the fire a small flask containing alcohol, and afterwards placing it in a vessel of water, by which the evaporated alcohol was condensed and the flask filled with water, first suggested the power and uses of steam. This surely was a small enough beginning from which to work out both the science and the sublime practical problem of a modern locomotive, sweeping, as a thing instinct with life, through our forests and over our fields, freighted with the wealth of whole communities.

How much time, to use the popular phraseology, must have been "wasted" upon the laws that regulate the evaporations of liquids, the properties and elastic force of vapors, the nature and laws of latent and sensible heat, before the multifarious applications of modern steam power could have been achieved ? From these small beginnings, the industrial pursuits of the world have been revolutionized. Fire and water have become the great operatives of the age. The coals that glow in our

furnaces have been taught by science to do the work of man, to card and spin and weave for the comfort of man ; to dig up from the bowels of the earth, and smelt and pound and forge into form the various metals for the use of man ; to print and bind and distribute books, to explore rich mines of mineral wealth, tunnel lofty mountains, traverse sea and land with the merchandize of man. These all are results of this "wasted time"—time squandered upon the properties of heat, the nature of vapor, the conducting and radiating power of solids.

We will admit that there was scarcely a particle of true philosophy in all the jugglery that attended the dawn of science. In the middle ages intellectual night brooded over the face of society—darkness rested upon every department of physical inquiry, and as the properties of matter could not be eliminated by the dialectics of the schools, nor chemical affinities regulated by a syllogism, this darkness seemed impenetrable. Science, confined as it was to monkish cloisters, and pursued only for mercenary purposes, could be expected to emit but a pale and sickly ray. The torch that was lighted in the gloomy cell of the alchemist, where he toiled night and day in his vain search for some mysterious stone, whose magic touch might turn all things to gold, gave only a delusive light ; and as its feeble glimmer, penetrating the deep, dark recesses of this universal gloom, came reflected back, enabling the observer to catch but shadowy glimpses of the things around, it was natural that the imagination should people this twilight obscurity with the ghost-like forms of stalking error, or at best of distorted truth.

But although there was little philosophy and less science in all the labors of the old alchemists, they were nevertheless not wholly unprofitable. The facts that had been, and were still accumulating, were like so many single rays of light, which science had but to collect and converge upon some central truth to make it visible, and when that truth was thus illuminated, like the diamond when exposed to the rays of the natural sun, it became self-luminous, and in the darkness that surrounded it, became a new centre of radiant light.

Every fact thus accumulated, every new experiment or observation became a real contribution to the sum of future progress.

Even their fallacies and superstitions, whose name was legion, served at least the useful purpose of warning the future inquirer of the points of error, and thus facilitating his advancement in the path of truth. In a word, "everything throws light on everything;" and it is idle to pronounce the little things of science unprofitable and useless, simply because they do not yield immediate results. Every great improvement has, and from the very nature of things must have, its origin in these humble beginnings. In the intellectual, as in the natural world, God has ordained progression as the law of development. You may admire some giant tree that lifts its gnarled and crooked branches in the forest, but a section of its stem would convince you that it has lived a thousand years, and during every day of each of those thousand summers, the busy sunbeams, with other electrical and chemical agencies, have been toiling on at their slow and quiet but progressive work of building up the various cells and fibres of its solid structure. You may admire the majestic roll of some mighty river, that bears on its bosom the commerce of a nation, but you must seek for its origin in the recesses of the distant mountain, where in small streamlets it trickles from the crevices of the granite cliffs. So with human progress. How different was that embryonic condition of the steam engine from the full grown locomotive, which, like a war steed, to-day snorts through our forests, as it rushes with sublime impetuosity onward! Nor did the complicated machinery of Lowell and Lawrence leap like Minerva from the head of Jupiter, fully armed, and dancing to the music of a thousand wheels and spindles. They have all been the offspring of the protracted and bitter throes of long-continued, intellectual labor. Again: for twenty-two centuries the attractions and repulsions of amber, with a few isolated particulars of the same kind, constituted the sum of what was known concerning electricity. As a science, it had no existence. Its phenomena had not yet been collated and digested, nor were they sufficiently varied or numerous to admit of any broad generalization, but each isolated observation, though trivial and unimportant in itself, was one step more in that preparation of materials which it was necessary to furnish before the slow processes of induction could

work out those splendid achievements in electrical science, which so soon followed with such brilliancy of effect and rapidity of execution, as to astonish mankind. But not only is this protracted induction of particular facts necessary as a feature of that heaven-ordained law of progression, which obtains in every department of human improvement, but it often happens, when we are least expecting profitable results, that facts great and small have been already so accumulated, and the general movement so set in the right direction, that the next step, though the most trivial of them all, gives us the mastery of some great principle, which brings a whole department of nature under the dominion of man, and thus ends a consummation for which all preceding steps have only prepared the way. A single observation on a single falling apple was sufficient to suggest to the mind of Newton that train of thought which immortalized his own name, and shed a flood of light over all the departments of physical science—an observation insignificant in itself, but which could scarcely be regarded as less useful and important in its results, than all the observations made by all preceding philosophers together. Again: it was only what men call accident—the sickness of a Bolognese lady—that led to the discovery of galvanism, which has resulted in issues to the physical world, second only in point of importance and utility to the great discoveries of Newton himself. And thus it is we greatly err in ridiculing the little things of science as foolish and unprofitable. These little things may prove to be the beginnings of important revolutions, the small out-crops of veins of inexhaustible wealth; for the great Ruler of the universe, who has ordained the activity of mind, and its consequence the progression of science, and to whose wise providence a higher and more rational philosophy would refer everything called accident, often selects in the natural as in the moral field the small things of the world to confound the great; as if He would convince mankind of their dependence on Him, no less for the guidance and advancement of the mind, than for the purity and holiness of the heart.

Such out-crops are visible in some of the departments of science at the present day. Facts scattered here and there

over the field, seem to be pointing to some great and undiscovered truths, which, as the result of a broad and comprehensive generalization, shall include and thereby harmonize under one common law many of the most distinct phenomena. It is from these small things that science is everywhere working out her great results. In astronomy, for instance, the small proper motions of minute stars, detected only by long and patient observation, is revealing facts under which the most daring imagination staggers. The sun, the centre of our system, which has long been regarded as fixed and immovable, no longer appears as an independent monarch, dispensing the blessings of light and life throughout his vast dominions, but that sun, around whose central throne so many satellites revolve at almost inconceivable distances, seems itself only a tributary, who, with all his princely cortege, is wheeling us along with his burning car, in majestic sweep around some other dread and unknown centre.

In the field of pure physics, also, experiment and observation seem tending to some new development. Facts have long been known which indicate many of the physical agents to be similar if not identical. If, for instance, a bar of bismuth and antimony be joined, and the jointure heated, a current of electricity is immediately produced; and conversely, if a current of electricity be passed through the bars, the jointure will become heated; thus showing heat and electricity to be closely related. Again, if electricity be passed through a coil of wire, the coil is rendered magnetic; or if a magnet be introduced into the coil, electricity will be developed; proving magnetism and electricity to be also intimately connected. If a piece of zinc be placed in acidulated water, the chemical affinities at work will decompose the water, with the development of electricity; and conversely, if the gases into which the water is resolved be collected and submitted to an electrical spark, chemical action is induced, and the gases are re-united into water; thus favoring the opinion that chemical affinity and electricity are but different conditions of the same agent. Again, it is known that a metallic wheel may be easily made to revolve by the mechanical force of heat in steam, but it has been recently

found by experiment, that if this revolving wheel be placed between the poles of a powerful electro-magnet, it ceases to revolve, and becomes heated. And so we might go on showing nearly all the forces of nature to sustain to each other this intimate relation of cause and effect, one to the other indifferently as circumstances may require. Even in organic life, by taking hold of the wires of a sufficiently sensitive galvanometer, it might be shown that every physical change, every muscular movement, every mental action, modifies the electrical condition of the body; thus proving, not an identity, it is true, but such a relation as that not only light, heat, electricity, magnetism, chemical affinity and mechanical force, but vital action, muscular power and the physical conditions of intellectual power, may all possibly be strongly allied to one and the same pervading principle, which only needs for its expression some suitable formulary, which, by equating the conditions of all, might adequately represent the particular phenomena of each. Such a generalization is at least possible, and who can tell how small a straw may point to it? When in the hands of Agassiz, Müller, and others, embryonic life has been subjected to laws and principles, and Humboldt has traced out the mutual dependencies which pervade the universal cosmos; when physicists everywhere have converged from their various fields of labor the scattered light upon this central truth, who shall say but that the smallest fact in the whole range of scientific discovery shall be at last the chosen instrument to reflect upon the mind the first rays that shall make that truth visible. We have seen distinguished naturalists sit for weeks together, peering with the intensest interest into the microscopic cells of the egg of some tiny fish. We have seen them spend anxious, sleepless nights, as they would catch a glimpse of some new fact in the processes of that egg's development. And we may sneer, if we will, at the pursuits of those great minds who can thus be absorbed night and day in hatching a fish's egg, or solving the problem of homology between the tooth of a caterpillar and the proboscis of a butterfly; but such laborers are adding rapidly to the rich fund of new and varied facts, from which as raw material, science must elaborate her future discoveries



and work out these great generalizations. The smallest fact in the smallest cell of that hatching egg may prove to be the hinge upon which hangs some of the profoundest mysteries of nature. Who can tell? A "falling apple" revealed the mystery of revolving worlds—drops make up the ocean, and we have already seen these small particles of truth are beginning to crystallize, as it were, into the forms of law; the next step, however small, may bring the world into full view of some sparkling gem which, but for this accumulated light from the full-orbed sun of science, could never have been visible. He knows but little of the nature of light, who supposes that the smallest of its tiny rays contributes nothing to the image on his retina. He knows as little of the nature of science who supposes that its minute details contribute nothing to its great results.

The second class into which the popular objections to science may be divided, we have denominated The Religious, or The Objections of the Church.

Science is charged with infidel tendencies—she is pointed at as the enemy of the Bible, teaching a huge and cumbrous pantheism, instead of the wise and superintending Providence of the great Creator. Or, if admitting a God at all, removing Him far off to some remote corner of His dominions, where He sits in listless and inglorious ease, leaving the world to pass on under the dominion of universal and immutable law; or else, becoming wise above what is written, in the pride of her speculations, she would teach unscriptural views of God's works and ways, and dwarf into the slow and labored processes of a gradual development, that sublime miracle of creation, when, as recorded by Moses, God said, "Let there be light, and there was light;" or even daring to contest the Divine origin of man himself, she would trace him from the scarcely vitalized monad, up through the ascending series of molluscs, fishes, reptiles and mammals, till having gone through all the grades of inferior life, he at length passes to the full maturity of his immortal and noble faculties as man. Such are some of the phases of infidelity laid to the charge of science.

In all ages of the world, man's natural heart, it must be ad-

mitted, has ever rebelled against the sovereignty of its Creator. Infidelity is its native air. All its tastes and feelings—all its pursuits and plans—the fierce and interminable strife within and without it, demonstrate the truth that it stands in open rebellion to God's moral government. Its false, deceitful character, often so blinds the judgment and warps the reason of man, as to enlist his intellect also in this unhallowed warfare against his Sovereign and Ruler.

But we should carefully discriminate between these offenders that originated and planned, and still stimulate this rebellion, and those passive instruments which have been reluctantly dragged into the battle-field, to swell the ranks of the enemy, though they strike not a blow in his defence. Science is not responsible for her position; her infidelity is the infidelity of the human heart. Science is in itself intensely religious, and it is only where its instructions have been garbled, or its heralds treacherous, that its trumpet has ever given an uncertain sound. It was not the voice of science, nor even of science falsely so called, but "the fool" "in his heart," that said "There is no God." "The invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, *being understood by the things that are made.*" Indeed, from the very nature of the case it cannot be that God has established an order of things that militates against Himself or His government, or exhibits the slightest discrepancy between His works and His word. Nature and revelation are parts of one great whole, each supplementary to the other, so that it is not possible that there should be in all the varied operations of the laws of the one, a single phenomenon hostile to the Divine and immutable truths of the other. There cannot be antagonism between truth and truth. All truth is a system of Divine harmony, of which God himself is the soul and centre—a transcript of the eternal nature, immutable, harmonious, perfect—whether it be reflected from the material, the intellectual, or the spiritual world. And hence, there never has been, nor ever will be discovered, throughout the broad universe of matter, the slightest discrepancy between the works of God's hands and the revelation of His word. Such a ruinous collision between the exhibitions the Creator has made of

Himself, would be equally subversive of all religion, natural and revealed alike. But not only can there not be any inherent hostility between science, which reveals the laws of God's natural government, by which His Providence is dispensed to man, and that other revelation of truth, by which He would dispense the blessings of His grace, but it is impossible also that there should be any inherent tendency in the pursuit of the one to alienate the mind from the doctrines of the other. The laws of mind are as fixed and necessary as the laws of matter. I can no more resist the conviction of a truth, when supported by sufficient evidence suited to the constitution of my mind, than I can change the gravity of the earth. An adequate amount of light admitted into the eye is, by the agency of its various humors and lenses, refracted and gathered into a visible image on the retina, not more naturally or necessarily than the mind which admits the demonstration of a proposition, yields its assent to the truths demonstrated. Nor does this fixedness of moral laws, which is essential to the stability of God's moral government, any more affect the personal freedom of man, than the stability of the material universe affects the individual freedom of motion among all its parts. Indeed, in God's physical systems, this freedom is often essential to stability. The "Heavens declare the glory of God" in this respect, and shall His moral government be subject to laws less noble and elevated? He whose omnipotent arm upholds and encircles all, binds none with an inexorable necessity. Man is free, but that freedom impinges not upon God's sovereignty, or the fact that He has placed man under a government of unchangeable principles, moral and mental as well as physical. If it were otherwise, and the laws of belief were such that no amount of evidence could establish a truth, on the one hand, or that a proposition could be admitted without being proved, on the other, reason, instead of being an instrument to guide us in the discharge of duty, would become a useless and unmeaning faculty—a guide to error, not to truth—a libel upon its author.

But it is not so. He who adjusted light to the eye, has adjusted truth to the mind. He who has suited the phenomena

of nature to the principles of revelation, has equally attuned to both the mental faculties of man, by which they are contemplated. So that it is impossible for the mind, in its healthful operations, to be led to doubt and scepticism as the legitimate result of such studies. Who can investigate the seeming antagonisms of that book of God, the volume of nature, and mark the beauty, order and perfection there displayed, without turning to that other Book of God, the volume of revelation, with a more assured confidence that all its inscrutable mysteries harmonize also. Finite minds may not be able to trace in all its windings, the thread that knits together the various parts of the web of revealed truth; but who that has grappled with the phenomena of physical science, and labored to rescue its numerous anomalies from apparently hopeless confusion, can fail to learn the useful lesson that man's finite understanding is no measure of the harmony of even natural laws, much less the "mystery of Godliness" and the laws of spiritual life. Where contradictions seem to exist in the physical world, we know some secret spring—some hidden pulse—hitherto unfelt by man, must heave the heart of nature, and thus we are taught where mystery shrouds the spiritual world, to be equally sure some law, attuned by God's own hand to harmony, must solve that mystery.

But the charge is, that science contemplating nature exclusively in her relation to physical law—atom bound to atom, and world to world, by one common, all-pervading necessity—so engrosses the mind with these second causes as to lose sight of the great first cause; indeed to obviate the necessity of any power higher than these laws themselves. The man of science is not necessarily a man of but one idea, who can, from the rich fields of physical inquiry, glean only the simple and single thought of the universal dominion of the laws of matter; he is not necessarily blind to all the wise and beautiful adaptations in nature, which prove those laws to be the result of nothing less than an Omniscient mind. He may take with him, when he enters into this field of inquiry, as into any other, all the light that revelation and reason have thrown upon the character and attributes of that Omniscient agent who not only

originated, but still energizes and sustains these laws, and there learn new proofs of His wisdom, power and goodness.

It is admitted that scientific pursuits, by directing the mind mainly to the working of natural laws and exhibiting nature from the smallest molecule that sparkles in the morning dew-drop, to the innumerable worlds that roll above us—all within the iron grasp of what seems an uncontrollable necessity—does furnish, when viewed in this partial light, a pretext to exalt the supremacy of law above the Providence of God. We know, however, that partial views of anything equally pervert the great truths it contains. The sceptic's favorite quiver, from which he draws his most poisoned shafts, is the Bible; but because the wicked heart can pervert and wield the Word of God against the truth of God, is it therefore inherently opposed to truth? No! The Bible, like a beautiful portrait, with its adjustments of light and shade—here the law and there the Gospel—here the penalty and there the promise—all sketched by God's own hand, must be adapted to present to the mind a perfect image of its great Original. And so the volume of nature.

The facts of science and religion are like the summits of the same mountain range; when viewed singly and alone they may appear as if frowning upon each other in stern and formidable rivalry, but if we will descend their sloping sides into the vales below, they will be found to stand united and rooted together in one common and enduring granite basis. If among the facts of science an isolated truth here and another there, seems to lift its frowning front in irreconcilable hostility, it is only because we have not yet descended to the solid base where all stand knit together. It is because we are ignorant of the facts that we misinterpret the teachings; hence the more thoroughly science is studied, the more ample will be her testimony to the truth of religion. If religion would be true to herself she must be the friend and patron of science, stimulating her researches till the veil which hangs between be rent and these twin-sisters of the skies embrace each other.

We will not deny that science has often been solicited to join the enemies of religion; she has been called upon to testify not

only against the Providence, but against the existence of God. Infidelity, when driven from the field of metaphysics, fled to the heavens, and taking refuge amid the nebulae, sought an alliance with astronomy. She raised her battle cry, and gathering all her energy as if for a final and fearful onset, strove to annihilate God and recreate worlds by the laws of revolving mists and vapors. But astronomy refused the alliance. Science turned her artillery upon the enemies of God; before the huge telescope of Rosse many of the nebulae vanished—their confused and misty light turned into stars and every burning point proclaimed “the hand that made us divine.” Thus deserted by astronomy and hunted from the skies, she fled to the earth, and burrowing amid the fossils and strata of a pre-Adamic age, called mightily on geology for aid. At first this young and inexperienced science seemed to hesitate, when infidelity, gathering new confidence, began to prepare for a still more fierce and terrible conflict. She marshalled all her remaining energies into the field, and entering the lowest paleozoic strata, whose vast deposits, miles below the earth’s surface, were teeming with the extinct forms of life, she began, amid its ferns and mosses, its corals and crinoids, the plan of her attack. In those rocky vaults where lay the scattered skeletons of earth’s first born inhabitants, she erected her banner. Beginning in the lowest strata, with that humblest type of plant-like animals, which, like beautiful lilies, lifted their branching stems, waving with buds and blossoms, amid the lakes and marshes of the infant world, she passed, step by step, up through the various families of molluscs, crustaceans and fishes—to higher and still higher forms of life, as strata after strata succeed each other, to those enormous plesiosaurs, megalosaurs, and iguanodons, which, like huge lizards, from forty to fifty feet long and from ten to fifteen high, stalked through the first low grounds of earth. Thence, still passing upward to those even more enormous mammals, the mastodons and dinotheriums, that roamed through the primeval forests of a later period, she at length came to man, and seizing upon the thought that he who thus stood at the head of this long ascending series, might never have been created, but only de-

veloped from those humbler forms of life, which lie buried in the earth beneath him, she boldly assayed to battle, not only with the Mosaic record of creation, but against the all-creative Power itself. Summoning from earth's vast charnel-house the skeletons that for ages had slept in her deep dark vaults, she strove to quicken their dry bones into life, and rally them, an innumerable army, around her standard, in the vain hope that she might establish man's relationship to the worm, and prove the miserable absurdity that the snails and clams at her feet, were the forefathers of the immortal Bacon and Newton and Herschel!!

But infidelity could not command the skeleton army she had summoned. Science refused her assent, and each grim spectre in earth's great cemetery stood mute as death, and each, as he stood, pointed his bony finger to some stony tablet upon which was traced the history of God's dealings with the earth. Here He had gone forth sweeping with the "besom of destruction" whole tribes of plants and animals from its bosom—there, with His creative fiat, He had re-peopled its solitudes. Again and again He had snapped the chain with which infidelity would confine the energies of the Omnipotent within the laws of dead matter, and link the family of man, both in origin and destiny, with the brutes that perish;—everywhere amid its living and its dead were distinctly stamped the "footprints of the Creator," who still rules and reigns over all.

Thus geology, which is still but an infant, numbering scarcely more years than some of you who hear me this evening, though even seeming at first, by its hesitancy, to encourage the enemies of the Bible, is already one of its noblest champions. In vain may Hume spin out his metaphysical sophistries against the possibility or the credibility of miracles; every fossiliferous stratum in the whole geologic scale is written full of the demonstration of miraculous power. In vain may Lamarck, Oken, and other physico-philosophers of the French and German schools, attempt to annihilate God, and harness up the universe in the essential laws of matter, insisting that like a machine it will run on forever. Upon every stony page of geology is written in unmistakeable characters the superin-

tending Providence of a wise and controlling mind. I know geology is still considered heterodox by many, in some of her best established doctrines. So was astronomy. I know that she is even regarded infidel by some in her teachings upon the antiquity of the earth, but she only teaches what Origen, Augustin, Justin Martyr, and others of the fathers taught long before geology was born, and what Bishop Patrick and Chalmers, with other distinguished divines of a later date, still maintain—that “the Bible does not fix the antiquity of the globe.”

But if there be no inherent tendency to infidelity in science, why, it will be asked, is there so much scepticism in her ranks? This is a pertinent question, and one which it becomes the friends of the Bible to consider well. It is because of the mist that hangs over these subjects in the popular mind. The enemies of the Bible have always loved darkness rather than light, and in the shadowy confines of science, where the forms of truth can scarcely be defined, scepticism loves to revel. It is not science, but the want of it, that makes scientific fields the theatre of sceptical speculations; if the Church, therefore, would meet the enemy successfully, she must light the torch of science in those dark recesses where infidelity plants her secret ambuscades; she must carefully reconnoitre the field of physical research, where the “signs of the times” clearly indicate the battle of the evidences must now be fought. The lamented Hugh Miller, who

“Quarried truth all rough hewn from the earth,  
And chiseled it into a perfect gem,”

has warned the Church of the points of danger and the mode of attack. “There is a mighty change,” he says, “taken place during the present century in the direction in which the minds of the first order are operating. In the last and preceding ages, when the higher philosophy of the world was metaphysical, the churches took ready cognizance of the fact, and in due accordance with the requirements of the times, the battle of the evidences was fought on metaphysical ground. But judging from the preparations made in their colleges and halls they do



not now seem sufficiently aware that it is the department of physics, not of metaphysics, that the greater minds of the age are engaged in—that the Lockes, Humes, Kants, Berkeleys, Dugald Stewarts, and Thomas Browns, belong to the past, and that the philosophers of the present time, tall enough to be seen the world over, are the Humboldts, the Aragos, the Agassizs, the Liebigs, the Owens, Herschels, Bucklands and the Brewsters. The battle of the evidences will have as certainly to be fought on the field of physical science as it was contested in the last age on that of metaphysics; and on this new arena the combatants will have to employ new weapons, which it will be the privilege of the challenger to choose.”

Let then this warning from that acute philosopher and zealous Christian, who has done more than any other man of his day to popularize and Christianize science, be heeded by the Church; let science become the friend and ally of religion in this struggle with a common foe; let religion be as a “wall of fire” round about science for her protection, then will the revelation of the Word, and the revelation of the works of God, unite in eternal amity, and become co-laborers in the great work of man’s spiritual elevation. And as the one lifts his mind in devout contemplation of the heavens—“the work of God’s fingers, the moon and the stars which He has ordained”—the other may increase that feeling to adoring reverence, by revealing those stars which were before only glittering points in the sky, to be vast armies of worlds moving on at His command in solemn and majestic tread through the regions of space. And as the one would illustrate man’s nature by pointing to the perishing “worm of the dust;” the other may extend the simile, by pointing to that same worm, as it bursts its chrysalis shell, and mounts, upon butterfly wing, into a higher and nobler state of being. Or, as the one points to the “lilies of the field,” more perfectly arrayed than Solomon in all his glory;” the other may unfold the mystic movements of the sunbeam that pencilled those gorgeous tints, and wove that web of beauty. Thus, while contemplating the book of Revelation with its mingled proofs of wisdom, power and love, we may gather from the fields of science a kindred lesson whis-

pered by every budding flower that sheds its fragrance on the breeze, to be borne as incense to the skies,—echoed back by the pealing thunder that tells of refreshing showers,—repeated by the insect that hums its song in the evening air,—reflected from the vault of the vast temple of universal nature, where wind and wave, earth, sea, and sky,—all things animate and inanimate, join the swelling anthem of praise, without a single note of discord, save from the broken harp of the *heart* of man.



## ARTICLE V.

## THE MIND OF MAN, THE IMAGE OF GOD.

To know God is to have eternal life. To search for him is, therefore, a duty of the utmost importance. We see him in his Works, his Providence, and his Word. Of his works, the noblest exhibit most of their Maker. The mind of man is his noblest work, and in it we see God most clearly. To develop this proposition, and to illustrate it, is the object of what follows.

The best definition of God is found in the answer to the fourth question of the Westminster Shorter Catechism, viz: "God is a Spirit, infinite, eternal and unchangeable in his being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness and truth." In this definition are included all the attributes of God. These have been, by theologians, divided into the natural, and the moral attributes of Deity. The natural attributes are: Spirituality, immensity, wisdom, and power. The moral attributes are: Holiness, justice, goodness, and truth.

We think that in the mind of man may be found traces of all these attributes. And we will remark that such traces are not to be perceived in any other thing besides the mind of man; not in the body of man, nor in any other form of matter, animal

or vegetable, nor in any of the modifications, attributes, functions, or tendencies of matter.

Observe, that we say, *traces*; for we do not pretend to find any thing more. Far be from us the Pantheistic Atheism, that would annihilate Deity by distribution—that calls the mind Divine, and knows no other God. Our views on this point will be unfolded as we proceed, and, we trust, without liability to be misunderstood.

Let us first consider the natural attributes, which may be named a little more familiarly than above: Spirituality, Omnipresence, Omniscience, and Omnipotence:

1. Spirituality. Assuming the idea of Spirit, we will not embarrass ourselves by attempting a definition of the term, further than to state that any definition of it must have reference to matter. Thus we enumerate the qualities of matter, as extension, hardness, divisibility, &c., and say that they do not belong to Spirit. And, on the other hand, we mention certain acts of spiritual beings, as thinking, remembering, willing, &c., and affirm that they are not compatible with our idea of matter. Thus we may, with sufficient accuracy, substitute the word *immateriality*, for *spirituality*.

Now, this immateriality is an indispensable element of our idea of God, and our idea of mind, and as indispensable in regard to the one as to the other. We will not stay to offer any proof of the immateriality of either God or the mind. We would only call attention to one fact, true of both, which is the result of the immateriality of each. God is invisible, and so is the mind. And we use the word invisible, as co-extensive with not perceivable. We cannot perceive either God or the mind by means of any of the senses, nor by all of them combined. And for this obvious reason; the senses are constituted as organs, for the perception only of matter, and therefore we cannot, by them, perceive what is immaterial. We deem it unnecessary to dwell longer upon this point. The spirituality of God is found in the mind of man. This attribute is (if we may so speak) the most essential in the nature of God, inasmuch as the others could not exist without it. A material being could not be Omnipresent, Omniscient, or Omnipotent;

in a word infinite. And so of the mind. It could not be what it is, it could not do what it does, if it were not immaterial. Spirituality is its essence.

2. The Omnipresence of God. This idea is familiar and needs no explanation. We will, however, call it up before the mind of the reader, in the beautiful words of the 139th Psalm:

“Whither shall I go from thy Spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven thou art there; if I take the wings of the morning and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea, even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me. If I say, surely the darkness shall cover me, even the night shall be light about me; yea, the darkness hideth not from thee; but the night shineth as the day; the darkness and the light are both alike to thee.”

Can we find in the mind of man a *simulacrum* or image of God's omnipresence? As it actually exists in God, certainly not. God's omnipresence implies, not merely the *power* of being present any where in infinite space—the *power* of being present in more places than one at the same time—but that he is actually present in all places at all times, and present in every particular place, in the undivided fulness of his Godhead. This cannot be said of the mind; but we can say of it what cannot be said of any other existence, that in a real and important sense, it can transport itself instantaneously, in conception, to any place that it has ever visited, or known of, or imagined.

If we have ever visited London, Edinburgh, or Paris, we can return to any of these cities in mind, as really as we were once there in body and mind. The rapidity of this process of mental transfer does not differ perceptibly from instantaneous action. If we name over any number of familiar places, as Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Richmond, New Orleans, the mind comes in contact with them as soon as the name is apprehended by the ear. And it is as easy to pass beyond the limits of accessible space, and wander in thought from world to world, throughout the universe. It may be said, that the mind does not really transport itself to these places, but brings these places to itself. The distinction, however just in itself, or

important in some aspects, does not affect the view I am taking. The wonder in either case is equally great, the effect is the same, and the analogy I am seeking to establish holds equally good. Again, it may be said, that this ubiquitousness is only in thought. But it is only in thought, or mental susceptibility, that any thing can be present to the mind. It is only thus that the mind sees the stars, the trees, the flowers, or hears the voice of man or God. An illustration of this characteristic of the mind is found in the fact, that it is actually every where present at the same time in all the different parts of a little world—a microcosm of its own—the body with which it is connected, and which it controls and directs, in every movement, however slight. The body is absolutely inert without the mind. No voluntary movement could be performed by the muscles alone without the mind, any more than by the mind alone without the muscles. The mind is present in the eyes, the hands, the feet, in hearing, tasting, smelling and feeling, and always and all at once. If the humblest member, or the smallest portion of the body is assaulted, it adopts instantaneous means for its defence. Nor does it feel itself wearied by this omnipresent and incessant watch, nor degraded by its minuteness. As Milton slowly paced his garden walk, meditating his immortal work, his mind trod empyrean heights with angels and arch-angels, while the same mind carefully guided the staff that felt for the unseen dangers of his blinded path. How like is the Providence of the mind over the body to the Providence, general and special, of God over the world! How this analogy should remove the doubts of some shallow thinkers, who will not believe that God notices the falling of the sparrow! The mind does as much in proportion, if we compare its powers with those of God. And how does it convict of sciolism the philosophy of Lucretius and his modern followers, who suppose that it would degrade God to interfere in the trivial affairs of ordinary life! As well, and far more reasonably might we say, that the mind impairs its dignity when it directs the hand to wipe the sweat from the heated brow.

Space is, in most respects, very analogous to time; and akin to Omnipresence as an attribute of God, is his power of

viewing all time, without reference to the distinction of present, past or future. This distinction is, for all creatures, inseparable from the conception of time. For them every specific moment must be either past, present or future, and cannot be but one at the same time. Matter exists only in the present. It cannot throw itself back into the past, from which it has emerged, nor advance itself into the future which it is constantly approaching. It is bound to the car of time by an inflexible chain. The mind, too, exists in the present, and cannot be separated from it, but it has the capacity to traverse, without stint, the illimitable past and the everlasting future. Further: Though the mind cannot so view the past, the present and the future, as not to discriminate between them, it can view these several times by one and the same conception. We can think of this earth, at the time of its creation, as it now is, and when it shall be burned up. We can adore Jesus Christ as the eternal Son of God, the Incarnate Saviour, and the final Judge.

What has been said seems sufficient to establish between our mental nature, and the omnipresence of God, a real correspondence—such a correspondence as we would in vain seek traces of in any thing else on earth.

3. Let us consider, with the same view, God's attribute of Omniscience. The signification of this word has been expanded by Dr. Witherspoon into the proposition, "that all things in all their relations, all things existing, and all things possible, are the objects of the Divine knowledge." It may aid us somewhat to make the remark, that there are two elements of Omniscience, which may be considered separately, though in fact they mutually imply each other—1. The Universality of knowledge with relation to the number of subjects known, and 2. The Perfection of knowledge with relation to the degree in which the subjects of knowledge are known. God knows all things. Can the mind know all things? Certainly not. It cannot comprehend God. The finite cannot comprehend the Infinite. Not only in the sense that we cannot fully understand all things about Him, but in the sense that we cannot understand anything at all, about some things in His nature,

mode of existence, in His plan of Providence, and His scheme of redemption. Both these ideas are presented in the words of the Bible: "who, by searching, can find out God? Who can know the Almighty unto perfection?" Again: The mind cannot know its own essence, nor the substratum of matter; and other things might be mentioned that are not cognizable by the human mind—problems, the solution of which require the use of elements not possessed by the mind. These are barriers in the career of human knowledge, impassable and irremovable—barriers which have defied the mightiest intellects of all ages. Some have fretted against them with vain efforts, and others have reverently, and with submission, bowed before them, but none have ever transcended them.

With regard to the perfection of human knowledge, the inquiry is briefer still. Not only we cannot know every thing to perfection, but we cannot so know any thing—not nature, not ourselves—not any thing past, present or future. The humblest and simplest subject of our investigation, has its unrevealed secrets, and the proudest philosopher must confess his ignorance, to a spire of grass.

The mind is not omniscient. But it approaches this attribute of God as nothing else does, and sufficiently near for us to behold in it the image of this attribute. There are some things the mind cannot know, but how exceedingly few are they compared to the things it can know? The former bear to the latter not as great a numerical ratio as do the Pyramids of Egypt, of whose builders we are ignorant, to all the monuments, temples, public edifices, and private dwellings, whose history is readily ascertainable. We can study matter in all its elements, forms, combinations, properties and relations—as a mass and as an atom—as it is now, has been, and will hereafter be. We can make ourselves acquainted with all the works of nature, in the heavens above, the earth beneath, and the waters under the earth, and works of man's hands in all the zones of the globe, in every period of time, and in every stage of civilization. We not only become acquainted, by means of our senses, with material objects, but also by means of consciousness, just as really, with the immaterial mind, and, by revelation, with the

invisible God. And while it is true, as has been already said, that we cannot know any thing to perfection, it is equally true, that there are no fixed limits to our approach towards perfection of knowledge.

We conclude this topic by remarking: 1. That to know is the distinguishing characteristic of the mind. It may be said that the mind's existence consists in knowledge. An unknowing mind would be no mind at all, for it could be such only by the negation of every single faculty it possesses. 2. That matter cannot know, that is: That nothing but mind can. And 3. That if our present knowledge could be infinitely extended in every direction, it would be omniscience; except perhaps as to the knowledge of the future. Perhaps a perfect knowledge of the past and the present would confer upon us the knowledge of the future also. Are we not justified then in affirming, that in the mind of man we see distinctly the reflected image of God's omniscience?

4. Let us now inquire if we can perceive in the human mind any trace of Omnipotence. We will not say that Omnipotence is the necessary result of the possession, at the same time, of Omnipresence and Omniscience, but it is obvious that it implies these attributes—that God could not be Omnipotent, if not Omnipresent and Omniscient. And we will be ready to admit, that whatever is most like Him in these two attributes, will most nearly approach Him in power. After what has already been said upon these two points, we see the reason which establishes the proposition that, after God, the mind of man is of all things the most powerful.

The most satisfactory test of power is actual accomplishment. Let us glance at some of the things that mind has done. The formation and use of language is one of its earliest and most universal achievements. This remark does not imply that language is of human origin. Allow it to be a Divine gift, and still we must attribute to mind its development. Language is the effort of the invisible mind to make itself visible. And how astonishingly has it succeeded in this effort! We see the mind in its nature, its workings, its attitudes. We see every thing but its essence. And not only can we communicate what



we will to those who are present, but we can arrest thought, all immaterial as it is, incarnate it in writing without impairing its spirituality, perpetuate it, and send it forth to float in a life-boat of language securely on the stream of time.

In the establishment of civil government, we behold another of the supreme works of minds. Of this, suffice it to say this much. Men, because of their power and their evil natures, are the most dangerous of all animals, and the most difficult to govern; yet man has always been subject to government, and whatever the form of government, or whatever the instrument used, mind has always been the governor. But let us look for a moment at the struggles of mind with physical nature. And let us select for an example, the ocean. As to the great, kind earth, she is our mother—from her we sprang—by her we are supported, and her motherly bosom affords the resting-place for our last, long sleep. It is not with her that we struggle. But the ocean is not seemingly subject to man, not even his ally. It has a proud, self-willed, defiant aspect. It is vast, irresistible, uninhabitable. It was ever a source of terror to man. He walked along its shores, oppressed by a sense of his own insignificance, and if he ventured upon its surface, dared not lose sight of land. But now he traverses it quicker, cheaper, with less fatigue, and almost as safely as he travels by land. What a space between the canoe and the steamship! And what must we think of the power that has made this space disappear? Is not the mind almost omnipotent? For mind has done it. Man is now no larger and no stronger than he was at first, and the ocean is no less vast, mighty and imperious. The peculiar prerogative of Omnipotence is creative power—the power to make something out of nothing. This power God possesses, and he reserves it to himself. He has not communicated it to any creature. But to the mind of man he has permitted a nearer approach to it, than he has to any other of his creatures. Matter has no tendency to create. It reproduces and multiplies itself by the development of germs, but it originates nothing. Mind, in some of its operations, is an originator, though not a creator. That is, it cannot produce any thing—not a thought, idea, image, emotion—from nothing; but from

given elements it does produce what is new, and bears no resemblance to these elements. This may be illustrated by the process of perception. The object perceived is material, the sense affected is material, the perception is mental. A material table, for example, through a material medium, affects a nerve which communicates with the brain, and there, or at least thus, thought originates. As we may say, matter has been converted into mind. In the communication of our thoughts the process is reversed, and, we may say, mind is converted into matter. A thought exists in our mind, but mental action is not directly transmissible. The mind transmutes the thought into sound, a winged word is uttered, speeds on its mission, reaches the brain of the auditor in a material condition, and there, by his mind, is reconverted into the thought which originally existed in the mind of the speaker. As an additional illustration of this semi-creative faculty of the mind, we would refer to the ideas gained by Original suggestion. The idea of space is not like a body inclosed in space. Time is not like successive events—nor is the idea of cause and effect like a ball, nor the nine-pins knocked down by it.

The illustrations given are, we think, sufficient to establish the proposition, that we find in the mind of man what corresponds to the Divine attribute of Infinity. Let us proceed to the next element in the definition of God that we have adopted. "God is infinite, eternal, unchangeable." God's Eternity is a necessary inference from his infinity. An Infinite Being cannot be created, for the Creator must be greater than the creature, and therefore he must be eternal. The converse of this is equally true. A finite being cannot be eternal, and is not necessarily immortal. The mind, therefore, might be annihilated by its Creator. Yet from its resemblance to God in those attributes which imply eternity in him, we might reasonably suppose that it is immortal. And of this we are assured expressly by Revelation: "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit shall return to God who gave it."

God is Unchangeable. Is the mind unchangeable? The line of remark that we make on this topic is parallel with

that just made on the attribute of eternity. The unchangeableness of God results necessarily from his omniscience and omnipotence—in other words, from his perfection. Change implies a cause of change. An uncaused change is inconceivable. It is equally inconceivable, that for an Omnipotent and Omniscient Being, any cause for change could exist. Unchangeableness is a necessary element of our conception of perfection. A being who changes must change for the better or for the worse. The former would imply that he was not originally perfect—the latter, that he had ceased to be so. No such *a priori* necessity exists for the unchangeableness of the mind, nor is it unchangeable as God is unchangeable. But as it bears, as we have seen, a resemblance to him in those attributes which make change, with him impossible, so we may expect to find in it something, in kind, like his unchangeableness, however inferior in degree. And, in fact, the mind is less changeable than anything else on earth. Of this unchangeableness, its immortality just spoken of is a most important part. The greatest change that can come to any living being is the change of death, and to inanimate matter, annihilation. To every thing that has life, the mind excepted, it is appointed to die, and we have reason to believe that, with the exception of the human body, the great system of matter that we know is doomed to annihilation. But the mind is deathless. Nor during its stay on earth does it change as do the combining elements of inorganic matter; nor as the vegetable world changes, that rises, flowers, bears fruit, decays, and reproduces itself; nor as the bodies of animals, or even its own body, the particles of which are in a process of continual mutation. Here meets us the striking fact that it is only in consequence of the unchangeable nature of the mind, testified to by consciousness, that we possess the notion of personal identity, which is the substratum of conscience, and the justification of the final judgment.

Another attribute of God possessed by the mind, is Unity. Our God is one God, and the mind is one. It does not consist of parts. It manifests itself in various modes, and is said familiarly, to consist of judgment, memory, imagination, &c.,

but it is a unit. And it gives unity to other things that would otherwise consist of disconnected parts. This is but an extension of the idea of personal identity. We are, by virtue of the unchangeableness of the mind, the same being from the cradle to the grave; nay, throughout eternity. And thus our history is one history—our old home is our old home still, even when it has passed into the hand of strangers. The wife of our old age is the love of our youth, and our children grown and scattered over the face of the earth, are still within the mystic family circle, whose circumference ever widens, but never sunders. We see this tendency of the mind to impart in a certain sense something of its own unity to every thing with which it is connected in the process of classification. If nothing was classified, almost nothing could be known. We could not use language that could be called language—we could not reason—we could not frame a law for the government of our fellow-men, nor receive one from God for our own direction. As well could man be the physical, sentient being that he is, without senses, organs and nerves, as he could be the man that he is without classification, genera and species. And yet there is not in the universe, and there cannot be, a single actually existing genus or species. There can be no being, animal, man, father, friend, horse, tree, flower, *in general*. Each must be *particular*. Nature does not furnish a single class, and yet, as we have seen, man could hardly exist without classification. The mind does it all. Thus one itself, it creates for other things a oneness, which, though not essential to their existence, is indispensable to our correct conception of them.

We have sufficiently established, we think, the proposition, that there is a correspondence between the mind of man and the natural attributes of God, viz: Spirituality, Omnipresence, Omniscience, Omnipotence, and Unity. Let us now consider His moral attributes, viz: Holiness, justice, goodness and truth.

It is proper here to remark: 1, That while in speaking of the mind heretofore, we have had reference only to its intellectual states, we must now have reference also to man's moral characteristics; and it is not necessary, for the purpose in hand,

to embarrass ourselves by drawing distinctions between his intellectual and his moral nature, separately considered. And 2, To state before hand that, for a reason to be given hereafter, we shall find the correspondence of the mind with the moral attributes of God, less manifest than with his natural attributes already considered.

To begin with Holiness. The Holiness of God has been defined to be, "that essential rectitude, or integrity of the Divine nature, wherein he infinitely delights in his own purity, and in every thing agreeable to his will, and hath a perfect hatred and abhorrence of any thing contrary to it. God is as necessarily holy as he is necessarily God. Who shall not fear before thee, O Lord, for thou only art holy." When we read this, it seems to be a description of just what man is not. And so it indeed is, if we consider the general state of our nature. God's word declares that the heart of man is desperately wicked; impartial self-examination verifies it, and the history of the whole race exemplifies it. And yet there may be distinct traces of something different from the prevailing character; as we sometimes see clouds high up, moving in a current contrary to that of the wind on earth.

In our intellectual operations we see the traces of God in our several faculties separately considered; in our moral nature, we are to look for like traces,—principally, if not entirely, in the conscience. Into the blotted volume of our moral nature God seems to have inserted this leaf that he might write his name upon it.

As to the acknowledgment of the claims of holiness, by man, the voice of conscience is distinct. We know that we approve whatever purity of motive or action we attribute to ourselves, and that we admire it in others. The instincts of modesty, the blush upon the cheek, and the delicacies of colloquial speech, testify to the same thing. We love the innocence of childhood, and admire the purity of woman, while in our conception of God, holiness is an essential element. How frequently is the word *holy* used in the Scriptures as a characterizing epithet? They speak of God's Holy law, Holy temple, Holy day, Holy Spirit, Holy saints—and our instant perception of the fitness of

the use of this word is an instinctive answering back of our conscience to the Holiness of God.

The next attribute is Justice, and of the recognition of its claims by conscience there can be no doubt, since it forms the essential basis upon which are established all our relations with our fellow-men. This needs no illustration, and demands no further remark than this—that the principle of justice is so firmly imbedded in our nature, and so constant in its action, that we never disregard it except upon considerations personal to ourselves, and whenever we do disregard it, we are conscious that our action is characterized, not only as morally wrong, but also as indicating weakness, or insufficiency otherwise to accomplish our end. By a short step, we proceed from this judgment of conscience to the proposition, that any being whose nature precludes the idea of weakness must be just without a possible exception. This being is God, and the proposition is the corner-stone of the Divine government. This truth, distinctly announced by Revelation, is likewise taught by natural conscience, as is shown by the mythology of the Greeks and Romans, whose gods were avengers, and who recognized one terrible deity, Nemesis, whose sole function was to distribute unsparing retribution.

Let us next consider the Goodness of God. This may be defined as that attribute which prompts him to communicate happiness to his creatures. When we contemplate man's inhumanity to man, the wars which have desolated the earth, the oppression of the weak, and the general disregard of the interests opposed to our own, we may hesitate before we call man benevolent. But, when we examine the laws and institutions of society, we have unmistakable evidence that men have a general purpose to promote the good of one another. And there is one recess in which God has planted this feeling, and kept it pure, strong, disinterested and ever active, as if to be a type to which to point, in order to give man some apprehension of his own infinite love. This is in the parent's heart. The mother loves her child, not because of any benefit received or expected, but simply because she must love it by force of an irresistible and indestructible principle of human nature. And

so God bids us call him our Father, and the tenderest promise in his Book is, "and ye shall be called my sons and my daughters, saith the Almighty." On the other hand men have declared that malevolence is to be hated, by making it the essential attribute of the Devil, the enemy of God and man.

The last attribute we have to notice is Truth. Here we have to make remarks of the same kind that we made when speaking of Justice. Truth is indispensable to the social system. By the constitution of our nature, and of the nature of things, we naturally speak truth, and every departure from it proceeds from selfishness and weakness. This natural propensity to speak the truth finds in man a correspondent readiness to believe the truth. He may refuse to hear it, but if he hears it, he must believe it, though he may refuse to accept it. We may close the eye against the light, or we may refuse to walk according to it, but if the light enters the eye, it is not at our option whether we will or will not see. This proposition might be illustrated by various examples, but the simplest are afforded by primary truths. In mathematics, for instance, we cannot refuse to believe that the whole is greater than the part, that a straight line is the shortest distance between two points, that two straight lines cannot enclose space, &c. And, outside of mathematics, we must believe in the existence of an eternal world, in our own existence, in personal identity, in a certain relation between cause and effect, &c. Or, to give a more general instance, it is not possible for the human mind to accept as true the two premises of a correct syllogism, and refuse to believe the conclusion.

We have now gone over, though briefly, yet one by one, all the most important attributes, natural and moral, of God, and have found in the human mind powers corresponding in kind, though infinitely less in degree. It cannot have escaped notice, that it is with the moral attributes that the correspondence is least complete. We have, for example, whether considered as individual or as a race, more knowledge, and more power, in proportion to the scale of our being, than we have holiness and goodness. Having ascertained the facts, let us endeavor to account for them. Having seen that the mind of man is like

God, let us ask why this is so. The answer will be at once made—because God is our Creator. This is true thus far, that if man is uncreated we cannot trace his resemblance at all—if he is the offspring of chance, there is no reason why he should be like any one thing rather than another—and if he is a development from some lower grade of being, we would expect him to bear the enlarged likeness of that from which he originated—but being none of these things, but coming directly from God, we expect to find him like his Creator. But here observe, that God is equally the Creator of all matter, and, as we have seen, we would look in vain in matter for such resemblances to God as we have found in mind. Something, then, in addition to the mere fact of creation, is necessary to account for the observed likeness, and this must be the *mode* of the creation of man. This mode we can know nothing about, except by a revelation from the Creator. Let us look at the account given to us in the Bible. In the first verse of the Bible, the account of the creation in general is summarily given in these words: “In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.” When the creation of man is specially mentioned, it is in these words, verse 26, “And God said, let us make man in our image, after our likeness,” verse 27, “So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him.” So much for man without reference to the different elements of his nature, that is, body and spirit. In the next chapter, the fact of man’s creation is stated, and the *mode* of it, having distinct reference first to the body, and then to the spirit, verse 7. “And the Lord God formed man” (that is his body) “of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life,” (that is, placed in him a mind or soul; for whenever this leaves the body, and never till then, life ceases,) “and man became a living soul.” From this we see that man’s body originated, (as to its mode,) from the earth, that is matter, and therefore we would expect to find it like the earth, material—and so we do. Had man’s body been formed from anything but matter, we would be at a loss to account for its actual character. On the other hand, the mind or soul is said to have been in its mode of creation an emanation from



God, who is a pure Spirit, and therefore we would expect to find the mind spiritual, as it actually is, that is, like God, as we have seen it to be. To the attentive reader of the Bible, it is obvious that different words are used, almost always, when speaking of God as the author of our bodies, and when as author of our spirits. Our bodies, and all other material things, he is said *to create, to make, to form, to fashion, to build*; but our spirits *he gives, he breathes, he puts into us*. A verse from Isaiah well exhibits this discrimination in the use of language, Isaiah 42: 5, "Thus saith God the Lord, he that *created* the heavens and *stretched* them out, he that *spread forth* the earth, and that which cometh out of it; he that *giveth* breath unto the people upon it, and spirit to them that walk therein." So in Job 32: 8, "But there is a spirit in man, and the *inspiration* of the Almighty *giveth* them understanding." Rev. 12: 2, Speaking of the slain witnesses: "And after three days and a half, the spirit of life, from God, *entered* into them." And in Hebrews 12: 9, God is called the "*Father* of spirits." God is equally the author of our souls and of our bodies, but in a different sense, and the difference brings our souls by so much the nearer to himself. Thus the Bible account of man's creation, *and the mode of it*, gives us the reason, and the only reason that can be assigned, why our nature corresponds with that of God, and why this correspondence is found in the soul only, and not in the body also.

Here another enquiry suggests itself. Since the immaterial part of man is so much like God, why is it not more so? With any likeness at all, why is there any difference? Could we suppose antagonistic principles originally implanted in man, the contest between the two would account for it. But we have accounted for man's likeness to God from the fact, that God is his Creator, and original unlikeness to him would therefore imply that there was some part of man that God did not create, and therefore it must have been created by some other being—that is, there must have been two creators, which is absurd. Then, originally, man was entirely like God, or perfect—just the doctrine taught by Scripture. Ecc. 7: 9, "God hath made man perfect." Rejecting then, as we must,

the hypothesis that man's nature originally possessed elements opposed to God, we can account for the undeniable fact that there is much actually existing in him so opposed, by supposing that powers originally perfect have since been deteriorated and perverted. How it was possible for a being originally perfect to become imperfect, is perhaps an unsolvable problem; but the time when, and the circumstances under which, this change actually took place in man's nature, we learn with sufficient precision from the Bible. Our first parents being tempted fell, and by one man's disobedience many were made sinners. This fact in man's history we could not have known, except by Divine revelation; but once known it is perceived that it must have been so; for otherwise, facts could not be as we find them actually to be.

As has been already remarked, our intellectual faculties are much nearer perfection in proportion to the scale of our being, than are our moral faculties. We know much less than such beings would know if our minds were in a state of original perfection; but, in holiness, we are far more deficient. This further remark may be made on this point. Our intellectual faculties are weakened merely; our moral faculties are perverted. Our mind does not delight in untruth, but in truth, while our hearts are not only alienated from God, but in many things opposed to him. "The carnal mind is enmity against God." Why this difference? We find the satisfactory reason for it in the Bible account of man's fall. This fall was not an intellectual fall, but a moral one, in its nature. It was not by ignorance that sin came into the world, but by disobedience. We might therefore reasonably deduce *a priori*, from the Bible account of the fall, that the consequences of it would be, as they actually are, more observable in the moral than in the intellectual part of man's spiritual nature.

We have now gone over the ground proposed. We have shown that the natural and moral attributes of God are to be found in the mind, and that they are so found, because God is the Creator of the mind, and that in a sense different from that in which he is the Creator of the body—that these powers are in a condition inferior to that which we might expect from

their Divine origin, and especially is this true of our moral powers—and that this degeneration in both, and the difference in the degree of it between the two, is accounted for by the great fact recorded in the Bible, and only there, of man's fall by disobedience.

Thus have we endeavored to be guided by the light of God's Word, and we have seen that it makes clear some portions of the subject, upon which mere reason could not cast the faintest ray. Are we mistaken in supposing that the view taken tends to strengthen our belief in the Bible? Allow that the observed phenomena of the mind can only be explained by receiving, as true, the history given in the Bible, and nowhere else, and is the presumption a slight one, that He, who is the Creator of the mind, is the author of the Bible.

We think that some corroboration of the views taken of the correspondence of the mind of man with the Divine nature, may be drawn from three other sources, a mere mention of which is all that our space allows.

1. When Christ appeared on earth, the undivided Godhead dwelt in humanity, and exercised all its functions, without requiring any faculty additional to those of the humanity it assumed. He was in all points like unto us, sin excepted. And we are taught in Scripture that He wears our nature still in heaven, and so continueth to be God and man forever.

2. A like remark may be made of that glorified nature promised to those that are saved. The view presented of the blest, as far as it is allowed for us to know it, is of human beings with all their powers enlarged inconceivably, and all their imperfections removed absolutely.

3. When the conversion of the soul to God is spoken of in the Scriptures, no new faculty or power is said to be bestowed; but only those that exist are made alive, quickened, renewed, sanctified—and, when converted, we are expressly assured that we are partakers of the Divine nature.

## ARTICLE VI.

## THE RELIGIOUS AWAKENING OF 1858.

We congratulate our readers on the interest in religion, so marked and peculiar, which has been awakened, and is fast pervading the whole of our great country. Men in the Church and out of the Church are becoming alive to the fact that they are moral and accountable beings, that fearful responsibilities cleave to them, and that they have interests of unutterable importance which are to last in all their high and ample proportions when the things of time and of sense shall have passed away. God is shaking his Church out of its slumbers and arresting the attention of the world in a way that he has not done heretofore. He is making himself felt as the great agent in the moral world, turning back the captivity of Zion, answering the prayers of his people, fulfilling his promises to his Church, and pushing on to consummation his cherished purposes towards our lost race in a way so striking, that those who seemed scarcely to admit his existence are now forced to acknowledge his presence and power. "The Lord hath done great things for us, whereof we are glad." We cannot permit the event of the times to pass without remark.

A strange incredulity has possessed the minds of many in reference to what are usually termed Revivals of Religion. We are by no means the defenders of all that has passed current in the world under this name. Yet it is a fact clearly proved by the sacred Scriptures, and the past history of the Church, that the extension of religion has chiefly been by large gatherings at favored seasons. The history of the Church from its earliest period has been a chequered one, presenting alternations of shadow and sunshine, of depression and exaltation. It has not been an evenly flowing current. There has not always been progress; many a retrograde movement is distinctly visible. Even underneath this apparent retrogression

preparatory processes have been at work, opening the way for further advancement. Still, it is a question admitting debate, whether the prevalence of religion in the world at this moment is as extensive as it was at the death of the Apostle John. It may at least be asserted, that if Christianity were confined to a smaller territory, there are not wanting indications that its followers then were as numerous as now, their Christian activities more fully developed, and their influence through all the departments of society more distinctly felt.

There is not uniformity in God's works of grace any more than in his works of nature. We do not expect the same intensity of heat from the sun, nor the same quantity of rain from the clouds, through all the successive weeks of the year. "He shall come down like rain upon the mown grass: as showers that water the earth." At one time there will be showers of blessings, at another the heavens are restrained.

So early as the days of Enos, it is said, "then began men to call upon the name of the Lord." Whatever may be the difficulties about this passage, it certainly expresses the idea that there was a change, and a change for the better. Soon afterwards we find, of all the teeming millions of earth, only eight souls saved, when a special judgment for sin was visited upon the remainder. The calling of Abraham, and events which immediately succeeded, indicate progress. Then comes a gloom of more than four centuries, followed by a light in the hands of Moses, almost extinguished more than once in "that great and terrible wilderness," but carried safely, by Joshua, through the divided waters of Jordan, and gleaming amid the valleys and hill-tops of the land of promise. From the settlement of the Israelites in Canaan till the Babylonish captivity, is a history of varied periods, now much to rejoice in and now much to deplore. The taking away into Babylon, and the turning the captivity of Zion, were epochs the most important in the Church's history—the one, dark and dreary, when the weeping prophet poured out his lamentations in the climax of pathos—the other, a day of gladness, the Pisgah height, from whence the prophets saw and depicted in such glowing words the glory of the latter days.

Under the Christian dispensation these alternations are equally visible. Pentecost! How many teeming thoughts and tender associations does it bring to the Christian heart; what lessons does it read to the Church, a seal of the Faithful Witness, an earnest of the Millennium, a stimulus to effort, an encouragement to faith, and a loud call to united prayer! We have not the *data* for ascertaining precisely the numerical strength of the Church in the primitive times. The addition of thousands on a single day is more than once mentioned in the inspired history. The unwearied zeal of the apostles and their co-laborers, and the cheerful sacrifices of all the faithful in promoting the common cause, are every where brought to the surface in the New Testament. The Gospel was fully preached in every province of the Roman Empire, and churches were planted throughout Asia Minor, and the islands and shores of the Mediterranean, embracing the whole world of learning, arts and commerce. The fiercest persecutions served only to diffuse it more rapidly. Tertullian truly said, *Semen est sanguis Christianorum*. The same father said, (at the first of the third century,) "if Christians were disposed to revenge themselves their numbers are ample, for they prevail not in this or that province only, but in all parts of the world. If they were to combine and forsake the Roman Empire, how great would be the loss. You would be amazed at the solitude that would follow." Pliny complains, that this superstition, as he calls it, had not only overrun the cities in the East, but had penetrated into all parts of the country, that the temples were deserted, and the victims for sacrifice were not bought in the markets. Porphyry attributes the prevalence of disease at Rome to the great numbers of Christians; "for, says he, "since Jesus began to be worshipped, no man has received any public help or benefit from the gods." It is at least a noticeable fact, that the increase of the Church in the first centuries was not gradual, but sudden. That period is remarkable for the simultaneous accession of great multitudes.

The favor of the Church's head so largely dispensed in times of trial was withdrawn when she was taken under the shadow of imperial patronage. Then Satan was permitted to execute

his master-device, and Anti-Christ reigned, drunk with the blood of the saints. The witnesses were slain and scarce a remnant of the wilted fruits of Pentecost was discernible. But even in the night of the Dark Ages, great preparatory processes were being wrought by Him "whose way is in the sea." God had not even then forgotten to be gracious. At the beginning of the fourteenth century, Bohemia reckoned its eighty thousand who had not bowed the knee to the image of Baal. Wickliffe, "the morning star of the reformation," unsealed the Bible in England. In the next century Huss and Jerome went to the stake as witnesses to the truth, and the fires, lighted by their martyrdom, burned on till Luther stepped upon the stage and inaugurated—THE REFORMATION.

It is true that there was mingled with true religion, in the great convulsion of the sixteenth century, much that was merely political, but it is wholly misunderstood when we fail to regard it as a spiritual movement, deep and wide-spread, in which many thousands were added to the Church, of such as shall be saved. Copious effusions of the Spirit, convincing and converting souls, were experienced. The Reformation was another thing altogether than a mere protest against the corruptions of Rome. Luther did more than preach against indulgences and expose the looseness of priests and nuns. Calvin had other work than to defend the Divine decrees. The correspondence of these two Reformers show that much of their time was taken up in directing the inquiring, consoling the tempted, and doing precisely the labor which now devolves upon a minister in a season of revival, and much of their published writings was intended for this purpose. They, with their compeers, felt themselves employed in the work of God, recognized the presence and life-giving power of the Spirit, and put forth their efforts to bring the truth to bear upon the hearts of men, in simple dependence upon this heavenly agent. It was as a spiritual and not a political movement that the Reformation was, in spite of rack and fagot, firmly established within less than forty years after its beginning, in Germany, France, Switzerland, Holland and the British Isles. It was essentially and pre-eminently an outpouring of the Spirit, by which converts

to the truth were multiplied as the dew of the morning, and popery was smitten with a paralysis from which it has never recovered.

Passing over many things which invite remark, we come to the first of the eighteenth century, when evangelical piety seemed to have sunk to its lowest point. Moderatism was rife in the Kirk of Scotland, and laxity in doctrine and practice prevailed to an alarming extent in the established Church of England, and among the Dissenters there. The spirit which animated the Scottish Covenanters, and the English Non-conformists of a former day, seemed well nigh extinct. A writer of the time refers to family prayer as a custom entirely neglected by men of any business or station. Lady Mary Wortley wrote, in 1710, that "there were more atheists among the fine ladies than among the lowest sort of rakes." Ignorance and drunkenness were the predominant qualities of the working classes in England; licentiousness and infidelity of the higher. Bishop Butler wrote, in 1736, "It is come, I know not how, to be taken for granted by many persons, that Christianity is not so much as a subject of inquiry; but that it is now at length discovered to be fictitious. And, accordingly, they treat it as if in the present age this was an agreed point among all people of discernment, and nothing remained but to set it up as a principal subject of mirth and ridicule, as it were by way of reprisals for its having so long interrupted the pleasures of the world." About the same time Montesquieu protested that the "English had no religion at all; that he had not enough for his own countrymen, but too much for the upper strata of English society." Bishop Burnet said of the great body of the clergy, that "they were unacquainted with the Bible, and did not even know the Church Catechism." Their fox hunting and card playing, and other conformities to the world, are remarked by all writers of the times, and even as late as 1780, Cowper, who was surely not censorious, said,

Except a few with Eli's spirit blest,  
Hophni and Phineas describe the rest.

In the American Colonies irreligion, for obvious reasons, was



not so general or so extreme in its manifestations; yet, the Puritanism so prominent in the first settlers had in great measure declined, and the daughter was closely copying after the mother.

And who could have thought that this was but the dark hour before the dawn! God was now raising up Whitfield and the Wesleys in England, and Edwards and the Tennents in America, to do a great work for the Church. Through their labors vast numbers of formalists and hypocrites in the Church, and careless hardened men in the world, were brought to newness of life. President Edwards says of Northampton, "so far as I, by looking back, can judge, this work appears to me to have been at the rate at least of four persons in a day, or near thirty in a week, take one with another, for five or six weeks together. If I may be allowed to declare anything that appears to me probable in a thing of this nature, I hope that more than three hundred souls were savingly brought home to Christ in this town in the space of half a year, (how many more I don't guess,) and about the same number of males and females." Whitfield says of his labors at the Tabernacle, "Three hundred and fifty awakened souls were received in one day, and I believe the number of notes (from inquirers) exceeded a thousand." Of his preaching in Philadelphia, Dr. Franklin, who certainly cherished no prejudices in favor of evangelical truth, bore this remarkable testimony: "It was wonderful to see the change soon made in the manners of our inhabitants. From being thoughtless and indifferent about religion, it seemed as if all the world was growing religious; so that one could not walk through the town in an evening without hearing psalms sung in different families in every street."

God, by the efforts of these men, gave an impetus to the cause of evangelical religion, both in Britain and America, which is felt till the present day. Especially has our country been blessed with many and precious "times of refreshing," two of which have been general, one about the close of the last century, and the other in 1830, in all of which large numbers have been hopefully converted.

The fact brought distinctly before us by the above summary

is, that God's mode of advancing the prosperity of his Church is not by gradual accretions, but by the addition of vast multitudes at once, and copious outpourings of his grace upon extensive districts of country. In the same way it is again and again declared in prophecy, that the latter day glory will be brought about. There are reasons for this way of dealing, some at least of which we can readily perceive, but on the discussion of which we cannot now enter.

We proceed to speak of the great awakening so generally diffused through our country. This movement differs in some respects from most of the previous revivals which the Church has experienced, not that it is the work of "another spirit," but only a different administration of the *same* Spirit. Let us attempt to bring out its distinguishing features.

1. Its extent is not the least remarkable of its characteristics. It is not Northern, nor Southern, Eastern nor Western; it is not metropolitan nor rural, but the Spirit has been poured out upon all our country in every part of it. Even where there are no ingatherings to the Church, the attention directed to religion, the more fervid prayers, and more intense longings for the prosperity of Zion, show that God's work is being revived. From St. Paul's to the Florida Reefs, from the lumber regions of Maine to the golden shores of the Pacific, from the crowded city marts to obscure nooks in the country, the movement has been felt. The literary institutions, both male and female, with their thousands of precious youths, who are to constitute the society, and give tone to the public opinion of coming years, have shared in the work. Crews of ships far out on the great waters have been strangely blessed. Clerks in stores, apprentices and journeymen in workshops and printing offices, slaves on the plantations of our Southern States, dignified legislative bodies, and persons of all ages, classes and callings, have felt the heavenly impulse. President Edwards often speaks of the work in which he was concerned as experienced through the whole country, but our country now is greatly different both in population and extent of territory from what it was then. And yet it would be scarcely an exaggeration to say of the America that now is, what he said of Northampton

more than a hundred years ago, "the whole town is alive and full of God;" or what Harlan Page said of New York in 1831: "The Lord appears now to be coming down upon this great city to arouse his children and to awaken sinners. Thousands of Christians here are, I think, praying as they never prayed before. Conversions are occurring in all parts of the city. Churches are daily crowded to overflowing, and a most fixed and solemn attention is given to the dispensation of the truth."

2. It is clearly and confessedly the work of the Divine Spirit. It was not gotten up by "revival preachers;" it was not brought about by any one man or class of men. It is not the result of protracted meetings, or pre-concerted measures. It is in no sense factitious. There were preparatory processes distinctly visible. The commercial panic, the efforts of the Young Men's Christian Associations, the ordinary labors of the ministry, the activities of private Christians, and other things, have place as instrumentalities, but as efficient causes they are not so much as to be named. The solemnity visible in the prayer meetings, the outward reformation of many, and the actual conversion of others, show it to be no counterfeit, but "the Lord's doing."

3. The order and quiet which has marked this revival is constantly spoken of in newspapers and in private circles, and distinguishes it from all the previous works of grace. The extravagances of manner and spirit, the animal excitement, the ebullitions of zeal without knowledge, which have been so prominent in previous awakenings, are scarcely discernible in this. The almost entire absence of these things has stopped the mouths of adversaries, and left us no occasion to discuss the question, how much of these may consist with the genuine workings of grace.

4. The absence of sectarian feeling is another pleasing feature. Christians have laid aside the shibboleth of party, and both ministers and laymen have associated themselves as brethren of one household, servants of a common master, and converged their energies, as they never did before, to the one business of saving souls. The elder brother, who would not go

in when he heard the music and dancing in behalf of the returned prodigal, has not yet made his appearance. The spirit which would call down fire from heaven upon those who followed not with us, may not yet be extinct, but has certainly been kept in the back ground in this revival. Never have the evangelical denominations of our country acted together so generally, and so harmoniously, as in the present work.

5. The respect shown to it by the world is a noteworthy characteristic, and has often been mentioned. The readiness of worldly men to lend their aid in furnishing facilities for promoting it, could be illustrated by numerous instances. The disposition of men to leave their stores, their offices and workshops, at the very busiest hour of the day, to attend upon a prayer-meeting, is something new among our enterprising and money-loving people. In all places, public or private, where people are brought in contact with each other, we hear it spoken of, and that respectfully. The secular press, with a unanimity that is unparalleled, speak kindly of it, and devote large space to detailing the facts connected with it. When it is remembered that the newspapers, more than any thing else, exhibit the public opinion of our country, and do it more fully here than in any other land, we cannot fail to remark, in this sign of the times, an omen for good.

6. The absence of opposition, though intimately connected with what we have just said, deserves to be singled out for specific mention. "These men are full of new wine," was the language in which a thoughtless world greeted the apostles, when endowed with the miraculous gifts of the Spirit. The Accuser of the brethren let loose a thousand tongues of slander upon Luther and his compeers. Whitfield was not only opposed by lewd fellows of the baser sort, who sought to disturb his meetings, but the Seceders of Scotland, the great body of the English Church, both Established and Dissenting, and a large portion of the Presbyterians of America, placed themselves in the front rank of opposition to his labors. They gibbeted him in the public prints, denounced him in ecclesiastical judicatories, shut him out of their Churches, and did all manner of evil against him. But we have fallen upon other

times. We have no Jannes and Jambres among us. In a way most marvellous, and which we can explain, only by a reference to the direct putting forth of Divine restraints upon the minds of men, all opposition is hushed. The few attempts to disparage it which have been made are positively too contemptible for notice.

7. We have reserved for the last what we regard as the most noteworthy feature of this revival—the prominence given to social prayer. The words of Zechariah are literally verified: “Thus saith the Lord of Hosts, It shall yet come to pass that there shall come people, and the inhabitants of many cities. And the inhabitants of one city shall go to another, saying, Let us go speedily to pray before the Lord, and to seek the Lord of hosts; I will go also. Yea, many people and strong nations shall come to seek the Lord of Hosts in Jerusalem, and to pray before the Lord. Zech. 8: 20–22. Leaving their business or pleasures in the week day and assembling together, not to hear some great man preach, or witness some pompous ceremony, but for the simple purpose of looking into each other’s faces for sympathy, and then pouring out their hearts together around the throne of grace. It is not surprising that Christians should pray, and pray in concert, but it is a wonder that these simple services should be attended upon so eagerly by such vast numbers of worldly men, who seem so intensely interested, and all this, not the novelty of a passing hour, but persevered in for months without any abatement, but rather perceptible increase. Concerted prayer, as an ordinance of God’s house, has not occupied heretofore that place in the Church, nor in the estimation of Christian people, which the Bible assigns it, and which God intended it should have. It is no where, from Genesis to Revelation, subordinated to the ministry of the Word. Were the scenes of Pentecost attributable to Peter’s preaching? This was an important link in the chain, but we must follow it back to that “upper room,” where the apostles, with the women, continued with one accord in prayer and supplication—**THE MODEL PRAYER-MEETING.** A full discussion of this part of the subject would take more space than we can here devote to it, and we dismiss it now with

the single assertion, that the great lesson to the churches, by this revival, is **THE IMPORTANCE AND POWER OF SOCIAL PRAYER**, which we earnestly hope the whole of Christendom will have the grace to read and understand.

We do believe, and think we can show, good grounds for cherishing the conviction that, at least in these United States, we are prepared for a state of things in reference to religion, of which the present awakening, wonderful as it has been, is only as the twilight to meridian brightness. We rejoice greatly in what has been done, but much more do we rejoice in the yet greater things which we fondly hope are about to be done. It seems to us that we can see good reasons why the progress of the Church, in former periods, should have been slow; why, after being greatly exalted, she should be let alone to sink into indifference and worldliness; why she should be subjected to the fiercest persecutions; why the combined forces of earth and hell should be permitted to do their utmost against her. But these reasons do not appear to exist now and here. In what furnace are her powers of endurance yet to be tested; what voice of slander has she not outlived; what form of error has she yet to confront; what phase of infidelity has yet to be abashed before her rebukes? She has fought her great battles and gained the victory in every field, and against every foe; and why should she not now have her promised triumph? There is not, at this day, in any part of the Christian world, a controversy which awakens general interest. The doctrines of grace—the leading principles of evangelical truth—are too firmly established throughout Christendom ever to be overthrown. Their diffusion may be hindered, but cannot again be endangered, and we dismiss every fear in reference to their ultimate triumph, as the suggestion of the Evil One. There are no perversions of the faith upheld with zeal and ability. Corrupt forms of Christianity are dwindling and fast losing their influence in all parts of our country. The asperities of sect are wearing away, and the different denominations no longer regard themselves as pitted against each other, but rather as separate battalions under one leader and commander. There is now more concerted action, and more

harmonious feeling, among evangelical Christians of different names, than there ever has been; not that they are giving up their denominational distinctions, but they are renouncing exclusiveness and bigotry, and that is all we care for. If we look into the political and social condition of our country we can find nothing like it in the past. The attention of the public is not absorbed with any political or social question, as it often has been in previous years. It is strangely true that men cannot be interested in any thing else than in things that concern them as moral and accountable beings. When all these things are viewed, in connection with God's oft-declared purpose to convert the world, we cannot fail to regard them as indications that "the time to favor Zion—yea, the set time—has come."

Our soul glows with the thought, that the Head of the Church designs to make this country a prominent instrument in bringing forward the latter-day glory. It was the bold utterance of a far-seeing man,\* more than an hundred years ago: God has already put that honor upon the other continent, that Christ was born there literally, and there made the purchase of redemption; so as Providence observes a kind of equal distribution of things, it is not unlikely that the great spiritual birth of Christ, and the most glorious application of redemption, is to begin in this. If he could see our country as it now exists, and contemplate its relations to the other governments of the earth, how greatly would this conjecture be strengthened. Our geographical position, our rapidly increasing population, our extent of territory, our plentiful harvests, our growing commerce, our enterprising people, our free government, our common language, our educational facilities, our noble charities, our churches enjoying the protection, but untrammelled by alliance with the State, the general diffusion of the means of grace, our Missionary operations, our past history, where the hand of a benignant Providence is so often and so distinctly visible—all these mark us out for great things, for a prominent place in the future of the world's history.

---

\* Edwards.

We suppose that our wisest statesmen have not yet caught a glimpse of the bright destiny which awaits us as a Christian nation. What God intends to do with the effete and rotten despotisms of the East, or with the unsteady and Gospel-hating monarchies of Europe, we pretend not to say, only that he will overturn, and overturn, and overturn, until they are prepared for the truth. But the revolutions, both ecclesiastical and civil, which will have to be gone through there, will not be needed here. In these respects our United States are ready. The machinery is in working order. It only remains that the motive power be applied; that the Spirit of Life and Power animate every part, and fill to the uttermost every capacity; that the energies of the Church be developed; that every one, from the minister to the lowliest slave, in his own sphere and place, obey the command of the great householder, "go work to-day in my vineyard." We do not need another Gospel; we do not need a Spirit of more grace, or tenderness, or energy; nor do we need motives to action more numerous or more urgent. We only need that this Gospel be received more fully by God's people; that the Church be moulded more entirely by it; that they walk in this light, and go forth with cheerful hearts, and ready hands, to the work which it assigns them. We only need more copious effusions of the same Spirit, a more wide-spread and permanent conviction of his personality and power, and more importunate pleading for his presence and influence. We only need that the motives furnished be felt; that our souls be opened fully to their influence; that they permeate our whole natures, energizing every faculty, and making each person, in the station where Providence has placed him, a burning and shining light. We do not need other ecclesiastical organizations, but that the powers of God's Church, purchased by his own blood, be brought into full exercise; that they be directed and converged, with the full tension of their capabilities, to the sole work of glorifying God in the conversion of souls, and the up-building of Zion's walls. The world has yet to learn what momentous results can be brought about by the "prayers and pains" of a single man. The moral force of which even one individual is capable, whose



heart is fired with love to the Saviour, and all whose energies are concentrated at all times, with singleness of purpose, to the one thing of doing the will, and promoting the glory of the Saviour, is an experiment we verily believe yet to be tried. If Paul be an exception, he is the only one which the history of the past affords. While his example deserves to be studied and followed, it remains to be seen how nearly it may be copied by those who are furnished only with the ordinary operations of the Spirit, but who certainly enjoy brighter light, and live in more propitious times. If we have yet to learn what even one man can effect, how can we even conceive of the results to be produced by the concerted movements and combined forces of the whole Church—by the millions of loyal hearts and ready hands throughout Christendom, or even in our own country! When God made the natural world, he made it out of nothing, but when he comes to build the walls of Jerusalem, he finds the material furnished and workmen ready for the labor—materials which he has furnished, and workmen whom he has made ready by his power and grace. We repeat it, then, and we do it with emphasis, that what the Church now needs, is simply *a fuller development of the energies which she now has in possession*. Let this be realized or approximated, (as it is now being approximated,) and Zion shall have put on her strength; the rebuke of God's people shall be taken away from off all the earth; the glorious things spoken of the city of the living God will be speedily realized; her intended influence upon those without will be fully exerted; God's Kingdom will come, and the whole world be filled with his glory.

We are fully persuaded that, under the application of the forces which the Church now has, (always including in our idea of the Church, not only ordinances of Christ's appointment, but also the presence of the life-giving Spirit,) many impediments to the progress of the Gospel, which now seem mountains, will dwindle into mole-hills, and many things which we now deplore in the Church itself, will slough off and be seen no more. The wise physician expends his skill and medicine upon the seat of the disease, and does not assail merely out-

ward manifestation. This latter, though inconvenient, or even painful to the patient, will, he knows, in due time disappear, if the source from whence it comes be dried up. Let the minister beware lest he spend his strength in vain, who directs his energies to excrescences—who does only the surface work. It is the truth that makes free, and the grand work of the minister is to hold forth the Word of life. "By manifestations of the truth, commending ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God." He may be called to rebuke and to expose corruption, but this is by no manner of means his chief office; he is to bring the truth in its native force, and life, and simplicity, in direct contact with the hearts of men. Let this great work of his ministry be done with earnest and believing zeal by every ambassador of Christ! And let the many and pressing motives resting upon all of God's people everywhere, and at all times, to make personal and unceasing efforts for the salvation of souls, be clearly and fully set before them! By the grace of God they cannot fail to respond, in yet greater diligence and activity, than they have ever put forth.

What God is able to do, and intends to do for the world through the Church, is a thought which deserves to be carefully pondered at this juncture. Think of the arm that is full of power; able to accomplish all His purposes, and to fulfil all His promises, even able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we are able to ask or think; of the boundless stores of grace treasured up in Christ; the efficacy of his blood; the power of his Spirit; his absolute dominion over ALL THINGS! In estimating what God can do, or will do, we have a more sure guide than the record of what he has done. With the light of inspired prophecy, we can look with open prospect into the future of the Church's history. It is not like the past, stained with the blood of martyrs, groaning under the iron wheel of power, overgrown with the rank weeds of heresy, and weighed down under a load of hypocrisy and formality in her own bosom. Our eyes open upon other scenes in looking to the future. We see Zion rising from the dust and putting on her beautiful garments; all organizations of error and superstition swept away, and all false doctrines exploded and re-

nounced; the voice of strife brought low, and God's people having one heart and way, that they may fear him forever. We see kings, and all in authority, bringing their glory and exerting all their influence in favor of pure religion; all nations acknowledging the divinity of the Gospel, and imbibing and rejoicing in its truths; converts gathered "in flocks, as clouds and as doves to their windows." We see all her reproach taken away, the days of her mourning ended, and all worldly interests vying with each other in heaping honors upon her. We see commerce, wealth, station, learning and science, pouring their varied tributes into her lap. We see her people "all righteous," piety pervading and controlling all secular business, and the common utensils of life dedicated to holy purposes. We see the fetters of ignorance broken from the lowliest, and knowledge increased in the earth. We behold types of Christian character differing greatly from what is now common, the child shall die an hundred years old, the feeble shall be as David, and a little one shall become a thousand. We see the river of grace widening and deepening, salvation running down our streets, waters to swim in, a river that cannot be passed over. We see the earth becoming abundantly fruitful, and multitudes of the sore calamities which prevailed taken away, and a universal blessing of God upon the whole world of mankind through the Church—upon their bodies and souls, upon their temporal and spiritual interests; and God shall rejoice over them, as a bridegroom rejoiceth over his bride. We hear songs from the utmost ends of the earth, even glory to the righteous; yea, more, a great voice of much people in heaven, as it were the voice of a great multitude, and as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of mighty thunderings, saying, Alleluia; for the Lord God Omnipotent reigneth. But we cannot depict a hundredth part of what prophecy unfolds to the eye of faith. Let him that readeth, understand! Let these things be studied more and more, be engraven upon the hearts of God's people, and stand forth as certainties towards which their efforts and prayers should be directed! Our hope reposes upon two immutable things, the Word and oath of the Living God. "*As truly as I live, all the earth shall be filled*

*with the glory of the Lord.*" Hath he spoken, and shall he not make it good?

It is too early to sum up the results of a work which is yet in its incipiency, nay, they cannot be fully reached on earth, but will doubtless furnish mines of research, to be fully explored in the heavenly state. Still, much has been done, and much more is in process of being done, which can be easily noted. Thousands of souls have already been converted to God—saved from hell and made to taste the joys of redeeming love. And if there had only been so much as one, it would have over-paid a million-fold the thought, and effort, and time, which have been expended in this revival. Thousands more of worldly, unconverted men, have been impressed with the thought, as they never were before, that there is a reality in the religion of the Bible, and this impression may, in many cases, ripen into deep conviction and ultimate conversion. Hypocrites are seeing the sandy basis of their hopes, and are seeking the sure foundation. The large numbers of young men brought into the Church, and the outpouring of the Spirit upon nearly all the Colleges of our land, is a noticeable feature in the great work; and Providence would seem plainly to design crowding our Theological Seminaries so as to meet the loud and earnest calls for more ministers, with which all the churches have been resounding for years past. God has a great harvest, and he is now sending forth the laborers to gather it. Many a drowsy minister has already been shaken out of his sloth and worldliness; and the sinking hearts and flagging energies of others, complaining, "Lord, who hath believed our report," have been revived, fresh ardor lighted up within them, and their efficiency increased an hundred fold. Every pastor has, without doubt, felt and mourned over it as one of the chief obstacles to the progress of the Gospel, that his labors were not seconded by the prayers and efforts of his own people. For the want of this co-operation on their part, much of what he does is as water spilled upon the ground, and much more of what he might do is left undone. The inconsistencies and faithlessness of professors, and the backwardness of those who are true Christians to come up to the measure of their duty,

have ever stood as huge impediments in the way of the Church's progress. This hindrance is now being taken out of the way. The soldiers of the Cross are rallying to the banner of the Captain of Salvation. Christians are showing themselves *live* men and *working* men. God's people are being quickened, and their energies developed, after a manner hitherto unexampled; opportunities of usefulness are being improved, which were formerly left to slip by disregarded; effort is being pushed forth to the highways and hedges; places are now found accessible to Christian labor, which were thought barred against entrance. An impetus has been given to the missionary work, both domestic and foreign, which it particularly needed, and the fruits of which will be gathered after many days. Bigotry, sloth, worldliness, and all forms of selfishness in the Church, have received a rebuke, from which, we pray God, they may never recover.

All these are things in which the finger of God must be seen, and for which God must be thanked by every Christian heart! Let us rejoice in them, every one! Let our mouth be filled with laughter, and our tongue with singing! For what has been done, let us thank God and take courage!

And yet, we rejoice not so much in this as in the state of preparation in which the Church is manifestly being placed, for accomplishing a thousand-fold more than has yet been effected. The unrepealed command of her ascending Lord is, "go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature." She dare not slacken her energies nor restrain her prayers, while so much as one of our race, however insignificant or distant, remains unsaved. She is now being brought to see her duty, to understand her mission, to feel her responsibility, and to concentrate her energies upon her proper work.

Here is a vision for the eye of faith. Behold a white cloud, and upon the cloud one like unto the Son of Man, having upon his head a golden crown, and in his hand a sharp sickle, and a voice comes to him, "*Thrust in thy sickle and reap, for the time is come for thee to reap, for the harvest of the earth is ripe.*"

## ARTICLE VII.

## THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF 1858.

The meeting of the highest judicatory of our American Presbyterian Church is worthy of being chronicled in our Theological journals, for the purpose of impressing its lessons more deeply on their readers, and adding haply to the perpetuation of its history.

The Assembly convened in the First Presbyterian Church, (of which the Rev. B. M. Palmer, D. D., is pastor,) in the city of New Orleans, on the 6th of May, 1858, and was opened with a sermon by the Rev. Cortland Van Rensselaer, D. D., the Moderator of the last Assembly. It met under favorable auspices. For months, almost throughout its entire extent, the Church had been visited, if not with the most unexampled, yet with unusual influences of the Divine Spirit, and these seemed in a measure to accompany the delegates as they journeyed on towards the place of their convocation. Wherever they met together in controlling numbers, on the steamboats of the Mississippi and the Alabama, they still engaged in those religious services in which they had been occupied for so many weeks at home,—to their own great enjoyment, and the manifest good of others. It is a pleasant reminiscence, for example, to that band, near a hundred in number, who passed down the Mississippi,—this year, asserting, by its overflowing floods, its right to the name “Father of Waters,”—that they enjoyed on the steamer *City of Memphis*, unusual religious services; that, by an arrangement with the Captain, remunerating him by a payment of \$500 for his loss of time and the increased expenses of his trip, they lay by over the Sabbath at Lake Providence, celebrating the Lord’s Supper with the little Church there, and inviting them to their own worship on board the steamer in the evening. Well might they “record,” as they did, with pro-

found gratitude to Divine Providence, the fact, that their voyage "has been one of unusual interest and agreeableness, and that all its incidents tend to awaken gratitude to God, pleasant memories of their Captain and his adjutants, and the sweetest recollections of one another, and of the delightful fellowship, religious and social, which they had enjoyed."

Great was the surprise of the Committee of Arrangements, who, bent on their hospitable errand, boarded the boat as it came into port at New Orleans, to find no one except the boat-hands on deck, a surprise pleasantly explained, when they found the passengers engaged in their last religious service below. That they came together in a state of mind so religious and tender, may, in part, account for the unusual harmony and enjoyment of so large a body of men, most of whom were strangers to each other.

OPENING SERMON.

The Moderator's sermon, from 2d Cor. 13: 11, "Be of one mind; live in peace; and the God of love and peace shall be with you," and his subject, "Unity, Peace, and Blessedness;" "first unity, then peace, then blessedness," were well suited to heighten these feelings. Deeply touching was his allusion to the dead of the last eventful year:

"Fathers, and Brethren of the General Assembly, I claim your indulgence before closing this discourse, while I appeal, in behalf of unity and peace, in the name of the faithful dead in Jesus Christ, who have gone to sleep since our meeting last year in Lexington. They have done with all the labors, strifes, temptations, cares of earth. They have gone up to 'the General Assembly and Church of the first-born, whose names are written in Heaven.' The venerable form of Father Moody, saint-like and lamb-like, will never more bless his brethren among the springs of Pennsylvania. Auld, of Florida, gifted in mind and heart, and abundant in missionary labors, even to the overburdening of a frail frame; his body shall yet be full of vigor, and his crown wear the evergreen of Heaven. Shannon, of Ohio, earnest in life, was no less earnest to depart and to dwell beside the river that makes glad the city of our

God. Finley, of Alabama, logical, candid, open-hearted, was wasted by disease, until his noble intellect became impaired; but he recovered his reason in the very hour before his final departure, and soared away into fullness of light. Edmunds, of New Jersey, youthfully energetic, with all the clothing of aged humility, went away in the vigor of years into the land where work is no more toil. Dear Daniel Baker, of the Lone Star State, with his tongue of truth and heart of flame, shall no more preach Jesus on earth, either in the new or in the 'blessed old States;' but hundreds of stars shall flash the light of Christ's glory from his crown of rejoicing. Deruelle was struck down by the visitation of God in the woods of North Carolina, like a towering pine riven by a thunder-bolt. Wylie, of Tennessee, was wrapped away from these scenes of darkness in the holy mystery of a sorrowful and unsearchable Providence. Brown, descended from that noble spiritual ancestry of Virginia, which is loftier than the boast of worldly genealogy, has gone to the fellowship of 'the first-born of every creature.'

On Ganges' banks, 'where every prospect pleases, and only man is vile,' behold a company of beloved missionaries awaiting death with meek and undaunted spirit, before the double threatenings of Brahma's vengence, and the false prophet's curse. The serene dignity of the disciples of the Lord in the hour of danger, exacts, as with the authority of their king, forbearance from the wonted personal indignities. The last prayer is offered from submissive and exultant hearts, and, incense-like, it is wafted to heaven, while the dark smoke of murderous musketry palls the dead bodies of Freeman, and Campbell, and McMullin, and Johnson. Blessed followers of the martyred Stephen! Before ye 'fell asleep,' saw ye not 'the heavens opened, and the Son of man standing at the right hand of God?'

All these ministers of the Church, with a score of others, not less faithful, who have died during the year, and whose memorials will survive the scrolling up of time, admonish all of us, who remain, of our duty and our doom—of the Divine contingencies, which, in another year, may make as strange se-



lections of death—unexpected always to the living, but, by God's grace, made welcome to the dying.

Fathers and brethren! Know we not, that these departed servants of Christ, could they return to earth, would 'seek peace and pursue it?' Oh! how the visions of heaven nurture unity and love! Soon our own earthly labors will end, and we be laid in the grave, with guarded repose, until the resurrection. For us, pastoral relations, church sessions, presbyteries, synods, and general assemblies, will very soon be no more. In the name of mortals ready to be transfigured into immortality, in the name of the spirits of just men made perfect, in the name of the Mediator of the new covenant, the Lord of all, 'whose blood speaks better things than the blood of Abel,' I beseech you to be united in the truth, and to love one another. 'Be of one mind, live in peace, and the God of love and peace shall be with you.'"

ELECTION OF MODERATOR AND ATTENDANCE.

The Assembly was organized, and proceeded to the election of a Moderator. Dr. William A. Scott, of California, receiving 106 votes; Dr. George Howe, of South Carolina, 58 votes; and Dr. R. L. Stanton, of Ohio, 38 votes. Dr. Scott was declared elected, and, with a few appropriate remarks, entered upon the duties of his office. The Rev. D. X. Junkin, D. D., L. J. Halsey, D. D., and Revs. E. E. Seelye and E. Emerson, were nominated for the office of Temporary Clerk. The vote resulted in the election of Rev. Dr. Junkin to this office.

Two new Synods were reported by the Stated Clerk as having been organized during the year—the Synods of Upper Mississippi and Southern Iowa; and two Presbyteries—the Presbyteries of Highland and of Platte; making the whole number of Synods 33, and of Presbyteries 157. All the Synods were represented in this Assembly, and all the Presbyteries except 23—of these, 5 are in foreign countries, and 3 on the Pacific coast. The representation in the Assembly was general from all parts of the United States, consisting of 149 ministers and 99 elders—248 in all. The number of ministerial delegates was only one less than last year. The elders did not

equal in numbers the eldership of last year by 29 names. Yet, it was especially gratifying that so large a convocation should have assembled at so distant a point, and at a place respecting which there were some wholly unfounded fears as to its insalubrious climate at that season, notwithstanding the abundant testimony to the contrary. To this point, the brethren of the Assembly gathered from all parts of the Union, from New Hampshire, Wisconsin and California, as well as from the nearer Southern States, and it was a matter of interest that they were presided over by the distinguished brother from San Francisco, most of whose life has been spent in frontier cities, who, at home, looks upon Asia across the Pacific, who had travelled more than 5,000 miles to reach the place of meeting, and who was called upon to occupy the Moderator's chair, in the city and church of his former residence and labors,—a source of gratification doubtless to himself, and to the people of his former charge.

#### HONORARY TITLES.

On motion of Dr. R. J. Breckinridge, it was resolved, that no other titles except those of "minister and elder" should be used in the Minutes of this Assembly, a motion which also prevailed in the Assembly of 1854, at the suggestion of the same gentleman. Some discussion was afterwards had as to the question, whether the rule of the House in regard to titles is applicable to persons nominated for Directors of Theological Seminaries; and it seemed to be generally conceded, although no vote was taken, that it was, and that these persons be denuded of their titles on the Minutes of the Assembly.

#### PLACE OF NEXT MEETING.

Rev. Dr. McKinney nominated Pittsburg for the next meeting of the General Assembly; Rev. S. C. Logan, in behalf of the Seventh Presbyterian Church, of Cincinnati, nominated the latter city. Rev. David Stevenson nominated the Third Church, of Indianapolis; Rev. Dr. McIlvaine nominated Rochester, N. Y. An animated and good humored discussion arose between the advocates of these several cities, exhibiting

considerable skill and agility in "parry and thrust," on the part of these several gentlemen. Pittsburg was a great city, the seat of Presbyterianism of old time, by the side of an important Theological School, and if it was "smoky," as alleged, the smoke was a sign of superior enterprise and industry, and showed it to be the very place for the meeting of a working church, and was eminently healthy. Cincinnati was a greater city, the queen city of the West, exceedingly central, accessible by multitudinous railroads, able to accommodate, and free from smoke. The advocate for Indianapolis contended, that this city was still more free from smoke, was far more central even than Cincinnati, that railroads from every place centered there, that it was a beautiful little city and of great hospitality, that the members of the Assembly could be accommodated near the church, that this venerable body had already sat twice in Cincinnati, and that it would greatly advance the cause of Presbyterianism if it should next hold its sessions there. This brief tournament was soon finished, and whether from the ability and valor of the last combatant, or for the weightier reason that its meeting might now be justly claimed by that region of the Church, the Assembly resolved to hold its next annual sessions at Indianapolis—the vote being for Indianapolis, 142; for Cincinnati, 24; for Rochester, 22; for Pittsburg, 21.

#### FUND FOR DISABLED MINISTERS.

The Report of the Trustees, as to the "Fund for Disabled Ministers in need, and the needy Widows and Orphans of deceased Ministers," was referred to the Committee on Systematic Benevolence. The Report states, that from May 1, 1857, to May 1, 1858, relief had been granted to 8 ministers, 20 widows, and two families of orphans. The disbursements have been \$2,750, being rather more than \$90 to each person. Though many churches neglect giving to this charity, the receipts have been as large as in former years. At a subsequent period the following resolutions were presented by Dr. Junkin, Chairman of the Committee on Systematic Benevolence, and unanimously adopted: 1. "Resolved, That this General Assembly most earnestly requests the Presbyteries and

Church Sessions to see to it, that in every church a collection be made, every year, for this fund, and forwarded to the Treasurer of the General Assembly, at Philadelphia. 2. Resolved, That every minister in our connection be requested to present this cause to his charge at least once a year, and ask for the gifts of the people in aid of the fund."

This is a charity which ought to receive more largely than it has yet done, the bounties of the Church. Some Synods may have organizations of their own, for the relief of disabled ministers, or the widows and orphans of those who have fallen in the service of Christ. There are few persons who more truly deserve the kindness of the people of God, than he who has worn out his life in the work of preaching the Gospel upon a scanty pittance, and is left in sickness or age without any pecuniary resource. And the change which comes over the widow of a clergyman when he is removed, is often extremely sad. She moves away from the conspicuous place in the social circle which she has occupied, and gives room to another, going often into the deepest and most poverty-stricken retirement, without bread for her children, or clothing and sustenance for herself. If the State pensions its soldiers who have worn themselves out in her service, an equal obligation lies upon the Church. It is required by Him, who is the widow's God and Judge, and the Father of the fatherless.

#### BOARDS OF THE CHURCH.

An order of the day was made for the several Boards, and they were limited to two hours each, for their own advocacy of the interests committed to their supervision.

#### BOARD OF DOMESTIC MISSIONS.

Dr. Musgrave, the Secretary of the Board, gave the House the following brief summary of its action during the past year. "Notwithstanding," he said, "the extraordinary commercial and financial revulsion which had overtaken the country, producing, for a time, an almost total suspension of business of every kind, and bringing bankruptcy to thousands, the Board have been able to prosecute the work entrusted to them with

ordinary success. Indeed, no sooner had the general gloom began to disperse, than the contributions to their treasury largely increased. In the month of February the receipts exceeded those of the corresponding period of the previous year by \$5,000. The Board have increased the number of missionaries by 20—making the total number now employed by them 610. The appropriations for the past year are slightly in advance of those made during the one preceding it, owing to the enlarged field of operation occupied. The total receipts for the year are, \$105,277 52; the entire disbursements for the same period are, \$104,153 67. The receipts of the Board are considerably above the record of any previous year, and this increase is not the result of individual bequests so much as of the contributions of the various churches. The excess of income the past year over any preceding one, is above \$8,000. An average reduction of \$3 had been made in the appropriation usually made to each missionary, in view of the embarrassments of business; but the churches, in which they had labored, increased the amount which they contributed to their salary, so that the salaries actually received by those engaged in missionary labor averaged \$500.

The reports from the Missionary churches indicate the most extraordinary success. There is a sensible manifestation of the influence of the Holy Spirit in a revival of the Church, and an awakening of the people in all parts of the missionary field. Although the fruits are not reported to this Assembly, it can be confidently stated, that such an extensive interest in the subject of religion has never been witnessed."

Dr. D. McKinney, on the part of the Committee on Domestic Missions, presented to the Assembly the following resolutions in relation to the above mentioned report:

1. *Resolved*, That the deepest gratitude of this Assembly is due to Almighty God for his goodness, that during a year of great financial embarrassment, he has disposed and enabled his people to supply the wants of this Board, making the annual period to close happily with an increase in funds and of laborers.

2. *Resolved*, That the Assembly rejoice in the increase of

contributing churches; and now cherish the hope that, by due effort, all may ultimately be induced to do their part in the work.

3. *Resolved*, That the Assembly give devout and hearty thanks to God, for the outpouring of his Spirit upon our Missionary churches, in common with the other portions of his beloved Zion.

4. *Resolved*, That while the Board have prudently made their appropriations, still the want of funds is such, and the demands so great and numerous, that there is a large amount of work which can scarcely be attempted, and that the Assembly regrets that a large portion of funds should still be absorbed by unproductive churches. Some that remain feeble from year to year, it is well known, are like hives, which send forth their annual swarms. But all are not such. Presbyteries should look into this and cease to recommend, or should unite two or more churches in one charge, thus husbanding both men and means for labor in productive regions.

5. *Resolved*, That the magnitude of the cause, the adaptation of the Presbyterian Church to useful labors in every part of the country, and the call for laborers increasing with the country's increase, demand of the Assembly vastly increased efforts to enlarge the funds and to multiply the laborers. The field is the world, but the part of the field specially entrusted to this Church's care, comprises the States and Territories where God has given her a being.

6. *Resolved*, That in view of the happy working and bright prospects of the scheme of systematic benevolence, the Assembly suggest to the Board the propriety of considering the question whether the services of an Associate Secretary might not be dispensed with, and the amount of the salary of the office be saved.

7. *Resolved*, That the Assembly is pleased with the effort of the Board to increase the number of itinerating laborers, believing that the system may be extended to the great advantage of sparsely settled districts.

8. *Resolved*, That the failure, on the part of nearly one-third of the missionaries, to send in a special report of their labors

for the use of the Assembly, is to be deeply regretted; and that in cases where such failure is the result of negligence, the Missionary has shown himself unworthy, and should not be re-appointed."

Dr. McKinney introduced his resolutions with some pertinent remarks: "So far," said he, "as we are successful in filling the whole land with ministers devoted to their work, will this nation and the world be blessed. The Missionary brethren who sow seed in our new settlements, give their future character to States."

The first, second and third resolutions were adopted without debate. The fourth resolution gave rise to some discussion.

Dr. Breckinridge moved to strike out the words which urge Presbyteries to cease to recommend unproductive churches, and to unite two or more churches under one pastor. He contended that they were virtually a discrimination against weak churches in the old States, which were poor by making many rich. "They were kept poor by the stream of valuable members they have all the while been sending out to new countries to form new churches." "There are two modes," said he, "of disposing of old and feeble people;—one is, that of Christianity, to provide for, and take care of them; the other, that of Paganism, to give them a gourd of water and some parched corn, and send them away to die. His experience taught him, that the hardest thing on earth to kill is a Presbyterian Church. He would cherish every one of our churches as long as there was one brick upon another, or one old woman to go there to worship God." Dr. Musgrave denied that the Board ever recommended the casting off churches because they are feeble. The point they had brought before the Assembly is, that there are many churches receiving aid that could do without it, and others receiving more than is necessary; that Presbyterian recommendations for aid are often inconsiderately and carelessly made, in many instances, private letters of members accompanying the recommendation, intimating to the Board the true state of facts. The Board were aiming to do a great aggressive work, but how could this be done when the old churches were absorbing so large a portion of the funds?

It is an injury to churches to help them when they could help themselves. It enervates them, and deprives them of true independence. Dr. McKinney mentioned the further fact, that when the Presbyteries appropriate funds where they are unproductive, it checks the liberality of our people.

There is force in these remarks. It may be *difficult* to destroy a Presbyterian Church, but it is not impossible that, in this changing and migrating country, Presbyterianism should die out in localities where it once existed, being in fact transferred by the migration of the chief part of the flock to the newer portions of our country. There are places in these older States where there was once a Presbyterian Church, and where it has long since disappeared, and others, where the house of worship yet stands, but the white congregation has removed. Our Presbyterian youth are often drawn away into other folds, and they should be followed in their migrations by the institutions of the Gospel, or they will be lost to the Presbyterian name, and, perhaps, to the Church of God. Our Board of Domestic Missions, while keeping its eye on the feeble churches of the old States, has its chief work to do in the new. It is right that their labors should be scrutinized, and not be allowed to fall into any unaccommodating routine. New and better modes of accomplishing the wants of the Church will often be suggested to them from without, but in their constant attention to this important subject, they are gaining a practical wisdom, in which we may well confide.

An overture from the Synods of Mississippi and Texas, for the establishment of a local committee of the Board of Missions at New Orleans, similar to that at Louisville, was taken up and discussed on the last day of the session. In reference to this, Dr. Palmer, who advocated the overture in behalf of the two Synods, "desired to make two preliminary remarks: 1st, That the measure now proposed did not originate in any feeling of dissatisfaction, or any want of confidence in the integrity and usefulness of the Board of Domestic Missions; 2d, That the friends of the measure have no desire to take what is termed a snap judgment, but that they are perfectly willing to refer it to the next General Assembly.



He supposed that the Presbyterian Church was entirely united in the principles upon which her operations are conducted; but that it might be necessary from time to time to review her policy, and improve her method of applying those principles.

He would lay down the proposition, that the Church should come as near as possible to the particular field she desires to overtake and evangelize. It was but lately that the Allegheny range frowned upon the Atlantic, and was the boundary beyond which we scarce looked. But yesterday, as it were, the Rocky Mountains were the *nil ultra* of all enterprise, and seemed the eternal limit to further progress; when suddenly, from causes which no human forecast would have conjectured, and which he need not now recite, by one tremendous bound we planted our feet upon the farthest verge of our continent, and California was added to the galaxy of States. The American Eagle dipping one wing in the Pacific, and the other wing in the Atlantic, now soars supreme over the whole continent.

Our preacher of the Centenary Sermon, (Dr. Van Rensselaer,) had alluded to the time when the Alleghenies formed the dark barrier, beyond which our religion and our civilization had not ventured. But that day is long since past. The Rocky Mountains even do not bound the field of our enterprise. 'The whole boundless continent is ours.' The Church should come as near as possible to the field of her operation.

In the Apostolic age, the great work of the Church was about its very cradle. Soon the mission of St. Paul to the Gentiles had its centre in Antioch. In the third part of the first century, the Patriarch Apostle John established his seat at Ephesus, where he could oversee the young plantations of the Church; and it is needless to recite how soon the city of Rome and the city of Constantinople were made similar centres.

Mr. Moderator, continued the speaker, I ask you to look at the city of New Orleans, in reference to its relations to the whole region of the great Gulf of Mexico. Who can tell how soon (by some of the operations of natural causes, or by the

irresistible current of events), the whole of that Gulf and its surroundings shall be ours? Look at the relations of New Orleans to Texas, that vast commonwealth, out of which five new States will soon be formed. Look at its relations to that country which of late has occupied the attention of so many of our citizens—Central America. Sir, we may regard the Mississippi as a vast speaking trumpet, and New Orleans its mouth-piece, where the least whisper is propagated to the farthest regions watered by it, in tones that reverberate to every part of our continent. Then think how important is this position for aggressive movements. Feeble as our Church is in this place, and burdened as we are with labors, we are willing to assume still heavier burdens, if it may advance the cause of our beloved Master and His blood-bought Church. I but throw out these suggestions, and will not enlarge upon them.

I wonder at the sagacity of the early traders—at the unerring instinct with which they seem to have been guided in the location of settlements, which afterward expanded into such cities as Pittsburg, St. Louis in the far West, and New Orleans. When Bienville selected the site of this city, he would seem to have been guided by such a prophetic instinct, that were he permitted to rise and appear among us this day, he would not even be surprised.

We ask the General Assembly to take possession of this city, to plant their banner, and to make it one of the grand centres of their operations, as it is already one of the greatest centres of commercial, social, and (we will hope) of Christian influence.

The Church of Jesus Christ is one. She undertakes, as a unit, to spread the Gospel all over the world, and preach it to every creature. That, I take it to be her great, her imperative duty, and her unchangeable purpose. If that be the doctrine, I desire, here and now, to say, that if the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church intends to occupy this particular ground to accomplish this work, she must, in some important particulars, change or modify her plans.

In all our Domestic Missionary fields there is a growing tendency to work outside, and if this Board does not modify its plans, it will be left behind, or will become merely a local

Board. In the Synod of Mississippi, for example," he continued, "nearly \$9,500 are reported in the minutes as having been contributed to the cause of Domestic Missions during the year 1857. But, according to the Report of the Board, only about \$1,900, less than \$2,000, passed through its treasury.

At this moment the Synod of Mississippi employs Dr. James Smith, at a salary of \$2,000—which alone is more than all they are credited for as having contributed to Domestic Missions. Very lately, in response to an appeal in this city, they gave at one time to this Board \$500. A few days later we were obliged, in a sudden emergency, to raise \$500 more, and it was done.

The discrepancy between the sum total raised for Domestic Missions, and our contributions as reported by the Board, is no evidence of disloyalty to the Board, but shows that our own local necessities are the most urgent. If the Board is unable to act more for this region, we shall be compelled to look, first, to God—and secondly, to ourselves.

It may, by some, be thought that this measure will prove an entering wedge to wide-spread change; but it is not so. Grant that a committee is established here, and another in St. Louis, and others at other points. The unity of the Church's operations will be strengthened rather than impaired, if they be made subordinate to the parent Board; and by the establishment of these various agencies, we shall concentrate energies upon those points which could never otherwise be called in action.

Mr. Moderator, I thank God that I was born in the Presbyterian Church! I rejoice that there is a Church which is equal to the wants of the age—an age for large plans and great purposes; an age when there is no time to sit down, fold our hands, and let red tape rule. To Christ the Lord is given the heathen for an inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for a possession. It is His kingdom, and we must gird up our loins, arm for the fight, and go forth to win it to the Saviour.

As I have listened to the lofty and noble utterances of my brethren upon this platform, urging the Church forward in her

great work, I have burned to speak the emotions that filled my soul. When, too, the accounts were given of the tremendous struggle which has convulsed India, I thrilled to think that this is but the revival of a contest that was begun at least five centuries before Christ was born. In all the historic ages the Occident and Orient have been in deadly strife for the dominion of the world—the powers of darkness opposed to those of light—hoary prejudice and apathy to human development on the one hand, and the love of man and human progress on the other—a contact between two civilizations. In such a contact the Church alone can mediate.

I believe the Church is panting for union, in spite of all the forebodings and the warnings which our fathers have given in this Assembly. I am glad that I am young. I hope to live to see the day when prejudices will be thrown aside—when all the branches of the Presbyterian Church finally will come together, striving for the same objects, and fired with the same hopes, and form one united family. I hope to see the day when I shall be permitted to sit down in the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of the World! I hope to see her yet perfect in her unity and perfect in all her parts.

I desire that all the policy of the Church shall be maturely considered and discussed in the public prints, and let the next General Assembly decide. I would strengthen the hands of our Secretary, not weaken them.

I move to refer the whole matter to the next General Assembly."

To this speech of Dr. Palmer, Dr. Musgrave, Secretary of the Board, made an elaborate and able reply.

He was opposed to the proposition, as one tending to increase the expense of conducting the mission-work of the Church; as complicating its machinery, and preventing the possibility of a knowledge of its entire fiscal operations. The Presbytery was the centre of influence established in the field to be occupied; it brought the Church in contact with the people to be affected by its operations, and had this business entirely under its control.

He gave some statistics, showing that work was done outside

the Board, even in the old Synods of Philadelphia, Baltimore and New Jersey. This proves that a local committee does not influence the matter one way or another. The multiplication of such committees increases expense; introduces confusion; divides responsibility. It was unjust to hold the Board responsible for engagements made by these committees. Besides, the tendency was to converge to the centre instead of to radiate to the circumference, as facts within the knowledge of the speaker would show.

He feared that the establishment of branches of the Boards of the Church, in different sections of the country, would tend to sectionalize it. It was now eminently conservative, and its nationality was mainly due to its centralization through the Boards of the Church.

When all the neighboring and the distant regions shall be ours, it is impossible to conjecture what they may do. With the vast and rapid growth of our nation, Washington is still the Capitol, and is long likely to remain so. The principle involved in that fact applies to the functions and the prospects of the Board.

He thought the measure proposed has truly been tried in New Orleans and failed—having resulted in embarrassments from which the aid, even of the Board itself, was invoked to extricate them. The brethren at Louisville are willing to give up their committee, after a trial of twelve years; and why should our brethren here wish to try an experiment which has already failed. It seems not to have been well considered. It has often happened, that men have failed to foresee the fruit of the seeds which they have planted. You may push the matter farther than you intend or wish. Finding it possible to get along without the parent Board, we may progress to the point of making many new Assemblies, and end with destroying the unity of the Church.

Dr. Baird offered an amendment, which was accepted by Dr. Musgrave, and is as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Board of Domestic Missions be requested to consider the whole subject brought before this body by this overture, and report to the next Assembly whether, in their

judgment, the appointment of a Committee of Missions in New Orleans would be wise and expedient.

The glowing description of the future of our country, and of the Presbyterian Church, presented by Dr. Palmer, will seem visionary to all who look forward to the speedy dissolution of our Republic, but those who believe in its future integrity and continued prosperity, will hardly deem it extravagant. Until the annexation of Texas, in 1845, New Orleans was the frontier city of these United States in the South-west. Its Protestantism dates backward hardly 40 years. It greatly needs to be strengthened yet. But there were men in this Assembly who confessed that the facts of our present history would have seemed as marvellous to them when they first went forth to preach the Gospel, as these anticipations of the future. The day will yet come when New Orleans will be a centre of religious influence to a wide region of country. Whether she is now prepared for this Committee of Missions the South-western Synods seek, will make itself appear, as the public mind of the Church shall be turned towards this matter during the year to come.

#### BOARD OF FOREIGN MISSIONS.

Rev. Dr. Stanton, Chairman of the Committee, to which was referred the Annual Report of the Board of Foreign Missions, read his report, from which it appears, that the receipts of the Board of Foreign Missions from all sources the past year, (including a special contribution to repair the losses of property in India,) have been \$223,977 79.

The expenditures have been \$207,057 50, (the sum specially donated for India, \$18,112 57, being reserved,) leaving a balance against the Board of \$1,186 29.

Thirty Missionary laborers have been sent out during the year; twelve of these were returned missionaries; and ten others are now waiting an opportunity to embark for the fields to which they have been respectively designated.

Under the direction of the Board, there are nine missions among the American Indians; one to the Jews, and one to the Chinese in California, within the limits of the United States.

There are two in South America; two in Western Africa; one in Siam; three in China; two in India, embracing fifteen stations, and extending over a region of country of more than a thousand miles; besides which, pecuniary aid has been extended to the evangelical societies of Belgium, Paris, Geneva and the Waldensian Synod.

Connected with the various missions there are 170 Missionary laborers from this country; 54 native helpers; 50 principal stations and out-stations; 22 organized churches, and nearly 5,000 native youth under Christian schools connected with these missions.

The sad disaster at Futtelgurh, India, cut short, under the most painful circumstances of suffering from the hands of the Sepoys, the lives of eight missionaries and two of their children; others have died on the Missionary field; a loss of a large amount of property has been sustained in India, and the mission-work in China has been partially suspended, but still the work of Foreign Missions has shown manifest progress since the last meeting of the General Assembly; and when in the greatest straits, the Board has found relief in the generous contributions of the Church.

His report concluded by the recommendation for adoption, by the Assembly, of the following resolutions:

*Resolved*, That we are called upon as a Church, through this supreme judicatory thereof, to record our special thanksgivings to God for the favor which he has shown us in this department of the labor which His providence and grace has committed to our hands: First, In that, in the midst of an unparalleled monetary disaster, the receipts of our Foreign Board have been larger than in any former year, and this without any agency beyond the regular action of the inferior judicatories of the Church and the spontaneous offerings of the people. Second, In that, while his hand has been laid heavily upon us, in the melancholy death of our beloved brethren in India, the same has been stretched out for the deliverance of the great body of our Missionaries and their families. And third, In that, the salutary effect upon the people at large of the death of those who have fallen victims to Mohammedan and Pagan cruelties, in awakening the Church to deeper humiliation and more earnest prayer for Zion's increase, has so signally illustrated a

proverb of primitive times, that "the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the Church."

2. *Resolved*, That while we are encouraged by the continued liberality of the people in their contributions to foreign missions, we feel called upon to admonish the churches to make even greater sacrifices in this regard, in view of the important considerations presented in the Annual Report of the Board.

1. That they may repair the great losses sustained in the destruction of the mission property in India, amounting in the aggregate to \$150,000, only \$25,000 of which have been refunded by an assessment of the British Government upon the city of Lodianna, under circumstances which do not apply to any other case. And 2d. That the Board may promptly enter—to use their own language—"the new field for Missionary enterprise in portions of the earth heretofore inaccessible," and that they may ensure "the prospective enlargement of the Missionary area in those which have been heretofore but partially occupied;" and, therefore, we earnestly recommend to all inferior judicatories to take such action as shall bring forth for this cause the united, systematic and generous charities of the Church, until all the tithes shall be brought into the storehouse, and every member of Christ's body shall faithfully exemplify that grace of the Spirit exhibited in free-will offerings to the Lord's Treasury.

3. *Resolved*, That we highly approve of the action of the Board in giving the "Foreign Missionary" gratuitous circulation in all our Sabbath Schools which make contributions to the Board; and that all Church Sessions be and they are hereby recommended to aid in this noble work, that the children of the entire Church may early become interested in the foreign Missionary cause and be trained in the duties of an active Christian charity.

4. *Resolved*, That the great loss of property sustained by our Board in the Sepoy revolt, is no discouragement to our future work in India, and that it is the manifest duty of the Church at once to repair these desolations; and, with this view, while as a general rule we should rely upon regular and steady rather than special contributions to all our Boards, the General Assembly, under the peculiar circumstances of the present case, earnestly urge upon the churches, and in particular upon individuals whom God has blessed with wealth, contributions to a special fund which the Board is endeavoring to raise for this purpose, now amounting to over \$18,000, which contributions, however, should in no case interfere with the regular collections for the ordinary and progressive operations of the Missionary work.



5. *Resolved*, That the report of the Board be approved and recommended to the Executive Committee for publication.

The venerable Secretary, Hon. Walter Lowrie, then addressed the House, in a speech which exhibited most lucidly the operations of the Board, and drew tears from the eyes of all who heard him. We would be glad to lay before our readers that portion of his speech which gives an outline of the different Missionary fields, but must content ourselves with his closing words.

“Some are of opinion that we are doing too much for Foreign Missions. Let the following facts be considered,” says Mr. Lowrie, “in answer to such objections.

1. On the minutes of the General Assembly, the aggregate collections of the Church is made in eight different columns. Add these eight items together and see what proportion that of Foreign Missions bears to the whole; the sum for Foreign Missions is less than four per cent.—in other words, out of every hundred dollars raised by the Church, ninety-six dollars are expended for the work at home, and four dollars for the work of Foreign Missions!

2. Take another view. The entire receipts of the Board from the churches, is less by twenty thousand dollars, than they would have been, if each communicant had contributed one cent a week. This cause also receives many donations from benevolent individuals who are not Church members.

Take a third view of this subject.

During an entire year there were 940 churches, with 55,603 communicants, under the care of 437 pastors or stated supplies, who did not contribute to this cause one cent!

There were 526 vacant churches, with 16,128 communicants, doing nothing for a whole year.

There were 126 vacant churches, with 8,157 communicants, who made contributions.

Thus we see that 1,466 churches, with 71,731 communicants, among whom are laboring 437 pastors or stated supplies, doing nothing for the entire year.

In view of such an exhibition as these statements present, I

feel much at a loss what to say. I did not come to this Assembly to exhort the members to do their duty. But placed, as by God's providence I have been, in the position I now occupy—and God knows it was without my seeking—it is my duty to spread these statements before you. To me it does appear, that nothing on this side of eternity can be more solemn than is the subject here presented. Millions in the heathen world going down to death, without having ever heard the name of Jesus Christ on the one hand, and on the other hand, 71,000 professing Christians, with 437 ministers of the Gospel laboring among them, and yet not lifting a finger to tell these perishing millions of Gethsemane and Calvary, and of that Saviour who groaned and died there to save His people from their sins.

Perhaps I ought to close; but I cannot well pass by without noticing the terrible overturnings of the last year.

1. The destruction of mission property, and the private property of our Missionary brethren—schools, libraries, apparatus, churches, dwellings—all destroyed.

2. The death and sufferings of the native Christians.

3. The sufferings of our brethren confined in the forts of Allahabad and Agra, but who were most mercifully delivered.

4. The death of our dear brethren and sisters after leaving Futtehghurh. On this point I can scarcely trust myself to say anything. Ten years ago, the mysterious, but doubtless wise providence of God, permitted a Missionary, beloved by the whole Church, and most dear to me, to be murdered by men of violence and blood. That wound has never ceased to bleed. But when the sad intelligence was confirmed of the death of these beloved Missionaries and their wives, and two infant children, the intensity of that wound was increased many fold. I knew those brethren and sisters before they went out, some of them intimately, and we highly esteemed and loved them all. The martyrdom on the China Sea, and the martyrdom at Cawnpore, almost seem to me to have occurred about the same time, although in reality there were ten long years between them. But the same calmness in the immediate view of death

marked them all. The one casting back his Bible, which he was then reading, into the boat, and when thrown into the sea, turning and swimming towards the boat, till sternly repelled by the iron spears of his murderers, then calmly sinking into the arms of death; the others saying to each other, 'our last day has come,' engaging in prayer, and calmly permitting themselves to be bound, husband and wife together. Mr. Campbell, while thus bound, carrying one of his children, while one of the company carried the other; their care that the native Christians should escape,—and even in these trying times, the ladies sending their good wishes to other native Christians not present,—altogether presents a scene of moral grandeur which the angels must have admired. He spoke of incidents of recent martyrdom in India. A native Missionary tied to the mouth of a cannon, and cut to pieces with swords, after the gun had twice missed fire. A mother and her babe left to die and remain two days unburied, at last flung into a stream by men of the lowest caste. He told of the personal loveliness of four ladies who were victims; of four men who are not excelled by the greatness or the excellence of any four brothers in this Assembly. When taken, they threw away all weapons, offering no resistance. Mr. Mc Lain, an Indian planter, offered \$150,000 for their ransom, and used all other possible means to save them; but the cry was, 'We want not money, but blood!' Husband and wife were tied arm to arm, and carrying their infants, they were marched to the place of butchery, and received the crown of martyrdom. Their passage through the dark valley was short. For them we need not weep; they have joined that blessed and glorious circle around the throne, where 'a great company, which no man can number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues, stand before the throne, and before the Lamb, clothed in white robes, and palms in their hands.' We know little of what is passing in heaven, nothing, indeed, but what God's word teaches us, but I have thought it not unlikely, that the Missionary martyr of 1847 hastened to the verge of heaven to meet and welcome the Missionary martyrs of 1858. However this may be, we know they have entered into their rest, that

God himself has wiped away their tears, and that the days of their mourning are ended."

Deeply touching were these words of our honored Secretary; and especially the allusion to the fate of his own martyred son, whose bones lie rolling under the China Sea, where he fell by the hand of pirates. The interest was again renewed by Mr. Painter, the nephew of Mrs. Freeman, one of the martyrs of Futtehgurh, and by Rev. Mr. Hay, of Allahabad, who had been in the midst of the rebellion, had witnessed many of its horrors, and who, with his family, had narrowly escaped a cruel death. He spoke "of the wonderful fortitude of the native Christians. They were placed in the stocks to die by inches. They were told that they would be mutilated in their ears, their noses, their chins, and their lips, if they did not deny Christ. All this, too, while they knew not that a European Christian remained in all that land; but not one of them renounced his faith, or denied the Lord that bought him; while many Europeans did, and even derided these poor natives as fools for not yielding. Here is proof of the spirit of Christ to which we can point ever more. It is hard to die—harder still to be mutilated. It is a terrible extremity, and multitudes preserved their lives by pronouncing the words, 'There is no God but God, and Mahommed is his prophet.'" Dr. Hewitt said, "The wail that is heard from India shall be turned into a hallelujah!" He quoted Heb. 11: 35-38, in application to our Missionary brethren of India, and their flocks. "Others had trial of cruel mockings and scourgings, yea, moreover, of bonds and imprisonment: they were stoned, they were sawn asunder, were tempted, were slain with the sword: they wandered about in sheepskins and goatskins, being destitute, afflicted, tormented; (of whom the world was not worthy): they wandered in deserts, and in mountains, and in dens and caves of the earth." "Could I behold a son of mine," said he, "gone to glory, in such white robes as were given to every one of them, how would my hallelujahs arise!" These reports convey but a faint impression of the deep emotion of all who in that large church were permitted to hear the voices of the several speakers.

BOARD OF EDUCATION—CALL TO THE MINISTRY.

The following is an abstract of the report, as presented by the Rev. Dr. Van Rensselaer, Secretary of the Board.

1. *Of Ministerial Education—Candidates.*—The number of new candidates received, 103—making in all, from the beginning, (1819,) 2,630. Whole number on the roll during this year, 385. In their theological course, 122; collegiate, 178; academical, 83; stage of study not reported, 6; teaching, or otherwise absent, 6; total, 385.

The aggregate number of candidates this year is two greater than last year; the number of new candidates is eleven more than were received last year—an increase that is encouraging, chiefly from the fact that there is no decrease.

*State of the Treasury.*—The accounts closed on the 18th of April, which is about two weeks earlier than usual:

1. *Candidates' Fund.*—Receipts, \$47,103 07; balance of last year, \$2,370 29; total, \$49,473 36. Payments, \$43,432 35; balance remaining, \$6,041 01.

2. *School Fund.*—Receipts, \$5,507 29; balance, \$36 96; total, \$5,544 25. Payments, \$5,458 20; balance remaining, \$86 05.

3. *Miscellaneous Fund.*—Balance, \$3 76.

4. *African Fund.*—Receipts, \$83 24; balance, \$1,387 45; total, \$1,470 69. Payments, \$90 00; balance on hand, \$1,380 69.

Total receipts for the year, \$52,693 60; total income, \$56,492 06; total payments, \$48,980 55; total balances, exclusive of the permanent African Fund, \$6,511 52.

From this statement it will be perceived, that the Treasury of the Board has been in a highly prosperous condition. In no year has so large an amount been contributed by the churches to the education of candidates for the ministry.

*Causes of Anxiety to Young Men and Candidates.*—As the present time, in the Providence of God, invites many young men to turn their attention to this subject, its candid and sober discussion may result in good. The following are the topics discussed, under this head, in the Annual Report:

1. The want of sufficient piety. 2. The want of sufficient evidences of a Divine call to the work of the ministry. 3. The want of pecuniary means. 4. Advanced age, beyond the usual period. 5. Ill health. 6. Defectiveness of early education. 7. A profession in life already selected, and entered upon. 8. The scanty salaries of ministers. 9. The opposition of relatives and friends. 10. The want of natural ability. 11. Obscure birth in a low condition of life. 12. The ministry is too vast a profession.

These various topics are discussed with the purpose of removing the objections and anxieties of candid and inquiring minds. Throughout the whole discussion the Board not only assume but lay stress upon the following propositions: 1. The individual possesses, in other respects, the qualifications requisite for making a useful minister. 2. The Holy Spirit can alone give a call to the work. 3. The standard of mental and moral requirements, prevalent in the Presbyterian Church, is not intended to be lowered by the arguments and incidents herein stated, but, on the contrary, the age demands higher qualifications than any preceding one.

*2. General Christian Education—Primary or Parochial Schools.*—The number of Parochial Schools, as nearly as can be ascertained, is about one hundred. Of these, thirty-two have been aided, during the year, by the funds of the Board. Six of these schools report considerable religious interest among the pupils.

*Presbyterial Academies.*—The number of Academies under the care of Presbyteries is *sixty*. An unusual religious interest has existed in several of these institutions.

*Ashman Institute.*—This institution, under the care of the Newcastle Presbytery, and designed for the education of young men of color, is in a hopeful condition. Four of the students expect to go as Missionaries to Africa.

*Colleges.*—The number of Presbyterian Colleges, under ecclesiastical supervision, or controlled by ministers and members of the Presbyterian Church, is twenty-four. Revivals of religion have been reported in Davidson College, N. C.; Oglethorpe University, Ga.; Hanover College, Ind.; Washington

College, Pa.; Jefferson College, Pa.; and the College of New Jersey, at Princeton, N. J.

Dr. Van Rensselaer said: He felt that the spirit of the Assembly is rising higher and higher. He was happy that this Board came before this body under circumstances so favorable. The Board of Education has reason to sympathize with what was said yesterday of our Foreign Missionary labors and sacrifices. One of those martyr Missionaries was once connected with this Board of Education, and we mourn the sad stroke which has taken him away. He spoke of the encouragements of the past year. Notwithstanding the great pecuniary crisis, contributions came in generously, and when churches could not take up their annual collections, individuals sent on their contributions voluntarily.

Rev. Mr. Rockwell, Chairman of the Committee on the Board of Education, presented the following resolutions, which were adopted:

1. *Resolved*, That the Assembly record their profound gratitude to God for the attendant tokens of the Divine blessing which have followed the efforts of the Board of Education to introduce young men into the ministry, and to aid in the religious instruction of our children and youth, as seen in the unflinching attachment of our churches to the cause, manifested even during a period of commercial disaster, in the number who have already been assisted to enter the Gospel ministry, the enlarged number of institutions for Christian education, and for the special influences of the Spirit of God, which have been poured out upon many of the Colleges and Schools under the care of this Assembly, or in connection with Synods and Presbyteries of our Church.

2. *Resolved*, That the field which now lies before our beloved Church, demanding, as it does, a vast increase of ministers of the Word, calls for earnest prayer to the Lord of the harvest, that he would send forth laborers into his harvest, and that the Assembly, while they trust that the cause will daily be remembered by the people of God, recommend the last Thursday of February as a day of special, united prayer, for the outpouring of the Spirit upon our Colleges and Seminaries of learning.

3. *Resolved*, That the present gratifying condition of the Treasury of the Board encourages this Assembly to believe, that the churches are impressed with a sense of the duty of providing for the liberal support and maintenance of indigent

young men, desirous of entering the Gospel ministry, and authorizes a renewed invitation to enter upon the studies necessary to fit them for the duties of such office, with the confident assurance of being sustained by the churches through the Board.

4. *Resolved*, That in view of the great work which Christ has laid upon the Church, to preach the Gospel to every creature, it be earnestly impressed upon pastors to set before youth of piety and promise, the question of their responsibilities in this matter, and to endeavor so to direct and assist them, as that there shall be an increase of candidates for the Gospel ministry, in some measure proportioned to the growing demands of the Church and the world.

The Rev. Wm. J. Hoge followed in an earnest and impressive address, on the importance of parents dedicating their children to God for the ministry, and also in reference to what constitutes a call to the ministry. He rejoiced to be able to lift his voice, for the first time, in this Assembly, in behalf of this Board. We all felt that more men were needed. How shall they be had? As individuals we may all do something towards finding them, and as a General Assembly we may do much. It is amazing that any Christian parent should do otherwise than desire to have a beloved child become an ambassador of Christ. Ministers are representatives of the Almighty God and our glorious Saviour. He enlarged upon the excellence of the office of the ministry. He urged ministers and others not to think too much of their privations, but to esteem it a privilege to make themselves and their children living sacrifices on the altar of Christ's service. We ought to urge men every where to consider this subject. Many young men were prevented from entering the ministry by false and mystical notions of a call to the ministry. Dr. Alexander had said, that no young man should enter the ministry unless he could *prove* that he *ought* to do so. Again it had been said, that every converted young man should enter the ministry, unless he could show good reason why he should *not* preach the Gospel. Both of these formulas were true, as, if time would permit, he could show. Between them both one could satisfactorily ascertain his personal duty. He urged these views earnestly on the attention of pastors and young men.



Mr. Caruthers offered an amendment to the resolutions presented by the Committee, making the last Thursday of February the day for prayer for the children at home, as well as the young men at the Seminaries and Colleges.

Mr. Lowrie offered a substitute for the amendment, when

The Rev. Lewis W. Green, D. D., took the floor, and presented a brief and stirring appeal. He said, a mightier and a nobler era than has ever yet been known, is dawning on our land. There is always an outward preparation for such events. God throws wide open the brazen gates of opposition, before the outpourings of his Spirit. The Westminster Review had said that the old spirit of Protestantism was gone—that it was dead, and nothing now remained but its corpse, lying in regal state, and awaiting its sepulture. Before the ink was dry with which the foul slander was penned, it was refuted, not by power or by might, but by the Spirit of the Lord.

He remembered listening, as to the visionary fancy of a waning intellect, to the late venerable Dr. Alexander, at Princeton, when he said China must be girdled with missions—it must be beleaguered on every side—we must be in readiness to go in suddenly and take possession of that land in the name of Christ. I thought it folly; it was prophecy. Truly the wrath of man is made to praise him. The opium trade, an unholy war, and the massacres of Missionaries, mark new eras to the Church; and we believe this great outpouring of the Spirit is to prepare young men for the work. Our present generation of ministers is rapidly passing away. But God can and does—not only open the way for the Gospel—he also from age to age, and from exigency to exigency, raises up ministers of the Gospel to proclaim it.

The Rev. Dr. Baird could not concur in the views Mr. Hoge has expressed as to a call to the ministry. The old doctrine of the American Education Society was, that every educated young man is bound to preach the Gospel, unless he can show the contrary. If he did not misunderstand Mr. Hoge, this was his doctrine. If so, he would enter his protest against that being considered the voice of the Assembly.

The Rev. Mr. Emerson said, that though yet a young man,

out of twenty-four candidates for the ministry, who started out with him, he could find but three in the ministry of our Church. The great reason was, that most of them had never, at the outset, looked the question fairly in the face, and counted the cost. What our Church needs is earnest men; and none but those who understand the true nature of a call to the Gospel ministry will prove to be such. We want men who will be willing to do any work, even the humblest.

The Rev. W. J. Hoge said, that if he had had the smallest idea that he was uttering the voice of the Assembly, he would have shrunk from speaking at all. He cared not what Board had held the views of a call to the ministry alluded to; they were his own views. His doctrine is, that a young man ordinarily should seek that position which most needs young men, until the demand is supplied. No doubt every candidate will have his siftings before he reaches the ministry. He will have them in the Academy, the College, the Seminary, and the Presbytery, if the latter will do their duty. As to presenting the bright side only, he was only presenting a set off to the cry about the sacrifices and burdens of the ministry, of which we have heard so much. He would have done with sickly sentimentality on the subject. He had no objection to presenting the shady-side, but he wished also to have the more cheerful side of the question looked at. He wished, even though brethren go as Missionaries to India, to be subjected to unspeakable horrors, that they might be able to say, "It is a good work."

The Rev. Mr. Erskine thought there had been extreme views presented here on both sides of the question of a call to the ministry. He supposed that it is the general doctrine of our Church that there is a special call, a call of the Word, Spirit and Providence of God; and that when a young man feels himself thus called, he will be willing to undergo all the trials of the ministry. We must place before every young man all the truth on the subject, and when the proper conviction is produced on his mind, that will keep him faithful, no matter what comes. He had often heard the remark, that if ministers had known in advance the trials of the work, they never would

have entered it. For himself, he believed that if truly called of God, nothing would deter him. It seemed to be implied in the remarks made here, that it is the duty of every parent to devote every son to the ministry. He could not agree to that.

The Rev. Dr. Junkin said, this Board has brought into our ministry many of our most valuable ministers, who otherwise would not be there. Our Foreign Missionary Board came to us yesterday with the crown of the martyrs on its brow; but has the Board of Education no martyrs? Yes, sir, it has had living martyrs—men who, amidst anxieties, uncertainties, toils, tears and prayers, have struggled with poverty and hardship, in order to enter the ministry.

The Rev. Dr. Hewitt read passages of Scripture showing that the true spirit for the ministry is to be new creatures, and to seek the things of Christ, and not our own.

The Rev. Mr. Tenney said he came from one of the newest sections of our country—from Texas. There are calls all around him, and his brethren there had far more work than they can properly do. Within the last year we have lost the opportunity to organize a Presbyterian Church, because we had no minister for them. The members, having waited long in vain, at last joined other denominations. There is this day a lady in this house, originally from Kentucky, who has heard at this Assembly the first Presbyterian sermon she has heard for five years. We need more men, the Board of Education can do much to furnish us men.

#### BOARD OF PUBLICATION.

*Abstract of the Twentieth Annual Report presented to the Assembly.*—Notwithstanding the extraordinary commercial embarrassments and depressions, the Board of Publication is enabled, by Divine favor, to report results which compare favorably with those of any former year.

1. In the department of Production. Fifty-five new works have been issued, of which forty-five are new volumes. Of these there have been printed 85,750 copies. In addition to these, 24,000 copies of nine new tracts have been issued, and 30,000 copies of the "Presbyterian Almanac," making in all

139,750 copies of new publications. Besides these, have been published 324,000 copies of works before upon the Board's Catalogue.

The total number of copies issued during the year has been 463,750 copies. The total number of copies issued since the organization of the Board to March 1, 1858, has been 6,817,188. The report gives special notice of the publication, by the Board, of "The Presbyterian Social Psalmodist." The Confession of Faith has been published in German, and other German publications are now passing through the press. Attention is called to "The Sailor's Companion," as a new work admirably adapted to do good among the brave and hardy sons of the deep. Dr. Jacobus' "Notes on the Gospels," with the accompanying questions, are now issued by the Board, and afford valuable aid to Sabbath Schools and Bible classes. A considerable number of choice volumes have been added to the Board's Sabbath School Library, which is increasingly popular and useful. The Board aims to furnish, as soon as possible, all needful facilities for Bible Class and Sabbath School instruction.

*Periodicals.*—The circulation of the Home and Foreign Record has declined during the past year from 19,000 to 17,500 copies. The circulation of the Sabbath School Visitor is now 54,000, an increase of 9,000 copies since the last report.

II. In the department of Distribution. The publications of the Board reach the hands of the people chiefly through three channels:—1. The regular trade sales at the Publishing-house have been during the year 191,993 volumes, a decrease of 1,583 volumes on the sales of the preceding year. Comparing these results with those of other publishing-houses, during the recent commercial embarrassments of the country, they afford cause for profound gratitude. The sales of tracts at the Publishing-house have amounted to 706,963 pages, an increase of 229,522 pages on those of the year preceding. 2. The Executive Committee have granted, in response to appeals made to it, to Sabbath Schools, feeble churches, humane institutions, and to individuals for gratuitous distribution, 3,724 volumes, and 246,395 pages of tracts. 3. By colportage, a most important

amount of Divine truth has been put in circulation, and the results of the year, considering all things, have been in the highest degree favorable. The number of colporteurs in commission during the year has been 263, being an increase of 9, notwithstanding the recent curtailments found to be necessary. These have been distributed into 29 States and Territories, besides all the British Provinces of the North. Increased quantities of books and tracts have been sent to California, Oregon, Washington Territory, and all the frontier and more destitute regions of our wide land. The number of volumes sold by colporteurs has been 123,924, being a decrease of 655 volumes. The pages of tracts distributed by them have been 1,555,469. The number of volumes gratuitously distributed this year has been 17,905, an increase of 876 volumes on the number last year given. The number of families visited has been 119,685, an increase of 5,503 over that of last year.

The total distribution of volumes of the year has been as follows: By sale at Publishing-house, 191,993; by sale by colporteurs, 123,924; given by colporteurs, 17,905; granted by executive committee, 3,724; total of volumes, 337,546, being an increase on last year of 636.

Pages of tracts sold at publishing-house, 706,962; distributed by colporteurs, 1,555,469; granted by executive committee, 246,395; total pages of tracts, 2,508,827, being a decrease, for reasons explained in the report, of 271,575 pages. Besides the above matter, the Board has issued a large number of pamphlets and periodical papers.

III. In the department of Sustentation. The Treasurer's Report shows an aggregate of receipts for the year of \$126,960 28, which is an increase of \$7,639 25 over the receipts of the preceding year. The total of expenditures has been \$106,801 68, leaving a balance in the Treasurer's hands of \$20,158 60. This, however, will rapidly be called for by the renewed and enlarged operations of the publishing department. The amount received from sales of books, tracts and Sabbath School Visitors, has been \$80,842 86, being a decrease of \$6,581 52 on the sales of the previous year.

*The Colportage Fund.*—The amount received from all

sources for this Fund has been \$21,369 76, a decrease of \$3,453 86. This decrease, it is pleasant to observe, arises not from decreased Church contributions, but from diminished receipts from legacies and miscellaneous sources. The sum received from the churches has been \$17,150 92, an increase from this source of \$1,761 67. The receipts from legacies and miscellaneous sources have this year been only \$4,218 80, while the last year they were \$9,434 37. The balance in which the Colportage Fund was overdrawn, March 1st, 1858, was \$8,788 46. It is hoped that the churches will help to make up this sum soon, so that the Board may proceed to extend its Colportage operations to many new, important and inviting fields.

*Agencies.*—During the past year no paid collecting agents have been employed. The results are such as greatly to encourage the Board to hope that no general recurrence to such agencies will become necessary.

This Report of the Board was followed by the report of the Committee on said report through their Chairman, Dr. Mitchell, which is embodied in the resolutions following, viz :

1. “*Resolved*, That the Assembly recognizes and commends the Board as an efficient and honored instrumentality in counteracting the pernicious effects of licentious and corrupt literature, and in disseminating, through the waste places of our Zion, the seeds of sound theology and of vital piety, which, doubtless, will ultimately produce in the hand of God’s people, thirty, sixty, and even a hundred fold.

2. *Resolved*, That it is subject matter for devout gratitude to God that, although within the past year an unprecedented commercial embarrassment pervaded the country, and brought sorrow and penury to the homes of thousands, the Lord put into the hearts of the members of our churches a spirit of more than ordinary benevolence, in consequence of which, (although there was a diminution in the miscellaneous receipts,) the amount of church collections for the colportage fund were larger than they had been in any former year; and that this unexpected and happy result was accomplished without the payment of a single cent.

3. *Resolved*, That it affords the Assembly much gratification to learn that, notwithstanding the aforesaid convulsion, the Board, by the discreet and prudent management of its re-

sources, during the crisis, not only paid all its pecuniary obligations in the publishing department, but also increased its usefulness by the publication and gratuitous distribution of a greater number of books and tracts than it had published in any previous year.

4. *Resolved*, That it gives the Assembly pleasure to learn that the Board, as far as circumstances justify, are publishing evangelical works in the German language suitable to the wants of the German population.

5. *Resolved*, That the humble and self-denying Colporteur is doing God's work, and deserves the sympathy of God's people; and that as he visits, from house to house, the Lord's poor, with Christ's love in his heart, and the books of the Board in his hand, he is effectually aiding the Missionary of the Cross in diffusing Christian light and knowledge where darkness and ignorance prevail.

6. *Resolved*, That the Assembly earnestly urges on the churches the importance of increasing their contributions to colportage, in order to enable the Board not only to pay off the arrears which, during the past year, necessarily accrued, but also to expand its operations in a degree commensurate with the demands of the Church.

7. *Resolved*, That the Assembly expresses its heartfelt gratification at the laudable and successful effort which the Board has made to publish works for Sunday School Libraries; and that this body, believing, as it does, that the books published are admirably adapted to the wants of children, would impress on the minds of ministers and members that it is their duty to purchase and circulate the books of the Board, rather than those published by any societies not connected with our beloved Church; and that, whenever Sabbath Schools have funds to expend for the purchase of Libraries to present to feeble churches in various parts of the land, the Board should have decided preference."

The resolutions were advocated with appropriate remarks by Rev. Dr. Mitchell, Rev. Messrs. Stevenson and Axtell, Mr. Israel Spencer, of Mississippi, Rev. J. E. Rockwell, Rev. Mr. Cowan and T. R. R. Cobb, of Georgia. The remarks of Rev. Mr. Savage, of New Hampshire, struck a cord of national sympathy in many hearts. "He had come on this long pilgrimage from the Old Granite State to the Crescent City, not simply to participate in the debates and actions of this body, but to show that the Presbyterian Church has no sectional feelings;

that she is conservative in her action, and her sympathies and fellowship are as broad as the Church of Christ. He wished to say there is no place where your publications are more welcome than New England. There was an effort at this very moment making, to render the issues of the American Tract Society sectional and divisive. Should this effort be successful, which, may God forbid, this Board would become of unspeakable importance not only to us, but to the whole land. He hoped this Board would be able to send many more Colporteurs into New England, and thus become as a golden cord to aid in binding our country together in love. He would go back to his Northern home with the most delightful recollections of the fraternal intercourse of this Assembly. Forty years ago he had visited New Orleans, and he was surprised at the changes which time had wrought. There was then no Protestant Church. Now he comes again, and finds numerous Churches, and a strong Presbyterian element. The temple in which we stand is cheering evidence of its progress."

#### CHURCH EXTENSION.

Mr. Coe, the Corresponding Secretary, presented an abstract of the Annual Report, and made a few pertinent remarks in explanation and illustration. The report is as follows:

*Receipts.*—The receipts from all sources during the year ending April 1, 1858, were \$24,741 15, exceeding those of the previous year, \$1,475 54. Less than half, however, of this excess is from donations. The number of contributing churches named in this report is 518; the number named in the preceding report was 502. These results have been reached in the midst of the hard times, without any salaried collecting agent, and are as gratifying as they were unexpected.

*Expenditures.*—The total expenditures of the year were \$24,384 03. The amount paid out to churches this year is in advance of the amount paid out to them last year, over \$7,000.

*Appropriations.*—During the year appropriations were made to seventy-six churches, amounting to \$27,571 03. This is nearly \$10,000 more than the amount appropriated to churches last year.



*Applications.*—From April 1, 1857, to April 1, 1858, one hundred churches applied for aid to enable them to complete their houses of worship, free from debt. The amount of aid they ask is not less than \$45,000, being fully \$12,000 more than the amount of aid applied for last year. At the close of the year there remained on file *sixty* applicants for aid calling for \$25,000.

*Cost of Church Edifices.*—In the two and a half years the Committee have been fairly at work, they have made appropriations to two hundred and five different churches. One hundred and fifty-three of these two hundred and five church buildings, cost from \$500 to \$2,500; thirty-nine from \$2,500 to \$5,000, and the other thirteen over \$5,000. Five of the thirteen were special appropriations.

*Distribution of Funds.*—The Committee have endeavored to distribute the funds entrusted to them as equitably as possible over the whole Church. How far they have succeeded in this endeavor may be determined from these two facts:

1st. Only three of the three hundred new applications received by them have been declined.

2d. Grants have been made to churches in thirty of the thirty-one Synods, and eighty-six of the one hundred and two Presbyteries, from whose bounds applications have come. The Synod and Presbyteries, to which no appropriations have been made, are those from whose applying churches the requisite information has not yet been received.

*Results.*—Scarcely three years have elapsed since the Assembly's Church Extension Committee was organized. In that time over \$57,000 has been raised for the Church Extension cause without any salaried agent. This is within \$11,000 of the whole sum raised during the eleven years of organized effort in connection with the Board of Missions. The amount received from churches in the last three years is double the amount received from churches during the previous eleven years.

These results encourage the Committee to hope that the blessing of God, and the favor of God's people, will advance the Church Extension Enterprise, until all our waste places

shall be supplied with sanctuaries wherein the Lord will take pleasure and will be glorified.

Dr. Breckinridge, from the Special Committee on that Report, then presented the following resolutions, which were adopted:

“1. *Resolved*, That the Church Extension Committee appears to have conducted the great interest committed to them by the General Assembly with diligence and fidelity, and the Lord has blessed and prospered them; for which, thanks are due to His blessed name.

“2. Inasmuch as the work of building houses for public worship over a region so immense and so diversified as that covered thinly by the Presbyterian Church, presents difficulties so various in their nature, as to render it impossible to give specific directions concerning them; the General Assembly, exhorting the Committee to press forward in the important work, and exhorting the churches to contribute liberally to it, contents itself with the general authorization to the Committee to prosecute it in such manner as its own increasing experience, and the continual indications of Providence, shall satisfy them is most wise and effectual throughout the Church.

“3. Such of our congregations as have insufficient accommodations for public worship, are expected, according to their means, to provide themselves with good and permanent places for the public worship of God. Such as have none are exhorted to make vigorous efforts to provide themselves with them; this being the form of Christian effort, especially in neighborhoods where we have no stated place of worship, towards which those without are usually most disposed to contribute.

“4. All our congregations in country places, and especially those in new settlements, are exhorted to make provisions, where it is possible, of suitable and sufficient grounds for a school for their children, a home for their minister, and a burial place for their dead, all convenient to their place of worship. And, in all these necessary matters, secured while the land is still low—all parsimony being avoided, and due care being taken to secure their titles alike against future disputes and future injury to the cause of Truth, and thus laying sure foundations, they act as becomes those who trust God and build for many generations.

“5. Seeing the vast extent of the land yet to be possessed, the almost indispensable necessity of a sufficient place of worship, to the permanent establishment of a congregation, and the great and constant blessing of God upon our Church in all its endeavors, it becomes all our ministers and people,

whose lot is so cast as to enable them to serve the Lord in this way, to use a wise forecast in good time to secure such necessary sites for church buildings, both in towns and in country places, as will facilitate the constant extension of the Church, and its firm establishment in every quarter of the country.

“6. That the Third Annual Report of the Committee be approved and published.”

Dr. Breckinridge called attention to the fact, that we already had eight hundred more churches than ministers, and that this gap between demand and supply is growing wider and wider. We cannot overtake this spontaneous movement of church growth; all we can do is to try to organize it as it advances. He freely confessed that he was one of those who doubted the practicability of organizing this Committee; but his brethren, as they often did, differed from his views; and when he found they would have it so, he submitted, and tried to help on the enterprise in proportion to his ability. He had, therefore, accepted the position at the head of this Committee, and was desirous that all should participate in this great work. He considered all these Boards (this Committee was sometimes called a Board) really *commissions* of the General Assembly; not committees to examine and report, but *commissions* to determine and act. And their organization was but the outgrowth of the life-spirit of the Church. The spiritual Church will always rebound from an effort to repress this spirit. The great reform of 1837 was precipitated and hastened by the attempt, on the part of the New School, in 1836, to carry the dogmatic declaration that the Assembly had no power, in its proper organization, to engage in the work of missions. From that attempt the Church powerfully re-acted. He deplored the idea sometimes expressed by young brethren, that the conflict of that period was an affair of the *past*, not altogether profitable to remember. He believed it to be the roused life of the Church tending to a great movement. It was the power of God impelling the Church to her great mission and great destiny.

The view which the proceedings of these several Boards (or Commissions, as Dr. Breckinridge calls them), for the year past presents, is full of encouragement and hope. It has been a

year of singular disaster. In the commercial world there has been great distress and financial embarrassment. Many have been reduced from affluence to poverty, and with great difficulty have obtained the means of subsistence. The religious principle of the people of God as to the matter of giving, has been severely tested. Yet it has not been found wanting. When the Secretaries came forward, one after another, and assured us that there had not been a diminution, but an increase in the contributions of the Church in the midst of so many reverses, the heart of the assembly throbbed with joy and gratitude. And though there had been mourning in our Israel, like the mourning of Hadadrimmon in the valley of Megiddo, over our martyred missionaries, their wives and their little ones, and though the tear of sorrow flowed down every manly cheek at the renewed recital, it was known that this demonstration of the malice of Satan would be overwhelmed with signal defeat by the King of Zion, and that there are now those who are ready to be baptized for the dead.

#### AMERICAN BIBLE SOCIETY.

This subject, embraced in overture No. 5, referred by the last Assembly to this, was taken up at an early stage of the proceedings of the Assembly, on the motion of Rev. Mr. Eagleson, and referred to a committee, with instructions to draft a minute expressive of the views of the Assembly on these subjects, and of the claims of the Bible Society on our churches.

This overture of the last Assembly affirms :

First, That the American Bible Society has no right to alter in any way the common and accepted version of the Sacred Scriptures. Second, This society has the right to print and circulate the Bible, and to collect funds for this purpose, but it has no power to edit it. Third, This Assembly have been and are the firm friends of the American Bible Society, and in this sense it feels called upon to resist the smallest departure from the original principles on which that society was founded. Fourth, The Board of Publication of the Presbyterian Church will consider and report to the next General Assembly a plan for the preparation and permanent publication by it of the common English Bible, in a form suitable for pulpit use, with the standard text unchanged, and the usual accessories to the

text commonly found in pulpit English Bibles, from 1611 to 1847.

This subject called forth an animated discussion, in which Rev. W. T. Findley, Dr. Breckinridge and Dr. Hewitt participated ; after which the resolution was adopted.

Mr. Findley wished to know why, in the present posture of the subject, it should be brought up at all. Dr. Breckinridge did not think the concern on this subject is, or ought to be allayed. The minority of the Bible Society's managers contend that the agitation is only begun. The point at issue, the power to make alterations, had been evaded in the discussion. He reviewed the history of the controversy, and expressed a deep gratification at the moral power the Old School Presbyterian Church has exercised in this movement. He admired, loved and honored Dr. Spring more than he had ever before done, for the noble, magnanimous manner in which he had receded from his first position, and for the manner in which he had conducted himself in this whole business. He was glad Dr. Spring continued on the Committee of Revision, and most happy that the other gentlemen had resigned. Our Church ought to take this occasion to express its views on the right of the American Bible Society to edit or alter the common version. Dr. Hewitt agreed with Dr. Breckinridge in his main positions, and honored him for having taken them ; but he thought there was no longer any reason for dread on this subject. No changes would be attempted. He did not wish even so much as to intimate the possibility of such a thing by any action here. Dr. Breckinridge, at a subsequent day, presented the following minute on this subject, expressive of the opinions of the Assembly :

By a vote of the General Assembly of 1857, an overture of that body, which is printed in its minutes, pp. 35-36, relating to the American Bible Society's new standard English Bible, and to the best method of preserving in its integrity the common version of the English Bible, was specially referred to the consideration of the present General Assembly. During the year which has intervened, the attention of the Christian public has been directed to this important subject in a very unusual degree ; and so far as this Assembly has the means of judging,

it is apparent that the Presbyterian Church throughout the country is decidedly opposed to the line of conduct in the premises, pressed by the late Committee on Versions of that society, and to the circulation by that society of their new standard English Bibles. It is, therefore, a matter of great satisfaction to the General Assembly, that the Directors of the American Bible Society have resolved to cease publishing and circulating the aforesaid new standard Bible, and to resume the publication and circulation of the standard English Bible, in exclusive use by the society, before the late work of collation and change commenced, about the year 1847. We also cordially approve the further action of the Board of Directors, so far as it secures a more vigilant oversight in the future, of the work of its Committee on Versions, and prevents any future change either of the text or its accessories, without the careful consideration and special order of the Board of Directors. With regard to any change whatever, either in the text of the English version of the Bible, commonly called King James's version, or in the accessories to that text as they were commonly printed at the foundation of the American Bible Society, we do not admit that the said society has any power or authority to make any alteration in said accessories or said text, except such as appertain to a printer, and not to an editor. By the text of King James's version, we do not mean a copy corrupted by errors and unauthorized changes, no matter where that copy may have been printed, nor how those errors originated, nor who may have ventured to make these changes. But we mean the true text in English, produced and published after the labors of the translators appointed by King James the First of England, which for nearly two centuries and a half has been the standard Bible of all people speaking the English language, and which the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America is resolved to preserve in its integrity and purity, and to use and circulate. Along with the greater portion of the Christian public in this country, we have confided to the American Bible Society the great work of circulating the English Scriptures in the version in common use, and, while we deeply regret the serious error into which it was betrayed, its recent action in the premises demands a cordial response from all the earnest supporters of the great work in which it is engaged. In discharge, therefore, of our duty as the General Assembly of our branch of the Church of the Lord Jesus Christ, to which he has committed his most blessed word for the guidance and salvation of men, we have made this deliverance; and upon the terms herein set forth, we reiterate our approval of the principles

upon which the American Bible Society was founded, our desire to co-operate with our brethren of all Christian denominations in united efforts to furnish the whole world with the word of God, and our earnest recommendation to our people to give liberally to the support of this great cause.

Inquiry was made, 'whether the paper of Dr. Breckinridge contemplates the version in use when the American Bible Society was organized in 1816, or the version of 1611?'

Dr. Breckinridge replied, by reading from his paper, and added, 'that he had intentionally left the description somewhat vague, from a disposition to avoid entering upon a discussion of the points of difference between the versions named.'

It was urged, 'that the true course of the Bible Society was to reproduce the edition of 1611, with no changes except such as are demanded by modifications of spelling.'

Dr. Breckinridge 'in the main agreed with this, and had tried to draw up a paper that might restore harmony to the Protestant public. Good had been done by the agitation of the subject. Vigilance had been awakened, and the public eye fixed upon it.' He gave notice of a paper, still in his pocket, containing a commentary with a specific text.

The paper of Dr. Breckinridge was unanimously adopted.

It is a source of gratification to the Old School Presbyterian Church, that she has been able to do thus much to preserve the English Version of the Scriptures from arbitrary changes. She has an interest in the so-called Version of King James beyond that of almost any other denomination of Christians. It was first suggested by the Scotch Assembly, in 1601, and cordially assented to by him before he became king of England, and was again requested by Dr. Raynolds in behalf of his puritan brethren after James ascended the English throne. The Scotch divines, of all parties, it is true, adhered to the Geneva Bible until about the year 1640, when the present translation, designed for the Church of England, and too partial to prelacy, was at length silently established in general use. The Presbyterians also contribute far the largest portion to the funds of the American Bible Society, and have the largest representation in it, though without any seeking of their own. The

duty of the American Bible Society plainly is, to publish the English Version as it came from the hands of the translators, with no other changes than the adoption of the modern for the obsolete orthography, and the correction of printers' blunders which may have been made. And there is no need, as is proposed, to adopt the clumsy expedient of collating the editions of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and of the king's printers for England, Scotland and Ireland, to find out the true version of King James. The Bible Society can go directly to it and reproduce it without change, according to the sensible suggestions of Rev. Dr. Curtis, in the last number of this Review, to which Dr. Breckinridge doubtless had some measure of regard in his resolutions. An *improved* version has not yet appeared in the English tongue. When it has been produced and obtained the approbation of the people of God, it will be time to take measures for its publication and diffusion.

ASSEMBLY'S COMMENTARY.

In connection with the Report of the Committee on the Board of Publication, Dr. Breckinridge offered an additional minute to provide a Presbyterian Commentary on the Scriptures, which shall be in accordance with the Westminster doctrines of this Church, as follows:

Inasmuch as the want of a sound, godly, and thorough commentary of the whole Word of God, composed in the sense of the constant faith of the Church of God, as that is briefly set forth in the Standards of the Westminster Assembly, held by the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, has long been felt to be a grievous want, whereby a great lack of due service to God and to his truth occurs, and whereby constant danger arises to men of needless ignorance on one side, and of dangerous misguidance on the other; therefore be it

*Resolved by the General Assembly,* That the Board of Publication shall, and is hereby directed, to proceed with all convenient dispatch to have such a Commentary composed, prepared for the press, and published. And in this great work, the following rules and orders, together with such further as may be adopted from time to time by the General Assembly, shall be carefully observed by the Board of Publication, and



by all others in any way engaged in the execution of any part thereof:

1. The Commentary shall be prepared exclusively by the members of this Church, and in the preparing of it, they shall have all such indulgence, as to time, as they shall respectively demand. And for their compensation, they and their heirs shall receive, for the legal term of twenty-eight years, a fair per centum on the price of work sold—which shall be settled in advance by the Board of Publication—and which shall be uniform; and in lieu of all claims and cost of every sort in any way connected with their said work.

2. The said Commentary shall be fitted for common use by all men, and, in the preparation of it, free use may be made of all materials that may exist—the design being to procure, not so much what may be original, as what may be best in the way of enlightening and saving men. It shall not be prolix, but so arranged that the whole may be embraced in 5 or 6 royal octavo volumes of good print, containing, besides the Commentary, the English text in full, together with the usual accessories thereof, and such other suitable helps to its understanding as plain people need. And the text used in it shall be strictly that of the version prepared by the translators appointed by James the First, King of England.

3. In order to secure the fittest men for this great work, the Board of Publication shall make special application to the general Synods of our Church, at their next stated meetings respectively; and the said Synods shall, upon careful consideration, nominate to the said Board of Publication, any number of their own members, not to exceed five from any one Synod, of such as they shall consider qualified to undertake the work; and the Board of Publication may add not more than four, in addition to the whole number thus nominated to it; and it shall communicate the list of names, thus obtained by sifting the Church, to the General Assembly at its stated meeting in May of next year; making, at the same time, and from year to year thereafter, report of its doings under, and by virtue of this minute.

4. The General Assembly of 1859 will take such further order in the premises, especially with regard to selection of persons out of the list communicated to it, to the distribution of the work among them, and to all things needful for its effectual prosecution, as shall seem most expedient.

This paper gave rise to an animated debate, in which Dr. Breckinridge, Mr. Parke, Mr. Eagleson, Mr. Hill, Mr. Morris,

Dr. Hewitt and Dr. Junkin participated on the one side, and Dr. Rankin, Mr. Floyd, Dr. Hoge, Mr. Squier, Prof. W. J. Hoge and Dr. Van Rensselaer on the other.

Dr. Breckinridge said he had at the beginning of this Board made a movement similar to the present, and from time to time it has been renewed. He was gratified to know from what the Secretary had stated, that the Board had already published something in this way. The theological seminaries, and Princeton in particular, have done much; and the Assembly is now better prepared than at any time previously, to make such a Commentary. Many Commentaries of great merit are in existence, but when asked by brethren in the Church for advice as to a choice of one, he had often been truly perplexed. There is not one that comes up to the Westminster standard, and that is a true exponent of the doctrines of this Church. The present is probably the last opportunity he would ever enjoy of bringing this enterprise before the Assembly. By adopting this scheme, you would have reported to the next Assembly forty or fifty, or perhaps one hundred and fifty names, from which you can then make your selections. Say, for instance, to Dr. Addison Alexander, "Revise and adapt your work on the Psalms for popular use." Go on in this way, and in thirty or forty years you will have the best Commentary the world has ever seen.

Dr. Junkin was in favor of the project, but opposed to its reference to the Board of Publication. This Board is already committed to publishing other Commentaries. If we are to publish Commentaries, let it be under the vigilant eye of the Church.

Dr. Rankin was opposed to the whole thing. Opposed because the paper did not say, "the version in common use." It leaves it optional with the commentators to take one of several versions, or virtually make a new version by combination of others. He would not give his sanction to any version produced in the present day. There is a sense in which the issues of the Board of Publication speak for the Church. But to make that Board give what will be regarded as an official interpretation of the word of God, is a very serious matter.

There are commentaries which were in existence before many of the questions of the present German criticism and philosophy prevailed, which answered every purpose. Even in the Commentary on the Psalms, mentioned here, the foot-prints of Germanism were seen. You cannot get men in our Church to undertake this work without involving a risk of this evil. In the nature of things, this body cannot do this thing. How can this Assembly take up in detail such a Commentary, verse by verse, and examine its accuracy? Rev. Mr. Floyd argued that if more than one man were employed on each of the sixty-six books of the Bible, as should be the case, some four or five hundred men would be needed. Let us see what they will do, before you disparage the works of others. There is often a great difference between the reputation of men when living, and when they are dead. Circumstances often concur to give very ordinary men an elevation in their life-time, which posterity does not ratify. You will be likely to get some of these among your commentators. He had, moreover, great confidence in spontaneity in works of this sort. Set men to writing as a mere duty, and you endanger the probability of getting the best productions of the best men. Prof. W. J. Hoge saw great difficulties. How, for instance, can we meet the diversity of views as to the book of Revelation and the question of millennarianism. As to doctrines we are not one. Take the recent discussion between Danville and Columbia on the imputation of Adam's sin. Dr. Breckinridge denied that there is any war between Columbia and Danville, and paid a high compliment to the professor of theology at the former institution. He admitted the work to be of transcendent difficulty, but there is a sense to the Westminster standards, and whatever that sense is, is to be the rule as regards this Commentary. If the Church cannot attempt and accomplish such a work as this, let us hang our heads in shame and sorrow. Dr. Hoge would be glad to see proper measures initiated to produce such a Commentary. But we hazard much in adopting this paper now. The Assembly, in voting for it, approves the specific way of accomplishing this end. He doubted whether referring to the Synods was the best mode. There are Synods which would not be willing

to name five or even three of their number for this service. In his own Synod, which is an important one, he could not name five whom he would recommend for this duty. He had further difficulties. So far as our standards are concerned, he had stood up for them through many trials; but can any one say that those standards go to the extent of solving every difficulty in interpreting God's word.

Rev. Dr. Van Rensselaer was opposed to the adoption of Dr. Breckinridge's proposition. First, Because the plan proposed opens anew the controversy about the true edition of King James's version, and pledges this General Assembly to a position different from that of the Christian world. Why should this Assembly attempt in any way to dishonor the version now in common use? I deprecate, says he, the agitation of any such question as exciting, unnecessary, and disparaging to our own Church. In the second place, I am opposed to this plan of a Commentary, because the Church, as a Church, is not called upon to make an authoritative interpretation in its own name, respecting the meaning of every passage of Scripture. There are hundreds of passages on which the most orthodox and eminent divines have differed in opinion; and some of these passages have received scores of interpretations. Then there are other passages which involve doctrines, such, for example, as the millennium, which the Church cannot explain in a Commentary without hazarding its peace and unity. Third, The mode of getting up this new Commentary is exceedingly complicated, and probably impracticable. You cannot obtain five Commentators in each Synod; and there are more than five Synods who will refuse to appoint any. It is to my mind exceedingly doubtful whether any of the Northern Synods will take any action on this subject, and if they should, whether any of their ministers would undertake any such work. The writing of Commentaries must be undertaken from the spontaneous conviction of those who may feel that they possess gifts for such a high service. The Church cannot expect to find suitable Commentators in all the Synods. A Commentary produced in such a manner, if produced at all, would not be likely to possess the requisite unity, or to

command in other respects the confidence of the churches. I shall move to refer this subject to the next General Assembly, for two reasons. First, Because this is a most important subject, requiring more deliberation than this Assembly is able to give to it. In the second place, the character of the Presbyterian Church is very much concerned in an undertaking of this kind. The public mind will be fixed upon us; and if we hastily begin so great a work, and should not be able to finish it, or should finish it in an imperfect manner—which are the two most likely alternatives—we shall suffer loss as a Church, and even bring reproach upon our character and standing in the Christian world.

The whole subject was referred to the next General Assembly.

Desirable as it would be for the Church to possess such a Commentary, the greatest practical difficulties will be found in its execution. Many of these were suggested in the discussions had before the Assembly; others will easily occur to the mind of the reader.

There are two kinds of Commentary, the *critical* and the *popular*. The one states the processes by which the commentator is led to his results, it embraces materials philological and grammatical, unfolds the sense, and brings before the mind the language of the original. It investigates the true reading of the sacred text, and not only applies that various learning—antiquarian, historical and geographical—requisite to elucidate the text, but brings it forth to the view of the scholar, that he may be satisfied with the result attained, and retrace, if he chooses, the process himself. *Popular* Commentary does not disclose the steps of the exegetical process, but gives the results in plain and untechnical language. It lays aside learned phraseology and scientific investigation, avoiding everything which a mere English scholar would be unable to understand. It strives only to exhibit in the clearest and most vivid way, the sense of the Holy Scriptures. It is not impossible, in some measure, to unite the two, to bring the one down to popular comprehension, and lift the other up out of the region of trite and vapid remark. Yet this is no easy task, and requires a rare combination of talent and wisdom. It is not the English ver-

sion, but the original Hebrew, Chaldee and Greek Scriptures, which our standards declare to be the rule of faith. Though only a popular Commentary be aimed at, this has to be the result of long-continued familiarity with the original. The comment, of whatever character, must flow from this. How few are the men who have the knowledge and the practice requisite. In our judgment such a Commentary should not be a mere compilation, another *catena patrum*. But if compilation be resorted to, it will not do to compile from the writings of men famed for talents and orthodoxy, without the utmost exercise of judgment. The noble Commentaries of Calvin would often fall short, in the exposition of particular passages, of what is now held to be their true meaning. To compile well, demands the same discriminating knowledge of the originals, and the spirit of these must pervade the whole, and be manifested in every particular interpretation. To meet the public expectation in such an undertaking, would indeed be difficult, if not impossible. To have one's work fail of giving satisfaction, after years of toil, would be deeply humiliating to the ingenuous scholar. Far sooner would a man undertake to prepare a Commentary as the free, untrammelled fruit of his own researches and pleasant studies, and offer it to the judgment of the Church, either to be approved or to be neglected, as they should see fit, than bargain to prepare one in concert with others, under the responsibilities of this scheme. A Commentary *made to order*, would soon, we fear, be as little read as "The Assembly's Annotations," purporting to be composed by members of the Westminster Assembly of Divines, which, however, was not set on foot by the Westminster Assembly, but by Parliament, who, by its Committee for Religion, nominated the commentators, and furnished them with books—nor were all the commentators members of that famous Assembly, nor even of the Presbyterian faith. The Church has a year to reflect upon this matter, and either to adopt the plan proposed, modify it, or reject it wholly.

## CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION.

Wednesday, the 12th of May, had been fixed upon to com-

memorate the re-union of the two Synods of New York and Philadelphia in May, 1758. The Moderator began with a psalm, and reading the Scriptures; the Rev. James Hoge, D. D., led in solemn and appropriate prayer; the Rev. Cortland Van Rensselaer, D. D., delivered the Centennial discourse according to the appointment of the last General Assembly, and the Rev. R. J. Breckinridge, D. D., offered thanksgiving and prayer. The whole exercises were closed with psalmody, the doxology and the Apostolic benediction.

Dr. Van Rensselaer spoke of the influence of a century on human progress, and regarded Centennial periods as furnishing appropriate points of observation of the train of events. He ascribed the origin of the Presbyterian Church in the United States to those persecutions which had swept like a tide over Scotland, Ireland, England and France, and borne with its wave from the Old World to the New, those sturdy men who subdued the wilderness and planted the standard of civil and religious freedom on the shores of the New Continent. The separation of the Church into the "Old" and "New side," was not occasioned by difference of doctrinal views on the fundamentals of theology. The Old Side adhered with the greatest strictness to the Confession of Faith, and stood up for education in the ministry. The New Side would license men to preach the Gospel who were neophytes in literature, provided they gave evidence of piety. The revival under Whitfield and the Tennents added fuel to the conflagration. The New Side men embarked in it with zeal, and were regarded by their opponents as extravagant enthusiasts. At length, in the year 1741, the highest judicatory of the Church was rent asunder and the Synod of New York was founded by the New Side in opposition to the Synod of Philadelphia. Meanwhile, both parties retraced their steps, and after the lapse of seventeen years, nine of which were spent in negotiation, came together after mutual concessions in the year 1758, in a union which has been accompanied with the happiest results.

The narrative of the reconciliation, as given by the speaker, brought the scene and the venerable men engaged in it before the view of the Assembly, with a portraiture and a grouping,

which showed how near together are the employments of the painter and the orator—the one addressing the mind through the organs of vision, the other through the hearing of the ear. The whole discourse was well conceived, rich in instruction, and eminently suggestive as to our future history. Towards the close he referred to the field which past events have opened to our progress in the following terms:

The old French war, which was in active operation at the time of the re-union, in 1758, was a war of principles, of races, of religions; and God gave might to right. By the treaty of peace, all the French possessions in North America reverted to England; and over the whole valley, east of the Mississippi, (with a small exception,) and north of the Ohio, the flag of liberty and King George waved its triumphs in the air, throwing its shadows on the prostrate emblems of France and the Bourbons. Then was achieved the first victory which announced the future destiny of all this glorious region. As between England and France, God vested this country in England, to retain it until the young Republic should become of age.

Next came the war of the Revolution; and the West having been annexed to the Colonies, the Colonies were now to be dissevered from England, in order that the West, with the East, might be cultivated for the whole world.

Thus did God mark out for the Church a country vast in extent—to be added to in future years, but now first guaranteed to the Church—vast in its increasing extent, until lake mirrors gulf and sea surges into sea. How great has been the political and civil influence of the last century upon this country! And who can tell what another century shall bring, of increase to this magnificent inheritance of liberty and religion? How the ignorance of man clouds the vision of faith? And yet, methinks, faith can see into the vista of years. Like as the eye, with a telescope, unravels the tangled skein of nebulae in the skies, faith can behold the confused mysteries of Central America taking their places as stars in the firmament of our Union. And as astronomers think there is some central point, whither the whole system is tending, so, were I to theorize about the territorial centre of our Republic, when expanded a century hence, I would say it might be here, in the city of our Centennial celebration; here in New Orleans, where lines from the North and South and West meet, a triangle enfolding a problem of greatness; here, on the highway to the whole of



the glorious Pacific States; here, in contiguity with Texas and with the States of the great Mexican peninsula, all the way down to the Isthmus.

At a subsequent period, as the Chairman of the Committee of Bills and Overtures, Dr. Van Rensselaer made a report, recommending the following overture on the Centennial celebration, which was adopted:

This General Assembly having been called upon, in the providence of God, to unite in a Centennial commemoration of the re-union of the Synods of New York and Philadelphia, in 1758, deem it proper, on this occasion, to adopt a minute relating to that interesting and important event.

The Assembly recognize the good hand of God, in early bringing to these shores immigrants of Scotch, Scotch-Irish, English and Huguenot extraction, to assist in establishing the Church of the Lord Jesus Christ among the waste places of this continent. The memory of the ministers who commenced the work of evangelization, and who laid the foundation of the Church, is treasured by this Assembly, with gratitude to Him who sent them forth to accomplish His purposes, with many self-denials, abundant labors and great success.

The Assembly record the goodness of God in leading the fathers to adopt authoritatively the Westminster standard for the future guidance of the Church.

The Assembly further record their views of the unspeakable importance and blessedness of pure revivals of religion in the Church; praising God for the general results of the great revival of religion within our bounds in the days of Whitfield and the Tennents, and rejoicing that the present year has been signalized by the same precious and glorious outpourings of the Holy Spirit.

The Assembly further put upon record their sense of the obligations of the Church to its Great Head, in preserving incorrupt its outward forms of order in the olden time; in gradually and surely increasing its educational and evangelical resources, and in endowing it, after the lapse of the first century of re-union, with such enlargements of its missionary work at home and in foreign lands.

On an occasion which forcibly brings to mind the blessings of God upon re-union, and which commemorates the dwelling together of brethren in unity, the Assembly expresses a deep conviction of the desirableness of the union of all sound Presbyterians; and do hereby cordially and earnestly extend an invitation to all who are like-minded with ourselves, to unite with

this General Assembly in the way and manner conformable to the acts and deliverances on this subject already made by this Assembly.

On motion of Dr. Breckinridge, the following resolution was added to the minute :

*Resolved*, That the thanks of this Assembly be tendered to Dr. Van Rensselaer, for his discourse, and that the Board of Publication be directed to publish it, together with the other papers connected with the subject, in book form.

#### CORRESPONDENCE WITH FOREIGN BODIES.

A communication was read from Dr. R. Baird, who had been commissioned to represent the Assembly in foreign Christian bodies, he reporting his visit to the Evangelical Conference at Berlin, which continued in session nine days. The whole Christian world was represented in that conference, and the number of delegates was not less than 1,400. The result of this meeting, which was the third he had attended—the first being held in London and the second in Paris—was the formation of an evangelical alliance, and the evident progress of religious truth.

An interesting communication was forwarded to the Assembly by Rev. Frederick Monod, from Dr. G. Fish, of France, in the name of the "General Synodale of the Presbyterian Church of Paris." It was referred to the Committee on Foreign Correspondence, the chairman of which, Dr. Hewitt, made a report, accompanied by the following resolution, viz. :

1. That when the statistics of the last year are completed, and more particularly that relating to the present revivals of religion, our Moderator be requested to reply to the President of the Synod of the Free Church in France, expressing the sympathy, veneration and affection of this Assembly for that sister church.

2. That if one or more of our brethren shall visit Europe the ensuing summer, our Moderator be empowered to commission him or them to represent this Assembly in that Synod.

The report and resolutions were received and adopted.

The Rev. William Young appeared before the Assembly as a Delegate from the "Associate Reformed Synod of the South."

He gave a rapid sketch of the condition of the Associate Reformed Synod, from which it appeared that it now has eight Presbyteries, ten churches, seventy ministers, a College in South Carolina which is prosperous, and a Theological Seminary which is doing something to prepare young men for the Christian ministry. A number of the churches have recently received times of refreshing from the Lord. They have, under their care, likewise, several colored churches, which are regarded as a part of their body, and to whose peculiar necessities their doctrines are especially adapted. He said, "our doctrine, faith, and practices, are the same as your own; and I am ready, on behalf of the body which I represent, to give to this General Assembly, the right hand of fellowship.

I am not authorized to speak, officially, as to a close and permanent union of our two bodies; but I take upon me to say, that such an event would fill all our hearts with joy unspeakable; and if the time has not yet arrived for such a union as that referred to, we may be still perfectly united in heart and purpose to proclaim peace on earth and good will to men, and to advance the Kingdom of the Redeemer." He closed by announcing that the next meeting of the Associate Reformed Synod of the South will be held at Abbeville, S. C., in October next.

Dr. Scott, the Moderator, in a few appropriate words, welcomed Mr. Young, in the name of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States.

The Rev. John Woodbridge presented a report of his attendance as the delegate of this General Assembly to the last General Synod of the Reformed Dutch Church of North America. And in the course of the Assembly's proceedings the Rev. Dr. Chambers appeared as a delegate from the aforesaid Synod, and offered the cordial salutations of that Church in an interesting address, responded to by the Moderator in corresponding terms.

#### UNION WITH THE ASSOCIATE REFORMED.

Negotiations to this effect have been going on for some years past between the Synod of South Carolina and the As-

sociate Reformed Synod of the South. It was soon found that these two bodies were not co-ordinate, and could not treat with each other. The Associate Reformed Church was divided into two Synods, the Northern and Southern, which had no connection with each other. The Northern Synod had become united, since the meeting of the Assembly at New Orleans, with the Reformed Presbyterian Church, and those two bodies have become merged into one. On a memorial from the Synod of South Carolina to the Assembly meeting in New York in 1856, a Committee of Conference was appointed, of which Rev. Edwin Cater is Chairman, and a co-ordinate committee, consisting of one from each of their Presbyteries, was appointed by the Associate Reformed Synod of the South. The Committee have never met face to face, nor had the reply of the Committee on their part to the last communication from us been received at the meeting at New Orleans. There had, however, been an informal Convention of ministers and elders of the respective churches held in Columbia, S. C., which convened in March last, at which were present six ministers and eight elders of two Presbyteries of the Associate Reformed, and twenty-two ministers and sixteen elders, chiefly of the Synod of South Carolina. This Convention did not act with any authority derived from the judicatories of either Church, but had in view to find out on what terms, if any there are, the two bodies might be brought together. The Convention having been organized, it was resolved that the two parties should meet separately, and that their correspondence should be conducted in writing. It was found that the only bar to this union, now existing, is the practice of the two bodies on the subject of Psalmody, the Associate brethren, in common with all bodies of Presbyterians in other lands, speaking the English tongue, using Rouse's version of the Psalms, and they, as a Church, making it a matter of conscience to use in Divine worship only what has been divinely authorized, and, therefore, insisting heretofore, that the Psalms are to be used alone, and in a version as nearly literal as the laws of metre will admit.

As a term of union they proposed:

1. A new version of the Psalms of David to take the place

of Rouse's version, now in use in the Associate Reformed Church; and of Dr. Watt's imitation, now in use in the Presbyterian Church. This new version to be prepared by translation or collation, or both, and to be as near the original as the laws of versification will allow.

2. This version, when approved by both bodies, to be employed in the congregations and private families of each denomination, not on the principle of accommodation or forbearance, but as authorized by the Head of the Church, and by the Church itself.

3. While we believe that the Psalms of David are the only songs which God has authorized to be employed in his praise; and while, on this account, we do not feel at liberty to use anything else, yet we believe that many persons in our body, for the sake of union, would be willing to forbear with their Presbyterian brethren in the use of uninspired songs.

To this, the reply of that part of the Convention representing our own Church, was as follows:

The spirit of your propositions we understand to be this: That a book of praise shall be prepared, in which there *shall* be a literal version of the Psalms, and in which there *may* be a collection of hymns and spiritual songs, such as those now in use in the churches in the General Assembly. The new version you propose, we do not understand as designed to supersede our present book of Hymns, nor even as excluding Watts' imitation of the Psalms, provided they are brought under the category of the Hymns. If we are right in this interpretation of your terms, we can not see what is to hinder an immediate union of the two bodies. We are prepared to concede to you the exclusive use of the version of the Psalms which you now employ, and to take steps for having it incorporated into our book. We do not desire you to relinquish it, if you yourselves are satisfied with it.

If, on your own account, you desire a new version, we shall be happy to co-operate with you in making one, not as the condition, but as the result of union.

If we have misapprehended your meaning, and your purpose is to exclude from our churches our present songs of praise, if the new version is to supersede our Hymns in our congregations, that would obviously be asking us to abandon our whole doctrine on the subject of Psalmody, a condition, we are sure, our Associate Reformed brethren do not desire to impose, especially as it would involve a serious loss to us, and its effect would be a gain to them in a better version of the Psalms.

The Convention came to no further results than to ascertain these facts and to part with feelings of fraternal regard, and, probably on both sides, with a conviction that the hour of our union had not yet come.

When the report of these proceedings was made to the Assembly, Dr. Breckinridge moved that the Committee of Conference be discharged. "He was persuaded the union of the two bodies on the terms proposed was impossible. The terms yielded by the Committee would never be agreed to by our Church, and the brethren of the Associate Reformed are so deeply rooted in their feelings about the Psalms that they never would be satisfied unless we went the whole length with them. There is no occasion for a new version of the Psalms, and if there were there are no men to make it. You cannot raise up poets to order, much less a committee of them. The great danger of our own body is its strength. We need homogeneity to enable us to develop it. Introduce this new element and you endanger our perpetuity and unity." Dr. Hoge "had never been sanguine as to the successful issue of these negotiations, nor even strongly desirous that they should succeed. We shall never agree in the matter of communion with other churches. In their communication to us they had made no allusion to this. He felt bound, under the circumstances, to support the motion of Dr. Breckinridge, but proposed as an amendment, that we assign as a reason, that we cannot agree in Psalmody and intercommunion." The motion of Dr. Breckinridge was earnestly opposed by others. Rev. Mr. Hoyt "lived in Abbeville District, S. C., near the headquarters of the Associate Reformed Church, and was a member of the Convention at Columbia. He felt confident that the matter is entirely misapprehended. The Convention was not an ecclesiastical body. It was entirely informal and voluntary. Nothing that it did can be binding on either body. Few of the Associate Reformed ministers were present at the Convention, and they mostly of the younger ministry. It was natural that they should feel embarrassed, and in the fear of yielding too much should not yield enough. The Convention did in part succeed. In guarded language the Associate

Reformed portion of that Convention expressed the opinion, that the principle for which we contend (Christian liberty in worship) would be conceded."

The Rev. Mr. Bishop thought the Assembly ought not to cut short this subject just here. 1. The Committee do not believe the matter has reached a finality. 2. The doings of an informal conference of the Associate Reformed body have been mistaken for official action of their Church. It is no such thing. And 3. The correspondence, thus far, has done good; by continuing it, much more will be gained.

Dr. McKinney opposed the discharge of the Committee—1st, Because the subject is one of serious importance, and has not been exhausted. 2d, Because the papers presented are truly to be regarded as the work of a committee rather than of the body itself. He had lived with these people in habits of intimacy, and often preached to them. He well knew their feelings towards us. They and we have come together within the last six months more than in the previous twenty years. Formerly they thought we had among us no religion, and we thought they had none. But we have learned to know each other better. These discussions have done us all good, and even the writings of Dr. Breckinridge have had their share in the good work.

Judge Calhoun, of Alabama, regretted to differ from brethren he venerated. The similarity of doctrines between the members of this body and the Assembly, the tenacity with which they had adhered to their principles, and their acknowledged piety and Christian spirit, were guarantees that they would introduce no disturbing element. He described, from personal knowledge, their purity of character, their heroic adherence to the usages of their fathers, and their devotion to the truth; and, though the time of union might be far distant, he thought true policy and Christian sympathy demanded the continuance of the Committee. He still had hope. Have not similar bodies been consolidated in Ireland. The changes he had witnessed among these brethren convinced him that the remaining obstacles would be removed. The great body of the younger

members would even now gladly hail the union, and probably on terms agreeable to us.

Mr. Eagleson, of the Special Committee appointed to consider the matter of continuing in office the Committee of Conference with the Synod of the Associate Reformed Church of the South, submitted the following report and resolutions :

The Committee, to whom was referred the report of the Committee of Conference in reference to a closer union between the Associate Reformed Synod of the South and the Presbyterian Church, represent that they have carefully examined said report, and recommend the adoption of the following resolutions :

1. *Resolved*, That the fidelity of the Committee be approved.
2. *Resolved*, That the Committee be continued with addition of the following persons, viz: Chancellor Job Johnson, Rev. Messrs. Thomas Hoyt, Thomas L. McBryde, D. D., and J. H. Thornwell, D. D. Said Committees to report to the next General Assembly.

*Resolved*, That it be recommended to all, and especially to our ministers and churches in the South, to circulate for examination and use, the psalms and hymn books of our Church, with selections from the Book of Psalms in metre, according to the versions used in the Church of Scotland.

The report and resolutions were adopted; and Rev. Mr. Young, the delegate from the Associate Synod, made an appropriate response.

We are better satisfied with this result, (the continuance of the Committee yet longer,) than if it had terminated otherwise. The origin of the Secession Church was an honorable one. When Ebenezer Erskine and his associates stood aloof from the Church of Scotland, and seceded from it, it was on a just principle—the principle of resistance to tyranny and error. Their secession originally was not from the *Church* of Scotland, but from the reigning party in it, the Moderates of that day, by whom heresy was protected, sound doctrine condemned, the rights of congregations violated. The secession of 1733 and 4, was on the same ground with the disruption of 1843, when Chalmers led forth the Free Church of Scotland from the Church of the Establishment, in that ever memorable exodus which filled the



world with admiration. They were, indeed, few in numbers, and were treated with great severity. In this severity they became unduly obstinate, but they were noted for godliness and doctrinal purity. We need only mention the names of the Erskines and James Fisher in illustration.

We do not sympathize in the fears expressed that the union with these brethren will introduce into our body a disturbing element. This was not so when, in 1822, a portion of the Associate Reformed Synod of the North came into our Church, and became a component part of it. Those brethren have been esteemed as among our most orthodox and useful members. In the struggle of 1837, the New School charged that we were instigated in our reform measures by this element. Even if it were so, we have never regretted the measures we then took. To the honor of the Secession Church be it said, that in the defection from the faith, which in former years had nearly ruined the Church of Ireland, this body stood firmly by the doctrines of the Cross, and by the salt of their truth and grace, contributed much to preserve that important branch of our Presbyterian family from apostacy. As to intercommunion, we would apprehend no difficulty. Their communion with us would be unrestricted. We may leave it with propriety to sessions, who are the original judges in the case, to decide how far intercommunion with other denominations should be carried. We might bear with them in this, and forbear, as they must do with us. And as to psalmody, which, in reality, is the only ground of present separation, they should remember that it formed no part of the original testimony of their founders; while we, on our part, should recollect that we are the only Presbyterians worshipping God in the English tongue, who do not use the version of Rouse. To those accustomed to its use, it has a venerable sanctity, notwithstanding its rugged verse. Its author, who sat in the British Parliament, was also a lay member of the Westminster Assembly of Divines, who sanctioned this book on the 14th November, 1645. It was revised by the General Assembly of Scotland, and adopted in 1648. The Westminster Assembly are said to have approved and acted upon the principle also, that "in using the book of

Psalms in the praises of God, we should not only keep to the *sense*, but to the *words* of the sacred text." We have not been able to ascertain this from any adequate authority. Certain it is that the Church of Scotland have used *paraphrases* of passages of Scripture from the Old and New Testament, for some one or two hundred years. Our Fathers brought this psalmody with them to these shores, and its use in our churches has never been repealed by any act of our highest ecclesiastical court. It has at different times allowed of the use of Watt's imitation of David's Psalms, and of his Hymns, and has provided for its churches the book of Psalms and Hymns now in use, without designing to exclude or prohibit the other. And not without considerable commotions among ourselves, was the New Psalmody first introduced. The Scotch version, too, is associated in the minds of those who use it, with the martyrdom of their fathers. In the martyrologies of the Church of Scotland, how often do we find the martyr at the stake or scaffold, chanting some portion of these Psalms as he is about to receive his dreadful baptism of blood. Their proposition that we join them in securing a new poetic, yet close version of the Psalms, is attended with great difficulties. Undoubtedly a smoother version than Rouse's could be made, and equal closeness to the text be preserved. But an absolutely *literal* version in unconstrained and "numerous verse," is perfectly unattainable. The number, rhythm and movement of true lyric poetry, can be secured only by a free translation made by a poet's hand. If we must confine ourselves to a literal translation in Divine worship, the version must be in *prose*, and the Gregorian chants, or some other such, be introduced in our church music, or it must continue to be inharmonious and constrained.

Our negotiations with our brethren of the Associate Reformed have, thus far, failed to result in that union which was hoped for. If this could be effected by bringing their Psalmody into connection with ours, by publishing in the same book either the version of Rouse or the new one they seem to desire, so that it could be met with by them throughout the bounds of the Church, this seems to us a concession, if it is entitled to this

name, which we could afford to make, and by omitting some of the least important duplicates of the Psalms found in each book, and some few of our Hymns, the size and cost of our book would not be greatly increased. An overture asking that the Psalms of David, in Rouse's Version, or such other as may be acceptable to the Associate Reformed Synod of the South, be published in the front part of our Book of Psalms and Hymns, was sent up to the Assembly by the Presbytery of Knoxville, but the Assembly declined to take action upon it *at present*. If union of these two bodies could be effected, it would secure in many neighborhoods strong Presbyterian Churches where now there are weak and feeble ones, or where each party is too inconsiderable in number to attempt any organization at all. For the want of it the Presbyterian cause is losing, especially in newly settled places, every day.

UNION WITH THE UNITED PRESBYTERIAN SYNOD OF THE SOUTH.  
(NEW SCHOOL.)

The Southern portion of New School General Assembly separated from that organization in May, 1857, in consequence of the spirit of abolition prevailing in that body. The ministers and churches who thus seceded, met in Convention subsequently at Richmond, and took measures for another and more general meeting, which assembled at Knoxville, and organized themselves into a Synod, on the 2d of April, 1858. This Synod appointed a Committee to confer with the Old School General Assembly on the subject of union. This Committee, consisting of Rev. C. H. Read, D. D., and \_\_\_\_\_ were understood to be in attendance. On motion of Rev. Mr. Cunningham, the subject of conference with this Committee was taken up. A motion made by Dr. Van Rensselaer to appoint a committee of three to meet this Committee of Conference, gave rise to a debate, in which Dr. Breckinridge, Mr. Cobb and Rev. Dr. Hoge participated. Dr. Breckinridge "was one of the few ministers who fought through the whole war of 1837. He had nothing to retract. We should take care that our extended and extending body is not rendered discordant by inharmonious elements. At the time of the great division there were minis-

ters and churches who went with the New School who ought to have been with us ; but this is a very different thing from saying that as bodies they and we should be one. He had personal knowledge that there are leading gentlemen in that body who are not like-minded with us. The body itself is not agreed as to the propositions they make us. Of nineteen gentlemen, ten voted for the propositions and nine against them. He agreed with the nine. We are called upon by them to retract our deliberate action as to the ex-scinded Synods—a thing we did considerately, and prayerfully, and which has been approved by the Church, and approved by God—to unite with them. As to abolitionism, the world has periodical periods of madness. This moral epidemic of late has raged in the North, and produced scenes of folly and absurdity which have astonished all sane and prudent men. But the conviction which has always swayed this Assembly is gaining ground, that Ministers, in their sacred capacity as ministers, have nothing to do with matters apart from the doctrines of salvation.

+ On the terms proposed he would not treat with his own father or his own brother. Cut his body into ten thousand pieces, and it was his individual conviction, that every individual piece of him would protest.” Thos. R. R. Cobb, Esq., plead eloquently for the Committee of Conference. “This,” said he, “is the battle of a past age. Of all the members belonging to this Assembly, Dr. Breckinridge is, perhaps, the only one remaining who fought in the beginning of the contest. In the contest which now presents itself—the contest of brotherly love and Christian charity, let us outvie them.” Dr. Hoge objected to the Committee of Conference: “1. Because without their terms officially before us, we are acting in the dark. 2. To appoint such a Committee will be the beginning of controversy with them. 3. Their terms, as published in the newspapers, indicate a wish to introduce into our body the elements of another contention. 4. The fact that they propose to us to change our views is indelicate and improper. 5. He doubts whether the Assembly has power to enter into any work of this kind, further than to prepare it and send it down to Presbyteries.”

The motion to appoint a Committee of Conference with the

Corresponding Committee of the New School prevailed, and the Rev. Drs. Van Rensselaer and Palmer and the Rev. Mr. Cunningham, were appointed by the Moderator, to obtain from the Committee of the United Synod, organized at Knoxville, their terms of union. This Committee subsequently reported that they had met that Committee, and, as the result of their meeting, asked leave to submit the following, which embraces the

TERMS OF UNION :

This may certify, that the meeting of the United Synod of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, which was organized in Knoxville, Tennessee, the 2d day of April, 1858, the following action, being instructions to the Committee of Two appointed to confer with a Committee of the Old School General Assembly in the event of that body appointing one for the purpose, with reference to a union of the two bodies, was taken.

*Resolved*, That said Committee be directed to propose to the Committee appointed by the General Assembly, the following terms of union as indispensable to our honorable union; on our part :

“1st. We agree to unite as ecclesiastical bodies by declaring, as this Synod now does, our approval of the Westminster Confession of Faith, and Larger and Shorter Catechisms, as an orthodox and excellent system of Christian doctrine; and, also, our adherence to the plan of Worship, Government and Discipline, contained in the Westminster Directory.

“2d. Both bodies agree in declaring it to be a fundamental principle, in the Presbyterian Church, that no judicatory of the Church can, *for any cause whatever*, by an act of legislation, constitutionally condemn, or exclude from the Church, other judicatories, or ministers or private members, without a process of trial, such as is prescribed in the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church.

“3rd. Both bodies agree that it is consistent with the requirements of the Westminster Confession of Faith to receive said Confession according to the adopting Act of 1729, to wit: As containing all the essential truths of Christianity, and also the doctrines that distinguish the Calvinistic from the Pelagian, Socinian and Arminian systems of theology. We agree likewise in believing that this system of doctrine includes the following truths, viz: The Trinity, the incarnation and deity of Christ, the fall and original sin, atonement, justification by faith, per-

sonal election, effectual calling, perseverance of the saints, the eternal happiness of the righteous, and eternal punishment of the wicked.

“4th. Both bodies agree in declaring that slaveholding, or the relation of master and slave, cannot, *in any case*, be a bar to membership in the Church of Christ. And while they admit the right of the judicatories of the Church to take cognizance, in the way prescribed in the Constitution, of cruelties practiced in the relation, they hereby declare the opinion, that as the continuance or abolition of the system of slavery, in this country, belongs exclusively to the State, the discussion or agitation of slavery, further than pertains to the moral and religious duties, arising from the relation, is inappropriate to the functions of Church judicatories.

“5th. It is further agreed that in effecting the union, the Presbyteries connected with this Synod shall be united as Presbyteries, and without an examination of their ministers, with the Synods belonging to the General Assembly, to which, because of their geographical limits, they should be attached, excepting that the Synod of Tennessee and the North Alabama Presbytery shall retain their name, and occupy their present territory.

“6th. In the event of the General Assembly agreeing to the above terms, the Committee of Synod are directed to communicate the fact to the Presbyteries in connection with this Synod, and the Presbyteries are hereby requested by the United Synod to take action upon the terms of union agreed upon by the Committees of Synod and the General Assembly, and to send a copy of their minute to the United Synod that will meet in Lynchburg on the third Thursday in May, 1859.

“7. The Committee appointed by this Synod to confer with a Committee of the General Assembly, are hereby directed to attend the meeting of the Assembly in New Orleans in May next, and present the preamble and first two resolutions adopted by this Synod as their authority for requesting a conference with a Committee appointed by the General Assembly to the General Assembly, which will then be in session in that city. And if no member of the Committee should be able to attend the meeting of the Assembly in New Orleans, they are directed to send a copy of the preamble and first two resolutions to the Moderator of the Assembly, and request that body, if they should think proper, to appoint a Committee for the purpose above specified, to designate a time immediately after the adjournment of the Assembly for a conference of the Committees. The Committee of this Synod are requested, in

the event of a conference being had with a Committee of the Old School Assembly, to publish, as soon as practicable, the result of their consultations."

JOSEPH H. MARTIN,  
*Permanent Clerk of the United Synod.*

The following additional article was submitted and adopted :

"8th. That in the event no union is agreed to, the Committee be directed to propose to the General Assembly the establishment of a mutual correspondence in the future between us as ecclesiastical bodies."

A true extract from the minutes.

JOSEPH H. MARTIN,  
*Permanent Clerk of the United Synod.*

The action of the Assembly on this whole subject is expressed in the following minute, which had been offered by Dr. Breckinridge in the opening of this discussion, and being amended, was unanimously adopted :

1. The Committee appointed by the United Synod of the Presbyterian Church has communicated to this Assembly the official action of said Synod, settling, on their part, the "*terms of union*" by them declared to be "*indispensable*;" and the Assembly is informed, through the public press, of the contents of papers adopted by that Synod, and called by it "*A declaration of principles*." In the judgment of this Assembly, those official papers do not afford a basis of Conference upon which this Assembly is able to see that there is any prospect of advancing the interests of Christ's kingdom in general, or those of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, or those of the United Synod of the Presbyterian Church in particular.

2. The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America has always received, frankly and in Christian love, all churches, office-bearers, and private persons of all denominations, making application for admission into her communion, upon the single condition that they are like-minded with herself. At this time ample provision is made in her existing acts and ordinances, for the reception of all such into her communion, on terms and by methods precisely equivalent, and, where it is possible, identical with those provided in regard to her own children, reared in her own bosom. Seeing that it was in a voluntary secession from the Presbyterian Church that the present difficulties of the United Synod of the Presbyterians had their origin, and that the door has always been open for the orderly

return of such of those who left us as were like-minded with us, it can hardly be unexpected that we decline any official conference based on terms which appear to us to involve a condemnation of ourselves, and a renunciation of the rich and peculiar favor of God upon us, in the very matters which led to their secession from our Church twenty years ago.

3. With reference to the recent secession of the New School body, this General Assembly does not see in that event, or in anything which has hitherto resulted from it, any call of Providence for the Presbyterian Church to take any new steps whatever, either with the view of union or that of a closer intercourse than now exists, with either of the parts into which that body is now divided. The subjects upon which the whole New School body differed from us, at the period of their secession from us, and the subjects upon which the two very unequal portions of that body have recently separated from each other, are questions upon which we, as a denomination, are at peace, and with regard to the whole of which we see no occasion to revise the understood and unalterable faith of our Church, or to enter upon fruitless conferences.

It was further resolved that the Moderator of the Assembly communicate the minute now adopted, to the "United Synod of the Presbyterian Church," as the official act of this Assembly.

#### THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES.

On Wednesday, May 12th, Dr. Dumont, from the Committee on Theological Seminaries, made the following report, which was adopted:

The Committee on Theological Seminaries report that they have examined the reports of Seminaries under the care of the General Assembly, as follows: Princeton, N. J., Union, Va., Western, Penn., Danville, Ky. All these Seminaries during the past year have been highly favored. The teachers have been faithful and the pupils diligent and exemplary. The numbers in attendance have increased, and a desire for the Missionary field has been manifested. It has generally been a year of health, and but one death has occurred. The Committee, in view of the pecuniary necessities of these institutions, recommend the reiteration of the resolution of the last Assembly, viz.: "That the churches be urged to complete the endowment of those Seminaries that are not yet fully endowed; to increase



the number of scholarships; to furnish funds for repairs and erection of suitable buildings, and the enlargement of libraries.”

*Seminary of Princeton.*—The Directors of Princeton Seminary have “resolved,” that the General Assembly be requested to amend the Plan of the Seminary, Art. II., sec. 1, so as to erase the following words: “And the President, or, in case of his absence, one of the Vice-Presidents shall be one.” The Committee recommend that the request be granted, and that the Plan of the Seminary be so amended.

*Union Seminary, Va.*—In the Report of the Directors of the Union Seminary of Virginia, they request “that the Board of Directors be authorized, with the concurrence of other judicatories, to whose care the Assembly has committed the Institution, to transfer to ‘the Trustees of Union Theological Seminary in the county of Prince Edward,’ recently incorporated by the General Assembly of Virginia, all the lands, funds and other property now committed to the trust of the Directors.”

The Committee recommend that the request be granted, and the following resolution adopted, viz.:

*Resolved,* That the Board of Directors of the Union Theological Seminary in Virginia be authorized, with the concurrence of the Synod of Virginia, the Synod of North Carolina, and the Presbytery of Winchester, to transfer to the Trustees of Union Theological Seminary, in the county of Prince Edward, Va., all the lands, funds and other property belonging to said Seminary, now in the hands of said Directors, or which may hereafter come into their hands.

*Danville Seminary, Ky.*—By the Report of the Directors of Danville Seminary, it will devolve on the Assembly, at its present session, to elect a Professor of Church Government and Pastoral Theology, to fill the chair made vacant by the resignation of Stuart Robinson, D. D. The Committee recommend that it be the order of the day, on Friday, at — o’clock, to elect a Professor of Church Government and Pastoral Theology, in Danville Seminary.

*Resolved,* That the arrangement made for this year to terminate the session of the Theological Seminary at Princeton, on the last Wednesday of April, be made permanent.

It was subsequently ordered, that the election of a Professor in the Danville Theological Seminary, to fill the vacancy occasioned by the resignation of the Rev. S. Robinson, D. D., be made the first order of the day for Monday next, (May 17th.) Nominations to fill the vacant Professorship were made on Friday, May 14th. L. J. Halsey, D. D., of Louisville; Rev. Joseph B. Stratton, D. D., of Natchez; Rev. S. J. P. Anderson, D. D., of St. Louis; Rev. T. E. Peck, of Baltimore; and Rev. A. Hamilton, D. D., of Pennsylvania, were severally nominated. The Assembly then, in pursuance of a standing rule, engaged in solemn prayer for Divine direction in the election of a Professor. In this prayer Dr. L. W. Green led the Assembly. On Monday morning, May 17th, the election took place. The name of the Rev. Dr. Anderson was withdrawn with leave of the House. Permission was also obtained by Mr. Smylie, the nominator, to withdraw the name of Dr. Halsey, at which moment Dr. Breckinridge had leave to address the Assembly. "He was not authorized," he said, "to speak for the Directors, or the Faculty. The Directors were prohibited from making any nomination, yet they had expressed their preference, and these were for the Rev. Dr. Van Rensselaer. But that gentleman peremptorily said he 'was not fit.' His next choice was the present Moderator, (Dr. Scott,) but that gentleman gave no encouragement. He was then at the end of his string. He would frankly say, that the exigencies of their case require a man who has either no particular sectional character, or, if any, it should be with the South. Two out of the present Faculty were from the North, and he himself is from no further South than Kentucky. The attempt has been made to create the impression that the Seminary is a Kentucky affair. But for this he would favor the election of Dr. Halsey. Upon the whole his mind has inclined to the Rev. Dr. Stratton, of Natchez. Nevertheless, you are to understand that we can make no nomination, and have no preference."

Dr. Junkin then withdrew the name of Mr. Peck, and Dr. Halsey's name was also allowed to be withdrawn. Rev. Dr. Breckinridge then moved that it be the sense of this House

that the Rev. Joseph B. Stratton be the Professor of Church Government and Pastoral Theology in Danville Theological Seminary. This was unanimously agreed to, and Rev. Drs. Green and Baird, and Rev. Mr. Worrell were appointed a committee to inform Dr. Stratton of his election, and to urge his acceptance of the position. Thus, with a solemnity and deliberation every way suited to so important an occasion, was this election conducted, and a worthy, able and beloved minister chosen to an important chair in the young but flourishing Seminary at Danville.

SERMONS DELIVERED BEFORE THE ASSEMBLY.

The Historical Discourse was delivered before the Assembly on Friday night, May 7th, under the appointment of the Presbyterian Historical Society, by Rev. George Howe, D. D., of the Theological Seminary, Columbia, S. C.; the Sermon on Foreign Missions, on Monday night, May 10th, by Rev. A. A. Porter, of Selma, Alabama; the Sermon on the interests of the Board of Publication, on Tuesday night, by Rev. S. P. J. Anderson, D. D., of St. Louis, Missouri; the Sermon on Education, on Thursday night, by Rev. J. N. Waddel, D. D., of La Grange College, Tennessee.

Mr. Lowrie moved that it be made the second order of the day for Friday next, to elect a preacher in behalf of the Foreign Board. An amendment, proposing to include in the order the election of preachers in behalf of all the Boards, was made and accepted.

Dr. Junkin had no objection to making this business a special order, but would respectfully invite the attention of his brethren to the question, *cui bono*, in regard to these sermons as a permanent appendage to the exercises of the General Assembly. Is the amount of good accomplished by them commensurate with the time, talent and money expended upon them? He was himself persuaded that one such scene as has just closed, was better calculated to further our great cause, than many sermons, excellent as they may be. Is the Church never to be considered as informed upon the doctrinal basis, or the Scriptural motives of Church enterprise? If the arrangement, which

seems about assuming the claims of a permanent institution, be designed to spread light, and do good in the most effective way; and if it can be shown that past experience has proven its efficiency, let it continue. But if one design, and a chief one, be to awaken interest, by extending compliments to particular ministers or churches, it is unworthy of the Church and of the cause. He merely desired to ask his brethren to ponder the question, and make up their minds in due season.

These remarks met with no response from the Assembly, and when this matter came up for action, Dr. B. M. Palmer as principal, and Dr. R. L. Stanton as alternate, were elected to preach before the next Assembly on Foreign Missions; Rev. Henry C. Clark as principal, and J. C. Brown as alternate, to preach on Domestic Missions; Dr. Nicholas Murray as principal, and Dr. Brown as alternate, to preach on Education.

#### JUDICIAL CASES.

The Judicial Committee made the following report in the case of the Rev. Mr. Thatcher, of the Synod of Albany.

*Judicial Case No. 1.*—Complaint of Rev. J. Fisher against the action of Albany Synod in the case of the Rev. F. H. Thatcher. The Presbytery permitted Mr. Thatcher to demit the office of the Gospel Ministry, of which action complaint was made by Mr. Fisher to the Synod in 1856. This complaint was sustained, but no copy of it appears on record, and no order was made to Presbytery on the action of Synod, as to what disposition Presbytery should make of Mr. Thatcher, but no protest was entered against this action, and no complaint was taken to this body. In 1857, at Synod, a memorial was presented from the Presbytery, asking Synod to define their action, which memorial was laid on the table. The memorial before us purports to lie against this latter action—yet it is called a complaint “of the action of Synod in the case of Rev. F. H. Thatcher,” and all the reasons of the complaint are against said action. The Committee recommend that the case be dismissed. 1. Because the complaint was not made in time. 2. Because the case being decided, should not be taken up on the complaint of a single individual. 3. Because neither the

complaint which the Synod sustained, nor the records of the Presbytery, are to be had here. Rev. Mr. Tully (charged with the management of this case for the brother, who was not present), explained at length, and said that the only action here sought for is to define the status of Mr. Thatcher. Rev. Dr. Halley replied. He complained that the proceedings which have brought the matter before this Assembly, are all wrong and unfair; that it was introduced in the Synod to which it belongs at the very last hour of a protracted session. He claimed that it is unfair to take it out of the hands of the Synod. That body is competent to decide, and is bent on doing justly and righteously. He urged, as an act of duty and right, that the subject be sent back to the Synod.

This case, thus introduced, was taken up on the eleventh day of the Session, the report of the Judicial Committee concurred in and the case dismissed, the Assembly expressing no opinion as to the original action of the Presbytery allowing Mr. Thatcher to demit his office.

*Judicial Case No. 2*—Which was styled an appeal, taken by the Presbytery of Kaskaskia from the decision of the Synod of Illinois, in the case of the complaint of Rev. James Stafford and others, against the Presbytery of Kaskaskia, for refusing to receive a Church organized at Trenton. The Judicial Committee believing that the act referred to was administrative rather than judicial, considered it a case of complaint rather than of appeal and recommended that it be so issued. This case was not reached till the last day of the Session, when many had left for their homes. Dr. Baird moved that the appellants have leave to withdraw their appeal, on the ground that the Presbytery had wrongfully made it an appeal, rather than a complaint, for the avowed purpose (as stated before the Judicial Committee) of arresting proceedings, removing Mr. Stafford from his field, and dispersing or defeating the progress of that church. They ought not to be allowed the benefit of their own wrong. After some further explanations the motion of Dr. Baird was adopted and the case dismissed.

*Judicial Case No. 3*.—The complaint of E. W. Sawyer and others against the decision of the Synod of Chicago, in the case

of O. M. Hoagland. Mr. Hoagland had been summoned to appear before the Session of which he was a member, on the charge of prevarication. After the Session had begun the trial of the case, they referred the whole to Presbytery, and Presbytery decided that there was no valid ground of accusation against Mr. Hoagland. Appeal was taken to the Synod of Chicago who confirmed the decision of Presbytery. An appeal was now taken to the Assembly, and the appellants had failed to appear, on the alleged ground of ill health of one of the parties who was expected to attend. Meanwhile, Mr. Hoagland was denied church privileges by the pastor. The Judicial Committee report the case as being fallen from, by the failure of the complainants to appear and prosecute their complaint. They recommended that the complaint be dismissed, and that Mr. Hoagland be considered as entitled to all his former rights and privileges in the Church of Hopewell. This report was adopted.

*Judicial Case No. 4.*—The appeal and complaint of Rev. Robert Finley and Smith Bloomfield, against the Synod of New Jersey, for their action touching the affairs of the Second Church in Woodbridge. This was the most important case before the Assembly, and occupied nearly two days.

The Session of the church had instituted discipline against certain members of the church for acts connected with a fourth of July festival. The discipline was commenced about six months after the acts complained of. Part of the congregation sided with the Session, and part against it. The parties under discipline complained to Presbytery, that in the circumstances then existing, justice could not be done them, and Presbytery remitted them to the Session, as the court having jurisdiction. Again they came to Presbytery with a memorial from sixty-seven persons, desiring that a parish meeting might be called, and they were again remitted to the Session. Some months after, on the night before the spring meeting of Presbytery, the pastor and Session bring charges against those who appeared before Presbytery against them. Presbytery, at this third meeting, advises a suspension of these trials, and under its general power “to visit churches for the purpose of inquiring

into their state, and redress the evils that may have arisen in them," appointed a commission to investigate the circumstances, who, after inquiring diligently into the case, reported that a majority of the trustees of the session, and of the congregation, desired the resignation of the pastor. Things grew worse and worse. At length the Session gave notice of a meeting, in connection with a lecture preparatory to the communion, to choose additional elders. When the pastor was proceeding to this business, after the lecture, the accused party and their friends nominated a moderator of their own, and created a disgraceful tumult. After the pastor had pronounced the benediction, he, with a majority of the church, retired, and the party remaining in the house passed resolutions denouncing the pastor. The trustees then closed the church, which remained shut three consecutive Sabbaths, but on the remonstrance of Presbytery it was again opened.

Charges were then tabled by the Session and pastor at a meeting, when all were not present, against six persons, one of whom was a member of Session, and they proceeded at once to discipline them. The Presbytery was convened at the call of the Committee, to hear their report. That report recommended: 1. That the session be recommended and enjoined to call a parish meeting, by a certain time, to get an orderly expression of the will of the people as to the disposition of the pastoral relation. 2. To avoid prejudice, they recommended that a neighboring minister be called to preside. 3. That none but church members and pew holders be voters. 4. That besides the Commissioners, to be selected by the people, the pastor and an elder should appear before the Presbytery. 5. That in consequence of the new cases of discipline, arising out of the recent difficulties, therefore, *Resolved*, That the Session be enjoined to suspend these trials until after the action of Presbytery, on the foregoing recommendation.

Presbytery then took action, recommended the cessation of these acts of discipline, dissolved the pastoral relation, recommended the resignation of one member of Session, and the election of others. The vote in Presbytery was nearly unanimous, 21 to 3, and 4 *non liquets*. Synod sustained Presbytery by a vote of 54 to 24. Mr. Finley, the pastor, has removed to

Illinois; thirty-seven members of the church have joined the Dutch Reformed, and the church is harmonious under another pastor. These facts are gathered principally from the statements of the Presbytery in its defence, as reported in the public prints.

Dr. Hoge, who assisted in the defence, maintained that Presbytery is the fundamental council in our form of government, and the fountain of power. Presbyteries constitute Sessions, have constituted the General Assembly, and reserve to themselves powers which belong neither to Synods nor Sessions. They may declare a church vacant, can remove a pastor when the church applies for it; but they are not restricted to this, but are endowed with the power of visitation to redress grievances. If the aggrieved party were a minority, they had a right to apply for redress. The majority were prevented from calling a meeting of the congregation by the majority of the Session. If the people came irregularly before Session, it was because they were tyrannized over. Dr. Breckinridge, counsel for Mr. Finley, said this was a struggle for power on the part of the trustees against the Session. These trustees had violated their trust. Civil power cannot control the ecclesiastical, but merely protect it, and follow its wishes in regard to its trusts. The majority, if they were opposed to the pastor and Session, could have *demand*ed from the Session a congregational meeting, and if refused, they could have complained to Presbytery. He differed, with deference, from Dr. Hoge on a question of government and discipline. Historically, there was no doubt on the subject. Makemie preached the gospel, and churches were gathered, other laborers came, and these churches formed themselves into a Presbytery. This Presbytery divided itself and formed the original Synod. This Synod divided itself and formed the Assembly, which is the General Assembly of *The Church* and not *the churches*. The Parochial Presbytery is the basis of our power. This is the Church. The final action of Presbytery was wrong. The weak have no protection except in *forms* of law. There are *forms* prescribed for installing pastors and dissolving their relations, and the Presbytery has no power to dispense with them. The appellant alleges that the whole proceedings, from first to last, are irregular and un-



warranted, and are an exercise of ecclesiastical tyranny, because: 1. A Presbytery has no power to make an uncalled-for interference with the internal affairs of a church, and tear up its whole proceedings. 2. A Presbytery can not dissolve the pastoral relation when neither the church, congregation nor pastor, requests its action. 3. The duty of the Presbytery was to have sustained the hands of the Session in maintaining purity of discipline and doctrine. 4. The Presbytery has virtually acknowledged its error in finally ordering to be done what the Session had attempted to do, both as regards the cases of discipline and the election of elders. 5. The Presbytery and Synod have virtually stood up with the world against the Session, aiding the trustees and the outside congregation to control in spiritual things. To conclude: in his judgment, the Assembly ought to set aside the judgment of the Synod, and to sustain the appeal. He was instructed to say, that there was never a time when Mr. Finley would not have gladly yielded to the desire of his people, if they, as a church, had ever said the word. Dr. McGill maintained also, 1. That a Presbytery has no power to dissolve the pastoral relation without the application of either pastor or people. 2. Presbytery has no power to interfere for the arrest of proceedings in the court below. By permitting a higher court to invade the province of a court below, you destroy the court above as a court of appeal, and thus overthrow the beautiful symmetry and gradations of our whole system. Mr. Craven was a member of the Synod, and voted against its decision. He proceeded to assign the reasons which determined his vote on that occasion. He said the Presbytery may arrest a decision, but in order to do so correctly, they must proceed regularly. The steps are laid down in our book of discipline. He read the law. The first step is to cite the judicatory. This step was never taken; its not being taken vitiates the whole proceeding. Never having been cited to appear, the arrest of decision could not take place. 2. A committee was appointed. But when such a committee is appointed, the parties must be cited, and have the means of producing rebutting testimony. This was not done. They sat with closed doors. 3. The evidence upon which the committee formed their opinion, was not introduced. It does not appear

that it was ever read in Presbytery. 4. The Presbytery directs the congregation to elect four elders; but where on the books do Presbytery find the authority to order the election of four elders? It was their duty to resist the exercise of unconstitutional power. 5. There are ways pointed out by the law in which the pastoral relation may be dissolved. Neither of these modes were followed by the Presbytery in the case of this pastor. The Presbytery have the right to visit—that implies the right to convene. They might have sent a committee to that church, and issued an order convening the congregation. This was not done. If there is an opposition which is factious, it should not be indulged. If it arises from heresy in doctrine on the part of the pastor, he should have been proceeded against judicially, and he should have been deposed. If the Presbytery were right in all their action, they were wrong in refusing the appeal.

The roll of the Assembly being called, the vote resulted as follows: To sustain the appeal, 84; to sustain in part, 24; not to sustain, 30; *non liquet*, 2. A paper was subsequently introduced by Dr. Palmer, defining the effect of this vote, that it was not to reverse the decisions of the court below, and restore Mr. Finley to his rights in the church at Woodbridge, plainly showing that though the case, by sufferance, had been treated as a case of appeal, it was really a complaint against acts administrative and not strictly judicial. The paper alluded to is as follows:

This General Assembly sustains the appeal and complaint of Robert S. Finley and Smith Bloomfield, against the Synod of New Jersey.

In this decision it is not intended to censure the courts below for want of zeal and faithfulness in doing according to their best judgment what the case required. Much less is it intended to reverse, in form, what has been done in the case of Mr. Finley, so as to restore him to his pastoral relation in the Second Church of Woodbridge; for this would be not only impracticable in the circumstances as they now exist, but inexpedient, even if it were practicable.

But the Presbytery of Elizabethtown erred in attempting too much to direct and control the action of that Session, interfering without being called to do so, according to the forms of our Constitution; in arresting the process of discipline before

it had been issued—while the Session was pursuing it in an orderly manner; and in dissolving the pastoral relation upon a mere presumption of a majority of the people desiring it, without the regular application of either party; thus making what they judged a necessity in the case, of more importance than the forms of the Constitution.

The Synod of New Jersey erred, not only in sustaining the action of the Presbytery in this case, but also in refusing to entertain as an appeal the remedy sought by a party who was both injured and aggrieved by said action of the Presbytery.

The following dissent was presented, and admitted to record:

The undersigned dissent from the vote of the General Assembly, assigning reasons for the decision in the case of the appeal of the Rev. R. S. Finley, because, in their opinion, it does not express the sense of the Court deciding the case; and because the minority were permitted by this vote to change or modify the deliberate decision of a majority of the Court. (Signed) John H. Rice, E. W. Bedinger, J. A. Smylie, P. E. Bishop, R. V. Shanklin, James Cleland, L. H. Long, R. C. Galbraith, Lilburn R. Railey, D. McQueen, W. E. James, E. M. Gregg.

It seems to be decided by the Assembly in this case:—1. That a Presbytery has no right to interpose to dissolve a pastoral relation, even though in the judgment of the pastor and Presbytery it ought to terminate, when neither the pastor nor the people have expressed the same under the *regular form*, the one by a resignation offered, the other by a regular vote of the congregation. 2. That there can be no meeting of the congregation for such a purpose except one called by the Session. 3. That Session is not bound to call one except upon a petition signed by a majority of the congregation. 4. That if the majority of the congregation do not desire the Session to call such a meeting, nor the pastor resign, the pastoral relation is to continue, whatever may be the immediate result to the peace and harmony of the church and congregation. 5. That Presbytery has no power to interrupt and postpone the process of discipline which is commenced in the Session, however incompetent it may think the court as constituted may be, through its divided state, or by being parties to an active contest, to conduct the case to a successful issue. 6. Whether the Presbytery has power to visit for the redress of grievances, the Assembly did not decide; but it seems to be intimated

that, if it has such a power, there are no means of finding out the wish of the congregation, except by a citation of the same, to ascertain, *by a regular vote*, what may be its desire in the premises.

The Committee who have it in charge to revise the Book of Discipline, will do a great service to the Church if they will define accurately the powers of the several courts; the difference between an appeal and a complaint; and the mode of procedure in the latter; and who are the parties before the court in each case. The vagueness and obscurities of our book, united with the inexperience of our ministers in judicial matters, give rise to great uncertainties often in the administration of discipline.

#### NARRATIVE.

This was an inspiring document, drawn up ably by the Chairman on the Narrative, Rev. Dr. L. J. Halsey. It embodies statements from 117 Presbyteries, all of whom have glad tidings to report, excepting about 12. About 70 Presbyteries, nearly two-thirds of the whole number, have enjoyed deep and powerful revivals of religion. At the close of the Report the Assembly joined in a joyful song of praise, singing in full chorus the 581st Hymn, and was led by Rev. Mr. Grimes, in a prayer of thanksgiving to God.

#### OVERTURES.

*Overture No. 20*—From the minutes of the last Assembly, requesting action of the Assembly in reference to the management of ecclesiastical property, and referred from that Assembly to the present, was then taken up, and was sent down to the Presbyteries with instructions to send up their opinions to the next Assembly.

*Overture No. 13*—In reference to the dismissal of a minister from the sacred office. A minute was sent down to the Presbyteries, for them to answer whether the office is not perpetual, unless the minister relinquishes it, or is disposed of for incapacity.

*Overture No. 15*—A Memorial from Dr. Wm. M. Awl recommended that the next Fourth of July, which occurs on the Sabbath, be observed as a concert of universal prayer; be-

ginning at 10 o'clock, A. M., precisely, by Cincinnati time, and continuing one hour. Adopted.

CONCLUSION.

The usual votes of thanks were passed to the citizens of New Orleans for their unbounded hospitality; to the Press of New Orleans and its Reporters; and a special vote of thanks to the Rev. R. C. Lancey, for his generous and successful efforts in securing a free return on most of the railroads and steamboats to the members in attendance. It was then *Resolved*, on motion of Dr. Junkin, "that this General Assembly be now dissolved, and that another General Assembly, chosen in like manner, be required to meet in the Third Presbyterian Church, in the city of Indianapolis, on the third Thursday of May, A. D. 1859, at 11 o'clock, A. M." The Moderator then made an appropriate and feeling address, the Assembly united in singing the 342d Hymn, the Moderator offered an impressive prayer, and thus closed the General Assembly of 1858.

The circumstances and place of its assembling, the harmony of its counsels, the prevailing unity of its views on all subjects of general interest, the patriotic and conservative influences which prevailed in all its proceedings, notwithstanding its members were convened from every section of this Union, equalling now in territorial extent the Roman Empire; and the true dignity of its deliberations, were sources of high encouragement to its own members, and to all beholders interested in the Kingdom of Christ. To a large part of the Assembly, the country, scenery, and locality were new. They went away with better feelings and a more candid spirit towards those who had looked on them with respect, and treated them with unmeasured kindness. New Orleans itself has a better view of our polity, our numbers, our unity, our strength, and of the honor with which our Lord and Head has crowned us as a Church, than it could otherwise possess. Even the outward political world has been attracted by our oneness, and our conservatism, and has not been silent in its auguries of good to our common country, from the influence of such a ministry and such a Church as have been raised up, in God's providence, over this wide domain.

## ARTICLE VIII.

## CRITICAL NOTICES.

1. *Sermons of the Rev. C. H. Spurgeon, of London.* Fourth Series. New York: Sheldon, Blakeman & Co. Charleston: Russell & Jones. 1858; pp. 445, 12 mo.

Here is a fourth volume of these lively and vigorous exhibitions of the Gospel of grace. The author, in an address to his American readers, dated London, April 1, 1858, says: "They are merely impromptu, extempore discourses, and were never intended to be printed for quiet reading. However, as the people would have them, they were reported and printed, the author yielding his consent, in the hope that the kindness which induced the demand would overlook the unavoidable defects." He adds: "I am free to confess all that my critics say against me, but the Lord is wiser than men; and be the sermons what they may, God has blessed them, and I am doubly content."

We are free to say, that whatever defects belong to these sermons, considered as mere literary productions, they are nevertheless *full* of the marrow of the Gospel of Christ. They are the simple, unpretending, earnest expostulations of one man with other men, he being called of God, as he evidently believes, to make these expostulations, and their everlasting happiness or woe depending, under God, upon the manner in which he shall make and they shall receive them. These sermons are full of the unction of a glorious Gospel. We recommend the study of this characteristic of them to all our ministerial brethren and students of theology.

- 
2. *The New York Pulpit in the Revival of 1858—A Memorial Volume of Sermons.* New York: Sheldon, Blakeman & Co. Charleston: Russell & Jones. 1858; pp. 395, 12 mo.

Our first impression as we took up this volume, was one of mingled amazement and indignation. What! Is the New York Revival to be brought into market and made a subject of profit, by the booksellers of Gotham? But we shortly dismissed that idea, and now deliberately record our satisfaction with the publisher's plan of getting up a memorial volume of the great work of God, in the chief city of our land. The great awakening has, indeed, "in many respects, been more remarkably developed in the city of New York, and in its vicinity, than in any other part of the country." These sermons are the ordinary discourses of that period—specimens of the preaching of New York ministers during the great awakening. They are not specimens of the talent or learning of the New York clergy, but of their mode of handling the doctrines of the Gospel, of their method of dealing with the hearts and consciences of men in that great city, of the kind of instruction furnished by them to the souls of perishing sinners. Of course they differ considerably amongst themselves, being the discourses of ministers of different denominations. The whole of them, of course, will please no body. To ourselves it appears, that some of them contain very little of the Gospel, and that others contain much that is quite contrary to the Gospel. Dr. McClintock's sermon on "The Strait Gate," and Dr. Peck's sermon on "The Life-Battle," have little evangelical truth, if any, in them. These are Methodist ministers of repute. Very similar is the verdict we have to render as to the sermons of Dr. Storrs' on "Men to be reconciled to God through Christ," and of Dr. Thompson on "Man's pride, or God's grace," and of Dr. Hatfield on "Man's perdition not of God." They all had noble themes of discourse—the texts they preached from were "precious texts" indeed. But the sermons are as cold as icebergs. No warm rays of Gospel truth pervade them. The New School Presbyterian, and the Congregationalist, preach much like the cultivated and polished city Methodist divine. Put the five sermons together in a parcel and no stranger could tell which two were the Methodist sermons, and which three those of professed Calvinists. Indeed, we do not hesitate to say, that the three last depart more widely than the two first

from the testimony of the Apostles. There is a more positive character about their teaching, but it is only a more positive unsoundness.

---

3.—We have received from the Board of Publication, the following works :

1. *The Sailor's Companion, or Book of Devotions for Seamen, in Public and Private.*

This work is divided into two parts; the first consists of prayers, sermons, psalms and hymns, suited to public worship on ship-board, and the second, of selections from Scripture illustrative of the nature of true religion, of brief expositions of the Ten Commandments, and the Lord's Prayer; of prayers for various occasions, and of friendly advices to seamen. The book, we are told, was prepared expressly for the use of mariners. There is certainly no class of men that have a stronger claim upon our Christian sympathies, and none, who in the walks of secular life, can do so much, for the glory of God and the salvation of the world. Converted sailors are real missionaries; and perhaps the Gospel has no greater obstacles to encounter among the heathen than those presented by the ungodly lives and unprincipled conversation of sailors and seamen from Christian States.

2. *Grains of Gold, suited to enrich Youthful Minds.* Compiled for the Board of Publication. A series of stories and anecdotes illustrative of great moral and spiritual truths.

3. *Pictures of Truth portrayed in pleasing colours.* Compiled for the Board of Publication. A book of the same kind as the preceding.

4. *The Great Reformer, or Sketches of the Life of Luther.* By the author of the Clarmont Tales.

We need say nothing more of this book than what is announced upon the title-page, that it is chiefly collated from D'Aubigne's History of the Reformation.



5. *The Stephenson Family, or Lessons on the Beatitudes.* Written for the Board of Publication.

6. *Scenes in Chusan, or Missionary Labors by the Way.* By the author of "Learn to say No."

"*Labors by the Way*" are certain labors performed by a Missionary of the Board of Missions of the Presbyterian Church while residing at Chusan, which labors were *outside* of those which occupied his principal time and attention, as one sent out especially to preach the Gospel to the inhabitants of China."

7. *The Highland Glen, or Plenty and Famine,* founded on fact. By MATILDA WRENCH.

8. *Valley of Achor, or Hope in Trouble.* By Rev. S. S. SHEDDAN.

These are both small pamphlets.

9. *Little Bob True.* 252 pp. 16mo.

10. *Christmas Eve—Illustrating the Fourth Petition of the Lord's Prayer.* 91 pp.

11. *Not a Minute to Spare.* 104 pp.

The above are among the late issues of the Board of Publication designed for juvenile entertainment and instruction, and are exceedingly well adapted to their end.

12. *Scripture Baptism, its Mode and Subjects.* By ASHBEL G. FAIRCHILD, D. D., author of the "Great Supper." pp. 204, 18mo. Board of Publication. Price 25 and 30 cts.

A brief, popular and forcible argument on the Pædobaptist side.

13. *Christ in the Desert; or, The Tempter Foiled.* By the Rev. HENRY MOORE PARSONS; pp. 129, 16mo. 20 and 25 cts.

14. *Only Believe; or, The Sure Way of Peace.* By the Rev. ALFRED HAMILTON; pp. 50.

15. *The Efficacy of Prayer.* By the Rev. JOHN C. YOUNG, D. D., Late President of Centre College, Danville, Kentucky; pp. 63. 15 cts.

These are among the smaller issues of the Board of Pub-

lication, designed for practical effect.' The first presents before us Christ in his mysterious temptation in the desert. The second, in a familiar dialogue, meets the difficulties which keep the convicted sinner from finding Christ. The third is an argument to show the power of prayer, from the pen of a man beloved and honored in the Church. The preparation of the first beguiled the invalid, as he informs us, of many a weary hour, and the last was the final offering laid upon the altar of God, by one who served him well through life, and whose days were terminated before the brief treatise was finished.

---

4.—We have received from Robert Carter & Brothers, No. 530 Broadway, New York, the following publications :

1. *Memories of Gennesaret* By the Rev. JOHN R. MACDUFF. author of *Morning and Night Watches*, *Words of Jesus*, *Mind of Jesus*, *Footsteps of Saint Paul*, *Evening Incense*, *Woodcutter of Lebanon*, *Great Journey*, *Memories of Bethany*, *Family Prayers*, &c.

Though we had been familiar with the works, we knew nothing of the name and connections of the Rev. Mr. Macduff, until we met with the following notice :

We should be very much puzzled to name a religious author of our day who has more rapidly attained wide popularity and, until this new volume appeared, anonymously, than the Rev. John R. Macduff, of Glasgow. It is with great pleasure that we now introduce him by name to our readers, who have already admired and loved, *incognito*, the author of 'The Faithful Promiser'—'Altar Stones'—'Morning and Night Watches'—'Words of Jesus'—'Mind of Jesus'—'Footsteps of St. Paul'—'Evening Incense'—'Woodcutter of Lebanon'—'Exiles of Lucerna'—'Great Journey'—'Family Prayers'—'Child's Book of Divinity' and 'Memories of Bethany.' There are often good reasons for going unnamed, and again there are good reasons for lifting the veil. Thousands in America as well as great Britain will be glad to know that the gentle, ingenious, elegant and pious writer, who has so often warned and so often comforted them, is an able and eloquent minister of the Established Church of Scotland, still in the vigor of early manhood, and likely to do good service in the Lord's vineyard for many years to come. All the works which we have named are published by those indefatigable benefactors of their race, Robert Carter and Brothers, who now for the first time reveal Mr. Macduff's name, in the

title of this fresh work. This book, of about four hundred pages, contains more than twenty chapters on events and teachings connected with the beautiful lake of Gennesaret; sojournings, journeys, miracles, discourses, parables; all set forth in the author's well known and justly winning manner. We have heard Mr. Macduff preach to young men, and we are the more ready, since we listened to his elevated strains, to commend what he writes, not to the young only, but to all who prize evangelical truth delivered with sacred unction. A.

2. *Memoir of Captain M. M. Hammond, Rifle Brigade*, pp. 372, 12mo.

This is a beautiful and intensely interesting illustration of the nature and power of true religion. We should like to see it in the hands of every soldier in the country.

3. *The Indian Rebellion, its Causes and Results*. In a series of letters from the Rev. Alexander Duff, D. D., L. L. D., Calcutta.

These letters "were addressed to the Rev. Dr. Tweedie, Convener of the Free Church of Scotland's Foreign Mission Committee, and being printed from time to time as soon as each was received, they were not only perused by many readers, but a very general desire was expressed for their republication in a collective form. To that desire the writer having kindly assented, the series is now brought together continuous and entire."

4. *Hymns in the Church-Militant*. 12mo. pp. 640. This is a collection for private use.

5. *The Story of a Needle, and The Story of a Rat*. By A. L. O. E. A book for children.

---

5.—*Select Discourses*. By ADOLPHE MONOD, KRUMMACHER, THOLUCK, and JULIUS MUELLER. Translated from the French and German, with Biographical Notices, and Dr. Monod's celebrated Lecture on the Delivery of Sermons. By Rev. H. C. Fish, and D. W. Poor, D. D., with a fine steel Portrait of Dr. Monod. New York: Sheldon, Blakeman & Co. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. London: Trübner & Co. 12 mo. pp. 408.

This selection consists of twenty-two sermons, beside the Lecture of Dr. Monod mentioned in the title-page. Of these, seven are from Dr. Monod, seven from Krummacher, four from Tholuck and four from Müller. The subjects of Dr. Monod's sermons are the Mission of Woman, the Life of Woman, the Love of Money, the Conflict of Christ with Satan, the Victory of Christ over Satan, the Weapon in Christ's conflict, the Omnipotence of Faith. The topics discussed by Krummacher are the Temptation of Christ, the Object and Agent in the Temptation, the Onset and the Arms in the Temptation, the Demand and the promised Reward, the last Assault and issue of the Contest, the Peril and Safety of the Church, the Believer's Challenge. The titles of Tholuck's discourses are, the Betrayal of Jesus, the Christian Life a glorified Childhood, the Touchstone of human hearts, the Father drawing men to the Son. Those of Julius Müller's are the Superior Might of God's servants, the Walk of Christ upon the Waves, the Relation of Religion to Business, the Longing for Home.

Better specimens of the evangelical pulpit of Continental Europe, whether in relation to preachers or subjects, could hardly have been given than are contained in this volume. Monod, Krummacher, Tholuck and Müller, are names familiar to the Christian world. Monod and Krummacher are particularly celebrated as preachers. Tholuck and Müller as Christian theologians. Müller's Christian Doctrine of sin is one of the most finished compositions in the German language—and exhibits rare powers of philosophical analysis. It is needless to add, that its orthodoxy is not equal to its learning. The evangelical school of Germany is sadly at fault in relation to points which one would not think of questioning in America, without abandoning all pretensions to faith in revealed religion. Even in the present selection, the discourse of Tholuck, on the drawing of the Father, is miserably defective in its exhibition of the nature of conversion, and positively erroneous upon the whole subject of efficacious grace. It may be taken as a specimen of the misty views which disfigure the soundest speculations of German theology.

- 6.—*The Reason Why: A book of condensed scientific knowledge for the Million.* By the author of "Inquire Within." New York: Dick & Fitzgerald; pp. 346, 12mo. Price One Dollar.

More than 1,300 questions, with their answers, in various departments of science and natural history; the professed object of which is to awaken and satisfy curiosity, and to impart a large amount of entertaining and useful knowledge without the labor of—that "much study which is a weariness to the flesh."

- 7.—*The Church of God.* By Rev. STUART ROBINSON, D. D., Professor of Church Government and Pastoral Theology in the Theological Seminary, at Danville, Kentucky. *With an Appendix, containing the more important Symbols of Presbyterian Government; Historically arranged and Illustrated.* Philadelphia: JOSEPH M. WILSON. 1858; pp. 130 and xcvi. 12 mo. cloth, gilt, price 60 cents.

The above is the Inaugural Discourse of Dr. Robinson, enlarged into a treatise, designed to be brief and suggestive, on the doctrine as to the Church. It bids fair to be a volume much sought after, and the publisher has made his arrangements to furnish it at the reduced prices of \$2 for 4 copies, \$5 for 10, and a volume to the friend sending the order; and to furnish it, also, in other and more costly styles of binding. We mention these things now, in behalf of the publisher, who has sent us the work. A review of it, or an extended notice, from a competent pen, is promised us for our next number.

## PERIODICAL LITERATURE.

### I. AMERICAN QUARTERLY REVIEWS.—CONTENTS:

- I. *Princeton Review*, April, 1858. Art. I. Hofmann's Prophecy and Fulfilment. Art. II. Confucianism. Art. III. Butler's Lectures on Ancient Philosophy. Art. IV. Sketches of Western Pennsylvania. Art. V. Haven's Mental Philosophy. Art. VI. The Providential Government of God. Art. VII. The Church Membership of Infants. Orestes A. Brownson's Development of Himself. Short Notices. Literary Intelligence.

- II. *Christian Review*, April, 1858; Baltimore. Art. I. Character and Literary Influence of Erasmus.—By Wm. C. Wilkinson, Rochester, N. Y. Art. II. Religious Persecution in Virginia.—By Prof. Geo. E. Dabney, Richmond, Va. Art. III. James Montgomery.—By S. F. Smith, D. D., Boston, Mass. Art. IV. Congregational Music.—By Rev. G. W. Hervey, Canton, Mass. Art. V. Qualifications for the Lord's Supper.—Editorial—G. B. T. Art. VI. The New Theology and the Old.—By Prof. T. F. Curtis, Lewisburg, Pa. Art. VII. Notices of New Publications.
- III. *Bibliotheca Sacra*, April, 1858. Art. I. English Translations of the Bible. Art. II. Sacred Chronology.—By Prof. Joseph Packard, D. D., Theological Seminary, Fairfax, Va. Art. III. Geological and Theological Analogies.—By Rev. Benjamin F. Hosford, Haverhill, Mass. Art. IV. Essay on Inspiration.—By Prof. Joseph Torrey, D. D., Burlington, Vt. Art. V. The Grounds of Knowledge.—By Rev. Charles B. Haddock, D. D., formerly Professor in Dartmouth College. Art. VI. Wisdom as a Person in the Book of Proverbs.—By Professor E. P. Barrows, Andover. Art. VII. The Future State.—By Rev. James M. Hoppin, Salem, Mass. Art. VIII. The Science of Etymology.—By Rev. Benjamin W. Dwight, M. A., Brooklyn, N. Y. Art. IX. Topography of Jerusalem.—By Joseph P. Thompson, D. D., New York. Art. X. Notices of New Publications. Art. XI. Theological and Literary Intelligence.
- IV. *New Englander*, May, 1858. Art. I. Spiritualism Tested by Science. Art. II. The Two Powers of the Pope. Art. III. Aaron Burr. Art. IV. Currency, Banking, and Credit. Art. V. Barth and Livingstone on Central Africa. Art. VI. Dr. Taylor and his System. Art. VII. Bishop Colenso and Rev. Lewis Grout on Polygamy. Art. VIII. Professor Fisher's Historical Discourse—The Church of Christ in Yale College. Notices of Books.
- V. *Theological and Literary Journal*, April, 1858. Art. I. The Inspiration of the Scriptures—Objections to it Refuted. Art. II. Notes on Scripture—Acts, Chapters II. and III. Art. III. The Glorified and Unglorified Race during the Millennium. Art. IV. Mr. Hudson's Doctrine of a Future Life. Art. V. God the Supreme Disposer and Moral Governor. Art. VI. Dr. Livingstone's Travels in Africa. Art. VII. A Designation and Exposition of the Figures of Isaiah, Chapter xliii. Art. VIII. Dr. Barclay's City of the Great King. Art. IX. Literary and Critical Notices.
- VI. *Mercersburg Review*, April, 1858. Art. I. Thoughts on the Church.—By John W. Nevin, D. D., Windsor Place, Pa. Art. II. The New Liturgy.—By Philip Schaff, D. D., Mercersburg, Pa. Art. III. The Calendar, Civil and Ecclesiastical.—By a Layman, Mt. Washington, Md. Art. IV. The Principle of Ecclesiastical Unity.—By Rev. I. E. Graeff, Selinsgrove, Pa. V. Origin and Progress of Buddhism.—By Prof. Adolphus L. Köppen, Lancaster, Pa. Art. VI. Butler's Ancient Philosophy.—By Rev. E. V. Gerhart, D. D., Lancaster, Pa. Art. VII. Recent Publications.
- VII. *Methodist Quarterly*, April, 1858. Art. I. Friar Bacon and Lord Bacon—(2d Article).—By the Author of the Articles on Sir William Hamilton. Art. II. British Methodism and Slavery—(2d Article).—By Rev. William J. Shrewsbury, England. Art. III. The Poet and the Dreamer.—By L. A. H., New York. Art. IV. The Moral Value of a Material World.—By Rev. J. T. Crane, D. D., Pennington, N. J. Art. V. Missions in America.—By Rev. D. D. Lore, Newark, N. J. Art. VI. Inspiration of the Scriptures.—By Rev. Daniel Curry, D. D., Brooklyn, N. Y. Art. VII. Wesley as a Man of Literature.—By Rev. G. F. Playter, Waterloo, C. W. Art. VIII. The Sin against the Holy Ghost.—By Rev. John Bate, Rouse's Point, N. Y. Art. IX. Religious Intelligence. Art. X. Synopsis of the Quarterlies. XI. Quarterly Book-Table. XII. Literary Items.
- VIII. *DeBow's Review*, June, 1858. Art. I. Report on the Slave Trade to the Southern Convention.—By L. W. Spratt, of South Carolina. Art. II. Mr. Hunter on the Negro Apprentice Bill. Art. III. Washington City and its Characteristics.—By Geo. Fitzhugh, of Va. Art. IV. Thomas Jefferson, his Life, Career, and Public Services. Art. V. Albemarle and Chesapeake Canal. Art. VI. Early History of Agriculture in Virginia.—By N. F. Cabell, of Virginia, Part III.

Art. VII. Agriculture. Art. VIII. Commerce. Art. IX. Manufactures and Mining. Art. X. Internal Improvements. Art. XI. Miscellaneous. Art. XII. Editorial.

## II. BRITISH PERIODICALS.

- I. *North British Review*, May, 1858. Art. I. The Philosophy of History. Art. II. Professor Owen's Works. Art. III. Gothic Architecture—Present and Future. Art. IV. The Scottish Universities—Defects and Remedies. Art. V. Lieutenant Maury's Geography of the Sea. Art. VI. Parliamentary Government and Representation. Art. VII. The Collected Works of Dugald Stewart. Art. VIII. Patristic Theology and its Apologists. Art. IX. Rifle Practice. Art. X. Poems by Coventry Patmore. XI. Recent Publications.
- II. *Westminster Review*, April, 1858. Art. 1. The Religion of Positivism. Art. 2. Recollections of Shelley and Byron. Art. 3. China: Past and Present. Art. 4. Party Government. Art. 5. The Boscobel Tracts. Art. 6. Our Relation to the Princes of India. Art. 7. Medical Reform. Art. 8. Organization of the War Department. Contemporary Literature.
- III. *Edinburgh Review*, April, 1858. Art. 1. Annals of California. Art. 2. The Eastern Church. Art. 3. Thiers' History of the Consulate and the Empire. Art. 4. The Railways of Great Britain. Art. 5. The Works of the late Edgar Allan Poe. Art. 6. The Speeches of Lord Brougham. Art. 7. Buckle's History of Civilization in England. Art. 8. The Conquest of Oude. Art. 9. The Second Derby Ministry.
- IV. *London Quarterly*, April, 1858. Art. 1. Early Life of Johnson. Art. 2. Fictions of Bohemia. Art. 3. Italian Tours and Tourists. Art. 4. The Progress of English Agriculture. Art. 5. Michael Angelo. Art. 6. Public Speaking. Art. 7. Siege of Lucknow. Art. 8. France and the Late Ministry.
- V. *Blackwood*, May, 1858. Food and Drink—Part III. What will he do with it?—By Pisistratus Caxton—Part XII. Antiquities of Kertch. Colleges and Celibacy—A Dialogue. Zanzibar; and Two Months in East Africa.—(Conclusion.) The Poorbeah Mutiny: The Punjab—No. III. Italy—of the Arts the Cradle and the Grave. Oude.

## III. FRENCH AND GERMAN.

- I. *Revue Chrétienne*, 15 Janvier, 1858; Paris. Le Monde Antique et le Christianisme.—E. de Pressense. Etudes Religieuses sur les Mémoires du Duc de Saint Simon.—L. Rognon. Vie de Miss Bronte. Dieu dans l'Histoire, ou Le Progrès de la foi a un ordre moral du monde, par Christian-Carl-Josias Bunsen.—J. Sandoz. Bulletin Bibliographique. Revue du Mois: La question religieuse dans l'insurrection des Indes. L'opium et les missions en Chine. Le parlement de Suede et la persécution religieuse. La liberté des cultes et les Mormons.—Eug. Bersier.
- Revue Chrétienne*, Février, 1858; Paris. Marie Tudor et Charles-Quint—Charles-Quint et Napoleon.—R. Saint-Hilaire. Vinet Comme Professeur.—E. de Pressense. Beranger—Sa biographie, par lui-même.—Eug. Bersier. Les premiers prédicateurs de l'Evangile.—J. Monod. Bulletin Bibliographie:—Robert Emmet.—Un opuscule sur l'Eglise, par L.-J. Ruckert.—Histoire d'Angleterre, par Emile Bonnechose.—Sermon pour l'ouverture solennelle de la session du Consistoire supérieur de l'Eglise de la Confession d'Augsbourg, par L. Meyer. Revue Du Mois:—Reception de M. Augier a l'Académie française.—Tristes révélations d'un grand succès dramatique.—La Revue Germanique.—Nouvel élan des Missions dans l'Inde.
- Revue Chrétienne*, Mars, 1858; Paris. Le Mysticisme de Fenelon.—Felix Kuhn. Histoire d'Angleterre, par M. E. de Bonnechose.—R. Saint Hilaire. La vie terrestre du Fils de Dieu et sa Glorification.—F. Godet. La grande insurrection des Indes dans ses rapports avec l'œuvre des missions. Bulletin Bibliographique:—Sermons prêchés a Strasbourg, par T. Colani.—L'Homme, la Famille et la Société, par Buisson.—Le Chef de famille, traduit de l'anglais. Correspondance. Revue du Mois:—Cours de M. Saint-Marc Girardin.—Le père Felix a Notre-Dame.—Mort du père Ravignan.—Exces de la réaction luthérienne en Allemagne.

*Revue Chretienne*, Avril, 1858; Paris. La Contre-Reformation en Allemagne, prelude et cause de la guerre de Trente-Ans.—A Vulliet. De la necessite d'etudier de nos jours les origines du Christianisme.—E. de Pressense. La vie terrestre du Fils de Dieu et sa Glorification.—F. Godet. Reboul de Nimes.—Ad. Cazalet. Spurgeon.—Eug. Bersier. Bulletin Bibliographique :—L'Arbre de la Science, par Eug. Huzar.—De l'Atheisme et du Deisme, par Amedee Pommier.—Jansenisme et Jesuitisme, ou Examen des accusations de jansenisme soulevees, par M. Lequeux contre M. l'abbé Guettee.—Memoires inedits et Opuscules de Jean Rou, publies pour la Societe de l'Histoire du Protestantisme francais, par Francis Waddington. Revue du Mois :—Caractere et effets de la predication contemporaine.—Un mot de reponse a la Revue Germanique.—Un grand reveil aux Etats-Unis.

II. *Revue des Deux Mondes*, Mars, 1858; Paris. I. Etudes d'Histoire Primitive.—y a-t-il eu des hommes sur la terre avant la derniere epoque geologique?—Par M. E. Littré, de l'Institut. II. Une Entreprise Maritime Internationale au XIX Siecle—Le Lieutenant Maury—1. son influence sur le commerce et la navigation.—Par M. E. du Hailly. III. La Poesie Grecque Contemporaine dans les Iles-Ioniennes.—M. Valaoritis et ses Souvenirs des Guerres de l'Independance.—Par Mme Dora d'Istria. IV. Acacia, Scenes de la Vie Americaine, premiere partie.—Par M. Alfred Assollant. V. Le Theatre en Allemagne.—Frederic Halm et la Litterature Dramatique Contemporaine.—Par M. Saint-Rene Taillandier. VI. Hermann, Poeme.—Par M. Victor de Laprade, de l'Academie Francaise. VII. De la Politique de la France en Asie a propos de la Guerre de Chine.—Par M. Charles Lavallee. VIII. Artistes Contemporaine.—Lablache.—Par M. P. Scudo. IX. Chronique de la Quinzaine, Histoire Politique et Litteraire. X. L'Instruction Publique en Espagne.—Par M. Ch. de Mazade. XI. Litterature Anglaise.—l'Annee 1756.—Par M. E. D. Forgues. XII. Bulletin Bibliographique.

*Revue des Deux Mondes*, Mars, 1858; Paris. I. Rivalite de Charles-Quint et de Francois I.—1. Le Camp du Drap-d'Or et la Conference de Calais, d'apres des documens nouveaux.—Par M. Mignet, de l'Academie Francaise. II. Acacia, Scenes de la Vie Americaine, derniere partie.—Par M. Alfred Assollant. III. Le Marechal Marmont et ses Memoires.—Par M. Louis de Viel-Castel. IV. Les Voyageurs en Orient et la Turquie depuis le Traite de Paris.—Par M. Saint-Marc Girardin, de l'Academie Francaise. V. Une Entreprise Maritime Internationale au XIX Siecle—2. Influence Scientifique de l'œuvre du Lieutenant Maury—Systeme de Circulation Atmospherique et Oceanique.—Par M. E. du Hailly. VI. Un Essai de Bonheur Conjugal.—Par M. Paul de Molenes. VII. Chronique de la Quinzaine, Histoire Politique et Litteraire. VIII. Essais et Notices.—La Regence de Tunis.—Par M. Th. Pavie. IX. Bulletin Bibliographique.

*Revue des Deux Mondes*, Avril 1, 1858; Paris. I. De l'Influence Spiritualiste de M. V. Cousin a propos de ses Souvenirs.—Par M. Ernest Renan, de l'Institut. II. Les Tribus Indienne des Etats-Unis—Enquete Americaine sur les Origines, les Moeurs et l'Etat Actuel des Indiens.—Par M. Armand Mondot. III. Zobeideh, Scenes de la Vie Turque, premiere partie.—Par Mme la Princesse Christine Trivulce de Belgiojoso. IV. Le Roman Contemporain en Angleterre—Un Roman Anglican, de M. Kingsley.—Par M. Emile Montegut. V. Rivalite de Charles-Quint et de Francois I.—2. Un Conclave et la Coalition contre Francois I, d'apres des documens nouveaux.—Par M. Mignet, de l'Academie Francaise. VI. Thomas Browne, le Medicin Philosophe de Norwich—1. Une epoque de transition scientifique.—Par M. J. Milsand. VII. L'Elkovan, Poeme.—Par M. Edouard Grenier. VIII. Sciences—La Terre selon le Cosmos de M. de Humboldt.—Par M. Auguste Laugel. IX. Revue Musicale : Les Operas de la Saison.—Par M. P. Scudo. X. Chronique de la Quinzaine, Histoire Politique et Litteraire. XI. Essais et Notices; Mouvement Intellectuel: Bulletin Bibliographique.

*Revue des Deux Mondes*, Avril 15, 1858; Paris. I. La Comtesse D'Ahlefeldt et le Poete Immermann—Le Roman dans la Societe Allemande.—Par M. Saint-Rene Taillandier. II. Le Bresil en 1858 sous l'Empereur Dom Pedro II.—Par M. Pereira da Silva, de la chambre des deputes de Rio-Janeiro. III. La Siberie et les Pro-



- gres de la Puissance Russe en Asie.—Par M. C. Clarigny. IV. Zobeideh, Scenes de la Vie Turque, dernier partie.—Par Mme la Princesse Christine Trivulce de Belgiojoso. V. Du Sommeil et du Somnambulisme au point de vue Psychologique.—Par M. Ch. Leveque. VI. Les Voyageurs en Orient et la Turquie depuis le Traite de Paris, seconde partie.—Par M. Saint-Marc Girardin, de l'Academie Francaise. VII. Chronique de la Quinzaine, Histoire Politique et Litteraire. VIII. Essais et Notices: Jean II de Lazarff. IX. Bulletin Bibliographique.
- Revue des Deux Mondes*, Mai 1, 1858. I. Etudes de la Vie Mondaine—Le Roman d'un Jeune Homme Pauvre, premiere partie.—Par M. Octave Feuillet. II. Alesia, Etude sur la Septieme Campagne de Cesar dans les Gaules, avec une carte gravee. III. L'Autriche sous l'Empereur Francois-Joseph—Les Questions Politiques et le Mouvement Reformiste en Autriche depuis 1848.—Par M. G. de Muller. IV. Poesies: Les Chants du Renouveau.—Par M. Andre Theuriet. V. De l'Alimentation Publique—Le Sorgho et l'igname de Chine, resultats de l'acclimation de ces deux plantes alimentaires en France.—Par M. Payen, de l'Academie des Sciences. VI. Une Conversion Americaine (the Convert, or Leaves from my Experience, by O. A. Brownson).—Par M. Emile Montegut. VII. Chronique de la Quinzaine, Histoire Politique et Litteraire. VIII. Revue Musicale.—Par M. P. Scudo. IX. Essais et Notices: Les Manuscrits Slaves de la Bibliotheque Imperiale.—Par M. E. Dulaurier. X. Bulletin Bibliographique.
- III. *Studien und Kritiken*, 1858 erstes Heft. Vorwort. Abhandlungen: 1. Rothe, zur Dogmatik. Zweiter Artikel. 2. Weiss, die Gesetzesauslegung Christi in der Bergpredigt. Gedanken und Bemerkungen: 1. Kamphausen, Bemerkungen ueber die Stiftshutte. 2. Rauch, Erklaerung der Stelle Jakobi 4, 5. 6. Recensionen: Rueckert, das Abendmahl. Uebersichten: Tischendorf, alttestamentliche Arbeiten; rec. von E. Ranke.
- Studien und Kritiken*, Zweites Heft. Abhandlungen: 1. Laufs, ueber die ursprungliche Bedeutung der heiligen Taufe. 2. West, Betrachtungen ueber einige eschatologische Stellen der heiligen Schrift. Gedanken und Bemerkungen: 1. Ranke, Bericht ueber Auffindung von Resten eines Italacodex. Nebst einem Facsimile. 2. Lehman, chronologische Bestimmung der in der Apostelgeschichte Cap. 13–28. erzählten Begebenheiten. Recensionen: 1. Horne, biblisches Einleitungswerk; rec. von Bleek. 2. Hahn, das Bekenntniss der evangel. Kirche in seinem Verhaeltniss zu dem der roemischen und griechischen; rec. von Koellner. 3. Wahl, clavis librorum veteris testamenti apocryphorum philologica; rec. von Grimm. 4. Zeller, biblisches Woerterbuch fuer das christliche Volk; rec. von Kling. Miscellen: Programm der haager Gesellschaft zur Vertheidigung der christl. Religion auf das Jahr 1857.
- Studien und Kritiken*, drittes Heft. Abhandlungen: 1. Schweizer, die Lehre des Apostels Paulus vom erloesenden Tode Christi. 2. Buttman, Beitræge zur Kritik und Grammatik des neuen Testaments. Gedanken und Bemerkungen: 1. Von Muralt, Ueber eine Moskauer Handschrift. 2. Bethe, Kritisches zu 1 Petr. 3, 19. 3. Hoelbe, Versuch einer Erklaerung der Parabel vom ungerechten Haushalter. Recensionen: 1. Horne, biblisches Einleitungswerk; rec. von Bleek. 2. Ostertag, evangelisches Missions-Magazin; rec. von Muehlhaeusser. 3. Vinet, homiletique; } rec. von  
Vinet, Homiletik, bearbeitet von Schmid; } Kienlen.
- Charakteristiken: Umbreit, einige Worte am Begraebnisstage Friedr. Creuzers.  
Miscellen: Preisaufgabe.



THE SOUTHERN  
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XI.—No. III.

---

OCTOBER, MDCCCLVIII,

---

ARTICLE I.

THE SYMMETRY AND BEAUTY OF GOD'S WITNESSING  
CHURCH.\*

“The King's daughter is all glorious within; her clothing is of wrought gold.”—  
Psalm 45: 13.

In the ordinary ministrations of the pulpit, and meditations of God's people, Christ the Saviour holds, and ought to have, the pre-eminent place; and exhibitions of doctrine respecting his person and work constitute the staple of every evangelical discourse, and the characteristic and leading theme of contemplation and faith to every believer. But there are other themes unfolded in the Scriptures besides those which are immediately conversant with the person and work of the Son of God—themes which indeed derive all their interest from Christ, and concentrate all their light to irradiate his glorious and adorable person, but which do not come into the category

---

\* This article was intended for the April number of the Review, but was too late to be inserted. Its publication was promised in the July number, and the appendix written with a view to its appearance then. In the absence of one of the Editors, through some misunderstanding, the publication was again delayed. We make this statement out of regard to the author, and in explanation of our own seeming remissness.

of the Gospel, in the popular acceptation of that term, and are, in consequence, often passed by with an indifference which is not justified by the word of God, and is injurious to the cause and glory of the person of Christ. Principal among these is the doctrine respecting the Church—a doctrine which is rarely admitted into our pulpits, unless in the form of controversy upon some one or other of the details of her organization—discussions in which the members of the subject are dislocated, and exhibited in fragments, so as to preclude the possibility of clear and adequate conceptions respecting it, or appreciation of its interest and importance. If others attach too much significance to questions concerning the Church, and have perverted them to the purposes of usurpation and schism, it can hardly be questioned that Presbyterians tend to error on the other extreme—to indifference concerning the doctrines which respect her constitution; and consequent under-valuation of her person and office.

But, in what exalted terms does the Spirit of God descant on the attractions of the queen, the bride of Immanuel! “The King’s daughter is all glorious within; her clothing is of wrought gold.”—Psalm 45: 13. “Beautiful for situation, the joy of the whole earth, is Mount Zion, on the sides of the north, the city of the great King.” “Walk ye about Zion, and go round about her: tell the towers thereof. Mark ye well her bulwarks, consider her palaces; that ye may tell it to the generation following.”—Psalm 48: 2, 12, 13. “Behold, thou art fair, my love; behold, thou art fair; thou hast doves’ eyes within thy locks: thy hair is as a flock of goats, that appear from Mount Gilead.” “Thou art all fair, my love; there is no spot in thee.” “Thou hast ravished my heart, my sister, my spouse; thou hast ravished my heart with one of thine eyes, with one chain of thy neck. How fair is thy love, my sister, my spouse! how much better is thy love than wine! and the smell of thine ointments than all spices!”—Cant. 4: 1, 7, 9, 10. A theme upon which we might multiply quotations such as these—a theme which arouses such emotions in the bosom of the Son of God, may surely claim something more than a casual and passing thought.

We have already, in a former number of this work, presented some thoughts as to the primary location of ecclesiastical power by the Son of God; and traced the results of the several theories on this subject in the Hierarchical, Independent, and Presbyterian systems.\* In the present paper, we propose to exhibit the design of the Church as God's witness to the world; and in this to develop the great principle which underlies her structure in all ages; which has determined her whole constitution and history; and which, in the final result, will cause her to become the joy of the whole earth.

When the purpose of mercy to our ruined world was made known, and the promise of the redeeming seed was given to our first parents, the Holy Spirit was sent to earth to work faith and repentance in their hearts. That these graces were wrought in them, appears by the institution of sacrifices, and the clothing of their persons in the skins of the sacrificial animals. These were the divinely appointed tokens by which the covenant of peace was sealed to faith; and since, in the order of the Divine economy, the grace must precede the seal, we conclude that the Searcher of hearts found faith in the fallen pair when these seals were given.

The Spirit thus bestowed came not as a transient visitor; but to abide forever—until all the chosen shall have been called and sanctified—until the body of Christ shall be perfect—until the consummation of all things. This presence of the Spirit is not an outside presence, but an indwelling. "He dwelleth with you, and shall be in you."—John 14: 17. Nor is it merely a several and separate indwelling and intimacy in the hearts of believers individually; but a common presence, exerting an assimilating and incorporating power, first, into Christ their Head, and then, of all believers, into each other—his members. In all he is the one fountain of a common life, which is hid with Christ in God. In all he is the one source of holiness, and principle of divine growth. In all he is the one

---

\* The Constitution of the Presbyterian Church.—Southern Presbyterian Review, Vol. 10, p. 1.

energy and pledge of a glorious resurrection from the grave—one power of an endless life, in the presence of God in heaven. In all, of all generations, whether long since dead, or yet for ages to come unborn, he is one bond of common identity, each with all the rest, so that they all are one; and of joint communion and property in the one common Head; and this by virtue of the fact, that the uniting and quickening Spirit, by whom all is wrought, inhabiteth eternity; and accounts nothing of the lapse of time, the transitions of ages, and the mutations of generations. All time past and to come is to him one eternal now; and the transient generations of men, are all ever present.

Thus, the relation which unites John and Peter to the Mediator, whom they saw in the flesh, and loved and followed—is precisely the same as that of Abraham and Job, and all the older patriarchs, who looked forward with loving and eager desire to the long postponed fulfilment of his promised coming. Nor was it different from that which we now enjoy who believe in Christ—now that his work of abasement and sorrow is long since finished, and he sits enthroned on the seat of his glory. By one Spirit are all, of all ages, baptized into one body, and made partakers of one common life, which, comprehending all time, shall be continued after time forever on high.

The organism thus formed by the power of this life-giving Spirit is the mystical body of Christ, composed of all those who were chosen in him before the foundation of the world, and called to holiness. It is the glorious bride, in whom the King, the Bridegroom, sees neither spot nor wrinkle; but perfect beauty and purity, and perfect love. To the several members of it, he, in the appointed times of his grace, gives this his Spirit. By it they are incorporated into the body. They, by the Spirit, are “transformed by the renewing of their minds.” In them he works sanctification alike by his several and his common presence and power; imparting to each, in his proportionate measure, repentance and faith, love, joy, peace, and every grace. Preparing them thus on earth for heaven, he at length removes to that world, first, the soul;

and afterward, at the resurrection, the body—transformed, incorruptible, spiritual and glorious.

Such is the fundamental and essential element in the constitution of the Church of Christ on earth—its constituents, the elect; and as these are distinguishable by no man; and will be known by none, until the time of the renovation of all things, this company—the mystical body of Christ—is commonly designated as the invisible Church. By the apostle, it is called “the general assembly and Church of the first-born, which are written in heaven.”—Heb. 12: 23.

But the intention of the election of grace and the redemption of man was not merely the salvation of the elect. Much more was it designed to provide, in the redeemed, a body of witnesses, to testify to the universe on behalf of the justice and truth, the grace and glory of God. This world is a province of that universe; and in it as well as in heaven, has God seen fit to exhibit that testimony—a testimony here the more demanded, by how much man has apostatized from the knowledge and love of God, and enslaved himself to Satan and sin. Hence the occasion that the Church should assume an outward visible organization, and have a form adapted to recognition by the world; and suited to perform the office of testifying for God to the understandings and consciences of men—sensual, and blind to the things of God.

Hence the erection of the visible Church. It consists principally and characteristically of the elect—the members of the invisible Church. From them it derives its constitution and functions; and in them dwells the Holy Spirit, which is its life. But not the elect only—all men were given to the Son of God in the eternal covenant; and he sees good to use others, as well as his own peculiar people, in carrying on his purposes of grace and glory. He has, therefore, in the visible Church, associated with the elect many others who are qualified to constitute elements in an outward witnessing organization; but are not possessed of the common Spirit and life; nor are they vitally united to the mystical body, nor heirs of the glory to come.

Thus arises the distinction between the Church invisible and visible. The one comprehends some elements which do not

belong to the other. Yet, characteristically, and as a whole, the Church visible and invisible is one; and hence the Scriptures continually predicate of the former as a whole, whatever is true of the latter. "*A potiori nomen fit.*" The epistles address the professed disciples of Christ, in terms appropriate to them at large, as a class; although the language does not in all cases belong distributively to every one of the class so addressed. Thus when Peter says to his readers—"Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people, that ye should show forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light; which in time past were not a people, but are now the people of God; which had not obtained mercy, but now have obtained mercy," 1 Peter 2: 9, 10—he speaks, without any formal discrimination, to the whole body of professed believers; yet is the language distributively appropriate to those, and those only, who have experienced the renewing of their minds, by the unction of the Holy One; and are become truly engrafted into the spiritual body—the living vine.

Precisely similar to this, is the discrimination which holds between our fleshly bodies, and those which shall live in the resurrection. Our natural bodies, besides those elements which are essential, and in which the identity resides, comprehend others of which it is said that "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption."—1 Cor. 15: 50. Yet is it of these bodies, thus constituted of mixed elements, that the promise of the resurrection is spoken; and they who are in the body, are represented as groaning with an ardor of desire for their change—"not for that they would be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality may be swallowed up of life."—2 Cor. 5: 4. We should feel it hypercritical and absurd, to deny that these corporeal frames are the bodies which shall inherit the resurrection, because we cannot tell which, of all the particular elements of which they are composed, shall realize the glory of that promise. As much so is it, to deny that the visible Church is the beloved bride of Christ—the true Church of God; because some elements in it are excluded from a share in



the inheritance in the heavens. To the Church visible the oracles of God were and are committed. To the apostles, as corporeal and visible agents, the commission was given for the re-organization of that Church and the gathering of the world into it as a visible body. To the particular visible congregations, by them organized as members of that body, were the epistles addressed; in which all the functions and prerogatives of the Church are predicated of them. It was in the Church visible that Christ set "first, apostles; secondarily, prophets; thirdly, teachers; after that, miracles; then gifts of healing, helps, governments, diversities of tongues."—1 Cor. 12: 28. To her—fulfilling his commission, in publishing salvation, to all nations—did he give the memorable and precious promise—"Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world."—Matt. 28: 20. In short, if there be any statement made in the Scriptures respecting the Church—whether it be, of duty, or privilege—of labor, or reward—of endowment, or prerogative—of threatening or promise—it will be found that to the visible Church it is addressed, and of her spoken. This, the very name by which she is designated, implies. Derived, not from *εκλεκτός*, the elect, but from *ἐκκαλέω*—to convene, *ἐκκλησία*, signifies a congregation or assembly; and is used to designate the "tumultuous mob of Ephesus."—Acts 19: 39, 41.) When Paul uses it as the designation of the family in heaven, he expressly marks it as synonymous with assembly—"The general Assembly and Church of the first-born."—Heb. 12: 23.

In short, any other view is fatal to the lawful administration of the ordinances at all, or the existence of the visible Church. If the predicates of the Church attach not to the visible, but only to the invisible body—it follows, on the one hand, that no association of men may exercise any of her functions until they have demonstrated, beyond peradventure, their membership in the invisible Church; they may not, for example, call a man to the ministry; nor, on the other hand, may he assume the authority of the ministry, unless he can prove infallibly his membership and ministry in the invisible body; which is impossible.

In fact, the visible is but the invisible Church putting forth her energies in an efficient form in the service of Christ. Her visibility is of necessity; and follows inevitably from the operation of two circumstances. First: Whilst she comprehends in her body all the redeemed in heaven, she also includes in it the multitude of the elect who still dwell in the flesh. As individuals here, they are personally known to the world, living in it, and busy with its concerns. Their lives and conduct are therefore open to observation and inspection. Second: The Holy Spirit which dwells in them, is the same who inspires in their brethren, before the throne in heaven, the adoring joy with which they proclaim, with tongue and harp, the praises of God's glorious attributes, and of the Lamb's redeeming grace. If, taught by that Spirit, those who have attained the inheritance, will infallibly proclaim the grace which brought them there—with equal certainty will that same heavenly Instructor impel those who are still on earth to testify of the grace which has bought them, of the promises which await them, and the God in whom they rejoice. But such a testimony given by men, in the flesh, is seen and known by the world, to whom it is strange; whilst it makes God's people known to each other. Thus outward pressure from the hostile world combines with the tie of the indwelling Spirit to bring them together, in visible separation from the world in which they live, and open testimony for God, and pursuit of heaven.

Whilst thus the visible Church is necessarily developed by the action of the mystical union, the identity of that Church is ascertained and established by the fact, that in her is seen the characteristic and habitual performance of the proper functions of the Church. All these have respect to what we have already hinted to be the end for which the Church was organized—the maintaining of a testimony for God. As this is a point of no small importance, we shall enter briefly into the evidence on which it rests. To attempt a full exhibition of it would involve a discussion of the entire scope of the Scriptures.

The Church is built upon "the foundation of the apostles

and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief cornerstone."—Eph. 2: 20. What then are the characteristics of these upon whom she is founded, and of whose spirit she partakes? They are, in the Scriptures, distinctively designated as official witnesses for God. Thus Christ, the chief cornerstone of the building, proclaims himself "the faithful and true witness."—Rev. 1: 5. He is that "Word of God," who came for a light to the world, to testify to it of the love, the grace, and the justice of God. So, in regard to the prophets, Peter tells Cornelius and his house, that to Christ "give all the prophets witness."—Acts 10: 43. Paul tells the Romans, that "the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets."—Rom. 3: 21. And the angelic interpreter of John's visions, tells him—"I am thy fellow servant, and of thy brethren that have the testimony of Jesus: worship God: for the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy."—Rev. 19: 10. To the apostles, Christ in his last interview before his ascension, says—"Thus it was written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name, among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem. And ye are witnesses of these things."—Luke 24: 46-48, and Acts 1: 8. When Matthias was called to fill the place of Judas, in the apostate, it was that he might be "a witness of the resurrection."—Acts 1: 22. And when Paul was called to the same office, he was appointed to be Christ's "witness to all men."—Acts 22: 15. Thus, not only is Christ, the Head, designated pre-eminently "the faithful and true witness," but the prophets and apostles, the official organs of the Church, in their several dispensations, fill distinctively this precise office of witnesses for God.

But still more clearly are we taught that the Church is God's witness to the world. Herein is the whole meaning of our Saviour's declaration, in the sermon on the mount—"Ye are the light of the world. A city that is set on an hill cannot be hid. Neither do men light a candle, and put it under a bushel, but on a candlestick; and it giveth light unto all that are in the house. Let your light so shine before men, that

they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven.”—Matt. 5: 14–16. With this compare the sixtieth chapter of Isaiah, which is evidently had in view in this language thus used by our Saviour—“Arise, shine; for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee. For behold the darkness shall cover the earth, and gross darkness the people; but the Lord shall arise upon thee, and his glory shall be seen upon thee. And the Gentiles shall come to thy light; and kings to the brightness of thy rising.”—Isaiah 60: 1–3. These may serve as examples of many places in which the Church is held forth as a light set in the moral firmament, not to shine in an original brilliancy, but to reflect the light of the glory of God shining upon her for a testimony to all nations.

To the same conclusion is the fact, that the hieroglyphic by which the Church is symbolized is a candlestick with its burning lamps. Thus, in the Revelation, John saw the Son of Man in the midst of seven golden candlesticks; and he is told by him, that the seven candlesticks which he saw were the seven churches; whilst, to the same effect, seven stars in the right hand of the Son of God were the angels or officers of the seven churches.—Rev. 1: 20. Such was the meaning of the candlestick of gold which stood in the tabernacle and temple. Burning continually in that part of the sacred place, which, veiled from the light of day, symbolized the earth—as, illumined by the shekinah, the holy of holies did heaven—it was a type of God's Church shedding its light on the world sitting in darkness.

Another fact to our present purpose presents itself in the institutions of Moses. The law of God, as written on the tables of stone, and committed to the guardianship of Israel is, by its Author, called “the testimony.” Thus, God says to Moses in one place, “Thou shalt put into the ark the testimony which I shall give thee.”—Ex. 25: 16. And again, “He gave unto Moses, when he had made an end of communing with him upon Mount Sinai, two tables of testimony, tables of stone, written with the finger of God.”—Ex. 31: 18. Hence the tabernacle itself, which, in its various parts and in-

struments, as well as its various ordinances, represented the place of the abode of the Church on earth and in heaven, and to which the people brought all their stated offerings, and looked, in their more private acts of devotion, is designated as "the tabernacle of the testimony." The language of the 122d Psalm is a forcible illustration of the design of the God of Israel in these things, to mark the office of that people as one of witness on God's behalf—"Jerusalem is builded as a city that is compact together; whither the tribes go up, the tribes of the Lord, unto the testimony of Israel, to give thanks unto the name of the Lord."—Psalm 122: 3, 4. This tabernacle of testimony re-appears in the book of the Revelation in striking connection with the witnessing office of the Church, and the judgments which sanction her testimony. "The temple of the tabernacle of the testimony in heaven was opened; and the seven angels came out of the temple, having the seven plagues, clothed in pure and white linen, and having their breasts girded with golden girdles."—Rev. 15: 5, 6.

A slight notice of the several particular functions which are in the Scriptures attributed to the Church leads to the same conclusion already indicated. These are comprehended under two heads—instruction and discipline. Her instructions are dispensed by example, by oral teaching, and by symbols. That, in all these, the object is the exhibition of a testimony requires but little argument. In all the narratives of the New Testament, and all the epistles, great stress is laid upon this as the end and aim of the life of God's people and the preaching of the Gospel. The saints are chosen "that they may show forth the praises of Him who hath called them."—1 Pet. 2: 9. Our Saviour states as prerequisite to his second coming—"Ye shall be brought before rulers and kings for my sake, for a testimony against them. And the Gospel must first be published among all nations."—Mark 13: 9, 10. So baptism is "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;" that is, as a testimony and seal to the truth and power of the doctrines which cluster around these adorable names; and as often as the people of Christ partake of the

Lord's Supper, they do show forth the Lord's death till he come."—1 Cor. 11: 26.

That the exercise of discipline is an erection of testimony we need not pause to prove. Its whole intent is illustrated in that solemn admonition of Peter—"As he which hath called you is holy, so be ye holy, in all manner of conversation; because it is written, Be ye holy, for I am holy."—1 Pet. 1: 15, 16.

Need we add to the evidence already adduced, the many passages in which, in express and various terms, the witnessing office of the Church is asserted? Thus Paul declares that the grace of the ministry was given to him, "to the intent that now, unto principalities, and powers, in heavenly places, might be known by the Church the manifold grace of God."—Eph. 3: 10. And, not to multiply examples, Peter tells the saints—"Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye should show forth the praises of Him who hath called you out of darkness, into his marvellous light."—1 Pet. 2: 9.

Thus, then, the idea of the Church—that which is common and central both to the visible and invisible body—is not the elect; but the company of God's witnesses. As our salvation, although included in the great end, God's glory is, in any just estimate, altogether secondary and subservient to that end; so in the conception of the Church, the fact of that salvation attained, although distinctly and conspicuously recognized, is entirely subordinate to the higher fact, of the office to which we are saved—the attestation and increase of that glory.

Did our space permit, we might here proceed to show by an analysis of her history in all ages and lands, that just in proportion as the Church has enjoyed the quickening presence of the Holy Spirit, awakening her to a consciousness of the life which glows within her, and the mission to which she is called, has she appreciated and exalted this witnessing office as her peculiar function and highest honor; whilst in times of backsliding and apostacy this idea has become obscured; and, in its stead, an unbecoming pre-eminence has been given to the con-

ception of the Church as the company of the elect—the society of the redeemed. So invariable have been these characteristics, that no more accurate criterion of the state of the Church in any age can be devised. When formalism and apostacy prevail, the Church is found wrapped in carnal confidence and self-righteous security; crying—“The people of the Lord—the people of the Lord—the people of the Lord are we.” On the contrary, times of revival have invariably been times of testimony for God and his truth. Hence the apologies and creeds, the confessions and declarations, the acts and testimonies which have characterized certain periods in her history. Hence, too, that name of *martyr*, which has been used since the days of Stephen, to designate those who have suffered “for the testimony of Jesus.” None but martyr sons are worthy of the bride of Christ, as a mother; and none but a martyr Church is faithful to her calling and her husband.

This doctrine as to the design of the Church, carries with it inevitably the necessity of her visibility; which we have already demonstrated in another way. If she is to bear testimony to the world, it is necessary that she come within the world's cognizance; which is to become visible.

The Church set apart to the performance of an office so important, is not a mere aggregation of individuals—the mere company of redeemed persons. But, as many Scriptures certify, it is a thoroughly organized body, symmetrical in its proportions, and perfect in its members. By this we do not mean that organization which results from the formal association of believers in distinct congregations, and the election of officers in them; but a higher, a spiritual organization, upon which the other is predicated, and which, engrafting all into the Head, thence imparts to the members severally the several gifts requisite for the edifying of the whole; so that no member is without his own appropriate gifts and offices for the common good; and the failure of any one to exercise his gifts and fulfil the duties to which by the Spirit he is called and qualified, results necessarily in the injury of all. “Whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; or one member be honored, all the members rejoice with it.”—1 Cor. 12: 26. To

this purpose Paul argues very clearly throughout that chapter. "Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit." "For to one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge by the same Spirit; to another faith by the same Spirit; to another the gifts of healing by the same Spirit; to another the working of miracles; to another prophecy; to another discerning of spirits; to another divers kinds of tongues; to another the interpretation of tongues. But all these worketh that one and the self-same Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will. For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that body, being many, are one body; so also is Christ." "Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular."—1 Cor. 12: 4, 8–12, 27.

We have already seen that the testimony to which the Church is consecrated, is maintained by example, by oral instruction, by symbolical teaching, and by discipline. By example she condemns the world's apostacy, and forgetfulness of God, and love of sin. By example she testifies to the competence of the redeeming grace of Christ, and the renewing and sanctifying power of the Holy Spirit. By example she most effectually commends the truth and the value of the Gospel; whilst she proclaims it, in oral instructions, to the ears and understandings of men. In the sacraments she bears witness, in another form to the need and the power of renewing grace, and the virtue of the sacrifice which was offered on Calvary. In the exercise of discipline; excluding from her society and fellowship the unholy, receiving believers, and correcting their faults, she attests the holiness of the God whom she adores, and the sanctitude which he requires of those who would come before Him; and marks the separation between the people of God and the people of Satan.

Such being the functions in the exercise of which the Church fulfils her commission, it follows from the fact, that in her dwells the Holy Spirit—a living Spirit, exerting in her a controlling energy—that she will always be found, in some degree, greater or less, engaged in the performance of these functions. Hence the marks of the true Church, as given by Calvin, and



commonly held by the Reformed. "The marks by which the Church is to be distinguished, are the preaching of the Word and the administration of the Sacraments." "Wherever we find the Word of God purely preached, and heard, and the Sacraments administered according to the institution of Christ, there it is not to be doubted is a Church of Christ."—Institutes B. IV. C. I. 10, 9. Precisely to the same effect is the doctrine of the Westminster Assembly—"The visible Church, which is also catholic or universal under the Gospel, (not confined to one nation as before under the law), consists of all those throughout the world that profess the true religion, together with their children, and is the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, the house and family of God, out of which there is no ordinary possibility of salvation. Unto this catholic visible Church, 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; and doth by his own presence and Spirit, according to his promise, make them effectual thereunto."—Conf. of Faith, Ch. 25: Sec. 2 and 3. It is those who *profess* the true religion, as well as possess it, who constitute the Church; and it is not the pretence of being the true Church, but the testimony of the truth which is determinate. The preaching of the Word and the administration of the Sacraments—where the testimony of God is maintained, in these ways of his appointment, with any measure of faithfulness—even though it be mixed with much of imperfection and error, there is a branch of the Church of Christ; whilst, wherever these fail, it is the seal of apostacy; and the body in which it occurs, although it may have been once a member of the pure bride of Christ, is thenceforth to be accounted a member of anti-christ, and its assemblies the synagogues of Satan.

"This catholic visible Church hath been sometimes more, sometimes less, visible. And particular churches, which are members thereof, are more or less pure, according as the doctrine of the Gospel is taught and embraced, ordinances administered, and public worship performed more or less purely in them.

“The purest churches under heaven are subject both to mixture and error; and some have so degenerated as to become no churches of Christ, but synagogues of Satan. Nevertheless, there shall be always a Church on earth to worship God according to his will.”—Conf. of Faith, Ch. 25: Sec. 4 and 5.

But whilst the possession and exercise of these functions are essential to the existence of the Church, the form and manner of their exercise is not of the same vital importance. In this respect much of error and irregularity is liable to mix itself with the work of God, seeing this treasure is put into earthen vessels. Yet is the grace of God not thereby so straitened, as to withdraw from those who maintain, however irregularly, yet honestly and in sincerity, a standard for the truth. As the tree is known, not by a reference to the deformity or symmetry of its branches, nor to the defective growth, or perfection of the fruit, but by the nature of that fruit; so the Church is to be recognized wherever the fruits are seen; even though they may hang immature and imperfect from gnarled and sickly branches. Wherever Christ's testimony is maintained, there is Christ's Church; there dwells his Spirit. If any particular Church should seem to be dissevered from the common body—whether by defect or succession, or of visible communion—yet, if it bear the fruit, it is certain that it is a shoot of the true vine, springing from the common root, and partaking of the common life and fatness. Like some majestic and spreading banyan, this vine of Lebanon increases; in one place, by the growing dimensions of the central stock and its extending branches; in another, by sending down shoots from its mighty arms to seize new soil, and derive new life and luxuriance from the extended surface; sometimes by scions shooting upwards from the roots, which have wandered, unseen and unsuspected, beneath the surface. Here a giant trunk rises in stateliness, and bears upward its branching honors toward the heavens; whilst a numerous retinue of scions surround the parent tree, sharing its life and fatness, and bearing up its fruitful head. There a thrifty stem shoots up in apparent independence, although embraced on all hands by the intertwining branches of the vine. Another stands alone, not only without

apparent connection with the root, but alien to the society toward which it extends no brotherhood, and from which it accepts no embrace. Yet are all true churches nourished by the one common life—all spring from the one common root—the Root of David—all are pervaded by one Spirit—consecrated to one work and service—witnesses to one testimony—and heirs of one inheritance.

As the unity of the Church does not consist in a visible incorporation into one body, but in the one life imparted by the Holy Spirit, inducing common sympathies, a common fruit, and a testimony essentially the same—so does not her perpetuity depend upon the continuity of a particular visible organization; but upon the efficiency of the Holy Spirit, raising up in all ages an unbroken series of witnesses, seen and known of the world, and faithful to the testimony of Jesus. Yet these successive bodies of witnesses never originate by a spontaneous or sporadic process; but in all cases arise immediately out of the labors of those who preceded them—offshoots from some older branch of the living tree—connected—not necessarily by an orderly succession of officers—but by an immediate derivation of life and testimony from the earlier to the younger branches. Thus is there an apostolic succession, not of ordination, but of spiritual life, endowments and labors—a succession, lineal, though not always rectilinear; real, if not always traceable by human skill—a succession, which although it flows at times through the body of the Roman anti-christ, is not identified with it, but hostile to it. The tumor which has grown at the expense of the structure and powers of some member of the body is penetrated by the natural arteries, by which the vital fluid is conveyed through the diseased mass to the extremities. The life and symmetry of these extremities is not derived from the revolting fungus which has interposed between them and the body. No more are the vitality and beauty of the churches of the reformation to be referred to any thing derived from the mother of abominations. The pious parents of Luther are but examples of the multitudes who, although within her pale, were not of her; but bore a testimony constantly, and in a more or less visible form, for Christ's

precious truth, which she betrayed. These constituted the apostolic succession, through whom the living waters flowed to after generations in an unailing stream.

Since then—as in the pre-Abrahamic dispensation—the Church may exist, and perform imperfectly her functions without distinct organization; much less is any precise form of organization essential to her existence. Yet has she a normal structure, which is held forth in the Scriptures, and through which alone she can exert with the greatest efficiency her powers, maintain her growth and beauty, and fulfil her office. In this organization everything springs from, and is subordinate to, the fundamental fact, of the unity of the body, and community of all the members in its functions, and in the various gifts and graces of the several members. If individuals are called to exercise important gifts, or fill conspicuous and influential offices, they fill them on behalf of the body, and by virtue of the authority which Christ has given her; and the peculiar gifts and graces with which they are endowed, they possess by virtue of union with her, and by the power of the Spirit which dwells in her. “Now hath God set the members, every one of them in the body, as it hath pleased him. And if they were all one member, where were the body? But now are there many members, yet but one body. And the eye cannot say unto the hand, I have no need of thee; nor again the head to the feet, I have no need of you.”—1 Cor. 12: 18–21. In fact here is literally verified that saying of the Lord Jesus—“Whosoever will be great among you, shall be your minister, and whosoever of you will be the chiefest, shall be servant of all. For even the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister.”—Mark 10: 43–45. The highest office and dignity in the Church is a ministry—a service; and the most privileged position is of self-sacrifice, at the behest, and for the advantage of the whole. In fact, all that her officers can accomplish, in any form of official labor, is to give voice to the life and conduct of the church—to the teaching of her example, which proclaims her a stranger and pilgrim here, and makes known the grace by which she is endowed, and the glories of which she is heir.

In the orderly constitution of the Church, there are three objects for which official provision is requisite. These are, the proclamation of the truth, for the warning and ingathering of those that are without, and instruction and sanctification of the members; the guarding and ruling of the fold, so as to exclude those who do not have the mark of the good Shepherd, to guide the flock, and reclaim wanderers; and provision for the temporal necessities of those who are employed in her service, or dependant on her charity. Hence arise the offices of the teaching eldership, of the ruling eldership, and of the diaconate. Of these, the two former have more immediate respect to the business of the Church as God's witness; and are therefore common to both dispensations of the organized Church. The deacon's office having more direct reference to the fact, that the Gospel is now published at home and abroad by preachers sent forth and sustained by her, and reveals its grace pre-eminently to the poor, is peculiar to the Gospel Church; although, to all essential purposes, the former dispensation was amply furnished with suitable provision for the poor, and the ministry.

Under the Mosaic dispensation, the tribe of Levi was set apart to the office of instruction; which they fulfilled, not only by performing the symbolical rites at the temple, but by teaching the people throughout the land; whilst with them the elders were joined in the duties of government and discipline.\* A passage in the prophecy of Zechariah, if we mistake not, bears directly on this subject, and illustrates the relation of these two offices to the functions of the Church. "And he said unto me, What seest thou? And I said, I have looked, and behold a candlestick, all of gold, with a bowl upon the top of it, and his seven lamps thereon, and seven pipes to the seven lamps, which are upon the top thereof; and two olive trees by it, one upon the right side of the bowl, and the other upon the left side thereof." "Then answered I and said unto him, What are these two olive trees, upon the right side of the candlestick, and upon the left side thereof? And I answered

---

\*See Deut. 31: 9-13; 33: 10, 11; 2 Chron. 17: 7-9, &c.

again, and said unto him, what be these two olive branches, which, through the two golden pipes, empty the golden oil out of themselves." "Then said he, These are the two anointed ones, that stand before the Lord of the whole earth."—Zech. 4: 2, 3, 11–14. Compare this with John's vision in the Revelations—"I will give power to my two witnesses, and they shall prophecy a thousand two hundred and threescore days, clothed in sackcloth. These are the two olive trees, and the two candlesticks, standing before the God of the earth. And if any man will hurt them, fire proceedeth out of their mouth, and devoureth their enemies: and if any man will hurt them he must in this manner be killed. These have power to shut heaven, that it rain not in the days of their prophecy: and have power over waters to turn them to blood, and to smite the earth with all plagues, as often as they will."—Rev. 11: 3–6. These olive trees are in Zechariah's vision seen to be organically united to the Church, although they are separate and distinct from its body. Through their activity the oil of grace in the Church is replenished, so as to render it continually luminous; showing thus God's glory. They are not peculiar to the former dispensation, but, as John testifies, are enjoyed by the Church in the time of anti-christ. They are God's peculiar witnesses; and are prophets; and in them is power—the power of the keys, to shut heaven, and inflict the judgments of God on incorrigible enemies. Are not these two olive trees—these witnesses, symbols of the ministries of instruction and discipline in the Church? These ministries are the instruments through whom the Church is nourished and built up. These are the means through which her testimony to holiness and God is published. These are they that bear the keys of the kingdom, so that "whatsoever they shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever they shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."—Matt. 16: 19. Against these equally and pre-eminently is the hostility of the world and anti-christ arrayed; a pure discipline exciting, if possible, a more intense hostility than the pure doctrine of God; and this, for the reason, that men may evade the truth preached, by refusing to hear; but they cannot evade that dis-

cipline by which, if without, the ungodly are forbidden entrance into the Church; and which, if they should gain admittance by its authority, retrains their lusts, or expels them from the fold.

The functions which, under the former dispensation, were performed by the tribe of Levi, and the elders of Israel, now devolve on pastors and ruling elders. The qualifications and duties of these officers are defined in the Scriptures; and those who fill them are called and designated to their service through the mediation of the Church, acting under the promised guidance of the Spirit of Christ, leading her to the choice of such persons as he has qualified and appointed for her service. The functions and services of these officers appertain, not to the particular congregations merely among whom they may be called to labor, but to the Church at large. This follows necessarily from the unity of the Church; and is very fully testified in the Scriptures. Of the evidence, our space allows us to introduce but one or two elements.

Upon occasion of the destruction of the first-born of Egypt, God commanded Moses—"Sanctify to me all the first-born, whatsoever openeth the womb among the children of Israel: it is mine."—Ex. 13: 2. These first-born, redeemed from destruction by the paschal blood, were thus set apart as holy to God; and the law was established, that all the first-born in Israel should be redeemed from death, by a price in money, and should belong to the service of God. Henceforward the priesthood, which had been previously exercised by the father, was vested in the first-born. Thus on them were bestowed the sacred functions, which, distributively, belong to their several families; and in them, collectively, were those of the entire Church. After this, the Levites having atoned for the idolatry of the golden calf, by the punishment of the idolators, God called them to take the place of the first-born—"I, behold I have taken the Levites from among the children of Israel instead of all the first-born that openeth the matrix among the children of Israel."—Num. 3: 5-13. That the vicarious character of this transaction might be more apparent, Moses was required to number the first-born, and the tribe of Levi.

The numbers were respectively 22,273, and 22,000. And the Lord said—"Take the Levites instead of all the first-born among the children of Israel. And for those that are to be redeemed of the two hundred and threescore and thirteen of the first-born of the children of Israel, which are more than the Levites, thou shalt even take five shekels apiece, by the poll, and thou shalt give the money wherewith the odd number of them is to be redeemed to Aaron and his sons."—Num. 3: 39-51. Still further to signalize the representative character of the Levites, they were ordained by the hands of all the people, (Num. 8: 10); whilst Aaron, the type of Christ, was set apart by Moses alone, (Lev. 8: 1-5,) who was to him "instead of God."—Ex. 4: 16.

Thus the sacred functions—which were essentially in each individual of that "kingdom of priests," (Ex. 19: 6,)—were distributively assigned to the first-born, in whom, as individuals, the several families recognized their own prerogatives and privileges. These, thus ascertained and located, were then so combined and invested in the Levites, as to preclude any idea of several and separable interests; and all were referred to a community of title in common prerogatives, and a common grace.

Precisely similar is the constitution of the New Testament Church. Hence the language of the apostle—"Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular. And God hath set some in the Church, first, apostles; secondarily, prophets; thirdly, teachers; after that miracles; then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues."—1 Cor. 12: 27, 28. Thus does he give to teachers helps and governments, the same extensive relation to the Church catholic which he attributes to the apostles and prophets on whom it is built. Yet as the labors of the ordinary officers of the Church are, by the nature of the case, confined to specific fields of more or less limited extent; so are they called and set apart to their work, through the intervention of particular congregations, or associations of them; acting under the guidance of the one Spirit which pervades the whole.

These officers do not derive investiture from any lineal apos-



toxic succession, but from the Head of the Church; and the form of ordination is not designed to intimate such succession, but to bear witness to the fact that the Holy Spirit, in the bosom of the Church, recognizes the commission which her Head has already given to the party. Nor is this view affected by the fact that men are sometimes ordained, who are undoubtedly children of Satan; since the case of Judas, conclusively shows that the Son of God may and does call to temporary service in his Church, for his own holy and inscrutable purposes, men who have no part in his salvation themselves. The essential requisite to official status, is the appointment of Christ. The essential evidence of it, is the attestation of the Spirit in the bosom of the Church. He that hath these, is a minister of Christ clothed with full authority; even though he should never receive imposition of hands.

Our space will not permit us to enter into an exhibition of the orderly gradation of governing assemblies—subordinate, the local to the provincial, and all to that in which the unity of the body is represented. The whole system grows normally out of the unity of the Church—the inseparable relation which we have seen—the functions of all the officers and members sustain to that unity—and the necessary distribution of those functions to every part. By these, on the one hand, that unity is maintained, and a common sentiment and sympathy cherished throughout the whole body; whilst, on the other, efficiency and pervasive power is secured, by the distribution of responsibility and labor to every member.

We have already intimated, that the Church sprang into life with the utterance of the promise to the woman. Its very beginning was marked by an event—the murder of Abel—which signalized the hostility to which the witnessing Church must ever be subject, from the children of the world. Says John to the saints—“Ye are not as Cain who was of that wicked one, and slew his brother. And wherefore slew he him? Because his own works were evil, and his brother’s righteous. Marvel not, my brethren, if the world hate you.”—John 3: 12, 13. In the family of Seth the Church was continued, whilst Cain went out from the presence of the Lord.

But although we find an Enoch walking with God, and for his faith and holiness translated, yet so alluring to human corruption were the pleasures of the world, that the "sons of God" by degrees abandoned their profession, and allied themselves with the ungodly; until Noah and his family remained alone of all the race, faithful to warn a guilty world, when the surging waters of the flood were ready to sweep away at once all traces of their existence and their crimes.

Peacefully borne upon the waters, safe in the midst of universal ruin, God preserved his Church. And no sooner is the danger past, than the ransomed family erect an altar, and call upon the Lord, who seals with them a covenant of peace, by the bow in the cloud. Yet, with the memory of this, God's judgment ever before them, and its monuments all around them, how quickly did the children of Noah go astray. We hear of a pious Abimelech, and of a Melchisedec, priest of the most high God; but besides these the whole world seems turned to idols.

The time had now come, in the designs of God, for the organization of the Church as a distinctive body. The prior dispensation was tentative, and the Church was under it unorganized. In it was tried the question, whether the world—voluntarily apostate—would, as a whole, freely and at once return to the freely offered covenant of peace—whether it would cease from rebellion, and cordially accept the offers of grace. The result showed the world alike obdurate to the arguments of interest, the persuasions of mercy, and the terrors of judgments; not only lost to holiness and peace, but deliberately and pertinaciously lost to the claims of gratitude, the motives of reason, and the attractions of goodness. But now was the Church formally organized, for preserving and transmitting the knowledge of the truth to the end of time—for the erection of a standard for God, and maintaining a testimony for him against the apostacy of a rebel world.

Abram was called from Ur, of the Chaldees. He buried his father, and left his brother's children in Haran; and was at length left, by the separation of Lot at Sodom, a pilgrim and a stranger upon the earth; alone, with his beloved Sarai. With

him was established the covenant of peace—"I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee, in their generations, for an everlasting covenant, to be a God to thee, and to thy seed after thee."—Gen. 17: 7. "And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed."—Gen. 22: 18. But the Church, as erected in the family of Abraham, was not designed for the publication of the truth, and the proclamation of the promise; but to keep and transmit it to others. She was not privileged to bear forward the standard into the conflict with the world and Satan for the possession of the earth; but to guard it, planted in the camp, until the day of battle and conquest. Erected in Canaan, in the very midst of the lands, its light gleamed afar upon the surrounding nations; shining, not to dispel, but to condemn the darkness. That was the time of the minority of the Church. As yet immature for her great commission, she was "under tutors and governors, until the time appointed of the Father."—Gal. 4: 2. The saints of that age, "having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise: God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect."—Heb. 11: 39, 40.

At length the fulness of time was come, and God sent forth his own Son into the world. He "loved the Church, and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the Word; that he might present it to himself a glorious Church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish."—Eph. 5: 26, 27. Thus having brought her up for himself, did the Son of God celebrate the espousals, purchasing her to himself at a price of blood. Then gave he her the world as her field, and the nations as her possession; with the promise that "the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High."—Dan. 7: 27. Thus espoused to himself, and endowed with a goodly dowry, he left her for a season, to return and dwell with her forever. As he departs he gives her his commission of grace—"Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature."—Mark

16: 15. And "when he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men;"—gifts of grace to the world, and of love to the Church. "He gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ."—Eph. 4: 8, 11, 12.

But though thus organized and commissioned, thus qualified and endowed, she may not yet enter on the glory. Not yet is the kingdom given to Israel. It is enough for the disciple that he be as his master, and the servant as his lord."—Matt. 10: 25. It is enough for the bride that she be as her husband. If he was abased before the exaltation—if he shed his blood to win the glory, it is a small thing that she should be partaker in the shame and sufferings of her glorious Head. Yet, through centuries of imbecility and unfruitfulness, of persecution and apostacy must she learn, that it is not her own arm that bringeth salvation; that it is not for her sake—faithless and forgetful—that he doeth this, but for his own name's sake; that it is not by might nor by power, but by the Spirit of the Lord of Hosts, that the world is to be overcome, and the kingdom of righteousness and peace established. But she shall at length appear in beauty and power. She shall "look forth as the morning, fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners."—Cant. 6: 10. Hitherto hath she rather bowed in widowhood and mourning, than sat as a queen, or rejoiced as a bride. But the time draws near when her beauty, hitherto veiled, shall shine forth—when—her widowhood ended—her tears shall cease, and sorrow and mourning shall flee away.

Such is she whose beauty delights the King—the bride, glorious and radiant in purest gold. Her body, the blood-bought host. Her office, the vindication of the honor of the Holy One in the presence of an apostate world. Her organization fitted in perfect adaptation to this end—in the perfection of beauty—the glory of holiness which shines in her person;—in the knowledge, the wisdom and diligence of her evangelists and prophets, her pastors and teachers;—the zeal, the faithfulness

and Divine authority and power of her elders—and the charity and self-sacrifice of her deacons. Her robes—of fine linen, spotless white, embroidered with gold—the marriage gift of her husband. Her history, one of affliction and suffering, of toil and triumph in his service. To the carnal eye there is in her, as in the King, no form nor comeliness. But to him she is altogether lovely; and to the believer, how radiant does her person appear, as she stands before the world, in the midst of the darkness of man's apostacy and sin, and the gloom of the curse, leaning on the arm of the Beloved, and testifying of his loveliness and grace; herself the purchase of his streaming blood, and dying groans; herself his commissioned witness to the lost, proclaiming peace, and offering salvation; herself baptized by that one Spirit with which he was anointed; and her whole being pervaded and quickened with the power and vitality of his life; she the fruitful mother of the many sons whom he will at length assemble on high. Shining in glory forever, sharing with the King in his throne his sceptre and power, shall she present the perfection of beauty and the fruition of joy. In her, will a wondering universe behold the riches of God's condescending grace; and the majesty of the Lamb's redeeming power; her countenance—beaming in his perfect likeness—and her beauty and blessedness, her history and state, the noblest display of the unsearchable depths of God's glorious wisdom and ineffable love—the subject of angelic studies, and the theme of all heaven's adoring song.

---

POSTSCRIPT.

Our article was intended for the April number of the Review; and although it was too late for that purpose, it was in the hands of the printer before the appearance of Dr. Robinson's treatise, entitled "The Church of God an essential element of the Gospel." This will account to the reader for our entire silence in respect to this publication of the distinguished scholar, whose withdrawal from the chair of instruction in Danville Seminary, our Church is now called to regret. The work of Dr. R., though short, is rich in suggestive thoughts and expansive conceptions on the great subject of which he

treats. We are not, however, altogether prepared to acquiesce in all his opinions as here set forth. He looks upon the Divine purpose—the doctrine of the decrees, as the great central truth of theology, whence all others spring, and derive their unity, form, and significance. The unity of the book of Revelation consists in the unfolding of this purpose; and in it all, the characteristic attitude of the Most High is that of absolute Lord, ruling all things by his omnipotent will, in the assertion of his sovereignty. The coronation strain in which the Psalmist says of the Son—“Thy *throne*, O God, is forever and ever; a *sceptre* of righteousness is the sceptre of thy *kingdom*—is regarded as the key-note of prophecy; and “in so far as the Scripture is a Gospel, strictly so called, it is the annunciation of a kingdom of heaven at hand.” Hence the highest conception of the Redeemer, is as king; the most adequate idea of his people is as subjects of his government, chosen in sovereignty to be such; and Dr. R's. definition of the Church is—“That body of men, taken as a whole, or any part thereof, which, according to God's eternal purpose to call out and organize a part of mankind into a kingdom, is called successively in time by his Word and Spirit to a confession of Christ, an engagement to his covenant, and subjection to the laws of his kingdom.

We dissent with deference from the views so forcibly put by our learned and respected friend. But the doctrine of the Divine purpose viewed in itself, does not seem to us to constitute a principle of unity at all; since the purpose of God, as such, might embrace a thousand independent lines of operation, and as many distinct results. Nor are we favorably impressed with a theory which would seem to exalt mere sovereignty to the place of highest consideration and honor. We love to look upon the whole work and revelation of God, as the unfolding indeed of an eternal purpose; but a purpose born of eternal love, and designed for the exhibition, in the creatures, and to them, of the ineffable moral glories of the Creator. We have regarded the distinctive office of our world, and of the dispensations of God toward man, as designed to reveal and illustrate, not to man only, the inner mysteries of the Divine nature—the doctrine respecting the moral nature of God, as he is the Triune. Hence the creation of Adam by the Three, in “the image and likeness of God.” Hence the several dispensations of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Hence the incarnation of the Son, the second Adam—“the brightness of the Father's glory, and the express image of his person”—who came for the avowed purpose of declaring

the Father—making known the Godhead in the flesh. Hence the organization of the Church, designed to accomplish the end for which Adam was made, and from which he apostatized; but in a far higher and fuller manner. As the body of Christ, the second Adam, it is in and with him, the Head, the noblest revelation of the infinite glories of the blessed Trinity; and will be so, as on earth, much more in heaven. We do not look upon either the prophetic, the priestly, or the kingly office of Christ, as involving the central conception of his relation to the Church. "He is the Head of the body." This is the consummate title, in which all the others are comprehended. And so of his people; they are indeed redeemed by his blood, instructed by his teachings, and governed by his laws. But they are elected and called to all this in order that, as members of his body, pervaded by the Spirit of the Head, "they may show forth the praises of Him who hath called them." They are not so much subjects obedient to his laws, as, members conformed to the Head. They are not only taught by his formal instructions—rather are they pervaded and enlightened by that very same Spirit of knowledge, which is his Spirit, and is the truth itself. They are not merely purchased with his blood; but as one with him, and partakers of the same sufferings, to the glory of the same God, and inheritance of the same joy. And when at last the voice of the great multitude shall shout "Alleluia: for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth. Let us be glad and rejoice, and give honor to him: for the marriage of the Lamb is come, and his wife has made herself ready;" all heaven will indeed exult in the sovereignty of the Omnipotent One; but every harp will be tuned and every tongue inspired with the contemplations of the other attributes which the marriage scene reveals; and in the light of which, it is that the sovereignty of God will indeed be recognized as infinitely glorious.

Whilst we thus venture to differ from some of the sentiments of our author, we hail the appearance of his valuable treatise, and the interest which was elicited by its first utterance in the presence of our General Assembly, and its publication in the present form, as the pledge of an awakening of interest to a vastly important, and by us too much neglected, subject.

## ARTICLE II.

## A REASONABLE ANSWER TO THE SKEPTIC.\*

"Be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you, with meekness and fear."—1 Peter 3: 15.

The Apostle entertained no doubt that a reason could be given for the Christian's hope. The firm and massive foundations on which that hope rests, he regarded, not only as not recondite or obscure to the believer, but as discernible, at least in outline, to the unbeliever; he thought not of them as enveloped in cloud and mist which only philosophical acumen can penetrate, but as standing forth within the limit of distinct vision, well-defined, clear, luminous, to every eye that is open to behold them. He considered, too, that such reasonable evidence as plain, unlettered men can appreciate, could be by them intelligibly stated to others; and hence exhorts all Christians to be "ready always to give an answer" to any one asking a reason of their hope.

The exhortation is still applicable to all; and, where the resources of cultivated intellect exist not, arguments are still doubtless within reach that may leave without excuse the unbeliever; but to do full justice to this great theme, to bring to bear upon the resisting intellect of a skeptical and luxurious age the momentous truth, that "light has come into the world," to infix in the minds of men the deep conviction that the God of the universe has sent to each of them a message, securing infinite joy to those who, with the heart, receive it, aggravating the woe of those who disregard it—who shall say that this is not a work more needful and more arduous in our times than in any past age?

---

\* This article is, for substance, a Discourse delivered by appointment before the Board of Directors of the Theological Seminary at Columbia at its Annual Meeting in May last.



For now it is the foundation of our common faith that is assailed. The variant shades of Christian opinion, the not unimportant, yet still non-essential differences, dividing true believers, which loom up largely in their polemic discourses, but melt away and disappear in their united prayers, hold not now the chief place in public regard; the interest that might otherwise be concentrated upon them, is now merged in that greater and all-comprehensive question: Has God so spoken to men, as that every one who is willing to hear and obey, shall "know" of the oracle that it is from God? This, the great question of all ages, is pre-eminently that of our times. For where, once, the fact of there being in the world a Divine revelation met at least with languid and indolent assent, it is now confronted by bold and bristling infidelity. From the high places of Continental, and even of English literature, there go forth, and are widely circulated and responded to in our own land, such multiform assaults upon the Divine origin of Christianity as no previous age has known. Not only in the always lawless domain of fiction and poetry, but in the severer studies of science, in grave historical, political, and economical disquisitions, in theories of philosophy and morals, the most subtle poison of infidelity is cunningly intermingled; and as, in this age and country, thought is free, its expression unfettered, and its diffusion facile and extensive beyond all precedent, as no artificial barrier can be erected against the progress of opinion, he who is "set for the defence of the Gospel," is likely to find the native disinclination of the heart to welcome it reinforced in every community by cherished skepticism, more or less declared, as to there being any solid reasonable proof of a Divine revelation extant in the world on which may be based the sure and certain hope of immortal life.

Compare, for one moment, the position of the defender of the Christian faith at the time when the Apostle Peter wrote, with that position now. The difference between the two positions is not, by any means, merely the difference between the year 58, and the year 1858, as the interval of time between certain historical facts and the faith that is built upon them; although that is no trifling difference. If the life and death

and resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ had taken place within the present century; if we, this day, could point to a multitude of living witnesses, of unquestioned character for intelligence and probity, who saw him "alive after his passion," and were ready to lay down their lives in confirmation of this testimony; would not our answer to an inquiry as to the reason of the hope that is in us, be vastly more simple and direct than it can be now? Would not the question of fact be held within very much narrower compass? Instead of ranging through eighteen centuries, to trace back through their cloudiness the advancing footprints of Christianity, to mark the monuments of her existence piled up all along the pathway; instead of the long process by which we now identify the Christian institutions and influences that live before our eyes, with those which originated on the soil of Palestine near two thousand years ago; instead of staking the whole question of our faith upon the truth and inspiration of a book, which, touching and glancing upon every topic of human thought, presents the broadest mark to hostile scrutiny, and whose every page is a battle-ground of infidelity, ours would be the simple and easy task of referring to those numerous living eye-witnesses, whose testimony to the plain but comprehensive facts on which Christianity is founded, could admit of no reasonable doubt, when taken in connection with what these witnesses were in character and conduct, and with the attestation borne also to *their* words, by attendant miracles and gifts of the Holy Ghost.

But suppose that the interval of time were of no import in this case, and that it were possible to transfer to this generation as vivid an impression of the narrative of our Saviour's life and death and resurrection as attaches to events fresh and recent, still the *credibility* of such a narrative would meet *now*, in the intellectual habitudes of men, obstacles which then it had not to encounter.

For the world, *then*, was credulous, rather than skeptical, as to *miracles*. "Signs and wonders," events so indubitably supernatural that men might reasonably say, "This is the finger of God," were then the expected and admitted attestation to

teachers claiming a Divine commission. Jews could not doubt on such a point; for not only their religion, but all that they gloried in as distinguishing them from the other tribes and families of mankind, was based upon the miraculous in their national history. Gentiles, too, had their prodigies and portents, their prophecies and presages; so strong was their faith in the supernatural, that when, in a certain case, a single cure was effected before their eyes, disconnected from any visible natural cause, they cried out at once, "The gods have come down to us in the likeness of men," and were ready to recognize Jupiter and Mercury as incarnate before them. But, now, not only is the classic Pantheon swept clean of its occupants, not only are the groves, the streams, the mountain tops, the caves of ocean, dispossessed of their time-honored divinities, but philosophy (so called) coldly looking upon the stable order of the universe, if it does not recognize that order as the only Deity, at least refuses credence to any alleged Divine *manifestation* other than that constant one in nature, and boldly declares a miracle, if not in itself impossible, at least impossible to be reasonably proved.

Hence, instead of the miracles recorded in the New Testament being received as the appropriate and decisive testimony to Jesus of Nazareth as the Christ of God, the miraculous element in his history is now appealed to as discrediting that history as a whole; as proving that false which, otherwise, must needs be accepted as true.

For scarcely can a reasonable man deny, that the transcendent, unearthly purity of the character and the teachings of Jesus afford the strongest proof that his history cannot be that of a deceiver, nor yet itself fictitious; (for what false heart could feel the motive, or conjure up the moral elements of such a fiction, whose inventor would indeed be "a greater miracle than its hero?") But when it is found that those teachings and that character cannot be dis severed from their supernatural accompaniment, when it is found that miracle is inseparably intertwined with the whole texture of that history, his claims, otherwise irresistible, as a truthful teacher and man, are coldly disallowed and repudiated, on account of that con-

nection with the supernatural which, in the first Christian age, was the very culmination of their proof.

In that age, moreover, whilst, among Gentiles, there was no pre-disposition to deny that there might be *oracles from God*, the Jewish world reposed in full faith upon their sacred books as a veritable Divine revelation. To him who asked *then* for a reason of the Christian hope, an answer might be given by comparing what the Old Testament, acknowledged to be a Divine Book, had foretold of the Messiah, with the recent history of Jesus of Nazareth. That history came to many a reflecting mind as the solution of an inquiry often and earnestly agitated before, "Of whom speaketh the *prophet* this?" The Apostle Peter himself, after appealing, in proof that Christianity was no "cunningly devised fable," to what his own eyes had seen and his own ears had heard on the Mount of Transfiguration, yet adds, "We have also a more sure word of prophecy."

It is easy to see what vantage-ground the first teachers of Christianity had in the previous firm faith of their Hebrew hearers in the reality of Divine oracles, when they made the announcement—"God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these latter days spoken unto us by his Son."

But *now*, when the reasonable ground of Christian hope is asked for by one whose moral convictions are not in harmony with the Christian doctrine, in whose heart it finds no welcome, the inspiration of the Scriptures, instead of being assumed, is the very thing to be proved; it is to be proved to those who, lightly passing by the independent credentials of Christianity, hold her to answer for her life to the correctness of every word and letter of the Old Testament, more assailable, as more remote; it is to be proved, too, in the face of objections, many of the most plausible and specious of which had positively no existence in the minds of men until the present century.

For hundreds and thousands of years, no one had dreamed of any discordance between the declarations of the Bible and the demonstrations of science. From age to age, the rising and the setting sun, the four corners of that extended plain,

the earth, the over-arching sky, gemmed with its greater and its lesser lights, ordained simply to *rule our day and night*, were to men, not only as they are now, optical, apparent truth, the natural language of poetry and of common life, but they were also, what they are not now, and never can be again, matters of scientific truth. With unfaltering faith, like that of our own childhood, generation after generation had read the first chapter of Genesis, no thought visiting their minds of proof that might be dug out of the bowels of the earth, assigning to it an earlier date, by thousands or millions of years, than that which was, or seemed to be, plain on the face of the sacred record. But *now*, the discoveries, or the imaginings, of scientific explorers bring a cloud over many a holy text which once stood forth clear and unquestioned, insinuating into the unguarded soul the fatal thought, that that Book on which all heavenly hope is based, may not, after all, be absolutely relied on as true.

How shall this state of things be met by those who are "set for the defence of the Gospel?" Shall we attempt to stop the march of science? As well think to "dam the Nile with bulrushes." Shall the theologian refuse to seek out the works of God? Shall he count science an enemy? Shall he, at the risk of being himself reckoned a fossil, sedulously ignore geology, or any other science that may wear, at the time, an ominous front toward the Christian faith?

It is a weak thing to turn and twist the language of the Bible in forced accommodation to each "new-hatched, unfledged" theory, the offspring of research yet incomplete. But there is one thing weaker than this, more treacherous to the cause which all good men desire to defend; and that is to imagine, that, in the heavens above, or in the earth beneath, or in the waters under the earth, in the domain of nature, explored to its utmost recesses, something may possibly be found *true* which shall render faith in the Bible unreasonable. Let all such unworthy dread be forever renounced. What seek we but truth? Let scientific investigation have the widest scope; let it range unfettered through earth and sea and sky; let it ascend to the stars and go down to the depths; let it explore

all nature, interrogate all time; and when, after many vagaries and many a plausible hypothesis discarded, it reaches its firm and final conclusions, these, if we may judge the future by the past, shall but the better teach us how to read that Book—from the same hand that has left its impress on all the riches of visible nature—which unveils to the exploring eye the everlasting glories of the world to come.

The Christian's hope is founded on the fact, that the Scriptures contain a revelation from God. The Author of Christianity himself said, "My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me." The historical fact, that He died upon the Cross could reveal to us nothing of its deep meaning, could avail nothing to us as a foundation for immortal hope, if it stood separate from that truth of which only God could assure us, that "Christ died for our sins; whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood;" who is "the Author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him." Only as a revelation from God can Christianity inspire hope; and only as a faithful, an infallible transcript of that revelation, can the Scriptures supply to us a sure foundation on which to build *our* hopes. For if the rays of heavenly light may possibly have been refracted by the medium through which they come to our eyes; if, in the writings of prophets and apostles, it may be that human imaginings adulterate the verities of God, we must ourselves be inspired, in order to determine what is revealed in the sacred writings. The Bible, as an *infallible record of a revelation from God*, is the only sure foundation for Christian hope. What proof, now, that it is such a record, are we ready to give to him who asks "a reason of the hope that is in us?" What proof can we give adequate to so great a hope, commensurate with so vast an expectation, as that "this pleasing, anxious being," this life, so dear and precious to each, shall not fall at last like a raindrop into the ocean and disappear, but, ruled by a far different destiny, shall blaze forth into a heavenly star, and mingle with the brightness of the firmament forever—Oh, what proof, what reason can we give, adequate to a hope like this?

"If any man will do His will, he shall *know* of the doctrine,

whether it be of God." The humblest believer can state his own conviction, the response of his own heart to that Book as Divine, which all good men revere; he can testify with what authority and sanctity it speaks to his soul, bringing with it its own evidence, immaculate and inseparable holiness and truth shining by their own light; he can tell what fulfilment of heavenly promise has been by himself experienced, what prayer answered, what evil passions hushed to rest, what good affections nurtured, what right action prompted, what strong and everlasting consolation ministered, by faith in that Gospel which proffers rest to the soul; and this testimony of an honest witness, borne out by a corresponding life, may well make the skeptic uneasy in his skepticism.

But an answer distinct from this, an answer that does not so much suspend the faith of one upon the convictions of another, is evidently contemplated by the Bible itself; else why that array of miraculous attestation lavished upon Christianity in its incipency, if all these evidences were soon to be obsolete, no longer to be reproduced as grounds of human conviction?

In this age, whose intellectual habitude it is to take nothing for granted, to count every subject of thought, in spite of any rescript of the past, still an open question, and ever to demand proof palpable and multiform in proportion to the magnitude of the things to be proved; in this age, if the Christian hope is to be reasonably evinced to those who possess it not, as something more than a pleasing illusion, a fond imagination, there must be given a plain, distinct answer to the ever-recurring question, "How know you that the Bible contains an infallible record of a revelation from God?"

We may answer this question from a single passage of the history of Jesus—(Luke 24: 44, 49.)—"And He said unto them, These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning me. \* \* \* And, behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you: but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high."

Is this true history? Did Jesus of Nazareth ever live? Did

he utter these words? Or were they simply attributed to him by some dealer in fiction?

The New Testament, the Christian institutions and influences now extant in the world, are *facts*. Can these facts be *reasonably* accounted for on any other supposition than the truthfulness of that history of Jesus, which has been most surely believed by all Christians from that day to this?

On this question, large and comprehensive, though but preliminary, let the skeptical inquirer after truth concentrate all his faculties. No claim is here laid on the credulity of any; the question is simply as to *reasonable proof*. When every searching test which reason invokes in all similar inquiries has been applied to this, and it is found impossible *reasonably* to believe the story of Christ a fable, and all the purest goodness the world has ever seen due to the belief of a lie, then, from this brief record of St. Luke, one step, and that a direct one, takes us to the conclusion, that the Bible contains *an infallible record of a revelation from God*. For here our Saviour lays his hand, as it were, at once upon the Old Testament and the New, recognizing the Divine element of prophecy as pervading "the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms," (demonstrably identical with the Old Testament that we have now,) and, at the same time, assuring to his Apostles, prominent writers of the then future New Testament, the Holy Spirit promised by the Father, the "power from on high," needful to make them infallible teachers of Christian truth.

Here, then, in a compact form, we have the answer as to the foundation of Christian hope. Upon the truthfulness of a simple, artless narrative, impossible to be reasonably discredited, upon the truthfulness of Christ, the strongest voucher conceivable, do we base our belief in the Bible, as pervaded by a supernatural element, rendering it an infallible record of a revelation from God, in which is "promised" to the true believer "eternal life."

But now the skeptic, evading that direct testimony to the facts of Christianity which no criticism upon the Old Testament can touch, boldly affirms that the Scriptures, especially of the Old Testament, plainly betray their human origin, inas-



much as they again and again state as *fact* what science has proved to be *not fact*. "Can that (it is asked) be taken as the Word of God, which bears on its face the demonstrably erroneous opinions of men? If the Bible be not *true*, it certainly cannot be *inspired*."

To this a reply is sometimes made, which really imperils the cause which it seeks to defend. The radical error lies in a groundless assumption—disowned, moreover, and repudiated by every page of the Scriptures, namely this: that the presence of a Divine, necessarily excludes a human element in the sacred writings.

Whoever takes up this notion cannot himself read these writings intelligently without continual misgivings as to their Divine authority. On one page, he finds an Evangelist declaring that he had bestowed some care upon his history—had (as the original word implies) "exactly traced every thing from the first." On another page, he finds an Apostle asking that a "cloak left at Troas" may be brought to him. If, from an inspired writing, all use of the natural faculties, all thoughts suggested by the circumstances and feelings of the writer, are necessarily excluded, the Gospel of St. Luke, the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistles of St. Paul, the Psalms of David, cannot be inspired.

But on what ground is a theory of inspiration held with which scarcely a page in the Bible is found to harmonize? The only philosophical mode of attaining a correct theory of inspiration is by a thorough analysis of writings known to be inspired. Instead of imagining what it may be, we thus see what it is. With this guide, what otherwise might seem exceptions to inspiration, become to us instructive examples of its working. Then we see how a human element pervades the Bible, no more excluding, or interfering with the Divine, than the humanity of our Saviour excludes his Divinity. Then we see what use the Holy Spirit has made of the *natural faculties*, and the religious *experiences* of men; and we also see with what continual *accommodation to human modes of thought* Divine instruction has been given.

Our Saviour expressly taught his disciples, that supernatural stimulus to the *natural faculty of memory*, "bringing all things to their remembrance" which he had said, was as truly characteristic of the Divine Comforter, as that influence which should give to the exalted and entranced spirit visions of "things to come." The Book of Psalms largely records *human experiences*, by no means peculiar to inspired men, ("Out of the depths have I cried unto thee:" "verily, God hath heard me," &c.); but was not a record so precious, so instinct to all ages with spiritual life, worthy to be prompted and presided over by the Spirit of God? Was it not thus an inspired record?

The Apostle Paul (1 Cor. chap. 1st) says, "I thank God that I baptized none of you but Crispus and Gaius." Presently he corrects himself: "I baptized also the household of Stephanas." Then he adds, more cautiously, "Besides, I *know not* whether I baptized any other." How clearly upon the face of this statement appears the natural movement of his own mind! Yet was not the record of this worthy to be prompted by inspiration, when, to show to all ages, how small a matter it is to baptize, compared with preaching the Gospel, the Apostle's forgetting how many of the Corinthians he had baptized, is far more forceful and significant than any thing he could have remembered? Nor is the "cloak left at Troas" without value, as a voucher for the authenticity of the letter which alludes to it.

That *accommodation* to human modes of thought pervades the Scriptures, cannot be denied; and why should any imagine this fact inconsistent with their inspiration, which, in truth, but proves their adaptation to the purposes of an inspired book? "God is a Spirit;" yet his eyes, his ear, his voice, his hand, his outstretched arm, are again and again spoken of; and how else could we attain so vivid apprehension of the Divine existence?

Now if this accommodated language is used in respect to that *spiritual truth* which the Scriptures were expressly given to reveal, much more should we expect to find it characterizing their incidental allusions to *natural objects*. We find, in

fact, that the language of the sacred writers as to "heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is," is just the popular language of their time; the only language which would not have been hopelessly perplexing to those to whom they wrote. Of this, that very phrase, *heaven and earth, and the sea*, is sufficient illustration. It bears the impress of an age, when the sea was not thought of as merely filling up a slight depression of the earth's surface. Sky, and land, and sea, was then a natural enumeration. Modern astronomy, indeed, does not speak thus. But sciences then unborn, not to be born till centuries upon centuries later in the world's history, did not (who could think they would?) mould the Mosaic narrative into a shape which would have made it an insoluble enigma to long-succeeding generations.

Is it reasonable to expect in the Bible a revelation of any human science? One book certainly could not contain them all. How many books, or rather libraries, might suffice for this, can only be determined when the limit of human knowledge is reached.

If the Bible could not reveal all human science, why should it reveal any? How could a selection be made, when all sciences are held together by a common bond? If it should reveal the true system of astronomy, could it consistently mix up with this the crude notions of ancient times as to geography? If it teach astronomy and geography, why not chemistry and other sciences?

Very little consideration will suffice to show the absurdity of expecting to find in the Bible a revelation of any human science whatever. Now, if not containing, in explicit terms, such a revelation, its language had (as some have piously, but ineffectually tried to prove,) anticipated and shadowed forth sciences far in the future, it would have been, in just that degree, a perplexing mystery, if not, indeed, a fatal obstruction through all intervening time. Men could not have believed that God had sent them a message to guide them to heaven, until they had first believed, not on demonstration, but testimony, and that, too, ever growing dim as it receded into

antiquity, that what to them seemed "the sure and firm-set earth,"—a plain, spread out at rest beneath the vaulted sky—was, in fact, a revolving globe, whirled ever with amazing velocity through space.

What then remained but that God's wisdom should make the Bible exactly what we find it, a book which, in its incidental allusions to the visible world, and to all subjects aside from the purposes for which it was given, accommodates its phrase to apparent, not scientific truth, and bears to remotest ages no slight or valueless internal vouchers of its authenticity, in its thus faithfully reflecting, in this respect, the prevalent ideas of the times when it it was written.

Is this inconsistent with its character as an infallible record of a Divine revelation? This is a momentous question; let us bring it at once to a decisive test.

Our Saviour said of the Father, "He maketh his *sun to rise* on the evil and on the good." He said also, "The wind bloweth *where it listeth*." But the sun only appears to rise; and the wind, apparently so spontaneous and free, in the language of poetry, "a chartered libertine," is, in truth, as obedient a slave to natural law, as any other agent in nature.

Is now the truth which our Saviour here taught concerning the impartial beneficence of God, and concerning regeneration by the Holy Spirit, obscured to any mind, however imbued with modern science, by its connection with the language, not of science, but of poetry and common life? If not, then, throughout the Scriptures the same connection may most harmlessly, most wisely, subsist between spiritual truth and language as to natural objects, accommodated to human apprehension, expressive of apparent, not scientific truth.

In this respect, the Bible is, in fact, just what it might reasonably be expected to be. All those objections to it, so current in our times, because it does not state scientific truth, fall to the ground at once, when it is seen how absurd is the expectation that it would. We may be well satisfied that all the conditions and purposes of a revelation from God to guide men to heaven are fully met, whilst yet, instead of anticipating

the discoveries of human science, it speaks of "things seen and temporal," in the only language intelligible to those to whom the revelation was originally made.

The Bible may be illustrated by advancing science; but it can never be made to speak in scientific phrase. Astronomy may give new intensity to the Psalmist's words—"The heavens declare the glory of God;" geology, establishing that interpretation (older than herself) of the first chapter of Genesis, which recognizes there the date, not of the earth, but of man's appearance upon it, may liberate us from that terrible incubus, the idea of six thousand years as the whole past period of the visible creation; but both astronomy and geology ought by this time to have taught men not to seek in, or force into, the Bible, the specific language of science. Chemistry may demonstrate the human body to be composed of the same substances that are found in the earth on which we tread; but the nearest approximation to this in the Bible is that simple but picturesque language, interpreted to us by chemistry, but intelligible and vivid whilst chemistry was unknown, "The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground."

Indeed, if we would feel the beauty and sublimity of much of the Scripture imagery, instead of forcing it into harmony with modern science, we must, for the time, leave that science altogether out of view; we must look up to the zenith for God's throne; like the ancient Hebrews, we must think of the earth as a plain, "founded upon the seas, established upon the floods," the beams of its chambers laid in the waters; we must think of the starry sky as a solid arch, a spherical roof, a dome, so resting upon the extremities of the earth, that when God "shakes terribly the earth," he shall shake the heavens also—*shake the stars out of the sky*—cause them to fall to the earth, "even as a fig-tree casteth her untimely figs, when she is shaken of a mighty wind;" we must think of *such* a heaven, folded up as a vesture, departing "as a scroll when it is rolled together."

In view of language like this continually recurring in the sacred writings, the question which the defender of their inspiration has to meet is: Does the human element which they

obviously contain—does the accommodation to human modes of thought which undeniably pervades them—adulterate in any degree the truth concerning the soul and its destinies, which they reveal from God? The answer is plain. If it does not in the case of Him to whom alone the Spirit was given *without measure*—if He could speak of the sun rising, of the wind blowing *at its will*—it surely does not in the case of those whose most decisive claim on our faith rests on His testimony to them, as guided by the same Spirit.

To all theories that would make it the test of an inspired writer that he should know every thing, (as if inspiration were identical with omniscience) we need but oppose the fact that, even as to spiritual truth, revelation has its progress and its limit. Whilst John the Baptist—than whom no greater prophet had previously appeared—was exceeded by the least in the kingdom of heaven, that Apostle, who more largely and systematically than any other has expounded the Christian doctrine, expressly says—“We know in part, we prophesy in part: Now we see through a glass, darkly.”

Is it not enough that the Bible is an infallible guide to that heaven where all shall be unclouded day? Is it not enough that it is just what the Holy Spirit intended that it should be? Does it not even exalt and aggrandize our estimate of that truth by which the soul is assured of endless happy existence, truth that soars above the stars and transcends the limits of time, when we find that, magnificent and sublime as are the disclosures of human science, they still are not found worthy of a place by the side of the Gospel in a revelation from God?

Faith in the Bible, as an infallible record of a Divine revelation, necessarily precedes the reception of its doctrines. Let this faith die out of the mind of a single generation, and what power could there be in the preaching of the Gospel? All the characteristic teachings of Christianity are based simply on Divine testimony. No one believes the doctrine of the Atonement, or of the Trinity, or of the resurrection of the dead, except as he believes that God has revealed as fact, what, otherwise, man could never know.

To bring the reasonable evidence of this Divine revelation

into clear, unclouded light, to disembarass it of all obstructions, to show it, as it is, impregnable to all assaults, a rock of adamant on which to build immortal hopes, is a work to which the exigencies of our times give peculiar prominence. It is a work which pre-supposes that *profound study of the Bible*, to initiate which is the highest purpose of a *Theological Seminary*. Who can measure the value to the Church of God and to the dearest interests of human society, of an Institution, which sends forth workmen needing not to be ashamed, strong in that intense conviction of truth which springs only from the personal grapple with its difficulties, prepared to set forth the Gospel in all the plenitude of its Divine credentials, in all the majesty and sanctity of a revelation from God; nor yet with cold, unfeeling hearts, as if all were but a demonstration to the intellect, but in genial sympathy with humanity, as those privileged to bring "healing to the broken-hearted, and recovering of sight to the blind," commissioned, in a sinful, sorrowing world, where delight is never perfect and death never out of view, to bear the messages of *heavenly mercy*, and to enkindle in human souls the light of *immortal hope*; speaking to their fellow-men, in the name of God, not to gain "dominion over their faith," but to be "helpers of their joy," not with austere and arrogant dogmatism, but giving "a reason for the hope that is in them, with meekness and fear"—that gentleness of true affection toward men, that deep-felt reverence toward God, which become an office at once so benevolent and so sacred.

What holier ambition than to be thus an ambassador for Christ! Higher than all earthly dignities, purer than all earthly joy, is the aspiration after the *true ideal* of the Christian minister—portrayed, as it has been, by no common hand, and worthy to live always in memory: "He had eyes lifted up to heaven, the best of books in his hand, the law of truth was written upon his lips, the world was behind his back; he stood as if he pleaded with men, and a crown of gold did hang over his head."

## ARTICLE III.

OUR DOMESTIC MISSIONS—THE TRUE THEORY OF  
THEIR CONDUCT AND MANAGEMENT.

“The history of the Church is the history of missions.” As a Divine organization, the Church is not subjected to contingent laws or fortuitous relations. It is not a product of human nature, a spontaneous fruit of man’s moral sensibilities, but the creature of God, founded upon the interposition of Christ. It is under a revealed economy of specific obligations and legitimate agencies. It is continued and developed by constantly recurring effusions of the Spirit, and is the expositor of the mercy of God, as disclosed in the special intervention of the Messiah. The Church is then Divine in its origin, in its laws, and in its development. It involves in its existence the element of missions, for it is a gift to man, conceived in heaven and brought to earth in the mission of Christ.

This element of missions is not restricted to the personal agency of Him who “went about doing good,” but enters as an organic law into the constitution of the Church. We can conceive of a spiritual kingdom established by means independent of the intellectual and moral endowments of man, and no subordinate agents employed for its continuance and growth—a Church brought into existence by Divine power and grace, and enlarged by direct communications of spiritual life, and no inferior instruments put in commission. But here we are limited to the charter of the Church, and can determine nothing concerning the Kingdom of Christ, but by His Word. “Christianity is a religion of facts,” and all inquiries touching these facts must proceed, not upon assumed hypothesis, but upon the declarations of the Bible. Recurring then to Revelation, we find that the early planting and training of the Christian Church, under its spiritual Head, was by agencies, by the use of means analogous to the laws of nature. The mystical body of Christ is composed of active members, whose



acknowledged vocation is that of service. The first conception of the Church is that of union, and union involves relation, and relation implies duty. A prescribed ritual demands labor. The administration of the Sacraments requires an officer, who shall make these ordinances the channels of spiritual good. The commission of Christ to his ministers imposes labor—"Go ye, therefore, and teach 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." Proofs are accessible from every part of the Bible evincing the truth, that the Church is now maintained by the employment of its members as free and active servants in their Master's kingdom. The laws which determine the nature and compass of the service demanded, are in perfect harmony with the great purposes of this kingdom. If God designs the extension of his Church, then the labors of his people must tend to that result. If it is His will to make manifest the glory of his salvation to all nations, then must his servants direct their efforts towards the planting of the Church in every land.

An obedient spirit is then a missionary spirit; and the active service of God's people is missionary labor. The promulgation of the Gospel to every nation is not an appendix to an otherwise complete system of duty, but enters, as a vital element, into the nature and purposes of the Church, and indicates the temper of our subjection to the law of Christ. The Church militant is essentially a missionary organization, and the "spirit of missions" is a fundamental law of her existence. It is that recuperative strength with which she is endowed, and without which she would soon die from exhaustion. Her life is maintained by a missionary struggle. Her soldiers are enlisted for all time, and as they pass from the battle-field, others must take their places. Her recruits are from the ranks of her enemies, and must be subdued and trained for the field before her veterans die. Success is here the condition of existence, and it must ever be "victory or death." Then the Christian must cherish the missionary spirit as a part of his renewed nature, as necessary to his spiritual life, and as harmonizing with the increased vitality of his social affections.

So far as obligation and duty are concerned, no distinction should be made between Foreign and Domestic Missions. The whole field, which is the world, is contemplated as a unit in the commission of Christ. Though the Apostles should first go "to the lost sheep of the house of Israel," yet, under the Spirit, they are soon distributed among the Gentiles. To whom shall the Gospel be preached, finds its solution in the clearly revealed truth, that God has a chosen people of every nation and tongue, and these are to be recalled to obedience in Christ by the ministry of the Word. The elect of God are not restricted to one nation or confined to Christian lands, but are scattered over the whole earth. If there be a chosen seed in China, there the Gospel must be preached; and the paucity of the number cannot make void the obligation to send the Gospel there. To concentrate the energies of the Church upon territories already occupied, violates this patent truth. Christianity is for all people, and we bring the Gospel in antagonism with the mission of Christ when we restrict the labors of the Church to the so-called "heathen at home." The hypothesis that we must reap the most abundant harvests from fields brought into partial tillage before we seek the forests, ignores the breadth of the commission, the compass of the Gospel, and the extent of God's election. Missions abroad and missions at home are under the same Divine recognition, impose the same obligation, and are equally imperative in the duties they imply. The distinction made is only a matter of convenience.

The early history of the Presbyterian Church in this country is the history of a Missionary Church, seeking its freedom in the wilderness. The Protestant Churches of Europe were released from the Romish hierarchy by a combination of moral and civil power. The pre-existing union of Church and State, under the Pope of Rome, was the antecedent cause of all subsequent extensions of civil power within the limits of Christ's kingdom. Every reformation then proceeded under the "powers that be," and was held a legitimate matter for legislation. This union was not the offshoot of Protestantism, but the product of Romanism. The reformation in England and Scotland had to struggle, not only against the Romish dogmas,

but against a persecuting government, which at times labored to establish a State-Church of uniform faith and ritual, and at other times strove to restore the Papal authority. The history of the Stuart line of kings on the throne of England is the history of a faithless race, false to many solemn pledges given under the advancing footsteps of freedom, and opposed to every constitutional right in collision with arbitrary power. Under this line of kings the Presbyterian Church was planted in the wilds of America. It was a Missionary Church, carrying the Gospel to a wilderness land, that they might enjoy its privileges in untrammelled freedom. Their first struggles were for mere existence, but soon we find them engaged in the missionary work, rendering aid to feeble associations, and establishing new congregations. In the year 1707, about two years after the formation of the Presbytery of Philadelphia, "it was recommended to every minister of the Presbytery to supply neighboring desolate places where a minister is wanted, and opportunity of doing good offers." Thus, almost simultaneously with its existence, the vitality of the Presbytery is expressed in missionary labor. Appeals were made to Protestant Churches across the waters for ministers and means, to train up infant congregations, and these appeals were renewed from time to time. But pending the response from the mother country, there was no remission of effort at home.

The Synod of Philadelphia was formed in 1717, and one of the first acts of the body was the initiation of a fund for benevolence. The proposition was made and adopted: "That each minister contribute something to the raising of a fund for pious uses, and that they do use their interest with their friends, on proper occasions, to contribute something to the same purpose." This fund was to be under the control of the Synod, in aiding feeble churches, in building houses of worship, in sustaining the ministry, and also in rendering assistance to the widows of their deceased brethren who were in indigent circumstances. In 1719 congregations are enjoined to make annual collections in behalf of this fund, and the first recorded disbursement was made for the benefit of the Presbyterian Church in the city of New York.

From this period the fund thus inaugurated assumes a systematic form and permanent existence in the Church. The Synod of Philadelphia, as the highest ecclesiastical court, continued to foster Domestic Missions. There was no manifest abatement of interest during the painful division of the Synod, from 1742 to 1758. Upon the union of the two parties, under the name of the "United Synod of Philadelphia and New York," the work of missions secured the earliest attention of the body.

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church was formed in 1789. It was composed of men who had been trained in an active Christianity. They had seen the Church struggling upward under manifold obstacles, and were themselves co-laborers with these feeble congregations. Partners in toil, they were now reaping some of the fruits of their early planting, but with no cessation of effort. This Assembly was now the Supreme Court of the Church, and exercised a supervision over the whole field of missions. With a wise foresight, they sent forth missionaries, under regular commissions, to the frontier settlements. The fields to be cultivated were designated in the written commissions granted, and missionaries were compensated according to the amount of work performed. In 1802, the Assembly appointed a "Committee of Missions," clothed with ample powers. In 1816 this Committee was enlarged and remodelled under the title, "Board of Missions," acting under, and amenable to, the authority of the Assembly. In 1827 the Board was authorized to appoint an Executive Committee as a sub-agent.

The mode of expanding the Church in its earlier history in this country, assumed different phases according to attendant circumstances. From 1707 to 1722, aid was rendered to feeble churches, or rather to the pastors of feeble churches; but when any congregation attained sufficient strength to maintain the ministry of the Word, then further assistance was withheld. Prior to 1722 the system of itinerating labors had not been introduced, and no evangelists seem to have been employed. But in this year we find missionaries sent to destitute places and frontier settlements. These missionaries were pastors,

taken from their respective charges, for a few weeks or months, without a dissolution of the pastoral relation. The paucity of ministers and scarcity of funds, rendered the employment of evangelists in large numbers impossible, and their support onerous. The salaries of pastors were often inadequate, but their withdrawal for brief periods of time for missionary labor involved no reduction of their salaries, and the compensation given, whilst itinerating under the appointment of the Assembly, was so much added to their annual income. Thus funds contributed to Domestic Missions returned to feeble churches which relinquished a part of the ministerial services of their pastors.

The itinerating system thus grafted into the missionary operations of the Church continued in full force, under slight modifications, from 1722 to 1825, when the Assembly imparted a new feature to the Board of Missions. Hitherto aid had been rendered only to evangelists or to pastors who for the time were doing the work of evangelists; but now assistance is to be given to pastors as such. The Assembly resolved: "That it be recommended to the Board to appropriate a considerable portion of their funds to the location of pastors in those destitute parts of the Church where, from the character of the population, there is a prospect of a permanent establishment, and where the pastor can, in the mean time, receive the chief part of his support." This resolution of the Assembly produced a change in the distribution of the funds entrusted to the Board, and feeble churches now received that aid which their weakness demanded. Itineracy now languished and nearly ceased to be known. The Board gave more attention to the occupation and cultivation of existing churches than to the exploration of new districts and territories. Cognizance was taken of this defect in the Assembly of 1839, in the following resolution: "This Assembly recognizes the great importance of itinerant missionary labors among the more destitute districts and newly settled parts of our country, and would urge its necessity, not only upon the employed missionaries of the Board, but also upon pastors, who, by an annual missionary tour of this character, might render equal benefit to

themselves, their churches and the Church at large." The churches are urged to release their pastors for short periods of time each year, that they may perform this itinerating work. The same recommendation is re-affirmed in several subsequent meetings of the Assembly.

Another feature in the history of missions, as associated with the earlier expansion of the Presbyterian Church in America, is the authority claimed by the higher courts of the Church over pastors during the continuance of their pastorate. The first Presbytery of Philadelphia, and afterwards the Synod of Philadelphia, did not hesitate to lay an injunction upon any pastor, and send him forth to do missionary service. The consent of either party to the pastoral relation seems never to have been sought. In illustration of the exercise of such authority, Rev. Messrs. Kirkpatrick, McWhorter and Latta, of the Presbyteries of Philadelphia and New Brunswick, were appointed in 1759, by the Synod of Philadelphia and New York, to visit Virginia, and the Sabbaths they are to preach in this distant colony are designated, lest there should be a failure. The Presbyteries of which these ministers were members, are enjoined "to take care that these gentlemen fulfil their appointments, and neither prescribe nor allow their employment in our bounds, so as to disappoint this our good intention." Similar appointments were made by the Synod in 1770.

The same powers were exercised by the General Assembly. Pastors were appointed to missionary service, and no controversy touching this right seems to have arisen between this highest court and the inferior judicatories of the Church. Had the right been questioned, then the deliverances of the Assembly in defence of the claim would have defined the power exercised in distinct outline. The importance of missionary work was acknowledged, and the Assembly challenged the right as exclusively appertaining to this body, and to be exercised by the lower judicatories only by express permission. In 1791, the Synod of the Carolinas obtained permission by special enactment, "to manage the matter of sending missionaries to places destitute of the Gospel and its ordinances, as

may appear to that Synod most conducive to the interests of religion in their bounds." The reasons assigned for such concession are, "the distance of the Carolinas from the seat of the General Assembly, and the peculiar state of the currency of North Carolina."

The work of Domestic Missions in the Presbyterian Church is now managed by a Board elected by, and amenable to, the General Assembly. This Board consists of sixty ministers and thirty-six laymen, fifteen ministers and nine laymen, going out of office every year, the same number being annually elected. The authority conferred upon the Board is ample for the work entrusted, and independent of all Presbyterial power. Their decisions within their legitimate sphere are final, and Presbyteries are never referred to but as advisory courts. The general principles upon which the work of missions in the home field are conducted are the following: "1st. It is a missionary work. 2d. The funds contributed for it are missionary funds. 3rd. The men employed in preaching the Gospel are, in their fields, missionary men. 4th. All the churches and fields, aided and supplied, are missionary churches and fields. 5th. The funds supplied are funds for temporary assistance, and not for entire nor permanent support. The people aided are to help themselves, be it ever so little, from the beginning, and to go on to independence. 6th. The grand end and aim of the Assembly is to establish self-sustaining churches and fields, as fast and as far as possible, and so to increase the solid material and power of the Church, and accumulate strength to go on expanding. 7th. Ministers and means are to be distributed according to the relative importance and promise of different fields, and in view of the necessities of the whole field, that there may be equality and no partiality. 8th. The Assembly conducts the work through a Committee or Board, responsible to itself alone. 9th. No debt to be incurred in carrying forward the missionary work." The relations of the Board to the several Presbyteries are set forth in various enactments of the Assembly. In the disbursement of funds, the Board is "to pay great respect to the advice of Presbyteries, touching missionaries laboring within

their bounds, yet, in the distribution of its funds, the action of the Board must be controlled by the state of its treasury and the relative importance of the various missionary fields under its care." The Board has absolute power, under the Assembly, to exercise their own "sound discretion upon the expediency or inexpediency of appointing, or withholding an appointment, from any applicant;" and this authority is not restricted by the powers or rights of any inferior court.

We propose to examine very briefly the scheme of Domestic Missions as now sanctioned by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church. This is a legitimate inquiry. The obligation to give the Gospel to the feeble and the destitute is not abrogated or infringed by a change in the mode of discharging the duty. When a Divine law prescribes a work to be done, but does not define the precise mode, then the details which appertain to the mode of its performance fall under the law of expediency. The work of missions is imperative, the agents and the instruments are defined, but minute details which belong to the manner are referred to the wisdom of the Church. We may search out the best mode of disseminating the Gospel without contravening the obligation implied. This inquiry, however, must proceed under some restrictions. No investigation must bring in question any one element which enters into the idea of the Church, as a Divine organization, or impugn, by the most distant implication, the instrumental agency of man. The obligation to give the Gospel to the poor is complete and distinctly revealed, and falls into the category of a foregone conclusion the moment the Bible is acknowledged as Divine.

Domestic Missions may be managed solely by the General Assembly, or entrusted entirely to the independent action of the several Presbyteries, or there may be a combination of the two agencies.

When the General Assembly takes authoritative control of the whole domestic field, then Presbyteries can be employed only as advisory councils, suggesting the churches and fields requiring aid, and testifying to the qualifications of ministers who may be employed. Their powers are not enlarged by



becoming auxiliary to the Board, the agent of the Assembly; but this relation, when constituted, is no more than a recognition of the agent, and of the obligation to subordinate co-operation.

Under the second scheme, the work of Domestic Missions would be wholly remitted to the independent action of the several Presbyteries. Concert of action under this plan could not be had. There must be a central agency as a balance wheel in the machinery—a common medium of intercourse, through which the funds of the stronger Presbyteries may flow to the weaker. A central agency may attain wisdom in method and vigor in action, from a wide observation and extended experience. It may be used as a stimulus to all the parts in a legitimate competition, gathering information from an expanded field, and making it accessible to all. This central agency should be a medium of exchange. Strong Presbyteries, whose means exceed their own pressing wants, require for their growth fields which shall make heavy drafts upon their active virtues. Feeble Presbyteries have a claim, founded in right, upon the benevolence of the strong. Here there is an interchange of good between the benefactor and beneficiary. We would reject, then, the scheme of Presbyterial action absolutely independent of a central agency.

The true theory of conducting Domestic Missions, we submit, is to place the management of the work primarily under Presbyterial control, with the benefit of a receiving and distributing central agency, employed only in maintaining a pecuniary equilibrium. By this scheme each Presbytery takes charge of the field embraced within its boundaries, searches out its waste places, ascertains favorable locations for mission stations and Church organizations, raises and disburses funds contributed for the purpose, and gives such aid to feeble congregations as shall stimulate to effort in erecting houses of worship and in sustaining the ministry of the Word. When there is an excess of funds beyond the local wants of the Presbytery, there intervenes a central agency to receive such excess and distribute the same under the general laws which now govern the disbursements of the Board. This scheme involves

no collision between the parties acting in concert, because the sphere of each is distinct.

Presbyterial powers are amply sufficient for the successful prosecution of such a scheme. All the parties are subject to the authority of the Presbyteries—the pastor, the evangelist, the Church. The candidate for the ministry is examined and licensed by this Court, and by it is ordained, installed, removed or judged. By this body he is inducted into office, and becomes a constituent member. This court may ordain to the office of an evangelist and determine, negatively at least, the field of his labors. The work of missions embraces also pastors and churches, and these are under the authority of the Presbytery. Here resides the power to constitute the pastoral relation, and to dissolve it upon the violation of its published stipulations, or for any reason deemed sufficient. Here is an inherent constitutional authority which belongs to no other judicatory of the Church. The Assembly has not these powers, and cannot delegate them to its agent, the Board. The arm of the Board is too feeble to reach the ends here contemplated. It is a crippled agency, which has no powers of legislation or government beyond the influence of the pecuniary aid granted or withheld. It is impotent without Presbyterial authority, and yet it is not subjected to this authority.

The preceding remarks logically conduct us to Presbyteries as the proper agents to manage Domestic Missions within their bounds; but the decision is suspended, not so much upon organic law, as upon views of expediency.

A preliminary inquiry here arises—If the powers of Presbyteries are ample, why have the missions of the home field been referred to the General Assembly? To one cognizant of the common elements of human nature, it is no matter of surprise that there exists so strong a desire to transfer personal responsibility. Men love the honors and emoluments of office, but if these could be separated from the obligations created by the office, gladly would they retain the place with its benefits, and relinquish the responsibility of duties imposed. No minister seeks the office of an ambassador because of the accountability attached to the office. Gratitude for salvation, love for

perishing souls, the flow of a heart responding to a Saviour's compassion, may prompt a herald of the Cross to preach Christ; but who would assume the ministerial garb if the ends of the office could be attained without its responsibilities! Hence the facility with which Agents are brought into play. The transfer of any part of official duty restricts the compass of duty. If a foreign Agent will assume a duty incumbent upon us, we acquiesce in the assumption because it releases from such duty. Domestic Missions is the sole charge of the Board, whilst it is only a collateral work of the Presbytery. Its isolation from other Presbyterial duties is possible, and when thus severed and entrusted as an only business to an *ab extra* agency, it is presumed to be better managed, and releases from much painful toil and responsible care. Such is the latent feeling which too often prompts to the transfer. It is a work of great magnitude. Feeble churches are to be visited and cared for; destitute places are to be sought out and supplied with the ministry; mission stations are to be cherished into organized churches; funds must be raised and disbursed; and each item mentioned involves close attention to minute details. A duty so complex and responsible is felt to be a burden; and hence, we repeat, it is not a matter of surprise that Presbyteries have permitted the work of Domestic Mission to pass under the sole control of the Board as the agent of the Assembly.

Missions in the home field make a strong appeal to the fostering care of the Presbytery. Here is a body conversant with the nature of the work, the character of the field to be occupied, the moral training and religious culture of the people;—a body fully competent to decide upon the wisdom of granting or withholding aid;—a body which can intelligently appreciate the liberality of a feeble Church or judiciously suspend help when such assistance would only confirm the parsimony of a strong Church. Presbytery knows the adverse influences to be encountered, and the fitness of the pastor or evangelist for the specific field to be cultivated.

It may be alleged as a counter plea, that this knowledge is available to the Board by means of the co-ordinate action of

the Presbytery submitting the information required. This is true in theory only, as a link in an ideal chain. Knowledge, embracing minute details, cannot be so exact upon transmission as when it takes cognizance of facts by direct observation, and of facts which lie in the daily experience of the witness. A mission field is a complicated aggregate of many items, which can be painted only in its more prominent features. A Presbyterian Committee may give a summary of their judgments, but no account they can render will embrace all that enters into the basis of these judgments. But suppose the final decisions of Presbytery are regarded as a sufficiently broad foundation for the action of the Board; then should not these final decisions authoritatively govern the operations of this Board? If the Presbytery is released in some degree from the responsibility of missions in the home field, then there will generally be less fidelity in gathering the information required, and transmitting it in sufficiently minute detail for wise action. Release a body from the obligation of direct accountability—which is done by the introduction of a foreign agency—and that body will be less circumspect in their recommendation of any feeble church or missionary asking aid. No Board located in Philadelphia or elsewhere, though it may be encumbered with many subordinate committees in every part of the field as so many *antennae*, can be in familiar and intelligent correspondence with every part of the mission field; and the lack of the information thus to be obtained cannot be supplied by the written deposition or formal recommendation of the Presbytery.

The Board cannot exert a power equal to that of the several Presbyteries. The supervision of Domestic Missions demands of the agent or body in charge, a knowledge of the field, its population, its resources, its susceptibility of tillage; and this knowledge cannot be attained by the Board. In planting and cultivating the soil, labor is modified by the seasons and the character of the ground tilled. So the accidental characteristics of missions are often modified, and these modifications of labor must be submitted solely to the wisdom of the missionary where there is no local body present. Emergencies arise

under irregularly recurring vicissitudes, which cannot be provided for by a distant body. The multiplied branches of the Church, the diverse character of the people, the sparseness of the population, the continued emigration to the West, are fruitful sources of change affecting the condition of churches and mission stations. If a central Board could confer adequate powers on local committees, then the missionary work might proceed with more vigor; but the transference of such powers would vacate the exercise of the authority now conferred upon the Board. It would still, however, be only a lame remedy for many pressing evils.

In 1845 the General Assembly attempted to remedy the evils arising out of the distance of the Board from the several parts of the field to be occupied. This was by the appointment of a Subordinate Executive Committee, located in Louisville. This Committee is amenable to the Board in the sense of subjection to its authority. At the last meeting of the General Assembly an effort was made to secure the appointment of another Executive Committee to be located in New Orleans. These are but feeble contrivances to meet wants which the Board cannot relieve, and their success can only be partial. The remedy lies in the remodelling of the whole machinery. The Church, as now organized in her courts, embraces the motive power required, and all the working parts of a perfect scheme. In her constitution lie the means of her success, and her activity must be awakened and stimulated by the elements of her own being.

The evils of a central agency managing the whole work of Domestic Missions was felt by the Assembly in 1791, when they waived their assumed rights, and permitted the Synod of the Carolinas to conduct missions within their own bounds. Distance was a formidable obstacle then, and an arterial system of railroads has almost annihilated distance; but our population has multiplied since then six-fold, and the occupation of waste territory is progressing every day. Can the Board, with all the facilities of railroads, keep pace with the growth of the Church and the progress of population? Rapid

communication is not a substitute for local knowledge and direct personal supervision. The Board is a noble agency as a common medium between the strong and the weak, but it is a feeble scheme when it holds in abeyance the more intelligent action of the Presbytery. The Assembly virtually acknowledged this in the following resolution adopted in 1842: "That it behoves our several Presbyteries to take a careful survey of the territory within their respective bounds, inquire whether the population residing there is fully supplied with the ordinances of the Gospel and in habitual attendance on the worship of God, and to take such measures as their wisdom may suggest, to establish at all proper points the preaching of the Word and the ordinances of God's house." This recommendation was renewed in 1854.

The success of missions, under Divine grace, must depend upon the distinctness with which the duty is apprehended, and the depth and compass of the interest awakened. The work must hang, not upon emotion alone or upon a simple abstract sense of duty, but upon a combination of the two—emotion prompting to obedience and duty clearly recognized in its Divine obligation. The prevalence of these two instrumental forces will determine the success of missions. Under these motives, the disciples of Christ must move in concert, and each must be ready to take the van. But they will not so readily respond to the voice of a stranger. A foreign Agent is known to them only by report. Whom will they follow? Their own pastors, given them by God as leaders of the people. These pastors are agents for missions by virtue of their office, and they can by authority speak to the churches that they move forward. Pastors have the sympathies of the people and command their confidence. It is no privilege then to have an agent present, a stranger to the Church, to conduct that part of public worship which consists in contributions for the expansion of the Church. It is the pastor's duty, and the discharge of the duty brings good to himself and to his people. Entrust the disbursement of funds to the wisdom of the Presbytery, the members of which are known to the churches

embraced in its bounds, and more confidence is inspired in the judicious application of such funds than when they pass to a distant and unknown body. We do insist, that no agency can compete with the Presbytery in collecting funds for benevolence, or command the same confidence in their right disbursement. Every faithful pastor is an efficient agent in his charge, and the Presbytery must partake more largely of that permanent home influence than any Board. A scheme of systematic benevolence can never be inaugurated by resolutions of the Assembly, unless pastors and Presbyteries will initiate the work; and these are the sources of influence which shall awaken the energies of the Presbyterian Church. Here are powers compact and equal to their limited territories—powers which do not embrace the evil of “absenteeism,” but are present where the work is to be done, and have a commanding influence because present, and recognized as Divine.

Labor generates interest in that upon which it is expended. Engage pastors and Presbyteries actively in the work of missions and their zeal is greatly increased. A scheme therefore which multiplies this kind of service must widen its own basis and augment its success. It is a serious evil to have this work transferred to a foreign power, and pastoral and Presbyterial service made but an incidental attendant. There must be the home influence of kind offices, the direct relation of benefactor and beneficiary to generate a profound interest in the work of missions.

Churches, too, are awakened to a more active benevolence when the field cultivated is under their observation, and they know the immediate destination of the funds they contribute. It becomes to them a child of adoption, and they watch with interest its growth. They aid directly in breaking up the fallow ground, in sowing the seed, in watering the tender plant, and the hope of a plentiful harvest invigorates their zeal. The presence of these churches in the field of missions will prevent mal-administration from neglect or want of firmness to resist unwise importunity, and operate as a check upon those congregations that would not hesitate to draw money

from a distance, and yet would not be free to plead their weakness to neighboring churches that know their strength. The Board has complained that the recommendations of Presbyteries are without due investigation, and are passed rather as matters of form. This evil will always accompany the present system, but would be excluded under Presbyterial control.

The scheme of missionary labor in the home field, which we propose, has been indicated in the progress of our remarks, and we only give the following synopsis:

1. That it is the duty of each Presbytery to take charge of the territory embraced within its bounds.

2. To search out the waste places within its territory, ascertain favorable locations for mission stations, cherish feeble churches by pecuniary aid, and disburse funds raised for this purpose.

3. To employ one or more missionaries to visit vacant churches and mission stations, and minister the Word and receive their contributions for benevolence.

4. To attend to the work of Church extension as a co-ordinate branch of Domestic Missions.

5. To correspond with licentiates and ministers without charge, and bring them in contact with vacant churches and mission stations.

To carry into execution the above scheme, Presbytery must have two agents; a Committee on Domestic Missions, and a Treasurer. Both these agents should present annual reports, and these reports should be published for the information of the churches.

The above scheme of missions is not like Berkely's ideal theory, a purely mental conception, but has been in successful operation, in one Presbytery at least, for many years. Under this scheme seven churches have been organized in the Presbytery alluded to, and the annual contributions have exceeded by three-fold what they had been in any previous history of the body. These are palpable facts which prove that the machinery will work.

This theory of missions does not render the Board a useless



agency. It would still be necessary, for the reason previously assigned.

To this whole subject we ask the serious attention of ministers and churches. Let not all investigation be waived under the plea, that old paths are necessarily right, and changes are the harbingers of evil.

---

ARTICLE IV.

*The Literary Attractions of the Bible; or, A Plea for the Bible Considered as a Classic.* By LE ROY J. HALSEY, D. D. New York: Charles Scribner, 1858.

When the future Macaulay shall arise to record the events, and to comment upon the characteristics of this age, an ample field will be spread out before him for the display of his masterly skill in grouping together all the points of interest, and in delineating them in all their ever-varying shades and colorings. He will have to tell posterity of wonderful discoveries in art and science, of amazing progress of mechanical skill, and of the unexampled advance which men have made in all labor-saving expedients; of the hitherto fabulous wonders of steam and electricity, already become every-day realities; of the architectural glories of this age, still modelled after Grecian forms, yet realized in their actual erections with a reduced amount of labor which would have been wholly inconceivable by the minds of ancient architects. But not these things only. The literary and the scientific world have enlarged, beautified and elevated their enterprizes in this age far beyond any former era. Wisdom has thrown wide open the portals of her temple, and thousands among classes which formerly were wholly excluded, have been admitted and introduced to her treasures, and permitted to share in her blessings. The Common School, the Academy, and the College halls, with their free

lectures for all who will attend, are now crowded, and immense libraries have been founded for the use of those hitherto denied access to the ample page of knowledge. We might specify as marked peculiarities of our age many other matters which are equally striking; such as the progress of missionary operations, not only unimpeded, but even forwarded by Sepoy mutinies and Chinese revolutions, with the vastly extended circulation of the Word of God among the nations of the earth, and the increase of Gospel light in the dark places of the earth once full of the habitations of cruelty. All this seems to be the fulfilment of the prophet's declaration that "many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased." And the constantly accelerated motion, which seems to be added to the advance of all knowledge, would seem to favor the views of those who are looking for the speedy dawn of millennial glory.

But there is no peculiarity of this age more striking than the wonderful productiveness of the printing press. This is emphatically the book-making age. The printing press, even with the aid of steam, can scarcely keep pace, however, with the productions of the teeming intellect of the age. It can hardly issue, with sufficient rapidity, the books that are offered to its machinery. Every mail coach and steam car that moves upon our highways, and every steamboat that traverses the broad bosom of our waters, groans with the weight of books seeking readers, whose minds are to be instructed or poisoned by their contents. An invalid pastor leaves his flock and crosses the ocean in quest of health, and visits the scenes of historic interest in the Old World, and the result of his journeyings is a book of notes and reminiscences, or pencillings by the way, or some other equally taking title, which gives him fame or notoriety, at least for the time. A single sermon containing great thoughts and striking truths, which could not be elaborated in the space of time assigned to its delivery, is called for in order to be published, and the author embraces the opportunity to expand it into a volume. A very popular Divine has astonished many by the rapidity with which he has issued his volumes of lectures through the press. But the surprise vanishes when we learn that a stenographer

takes down the discourses as they are delivered, and an amanuensis having written them out in full, they are made ready for the press in a very short time, and the preacher becomes, in a few weeks or months, as voluminous an author as the old Divines became in as many years. A set of gentlemen invited to lecture to young men, have their lectures published in a volume, and adorned with portraits of each distinguished author; there is thus formed a gallery of pictures as variable in beauty as the style of their several productions is in point of merit. A notorious murder is committed, and forthwith the press is set to work, and in an incredibly short time there is produced a respectable volume (in size at least) containing the testimony, the pleadings, the last speech of the murderer, and pictures of the victim and the scene of the murder, and it, too, has its day of ephemeral popularity, and then dies its merited death. Essays are often published in a weekly journal which the worthy essayist, in his unsophisticated modesty, had never dreamed of turning into a book, when lo! it was discovered by friends, in whose candor he had unbounded confidence, that these essays possessed such merit as entitled them to a better fate than to be doomed to sink into oblivion; so, contrary to his own judgment, he is persuaded to collect them and publish them in a volume, and thus he "awakes some morning and finds himself (if not a great man) an author." The Rev. Mr. Caird prepared a sermon for the merely ordinary services of the sanctuary,—a good sermon,—a most excellent sermon,—but prepared, so far as appears, with no sort of view to publication. But the Royal Auditors, in their Scottish tour, spending the Sabbath in the vicinity, visited his Church to unite in worship with their Presbyterian subjects, and all unused to such close, pungent and spiritual doctrine in the pulpits of the Establishment at home, they are struck with its singular excellence in these respects, and resolve to have it published. So, all at once Mr. C., from a faithful, laborious, yet comparatively obscure pastor in one of the rural districts of Scotland, becomes a world-renowned author, and his little tract is circulated and read on both sides of the Atlantic with eager earnestness, by thousands and tens of thousands of intensely interested readers. The

great popular movements of the day which agitate the whole country, suggest to some lover of money and notoriety the lucky thought that the events, speeches, sermons, or whatever constituted the substance of the movement, ought to be preserved in book form, and the thing is done on the instant, and the book is issued steaming hot from the press, with many a mark of hasty composition, and bad taste, and incorrect sentiment. It is, however, a book and the compiler is an author. Now, it is a fact which there is no disputing, that amidst all this vast amount of production there is a very great variety in point of merit. It is not all trash—it is not all mental poison. There is much that is solid and nutritive. While we have yellow-covered literature, full of mawkish sentimentality and dissembled infidelity, in very miserable diction and style, *ad nauseam*,—enough to stamp upon the age a stigma of reprobation; we have also a literature enriched by the great thoughts of the great souls of living authors, and the old and grand truths, which are the property of all times, presented in new forms and combinations, and clad in new vestments, which, having passed through the alembic of modern minds, come forth newly stamped and beautified. And we can console ourselves with the reflection, that while the press has been sending forth a stream of moral trash and filth, which floats rapidly along and speedily loses itself in the dark gulf of oblivion, it has also opened the channel for new tributaries to the great ocean of truth. We have the ephemeral issues of fiction, it is true, but we ought to be very thankful that we have the contributions of science and the laborious offerings of the scholar and divine. The knowledge of God, too, reduced to a science, and brought by a master-mind into such a mould and fashion as it has never before received, has been sent forth into the world in this age, and read by as many eager admirers as the most fashionable novel, and is destined to retain its popularity forever. And this brings to mind the noticeable fact, that the “dark and bloody ground” seems within these few late years to be making rapid progress towards the entire obliteration of that ominous name from her heraldic escutcheon; and, if her sons continue to publish such works as “The Knowledge of

God," "The Church of God," and "The Literary Attractions of the Bible," she will speedily achieve for herself the title of "The Land of Light and Peace and Love." Of the first of these great works it may be said that it seems to rise before the mind like a granite mountain of truth; or, like the Mammoth Cave itself, full of deep recesses of mysterious grandeur, inviting the explorer to enter and survey its wonders, and leading us on from one marvellous chamber to another of sublimity and beauty, and floating us along upon the rushing subterranean tide of its eloquence and power, until we are almost lost in the infinite ocean of the exhaustless subject. While of the second we may say, that it seems to stand of the same granitic material erected into the form of a massive column, based upon the foundation principles of eternal truth, rising layer after layer, and block after block, by an inexorable logic until, when we find ourselves at the apex, we are almost persuaded that we plain Presbyterian folk are *jure divino*, "The Church," par excellence.

But what shall we say of the last? Why, what can we say, save that it is just a moving panorama of beauty, or a landscape which presents before us a lovely group of the most attractive objects that ever enraptured the fancy of the poet or captivated the genius of the painter; and that while reading it we wander through groves of gorgeous green, and listen to the sound of waterfalls or the murmur of rivulets, and gaze upon green fields promising fruitful harvests, while the earth is enamelled with its verdant carpet and its springing flowers, and over us are the bending skies in their azure purity. This book is not the hasty production of a day or a month. The excellent author bestowed upon it the pains which he felt to be due to the grandeur of his theme. The substance of these eight chapters having been originally delivered to the people of his pastoral charge in the city of his residence, he has re-written, corrected, enlarged and variously modified, until the whole has been sent forth some six years after their original delivery in their present form, a handsome volume of 441 pages, in Mr. Scribner's best style.

Two remarks must be made in advance of a further notice of

this work. Many persons might be misled by its title to suppose that there is a great deal of fancy and poetic conception in the author's treatment of the subject, and that however beautiful and attractive, the book can hardly be of much practical utility. But it is far otherwise. The object of the author is to do good, and not simply to please and amuse. And it will be found on perusal, that the method pursued is eminently adapted to produce this effect, as we shall see by an analysis of its contents. On the other hand, some may suppose that the theme itself is one so dry and unattractive to the general reader, that nothing on the subject could be so written as to interest or entertain. This may be true in the case of a corrupt and vitiated taste, which, by long devotion to novel reading, has become incapable of any just appreciation of the truly beautiful and attractive in style and matter. But to a mind rightly disciplined, and a soul alive to proper estimates of literary excellence, we do not hesitate to say, that this book cannot fail to arrest the reader with a most absorbing and intense interest from the beginning to the close.

With regard to the purpose had in view by the author in this volume, let us hear from himself:

"The topics presented in the several chapters of this volume, though apparently disconnected, have all been selected and discussed with one great end constantly in view; and that is to make them bear, as an unbroken and cumulative argument, on the superhuman and consequently Divine character of the Bible. This is the thought that underlies the whole arrangement, and gives it unity. This main design, though running through a wide range of illustration, will be found constantly recurring, especially at the end of the chapters, and most of all in the last chapter, which was first in the order of conception and led to the composition of the rest. \* \* \* \* \*  
The object of these pages is to tell, at least in part, what it (the Bible) contains; to gain the eye of those, who under an impression that there is nothing in the Bible but religion, really do not know how much there is in it; to bring out to view some of its many treasures; and to present them in such a way that they shall desire to see more; and so be attracted to the book itself."

And there is no doubt but this object is fully accomplished. Judging from the effect produced by the perusal of this book upon our own mind, we should say that it cannot fail to intro-

duce the reader to beauties and excellencies in the Bible, the existence of which he might not be at all disposed to doubt, and yet they had entirely escaped his notice in his reading. And then could the other class of readers (their "name is Legion") who either avoid the Bible, "under the impression that it contains nothing but religion," or who read it as a task, self-imposed, under a merely superstitious feeling of duty, be induced to give themselves time to read this book carefully, they would readily discover in it such attractions as would elevate the sacred volume from its present position, in their estimation, to the loftiest place both in their hearts and in their minds. It will convince any man who has the soul to appreciate such an argument, that the Bible is replete with glorious truths, set forth in a variety of illustrations most attractive, and of the highest forms of æsthetic beauty. And many, who are good men, but cynical critics, could they get their own consent to give the book a calm and attentive perusal, would be constrained, by conviction of its merits, to lay aside their expressed opinions, that the legitimate method of recommending the Word of God is not by calling attention to its "literary attractions." They would see that the very admiration which it excites for the style and sentiment of the sacred volume, will invariably create a love for the book, and a higher appreciation of its great truths as connected with man's highest interests. This is the author's object throughout the entire volume. There is apparent a deep moral earnestness pervading the book from the beginning to the end. There is no effort at mere fancy-sketches, or scenic effect, nor is there anywhere observable such a thing as bombast, or great swelling words of vanity, such as most certainly characterizes the style of some other authors who have written or attempted to write works illustrative of Bible scenes or Bible characters. The topics discussed are natural and capable of being turned to practical benefit. We have in the opening chapter a very interesting presentation of the claims of the Bible as a classic, its adaptation to childhood, the school and college; the purity and excellence of our English version, a timely topic which has recently attracted a large share of the attention from the Chris-

tian mind in this land; the position of the Bible in the four classic tongues, viz: Hebrew, Greek, Latin and English—showing that “at the head of these four languages it has led the march of civilization around the globe; the relation of the Bible to the State and its schools; where the position is assumed and maintained that while the great object of the State in introducing the Bible into the schools “is not to teach religion, but only morality and intelligence,” yet this Divine Book is of vast importance as a text book for this purpose, considered in its connection with the interests of this world; and where the subject of Romish hostility to the introduction of the Bible into our common schools is ably discussed, and severe and well-deserved blows are dealt against the Papacy in this connection. The chapter concludes, then, with a kind of sketch of the general characteristics of the Bible. We do not design giving an analysis of these eight chapters, but we enumerate the topics of this first chapter simply as a specimen of the whole. We think that in this way it will be seen that the book is full of practical utility, pregnant with matter that is of deep and abiding interest to minds of all classes. Some men love no book but what is classical in its thought and diction. Here it is shown that the Bible is “the greatest of classics, because it is inspired of God—the most perfect work of the human mind, because a mind more than human is everywhere at work in it.” Some parents are fond of procuring books for their children to read adapted to their tender years and immature minds. Dr. H. shows in this chapter (and that by a method, new to us at least,) that the Bible is the very best book for children. He does this by pointing attention to a fact that has, perhaps, escaped the notice of most persons, viz: that “there is a sort of development and progress in the Sacred Scriptures corresponding to the development and progress of human life.” That “the New Testament with its sublime Gospel history, its profound doctrinal epistles, and its mysterious prophetic apocalypse, is but the finishing of that intellectual and moral manhood, which is supposed to have had its early education in the preparatory school of the Old Testament.” He then recurs to the fact, well known to all of us



who have been trained in early life to read our Bibles, that no after reading ever so profoundly impresses our minds as did the reading and knowing the Bible in the days of our childhood. The narrative portions especially are those "which no child can read without wonder and delight, and which none that reads can ever forget." This point is forcibly illustrated also, by observing the difficulty with which "an old man, unacquainted with the Bible in his youth, is induced to read it regularly through." He will be disgusted before he gets through Genesis. He sees no beauty in it. He must begin with the New Testament and thread "his way back to the simple faith of childhood." And in this way he may arrive at some kind of appreciation of the Bible, and yet "even then there may be some things hard to be understood which will be to him a stumbling-block as long as he lives; and that for no other cause than this—that his parents neglected the ordinance of God, which, old as the days of Moses, required them to teach all these things to their child, while he was a child." But the child who begins in his childhood to read and know the Old Testament comes gradually on to the New with a full preparation for its higher forms of revealed truth, and with a more matured capacity for its appreciation. Many object to the Bible in school on the score of its not being the proper place to teach religion; that nothing but secular knowledge is admissible; that if we wish to teach our child religion we must do it at some more suitable place. Admitting this to be a tenable objection, still the plea is successfully made that the Bible, as a text book, is unequalled even for "its history and biography, its morality and learning, its eloquence and poetry." "The Bible, in our English version," is held up as a collateral topic of great interest at this stage of the volume. And what, we may ask, could be better calculated to attract attention than such a topic at such a time and in such an age as ours? When the besotted bigotry and conceited ignorance of *some* find themselves called to the mission of improving this grand and glorious old version, how timely the effort made by the author of this book to recall to our recollection its history! John Selden's early opinion that "the English translation of

the Bible is the best translation in the world, and gives the sense of the original best, has been confirmed by the almost unanimous judgment of posterity." And while it is true that "when our translation was made, the age of Addison, with its polish and graceful diction, had not come;" yet "it is enough to say that it was the age of Lord Bacon and of Shakspeare—the father of the inductive philosophy and the greatest name in the annals of dramatic literature," and that "they were soon followed by Milton, Locke and Sir Isaac Newton." A mutual benefit is thus obtained both for the religion of the Bible, and for all English literature—first, that "this robust Anglo-Saxon speech, in its glory and strength, should be the vehicle for this religion;" and secondly, that "English literature should have such a canonization in the Bible, and such a book in which to be canonized."

But we have dwelt long enough on the topics presented in this chapter to attain our purpose, which was to vindicate its claim to be considered a volume of solid and substantial merit, as well as one of beautiful and attractive style.

This volume is characterized by another feature peculiar to itself. The various characters of the Bible, as they pass in review before the author's mind—the various topics arising from a study of the sacred volume—always open before him a field for the discussion of matters of interest and importance to the scholar, the private Christian and the theologian. When the author comes to notice "poetry and the bards of the Bible," he takes occasion to give us a fine essay on the nature of poetry in general, and of the poetry of the Bible in particular, furnishing specimens of it, and giving explanations of various points connected with it, so that the second chapter is as fine a piece of criticism as can be found upon the subject. So, also, when he takes up the "eloquence and oratory of the Old Testament," we have the elements and characteristics of eloquence set forth, and the distinction between poetry and eloquence pointed out. And then, by a natural transition, he passes on to his illustrations drawn from ancient and modern times. The analysis of the peculiar powers of one "remarkable triumvirate" which Dr. H. gives, is highly discriminating and

just. He assigns to Mr. Calhoun the eloquence of intellect and enthusiasm, Mr. Webster he takes as the exponent of the eloquence of reason and imagination, and Mr. Clay is styled the representative of the eloquence of action and delivery, combined with enthusiasm and the passions.

The chapter on eloquence we regard as one of the most attractive in the book. It is always a matter of interest to us to ascertain, that what is now in existence as an influence or a power, has been known and felt in all time past in a greater or less degree. This is true of eloquence. We may not have been in the habit of observing this fact—nay! we may be rather disposed to doubt it on its first presentation. Yet the proof is clearly made out from the Bible, that there were in the early days of the world's history "specimens of almost every kind of eloquence." And the reason is obvious. The same occasions then occurred that now give rise to eloquence. The oral narrative, the dialogue, the prayer, the pleading for life, the speech before a judicial tribunal, the debate in the cabinet council, were the various occasions then, as they are now, for the display of all those elements entering into the composition of eloquence. What a fine rebuke is that which is here given to those who pervert the high and sacred gifts of eloquence, suggested by the speech of Satan to our first parents. We leave this topic with a single reference to one of the author's parallels between ancient and modern oratory. Hushai, the Archite, made a speech in the cabinet of Absalom, during the rebellion against David which, though included in seven verses, was attended by a complete triumph, an overwhelming effect; the result of which was, that Absalom perished in the battle, and David was restored to his throne! This brings up the case of John Somers, a young lawyer, as yet unknown to fame, who, in the celebrated trial of the seven bishops, "spoke little more than five minutes, but every word was full of weighty matter; and when he sat down, his reputation as an orator and a constitutional lawyer was established," and the side he espoused "also gained the day."

Not the least instructive and impressive among these eight chapters, is that one devoted to "Types of Female Character

in the Bible." It has come to be considered an essential part of every public address to have a few sentences devoted to the ladies. The College orator (yea! the Latin salutatorian) must have a few words to them full of flattery and extravagant adulation. The stump orator, in a political canvass, adopts the same expedient to gain favor, and the Masonic speech that should omit the address to the ladies, would be essentially defective. But it is to be lamented that, with such opportunities to convey instruction which such a custom bestows upon the speaker, the whole thing is perverted to the most idle, frivolous and unmeaning compliments. This is not the character, however, of the chapter before us. By the industrious investigation of the topic, our author has discovered that "there are, in all, about one hundred females whose names or characters, singled out from the general mass, have acquired a distinct personality, and have been rendered immortal on the pages of the sacred volume." And while we are earnestly assured that "there is no sphere of honor and trust, no post of danger, trial and responsibility, which woman ever filled on earth, higher than those which the women of the Bible have filled," at the same time we are warned that we "must not expect to find *the women of the Bible all angels*. If they had been, they would not have been the best models for us. We need the shadows as well as the lights, to form a perfect picture." But we have fine and graphic delineations of female character in the author's four-fold classification. First, The class of all who are proverbial for wickedness—such as Potiphar's wife, the witch of Endor, Herodias and her dancing daughter, Athaliah and Jezebel, Lot's wife, Delilah and Sapphira. Secondly, Those once wicked, but afterwards converted, such as Rahab of Jericho, the woman of Samaria, Mary Magdalene, the damsel of Philippi, &c. Thirdly, the largest class of all, those whose characters were mixed of good and ill—such as Sarah, Hagar, Rebekah, Miriam, Martha and Salome. Lastly, the class in whom "the world has found no blemish—all light without a shadow, all beauty without a fault;" yet, as the author carefully remarks, not because they had attained perfection, but because the pen of inspiration has purposely given

us their virtues, and left their sins and imperfections unrecorded." Such are Deborah, Hannah, Abigail, Ruth, Esther, in the Old Testament; Anna, Priscilla, Elizabeth, Mary of Bethany, Mary the Mother of our Lord, Eunice and Lois, &c., of the New Testament.

Now, under this classification, the characters of various females are set forth, and, along with each description, we have the moral instruction which it conveys. It would be impossible to make any thing like a minute reference to each case, but we shall call the reader's attention to only two of the characters, and to two subjects incidentally discussed in connection with them. The first is "Rebekah, the youthful bride, the matronly wife, and the aged companion of Isaac." In the marriage of these two, Dr. H. finds this sacred institution entered upon and observed through a long life, precisely as God ordained it in Eden, and as Jesus Christ re-ordained it in the New Testament, when he said: "For this cause shall a man leave father and mother and cleave to his wife, and they two shall be one flesh." Making allowance for the change of the customs of society, in the matter of courtship and marriage, there are "four circumstances which render this marriage, notwithstanding its antiquity, a manual of instruction to every young man and woman in choosing a companion for life." These four circumstances are: 1st. It was a marriage literally and truly in accordance with the will of the Lord. 2d. It was free, cordial and unrestrained on Rebekah's part, as well as on the part of Isaac, and on the part of their parents. 3dly. It was no wayward, foolish and ungrateful runaway match! 4thly. The courtship of Isaac and Rebekah, unlike many of our day, was one of perfect candor, of straight-forward, business-like simplicity, and of admirable delicacy and fair-dealing on all sides." The object we have in view, however, in referring to this subject, is to let the author speak for himself, as he does, strongly and earnestly, on the subject of "marriage in defiance of parental authority." Says he:

"Thus to the parent and the child belonged a rightful veto, as God intended it should belong in every case of marriage. Do you ask, what is a young lady to do, when her parents oppose her marriage in a

particular case? We answer, do nothing; but remain as she is. Do not marry at all, rather than marry under such circumstances. There had better be no marriage while the world stands, than marriage in defiance of parental authority. It is a sinful breach of the great law of nature, and of Heaven, when a parent compels his daughter to marry against her own heart's choice; and it is no less so for a daughter to marry in defiance of the will of her parents. The young woman who is capable of bringing upon the once happy home of her childhood all that desolation which is implied in an elopement, and of inflicting such unmitigated cruelty upon the mother, to whom she owes the highest of all earthly obligations, is, to say the very least, unfit herself to be a wife and mother; and the world would be no loser if she should never marry. We speak with emphasis upon the subject; because any thing which, in the name of marriage, thus tramples upon the sacredness of home, and the rights of parents, however it may be tolerated in our fashionable society, we can only regard as an evil and an outrage, as abhorrent to nature, as it is contrary to the law of God."

Most heartily do we subscribe to these sound and Scriptural sentiments. We desire to add, however, one consideration to the above. It is to our mind a very sure proof that there is something radically defective in the training of a young person who flies violently in the face of parental wishes in this matter. Nor can we believe that such scenes will be found occurring in any well regulated family, where the parents have obeyed the command of God—"Train up a child in the way he should go," &c. In such cases there will always be found a perfect mutual confidence existing between parent and child, and a tender and sacred regard for the feelings of each other, and where a difference of views may exist, a spirit of mutual forbearance will characterize the parties. When elopements take place it is evidence irresistible that the parent has been unfaithful, and by consequence the child is wayward and disobedient. The misery that results is the token of God's displeasure towards both parties for the violation of His laws.

The other character which we wish to notice is Salome, the daughter of Herodias, or rather, Herodias herself, since the daughter in this case was but the reflected image of the mother. And the particular topic connected with the description of these females which Dr. H. discusses, and on which we would animadvert, is that of the promiscuous dancing of the sexes. "The incident recorded of this young girl," says the author,

“gives a striking illustration of the depravity which prevailed in what might be called the elegant fashionable circles of that day. It was then, as it is now, in such circles—the child was a true mirror to reflect the vices of the parent.” After speaking of the dreadful results of that festive dancing of the daughter of Herodias, in such terms as are well calculated to excite our horror and pity, he says:

“And what a commentary, by the way, does this case afford on the boasted accomplishment of dancing! The evil of dancing consisted then, as it always has consisted, not in the dancing itself, but in the things it leads to. In that case it led to a sinful excitement, a foolish oath, and an awful murder. And in how many cases has it led to the loss of health, the loss of life, and the loss of the soul? In how many cases has it blotted out for ever every serious impression, and prepared the young to run a career of folly and reckless dissipation? And is it no sin for Christian parents, knowing the evils to which dancing is sure to lead, deliberately to teach their children this dangerous accomplishment? Will they give them cards and not expect them to gamble? Will they send them to the theatre and not expect them to be injured? Will they send them to the race course and then caution them to beware of evil influences? And shall they train their children to all the ‘misty mazes’ of the dance, and yet, with strange inconsistency, expect God to convert and save them, while thus placing one of the greatest obstacles in the way.”

“Salome’s dancing was evil, because it led to evil. And yet this was the least objectionable form of dancing. It was a solo dance, and that by a female; and that, too, at home in her mother’s house. The advocates of our modern promiscuous dancing sometimes pretend to justify it by the Scriptures. But they forget that no such thing as the dancing of the sexes together is to be found in the Scriptures. There are instances of a man dancing alone in a religious service, as David did; and many instances where women danced with women, as Miriam at the Red Sea; but we can confidently affirm that there is not a single example of our modern fashion of the sexes dancing together, in all the Bible, from Genesis to Revelation. No man can show any place in the Bible where men joined with women in the dance.”

This fact which has been brought forward by other opponents of dancing is, however, not sufficiently noticed by its advocates. Those who claim that the Bible countenances dancing, seem never to think of the kind of dancing the Bible mentions, and of the difference between it and modern dancing. They quote, too, the remark of Solomon, “there is a time to dance,” without noticing these two things: 1st. The

fact is only mentioned that there is such a thing, without deciding whether it be right or wrong, and just as well might you quote his other remark, "there is a time to kill," as good authority for the commission of murder, as to quote this remark to justify dancing. 2d. The remark is merely the statement of the fact—in other words, that there is a time for joy, as well as for sorrow, and is intended to be one of the many particulars in the enumeration of life's various scenes and vicissitudes. It certainly gives no countenance to dancing, as practised in our day. This is a growing evil, and the fact cannot be disguised, that it is fast invading the peace and purity of the Church. It has become almost an obsolete idea in many churches to adopt any restrictive or disciplinary measures to check this evil. And when a minister presumes to remonstrate with his people, he is either an offender, an intruder into family arrangements with which he is in no wise concerned, or is laughed at as being behind the age, an old fogey, and his people dance on as much as ever, and send their children to dancing schools besides. The Presbyteries and Synods and General Assemblies have made repeated deliverances on this subject, but it has no effect. There are (shame to say it!) ministers of the Gospel who also stand by and look on, and countenance the evil, notwithstanding the voice of the Church, in its purest and wisest days, has been uniformly against it. Hence it is that light-headed girls, and smooth-faced young men, are emboldened to argue with their superiors on the innocence of this amusement, and plead the example of these loose professors of religion and preachers to prove that there is no harm in it. The alarming increase of this practice in the churches is owing chiefly to the neglect of proper training in the family. The Presbyterianism of a former day was free from this stigma, and, consequently, it was not a difficult matter then (as alas! it is now) to distinguish a professor of religion from a man of the world. It is a question which has been discussed, whether it is a proper subject of Church discipline? It was our fortune once to listen to such a discussion by one of our Presbyteries. And while it was decided by a large majority, that the sessions of our Churches



should discipline their members for promiscuous dancing, there were not wanting those (*one of them a minister*) who espoused the negative. What is to become of the Church under these circumstances it is not difficult to foretell. An increasing number of our members, with few exceptions, attend these places, and quiet their consciences by refusing to dance, while they look on with great complacency and encourage others to do it. They forget that they are enjoined not to be "partakers of other men's sins." The Church is thus making dancing far more respectable than it has heretofore been, and that, too, when all its evils still cling to it, in unmitigated forms. We see, also, that this mingling of the Church and of the world by compromise, has worked both ways to the production of evil. For while the Church has met the world in the domains of the latter, and has thus laid aside her purity and sacrificed her principles, the doors of the Church have been opened more widely for the admission of the world. The modern system of religious excitements, misnamed revivals, is a result of this laxity of views and practice; and so true is this, that you may see scores of persons received into our churches, who have not been able to give any rational account of their exercises of mind: nor do they, in many cases, understand anything of the plan of salvation, nor are they able to "give a reason for the hope that is in them." We are constrained, therefore, to conclude that the prevalent motive is the love of excitement, which prompts them alike to engage in a ball or a revival, and finds them as ready for a funeral as for a party. There are two remedies for this thing, which may be found corrective, if adopted by our Sessions. 1st. Let them put the question always, even to those who are most satisfactory in their examination for admission into the Church: Are you now willing to renounce the sinful amusements of the world, including dancing, and do you promise no more to engage in or countenance such practices? 2d. Let them bring to their tribunals all violators of this long settled principle of morals. Until the Church reforms there can be no hope of a decline of this evil, and so long as Presbyterian parents continue to countenance it, there can be no hope of a reform in

the Church. On the contrary, as our young people grow up and succeed the present generation of Church members, (if they are not seduced away by such amusements entirely from the Church, and ruined eternally,) a majority will be found advocates of dancing, and gradually every trace of old-fashioned Bible Presbyterianism will be erased, and every landmark removed. If, indeed, persons are so besotted in their attachment to this ridiculous and sinful amusement, as that they are unwilling to give it up even when contemplating application for membership in the Church, then, for our part, in behalf of the venerable and beloved old Church of our fathers, we earnestly entreat them not to come to us. We deprecate the idea of your forcing yourselves upon us with such sentiments in your hearts, especially as there are Churches in whose pale you can find a more congenial atmosphere. We honestly think such persons yet unfit for any true Church of Jesus Christ; but, if they must join a Church, let them go elsewhere, and not connect themselves with a body whose long uttered and well known principles are so entirely at war with them on this subject. We would go even further, and say to those of our members who advocate dancing, and practice it also, you are acting, in the highest degree, in bad faith. We care not what your own private sentiments may be on the subject; that has nothing to do with the state of the case, as relates to your position in the Church. You belong to a body of Christians whose rule of action, as laid down for ages, has been to forbid dancing, or the countenancing of it, in their members, and you have no right to set yourselves up in opposition to this rule. If you will keep your opinions, grievously erroneous as they are, then leave us, we insist upon it, leave us in peace. Let us have a Church, while we have any Church at all, that is a pure Church, a Bible Church—a Church without the stigma of corrupt practice with a pure system—a Church whose membership are undivided upon the great principles of Christian morality. And for those ministers who stand by and look on in silence, and even with a smile of approval and encouragement, we can only add, that the sooner they apply for a letter of dismissal to their respective Presbyteries, the better for the

Church, and the better for them. The better will it be for the Church; because their conduct is now a reproach to it. And it will be the better for them, as the indications seem to foreshadow for them a greater departure from Christian consistency, and then the chances for honorable dismissal will be greatly diminished.

But enough of this. And we wish now to introduce our readers to a passage in this connection, which will enliven this discussion, since it shows up our author in a new and pleasant phase, that of a witty satirist. Having spoken of the uselessness of female dancing as an expedient to secure gracefulness, even should the ladies dance alone, the author adds:

“But be the case as it may with a young girl, who ever saw anything graceful and dignified in the dancing of men? To us, the whole thing of a man’s dancing is absurd and ridiculous to the last degree. If there were nothing else against it, the closely cut dress of our modern man of fashion, fitting his body and limbs like the bark of a tree, renders graceful dancing an impossibility. There is no poetry in any such exhibition of a man, or of any other animal clad as he is. For if the man is large and heavy, the spectacle calls up the image of an elephant whose very footstep shakes the ground. If the man is small and frisky, we are constantly reminded of the fitful antics of a monkey or baboon. If the performer is tall and slender, who knows when his excessive gyrations may bring him down like a sapling before the wind? Whatever dancing may be as an amusement for women and children, we cannot rank it among the manly sports and performances.”

“Hence, we say, dancing was never intended for men; least of all, for our modern cloth-harnessed men. And if our fine gentlemen must dance, they ought, out of mere poetic justice, to assume the toga of the ancients; or else, for the sake of this peculiarly feminine amusement into which they have intruded, they ought to borrow a belt and a skirt from their lady partners.

“Who ever read of Alexander the Great, or Julius Cæsar, or Pompey, or Demosthenes, dancing like a young girl?” “If dancing was thought thus unmanly when the performers had the long, flowing Grecian dress to redeem it from contempt, how much more undignified is it now, when the prim, starchy, tight-fitting attire of the gentleman dancer, instead of concealing, only exposes the muscular machinery by which the performance is carried on.”

We will venture on but one more extract of this kind, and we do this the more readily from the fact, that it sets forth in a vein of fine sarcasm, as keen as our author’s gentle nature

would admit, the folly of another marked characteristic of our age. We allude to its *fastness*, especially among young men. We take this extract from the chapter on "Representative young men of the Bible." It would be a grateful task to cull from its numerous beauties the fine delineation of many of the characters of these young men with which this chapter abounds. But we must deny ourselves this pleasure, and passing over the cases of Abel, and David, and Jonathan, and Solomon, of the Old Testament, and the two Johns, Paul and Timothy, the whole circle crowned by the inimitable Jesus of Nazareth, of the New—we must content ourselves with this rich and racy extract, by way of contrast between the best type of character of the young men of the Bible, and the modern young man of our own times.

"What would they" (the young men of the Bible) "think of our progress, our vaunted greatness and refinement," "if they could come back into the world and compare experiences with the young men of our own highly civilized generation? What opinion could these earnest, athletic, temperate, God-fearing young men of the olden time form respecting the fashionable young gentleman of our modern cities, whose chief accomplishments are, that he can smoke and swear, drink and gamble, swagger and bet, and fight duels; that he can, after the most approved maxims of the science, dance and flirt with silly women; that he can afford to wear fine clothes, and do nothing; whose most brilliant achievements are his victories in the ball room, the bowling saloon, or at the card and billiard table; and whose only title to fame is the fascination of his fine smile, and voice, and waving hair? We honor and love the young man, who is a man, or is likely to become one; we hold him in eternal honor; but if there is anything on earth which we abhor it is the character of the young fashionable loafer, your cane-bearing, cigar-consuming professed loafer, who is neither boy nor man, but a compound of both, with very little of either."

"You have here a type of character which is produced no where else on earth, except in cities and large towns; you have young men with some of the external without any of the internal attributes of the gentleman; young men who combine the effeminate appearance of a girl with the ferocious vices of the Gladiator; young men, who to the morals of a bear, add the manners of a monkey. Aye, we honor the young man; but it is when there is something of a man in him; something more, at least, than his clothes and his hair."

In summing up our opinion in regard to this book, we may set down as noteworthy the following particulars: 1. The

conception of the book is fresh and new. Gilfillan's work, "Bards of the Bible," is not in the same line, save only as to one of its topics, and even that treated in a method entirely different. 2. The method of its treatment is original. There is no other book like it. Dr. Halsey quotes freely and always gives ample credit, but, we think, that his own words on the subjects upon which he quotes from others, are always equal, and frequently superior to the style and language of the authors quoted. 3. One or two critiques which we have seen, speak rather doubtfully of the practicableness of so treating the Bible, as well as the utility of such a book. But the success which has attended the book, and the undeniable fact that the various topics handled are clearly shown to be of practical value to us all, set aside this view. It is one of the most popular books recently issued from our prolific press. 4. This book would answer a most excellent purpose as a text book in our male and female high schools, both to teach them the art of reading elegantly, and to discipline the mind and mould the taste by its sentiments and style.

With a few remarks on the general subject of this volume, we close this article. It is coming very far short of the proper idea of our author's high purpose, if any one should suppose that he meant simply to show that the Bible possesses literary attractions. To say this, would be to place it upon the same level with a mere human production. The higher and more correct ground is, that the Bible is the great original fountain of light, intellectual, moral and spiritual.

That this is true, may be easily shown by many considerations. All authentic information in regard to the origin of the world is derived from the Bible. The bearing of this fact upon intellectual advancement is very manifest, when we remember that "history is philosophy teaching by example," and that the Bible is the original source of historical materials. When we direct our researches into the past history of any one of the nations of antiquity (save that of the Jews) by the light of the annals furnished us by their most authentic historians, we find all involved in vague, misty uncertainty and confusion;—"shadows, clouds and darkness, rest upon" their

origin. And these annalists while endeavoring to gratify national vanity, have been forced into the region of fable and conjecture. But the Bible always speaks authoritatively in regard to the origin of all things—nothing fabulous, nothing speculative, is mingled with its narrative of events. It will only be necessary to refer, in this place, to the facts which many writers have brought to view already, to add strength to this position. For instance, we have long been called on to note the admission of Porphyry, that most inveterate enemy of the Christian faith, that Moses lived 1,000 years anterior to the time of the most ancient Grecian historians. It is, therefore, a matter of no surprise, to find that these historians, in their accounts of the world, confirm and establish the statements of the Pentateuch. These are to be found, also, in the writings of Manetho, Berosus, Herodotus, the Greek, Roman and Egyptian historians, many statements (exaggerated, and variously modified it may be), in reference to the creation of the world, the fall of man, the deluge and the dispersion of men upon the face of earth, for which they are unquestionably indebted to the writings of Moses. The investigations of Biblical critics have brought to notice the additional fact, that to the Bible the ancient classic writers are indebted for the origin of numerous circumstances detailed by them, arrayed in the drapery of mythological narrative—such as the varied traditions in regard to the deluge—the flood of Deucalion, and Homer's allusion to the rainbow *as a token* fixed by Jove, for men, in the clouds—the thyrsus of Bacchus answering to the rod of Moses, and the caduceus of Mercury, doubtless derived from the same source—the fable of Agamemnon and Iphygenia founded on the story of Jephtha and his daughter—the lock of Nisus cut by Scylla, based upon the story of Sampson and Delilah. All these facts, and others that might be pointed out, prove that these elements of beauty and taste, which make up the works of ancient historians and poets—works which, by the united suffrages of ancient and modern scholars, are regarded as the most effective and successful implements of intellectual discipline—are all derived from the Bible.

And yet more. These investigations show that all modern

constitutional Governments are founded upon the code of Moses interpreted by our Saviour. If we criticise the characters of the most celebrated law givers of antiquity—Solon and Lycurgus—we shall find that the Athenian, instead of being a reformer of public manners, was but the exponent of the public sentiment, and that while the Spartan did strike an uncompromising blow at many vices, an attentive examination of his code will discover many objectionable features in his system. Furthermore, Solon's laws recognized the vassalage of the female sex, and the ostracism. The Spartan institutions encouraged female licentiousness, theft, the subduing of the feelings of humanity, cruelty to slaves. The remark has been well made, that the sole object of Lycurgus seems to have been "to make a nation of soldiers." In modern heathen lands, also, alternate despotism and anarchy, dark and cruel laws, their fearful degradation, their detestable prostitution of themselves, shameless, uninterrupted, and even licensed by the laws, teach what a nation will become without the Bible code to govern them. England, under her various transitions from Druidism, through Roman mythology and despotism, and then a barbarism of even more revolting form; and England, "with all her faults," under the benignant sway of Christianity, only establishes the fact, that the Bible alone can give to a people the blessings of civil and religious liberty. So, also, of our own laws and form of government, the Divine precepts of the Bible are the foundation. But as a source of intellectual light we may, also, present the well known fact, (so finely illustrated, as to some of the fine arts in this volume of Dr. Halsey's,) that the Bible is the exhaustless fountain of material for the noblest masters in all the arts. Hence the painter, the poet, the statuary, the orator, are all indebted to the beautifully described and glowing scenes and noble characters of Bible history, for their most exquisite specimens of excellence. An imperfect enumeration of some of the most celebrated paintings of the Italian, English, Continental and American artists, will show the value of the Bible as an instrument of intellectual light. Rubens' Death of Cain, Judgment of Solomon, and Daniel in the Lion's den; West's Belshazzar's Vision,

Christ Healing the Sick, and The Women at the Crucifixion; Raffaele's Triumph of David, and The Resurrection; Leonardo da Vinci's Last Supper; and the noblest designs of Guido, Michael Angelo, Salvator Rosa, Domenichino, Ludovico Caracci, Forbin and others, were drawn from the Bible.

Poetry, too, has found in the Bible both models for imitation and fountains of inspiration. Hence the gifted sons of song, while drinking in the rich sublimity of Bible poetry, have learned to breathe the same spirit, and

"Wak'd to ecstasy the living lyre."

It is not the measured and affected correctness of Dryden—the melancholy romance of Byron, the playful elegance of Moore, the descriptive vigor of Scott, the tenderness of Beattie, the harmony and sweetness of Cowper, the stately grandeur of Milton—nor the marvellous, nameless charms of Shakspeare, not one of these characteristics alone, nor all of them combined, that is stamped upon the poetry of the Bible, but something far above all these. It is the bold and ardent, soft and tender, nervous and sublime and heavenly style—the result alone of heaven's own inspiration.

The statuary has derived from the Bible that species of magic power which has enabled him almost to embody breathing forms of beauty and of grace.

Here, too, as we have already had occasion to notice in the volume under review, the student of eloquence may find the truest models of all that constitutes the glory of his art. We need only refer the reader to the third and fourth chapters of Dr. Halsey's book, as guides to the eloquence and oratory of the Bible.

Our second position is, that we have no *system of morals* deserving the name, save as it is founded upon, and coincident with, the Bible. Plato was prone to indulge in metaphysical vagaries, and with all his noble and excellent sentiments, his conceptions in regard to morals are more romantic and visionary than practical. Some fatal defect mars, in like manner, every other system of ethics among the ancient philosophers, and there is one thing common to all—the inade-



quacy of the motives to virtue—which shows the need of some better and nobler creed. This want is supplied in the Bible. Here we learn what no ancient system ever taught, that the highest incentive to moral action is the love of a revealed Supreme Being. Here we are furnished with collateral and powerful motives in the certainty of a future state of retribution, the resurrection of man to an immortal state of existence, and the general judgment. Here we find those original conceptions presented in Dr. H's last chapter—The Divine Existence, The Providence of God, The Personal Character of Christ, The Idea of Special Divine Influence, The Church of God, The Common Brotherhood of Man, The Day of Sacred Rest, The Millennium, The Resurrection of the Dead, The Last Judgment, The Heavenly World, The Scheme of Redemption, which, though really and truly objects of intellectual beauty, are all of them, also, centres of light radiating the glory of the moral image of God, and giving a quickening energy and a powerful impulse to all man's moral faculties. The chief elements of superiority in Bible morality, consist of its purity, extent, spirituality and perpetual obligation, and these elevate it to an immeasurable height above the most exalted systems merely human.

In estimating the value of the Bible as a source of moral light, we must consider its humanizing influence upon the nations. When we learn that Germany was once the land of barbarism and human sacrifices; that the Scythians once used the skins of their captives as clothing; that the Hungarians were in the habit of devouring the hearts of their conquered foes; that the Scandinavians once encouraged suicide, and devoted to death their wives and slaves as offerings to their gods; that the Danes, Norwegians and Russians, once practised piracy; and when we recall the former condition of the Sandwich Islands and compare it with their present state, we need only remember that they have the Bible and the religion of the Bible among them, to be able at once to decide to what cause to assign these marvellous, moral transformations. The first hospitals, for the relief of the sick and wounded in the different provinces in the Roman Empire, are said to have been

built by the Christian Emperor, Constantine, and these were greatly increased as the principles of the Gospel were disseminated.

If, however, there is one class of society more indebted than another to the humanizing influence of the Bible, it is woman. In countries destitute of the Bible, she is born to an inheritance of degradation and slavery. Alternately the toy of the leisure hours, the ministering servant to the grosser appetites, the slave of the passions, the object of the suspicion and contempt of her lord and master, man; she is, finally, when disgust has been produced by satiety, condemned to be thrown by as a useless and burdensome encumbrance. But the Bible, like a great telescope, has been turned upon the once gloomy regions of moral space, and revealed to the wondering view of mankind the planet of woman's destiny in all its mild radiance and softened glory, has defined her true orbit, and taught the diversified relations she sustains to the system of created being, and elevated her to that rank to which she is entitled. Immediately she becomes the associate of man, and he becomes aware of the necessity of bestowing upon her a corresponding mental and moral culture to fit her for being the wife of his bosom and the mother of his children. All this the Bible does for woman; and, accordingly, you have but to blot out the light of this Holy Book, and again, as in the "Reign of Terror," women become furies; or, as in the darkness of heathenism, they become slaves. You have but to kindle this light and the chains of her oppression fall from her, and she walks forth in gladness of heart and buoyancy of spirit, fulfilling the exalted destiny ordained by heaven, scattering blessings in rich profusion around her, forming the brightest ornament of civilized society—the centre jewel in its diadem of glories.

To the Bible it is to be attributed, that the Anglo-Saxon race stands first of all the nations in art, literature, science and religion. It is the Bible that has stimulated them to all the great enterprizes which have benefitted and elevated themselves, and it has been the Bible that has enlarged their hearts to communicate these blessings to others, and thus to elevate

the rest of mankind to the same point of civilization to which they have attained. We introduce one illustration just here which will be in point.

Modern pilgrims to the "Eternal City," when standing amid the magnificent relics of her ancient grandeur, are wont to dwell in rapturous admiration upon the ruins of the Coliseum. And we are free to confess, that the associations it suggests are of the kind to inspire the muse of Byron. And the pen of many a gifted son of song and genius has contributed to give to this stupendous, yet mournful pile, with its crumbling arches, its bowing walls festooned with creeping wild vines, and its fallen columns, an immortality of renown. Marvellous in its noble architecture, admirable in its proportions, astonishing in its magnificence, vast in its area, wonderful in its heights,—no wonder that the imagination is carried back to the days when this mighty amphitheatre, now silent and crumbling to decay, was occupied by its audience of one hundred thousand Romans. And yet it may be doubted whether, amid all the degrading monuments of human folly and iniquity, with which the world abounds, there can be found one which may bear comparison with the Coliseum. Let us recall the purpose of its erection. And when we remember, that this grand and costly fabric was erected for the sole purpose of fostering a cruel, barbarous and depraved appetite for scenes of butchery and blood, then the Coliseum stands shorn of its glory, stripped of half the ideal grandeur with which it was invested, and serves to teach the mournful degradation to which human nature must sink destitute of the heavenly teachings of the Bible. Come and let us stand within the Coliseum, along with Byron, and call up the vision of the dying Gladiator, his life-blood trickling from his wounded side, captured in unlawful warfare, torn from his "barbarian boys, and their Dacian mother," and his "Danube hut," and brought here, on some festal day, to fight for the amusement of a blood-thirsty and brutal populace, either with fellow unfortunates or savage beasts of prey. Perhaps, too, the very arena upon which the traveller stands, may have drunk the blood of some

Christian martyr, perishing by wild beasts, for the testimony he bore to the truth of Jesus. This view of the Coliseum is a true index of the real condition of the Roman people. The masses were utterly neglected, morally and intellectually.

“ Knowledge, to their eyes, her ample page,  
Rich with the spoils of time, did ne'er unroll.”

Hence, they were left to the unrestricted indulgence of all the darkest and most ferocious passions of the human heart. The men in power, in order to preserve their popularity and strengthen the tenure of office, availed themselves of this ignorance and brutality, and by resorting to this bloody expedient of Gladiatorial combats, endeavored to conciliate this brutal monster, the people. Infatuated, indeed, were the men who reasoned thus; for they were but hastening the downfall of the Empire, by educating those very principles and passions which constituted the elements of their destruction. The secret cause of their infatuation, as well as the brutality of the people was, that they had no Bible. The Christian nations of the earth, that really deserve the name, are not degraded by a Coliseum. The last relic of such barbarous exhibitions is to be found in Spain and her dependencies, and all countries under Papal domination; and the same reason still exists for it, viz: “The Bible—the Bible—the religion of Protestants”—is to the people a sealed volume. We may confidently indulge the hope, therefore, that if ever, in some remote age hereafter, the curious traveller shall pause to muse upon the monuments of departed glory upon our country's soil, he shall find no Coliseum in ruins to give to our native land an immortality of infamy.

And shall we labor the third point, that the Bible is the only source of spiritual light? Why, that is universally admitted by all, except infidels, and, not unfrequently, the time of their extremity wrings from even them the reluctant admission. The only point to be insisted upon in this place, is the absolute and authoritative confidence and certainty with which the Bible conveys its truths to us. The unity of God,

the immortality of the soul, the future retribution, the gracious design of God toward man, are no longer speculations of philosophy, but the verities of an undeniable faith. The influence, then, of these truths, practically, on man; the light they shed on the troubled waters of life, and the valley of the shadow of death, gilding life's joys, mitigating its sorrows, protecting us from imminent moral perils, robbing death of his sting, the grave of its victory, and opening "a vista to the skies," completes this triple crown of glory for the blessed volume of inspiration, and brings forth the topstone of its temple with shoutings of "grace, grace unto it."

In view of all this, there remains for us to manifest our love for the Bible in every possible way.

Let us cling to this Divine gift of heaven. Surrender it not. Let life go—let wealth go—suffer the loss of all things—aye! sooner let

"The bright sun be extinguished, and the stars  
Wander darkling through the eternal space  
Rayless, and pathless—and the icy earth  
Swing blind and blackening in the moonless air,

than voluntarily surrender the Bible.

Elevate the Bible on high. Let it be the Book of Books. Give it a prominent rank among the text-books of our seminaries of learning. Well may Skeptics and Papists dread the engrafting of Bible instruction upon our educational systems, for birds of night always hate the sun. But for us,—Protestant Americans,—we will give to the Bible "the wings of the morning." We will send it traversing the broad earth, and shedding in commingled abundance from its exhaustless stores, light and joy and peace and hope upon the nations of the earth. It will scatter the night of superstition, and usher in "the day-spring from on high." It will break the spell of ignorance; it will drive to their native regions of darkness all the scowling forms of despotism; "its entrance will give light," and wherever it may enter, civil liberty will erect her magnificent temple upon the spot once occupied by the de-

molished fabric of lawless power—the foot of oppression will be removed from the neck of the victim of tyranny. Man will cease his brother, man, to slay, and the dawn of millennial glory will no longer linger. We may read in “the shadows of coming events” the assured grounds of a joyful anticipation, that the march of Bible truth is irresistibly onward. The ceaseless vigilance of the friends of the Bible, led by “the hero of a hundred” theological fights, has achieved a peaceful victory over the rash and ill-considered enterprize of amending the good old Bible of our fathers, and brought the noble and beloved institution, which has done so much in the dissemination of the Word of God, back to the safe channel of the ancient version, and a deeper and more wide-spread determination has taken hold of God’s people’s hearts to put a copy of the Holy Book in every family in the land, and in the world. Church schools and Church colleges are springing up and meeting with favor every where, that the Bible may be taught to the youth of the land. This zeal of Christians has awakened the activity of the foes of the Bible; and while this proves that the cause of truth is advancing, it brings no ground of hope to them, or of fear to us. Their efforts will be futile. “The angel having the everlasting Gospel to preach, is now flying through the midst of heaven,” and the Church is in her preparation state for the blessed time, when the glad tidings of peace and salvation shall be preached “to them that dwell upon the earth, and to every nation and kindred, and tongue and people.”

“Even so, come Lord Jesus, come quickly! Amen!”

ARTICLE V.

ON THE CONVERSION OF THE WORLD.

*(Review of Dr. Cumming's Theory Continued.)*

It has been shown that the Word of God abundantly authorises the expectation of the conversion of the world. After adducing many other texts, we examined the celebrated passage in the twentieth chapter of Revelation, and found that it will admit of no reasonable interpretation which will not sustain our doctrine. We have, likewise, adverted to the following positions, contended for by Dr. Cumming, viz: That the second coming of Christ is to take place suddenly, and at a time of abounding iniquity, and that, in point of time, the resurrection of the just will precede that of the wicked—and, we think, it has been made apparent that these positions, whether tenable or not, imply nothing, in the least degree, inconsistent with what we have undertaken to prove.

Some other objections, which are urged by Dr. C., will now be noticed. He says:

“If we turn to the thirteenth chapter of Matthew, we shall find an important explanation at the twenty-first verse. The kingdom of heaven is likened unto a man sowing good seed in a field; and while he slept, the enemy went in and sowed tares; and when the seed sprang up, the tares and the wheat came up together. What did the Lord of the harvest do? Did he send men forthwith as reapers to separate them? No—he said: Let both grow together until the harvest; and then I will say to the reapers, ‘Gather first the tares, and bind them in bundles and burn them; but gather the wheat into my barn.’ It is so in the present dispensation; the good and bad grow up together, and are not separated until the end; and as the tares were gathered and burned in the fire, so shall it be at the end of this dispensation, for the Son of Man shall come, and cast out the unbelievers into a furnace of fire, ‘where shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth,’ and gather the good into heavenly habitations. The whole Christian economy is a composite one. The visible Church is not all pure wheat, but a mixture of tares and wheat, and it appears it will continue to be so till Christ himself comes at the end of this dispensation. It is quite plain there will be no such thing as a perfect visible Church till the

Lord comes. It will continue a mixture of good and bad until the end. I regard, in fact, the very existence of a visible Church very much as I do a provisional committee. We used to hear, in railway times, of provisional committees. These were simply committees appointed to act until the true or competent committee should be appointed. The whole visible Church is, at this moment, purely provisional; but when that which is perfect is come, that which is provisional shall be done away. Meantime, the Church is made up of tares and wheat, and this mixture will continue throughout this dispensation, till there arrive that perfect state after the advent, in which there will be neither flaw, nor sin, nor defect, but all God's people shall be presented a glorious Church, without spot or blemish, or any such thing. This takes place at the advent of Christ; but those who hold that the millennium must come first, must conclude that the tares will be separated from the wheat a thousand years before Christ comes. According to the text I have read, they will not be separated until Christ himself comes, and, therefore, the perfect Church is not prior, but subsequent to Christ's advent, and, therefore, Christ's advent is pre-millennial, and not post-millennial. (S. T., pp. 118-119.) The same views are more briefly expressed in L. R., pp. 445-446."

Our author seems to have paid very little attention to the Saviour's own exposition of this parable. Though our Saviour has declared, "*the field is the world,*" it is here unhesitatingly assumed to be identical with the visible Church. But were the assumption well founded, it would have no bearing on the point at issue. The conversion of the world, in the sense in which we expect it, does not imply the perfect state of the Church. Dr. C. mentions the millennium in this connexion; but where did he learn that the Church will be perfect during the millennium? The term *millennium* was suggested by Revelation 20: 1-5; but that passage contains not a word about a perfect Church.

But, admitting that the field is the world, it may, perhaps, be argued from this passage that there will be some wicked people on earth till the end of the world. We believe this to be true; but it is not inconsistent with the doctrine we are advocating. Were the wicked as few as the righteous were just before the flood, the wheat and the tares would still be growing together. We have no doubt that human beings will still be born into the world; that they will still need to be regenerated; that the Gospel will still be the ordinary instrument of regeneration; and while these things are so, there must be some



unconverted persons in the world; nor do we imagine, that to be born of the Spirit will ever be an invariable consequence of being born of the flesh.

This opinion is by no means peculiar to ourselves. It has prevailed generally, if not universally, among intelligent Christians who have held the doctrine of the conversion of the world. It is thus expressed by the justly celebrated Jonathan Edwards, in his history of redemption:

“It shall be a time of great *holiness*. Now, vital religion shall every where prevail and reign. Those times shall be an exception from what Christ says of the ordinary state of the Church, that there shall be *but few saved*; for now holiness shall become general. Isaiah 60: 21. ‘Thy people, also, shall be all righteous.’ Not that there will be none remaining in a Christless condition; but that visible wickedness shall be suppressed every where, and true holiness shall become general, though not universal.”

These views cannot be refuted by proving that the wheat and the tares will grow together till the harvest, and the harvest is the end of the world.

Let us notice another objection:

“In the second chapter of the second epistle to the Thessalonians, (says Dr. C.,) we read,—‘Let no man deceive you by any means; for that day shall not come, except there come (as I translate it) the apostasy, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped, so that he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God. For the mystery of iniquity doth already work; only he who now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way. And then shall that wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming: even him whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they have not received the love of the truth, that they might be saved.’ We are told, in this chapter, that the great apostasy commenced in the apostles’ days, and that it would continue till Christ shall come again. According to those who hold that the millennium precedes Christ’s advent, Popery is to be destroyed by the preaching of the Gospel; but, according to the Apostle Paul, Popery is to be wasted progressively by the preaching of the Gospel, but to be uprooted and destroyed finally at, and by, Christ’s advent—indicating that it will be co-existent with this dispensation. I cannot conceive any one passage of Scripture more fatal to the theory that the millennium precedes Christ’s advent,

than this prediction of the great apostasy. It begins in the days of the Apostle, and stretches forward to the millennial glory, and is to be destroyed, not by the preaching of the Gospel, but by the personal advent and glorious appearing of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." (S. T., pp. 119-121.)

Anxious to exhibit the whole force of the argument derived from this portion of Scripture, we will here present another extract:

"The next evidence of this I will give you is from 2d Thess. 2: 4, where we have the description of 'the man of sin, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God. Remember ye not, that when I was with you, I told you of these things? And now ye know what withholdeth, that he might be revealed in his time. For the mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who now letteth will let until he be taken out of the way. And then shall that wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth;'—the wasting away of Rome first—and 'destroy with the brightness of his (παρουσικ) personal appearance.' What does this prove? That the great apostasy, predicted by St. Paul, is to prevail during the whole period from Christ's first to his second advent, and that this hoary apostasy is to be consumed and utterly destroyed only by the personal advent and appearance of the Son of God. At that very period, the Apostle speaks of 'a gathering together unto Him,' which he calls by the expression, (ἐπισυναγωγή,) 'a collection together unto' Christ of the risen saints, when he comes to consume and destroy the great Papal apostasy by the brightness of his coming." (L. R., p. 446.)

It will be perceived that the passage of Scripture now in question can afford no objection against our doctrine, unless it relates to the coming of Christ at the end of the world. Accordingly, Dr. C. insists that this is the true reference; and, if we understand him correctly, he bases his conclusion on the following grounds:

1. The meaning of the word translated, *coming*. It will be observed that he quotes the original, and changes the translation of this word.

2. The occurrence of the same word in the first verse of the chapter, in connection with the phrase, "*our gathering together unto him.*"

3. The juxtaposition of the two phrases, "*consume with the*

*spirit of his mouth, and destroy by the brightness of his coming;*" implying, as our author thinks, that "Popery is to be wasted progressively by the preaching of the Gospel, but to be uprooted and destroyed finally at, and by, Christ's advent."

These are all the suggestions Dr. C. has made, and; we think, they are all that can be made with any plausibility, in support of his interpretation. Let us examine them.

1. Does the word translated *coming*, in 2d Thess. 2: 8, necessarily mean a visible and bodily approach? Certainly not. The idea of an approach is not included at all in its primary signification. Its primary meaning is *presence*; and so it is translated in the following passages: 2d Cor. 10: 10—"His letters, say they, are weighty and powerful, but his bodily *presence* is weak, and his speech contemptible." Phil. 2: 12—"As ye have always obeyed, not as in my *presence* only, but now much more in my absence." It would well admit of the same translation here: "Whom the Lord shall destroy by the brightness of his presence,"—that is, "by the glorious manifestation of his presence."

But we are quite satisfied with the translation as it stands. When the coming of Christ is mentioned in Scripture, the connexion must decide whether his coming to judge the world at the last day is meant; and the mere fact that the reference is not to his coming to purchase redemption for us, will not decide this point. According to the style of the Old Testament, any remarkable interposition of God may be described as His coming, or coming down. Thus, Gen. 11: 5,—“The Lord came down to see the city and the tower, which the children of men built.” Isaiah 19: 1—“Behold, the Lord rideth on a swift cloud, and shall come into Egypt; and the idols of Egypt shall be moved at his presence, and the heart of Egypt shall melt in the midst of it.” Isaiah 64: 3—“When thou didst terrible things which we looked not for, thou camest down, the mountains flowed down at thy presence.” In the New Testament, the exalted Mediator is spoken of in the same manner; any signal manifestation of his power is described as his coming; and, on a principle hereafter to be explained, the

figurative language sometimes employed, conveys a manifest allusion to his coming at the last day. In reference to the overthrow of the Jewish nation, we read, *Matt. 16: 28*,—“Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom.” This passage bears far more of the appearance of relating to the day of judgment, than the one we are now considering; but all who stood there have long ago tasted of death, and the day of judgment is still future. To the destruction of a particular Church—to the angel of the Church in Pergamos, the Redeemer said,—“Repent; or else I will come unto thee quickly, and will fight against thee with the sword of my mouth. (*Rev. 2: 16.*) To the communication of spiritual consolations and blessings, *John 14: 23*,—“If a man love me, he will keep my words, and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him.” To the death of the body, *Luke 12: 40*,—“Be ye therefore ready, also; for the Son of Man cometh at an hour when ye think not.”

Dr. C. thinks it improper to speak of Christ as coming at death. (See *S. T.*, page 128.) Of course he refers this, and similar passages, to His coming at the end of the world. If this view be correct, our Saviour was accustomed, during his personal ministry, to warn his hearers that, for aught they knew, the final judgment might commence at any moment; and yet, many years after, Paul conjured his brethren, by their hope of eternal salvation, not to imagine for a moment that the day of the Lord was at hand; since certain events, which would occupy a considerable length of time, must first take place. (See *2d Thess. 2: 1, 2.*) If, then, Paul does not contradict his Lord, our author's interpretation is evidently erroneous.

Other passages of Scripture, confirmatory of our general position, might easily be cited; but it is unnecessary. Those already adduced are sufficient to prove that, according to the style of the New Testament, any signal interposition of the Redeemer may be described as His coming. Hence, when we read of the man of sin, “whom the Lord shall destroy by the brightness of his coming,”—all we can infer is, that his de-

struction will be a glorious work of Christ. Indeed, the word *coming* is used in this sense in the very next sentence, where Paul describes the man of sin, as "him whose *coming* is after the working of Satan. Here the word *coming* evidently means, simply, *the exercise of his power*. Why should not the same word be understood in the same sense, when, in the sentence immediately preceding, we read of the coming of the Lord?

2. As to the second allegation: It is readily admitted that "*the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ*, mentioned in the first verse, is his coming to judge the world. But how does it follow that the coming mentioned in the eighth verse is the same? If this can be proved at all, it must be either from the identity of the word, or from the connexion of the two sentences. It cannot be proved from the identity of the word; for we have already seen that there are several events, each of which is sometimes described as the coming of the Lord. And now, as to the connexion: In the first verse of this chapter—2d Thess. 2:—Paul earnestly exhorts his brethren to be on their guard against every influence which might betray them into a certain error. To enforce the exhortation, he appeals to their expectation of the coming of their Lord to judge the world, and to their hope of eternal salvation. From this appeal nothing more can be inferred than that the subject is one of very great importance, and the error in question one of dangerous tendency. Having specified the error, he proceeds to argue against it; and, in the course of his argument, he happens to use the same word—*coming*—which had previously occurred, at the distance of eight verses, in his preliminary exhortation. In these circumstances, the recurrence of the word has no more tendency to prove that it must be used in the same sense, than its occurrence in different epistles.

3. Let us notice the only remaining allegation of our author. The Apostle speaks of "the man of sin," "whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and destroy by the brightness of his coming;" and Dr. C. maintains that the former expression denotes a progressive wasting away under the preaching of the Gospel, and the latter a sudden destruc-

tion by the coming of the Lord; and, therefore, his coming at the end of the world must be meant.

Our reply to this argument is, that the premises are extremely uncertain *at best*; and that, even if admitted, they will not warrant the conclusion.

The premises are uncertain. An attentive and unprejudiced reader of the passage in question would probably suppose that the two phrases, "*consume with the spirit of his mouth, and destroy by the brightness of his coming,*" describe the same work, and express the same general meaning, the idea being repeated for the sake of emphasis. Certainly the terms used by the Apostle do not necessarily imply the distinction asserted by our author. "*The spirit of His mouth,*" we are told, means the preaching of the Gospel. In Psalm 33: 6, we read, "By the word of the Lord were the heavens made; and all the host of them *by the breath of his mouth.*" The Hebrew phrase translated, "*by the breath of his mouth,*" when literally translated into Greek—as it is by the LXX—gives the very words here used by the Apostle, and rendered, "*by the spirit of his mouth.*" The Psalmist, we imagine, did not mean to affirm that the host of heaven were created by the preaching of the Gospel.

We next inquire whether the terms translated *consume* and *destroy*, are contrasted with one another in the manner demanded by Dr. C.'s interpretation. The question, let it be observed, is not, whether they admit of being applied, the one to a case of gradual decay, and the other to a case of sudden destruction; but whether they are distinguished from one another by expressing these ideas respectively. They certainly are not. The word which, according to our author, signifies a progressive wasting away, is translated *consume* in the following passage. Luke 9: 54—"Lord, wilt thou that we command fire to come down from heaven and *consume* them, even as Elias did?" Here the idea is unquestionably that of sudden destruction. The word to which he attaches the idea of sudden destruction is translated *cumbereth*, in Luke 13: 7, "Cut it down," (the barren fig tree,) "why *cumbereth* it the ground?" It is manifest, then, that these terms cannot be contrasted in

the manner he supposes. Or, should this point be regarded by any as doubtful, it will be admitted that, as we have stated, his premises are extremely uncertain *at best*.

But we proceed to show that, if his premises be admitted, his conclusion will not follow. On this hypothesis, the passage before us teaches that the man of sin is first to be progressively wasted away by the preaching of the Gospel, and afterwards suddenly destroyed by what the Apostle here describes as *the coming of the Lord*. How does it follow that the coming meant is his visible advent at the end of the world? We have seen that any signal interposition of the exalted Saviour may be described in this manner; and there is nothing in the connexion to require the idea contended for by Dr. C. Surely it is not established by the mere fact, that the *coming* in question is to take place after the man of sin has been progressively wasted by the preaching of the Gospel. Suppose the Lord will first cause the man of sin to decline gradually through the preaching of the Gospel, and afterwards destroy him suddenly by some other glorious manifestation of His power—it is no necessary inference that this latter work is not to be performed till the close of this dispensation. But if this does not follow, our author's argument is powerless.

Of all the objections urged by Dr. Cumming against the doctrine of the conversion of the world, the one founded on this passage is the only one in which we have been able to detect the least plausibility. For this reason we have dwelt on it at considerable length. No doubt the passage, if taken alone, will *admit* of an interpretation which is inconsistent with our doctrine; but we have seen that it by no means *requires* such an interpretation. Of course, then, it can have no weight against those clear and numerous testimonies of Scripture by which the doctrine is established.

Our author next proceeds to remark:

“In another passage, in the first chapter of Acts, we read, that when the disciples were gathered together, they asked the Lord, saying—‘Lord, wilt thou, at this time, restore again the kingdom to Israel?’ Every Jew looked then for a temporal Messiah, and every Jew still expects Messiah to come in temporal glory. But what answer did our

Lord make to the inquiry? Not your expectation is wrong; but 'It is not for you to know the times or the seasons, which the Father hath put in his own power.' I believe so far with the Jew, that Christ will come in his everlasting glory. The Jew, however, has passed over the first advent, and sees the promise of the second only. When the apostles said—'Wilt thou, at this time, restore the kingdom to Israel?' Our Lord did not answer, that they must not look for such a thing. He said—'It is not for you to know the times or the seasons, which the Father hath put in his own power,'—intimating that God would restore the kingdom to Israel, and that the only point then hid from them, was the time and the season that he would select; and the two men in white apparel, that spake to them from heaven, said,—'Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come, in like manner, as ye have seen him go into heaven,'—and surely this must be his personal advent. They saw him ascend from amongst them, and a cloud receive him into glory; and we shall see him again return in a cloud, and descend upon earth in the same cloud, surrounded by the same glory." (S. T., pp. 121-122.)

We know not why our author has thrown these two passages together, unless it be for the purpose of intimating that they relate, prophetically, to the same period. But if this is his meaning, the assumption is wholly gratuitous. In the former, we have a conversation which took place between our Saviour and his apostles; the latter is the record of a communication made to the apostles by "two men in white apparel," at the time of their Lord's ascension, and contains no allusion whatever to the conversation previously recorded. The two passages relate, moreover, to subjects entirely distinct. The subject of the one is the restoration of the kingdom to Israel; of the other, the future advent of the Lord Jesus. We repeat, then, the assumption, that these passages relate to the same period, is utterly unfounded. But even were it an unquestionable truth, and were it further evident that the former contains a promise from the Redeemer for the restoration of the kingdom to Israel, how would all this affect the question under discussion? The argument would stand thus: At the time of Christ's second advent, the kingdom is to be restored to Israel; therefore, the world is never to be converted. How does this conclusion follow from the premises?

But we do not admit any such connexion between these



passages as Dr. C. seems to assume. Let us, then, look at them separately. If our author is right in concluding from the former, that our Saviour's answer to the apostles sanctioned the expectation by which their question was suggested, then the Jews are yet to be restored to political independence and power. On this point we have no occasion to express any opinion at present. Let it be admitted. How does it follow that the world is never to be converted? Dr. C. is certainly right in referring the second of these passages to the future literal and visible advent of the Lord Jesus. Such an advent we expect as confidently as himself; but surely it does not follow that the world is not first to be converted.

It is next stated, that,

“In the nineteenth chapter of Matthew, the promise made specially to the apostles indicates the same truth, where our Lord says—‘Verily I say unto you, that ye which have followed me, when the Son of Man shall sit in the throne of his glory, in the regeneration, ye also’ (that is, ye who have followed me now,) shall sit upon thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.’ The Greek here is *ἐν τῇ παλιγγενεσίᾳ*, or the age thus delineated. ‘And I heard a great voice out of heaven, saying, Behold the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God, and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain; for the former things are passed away.’ Now this promise made to the apostles, of sitting upon thrones in the regeneration or restoration of all things, is evidently connected with the fulfilment of the promise in the twenty-first chapter of Revelation, where Christ is described as descending from heaven to his redeemed and ransomed people. In Daniel it is thus described—‘I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like the Son of Man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of Days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given unto him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations and languages, should serve him.’” (S. T., pp. 122–123.)

We are utterly at a loss to discover in any one of these passages, or in all of them taken together, the least tendency to disprove the doctrine for which we are pleading. Dr. Cumming's comments leave this point wholly untouched. Whatever may be the dignity to which the apostles are to be advanced, we know not how it follows that the world is never to be con-

verted. According to Dr. Cumming, their advancement is connected, in point of time, with the passage which he has quoted from the twenty-first chapter of the Revelation, and the passage in Daniel relates to the same period. If this is correct, no one of these passages can have any possible bearing on the subject now under discussion. For the mere reading of the twentieth and twenty-first chapters of the Revelation will make it evident that the reign of the martyrs, or the general prevalence of piety among mortal men, foretold in the former chapter, is to pass away, before the introduction of the state of things described in the passage quoted by our author from the latter. It is plain, then, that unless Dr. O. has misinterpreted these texts, they prove nothing against our doctrine; and this being evident, we have no occasion to express any opinion as to the merits of his interpretation. He adds:

“The second coming of Christ is also referred to in such texts as these—‘Behold, he cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see him.’ He shall come ‘as the *lightning* shineth from the east to the west.’ According to the theory that the millennium precedes Christ’s advent, it ought to be, ‘as the *light* shineth from the east to the west;’ but it is not the growing light, but ‘the *lightning* flash,’—instant—unexpected. So shall it be with the coming of the Son of Man. In the prophet Zechariah, sixth chapter, we read—‘Behold the man whose name is THE BRANCH; and he shall grow up out of his place, and he shall build the temple of the Lord: even he shall build the temple of the Lord, and he shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule upon his throne; and he shall be a priest upon his throne; and the counsel of peace shall be upon them both.’ And again, in the fourteenth chapter of Zechariah, at the ninth verse—‘And the Lord shall be King over all the earth: in that day there shall be one Lord, and his name one.’ So, also,—‘The Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord.’ But some say, these predictions of the advent of Christ may be legitimately construed as purely spiritual. I would ask of those who think so—Is there a promise in the whole Bible that Christ will come personally? If you insist upon these prophecies being figurative only, or spiritual, and not literal, then there is not a text in the whole Word of God that will satisfy you that Christ will personally come at all. Consequently, the texts I have read do not denote a spiritual, but a personal advent.” (S. T., pp. 123–124.)

The objection drawn from the suddenness of our Saviour's second advent was considered in a former article. Apart from this, we can find nothing in all or any of these texts which presents the least appearance of inconsistency with the doctrine that the world is to be converted. Surely Dr. C. does not charge the advocates of this doctrine with denying that the Lord Jesus will come, literally and in glory, to judge the world. Some of these texts unquestionably relate to that event; some of them—the two quoted from Zechariah, for example,—we think, do not. But suppose them all to relate to it, they furnish no plausible objection to the doctrine for which we plead; for the subject is entirely distinct.

All Dr. Cumming's objections, we believe, have now been examined; and, we think, it has been made apparent that none of them are entitled to the least weight; the evidence that the world is to be converted, remains unimpaired; our author has adduced nothing which has the least legitimate tendency to create a doubt. But there is another view of his theory, which ought not to be passed over in silence.

It is evident that the Scriptures afford us as much reason to expect the conversion of the world, as to expect that a better state of things than now exists will ever take place among mortal men. Hence Dr. Cumming is compelled to refer every text which predicts a better state of things, to what is to take place among the saints after their resurrection. A full exposure of the absurdities into which he has thus been betrayed would be, in some respects, the best possible refutation of his theory. For example: Those who have read the former part of this review, cannot have forgotten the terrible assault which, according to him, the saints are to suffer long after their resurrection. This monstrous absurdity resulted naturally, perhaps necessarily, from an attempt to reconcile the twentieth chapter of Revelation with his general system. A few more examples shall now be exhibited:

“At that day, the promises of the new heaven and the new earth, as these are enunciated in the Epistle of Peter, shall all be realized. ‘The day of the Lord will come,’ he says, ‘as a thief in the night, in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the ele-

ments shall melt with fervent heat; the earth, also, and the works that are therein shall be burned up. Seeing, then, that all these things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness; looking for, and hasting to, the coming of the day of God, wherein the heavens, being on fire, shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat? Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth.' What promise is this? That promise which Peter recognised, which is still unspent, but which Peter believed to be reserved for the future, is contained in the sixty-fifth chapter of Isaiah, at the seventeenth verse, where we have the promise given in full, graphic, eloquent and expressive terms: 'For, behold, I create new heavens and a new earth, and the former shall not be remembered, nor come into mind. But be ye glad and rejoice forever in that which I create; for, behold, I create Jerusalem"—in the new heaven and new earth—a rejoicing, and her people a joy. And I will rejoice in Jerusalem, and joy in my people; and the voice of weeping shall be no more heard in her, nor the voice of crying. There shall be no more thence an infant of days, nor an old man that hath not filled his days; for the child shall die an hundred years old; but the sinner, being an hundred years old, shall be accursed.' Whether that relates to the millennial state, prior to this continuity of it, which is to last for ever, it is difficult to say; or whether it is to be translated figuratively, meaning that, in this future state, there shall be no death at all. Some have supposed that, in the millennium state, the first thousand years of it, there will be deaths. I cannot see how this is possible among the people of God; they are in their resurrection bodies. If death takes place, it must be among those who are spoken of as at the four corners of the globe, unconverted and unsanctified, called Gog and Magog, who rise up at the end, in rebellion against the saints and the people of the Most High. But I incline to take the language as figurative in this part: "They shall build houses and inhabit them; and they shall plant vineyards, and eat the fruit of them. They shall not build, and another inhabit; they shall not plant and another eat.' It is said in the twenty-fourth verse—'Before they call, I will answer; and while they are yet speaking I will hear. The wolf and the lamb shall dwell together, and the lion shall eat straw like the bullock, and dust shall be the serpent's meat. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain, saith the Lord.' Nobody can assert that this has been fulfilled. No era that has occurred from the day when Isaiah uttered this—that is, 700 years before the death of Christ to the present moment—can be said with any propriety to have been even an approximation to this glowing prophecy—no such era has ever yet taken place; and we are sure it had not taken place before Peter's days, for he says—'We, according to his promise,—the promise we have just seen—'look for a new heaven and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness. That promise, therefore, relates to a future, in which everything shall be actually fulfilled. That there are difficulties connected with every view of unfulfilled prophecy

it is perfectly reasonable to suppose; so there are in every other interpretation. The question is, in which view is the greatest amount of difficulty? On the side of those who believe the millennium is to be a mere improvement and expansion of the existing age, to be followed by the last judgment, it does look as if the difficulties were insurmountable; on the side of those who believe that the advent of Christ is to be pre-millennial, there are difficulties, no doubt, but these are few in comparison with those that cling to the other view." (S. T., pp. 249-252.)

At this stage of the discussion, the reader is requested to examine attentively the whole of the passage of Scripture in question—Isaiah 65: 17-25. A mind not pre-occupied with a favorite theory, would at once conclude that there is here some reference, at least, to a state of things which is to take place among mortal men, and, of course, before the second coming of Christ. Among the particulars included in the description are the following: The continuation of the species by natural generation—"They are the blessed of the Lord, *and their offspring with them.*—Secular occupations, such as building and planting. "*They shall build houses, and inhabit them; and they shall plant vineyards, and eat the fruit of them.*"—The mixture of the wicked with the righteous.—Temporal death. *The child shall die an hundred years old; but the sinners, being an hundred years old, shall be accursed.* But Dr. Cumming adopts a different view; his system makes it indispensable. His first remark, after quoting the former part of the passage, is very extraordinary. We allude to the sentence beginning with the words—"Whether that relates to the millennial state, prior to this continuity of it, which is to last forever," &c. He believes, it will be remembered, that there will be no millennium prior to the resurrection of the just. Here, then, he assumes that glorified saints are to experience two millennial states, of which the first is to come to an end, but the second "is to last forever." He does, indeed, admit a difficulty in applying the distinction to this particular passage of Scripture; but the distinction itself he assumes without either explanation, argument, or apparent hesitation—just as if it were universally recognised as an article of the Christian faith. For ourselves, we confess that we have no conception of an eternal

millennium, and can attach no idea to the term *millennium*, when thus qualified. Since, however, Dr. C. will have two millenniums, perhaps it would be well for him to change the time of the first, placing it *before* the resurrection of the just. This, we think, would set him right on the subject now under discussion.

On the grounds of this distinction, he represents it as difficult to say, whether the passage quoted from Isaiah relates to the first millennium or the second. This point, indeed, he leaves undecided; but maintains that, on the latter supposition, the words—“*The child shall die an hundred years old,*” mean “that in this future state there shall be no death at all.” At any rate, he is fully committed to the idea, that this is an admissible interpretation.

Paul, in one place, uses the expression: *That sin, by the commandment, might become exceeding sinful*; on which some one remarks—“When we speak of a treacherous person, we call him Judas; and when we speak of Judas, we call him a devil; but we must stop here, because there is no worse character with whom the devil can be compared. Even so, Paul could think of no worse thing with which to compare sin; and, therefore, contented himself with pronouncing it *exceeding sinful*. This interpretation involves us in a like difficulty. We know of no grosser absurdity, and, therefore, can only say that it is *exceedingly absurd*. It would be useless to attempt a formal refutation, because no consequence which might be conceived to flow from it, would be more shocking to common sense than the original proposition. To say that one shall die an hundred years old, it seems, may mean that he shall never die at all. That is, a hundred years may mean *eternity*; and when God told Abraham that his seed should be in bondage four hundred years, the patriarch might reasonably have concluded that they were to remain in bondage *four eternities*. On this principle, a man might assert the eternity of God, and the immortality of the soul, by saying,—“*God lives a hundred years, and the soul will live a hundred years.*”

It will not be well for Dr. Cumming to communicate his discovery to the Universalists. They may make a very bad use of

it. If to say that a thing shall take place at the end of a hundred years, may mean that it shall never take place at all; then, the declaration that a thing shall never take place at all, may mean that it shall take place at the end of a hundred years—"he that believeth not, shall not see life," may mean, he shall see it at the close of a hundred years. At this rate, it is evidently impossible to *assert*, (to say nothing of proving,) the eternity of future punishment, or, indeed, the eternity of anything else.

But Dr. Cumming thinks that, if this sentence is a prediction of temporal death, it must be confined to the wicked exclusively. This is an indispensable requirement of his general system, as it is certain the righteous will not be liable to death after their resurrection. But this is manifestly erroneous. The distinction is clearly marked between the wicked and others who are to die. "The child shall die an hundred years old; but the sinner, being an hundred years old, shall be accursed." It is as plain as language can make it, that the sinner, who shall be accursed, is here distinguished from others who shall die. The same thing is evident from the twenty-second verse—"For as the days of a tree are the days of my people, and mine elect shall long enjoy the work of their hands. Here is a promise of a long life, but still a life that shall come to an end. The days of a tree are not endless; nor can the phrase, "*as the days of a tree,*" mean eternity. Moreover, the reference cannot be to the wicked, as distinguished from the righteous, especially after the resurrection of the latter; for God describes the people meant, as "*my people,*" and "*mine elect.*"

It will be observed that, according to one of the interpretations between which Dr. C. declines making a choice, the saints, after their resurrection, are to be fellow-inhabitants of the globe with sinners, still unsanctified and in their mortal state—the Gog and Magog, who are to make the attack foretold in the twentieth chapter of the Revelation. But in his lectures on the Revelation, (as quoted in the former part of this review,) he has told us that this attack is to be made by the wicked, "*raised at the close of the millennium.*" We presume he does not think that the wicked, after their resur-

rection, will be liable to temporal death—at least, he would not apply to them, in connexion with that period, the prediction—*The child shall die an hundred years old.*

Nor would a retraction of the opinion just alluded to suffice to reconcile him with himself. He has repeatedly stated that, during the millennium, there will be neither sin nor sinners on earth. The following is a specimen:

“After this resurrection”—of the just—“has taken place, the millennium will begin; for a thousand years Satan will be chained, all the powers—the Satanic powers—that have tempted mankind, will be repressed during the lapse of a thousand years, and the earth shall be the holy platform, the consecrated temple—the altar ground on which the congregated saints in their resurrection bodies, free from all sin, shall worship and adore the Lord. Every flower that decks the earth shall reflect the splendor and send up, as incense, the fragrance of the Sun of Righteousness; every sound in creation—the chime of waves, the breath of winds, the hum of bees, the song of birds, the lowing of cattle—shall lose the minor sound that now runs through them all, and, with Christ for their key-note, shall be woven into the harmony of a happy universe; every mind shall be light, every heart love, and every tongue shall be praise.” (L. R., p. 457.)

And yet, in connexion with the same period, he tells us of “those who are spoken of at the four corners of the globe, unconverted and unsanctified.”

But the author not only contradicts himself; he contradicts the Bible. He gives it as at least a probable supposition, that the righteous and the wicked are to inhabit the globe together, after the resurrection of the former. Compare this with the declaration of the Son of God—“As, therefore, the tares are gathered and burned in the fire; so shall it be in the end of this world. The Son of Man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity; and shall cast them into a furnace of fire; there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth. Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun, in the kingdom of their Father.” (Matt. 13: 40–42.)

It will be observed that Dr. Cumming assumes that the exclusive reference of the passage quoted from Isaiah, is to a state of things subsequent to the resurrection of the just. In order to sustain this assumption, he is under the necessity of resort-



ing to two theories, and maintaining that both of them are admissible, and one or the other of them must be true—the one is, that the declaration, “*the child shall die an hundred years old,*” means, “there shall be no death at all;” the other, that the righteous and the wicked will inhabit the globe together after the resurrection of the former, the righteous being in their immortal, and the wicked in their mortal state. The former of these theories is simply absurd; the latter, as we have seen, is contradicted by Dr. Cumming, and contradicted by the Saviour.

But it will be said, Peter alludes to this passage when he says—“We, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness.” Does not this prove that the passage can have no reference to what is to take place among mortal men? We answer, by no means. In prophecy, two subjects are often blended on account of their analogy—in other words, expressions are applied, in a lower sense, to one person or event, which can find their full accomplishment only in some other person or event; and every such prediction is to be fulfilled in both its lower and its higher sense. For example: In 2d Samuel 7: 12–14, God says to David—“And when thy days be fulfilled, and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, I will set up thy seed after thee which shall proceed out of thy bowels, and I will establish his kingdom for ever. I will be his father, and he shall be my son. If he commit iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men, and with the stripes of the children of men.” Unquestionably the primary reference of this passage is to Solomon; and it contains expressions which, we presume, no Christian will think of applying to the Redeemer. But here we find the words—“*I will be his father, and he shall be my son;*” and in Hebrews 1: 5, these are quoted, and applied to Christ, in proof of his immeasurable superiority over the angels. In a lower sense, then, they are applied to Solomon, as a type of Christ; in the fulness of their meaning, they apply to Christ alone. We apply the same principle to the passage before us. The promise of “new heavens and a new earth,” can find its full accomplishment only in the heavenly state; and, in this sense,

it is alluded to by Peter; but Isaiah applies the expression, figuratively, and on grounds of analogy, to a state of things which is to take place among mortal men. This is the principle to which we have already alluded, as applicable to some texts in which the coming of the Lord is mentioned.

We will trouble our readers with but one extract more:

“When that day comes, every service shall, also, be ‘Holiness to the Lord.’ Man’s labor shall be like Adam’s in Paradise, refreshment and joy—our life shall be a ceaseless liturgy—our labor shall be a holy offering—our conversation instinct with the purest and the noblest thoughts—the present shall be all peace, the future shall be bright as hope, the review of the past shall only give us thankfulness, and the anticipation of the future shall only give us joy. In that day, when all things are re-instated and restored—in the millennium era—there may be all that we now have, but disinfected, purified, ennobled, invested with a grandeur and a magnificence of which we have no conception now. The sower may still sow, but in sure hope. The reaper may still reap, but in ecstasy and joy. We must not etherealize the future; we are to have bodies, though resurrection bodies; we are to live upon this orb, though a re-baptized and regenerated orb; we shall be men as we are now; and much, perhaps, that science discloses, that genius strikes out, that we regard as our privileges, our blessings, the elements of our greatness, may, being purified and consecrated, and having stamped upon them, ‘Holiness to the Lord,’ continue in the beautiful age that is to come; that day when the Lord shall reign on Mount Zion, and shine before his ancients gloriously.”

“In that day every house and dwelling shall no more be common and profane, but ‘Holiness to the Lord.’ The head of the house shall be the high priest, to offer up the prayers and the praises of the group that is around him. Wherever smoke ascends, or a heart beats, or a family congregates, shall be ‘Holiness to the Lord.’ Daily bread shall be eaten like sacramental bread; the table of God’s providence shall be as holy as the table of the Lord; the church shall be in the house, and the house shall be in the church; and the humblest furniture within shall be holy as the ark, beautiful as the cherubim and the glory that was between; for on the very ‘bells of the horses,’ and the humblest furniture of the humblest household, shall be inscribed what shall be struck into its very nature—‘Holiness to the Lord.’” (S. T., pp. 231-233.)

All this is eloquent and beautiful; and, a few particulars excepted, it accords well with our conceptions of a converted world. But our author refers the whole to a period subsequent to the resurrection of the just; he gives it as a description of the state of glorified saints. On what authority, then, does he

connect families and heads of families with that state? Families and heads of families pre-suppose marriage; and *in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage.*" It seems, too, that glorified saints will have need for sowing, reaping, horses, bells, household furniture, &c., &c. We will not argue this point. Sober-minded Christians will think it quite enough, that the system leads to such a conclusion. They know that the Bible is not intended to make known the particular circumstances of the future state, and that its teachings imply that those circumstances differ widely from all that we have as yet experienced, and, from all of which, at present, we can form a distinct conception.

Dr. Cumming, we have seen, has labored very hard to explain the Bible in such a manner that it shall not predict the conversion of the world; and, for this purpose, he has found it indispensable to adopt the following opinions:

1. When it is said, in Scripture, *the child shall die an hundred years old*, the language may, by an admissible interpretation, be understood to mean that there shall be no death at all.

2. The saints, after their resurrection, may be inhabitants of the same world with unsanctified and unconverted sinners, still in their mortal state; and they will actually be so, unless what has just been mentioned as an admissible interpretation be, in fact, a true interpretation.

3. Glorified saints will still have need for those secular employments—agriculture, for example,—which are necessary to our subsistence in the present state.

4. There will be among them families and heads of families.

5. Long after their resurrection, they are to be assailed by innumerable enemies, brought into circumstances of extreme peril, and preserved from destruction by nothing short of the miraculous interposition of God.

Were these the mere fancies of a visionary, we should have passed them over in silence. We regard them in a very different light. They are legitimate results of the diligent study of the Bible by one whose prejudices will not permit him to find any promise of the conversion of the world in the Bible. Dr. Cumming has attained, as he richly deserves, a place

among the first religious writers of the age. His reputation warrants a presumption, that he has done justice to the cause he has attempted to defend. We think he has. In discussing other subjects, he has been led to notice texts which, taken in their obvious import, teach that, before the consummation of all things, the moral state of the world is to become better than it now is. To these texts his general theory required him to assign some other meaning; and thus he has been betrayed into most of the extravagances to which we have adverted. He has interpreted Scripture absurdly; but it was because he has adopted an unscriptural theory.

This discussion has grown to a length which we did not anticipate; and yet we are far from having said all that we originally intended to say. We should like to point out the practical tendencies of the doctrine, that the world is to be converted. We should like, too, to show how it serves to illustrate some other precious doctrines of the Gospel. Perhaps we may find some future opportunity for the discussion of these topics. For the present, we will not trespass further on the patience of our readers.

---

ARTICLE VI.

**CHRISTIANITY—A DISCIPLINARY ELEMENT IN AN  
EDUCATION.**

It is a very prevalent, but very erroneous impression, that religion is valuable only as a preparation for another world. Some, however, admit that it has an indirect bearing upon what may strictly be termed our *temporal* interests, in that it restrains vice and strengthens patience. But valuable as Bible religion is in these respects, yet there is still another, superior to the last, and inferior only to the first, that is not yet sufficiently appreciated—we refer to *Christianity as a disciplin-*

ary element in an education—which it shall be our humble effort, in some degree, to set forth and illustrate in the present article.

The human mind is composed of—or rather is, characterized by a certain number of capacities called faculties—such as memory, reason, judgment, imagination, taste, &c. No education is perfect in which *all* these faculties are not equally and proportionately developed. If, for example, the memory be developed to the neglect of reason and judgment—as is done to a lamentable degree by the wide-spread use of a certain class of “labor-saving” school books, in which science is reduced to a catechism, so that the only essential qualification of a teacher is to be able to read in order to ask the questions, and the only required proficiency of the scholar is to have memorized the answers!—there is a want of mental harmony—there is something like intellectual distortion. Or, if imagination be unduly indulged without a corresponding cultivation of taste—as is done by indiscriminate novel-readers, and devourers of silly fiction—its creations will become grotesque and morbid, and its influence, which is powerful upon mental action, will be obstructive. Hence a perfect education requires all the mental faculties to be equally and proportionately developed in order to mental symmetry.

Some branches of human knowledge are calculated to cultivate one class of faculties, some another. The pure Mathematics, for example, cultivate the powers of attention and mental concentration—Metaphysics, the reasoning faculties—Languages and History, the memory—and the Belles Lettres, the taste, or æsthetic faculties. But something is still wanting—the noblest constituents of the soul are yet dormant. Man’s moral faculties and genuine affections remain undrawn out; and will so remain till religion—and by religion we mean Christianity, the religion of the Bible—becomes the magnet that will draw out and cultivate these noblest ingredients of our moral and intellectual being—we say *noblest*, from the fact, that they elevate our thoughts from earth to heaven, and become the ties and tendrils that attach our souls to the throne of God, and assert our kindredship to Divinity!

We have, 'tis true, what are strictly earthly affections, which are drawn out and cultivated by the earthly circumstances in the midst of which we are placed—such, for example, as paternal and filial affection, conjugal love, pity, sympathy, and such like, which many mistake for piety. These, however, are earthly affections, developed by earthly things, and designed for our earthly existence, and may belong to the brute heart, for ought we know, as well as to man. They are not, therefore, the distinguishing and ennobling lineaments of soul, that elevate the mind of man infinitely above mere earthly things—these, as already intimated, can be drawn out and properly cultivated only by religion. It follows, therefore, that no education is perfect in which the religious constituents of our nature have not been developed *pari passu*, with the other faculties of the mind—and that no system of mental training is complete that does not embody Christianity as a *disciplinary* element.

1. This it becomes, in the first place, by its influence in training the mind to that most difficult, and yet most essential of all mental accomplishments—*abstract* thought and reasoning. This is the first step towards that species of mental action that distinguishes the cultivated from the uncultivated classes. So far as the mere exercise of the *senses* is concerned, all stand on the same level, and, indeed, not much above the brute beast—because all can see and hear, and taste and smell, and feel—and, in this respect, there is not much difference between the high and the low, the rich and the poor, the bond and the free, except that some may survey wider fields than others, and therefore may possess a larger stock of ideas derived from sensible objects. It is the power of *abstract* thought that makes the great difference. This is difficult to attain—it is hard to wean the mind from its first sources of nutriment—sensible things. Religion, however, is admirably calculated, and tends to effect this object. All its truths are invisible to, and unperceived by, the bodily senses, if we may so express it. God is invisible, the soul is invisible, the spiritual world is invisible, moral qualities are invisible, even heaven must be realized to the mind by the power of abstraction. The

first thing, therefore, a child thinks of, independent of the aid of the senses, is God, heaven, and the spiritual world; hence the great value of religious ideas in an education, in order to discipline the mind to that most indispensable of all mental attainments—the power of abstract thought and reasoning.

2. In the next place, the religion of the Bible is eminently disciplinary, in that its truths transcend the grasp of human minds,—and, we might add, of angelic minds, also,—fully to comprehend them. They constantly stimulate the mind to renewed exertion, whereby it constantly gains new strength and additional power! We are told in ancient story of Milo, the celebrated athlete of Crotona, in Italy, who could carry an ox on his shoulders, and kill him with a single blow of his fist; that he gained his prodigious strength by constantly increasing, in a small degree, the weight of each succeeding burden that he bore. That, in the case of the ox, he began by lifting the calf when it was but a day old, and repeated the act every day until it was a fully grown ox! Thus his strength grew, as the burden increased in weight, by exertion. Thus the mind of man also grows in strength and power, by repeated exertion, and constantly grappling with ideas a little beyond its present intellectual ability. It is easy to understand, that when a truth or an idea has once been fully grasped by the mind, it ceases any more to expand or strengthen it. For example: In learning “the multiplication table,” the mind of the child is constantly strengthening until the labor is accomplished—then nothing is gained by simply repeating over and over again what is already mastered. If the mind would continue to *expand* and strengthen, it must continue to *labor*. This constant tax upon thought is imposed by the religion of the Bible.

It is confessed that this disciplinary effect upon the mind is produced by any and all the human sciences to a certain degree, and for a certain time, and *only* for a certain time. All can understand the illustration of the “multiplication table.” At first it is disciplinary, but after it is completely memorized, it ceases to be so any longer. The same is true with regard to

any other human science—even of Astronomy, the greatest and sublimest. For after the astronomer has once thoroughly mastered the laws and machinery of the stellar worlds, the simple multiplication of worlds and systems of precisely the same sort, and governed in precisely the same way, ceases to enlarge the mind, or to be disciplinary, any more than counting the sands of the sea-shore would be! But not so with the thoughts and themes presented to mental view by the religion of the Bible. These, into which angels desire to look, multiply endlessly! The standards of intellectual gradation, contained in Christianity, are infinite! Infinite power—infinite goodness—infinite wisdom—infinite justice—infinite holiness—infinite truth—an infinite God—an infinite Saviour—an immortal existence—an eternity of duration! Themes ever developing, ever unfolding!—themes the most incomprehensible, and yet the most exciting!—that ever rise above the power of the mind, yet ever beckon it on to renewed exertion! Like the swelling ocean, whose surges are rolled against its own rocky battlements—the higher they reach, like the pendulum, the farther back they recede, but to renew the charge with increased volume and power! The more the sanctified mind knows of God, the more it wants to know, and the more it is capable of knowing. Therefore, we hesitate not to affirm, that there is no science, theme or thing, in all the wide universe of God so well calculated to discipline the mind, expand and strengthen its powers, and restore it to its primeval excellence as Bible religion!

3. But, in some respects, the most important part of an education—certainly that which is most conducive to our enjoyments, purely of a *temporal* kind—consists in the proper development and cultivation of *taste*, or the *æsthetic* capacities of the soul. In a world of so much beauty and sublimity, notwithstanding it bears the marks of God's curse, pronounced on account of sin—associated with beings like ourselves, still retaining some traces of angelic nature, in spite of the blight of depravity with which it is sadly marred; and, coming frequently in contact with the fine arts—products of human advancement and civilization—we should be cut off from a very



pure and high degree of earthly enjoyment in the absence of a developed and cultivated taste.

The taste is developed and cultivated by being conversant with objects of taste—that is, with sublime and beautiful, pure and elegant things, in the natural, moral and intellectual world—such as the beautiful landscape—the sublime mountains—the majestic water-fall—the starry heavens—the cultivated fields—the elaborate flower garden—the graceful temple—the finished sculpture—the elegant painting—the sweet music—the harmonious concert—the thrilling poem—the moving eloquence—the sports of innocence—the reflection of purity, of charity, of fortitude, of courage, &c., from human character—all which tend to develope and refine the mind, and thus capacitate it for the purest and highest enjoyment that strictly belongs to earth.

But all these things combined are not equal in producing this effect to the influence of Christianity alone.

1. What object in all the universe so pure, so perfect, so beautiful, so sublime, so high, so holy, so well calculated to refine and ennoble the mind, as the person, life and character of the Lord Jesus Christ? Do we visit the galleries of Florence to see the “Venus de Medici?” Do we tread the corridors of the Vatican to behold the “Apollo Belvidere?” Do we frequent the halls of statuary and painting to contemplate the “master pieces” of famous artists, whose wonderful powers consisted in expressing upon canvass, or in marble, the attributes of human perfection? Do we read the grand efforts of poets, orators and dramatists, in their attempts to depict a perfect character—and all for the improvement of our taste and the refinement of our minds? How much more effectually is this end accomplished by the careful study of the life and character of the Lord Jesus Christ, as portrayed in the Gospel—in whose noble person were combined the attributes of humanity with the perfections of Divinity—holy, yet condescending—powerful, yet submissive—wise, yet patient with others’ ignorance—immaculate, yet indulgent—infinately above all sin, yet not above associating with sinners—persecuted, yet forgiving—“reviled, yet he reviled not again!” As a char-

acter, what can be more beautiful?—how is it possible to conceive of any thing more lovely?

But as an *actor*—in walking on the sea—in quelling the storm—in casting out devils—in raising the dead—in his transfiguration—in the dread scenes of the crucifixion—in his resurrection and ascension, what can be more grand, or better calculated to excite the emotions of sublimity and awe? These facts in the Saviour's history have furnished the rich material out of which artists and poets, in all succeeding ages, have elaborated their master pieces.

2. But even the *place* where our Saviour chose to sojourn amongst men—the local, the geographical scenes of his pilgrimage on earth, Palestine—viewed as our Saviour viewed it, is not surpassed, if equalled, by any other portion of the earth's surface, for picturesque beauty and grandeur. It combines in an eminent, nay wonderful degree, all the elements of every variety of landscape scenery. "The waste howling wilderness" on the south—the green savannahs along the sea shore—the vine and olive clad hills around about Hebron, Bethlehem and Jerusalem—the robber-infested desert, wild and rent and rugged, between Jerusalem and Jericho—the mephitic waters of the Dead Sea, enclosed by sea-walls, whose terrible grandeur defies pen or pencil to depict—the rich fields of Moab and Gilead on the east; the Jordan, the inimitable Jordan, gleeful as a school-girl let out from school, jumping, skipping, plunging over precipices, (twenty-seven in number,) whirling, reeling, waltzing, frisking and frolicking, until it plunges into the stagnant bosom of the dark Dead Sea, and is absorbed and lost in its bitter waters! Then comes, on the west, the exceedingly picturesque plain of Esdraelon, or Jezrael, the battle-field of nations; north of that the mountainous region of Galilee and the beautiful views about Nazareth, the Great Ocean, the Mediterranean Sea on the west, seen from every high hill top—the lovely Sea of Tiberias, like a gem in the richest setting, surrounded with gentle hills and olive groves, and vineyards and villages; and last, the great mountain ranges on the north, Hermon and Lebanon, with his hoary head wreathed with everlasting cedars, celebrated in poetry and song, looking down

from an altitude of thousands of feet upon the grand and beautiful and thrilling scenes around him! This is PALESTINE—a land which, for beautiful, for thrilling, for variegated scenery, stands unrivalled by any other land in the world! This is the land of our Saviour's nativity—here he was born—here he lived, here he died—here he arose again and ascended on high!—whose hills and valleys his feet trod—whose seas obeyed his commanding voice—whose mountains his eyes beheld—whose dark and terrible deserts witnessed his fastings, his tears, his conflicts! Whosoever, therefore, will study the Saviour's history, follow him in all his wanderings through the length and breadth of this picturesque region, conceive accurately and vividly of the scenes with which he was familiar, will thereby store the mind with landscape pictures and visions, which, for varied beauty and sublimity, cannot be surpassed, if equalled, by any other portion of the earth's surface!

3. In the next place, the *doctrinal* pictures, if we may so express it, presented by Christianity to mental vision, are refining and ennobling beyond anything that man can create, or earth furnish. What can be so refining to the mind as the contemplation of HOLINESS—holiness in saints, holiness in angels, holiness in God? What so grand as the idea of creative power, that which can create "the heavens and the earth," and call a universe into existence? What so awful as the judgment scenes, as portrayed by the pen of inspiration? What so beautiful—what so pleasingly, nay thrillingly grand, as the allegorical representations of Heaven—the "New Jerusalem"—with its "pearly gates" and "golden streets," and the glorious effulgence of the Divine presence? How can the mind and soul of man repeatedly and earnestly contemplate these scenes without being elevated, ennobled and refined by them?

Therefore we conclude, that simply as an *aesthetic* element in an education, Christianity takes the precedence of all other things that belong to the sphere of human knowledge.

4. But there is another aspect of this subject which we are unwilling to pass by unnoticed. It relates to Christianity as a *Base*, around which all our other knowledge and attainments

may, as it were, crystallize—or, as a *nucleus*, around which all our thoughts and all our desires, and all our acquisitions, and all the exercises and operations of our ever-developing and ever-expanding minds may, with fitness and congruity, cluster; which is not the case with regard to any other science, profession, theme or thing, in the whole range of human thoughts or pursuits. For illustration; if Medicine be the profession, then all that pertains to the science of Physiology and Natural History, &c., will be appropriate and subservient. But there will still remain a large domain of human knowledge inappropriate to this profession. Or, if Law be the calling—a certain other department of knowledge will be in quest, whilst many rich regions of human learning will be left out. So of the pursuit of any one of the sciences:—there is no one of them around which all our intellectual acquisitions can rally. Let us, for illustration, take Botany or Physiology;—What affiliation has this science with Mathematics or Astronomy? Or, if Astronomy be the “*Base*,”—What affinity will it have for Mental Philosophy, History and Civilization? Or, if the Belles Lettres be the “*nucleus*,”—What attraction will they have for Chemistry and Comparative Anatomy, or the pure Mathematics? what fellowship between Mineralogy and Morals, Mechanics and Metaphysics, Medicine and Mensuration?—Thus it is perceived that there is no one science, theme or thing, that will serve as a base, or a nucleus, around which all our thoughts, emotions, imaginations and acquired knowledge, can crystallize into one beautiful and glorious form, but Christianity alone! All the sciences in the world, like the concentric radii of a circle, may centre, and ought to centre, and *will* centre, upon Bible religion. Christianity is to them what the trunk of a noble tree is to its branches, leaves, fruits and flowers—the source of their support and strength, and beauty and glory! Is *Astronomy* the theme? “The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth his handy work. Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night showeth knowledge!” Is *Anatomy* the subject of investigation? Then we can adopt the language of the psalmist, “I will praise thee, for I am fearfully and wonderfully made;—marvellous are thy works, and that my soul knoweth right

well!" Is *History* your study? It will illustrate the astonishing providence of God, "who works all things together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose." Are you a devotee of *Mathematics*? This science will reveal to you the wonderful, the amazing wisdom of God, as well in the structure of the plant and the mineral, or in the planetary system! Is *Taste* your favorite theme, the æsthetic departments of nature, if it may be so expressed? Then you may indulge a continual anthem of praise; for where will you look, and where can you turn, without being regaled with some thing that is beautiful and excellent, and noble and grand, indicative of the goodness and wisdom, and glory and power of the Father and Maker of all!

As, in ancient times, at certain seasons of the year, all the inhabitants of beautiful Palestine might be seen going up to Jerusalem, "the city of the Great King," each one with an offering to the God of Israel; so now, all the sciences in the world, like grateful devotees, bring each one their offerings to the shrine of the same God, illustrative of his "Being, Wisdom, Power, Holiness, Justice, Goodness and Truth!"

Thus we have attempted to show, but very inadequately, as we are deeply conscious, that Christianity is not only eminent above all other things as a *disciplinary* element in our mental culture; but, unlike any other department or species of human knowledge, it is capable of becoming, and ought to be, and will most inevitably be, the *grand centre*, around which all the thoughts, ideas, acquisitions, hopes and aims of our ever-developing and ever-expanding minds, may cluster in their fitting and beautiful proportions like polished stones in a great temple; and, like the precious ointment that ran down upon Aaron's beard, imparting and diffusing its Divine fragrance to all, rendering them subservient to the glory of God and our own everlasting happiness!

With these views and considerations, imperfect as they confessedly are, who would not desire Christianity, even irrespective of a future state of existence, to be a distinguishing element in our education, and the *nucleus* around which all our knowledge should arrange itself, so as to reflect the image and perfections of God?

## ARTICLE VII.

*The Church of God as an Essential Element of the Gospel, and the Idea, Structure and Functions thereof. A Discourse in four parts.* By REV. STUART ROBINSON, Professor of Church Government and Pastoral Theology in the Theological Seminary at Danville, Ky. *With an Appendix, containing the more important symbols of Presbyterian Church Government, historically arranged and illustrated.* Philadelphia: Joseph M. Wilson, No. 111 South Tenth street; A Davidson, Louisville, Ky., 1858.

When Mr. Robinson was chosen in 1856, by the General Assembly, to fill the chair of Church Government and Pastoral Theology in the new Seminary at Danville, there were not wanting many who doubted the wisdom of the appointment. Some of his strongest friends and warmest admirers, in the Assembly itself, voted blank when the votes were given; and they so voted because they regarded him as more eminently fitted for the pulpit than for the Professor's chair; and because he had begun a Church enterprise in Baltimore, which was still in its infancy, encumbered with many difficulties, and likely to be seriously endangered, if not totally destroyed, by his removal from it. Mr. Robinson, it was argued, is gifted with a power to attract and move a mixed audience, not surpassed by any that belongs to any minister in the country; he possesses a rare combination of vigorous thought, of brilliant and versatile imagination, of broad and genial human sympathies, by which he is enabled not merely to attract, but to hold large crowds of dying men in attendance upon his ministry. He ought not, therefore, to be taken from the pulpit, which he is so eminently qualified to adorn, and from a commanding position in a large city, to do a work in which he cannot expect a larger measure of success than might fall to the lot of many of his brethren, far inferior to him in the gifts of a popular orator.

We shall not undertake to discuss the comparative merits of our honored brother as a preacher and a professor; but we should be happy to believe, that the Presbyterian Church in the United States has, among its twenty-five hundred ministers, "many" who, after having occupied the chair which he has occupied, for the same period of time, could be the author of "The Church of God as an Essential Element of the Gospel." Perhaps our Church *is* rich to this extent; if so, her riches are carefully hoarded, wrapped in a napkin and buried; and something should be done to disinter the talents, and to give them to the Church both to use and to enjoy. So far as our observation has qualified us to form a judgment in the matter, there is no topic lying within the range and scope of their profession, in regard to which our ministers generally are more at sea than in regard to the Idea, Structure and Functions of the Church of God. Our young men come indifferently prepared upon this class of subjects before the Presbyteries for licensure and ordination; they are superficially examined upon them; they enter upon the discharge of pastoral functions with a very slender knowledge of ecclesiastical principles and ecclesiastical law; they go into our appellate courts and there re-enact the blunders of the courts of original jurisdiction; till, finally, in the highest court of all, confusion becomes worse confounded, and, in utter despair, we look to a revision of the constitution as the only remedy. Now, without denying that the constitution is susceptible of improvement, we need not hesitate to assert, that no constitution, however perfect, can administer itself; that no rules of judicial proceedings can apply themselves; that no principles of evidence will, of themselves, conduct a case to a true and righteous conclusion. We must have competent judges besides—judges that have some adequate knowledge of the constitution and of the rules of process and evidence. If a perfect system were let down to us from heaven, and it were as little studied as the present lame one, we should soon begin again to talk of amendments and revisions.

If any thing became clear in the controversies about elders and ordination in our Church, some years ago, it was that the

Church was in great darkness in regard to its own structure and functions, and in regard to those great principles which constitute its very foundation. Here were worthy brethren, suspected by their own friends, of denying not only the *jus divinum* of Presbyterian government, but of the Church visible itself, and yet holding views of the nature of ordination marvellously resembling the views held by those prelatical communions which make the Church visible all. Here were other brethren, great and good as the first, who held that Presbyterian government was a commonwealth, not a hierarchy; that ordination was not a charm, but an act of government; that the ruling elder was not a figure of speech, but a real entity; and that a *quorum* was not another court, not a substitute for a court, but the court itself, with the fewest elements with which it was allowed to exist and to proceed to business. All manner of wild things, all manner of strange, obscure and false things, were uttered in this controversy, which was *settled*, like Huss's testimony at Constance, by the General Assembly of 1844.

Once more. The neglect of infant baptism in our communion, about which, of late years, so much has been said and written, bears its testimony to the same effect. If our ministers and elders had adequately studied the idea and structure of the Church; if they had had just apprehensions of the true relation of the seed of believers to the covenant of God; if they had clearly perceived the immeasurable difference in degree of importance between the question of the mode of baptism and the right of infants to the ordinance in any mode; that the question of the mode is a trifle, light as air, compared with the question of the constitution of the Church visible, and the membership of infants in it—such a neglect of this seal of God's covenant would not now be a reproach and a shame to us. We rejoice to add, that it is one sign of that "re-awakening" in our Church, of which Mr. Robinson speaks in the opening of his discourse, that so much has been preached and published on the subject of infant membership in the Church visible, within the last twelve months.

Lastly. In reference to that important function of the



Church of God which we call *worship*, how confused and unsatisfactory the views which are afloat among ministers and people in regard to its true nature. Not to mention other things, how hard it is for the Church to understand the doctrine of giving as a part of the stated worship of God! reports, resolutions, speeches, essays, sermons, all manner of expositions of the doctrine, have been given to the Church; and yet, in the month of June, 1858, at head-quarters, in the very focus of Presbyterian light and power, in the city of Philadelphia, at a meeting of the Board of Missions, grave and reverend pastors, men useful and honored in the Church, are reported to have said that they had no faith in the scheme of systematic beneficence! For such a statement, the most charitable reason which can be assigned is, that they have not taken the trouble to ascertain what systematic beneficence means. To make the thing still more glaring, the great weekly organ, commenting upon the doings of the meeting aforesaid, and casting about for something for the Associate Secretary to do,—the Secretary who was, by a tie-vote, not abolished,—recommends that he should go round and get this systematic plan into general operation! which, being interpreted, is, that an agent should be employed to teach the Church, pastors and people; that all agencies, other than the regular officers of the Church, should be abolished; that they have been abolished *de jure*, and will be *de facto*!

One reason, doubtless the chief reason, why the doctrine of the Church has been relegated to a very subordinate position in the curriculum of our theological schools, in the studies of our ministers, and in the teaching of our pulpits, is an inadequate apprehension of its importance. It has not been perceived, as it ought to have been perceived, that the Church, as Mr. Robinson expresses it, is “an essential element of the Gospel,” a necessary part of that grand scheme of restoration, by which sinners are emancipated from the bondage of the curse, renewed in the image of God, adopted into His family, and educated as His sons and daughters, for glory, honor and immortality. In that tremendous re-action against the tyranny of Rome, which took place at the period of the Reformation,

men awoke to the consciousness that they were men; that they possessed an individual importance, a personal responsibility and a personal immortality; that they were not made to be spokes in a great iron wheel, whose remorseless revolutions served only to gratify the lust of power and the insatiable cupidity of a self-appointed hierarchy; that they had a worthier destiny than to fall into the maw of a monster calling itself the Church; that human souls were not to be degraded into articles of merchandize. They began to see that the Church had usurped the prerogatives of the Son and of the Holy Ghost; that the priesthood and the sacraments had effectually barred the kingdom of heaven against all who would enter in; and, in short, that the Church, instead of being the thing which was founded upon the rock, was itself the gates of hell. They discovered that Jesus Christ was the only Priest, that His sacrifice was the only sacrifice, that His intercession was the only intercession, and that the Holy Ghost was the only source of spiritual life. They found, in spite of the Church,—what was recognized as such,—in spite of the deafening roar of the maledictions which thundered from the Vatican, and from every altar, that they had peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ, being justified by faith. The Church seemed to be, not an essential element of the Gospel, but an unrelenting enemy to it; and a large part of Europe was revolutionized by preaching the Gospel in opposition to the Church.

And this has been, to a greater or less extent, the posture of the parties ever since; Papists making the Church every thing, Protestants tending to the other extreme of making it nothing; one party insisting that out of the Church there is no salvation, the other insisting, with equal pertinacity, that out of Christ there is no salvation; the one urging the necessity of man's believing unto righteousness, the other the necessity of man's confessing with his mouth unto salvation. In our own day, and in our own Church, elaborate essays have been published by men who are honored by all our people, which have created serious doubts whether they hold that the Church exists, *jure divino*, at all. Now, these very statements of the relative importance of faith in Jesus Christ, and of connexion

with the Church, serve to show that the doctrine of the Church is one of immense consequence. It has been made so, if not by the Word of God originally, yet by the errors of the adversary; and the whole question is one which eminently demands attention to the injunction, "to prove all things, and hold fast that which is good." Is there no Church visible ordained of God? If there be a Church, what is it? what is its structure, and what are its functions? what is its great design? and what are its relations to the salvation of men, "the redemption of the purchased possession unto the praise of God's glory?" Of these things we ought to know something, we must know something, if we would be found workmen that need not to be ashamed.

In the introduction to this inaugural discourse, Mr. Robinson has the following paragraph:

"It is the striking observation of a modern German thinker—after arranging the entire cycle of sacred knowledge into the four categories, (1) Theology, the science of God; (2) Anthropology, the science of man as related to God; (3) Soterology, the science of salvation; and (4) Ecclesiology, the science of the Church of God—that the history of the Church since the Apostles seems to have been a development in succession of each of these four in their order. The first of these had its full development during the controversies concerning the nature of the Godhead, which closed with the labors of Athanasius; the second, during the Pelagian controversy, closing with the labors of Augustine. Next, after a thousand years of repose and silence in the Church, was developed the third, (Soterology,) through the labors of Luther and Calvin, proclaiming salvation as by grace through faith; leaving the fourth, Ecclesiology, yet to be developed. Do not the providences of God toward the American Church, in freeing her from the civil domination which, by violence or seduction, silenced the martyr voice of her Scotch mother when she would testify for Christ's crown and covenant, and in placing the Church here in a position (for the first time, perhaps, since the Apostles), to actualize fully and without hinderance her true nature and functions as a spiritual commonwealth—do not all seem to indicate that the time has fully come for the final development of the visible Church as a governmental power on earth, yet a kingdom not of this world, a people not reckoned among the nations?" (P. 27, 28).

This is not only ingenious and plausible, but true; certainly contains so many marks of truth, as to lay upon the Church, in this country, the obligation of considering whether it be not her peculiar commission, or an important part, perhaps the chief part, of her commission, to teach the world what the

Church visible is. The life of the world thus far bears an analogy, as the observation cited by Mr. Robinson suggests, to the life of the individual man. There are certain crises or eras in both, in which great questions are to be settled, right or wrong, upon the settlement of which the future manifestations and development of the life will depend. The principles of liberty, for example, the true principles of liberty, have been a part of the most ancient inheritance of man; the title-deed was given to him in the garden of Eden. But, after the fall, the title-deed was lost, though not cancelled or destroyed; and it was well for man, perhaps, as he had forfeited his ability to use, that he lost also the means of proving his claim to the inheritance. But, from time to time, when groaning under oppression, or when inflamed by the touch of some superior genius, endowed with the magic power of drawing all meaner things within the vortex of its own noble impulses and fiery zeal, the memory of the lost inheritance returns, and he searches again amidst the rubbish of lies and vanities for that title-deed. He looks anxiously, in the darkness of the long and dreary night, for the coming dawn and the rising of the sun, and, in his very haste to greet the true source of light and joy, welcomes every parhelion in its stead. But time rolls on—battle after battle is fought—head after head of martyrs falls upon the scaffold reared by tyranny and falsehood—the cause seems lost, then restored again—the banner now floats gloriously upon the breeze, and now trails ignominiously in the dust, till at last the shout of victory from the ranks of those who are contending for the right—but, alas! that period has not yet arrived.

We say the period of final victory has not yet arrived. But the principles of liberty, of true liberty, have been expounded and illustrated in this country, and have become the possession of the world, and men will no more lose sight of their title-deed. The nations, whose glorious mission it has been to teach mankind these lessons, may, by their fall, afford a melancholy illustration of the fact which has been so often illustrated in the history of our unhappy race, that while truth is mighty, men are weak; England may become the victim of the con-

tinental despotisms, and the United States the victim of the madness and folly of their own people, unworthy any longer to bear aloft the torch of truth before the tribes of earth. But the principles will remain, the torch will pass into worthier hands, or, the long-suffering of God being exhausted, Jesus Christ, His Son, who alone can make us free, will come in vengeance against the mighty hunters and plausible deceivers of mankind, and establish true liberty amid the splendors of the millennial glory.

But now it is very important and striking to observe, that the Church visible has been the chosen repository of the principles of true liberty, the very shrine in which the spirit of liberty has delighted to dwell; and, in her own Divine constitution, in her very organization, and in the modes and forms by which her power is exercised, has been the model of the freest governments of earth. It would appear, therefore, to be the mission of the Church in this country, as it gave the original lessons, so constantly to repeat them in the ears of those whose duty and interest it is to give careful heed; to teach the United States what they are to teach the world, that true liberty is not a thing of external forms merely, but must begin and be maintained from within; that it is not license, not emancipation from the restraints of law, but obedience to law, the law of God, which is "the harmony of the world," and the law of man, which is also the ordinance of God. It is her mission now, when "equality" is the cry, to teach this country, and through this country to teach the world, and to teach, by her own organization and model, that the "equality" for which men are clamoring is a mere dream and delusion, and, if it were a reality, would be a blasting curse; that the true notion of a body politic, as of a body ecclesiastic, is, that while there is but one body, there are many members, and that all members have not the same office; that some are more honorable, others less so; some direct, and others are directed; that the liberty of the members consists in their freedom from all restraint but the law of the whole body, or, in other words, the liberty of doing the thing which the law of the whole body ordained it to do; and that the "equality" of the members

consists in an equal right on the part of all to exercise their own functions under the general law of the body equally binding upon all; that the eye has a right to see equal to the right which the ear has to hear, or the nose to smell; that the "equality" of the eye does not consist in its having the right to hear or smell, as well as see. It is the mission of the Church, now when the cry is "fraternity," to teach the country and the world, that the true brotherhood is to be found in the second Adam, who is a life-giving Spirit, more than in the first Adam, who was only a living soul; that the true "solidarity," or "solidarity" of the peoples is to be found in Him, over whose cross was a superscription written in the three leading types of all the languages of earth; in Him in whom there is neither Jew nor Greek, Barbarian, Scythian, male nor female, bond nor free. Let us hold up before the world a brotherhood, free, yet subject to law; equal, yet occupying different positions and discharging different functions. We hope we shall be pardoned for saying, that the prevailing forms of polity in the Church of God, for the last sixteen or seventeen hundred years, have been adapted rather to conceal than to illustrate these great principles; that in modern times, and in Great Britain and the United States, the Presbyterian Church has done more than any other Church to illustrate them; and that she might have done still more if her principles had been more thoroughly understood by herself. Still further we are presumptuous enough to express our conviction, that in every great effort to amend the social and political condition of this country, which shall be successful, the principles of this Church will be the standard of reform. A true ecclesiology and a sound political philosophy must go hand in hand. No bishop, no king.

The immense practical importance of the doctrine of the Church may be seen in connection with the idea, to which a passing allusion has been already made, but which deserves a more particular notice at our hands; and that is the idea of "fellowship." The true idea of fellowship was the original property of the Church, at least after the fall of man. Recognized in the garden of Eden, though exercised in a narrow

sphere; well nigh extinguished in the blood of Abel; restored in the line of Seth; publicly recognized again in the time of Enos, when men began to call themselves by the name of the Lord; almost lost again when the sons of God intermarried with the daughters of men, and brought upon the earth the devouring curse of God; ambitiously counterfeited and pressed into the service of rebellion by the builders of the Tower of Babel; obscured by the diversities of languages and the divisions into tribes and nations which followed upon the confusion of tongues, the true home of this great idea, the only portion of mankind among whom it was a conscious possession and a cherished jewel, was the Church of God. And when that Church passed into the form ordained for it under the institute of Moses, the idea of fellowship was brought out with great clearness in every part of that wonderful code, albeit very imperfectly realized, it must be acknowledged, in the actual life of an intractable and hard-hearted people. It was expressed so clearly, and incorporated so thoroughly into the very texture of the law moral, ceremonial and political, that no child of Abraham could fail to see it or feel it, without the most wilful blindness, or the most inexcusable malignity of temper. And we are bold to say that, so far as the Levitical law is to be regarded as an instrument for the promotion of the social and political happiness of human beings living together in the same community, no government of man's contrivance can be compared to it, in the wisdom and benevolence of its provisions. Indeed, the most complete political systems of modern times, the glory and the crown of Christian civilization, are founded upon the principles and animated by the spirit of the Mosaic Institute. It is true that, for wise reasons, the Jewish State being designed of God to be temporary and to prepare the way for another, the rules which regulated the intercourse of the people with other nations were apparently out of harmony with the idea of fellowship; but the explanation of this apparent inconsistency would lead us too far from the main point. It is sufficient to say, that the stringency and harshness of these rules was no more inconsistent with the tenderness of brotherly love inculcated every where else in the law, than the

rough and sometimes thorny integument, which closely confines the infant bud, is incompatible with the softness, beauty and fragrance, of the mature and expanded flower.

Now, in the Church under the gospel, we have the flower; and where, in all history, is there a more charming picture of the lovely fruits of true fellowship than the account of the daily life of the Christian Church at Jerusalem? "And they continued steadfastly in the Apostle's doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread and in prayers; and fear came upon every soul; and many wonders and signs were done by the Apostles. And all that believed were together, and had all things common; and sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men, as every man had need. And they, continuing daily with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread from house to house, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart; praising God and having favor with all the people."—(Acts 2: 42, etc.) Alas! that this glorious and happy ideal should not be always realized among the followers of Christ! Thanks be unto God! the time shall surely come when the communion of saints will far exceed in glory and perfection any exhibition which has hitherto been made of it on earth, and all the nations will walk in the light of it.

But what are the elements of this fellowship? The fundamental element, as the term itself implies, is *common* possession of, or mutual participation in, some thing or things. Paul describes the fellowship of Christians in the fourth chapter of his Epistle to the Ephesians, thus: "There is one body and one spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all and through all, and in you all." And elsewhere, frequently, for it is a favorite topic with him. Our relation to God as our Creator constitutes the primary and the widest basis of fellowship. But He is the Creator of irrational and inanimate things, with which we cannot properly be said to have any fellowship. He is also our Father; and this implies that we are made in His image and in the image of one another. Here, then, is a foundation of fellowship with one another, and with all intelligent creatures in the universe, made, like us, in



the likeness of God. We have the same nature, and are members of the same family. We have all fallen together from our high estate of fellowship with one another and with the Father—have lost His favor, His image and His inheritance. But He has devised a way by which His banished may be restored to Him. He has “called” us to “hope;” and we have “one Lord,” our Saviour and our King; our Saviour as our King; our King because our Saviour, and our Saviour because our King; our Brother as well as our King and Saviour; bone of our bone, and flesh of our flesh; as really one with us in nature as the first Adam, yet without sin; our spirit as well as our bone and our flesh, for He dwells in us and we in Him. But knowledge is indispensable to conscious fellowship; knowledge of the common property and the common participation. Hence it is added, “one *faith*.” Without faith it is impossible to please God; it is impossible to please man; it is impossible to do anything, but sigh over a meaningless existence. We must have a common standard as well as a common object of faith; the word of our common “Lord,” who is the faithful and true Witness, we believe, because it is His word. He is Lord of our understandings, because He is the truth. Once more, if there is to be organized fellowship, there must be “baptism” as well as “faith.” For upon the principle of “*de non existentibus et de non apparentibus eadem est ratio*,” the faith would be nothing for the purposes of fellowship, unless confessed and manifested. There must be some common sign or badge by which we may recognize each other as having “one faith” and “one Lord.”

If this is a just account of the elements of fellowship as exhibited in the constitution of the Church of God, it makes sad havoc of some worldly theories and some Church theories of the same thing. The necessity of organization, indeed, is fully recognized. The great watch-word of the times is “organize,” “organize!” Regalia, insignia, vestments and banners, devices and mottoes of all sorts, sizes and colors, the signs and badges of association, are plentiful as the leaves of autumn. But when we come to look into the principles of fellowship of which these things are designed to be the symbols, we find them to be

wholly defective, and because defective, false and fatal. We have seen, for example, that the relation of man to God is a primary element in true fellowship. But in most human associations this relation has no place. In Free Masonry a great parade is made of liberality and toleration in the matter of religion. Men of all complexions of religious faith and of no religious faith at all, we are told, meet in perfect harmony in the halls of this ancient and venerable order, and love one another as brethren. In a paragraph which has been going the rounds of the newspapers recently, the Church is modestly lectured for not imitating this fraternity in this particular. Now, one of two things is certain. Either religion and the whole affair of man's relations to God have nothing at all to do with the purposes and ends of Free Masonry, or the contrary. If the first, then it is as idle to boast of mutual religious toleration in such an association as it would be in a railway corporation, or in any other body constituted for ends which are of the earth, earthy. It is not an association of men, as men; for the religious nature of man, which is as universal and indestructible as any other part of human nature, has been left out of the plan. It is, therefore, supremely ridiculous for the members of such a body to read lectures to the Church about charity and toleration. If, on the contrary, Free Masonry has for its object the cultivation of man's higher nature, to boast that all complexions of faith are tolerated, is of course to say, that faith is a matter of no consequence in the business of religion; that the man who believes in the God of the Calvinist, and the man who believes in the God of the Unitarian, and the man who believes in the God of the Mormon, all stand an equal chance of promoting the highest interests of their spiritual being—all which is not less absurd than it would be to say that an Atlantic Telegraph Company, composed of men who cannot agree about the properties of copper wire or the laws of magnetic electricity, or the force and direction of ocean currents, is as likely to be successful in establishing and maintaining electric communication between two continents, as a company composed of men who agree upon all these points. It is tantamount to asserting that there is no such thing as truth. It is putting

light for darkness and darkness for light, bitter for sweet and sweet for bitter. It is turning cosmos into chaos. The toleration, then, which the Church is advised to imitate, is the old Roman toleration of the Augustan age, founded upon a total denial of the *truth* of any religion. All the *simulacra* of the gods may stand together harmoniously in the Pantheon, because they are mere *simulacra*, without any reality to represent.

Similar statements and reasonings would apply to numberless other associations, and particularly to those which are based upon pantheistic and socialistic principles. False views of man's nature, and of his relationship to God, the absence of faith in anything which cannot be weighed by the pound, or measured by the pint, peck or yard, all betray a poor creature which has forgotten its Creator and Portion, and is striving to frame some substitute for Him. Neither God, the Father of all, nor man, His erring child, being understood or believed in, true fellowship is a goal still unreachd.

Again, the Church theories which make the ministry and the sacraments the channel by which grace comes into the soul, and men are made new creatures in Christ Jesus, violate the true principles of fellowship by the absurdity of making the fellowship the cause, or at least the antecedent of that nature, which is the indispensable pre-requisite of fellowship; an absurdity as great as it would be to make a man's connection with civil society the cause or antecedent of his social nature and appetites.

But our readers, doubtless, think it is full time we were saying something about the book we profess to be reviewing. The truth is, it has not been our purpose to review it, but to persuade all who have not read it, to read it. The principles expounded and defended by Mr. Robinson are stated by him with great succinctness, and will not admit of looser discussion and fuller illustration on our part, without making a book bigger than the one we are noticing. We shall attempt to give only a general view of the argument, with occasional examples of the manner in which our author handles some of its topics.

The whole subject is divided by Mr. Robinson into four parts, viz :

I. The relation of the idea of the Church to the plan of redemption ideally in the eternal purpose of God.

II. The relation of the idea of the Church to the mode and structure and the subject-matter of the revelation of the Divine purpose in the Scriptures.

III. The relation to the idea of the Church, thus obtained, of the principles of spiritual government as set forth in the Scriptures.

IV. The relation to the idea of the Church of the ordinances of worship, and the agencies appointed to the Church, according to the Scriptures.

In the first part it is shown, as a matter of fact, that there has always been a correspondence between peculiar views in theology and certain theories of the Church; and that, as a matter of doctrine, such a correspondence is suggested by the general tenor of Scripture. Our author's idea will be readily apprehended by the following extracts :

“ Since the Reformation, four chief theories, and those inclusive of all other theories of revealed theology, have had currency in Christendom—the Papal, the Zuinglian, the Lutheran and the Calvinistic. Of these, the first named is the original error against which the last three may be regarded as successive forms of just protest. All three of these protests are true in their general idea intrinsically, and successful in developing the chief truths of the gospel, but with widely different degrees of success in preserving pure and incorrupt the doctrines of grace. Recurring again to the analogy just employed, these four theories may not unaptly be compared, as to their relative value, with the four different theories of the visible universe which have in different ages had currency in the world. The Papal theory of theology, like the ancient mythological theory of the universe, scarce pretended to have any foundation other than in mere human fancies and its general prevalence among men. And just as the Ptolemaic, the Copernican, and the still more modern theory of the *Mécanique Céleste*, are successive protests against the mere prejudices and dreams of men, yea, just as by each of them the fundamental facts of the *Cosmos* had, in some sort, their explanation, but with different degrees of consistency, clearness and beauty, so with the three Protestant theories of theology. The Zuinglian, taking as the central principle of its structure the truth that the word of God alone can be any authoritative rule to the conscience, developed from that point a true, in opposition to a counterfeit

gospel; yet a gospel too easily perverted by reason of its tendency to exalt the rational man of earth into a centre of the spiritual system, or, at least, from its narrowness of view, to obscure the higher truths of the scheme of redemption. The Lutheran theory, taking as its central principle the justification of the sinner by grace alone through faith, after the fashion of Copernicus, exhibited Jesus Christ, the Sun of Righteousness, as the real centre, to whom the rational man of earth, with all that concerns him, is attracted, and around whom he revolves. Calvin, while perceiving that the central truths of both Zuingli and Luther were indeed great truths, yet with the still wider vision of Laplace and the moderns, beheld not only the rational man revolving around the mediatorial Sun of Righteousness as his true centre, but also that man and his central Sun revolving again around a still profounder centre, even the Eternal Purpose of God, fixed in the counsels of eternity before the world began. Such, generally, is the relative position to the others of that remarkable theory of theology, which, however men have cavilled at, they must be constrained to admit both its singular accordance with the very language, and its logical development and elucidation of all the great facts of revelation." (P. 35 et seq.)

Having thus ingeniously and strikingly illustrated the doctrine of the Divine purpose in the Calvinistic theology as not merely one truth in a system of truth, but as a mode of conceiving and setting forth all the doctrines which make up revealed theology, our author proceeds to show how the theory of the Church, corresponding with the Calvinistic theology, is evolved; how the theory of the Church flows from the doctrine of the Divine purpose. We give his own words:

"The fundamental idea of the Church as a separate and distinct portion of the human race, is found in the peculiar *mode* of that purpose itself. It is set forth as a distinguishing feature of the purpose of redemption, that it is to save not merely myriads of men as *individual men*, but myriads of sinners, as composing a mediatorial body, of which the Mediator shall be the head; a mediatorial kingdom whose government shall be upon His shoulder for ever; a Church, the Lamb's Bride, of which He shall be the Husband; a Bride whose beautiful portrait was graven upon the palms of His hands, and whose walls were continually before Him, when in the counsels of eternity He undertook her redemption." (P. 38).

"The mission of Messiah, undertaken in the covenant of eternity, was not merely that of a teaching Prophet and an atoning Priest, but of a ruling King as well. His work was not to enunciate simply a doctrine concerning God, and man's relations to God, as some Socrates, for the founding of a school; nor even merely to atone for sinners as a

ministering Priest at the altar ; it was, as the result of all, and the reward of all, to found a *community*, to organize a *government*, and administer therein as a perpetual *King*." (P. 39).

"The elementary conception of the Church, therefore, and that conception of it which must be pre-supposed, and enter into every definition of the Church, is of that elect body of men which was contemplated in the covenant of redemption, as constituting the mediatorial kingdom of Christ, and for the sake of which body He undertook the work of salvation. Other elements, as we shall see, must necessarily enter into the definition as this *ideal* of the purpose of God becomes *actual* in the external manifestation of the purpose in time ; but this element must obviously be found involved in any and every form which the notion of the Church, as actual and external, can take. In this view of the case is found the reason for the fact, that a Calvinistic theology cannot long retain its integrity and purity save in connection with a Calvinistic ecclesiology, and for the more general fact already referred to, of the intimate connection between a wrong theology and wrong views of the Church." (P. 40.)

From this view of the relation of the idea of the Church to the eternal purpose of redemption, in the first part, Mr. Robinson proceeds in the second part to consider the relation of the idea of the Church to the manifestation of that purpose, as revealed in the Scriptures. And here he shows the importance of the doctrine of the covenants to any true Ecclesiology, especially the pre-eminent importance of the Ecclesiological covenant with Abraham, and insists upon the representative principle as the grand characteristic of these covenants ; the principle that the children of the covenanting people have a birth-right to the privileges of it. The leading ideas of this part of the discourse are, of course, the unity of the Church under all dispensations of religion, and the unity which pervades the structure of Scripture. These points are illustrated with great felicity, and we have been impressed with the immense advantage which our honored brother derives, as a teacher, from the possession of a vigorous imagination. We copy a paragraph or two :

"As a general statement, it may be said that so far as the Scriptures are historic, they are the history of the Church, even of that particular portion of mankind which has been selected out of the race at large, and organized as a body under the Mediator. In so far as the Scriptures are prophetic, it is to foretell the destiny of this community under the administration of its Founder and King. The key-note to which

the harp of prophecy attunes every other strain is, 'Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever; a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of Thy kingdom.' In so far as they are a theology, it is the revelation of a God-man Mediator, administering by His Providence all things with reference to a Church which He hath purchased with His own blood. In so far as the Scripture is a gospel, strictly so called, it is the annunciation of a kingdom of heaven at hand. For this is the grand conception with which the series of Old Testament gospel revelations had its final culmination. With this the New Testament gospel opens, crying, 'The kingdom of heaven is at hand.' This was the grand subject of the preaching of Jesus himself during His personal ministry. This was the charge on which He was condemned, and the truth for which, in so far as His death was a martyrdom, He died. And, finally, the truth which, as His distinguishing heresy, His enemies would sarcastically hurl contempt upon, by placarding it upon His cross, was, 'This is the King of the Jews.' And so, too, the gospel of His triumph, after His resurrection and ascension, is, 'Him hath God exalted to be a Prince and a Saviour;' and the last gospel vision of Him is as the Lamb in the midst of the throne. Now, the great correlative truth to Messiah as a King is that of His people as a kingdom—an organic body; and from these two facts arises that wonderful unity of idea which pervades a Book whose several parts belong to different ages, different civilizations, and different eras of an ever progressive revelation extending through thousands of years. It is the history of the administration of one King—Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to-day and for ever—over one community, having essentially one Lord, one faith, one baptism throughout this whole series of ages."

"However the Bible, as a book of theology in general, may lack *system* in the logical sense of the schools, a diligent study of its subject matter will evince that it is none the less remarkable for its rigid *method* throughout. Men construct intellectually by system, as they build their houses and other structures of art. They lay truth by measurement upon truth, and chapter upon chapter, and all incomplete till the last beam is laid and the whole structure jointed together into one. God constructs His revelations as He constructs the oak of the forest or the cedar of Lebanon—by a continual development from a germ which is perfect from the first, and a perfect tree in every stage of its growth. As the oak is in the acorn, so the whole gospel of God is in the first germinal promise imbedded in the very curse of Eden. It springs forth and develops ever in larger and clearer proportions, through each successive revelation, from the paradise of Adam to the paradise revealed anew in the visions of the Apocalypse. So, too, with the development of the Church of God as an element of the first gospel promise; each successive covenant enunciates more and more clearly and largely the same one idea through the entire Old Testament to the fully revealed kingship of Messiah; and so far from being something distinct from the Old Testament, the New Testament glories ever in

being the grand fulfilment of all things spoken in the Prophets and in the Psalms concerning Christ. The very first voice from heaven which breaks the long silence of four hundred years of suspended revelation, is the annunciation of Gabriel to his mother—even before the angels heralded His birth—of the coming of the Son of the Highest, as the fulfilment of the covenant with David; and His mother, under inspiration of the Spirit, sang of His coming to fulfil the covenant with Abraham and his seed. And, in like manner, at the opening of our present dispensation of the last times under the ministration of the Spirit, the Apostles, so far from claiming for themselves or their crucified Master the honor of now originating a new scheme of salvation and a new Church, rather (with elaborate care on all occasions), aimed to prove that both the doctrine and the Church now manifested to the world, had their origin first in the determinate counsel of God; had been first manifested in a visible Church and a covenant in ages of old, and developed more and more clearly by successive covenants and prophetic revelations afterwards; and that they acted as the agents of Jesus, their Master, who, in fulfilment of the provisions of all ancient covenants, was now reforming the Church of God with a view to carry it forward to an infinitely higher glory.

“Such is uniformly the method of the apostolic argument—they ever look both backward and forward from the stand-point of the dispensation given through them. As after the method of those immense triangulations of the modern trigonometrical surveys which, from some known base line measured upon the plain, take observations forward and backward of the prominent mountain tops at immense distances, from which, again, other observations are extended, till the measuring line of their science is laid, encompassing half the globe, and determining, with marvellous accuracy, even to a single inch, the distance—so these inspired Apostles, assuming as the ground-work of their argument that which they now see and hear under the outpouring of the Spirit, from this direct their vision back to the prominent facts in the past dispensations of God, and onward to the prominent heights of the prophetic views of the dispensations yet to come, and from these in turn they determine new points of the argument. With a logic at once sublime in its reach, and infinite in its comprehension, they determine the measure, the proportions and the relations, of that transcendent problem of man's salvation, which has its primary elements in the depths of eternity past, and its conclusion in the depths of eternity to come.”  
Pages 57 *et seqq.*)

We should like to quote, also, if our limits would allow it, Mr. Robinson's glowing and eloquent words touching the uniformity of form, even, in which the doctrine of salvation is presented from the first to the last revelation. Our readers who have never heard him in the pulpit, might then under-



stand, if they do not already understand, the control he is able to exercise over the minds and hearts of his hearers. But we must proceed with our outline.

In the third part, Mr. Robinson discusses the relation of the principles of Church-government set forth in the Scripture to the idea of the Church. By principles of Church-government we mean the principles concerning the origin, nature and distribution of ecclesiastical power. These principles are clearly stated, in opposition to the heresies of Prelacy and Independency; and the line between the sphere of civil and the sphere of ecclesiastical government is drawn with more than usual fulness and distinctness, and the relation of all to the idea of the Church demonstrated.

In the fourth and last part, our author discusses the relation to the idea of the Church of the ordinances of worship appointed in the Scriptures—the word and sacraments, prayer and singing, contributions, etc. It is, in some respects, the ablest and most original portion of the book, and is full of the seeds of thought. The principles of worship, its hidden harmonies with the nature of God and the soul of man, its correspondence with the truths of salvation and with the design and constitution of the Church visible, are not much studied amongst us; and we heartily wish our young brethren in the ministry would avail themselves of the suggestions of Mr. Robinson's discourse. The more hidden harmonies of things we discover, the more is our faith confirmed in the wisdom and goodness of Him who made everything beautiful in its place, and the less readily will we listen to any temptation to accommodate the ordinances of God to the tastes and fashions of ignorant and foolish men. The worship of God is not an arbitrary thing. Its forms are not like algebraic symbols which represent quantities by mere convention, but rational symbols adapted in their own nature to instruct, edify and exalt the worshipper. No stronger evidence of the truth of this proposition can be desired than the fact that corruptions in worship have generally been followed, and that speedily, by apostasies from the faith of God's elect.

But we must stop. We think no man who has an intelligent

love for the Presbyterian Church, can read the book we have been noticing without a feeling of sorrow that the author was compelled, by circumstances beyond his control, to resign his Chair in the Seminary at Danville, when he had not even completed his course of lectures. These first fruits of his studies are enough to show what he is capable of doing; and we cannot help expressing the earnest hope that the harvest time will yet come; that he will pursue these studies still, and, amidst the pressure of his engagements as a pastor, may yet be able to give to the Church a larger and more complete exposition of this great subject, in a book which she will not willingly let die.



## ARTICLE VIII.

## CRITICAL NOTICES.

*Notice of the Rev. John B. Adger's article on the Slave Trade.*

Published for the author. Charleston: Steam-Power Press of Walker, Evans & Co. 1858; 28 pp. 8vo.

This pamphlet is in reply to the views put forth by us in the April No. of this work. It has been generally ascribed to Ed. B. Bryan, Esq., Chairman of the Majority of the House Committee, and author of their report, which we reviewed in connection with that of the Minority.

Six months more of reading and reflection (with the arrival in our harbor of the *Echo* or *Putnam*, and her cargo of slaves), have wrought no change in the views we expressed in April. The newspapers generally agree that it will be a cruelty to these Africans to send them back to Africa, and we agree with them. For these poor creatures, no doubt slavery in South Carolina would be better than either slavery or their liberty in Africa. And so of all barbarians the world over. To subjugate and civilize them, might be for all who should survive the process,

a blessing conferred on them and their posterity. But this does not make their subjugation a good thing. It does not entitle the Individuals or the States, who should, by fire and fagot, with brands and with swords, and with chains, get possession of one-half the population of a village after putting the other half to death; it does not entitle the doers of such work as this to any but the most dishonorable epithets, even though the final results of their work should be greatly to the advantage of the captives. This argument of the advocates for the slave trade will not bear examination for one moment. "The end can not justify the means." We may not do evil in the hope of a good result.

There are no doubt a great many slaves in Africa, but we know, also, upon the best testimony, that there are a great many negroes not slaves. We hold that it is right to buy the former, and the Scriptures justify our opinion. But we hold, as the Scriptures also explicitly warrant, that it is equally wrong to steal the latter, in order to make slaves of them. The advocates of the renewal of the African slave trade can not make out that it is in no respect worse than the domestic slave trade. This position will bear examination no more than the other. When you send to Virginia to buy slaves for the South-west, do the slaveholders of Virginia kidnap negroes that are free to sell to you? Do they send out bands of armed men to scour the country, and burn villages, and seize on the flying population as far as the sword has not devoured them, that they may furnish you the means of cultivating your cotton fields? To make any just comparison is an insult to the institutions of our country. And yet it is openly made in high quarters.

We are free to acknowledge that you might regulate the African slave trade in our own markets, and also the passage of the slaves across the Atlantic, in such a manner as to secure the chief ends of humanity. But all must admit that it is not possible to regulate the trade in Africa itself. For us to reopen the slave trade, would be for us to set on fire a large part of that whole continent, and to give up once more to savage warfare whole tribes of that people.

Individual sins God sometimes punishes here, sometimes hereafter. But for *national* crimes there can be, of course, no future punishment. There is no judgment day for nations as such. The King of the Nations must judge the nations here, or He can never judge them at all. We are now tempted as a people to practise a crime for gain, which would not only tarnish our name on the page of history, but also expose us as a people to the wrath of Heaven! We would, indeed, be recreant to our duty, whether as sons of the South or as ministers of religion, were we to be silent, and not raise a voice of remonstrance and of warning. The South, which is our country as well as that of those who urge this measure, needs all the devotion, and all the wisdom, and all the courage, of all her sons, to rescue her from impending danger; but she needs one other thing more than she needs all these things, and that is the approbation of Him who rules in heaven and on earth to be given to all her measures and to all her acts.

---

*Religion and the State.* A Discourse delivered in the First Presbyterian Church, Savannah, Georgia, July 4, 1858, by Rev. DAVID H. PORTER, Pastor. Published by request. Savannah: Power-Press of John H. Cooper & Co. 1858.

We have read this discourse with great satisfaction. The author took advantage of the circumstance that the anniversary of our national independence fell, this year, on the Lord's Day, to consider "the subject of religion in its national bearings, its relations to the State—striving to discover what those relations are," and illustrating, with happy success, the blessedness of the nation whose God is the Lord. The views presented by Mr. Porter strike us as eminently sound, just and seasonable. He has avoided the Scylla of a church-establishment on the one hand, and the Charybdis of absolute indifference on the other. He shows how a State can be truly religious without making an invidious distinction among its sects, and how a nation can really acknowledge God without the legal enactment of any particular creed. He guards against the fatal error of those

who, because in this country there is an indiscriminate toleration of every faith, and an indiscriminate protection of every form of religious worship, take for granted that as a people we are free from allegiance to the true God, and under no obligation to distinguish betwixt the wheat and the chaff. He shows, on the contrary, that we are bound to be a Christian nation, because we are bound to be a nation of Christians. He shows, too, that no people have a right to presume upon the blessings of God, among whom the institutions of God are not honored and observed. States are as much subject to the Lord as individuals. Jesus is as much the king of nations as of saints, and the rulers and judges of the earth who refuse or neglect to acknowledge His authority, must expect to perish from the way when His wrath is kindled but a little.

But our purpose is not to analyse, but only to commend this discourse. It is a fine specimen of the way in which alone political topics should ever be allowed to appear in the pulpit. We must allude particularly to the happy and successful manner in which Mr. Porter has illustrated the great fundamental proposition, so ably discussed by Bishop Butler, that virtue in communities is power, and sin weakness.

Our brother will excuse us for pointing out a slight mistake into which he has been betrayed in the use of language. We refer to the sense in which he has employed the word, *predicated*, p. 7, as equivalent to founded or established. He speaks of "the prosperity and happiness of a nation" as "*predicated upon* certain relations" subsisting between it and God. This is not good English. We can predicate *of*, but never *upon*. To predicate is simply to affirm or deny, to say one thing of another, and not to ground, or found, or establish.

---

*Religious Poems.* By Mrs. M. MARTIN, Author of *Day-Spring*, &c., &c. Nashville, Tenn. Published for the author. 1858; 12 mo., pp. 234.

The accomplished author of these poems is highly esteemed in this community for her literary taste, her Christian simplicity of manners, and her devotion to the principles of vital

godliness. She has shown her good sense in affixing to her name a title which marks her out, like the mother of our Lord, as a wife; and if to this she has added, as we know she has, the equally endearing tie of a mother, she is only imitating more closely, in her domestic relations, the example of her whose greatest glory it was to have given birth to a son. We do not hesitate to say that it increases the charm of these poems to us, the circumstance that they were written by a wife and a mother. We accept it as a pledge of the genuine sympathies of the female heart. The spirit which pervades the book is the spirit of true religion. The amiable author knows the delight of prayer and the blessedness of communion with the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. The pictures she has drawn of the power of grace to sustain, to strengthen and to cheer amid the darkest trials, are no sketches of the fancy, but real experiences of her own bosom, or of other children of God whom she has seen brightening in the furnace. She speaks of what she has felt, and testifies to what she has known, and her words are worthy of credit, because they are according to the law and the testimony. The book consists of a longer didactic poem, entitled *Christianity*, divided into two parts; the first celebrating the progress, the second illustrating the power of the Gospel, and of various collections of minor pieces grouped under the heads—*Poems by Lamp-light*, or *Paraphrases of Scripture*; *Foreign Missions*; *Domestic Missions*; and *Miscellaneous*. They are all possessed of merit, and, we are happy to say, of a merit which is very rare among modern aspirants to the honors of the Muse; the merit of good sense intelligibly expressed. Mrs. Martin's inspiration is not from the clouds, or the fog, or the mist. She is not an owl that croaks in darkness, nor a bat that flies by twilight. She is a daughter of light, and all that is necessary to understand her verses is a human heart, touched and refined by Divine grace. Some of the shorter pieces are marked by a high degree of lyric excellence; but we confess that the sweetest attraction of the whole book to us is the odour of Christian piety which is diffused from every page.

We would not be true to our trade as critics, if we found no

fault. We mean, therefore, to take an exception, not to the poetry, but to the theology of the ode, *Born Again*, on page 86. Mrs. Martin asserts that the day, the hour, the moment, in which she was born again, are distinctly known to her.

Just five and twenty years ago,  
The day dawned to me, when  
My new, my better life began;  
Forget the time I never can:  
From earth to heaven the tidings ran.  
The angels there rejoiced to know  
That I was born again.

And again:

'Tis known to me, the time, the place,  
The very moment, when  
God's spirit witnessed unto mine  
That I was saved through grace divine.  
What light upon my soul did shine,  
What floods of glory and of grace,  
When I was born again.

In all this, we think, there is a singular confusion of the new birth with the first conscious exercise of faith, or with the peace resulting from a sense of pardon. We are never directly conscious of our states of mind. We know them only through their manifestations. We know our exercises and our feelings, but we do not know directly the soul from which they spring. We know life in its energies and operations, but not in itself. Of the Spirit's work in the production of the new nature, we know nothing immediately. Of its effects in our changed views and feelings, we are directly sensible. The child knows that it *is* born into the world, but when or how it knows only from testimony. It is the privilege of God's children to know that they *are* His; it is not their privilege, nor is it of any importance to them to know *when* they became so. They may remember distinctly when they first laid hold upon God, but they are not authorized to say when God first laid hold upon them. And, after all, the great decisive proof of the new birth is the new life. They only, whatever may be their impressions and assurances, are truly born into the kingdom who live as heirs of

the kingdom. By their fruits ye shall know them. To this test we know that Mrs. Martin would heartily subscribe, and in the closing stanzas of the ode in question we as heartily concur.

---

*An Exposition of the Epistle of Saint Paul to the Colossians.*

By the Rev. JEAN DAILLE, Minister of the French Reformed Church at Clarenton, A. D., 1639. Translated from the French by F. S. Revised and corrected by the Rev. JAMES SHERMAN, Minister of Surrey Chapel, London. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 821 Chesnut Street; 698 pp. 8vo.

Jean Daille was one of the lights that burnt so brilliantly in the 17th century amongst the French Reformed. His name occupies the same page with Saumaise, (Salmasius,) David Blondel, Pierre des Moulin and De Plessis Mornay. Daille devoted himself to historical investigations also, and was distinguished for learning, acuteness and discrimination. The present work presents us with some of the fruits of his theological and critical studies. It is in the form of sermons. Consecutive portions of the Epistle, from the beginning to the end, are thus expounded in forty-nine discourses, that are rich and sweet with the marrow of the Gospel.

---

*The Divine Life: A Book of Facts and Histories.* By the

Rev. JOHN KENNEDY, M. A., F. R. G. S. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, No. 821 Chesnut street; 384 pp. 12mo.

The object of this book is to establish the Christian doctrine of Regeneration by a careful induction of facts, interpreted with rigid fairness and candor. To this end the writer adduces the histories of numerous individuals living in different ages and countries. It is an able and an attractive work. We



should judge that it would be very suitable to put into the hands of intelligent persons who are inclined to skeptical views. We have already made that use of it ourselves, and recommend the same to others.

---

*The Coming and Reign of Christ.* By DAVID N. LORD. New York: Franklin Knight, 138 Nassau street. 1858; 430 pp. 12mo.

We have a great respect for Mr. Lord, and for his talents, learning and general soundness of doctrine. We welcome this work from his pen as presenting, in a compact form, his views, and those of the Millenarian school, on the subject of unfulfilled prophecy. Whether the reader of this book shall be convinced or not of the truth of the Millenarian views, he will at least be led, it is probable, to a more diligent searching of the Scriptures to see whether these things be so.

---

*Sketches for You.* By S. S. EGLISEAN, Author of "Gleanings from Real Life," and "Lucy Dunlevy." 232 pp. 18mo.

*Ragged Tommy; or, The Boy and the Bishop.* 36 pp. 18mo.  
*Bridget Sullivan; or, The Cup without a Handle.* 80 pp. 18mo.

*How to Die Happy.* Written for the Board by the author of "Learn to say No," and "Scenes in Chusan." 101 pp. 18mo.

These all bear the imprimatur of our Board of Publication, and we do not doubt are safe and useful books for children. It is a very responsible work to write books for this class, and to publish them is responsible also. So it is a responsible thing to recommend books for children. We trust the Board will always exercise due care and watchfulness over this department of their publications. Hundreds of books are scattered amongst children as religious story books, which are only fit preparations for the novel reading, that subsequently throws its dangerous fascinations round their minds.

*A Consideration of the Sermon on the Mount.* By Major D. H. HILL, Professor of Mathematics in Davidson College, North Carolina. Philadelphia: William S. & Alfred Martien, No. 608 Chesnut street. 1858; 282 pp. 12mo.

Prof. Hill does not call his work a commentary, and does not profess to have written with the aid of any extensive critical apparatus. He has evidently studied the original, however, with care, and his suggestions are sometimes striking and valuable. He illustrates the subject in hand with frequent references to history. His style is simple, clear and strong. He has produced a book that is well calculated to be useful to many. The "Dedication" of it shows that it is a production associated in his own mind with some saddening recollections. We earnestly hope that the work, as published, may become a blessing to many readers, and thus be linked for him to thoughts of gratitude and gladness.

---

*The Model Merchant; or, Memoirs of Samuel Budgett.* Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 821 Chesnut street; 187 pp. 16mo.

Samuel Budgett was an eminent English merchant—a *Christian* merchant—of Bristol. This book is a sketch of his life, re-published, of course, by our Board. It is well adapted to be useful to all men of business.

## PERIODICAL LITERATURE.

## I. AMERICAN QUARTERLY REVIEWS.—CONTENTS:

- I. *Princeton Review*, July, 1858: Article I. Sprague's Annals of the Presbyterian Pulpit. II. Historical Value of the Pentateuch. III. Missions in Western Africa. IV. The Present State of India, with Map. V. The General Assembly. Short Notices.
- II. *Christian Review*, July, 1858. Article I. The Authorship of the Epistle of Jude, [Translated] by Rev. Edward C. Mitchell, Brockport, N. Y. II. The Religion of Phrenology; by Rev. T. H. Archibald, Exeter, N. H. III. Randall and the Free-Will Baptists; by Rev. P. Richardson, Lawrence, Mass. IV. Alleged Discrepancies in the Bible; by Rev. Enoch Pond, D.D., Bangor, Me. V. Christianity in the Legal Profession; by \* \* \*, Esq., Richmond Va. VI. Hanserd Knollys in America; by Rev. J. Newton Brown, D.D., Germantown, Pa. VII. The Plague of Blood; by Rev. Joseph Banvard, Pawtucket, R. I. VIII. Notices of New Publications. IX. Ecclesiastical Record.
- III. *Quarterly Review of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South*, July, 1858. Article I. German Philosophy; by Prof. W. J. Sasnett, of Oxford, Ga. II. Use and Abuse of the Pulpit. III. Power of the Press; by J. B. M'Ferrin, D.D. IV. Popular Education; by D. R. M'Anally, D.D. V. The Fourth General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. VI. Address of the Bishops to the Fourth General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. VII. Pastoral Address of the Fourth General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. VIII. Reports on Education, Adopted by the Fourth General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. IX. Brief Reviews.
- IV. *Methodist Quarterly Review*, July, 1858. Article I. Attic Tragedy and the Modern Theatre; by Prof. S. D. Hillman, Carlisle, Pa. II. Faith, the Everlasting Bond; by Miss Imogen Mercein, Stamford, Conn. III. American Slave Code in Theory and Practice; by Rev. J. Dempster, D.D., Evanston, Ill. IV. Aaron Burr; by Rev. R. H. Howard, Burlington, Vt. V. Hudson on a Future Life; by James Strong, S.T.D., Flushing, L. I. VI. Béranger; by Rev. J. F. Hurst, Irvington, N. J. VII. The Berlin Conference of 1857; by Rev. William Nast, D.D., Cincinnati, Ohio. VIII. Nott's Lectures on Temperance; by Rev. Luther W. Peck, New York. IX. The Relations of Christianity to Humanitarian Effort; by Dr. L. P. Brockett, Hartford, Conn. X. Religious Intelligence. XI. Synopsis of the Quarterlies. XII. Quarterly Book-Table. XIII. Literary Items.
- V. *Evangelical Review*, July, 1858. Article I. The Review—The Church. II. Select Analytical Bibliography of the Augsburg Confession. III. The Three Saxon Electors of the Era of the Reformation; by Charles F. Schæffer, D.D., Gettysburg, Pa. IV. Christ Preaching to the Spirits in Prison. V. Mormonism; by Rev. R. Weiser, President of Central College of Iowa, Des Moines, Iowa. VI. Baccalaureate Address. VII. Liturgical Studies; Translated from the German of the late Dr. Hœffling, by Rev. Henry S. Lasar, Pastor of the Lutheran Church in Carrolton, Ohio. VIII. Olshausen's Commentary. IX. Livingstone's Travels in Africa. X. Manual of Church History. XI. Notices of New Publications.
- VI. *Southern Baptist Review*, April, June, 1858. Article I. Avenging of the Elect; by D. D. Buck. II. The Rise of the Dutch Republic; by Professor Dabney, Richmond College, Va. III. Duelling; by W. B. Carson, S. C. IV. Christian Union; by J. M. C. Breaker, S. C. V. The Rise, Progress, and History of Infant Baptism and Rhanatism; by G. H. Orchard, England. VI. The Allegory of Dante's Divine Comedy; by T. J. Bowen, Ala. VII. The Present Age; Quarterly Rev. of Proph. VIII. Theology—The Philosophy of Religion; by A. C. D. IX. Breckinridge's Theology; by J. M. P. X. Book Notices.

- VII. *Mercersburg Review*, July, 1858. Article I. Savonarola; by Rev. Philip Schaff, D.D., Mercersburg, Pa. II. How Little we Know; by Prof. Taylor Lewis, LL.D., Schuylkill, N. Y. III. Thoughts on the Church, (Second Article); by Rev. John W. Nevin, D.D., Lancaster, Pa. IV. Baptism; by Rev. Isaac S. Demund, Lancaster, Pa. V. Rauch on Education; Edited by Rev. E. V. Gerhart, D.D., Lancaster, Pa. VI. A Plea for Mathematics; by Rev. Prof. Theodore Apple, Lancaster, Pa. VII. Mahan's Logic; by Rev. Prof. E. V. Gerhart, D.D., Lancaster, Pa. VIII. Hymn of Bonaventura; by Rev. H. Harbaugh, Lancaster, Pa. IX. Recent Publications.
- VIII. *Theological and Literary Journal*, July, 1858. Article I. The Principle of O. A. Brownson's Successive Theological Opinions. II. The Prophetic Periods of the Apocalypse and Daniel. III. Notes on Scripture: John the Baptist: Christ. IV. The Annals of the American Pulpit—The Presbyterian. V. The Religions of India and China. VI. The Land of Promise. VII. Literary and Critical Notices.
- IX. *New Englander*, August, 1858. Article I. The History of Modern Philology. II. Ellis on the Unitarian Controversy. III. Lewes's Biographical History of Philosophy. IV. Theodore Parker and "The Twenty-eighth Congregational Society," of Boston. V. The Right of Search. VI. The American Tract Society. VII. The Religious Awakening of 1858. VIII. The Literature of Spiritualism. IX. The Ante-Mosaic Origin of the Sabbath. Notices of Books.
- X. *Bibliotheca Sacra*, July, 1858. Article I. The Greek Church; by Rev. J. M. Manning, Boston, Mass. II. The True Theory of Missions to the Heathen; by Rev. W. W. Patton, Chicago, Ill. III. Was Peter in Rome, and Bishop of the Church at Rome?—A Historico-Critical Inquiry by J. Ellendorf. Translated from the German by E. Goodrich Smith, M. A., Washington, D. C. IV. The Scriptural Doctrine of a Future State; by Prof. E. P. Barrows, Andover. V. Congregationalism and Symbolism; by Prof. William G. T. Shedd, Andover. VI. Notices of New Publications.
- XI. *The Presbyterian Quarterly Review*, July, 1858: Philadelphia. Article I. John Wycliffe (Second Article). II. Abelard (Second Article). III. The Antecedents of the Moravians. IV. The General Assembly of 1858. V. The Mosaic Account of Creation, Scientific. VI. Notices of New Books.
- XII. *Journal of Prison Discipline*, July, 1858. Article I. Separation—What is it in a Convict Prison? II. State Penitentiaries. III. Pardons, Reprieves and Commutations. IV. Schools of Reform. V. Extracts from Proceedings of Acting Committee of the Philadelphia Society for the Alleviation of the Miseries of Public Prisons. VI. Uncertainty of Penal Suffering. VII. Insecure Custody of Prisoners. A Law Net Broken.
- XIII. *Southern Episcopalian*, Sept., 1858. Miscellaneous: The Messianic Kingdom—a Plea for Missions; by Evangelicus. The University of the South; by G. More Wonderful than the Telegraph (selected). The Cloak left at Troas; by Gaussens. Mothers in Israel; by Alpha. On the Union of the Order for Morning Prayer, the Litany and Communion on Sundays, as one service, &c.; by Laymen. Heat in India. Items—Vicissitude. Faith all the time. Advice. Editorial and Critical. Religious Intelligence.
- XIV. *DeBow's Review*, September, 1858. Article I. The Trans-Atlantic Telegraph; by T. P. Shaffner. II. American Coal Fields; by P. W. Sheefner. III. American Geographical and Statistical Society. IV. Protest against the Revival of the Slave Trade; by Johnson Pettigrew, of South Carolina. V. The Natural Equality of Man; by W. S. Grayson. VI. Justice even from the North; by Hon. Ed. Burke. VII. Our Diplomatic Relations with Mexico. VIII. Department of Agriculture. IX. Department of Commerce. X. Department of Manufactures and Mining. XI. Department of Internal Improvements. XII. Department of Education. XIII. Editorial Miscellany.
- XV. *The Historical Magazine, and Notes and Queries, concerning the Antiquities, History and Biography of America*, September, 1858. General Department. Societies and their Proceedings. Notes and Queries. Obituary. Notices of New Publications. Historical and Literary Intelligence.

## II. BRITISH PERIODICALS.

- I. *Blackwood*, July, 1858. The Soldier and the Surgeon. The Poorbeah Mutiny: The Punjab.—No. V. What will he do with it? by Pistratus Caxton.—Part XIV. The First Bengal European Fusiliers at Lucknow. A Plea for the Principalities. My First and Last Novel. The Great Imposture. Mr. Dusky's Opinions on Art. *August*.—Gladstone's Homer. Circulation of the Blood: Its Course and History. White's Eighteen Centuries. London Exhibitions and London Critics. The Byways of Literature. Kingsley's Andromeda. What will he do with it? by Pistratus Caxton.—Part XV.
- II. *Edinburgh Review*, July, 1858. Article 1. Hugh Miller. 2. Thiers' History of the Consulate and the Empire. 3. The Progress and Spirit of Physical Science. 4. Canning's Literary Remains. 5. The Health of the Army. 6. The Celts and the Germans. 7. Posthumous Memoirs and Songs of Béranger. 8. Chronicles of the Teutonic Knights. 9. Froude's King Henry VIII. 10. The Hindú Drama. 11. Earl Grey on Parliamentary Government.
- III. *Westminster Review*, July, 1858. Article 1. Calvin at Geneva. 2. The Last Days of Church-rates. 3. Domestic Annals of Scotland. 4. Cardinal Wiseman's "Recollections." 5. Medical Education. 6. Women Artists. 7. Recent Astronomy, and the Nebular Hypothesis. 8. Contemporary Literature.
- IV. *London Quarterly*, July, 1858. Article 1. Admiral Blake. 2. History of Civilization in England. 3. Iron Bridges. 4. Life of Wycliffe. 5. Professor Blunt and his Works. 6. Shipwrecks. 7. British Museum. 8. British India.
- V. *North British Review*, August, 1858. Article 1. Chateaubriand, by M. Villemain. 2. Gladstone's Homer. 3. State Papers—Pre-Reformation Period. 4. Biblical Interpretation—Epistles to the Corinthians. 5. British Art—Painting and Sculpture. 6. The Modern British Drama. 7. Egypt and Syria—Western Influence. 8. Researches on Light—Sanatory, Scientific, and Æsthetical. 9. Our Army in India. 10. The Literary Fund. 11. Political Parties. 12. Recent Publications.

## III. FRENCH.

- I. *Revue Chrétienne*, 15 Juin, 1858. Essai sur saint Augustin: Ed. de Pressensé. Calvin, sa vie, ses écrits, son époque: L. Bonnet. Bulletin bibliographique.—Rapport sur la question des divisions entre les chrétiens, par M. le professeur Munier.—La Liberté protestante, par J. F. Bruch.—Recherches homilétiques, ou Quelques idées sur la prédication, par Alfred Vincent.—Frédéric de Diétrich, premier maire de Strasbourg, par Louis Spach. *Revue de mois*.—Mort de la duchesse d'Orléans.—Assemblées annuelles des Sociétés religieuses anglaises. L'Amérique d'après un témoin oculaire.—Séance anniversaire de l'Alliance chrétienne universelle.—L'intolérance suédoise.
- Revue Chrétienne*, 15 Juillet, 1858. Du rôle de la famille dans l'éducation: Edm. de Guerle. De la crise religieuse en Suède: J. P. Trotter. L'Afrique ouverte, ou les découvertes du d'Livingstone: H. Paumier. Bulletin bibliographique.—La Bible et la version de Lemaître de Sacy, par B. Pozzy, pasteur.—Exposition et défense des dogmes principaux du christianisme, par l'abbé Martin de Noirliu. *Revue de mois*. La Réformation jugée par l'Univers.—Mort de M. Ary Scheffer.—M. de Montricher.—Le dernier ouvrage de M. de Sacy.—Voltaire et M. Arsène Houssey.—L'Assemblée constituante de Neuchâtel et la séparation de l'Eglise et de l'Etat.
- Revue Chrétienne*, 15 Août, 1858: Paris. Du rôle de la famille dans l'éducation: Edm. de Guerle. Mort de Curione: Jules Bonnet. L'Afrique ouverte, ou les découvertes du Dr. Livingstone: H. Paumier. Causerie sur les Etats-Unis: Th. Monod. Bulletin bibliographique.—De la croyance due à l'Evangile, examen critique de l'authenticité des textes et de la vérité des récits évangéliques, par H. Wallon, membre de l'Institut.—Réveries et Vérités, ou De quelques questions astronomiques envisagées sous le rapport religieux, en réponse à l'ouvrage du docteur William Whewell.—Lettres genevoises sur la confession auriculaire, ou Réplique à la brochure d'un ancien supérieur de Nancy, par C. E. Schmidt.—Fables et poésies choisies de Théophile Conrad Pfeffel, traduites en vers français par M. Paul Lehr. *Revue de mois*. Lettres due père Lacordaire.—L'école tra-

- ditionnelle et Mgr Parisis.—Documents inédits sur Rousseau.—Les sentiments religieux de l'auteur d'Emile.—Un article de M. Naville.—L'individualisme de M. Renan: Eng. Bersier.
- II. *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 15 Juin, 1858: Paris. L'Angleterre et la Vie anglaise.—III.—Les Gypsies et la Vie errante, par M. Alphonse Esquiros. L'Homme de Neige, deuxième partie, par M. George Sand. Les Russes sur le fleuve Amour, par M. Auguste Laugel. La Monarchie de Louis XV.—II.—L'Europe et la Diplomatie française pendant la Régence, par M. Louis de Carné. La Guerre de l'Oude.—I.—L'Insurrection de Lucknow, par M. E.-D. Forgues. Les Voyages d'exploration en Afrique.—III.—Expédition du Dr. Barth, par M. Alfred Jacobs. Chronique de la quinzaine, histoire politique et littéraire. Essais et Notices.—Les Livres nouveaux, revue critique.
- Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1er Juillet, 1858: Paris. I. L'Homme de Neige, troisième partie, par M. George Sand. II. Épisodes de la Guerre de L'Inde en 1857.—II.—Le Siège de Lucknow et le Général Havelock, par M. E.-D. Forgues. III. Les Voyageurs en Orient et la Turquie Depuis le Traité de Paris.—III.—De L'Avenir des Populations Chrétiennes Orientales, par M. Saint-Marc Girardin, de l'Académie Française. IV. Écrivains Modernes de la France.—M. Edgar Quinet et ses Oeuvres, par M. Saint-René Taillandier. V. Scènes de la vie Romaine.—Le Château Saint-Ange, Souvenirs d'un prisonnier politique sous le Pontificat de Grégoire XVI. VI. Un Botaniste en Chine, par M. Charles Lavollée. VII. Chronique de la Quinzaine, histoire politique et littéraire. VIII. Revue Musicale, par M. P. Scudo. IX. Essais et Notices.—Livres Nouveaux. X. Bulletin Bibliographique.
- Revue des Deux Mondes*, 15 Juillet, 1858: Paris. I. Les Préraphaélites a propos d'un Tableau de Raphael et de Divers Ouvrages Français et Anglais, par M. Henri Delaborde. II. L'Homme de Neige, quatrième partie, par M. George Sand. III. La Question du Servage en Russie.—I.—Nécessité de L'Emancipation et condition actuelle des Serfs, par M. L. Wolowski, de l'Institut. IV. Moeurs des Écoles dans la Grande-Bretagne.—Souvenirs d'un Écolier Anglais, par M. Émile Montégut. V. Les Iles-Ioniennes Sous la Domination de Venise et Sous le Protectorat de L'Angleterre.—Origines et Tendances des partis Indigènes, par Mme Dora d'Istria. VI. Quelques Jours en Espagne, par M. John Lemoinne. VII. La Littérature Romanesque en France.—II.—L'Astrée et le Roman Pastoral, par M. Louis de Loménie. VIII. Chronique de la Quinzaine, histoire politique et littéraire. IX. Essais et Notices.—Livres Nouveaux. X. Bulletin Bibliographique.
- Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1er Aout, 1858: Paris. I. L'Homme de Neige, cinquième partie, par M. George Sand. II. L'Agriculture et la vie Rurale en Italie, par M. Vidalin. III. La Question du Servage en Russie.—II.—Les Serfs de la Couronne et le Communisme Russe, par M. L. Wolowski, de l'Institut. IV. Thomas Browne, le Médecin Philosophe de Norwich.—II.—Une Époque de Transition Morale, par M. J. Milsand. V. L'École Libérale, ses Principes et ses Tendances, a Propos d'un Livre de M. De Sacy, par M. Ernest Renan, de l'Institut. VI. Une Campagne Maritime dans L'Océan-Pacifique pendant la Dernière Guerre. I.—L'Expédition de Petropavlosk, par M. Ed. du Hailly. VII. Chronique de la Quinzaine, histoire politique et littéraire. VIII. Essais et Notices.—La Poésie Nouvelle, par M. E. Lataye. IX. Bulletin Bibliographique.
- Revue des Deux Mondes*, 15 Aout, 1858: Paris. I. Philosophie du Dix-Huitième Siècle et la Révolution, par M. Charles de Rémusat, de l'Académie Française. II. L'Homme de Neige, Sixième partie, par M. George Sand. III. La Monarchie de Louis XV.—III.—Le Ministère du Cardinal De Fleury, par M. Louis de Carné. IV. Les Derniers Temps de L'Empire Mogol.—I.—Molhar-rao-holkar et Rano Dji-Sindiah, par M. Théodore Pavie. V. Jonathan Swift, Son Génie et Ses Oeuvres, par M. Henry Taine. VI. L'Intolérance Suédoise, les Périls du Danemark et le Scandinavisme, par M. A. Geffroy. VII. De L'Alimentation Publique.—Les Cultures Algériennes et la Récolte de 1858, par M. Payen, de l'Institut. VIII. Chronique de la Quinzaine, Histoire politique et littéraire. IX. Essais et Notices.—Le Dernier des Philidor, par M. P. Scudo. X. Bulletin Bibliographique.

# THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XI.—No. IV.

---

JANUARY, MDCCCLIX.

---

ARTICLE I.

## THE ASTRONOMICAL ARGUMENT AGAINST CHRISTIANITY.

The history of Christianity presents a scene of continual conflict. The ingenuity of man, and the malice of Satan, have been exhausted in assailing it by every form of opposition from without, by every mode of seduction from within. Its Divine Author predicted this when he said—"think not I am come to send peace on the earth; I came not to send peace, but a sword." The various modes of assault may be reduced to three classes—persecution, corruption, and the antagonism of science, falsely so called. Persecution, though reeking with the blood, and encompassed with the dead bodies of the saints, has ever proved to be the most harmless. Its attacks are open, and, therefore, may be more readily guarded against; its instrument is physical violence, and it is, therefore, unfitted to cope with moral courage and the spirit of devotion. Days of persecution have often been the most flourishing times in the Church. It was so during the ten devastations under the Roman Empire. It was so in the days of the Reformation. Corruption is the most dangerous form of attack, because it is the most insidious, and because it begins at once to prey on the

vitals. A debased Christianity, which holds truth enough to attract, but not enough to save, or whose truth is hidden under a mass of heresy and superstition, which possesses the form of godliness, while it denies the power thereof, presents the most hopeless spectacle among the religions of earth. It is well nigh as destructive as Atheism or Idolatry, far more capable of expansion and progress, and far more tenacious of life. Witness the spiritual dearth of the middle ages, the boundless sway of the Roman superstition, and the result of the contest between Protestantism and Papacy. After three hundred years of unceasing warfare, what has evangelical religion gained in Europe? Scotland, a part of England, a moiety of Ireland, and a few feeble and scattered churches in some half-dozen other countries, comprise all its possessions. Romanism, though beaten back for a while, has slowly regained nearly all that was wrenched from her in that great struggle.

The efforts of infidelity are directed either against the evidences, the facts, or the doctrines of the Gospel. The battle around the outworks of the evidences was long and arduous. It is now suspended, probably, until another cycle shall have buried in the minds of opposers the sense of their former defeat. The conflict, if not hotter now, is closer, being within the fortress. Every science is laid under contribution to gainsay the Gospel. Infidel philosophers deny the consistency of its statements with the dogmas of their science, and either convert man into a machine, or endow him with Omnipotence. Infidel moralists unsettle the ground of distinction between virtue and vice, and repudiate the doctrines of original sin and total depravity. Infidel logicians reject as fallacious and irreconcilable, its teachings concerning the origin of evil, and the goodness of God, concerning man's freedom and his inability. Infidel physiologists deny to man a spiritual existence, and attempt to account for the phenomena of mind by the organism of the brain and nerves. Infidel historians deny its facts, and pour contempt on its prophecies. Infidel geologists disembowel the earth, and find alleged contradictions to its supposed account of the age and formation of the globe. Infidel ethnologists will not admit the unity of the race; and in the



cranium, in the cuticle, and in the heel, discover evidence of a multiform origin, and can even point out the transitions by which a fish has been expanded to a man. Infidel astronomers measure and weigh and number the stars, and from the magnitude and splendor of the firmament infer the incredibility of the Gospel narrative. Each science is seized at its birth and declared to be a champion of scepticism; but as soon as it can speak, and while in the very gristle of childhood, it proclaims itself a true knight, and a defender of the faith.

It is to the Astronomical argument that we now invite the attention of our readers.\* We shall attempt no description of the sidereal heavens. Suffice it to say, that this great globe is but an obscure member of our own system. Jupiter is fourteen hundred times, the sun is twelve thousand times, larger. The earth wheels along its orbit at the rate of sixty-eight thousand miles per hour, and describes annually a mighty circle, whose circumference is above five hundred millions of miles. The sun shoots his bright and burning rays athwart a vast and awful chasm, and beams upon us at the distance of near one hundred millions of miles; and struggles to illumine the most distant planet at the long interval of two thousand millions; and yet these inconceivable figures are but as the lisplings of infancy in the arithmetic of the heavens. Sirius pours forth a flood of splendor nearly equal to fourteen suns, and though the centre of a system twenty billions of miles from us, sheds on the earth a vivid light rivalling the lustre of Venus. A cannon ball, moving at the rate of five hundred miles an hour, would traverse this inconceivable space after a weary journey of four and a half millions of years! And the earth, if projected through this space from its orbit at its present terrific velocity, would accomplish its flight when five times older than it is now. The naked eye, on a cloudless night, beholds a thousand stars; the best instrument invented by man can take in eighty millions. The nebulæ are the luminous points in innumerable clusters of suns, of which our sun and all the thousand

---

\* See, generally, Chalmers' *Astronomical Discourses*, and John Foster's *Review of them*.

fixed stars which appear in the firmament, together with, perhaps, untold multitudes lying beyond the reach of our vision, are but the components of a single member; the grand central orb, around which revolve these thousand suns with their ten thousand planets, with all their hundreds of thousands of attendant satellites, wheels its majestic evolutions around some more remote and more glorious centre, and lies beyond our perception in this distant, and it may be utmost, verge of the mighty circle, or else emits a hazy and undistinguished ray amongst incalculable millions of associated spheres of equal or superior splendor. There is reason to suppose that this is but the hem of Jehovah's garment. It is just as absurd to think that we have now reached the bounds of creation, as it was when men gazed upon the stars without a telescope, or looked through Gallileo's invention. Nothing can be more unphilosophical than the supposition, that the creative energy was exhausted at the precise point which the vision of man, at a particular stage in the perfection of optical instruments, is capable of reaching. We would not check the belief that this is a corner of the universe, and that all we have seen, and all we have imagined, are but the skirts and shreds of creation, while the vast whole stretches, in some sort, infinitely around us. And then to the question, whether all these worlds are inhabited, we are more inclined to return an assent than a denial. We cannot believe that these innumerable and stupendous masses of matter wheel along their endless courses amid the silence of death. We would crowd them with living, active, intelligent beings. In every star we behold a sun—and our imagination fills the boundless spaces between them with the habitations of God's worshippers.

This is a brief outline of the facts on which infidelity builds its reasoning. It alleges that the Christian religion can be rendered credible only by giving to earth the prominence among the works of creation assigned it in the days of ignorance; but that amid the discoveries of modern astronomy, and while surrounded by untold millions of blazing suns, this insignificant ball becomes utterly contemptible, and the story of its redemption by the incarnation and death of the Great

Creator is simply ridiculous. The argument is entirely presumptive; we shall have answered it when we afford a counter and more violent presumption. We accept the facts, but reject the reasoning. On the hypothesis that this globe is the only habitable portion of the universe, with the exception of a circumscribed place called heaven, and a narrow pit called hell; that the human race comprises the entire number of God's rational creatures, with the solitary exception of a limited number of spiritual existences,—these being the only conditions on which infidelity will accept the statements of revelation,—there is nothing marvellous in the scheme unfolded in the Gospel, but the Almighty is placed in a position which it is the depth of humility to assert He can never, never occupy. He is represented as being urged to the work of salvation by motives of which the Divine nature is wholly unsusceptible. A part, it may be a large part, of the angelic forms of intelligence, have openly and forever abandoned His service; and now this lower type of human existence has been seduced from its allegiance by the intervention of those malignant spirits, and all mankind are at enmity with His law and His nature. There is apparently imminent danger that all His creatures will desert him; that He will present the awful spectacle of a king without a kingdom, a sovereign without a subject, a God without a worshipper. Under these appalling circumstances, it is quite probable that He will exert himself to reclaim the rebels; it is not incredible even, that He should in these efforts go to the length depicted in the Gospel. The whole matter is reduced to a question of self-preservation, or rather to a question, which to every crowned head is infinitely more vital than that of personal safety—the honor of his throne, and the integrity of his empire. Everything bears the aspect of a desperate and doubtful conflict between the king of kings and his rebellious subjects. All such ideas as free grace, mercy, love, condescension, and an eternal purpose, comprehending all these transgressions and all these displays, are entirely impertinent; and the work of redemption, even to the last extremity of the sacrifice of His own Son, is forced upon the Supreme Being as a sheer and humiliating necessity. Nothing can be more blas-

phemous than all this; yet all this flows naturally from the requirements of infidelity. The necessities of the Christian argument demand no such contracted field; but find full scope only in the widest view of creation, and allow the presumption, that as this globe is but one among many globes, so the human race is but one among many races of intelligent creatures. And in order to aggravate the objection, and afford the carpings of scepticism full utterance, we admit the apparent probability that the human race is among the lowest in the scale of intelligent existence; we even assent to the certainty of this, because a being inferior in intellect to man could not be rational. He occupies a position at the very next remove from the brute, and it is impossible to conceive of an intermediate grade which shall be possessed of the essential attributes of reasonable existence.

However we may escape the supposed dilemma, we are very far from wishing to do so under any false colors. We accept with delight all the developments of astronomy, and revel in the view of unnumbered millions of radiant glories inscribed by the finger of Omnipotence throughout the boundless realms of space; we admit that this is but a speck in the midst of an almost limitless space—an atom amongst an apparent infinity of worlds. We urge that as immensity seems to be of the Creator's plan, that immensity must far transcend, not only what the eye of man hath seen, but also what his imagination can conceive, and must, to the apprehension of the most exalted finite intellect, be practically infinite; so that the loftiest of them all, and of most rapid wing, shall never, through the ceaseless ages of eternity, be able to survey all the scene, or to reach the spot where

“The terminating pillar raises high  
Its extra-mundane head.”

We insist, also, on man's insignificance, and admit him to be a child of clay, brother to the beast, and a worm of the dust; that he is the connecting link between animal and spiritual existence, the very meanest creature capable of loving and adoring its Maker; the feeblest voice in the swelling anthem

of universal praise; that in his loftiest efforts to conceive the Deity, he may not be able sufficiently to stretch his imagination to take in the full proportions of those majestic, but created beings, who stand next the awful throne. We allow all this, and yet maintain that reason and science offer no valid objection to the truths of Christianity; and that for anything they may say, there may have been unfolded in such a world as this, and among such a race as this, the wonderful scheme of redemption revealed in the Gospel.

I. The infidel argument briefly stated is, that this world, and this race, are so insignificant amid the wide-spread glories of the universe, that God can never have concentrated on them the care depicted in Scripture.

1. The argument is fallacious on its face. From the multiplicity of God's works it infers partial attention to each one. It is guilty of the sophism of inferring littleness from greatness. The data are infinite, the conclusion is less than nothing. It proceeds upon an assumed deficiency in God's attributes, and it makes out this deficiency in one direction, from the fact of their infinity in another direction. Because God has exerted Himself infinitely in creation, He cannot exert Himself infinitely in providence. He has made a universe wider than He can compass; He has brought more beings into existence than He can properly attend to; His creatures must endure an eternal inanition, not because they have forfeited His favor, but because He is unable to bestow it. He is overwhelmed by the vastness, and confused by the complexity of His own works. Man needs salvation, but his Maker cannot grant it, for the same reason that the man who began to build without counting the cost, was unable to finish. The world is suffering under a deep and dreadful disorder, but God is so occupied with other things that He can never find time to visit this portion of His dominions.

This argument is analogous to that of John Adams' concerning original sin. God's providential care is either divisible or indivisible; if divisible, the share falling to each creature is so small that, like a remote decimal, it may be overlooked in our calculations; if indivisible, the chances are billions to one

that the fortunate recipient dwells somewhere in the milky way. God is able to do a little, in a general way, for His creatures; but we cannot expect a being, on whom devolves the charge of an entire universe, to be very special in His attention, or to do for each creature precisely that which he most needs, and that which he must obtain or else be forever miserable.

2. Further, these reasonings find their legitimate conclusion in epicureanism. If they prove anything, they exclude the Almighty from all intervention among the affairs of the world, and commit all things to the guidance of chance. For if God be incapable of directing the particulars, it is impossible that He can control the generals. If the minutest event may occur without His agency, there can be no general and efficient supervision, and the character of infallibility cannot be ascribed to His administration. Great affairs are so interwoven with small ones; broad issues, which affect whole nations, so often depend on trivial matters, that no plan can be pronounced perfect which does not embrace all these disturbing influences. Life is a tangled web, with many a knot, and many a twist, and only he who can follow the thread through all its devious courses, can reel it smoothly off. Each event stands related to a thousand others, each of these to a thousand more, and the circle widens geometrically, so that the final bearings of the most trivial act on the destiny of a nation, or the race, may be immeasurable; and no mind which fails to observe these incipient forces can secure the furtherance of its plans. God either comprises *every* thing in His purpose, or He has no purpose, and hence is not God; for a decree which does not fix the event is a solecism; and no event can be fixed unless there be a knowledge and arrangement of *all* the causes which combine in its production.

3. But again. It affords a more exalted conception of the Divine Being, and removes our ideas of Him further from those appropriated to human imperfection, to suppose that while occupied with the concerns of the vast whole, He is not at all over-burdened thereby, but is able to bestow an undiminished attention on the minutest portions of His works. This being the most glorious view of the Deity, must therefore be the

true one; for nothing can be more absurd and impious than to say, that we are able to form a higher conception of God than is really and actually true—thus making the powers of our finite and feeble minds not only to grasp, but to reach, beyond the true expression of the Divine glory.

4. *Facts* establish this minute attention. Each one of us, though but a unit among the thousand millions of earth's inhabitants, is watched over, provided for, and guarded, as though we were the only inhabitants of this planet;—as though, in our single self, we exhausted all the energies of the Godhead. We are assured of the minuteness of this watchful care in the statement, that the very hairs of our heads are all numbered. And looking far down below our position in the scale of being, we are told that the same observant eye notes all the winged warblers who disport themselves in the depths of the trackless forest, so that not a sparrow falleth to the ground without the notice of our Heavenly Father. And still again, beyond the reach of our intensest vision lie unnumbered races whose existence can be made known to us only by the powers of the microscope. Myriads of sentient beings occupy every particle; to them an atom is a world, a leaf is an universe. And could our senses be quickened as we stand in the solitude of some retired scene, instead of the desolation which saddens, and the silence which oppresses us, we would behold around us countless generations, all instinct with vitality, and vocal with praise. All these, even to those infinitesimal existences which no glass can take in, are the objects of Divine protection; for in Him they live, and move, and have their being. If God care for these creatures who tremble on the verge of nihility, how much more will He clothe us, the partakers of His image, and the lords of this lower creation.

5. The objection is, that such condescension is incredible; but condescension must stoop, and is striking in proportion to the distance which it descends. If this world stood pre-eminent among the stars of heaven; if, as was formerly supposed, this were the grand centre around which the firmament revolves; if the human race held the topmost round in the lofty scale of creation, the story of the mighty intervention in

their behalf might be more credible, but it could not then, as now, be asked with emphasis, "What is man that thou art mindful of him; or the son of man that thou visitest him?"—and no such humiliating comparison as the inspired Psalmist makes between the splendors of the skies and the insignificance of the earth would be appropriate.

Thus, our littleness offers no obstacle to belief, but simply enhances a quality pertinent to the subject, the quality of a marvellous loving-kindness. True, God is presented in a new and most wonderful relation to his creatures; but it is a relation which, while full of blessing to them, does Him no dishonor—but, on the contrary, displays Him in His most glorious aspect, and endows our conception of Him with a deeper and more tender reverence.

II. This entire reasoning proceeds on the supposition, that Christianity is circumscribed in its sphere, and affects only the destiny of the human race. But this is an infidel assumption; and although it has been attempted to compel Revelation to utter what was imagined to be the sentence of its own condemnation, it has remained proof against torturing expositions. No such doctrine can be found in its pages; all the light shed on the subject beams full on its antipode.

1. It is abundantly evident from the plainest declarations of Scripture, that the work of redemption affords matter of *study*, of *instruction*, of *delight*, to the angelic world. "Which things the angels desire to look into." "To the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known, by the Church, the manifold wisdom of God." "There is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth."

2. There are indications of a peculiar moral government co-extensive with, but distinct from, the essential dominion of the Godhead, growing out of the Mediatorial work brought to view in the Gospel, and devolved on Him who was specifically designated to be the Saviour of the world. In the epistle to the Ephesians it is said—"that in the dispensation of the fullness of times He might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth; even in



him." Again—"when He raised him from the dead, and set him at His own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality and power, and might and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come; and hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the Church, which is his body, the fullness of Him who filleth all in all." In Hebrews it is said—"thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet; for in that He put all in subjection under him, He left nothing that is not put under him." Peter declares that "Jesus Christ is gone into heaven, and is on the right hand of God; angels and authorities and powers being made subject unto him." In Philippians it is said, that "God hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth." And in Colossians it is asserted, that "having made peace through the blood of his Cross, by him to reconcile all things unto Himself; by him, I say, whether they be things in earth or things in heaven."

Two positions may be firmly based on these passages: 1st, That Christ rules and governs angels; and 2d, That this is not the original and essential dominion which he exercises in virtue of his diverse nature, but that delegated and Mediatorial kingdom for which he was fitted by the mysterious constitution of his complex person. This wonderful person, embracing the infinitely diverse natures of God and man, was certainly appointed with special reference to his offices among the children of men; but these passages show that Christ sustains a much wider, viz: an universal relation. Hence we infer, that Christ Jesus performed a work which affects all created beings; and as the work required by us was specifically different from that necessary to other orders, though generically the same, he took our nature, and accomplished it on the earth. Had our wants been identical with those of angels, for anything we can see, he might have assumed a spiritual and unfallen nature, and simply rendered a preceptive obedience to the law; but, as man was sinful, and condemned, his necessities demanded

that the Mediator should be made flesh, and should become obedient, even unto death. But the further comprehension of special and additional matter does not, in the least, detract from the character of universality properly belonging to this great scheme of mediation—and the Gospel, which principally reveals so much of this scheme as bears directly on our case, does not offer itself as an isolated and unaccountable fact, but as part, probably the most glorious part, of a wondrous plan, embracing all ages and all generations. The radical and distinctive principle of this new mode (if we may so express it) of the Divine Government, is *grace* in distinction from law. A legal relation with God appears to be not only ruinous to the sinner, but insecure to the holy. There would seem to be in the creature, as such, whether partly material, or entirely spiritual, an inherent tendency to depart from the injunctions, and to incur the penalty of law. They were unquestionably created with an ability to obey it perfectly, but the retention of that ability appears ever to have been a difficult and doubtful task. A lofty rectitude, and an immaculate holiness, are their birthright, but they are prone to seek out many inventions. Of the two orders concerning which we are informed, only a portion of one have maintained their integrity, and they have been kept in their first estate, we believe, by a radical change in their legal relations. Except by the supervention of some additional element in the Divine Government, there cannot be, so far as we can perceive, any absolute security against a deadly fall to the seraphim and cherubim, who, radiant with celestial glory, encircle the eternal throne. This new element is *grace*, which, in its genus, signifies favor shown beyond the requisitions of law, and in its specific varieties of favor, on the one hand, to the undeserving, and, on the other hand, to the ill-deserving, bestows confirmation on angels, and redemption on man.

Two objections are urged against this, not with the flippant impiety of scepticism, but with the gravity of an earnest search for truth.\* 1. It is not clear that angels are the *indi-*

---

\* See Foster's Critical Essays, Vol. 2., pp. 384–385. Bohn's Edition.

*genae*, the original inhabitants of the various worlds in space; but they are styled ministering spirits—classes of which may be appropriated to each globe; and the angels mentioned in Scripture may be merely that particular set of spiritual beings whose offices are confined to earth; hence, though all that has been said concerning the relation of angels to the work of Christ be true, we have arrived very little nearer universality in the scope of the Gospel, than if its designs terminated on the children of men. The foundation for this opinion is laid in those Scriptures which represent angels in a posture of attendance on earth, “Are they not all ministering spirits sent forth to minister?” “He shall give his angels charge over thee, to keep thee in all thy ways,” together with those frequent instances in the Old Testament in which angels appeared to the patriarchs. But consider (1) that these services are rendered by special commission from God, and are everywhere held out as the peculiar blessings and privileges of a certain specified relation to Jehovah. This attendance is not conferred on man as such; these offices are not discharged upon the whole human family; angels are not the ministering spirits of all the earth. They are attendants on the Most High; they wait around His throne; they do His bidding. They are enlisted in the progress of His most glorious manifestation, the work of redemption. Those who are included within its provisions receive their kind benefactions, and no others; “they are sent forth to minister for them who shall be the heirs of salvation.” It is by a gracious provision of God’s love that the redeemed are allowed the benefits of this spiritual service; it is altogether a covenant blessing. Mankind in general have no part nor lot in the matter. There is no reason, therefore, to be assigned from analogy (and the reasoning is entirely analogical) for the opinion that other worlds enjoy the ministry of angels. The doctrine of their earthly ministration is a component of the scheme of redemption, which embraces the infinite grace of God, the advent of the Son, and the mission of the Spirit; and as these constitute a system perfectly unique, and superior to the ordinary dealings of Providence, no argument drawn from analogy possesses any force.

Answer (2). Various names are employed in Scripture to designate the diversified ranks and orders of spiritual existence; they are called thrones, dominions, principalities and powers, cherubim, seraphim, angels, archangels, morning-stars, and the sons of God. How incongruous are these imposing titles if applied to a small detachment of an inferior race, who have no local habitation, though, indeed, a superfluity of names, and whose existence and happiness are exhausted in attendance on an insignificant child of earth. The Scriptures could not more clearly have indicated the universal application of this spiritual nomenclature, unless it had first given lessons in astronomy; such instruction it was not the province of Revelation to communicate. But, although the Bible does not instruct in the truths of science, it is often illustrated by their discovery; and we are able, standing as we do amid the developments of modern astronomy, to perceive a greater significance than those of old in these lofty appellations, as we see spread out before us the universal range of created intelligence, stretching from earth to the central orb, the most gorgeous palace of the Great King; and from man to the brightest intellect who, in the heaven of heavens, beholds his Maker's glory face to face.

Objection (2). There is another objection which affirms supernal beings to be fully occupied with the affairs of their several worlds, and the alleged diversion of their attention to these sublunary concerns to be inconsistent with the necessary limitation of their faculties, and to involve the idea of a knowledge too nearly approximating infinite. Now, it is evident, that however absorbed we may suppose the heavenly hosts to be with those parts of the Divine plans and processes which lie immediately around them, there might be some manifestation of His glory far transcending all ordinary exhibitions, and which would catch the attention, excite the inquiry, and call forth the praise of every creature. It is clear, also, that this pre-eminent work might be so conspicuously revealed as to afford them information, while, at the same time, they were left in some degree ignorant of what was contiguous to them, and of what intervened; even as the sun, though many millions of miles distant, is to us the most con-

spicuous of all objects, and while we know the earth but partially, and almost nothing of what lies between, we behold his splendor, we rejoice in his light, and are sustained by his genial warmth. This objection, therefore, is based on the hypothesis that each globe has been the object of some great moral demonstration, and that the work of man's redemption is but one among many similar displays of the Divine glory.

Now, while we would not circumscribe the loftiest conception of the power, wisdom and goodness of God, and freely admit that He manifests His glory in all places of His dominion, we cannot allow the thought that He has ever made any other such display as is brought to view in the Gospel.

And this for several reasons: (1). The principle of grace above referred to needs but once to be engrafted on the moral government of God; and as this principle has full scope in the Mediatorial work of Christ, even on the contracted field of human salvation, but more perfectly in the broader relations we have ascribed to it, there is no ground to suppose the devising of any other scheme for its introduction.

(2). And as the grace of God, exhibited in the face of Jesus Christ, involving the display of all His attributes, His wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness and truth, lifts its infinite provisions far above the utmost reach of our imagination, we are convicted of unwarrantable speculation when we attempt to conceive of something higher than all this, and are guilty of a wicked audacity when we undertake to affirm that this glorious work is but one of God's ordinary operations, and that it possesses nothing intrinsically, and nothing in its relations to the universe, which serve to mark it as a singular and wonderful production of its Divine author. Scripture everywhere represents Christ's assumption of the Mediatorial offices as the highest expedient ever adopted, not only in the government of earth, but throughout the bounds of His universal empire; and demands for it, beside the feeble thanksgiving of man, songs of loudest praise from heaven's assembled choirs. "And I beheld, and I heard the voice of many angels round about the throne, and the beasts, and the elders; and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of

thousands; saying, with a loud voice, Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing. And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying: Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever and ever."

(3). Consider again the arrogance of the opinion, that the condescension of God has ever stooped lower than it did in the assumption of our nature; that His justice has ever been more awfully displayed than in the sacrifice of His Son; that His truth has ever been more completely verified than in fulfilling the promises of the Gospel; that the treasures of His wisdom, and of His love, surpass those laid up in Christ; that the honor put upon any creatures transcends that of the heirs of God, and the joint heirs with Jesus Christ.

(4). But again we are taught, that all things are put in subjection to the Incarnate Redeemer. The adoration of all creatures must be rendered to the Divine nature in its mysterious conjunction with humanity; and heaven shall forever present the amazing spectacle of the "Word made flesh." Nothing less than the most daring impiety can surmise that such an event may pass unnoticed among the worshippers of God; or, that this unutterable transaction, which raises the lowest form of intelligence far above all principality and power to the occupancy of the eternal throne, and to personal subsistence with the Almighty, is an ordinary occurrence, overlooked amid greater splendors, beyond the small province where it took place, and the few families affected by its provisions. Have we reason to suppose that other natures have been assumed by the Godhead? "Christ took not on him the nature of angels, but took on him the seed of Abraham." Have, then, the Father and the Holy Ghost, each, selected some created type in which to veil their glories? If not, and nothing can exceed the presumption of the conjecture, the incarnation of the Son of God must ever remain the great event in universal history; the most glorious, and the most

blessed manifestation of the Deity; and Christ Jesus shall receive throughout eternity, by the acclamations of all worlds and all races, the sublime appellations ascribed to him on earth, and shall be to them, as he is to us, the wisdom of God, and the power of God, the brightness of the Father's glory, and the express image of His person.

III. We rest this discussion, finally, on the establishment of a truth, which far surpasses the low conceptions of infidelity; which rebukes its mean attempt to honor God, and which reveals His true dignity and excellence. The advocates of this vain philosophy cannot conceive that God has any end in view in creation and providence other than the welfare of His creatures; and they object to the Gospel, not because man is infinitely unworthy of God's notice, but because he is not so worthy as some other races in the universe. Had it been revealed to the greatest globe, and to the tallest race in the heavens, they would admit its credibility. But this position, arrived at by weighing worlds, and measuring angels, is unsound and absurd; for it must be supported by one of two suppositions; either that God makes His creatures His end, or that He makes Himself His end. If we say the creature is His end, we are guilty not only of a fallacy, but of impiety; not only of a lie, but of blasphemy. But even admit it, and the adverse inference drawn from man's littleness is illogical; because, however creatures may differ among themselves, the finiteness and meanness of their natures is such, in comparison with the Infinite Being, that the difference is not worth considering. We may, in time, compare a year and a century, but when considered with reference to eternity, there is no difference between them; in fact, neither has an appreciable value. If we say He makes Himself His end, then the accomplishment of His glory by feeble instrumentalities is in accordance with the analogy of nature, and is highly expressive of His wisdom and power. In the works of nature, God does not sound a trumpet before Him. When He illumined the darkness of chaos, He said, "let there be light, and there was light." When He educed the universe from nothingness, "He spake, and it was done, He commanded, and it stood fast." These

majestic spheres, revolving in their grand orbits with terrible velocity, address no music to the outward ear. All vegetation springs and buds, and blossoms and matures, by an imperceptible process. Man needs long preparation and abundant material, because his faculties are limited; but God's infinite perfections are illustrated in His making all things out of nothing. If, then, His own glory be God's end in all His works, the argument against Christianity, drawn from the smallness of its objects, falls to the ground.

That the ultimate reason of God's actions must reside within Himself, will appear from the following considerations:\*

1. All the plans of Deity were formed in eternity. He dwelt absolutely alone, and hence all influences must have been drawn from Himself. He was not influenced by extraneous objects, for no extraneous objects existed. Nihilism can exert no influence; therefore, whatever reason there was for making and executing His designs, must have been drawn from Himself.

2. God is the most glorious of beings; hence His glory is most worthy of pursuit and regard. God is infinite in understanding; and hence most fully comprehends this great truth. He is holy and almighty; and hence will assuredly secure the most worthy and righteous ends; therefore He will pursue His own glory.

3. The same truth results necessarily from the relations of the Creator to the creature. It is absurd that God would create beings for the express purpose of becoming their servant. All creatures are required to love, honor and obey their Maker supremely. How is this command consistent with the supposition that these creatures are the objects of His supreme regard, for whose benefit all the infinite treasures of Divine wisdom, power and goodness, are exhausted? There must lie some reason further back which ultimately refers all things to God, not only as their cause, but also as their end.

4. On the hypothesis, that the happiness of the creature, in itself considered, is His one great end, the existence of moral

---

\* See Edwards' Dissertation on the End for which God created the World.



evil in the government of God, inexplicable in any scheme, but preposterous in this, casts a dreadful imputation, either on His goodness or His power. If He inflicted misery on some for the sake of greater good to the rest, the benevolence is questionable; if He allowed it partially, that it might not be universal, His arm is shortened that He cannot save.

But the Scriptures are abundantly clear on this subject. "For by Him were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in earth, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; all things were created by Him and for Him. Col. 1: 16. "For it became Him, by whom are all things, and for whom are all things." Heb. 2: 10. "The Lord made all things for Himself." Prov. 16: 4.

The glory of God is the end of all things, and the interests of the creature are entirely subsidiary. If this be a truth, it is a fundamental truth; and the sceptical argument, by leaving it out of account, renders itself hopelessly vicious.



## ARTICLE II.

### THE STATESMAN.

The Earl of Chatham being asked, on a certain occasion, where he learned politics, replied: "That he picked them up in the streets." Though uttered, perhaps, in a spirit of levity, this remark is not destitute of significance and wisdom. The development and happiness of the individual constitute the great ends of human government. Experience teaches that legislation should be limited to the actual wants and capabilities of a people with reference to their prospective development. Much, indeed, of the philosophy of political, as well as legal administration, is expressed in the maxim, *summ cuique tribuere*—so that the legislator or statesman could not, perhaps, better acquire practical wisdom to direct the legislative affairs of his country, than by mingling with his fellow-

men, and gathering from them a knowledge of their various wants, interests and opinions. Such knowledge gives a practical edge to the statesman's sword and power—enabling him to direct his abilities and his learning to useful and benevolent purposes; to the improvement of his race, to the development of the resources of his country; in short, to all proper means of national greatness.

But the *data* for political judgment—the practical thoughts and hints, which serve as a basis for legislative enactment, must not be confounded with the ability to use these necessary materials for wise and important ends. The mere coffee-house politician, the lounging street-talker, with no aspirations for his country's glory, may possess a fund of valuable information, which with him can avail for little practical good; but, under the plastic hand of the true statesman, might achieve wonders for the prosperity and happiness of a people.

The politics picked up in the streets by the Earl of Chatham could have been nothing more than a knowledge of the individual wants, feelings, sentiments and desires, of his fellow-citizens—the fountains from which that eminent statesman and orator drew the wisdom of his public conduct. But this great man had first prepared his mind for a statesman's labors. Beside the cultivation of eloquence and polite literature, according to his noble biographer, he reflected deeply upon the principles of human nature, and pondered thoroughly the structure of society.\*

They, therefore, who take shelter behind the above remark, rendered famous by the sanction of a great name, as an apology for superficial attainments, or for the neglect of that higher, more severe mental culture which has formed the great statesmen of the world, misconceive the spirit in which it was uttered, and rear for themselves a false standard of political conduct. The field of mental labor for the statesman is the broadest, deepest, noblest of all the departments of human knowledge; and it would be an anomaly, inexplicable on any known principles of the human intellect, if the proper culture

---

\* Lord Brougham.

of that field did not require the severest mental discipline, as well as a comprehensive knowledge of all the great branches of learning, and a complete mastery over the moral elements of our nature.

The great object of government is to procure the highest happiness by means the least objectionable. The highest happiness! What a world of thought, of research, of attainment, is comprehended in these brief words! What are the great principles of political science? What the lessons of experience? What the lights of general knowledge? What the teachings of an enlightened conscience, by which this great end may be achieved? The most gifted statesman may master these various resources, and the concentrated rays from all will form, at most, but a dim light to guide him through the mazy paths he is to pursue in fulfilling his high destiny.

But, in achieving this grand object, he must employ means the least objectionable. Rejecting the vagaries, the moral obliquities of a superficial, false philosophy, and searching earnestly through the broad fields of moral and political science, he is to educe from the depth of his meditations, as well the important objects of legislation as the specific measures by which these objects may be achieved; achieved, too, without a jarring of the parts of society, by reconciling antagonistic interests and conflicting opinions, and by a full development of the broad principles of public justice. Do not these things involve genius, and learning and wisdom?—in brief, all the aids that can be drawn from the highest gifts and the most complete discipline of mind and heart?

To direct the affairs of a great and free people with happiest success, requires, indeed, a rare combination of intellectual endowments; a mind not only gifted by nature, disciplined by study, instinct with bold and manly thoughts, inspired by wisdom, endowed with comprehensive knowledge, and improved by all the noble arts of life, but powerful, likewise, in wielding the heaving engines of elaborated thought, and in swaying the passions and affections of men. Such, according to the humble conception here formed of him, is the accomplished Statesman.

Something more is meant by this term, it will be readily perceived, than the mere stump orator, or the ordinary politician of the day, of whom our country has yielded a most fruitful crop, but the mysteries of whose character little merit the study or admiration of the age. With quickness of speech and pomp of language, these men parade before our countrymen such a show of smartness and flippancy as, in the illusory glare with which they succeed in encircling themselves, to secure the more important posts of government, but with no skill, when in office, to illustrate their administrative capacity. Destitute of political knowledge, except that acquired by attendance on a few debates, or by a study of newspapers, and with no presiding principles of action, they are generally the sport of every shifting breeze of opinion, degrading themselves often into mere tools of faction, and seeking their ends of personal ambition by all the arts of cunning and diplomacy.

A vitiated state of public sentiment, a thirst for change and novelty, a diminished admiration of high moral and intellectual worth, and an undignified worship of little great men; by all these prevailing evils do we see illustrated the baneful influence of this numerous class.

Different is the character here sought to be illustrated, whose bright archetype may rather be found among the fathers of our Republic—among those men of an immortal stamp, whose colossal pillars of fame tower high above the pigmy monuments of our own day, and whose genius and virtues have given to this Republic a marked lustre among the nations of the world. How bright the example, and how sacred and genial the influence, of such men upon the destiny of our race! To emulate them, at whatever sacrifice it may involve, should be the heroic effort of every patriot heart; for in this is comprehended the honor, glory and happiness of our future career. It is a maxim, old as the Grecian Acropolis: "*Such as are the heads of a community, such must the people at large speedily become.*"\* The great epochs in the history of the world are those in which great men have flourished. Athens reared her

---

\* Aristotle.

fame in the age of Themistocles, Cimon, Pericles, Thucydides, Socrates, Aristotle and Plato. Rome ruled the world, and emblazoned her name on the historic page, when Cæsar, Pompey, Brutus, Cato, Atticus, Livy, Cicero, Horace, Virgil, Hortensius, Augustus and Varro, were contemporaries. The brightest epoch in English history was when Chatham, Burke, Fox, Sheridan and Pitt, controlled the destinies of that great Empire; and the golden age of our own country extends only through the short period from Washington, Hamilton, Adams, Jefferson, Madison, Patrick Henry and Randolph, down to Calhoun, Webster and Clay. No nation can preserve, through the long ages of time, a high, honorable fame, without the lustre reflected upon it by great men—by men of superior mental discipline and of lofty genius, creating an enlarged national literature, and directing the public mind to worthy objects of pursuit.

Are we to have no more “bright particular stars” to adorn our once brilliant political galaxy? Is the genius of American statesmanship departed? Is the golden rule of Washington, Hamilton, Jefferson, Calhoun and Webster, to be succeeded by the brazen rod of the Swards and the Sumners? Is all true intellectual greatness lost to our once glorious Republic? These are grave inquiries, to determine which is the province of the generous youth of the country. To them belong the work of reform. On their aspirations depend now the future glory of the Republic. If they shall be satisfied with a tame mediocrity, the Commonwealth must continue to recede in its greatness, and there will soon have to be recorded another “decline and fall” of a great Empire, constituting another grand epoch in the history of the world. But they who fear toil should not strive for the Statesman’s glory. Its very *insignia* are effort, boldness, prudence, moderation and wisdom.

In forming this elevated character, the first and leading objects are a proper discipline of the mind, and a masterly acquaintance with all the appropriate branches of knowledge. The development of those higher analytical powers, which give to the philosopher his penetrating scrutiny into the hidden mysteries of nature, or of mind, and which enable him to

educe out of the chaos of the elemental world the sublime principles of science, from which flow the most important practical results to mankind, is equally useful to the statesman, by inspiring him with enlarged views of subjects arising for his consideration; by imparting to him a political forecast, and a pre-science which looks far into the future, and enables him to predict with certainty the probable course of events; and by pointing his eye to the cloud of danger while it is yet too remote for the vision of ordinary men, and thus assisting him in time to prepare against its ominous threatenings. This magic power, which elevates the patriot to the lofty sphere of statesmanship, weaving around his brow the chaplets of wisdom and philosophy, is the foundation of an enlarged usefulness, commensurate with all the varied interests of society. To this noble height every politician should aspire. This should be the pearl-stone of his search; and no labor can be futile which is employed in the attainment of this power, whether bestowed in sounding the depths of mental and moral philosophy, in exploring the hidden arcana of nature, in storming the heights of mathematical science, or in culling the flowers of rhetoric and poetry along the paths of polite literature. A close study of these various branches, requiring for their complete mastery a rigid separation of the subtle, abstract ideas so elaborately interwoven in them, forms, indeed, the best analytical training to the active intellect, while they create within the mind a breadth and depth and variety of learning, which, in affording to the possessor an ample storehouse of useful knowledge, imparts to him an elevation of sentiment, a benevolence of soul, and a dignity of character, peculiar only to the great and the good. Behold the man who, after years of toil, has brought his mind under this admirable discipline; who has grappled with the great questions of science and philosophy; who, from morn to eve, has traced out analytically the scope and tenor of his best thoughts, mounting up to their origin and following them out to their legitimate conclusions;—in brief, applying the crucible of investigation to the most difficult problems of thought, and you will see before you a man capable of the noblest efforts, of

laboring constantly for the good of his fellow-men, and of exciting respect and admiration by a wisdom almost divinely inspired, and by a dignity of character like to those who dwell "fast by the oracles of God!"

To repeat: The only sure basis of able statesmanship is profound thought, thorough discipline of the mind, and varied systematic knowledge. The world of Philosophy, revealing the secrets of natural science and of human action; the pages of History, lit up by the bright lamps of experience, as a guide to public conduct; the depths of moral science, where repose the immortal principles of Justice, on which rests the great standing policy of society; the untold riches of Political Economy, disclosing the grand aids to a proper development of the wealth and prosperity of nations; the broad canons of International Law, directing, by their sublime conceptions, the mutual intercourse of the family of nations; the limpid streams of Classic Lore, brightening the thoughts, polishing the mind, purifying the taste; the golden treasures scattered through the flowery fields of Poesy, Rhetoric and General Literature, enriching the fancy, elevating the imagination, emboldening the heart, and throwing, as it were, a veil of divine imagery over the whole intellectual being—these all, when brought to the fair grasp of the mind, conspire, in wonderful harmony, to develop the full stature of the statesman, and to fit him for the great work of human government.

Without the inspiration to be derived from studies like these, the statesman can make no lofty flights in the sphere of his duties. He can rear for himself no proud fame which is to endure for ages. He can acquire no commanding sway over the minds of his contemporaries. He can achieve no victories on which an admiring world may gaze. True: By the flashes of a brilliant wit, or a dashing, superficial eloquence, he may, for awhile, dazzle the eye of the incautious, and throw a temporary spell over the minds of his compatriots; but time, the severe critic of the unsubstantial, will gradually dispel the charm of his power, and disrobe him of his mantle of fame. He must be elevated in his aims and profound in his views before he can expect to create any enduring monuments of

national glory, which shall rest in the hearts and judgments of posterity.

Nor can this excite surprise in the reflective mind. To act well, it is necessary to judge well;\* and to judge well implies a sufficient knowledge of the subjects upon which an opinion is demanded. What now is the proper sphere of the statesman's action? In other words—What are the peculiar subjects which call for his special study and attention? They may be considered in a two-fold relation. First, as to the internal policy of a State: Secondly, as to the external policy.

The former includes a vast variety of considerations, which, on this occasion, can be only hinted at. What a multitude of thoughts arise at the very suggestion of the social, civil, political and commercial regulations of a country! To develop and guard the civil and political rights of a people, involving, as they do, a great multiplicity of delicate and difficult points—to treat the complicated relations of commerce and trade in their connection with all the industrial pursuits of life—to unfold the mysteries of the social relations in which are embraced the virtue and refinement of society, the secrets of a proper education, and encouragement to every species of literature and science—what a scope for the broadest genius, and for the most profound and varied attainments! These all properly and necessarily fall within the statesman's province; and no man aspiring to an elevated performance of duty could, without extreme arrogance, assume to himself the task of promoting these various interests, unless he has first enlarged his views by a correct knowledge of the subjects which they embrace. Such presumption might not be unexpected in the vain, ambitious politician, who hopes, by some lucky stroke of policy, to succeed in riding into favor and power. Charlatanism may, in its empty boastings, lay claim to such an investiture; but statesmanship, which, in its broad tendencies, never fails to yield an abundance of magnanimity and benevolence of soul; which forgets self in promoting the public good, and seeks first the country's welfare, would blush at the pre-

---

\* "Il suffit de bien juger, pour bien faire."—*Des Cartes.*



sumptuous effort. The daring wretch who, in the pride of his heart, can aspire to a controlling influence in the great concerns of government without an intelligent survey of the ground he occupies, and a competent knowledge of subjects on which he seeks to enlighten the world, should be condemned to ignominy in the criticism of the present age, as well of enlightened and impartial posterity. Like the fabled Phæton, who so rashly seized the reins of the horses of fire, he would seriously disturb the harmonious elements of society, and he deserves to precipitate himself down to degradation and ruin.

Not less important in regard to the foreign policy of a State is an ample knowledge of the great principles which regulate the family of nations. The genius of the modern world, by the labors of such men as Grotius, Puffendorf, Bynkershoek, Vattel, Burlamaqui, Wheaton and others, has wrought out a beautiful system of international law which should claim the profound study of the modern statesman, as without a knowledge of this the peace of the world may be constantly and unnecessarily endangered. The great fruits of enlightened statesmanship are security at home and peace abroad; a smiling prospect of internal cheerfulness, and a beautiful display of external comity. The boast of some that war is, at times, desirable as developing the sterner energies of a people, is repugnant to the precepts of a sound morality, and is based on a low, false philosophy. War is evidently an abnormal condition of our race, destroying energies and exhibiting vices greatly overbalancing all the virtues it may occasionally develop; and, though sometimes necessary, it is most generally the result of bad statesmanship—arising often from actual blunders in the conduct of a ministry; or gradually brought on by a series of unwise legislative enactments, leading the people into acts of aggressive violence, or else spoiling them by improper indulgence and effeminacy. Peace, on the contrary, is the natural, normal state of man; for in this condition man may develop all his virtues and all his energies. He may, in fulfilment of a great command, increase and multiply; he may call forth the resources of the soil which he inhabits; he may assist in the improvement of his race, and,

in the discharge of the highest duty, he may learn to know the character and practise the religion of his God. War contravenes all these ends.

Tutored, then, in the ways of a comprehensive Philosophy, the modern statesman feels it his duty, because it consists with the moral economy of the universe, to promote a spirit of peace among the nations of the world; and, acting on this principle, he would be little less than criminal were he to hazard this peace through an ignorance of those great principles by which alone it can be preserved. How often, in the bungling diplomacy of empirical statesmen, have nations been unwisely and unnecessarily plunged into war with each other, wasting millions of treasure and thousands of lives, and entailing a long catalogue of the worst miseries upon posterity! Untaught in the precepts of international law, it is the ambition of many who aspire to be statesmen and diplomatists, to secure the advantage, by cunning and stratagem, in all international negotiations; priding themselves as adepts in the diabolical heresies of the immortal Machiavelli, whose political teachings have been rendered famous in the characters of a Malagrida, a Talleyrand and a Metternich. In this way a new school of diplomacy has arisen among the second-rate statesman of the age, at variance with the fundamental principles of international law, and of a sound morality; having, for its aim, cheating on the most extensive scale, and, for its appliances, all the arts of dissimulation and hypocrisy. Such are the leading traits of European diplomacy at this day, as strikingly illustrated in the recent negotiations among European powers relative to the Crimea.

Diplomacy forms a part of the great policy of a State; and what is the standing policy of a nation but *justice* itself.\* "Any eminent departure from justice," says Mr. Burke, "under any circumstances, lies under the suspicion of being no policy at all." And that international public management which has not justice and equality for its foundation, can be no diplomacy at all. Without these it is a mere species of political

---

\* "Justice is the fundamental virtue of political society."—*Aristotle*.

jockeying, in which the greatest dissembler stands the best chance of winning. It is no more nor less than a licensed system for extensive operations of public swindling. Can peace between nations, secured by these means, be of an honorable and lasting nature? Can negotiations thus conducted procure for the treating powers honorable friendship and a cordial intercourse? What State, boasting of its pride and honor, could submit to a dishonorable treaty any longer than it could muster the means for an honorable resistance? Smarting under the national disgrace, would not the people indulge heart-burnings and envyings and grudges? Would they not avail themselves of every opportunity to annoy the adversary and to renew hostilities? Diplomacy like this must utterly fail of any legitimate results—nay, it will naturally and inevitably beget, instead of peace, friendship and comity—envy, hatred and strife, among nations.

The true principles of international negotiation, like those of negotiations among well-bred gentlemen, are equality, justice, honor, moderation and candor. On these grounds the parties must meet and adjust their matters of difference, and lay the foundations of their future intercourse. The diplomatist should neither give a dishonorable advantage nor take one. No gentleman could acquiesce in an adjustment involving inequality and dishonor; no more could any nation having regard to its historical fame, or to its lasting prosperity, nor any high-toned intelligent people. It is a just saying, that “a monarch who submits to a single insult is half dethroned.” The political motto, therefore, of every patriotic people, should be—*fiat justitia, ruat cælum*.

To seek for this *justitia*—to master those broad principles of equity and natural reason, which underlie all safe and honorable diplomacy, should be a leading object with every statesman who seeks to advance the glory and prosperity of his country. As Americans we have cause to be proud of much of the diplomatic talent employed, since the formation of our Government, in our important negotiations with foreign countries; though it cannot be denied that very many of our diplomatic agents, at this day, accredited near the polished courts of

Europe, greatly lack the attainments essential to a proper discharge of their duties, and necessary to the good reputation of the Republic. There can be no doubt that gentlemen, scholars and statesmen—men at least of good sense and sound scholarship—should alone be sent to the governments of foreign countries with which we have important relations; yet such, among us, is the sway of party ambition, that to subdue personal animosities and to conciliate political influence, men are often appointed to these stations who have little pretensions to statesmanship or attainments of any sort—having even no knowledge of the foreign tongue, through which they can communicate their views and make themselves known and felt for their country.

But other virtues should adorn the statesman's character. In these United States, in which Liberty sprang forth, Minerva-like, into full perfection of growth, clothing herself in the most remarkable institutions, and where now a wild spirit of change is rapidly sweeping away these great bulwarks of the public freedom, there is no political virtue more to be cherished by the statesman—none which he should more profoundly study, than a wise spirit of conservation, to preserve, if possible, from an untimely ruin, the great blessings of American liberty. This calls for all the strength of his intellect, all the depths of his knowledge, all the moral heroism of his nature, and all his burning eloquence.

Reason, without experience, would teach the wisdom and necessity of preserving that which is good and useful in all existing things, as well as in the laws and institutions of a people. Consult the great world of thought spread out in the works of nature and of revelation. How pregnant with the weightiest suggestions on this important matter! All nature, while presenting to the eye the most diversified forms of existence, while filling space with appearances of change and variety, is yet replete with exhibitions of this great conservative element. The laws which govern and support physical being, the forms of material objects, the principles of motion, the properties of matter, exhibit an enduring uniformity in the results of their operations—teaching the fickle mind of man that all which is great and grand in being is

ended with a power of continuation, and finds perfection in its approach towards perpetuity. But more strikingly than in the works of nature, whose mysteries are disclosed only to the eye of science, the great Author of our being has given sage teachings of this important lesson in the written records of His sublime wisdom. What is the whole moral law—what the Bible itself—but a great written code of human conduct, to be perpetuated throughout the whole existence of man upon earth, adapted to his every moral want, and meeting every condition in which he may be placed? Is the Christian religion better suited to man in one stage of his existence than another? Do its holy precepts change to suit the growing necessities and expansibilities of the age? Do we require our system of morals to grow in perfection as we grow in science and physical development? So, indeed, would the modern fanatic, impelled by a “higher-law” morality, inculcate; but is there reason in his self-built morality? Surely not. And why? Because the great canons of the moral law, like the genius and spirit of Christianity itself, consist with the eternal laws of our moral nature, which are as unchanging as the immutable laws of the universe—which continue now as they were in the days of our Saviour, and which, throughout the endless ages of time, will remain the same. Are the laws which govern our mental being less fixed and invariable? We choose to regard man as a sort of compound being, made up of a mental and moral nature; but philosophy teaches, and teaches truly, that while endowed with various faculties and sensibilities, our whole being is a unity; that mind and heart are one, which sometimes thinks and sometimes feels, always governed, however, by the same laws, and unitedly developing, under like circumstances, the same results, and in the same manifold variety. Why, then, should the canon of conduct for our political being, which is only a compound of our moral and mental nature, be less stable than the moral code? If the moral and mental need no change to meet the corresponding changes in the progressive stages of man’s development, why should the political code,—why should government and political institutions, which simply

embody the canons of conduct for our political being, require change for the successive developments of society? Will not suitable changes in the practical legislation of a country provide amply for all progressive improvement without disturbing the fundamental law of the State? If founded, as the moral law, upon the principles of our being—if adapted to the genius and natural temperament of our race—if consonant to the great elements of public justice, the political needs no more change than the moral. We admit that no change is needed in the moral, because through the aid of Divine inspiration, its adaptation to our moral nature is perfect. The same principle applies to the political law—I mean the fundamental law, the great canons of political association; for both have their foundation the same, viz—in the immutable principles of our nature.

It is the province of the statesman to seek out this adaptation—to discover the connecting link between a particular government, or a particular institution, and the foundation principle on which it has its stay in the bosom of the natural mind and heart of a people. This tracing up of the mysterious union between the abstract subject and the concrete law—between the laws of mind and the laws of society, may, it is true, be no easy task, but still it is a task within the reach of effort, demanding, as a pre-requisite of success, a profound acquaintance with the subject, Man—man internally and externally—the complex, subtile qualities of the mind, as well as the particular conduct naturally flowing from the laws of mind. There can be no doubt that political philosophy has its broad basis in the philosophy of the mind—in a profound knowledge of man as *subject* and *object*, as a thinking being and a being of action—in short, as a creature of thought, of passions, of affections, of conduct.

This fundamental knowledge is to be derived from a thorough insight into man's mental and moral nature; a study of history and of man in society as he actually is, (a point so well labored by the immortal Shakspeare,) being important adjuncts, because reflecting back a knowledge of the sentient being, and of the

secret springs of his action—hereby illustrating the wisdom of the maxims, that “*History is philosophy teaching by example,*” and that “*the proper study of mankind is man.*”

When the statesman, after tracing up this mysterious chain, has discovered the natural agreement between the law and the principles of the human heart, on which it rests—wisdom, nay *common sense*—would teach him to put forth the best efforts of his nature to preserve this agreement, and to give perpetuity to the law; for on this depends the harmonious preservation of the parts of society, without which, all human institutions, devoid of any fixed ruling principles, must be thrown into the utmost confusion and disorder. Thus considered, *law*, the material out of which government and all political institutions are reared, assumes a power almost divine. Well, in this respect may it be said, that she has “*her seat in the bosom of God, and her voice is the harmony of the world.*”

Is there now nothing in the governments and institutions of this broad land, as they came forth from the hands of their venerable framers, worthy of preservation? Have their foundations no links which bind them to the great first principles of the human heart, on which alone they can stand, to stand surely? Can we expect to improve upon these wise models?—to be masters even of the wondrous materials out of which they were created? Have we the right kind of experience? Have we the proper motives? Have we the right kind of men for such work? Who were they who built up the gigantic structure of our political liberties? They were men of toil and of wisdom—men disciplined by profound thought and a bitter experience—who studied human nature theoretically and practically—who sounded the philosophy of mind, and the philosophy of life—who figured alike in the cabinet and in the field—familiarizing themselves with the secret springs of human conduct by an actual commingling with men, and by a practical skill in the affairs of life.

Driven, by the fierce tyranny of the days in which they lived, to seek a government by which they might secure the blessings of liberty to themselves and their children, and bringing to their aid the discipline of a seven years' war, and a life-time of

profound study, such as already indicated, they struck out from the vast headwork of their experience a system of Republics in every point of view admirable; to sustain which they reared a frame-work of civil and political institutions, rooted in the very texture of the great heart of the people, and which have secured for us not only a state of unparalleled happiness and prosperity, but, while they remained in their purity, acquired for these United States almost a fabulous fame among the nations of the earth.

If any thing beside good sense were wanting to teach us the advantages of holding on to institutions so remarkable, it would be the fact that nearly every innovation made upon these wise models has worked injury to the body politic, and led to a degeneracy of the public liberty. Moderate reflection only will attest the fact that, in the random, superficial legislation of the day, being for the most part the off-hand suggestions of hasty and impetuous thought, or the dictates of some selfish, private interest, the political mind of the country has been almost completely turned from subjects commensurate with the State at large to those having a local and exclusively special character. Legislation is, with us, no longer based upon the principles of justice and equality, which lie at the bottom of our noble constitutions, but chopped out of a ready logic to suit the tastes, interest and ambition of factions, or of sectional prejudices. In short, we have no longer statesmanship in the ruling councils of the country, but, for the most part, a bungling rule of selfish, aspiring, corrupt politicians. To expect from such a source any wise improvements in our great body politic, would be to indulge in the most wanton credulity.

It is a fact, also, which stands out prominently on the pages of history, that Governments which have adhered most closely to primitive laws and institutions, have been of longest duration, and have secured the largest share of public happiness. When once established, nearly every change in a Government has a tendency to increase the authority of the powers that be. It is a maxim in political philosophy, that "*power is always creeping from the many to the few;*" and it certainly is the



policy of the many to hold fast to the rights and liberties originally secured to them before any great interest in the State had yet become predominant; and so we find, that among the daring efforts put forth by the peoples of the world, as distinguished from their rulers, to recover their liberties, they only ask to be restored to former rights and ancient privileges. This is the instructive history of all the past; and can any doubt that such will be the demands of our own people, if, at some future day, when a reckless spirit of change shall have torn down the bulwarks of our political liberties, they shall be driven, by an intolerable spirit of tyranny, to resist, arms in hand, the oppressors of their country?

All the lights of reason, then, and all the experience of the world teach, in language of burning import, the importance and necessity of a genuine, conservative spirit, running through and animating every thought, sentiment and act of the American statesman.

From this outline of the statesman's duties, it will be readily perceived, that he needs a high moral culture to nerve his heart and brain for the trying difficulties that beset him in the vicissitudes of his public career. Moral courage of the loftiest stamp, supported by powerful convictions of the truth, and by a well-developed, well-balanced mind, is his only security amid the conflicting passions of men, and the strong temptations thrown out to allure him from the path of duty and of right. When the passions of an excited community are arrayed against him—when he seeks to tear loose from *party* to save the honor of his country, or to protect it against some disastrous course of conduct, what moral heroism must he not put into exercise in order to withstand the almost resistless tide? Reproach, ridicule, slander, vituperation, will all be brought to bear against him. His former political friends, no longer able to avail themselves of his influence, will desert him. He will be abandoned, probably, by all except the most virtuous. Still, duty to his country and fidelity to the dictates of an enlightened judgment, pointing to his country's good, will keep him in his onward career of patriotic duty against all the malevolence and abuse of the times. These will urge him

often not only to desert his party, but to throw himself in opposition to it, when that party abandons the presiding principles of his political faith—nay, sometimes, to join the adverse party in carry out measures involving the public welfare.

The statesman, in working for the glory and prosperity of his country, will constantly employ himself in studying out and diffusing correct notions of political rights and just rules of political action. He will boldly combat error and prejudice, in whatever shape these may present themselves. He will not step aside from the path of rectitude to study flattery or to court popularity; but, pursuing an honest, independent line of policy, he will freely proclaim the truth on matters affecting the public weal, without fear or favor, if, in so doing, he can promote his country's interest. It is this, indeed, which elevates him in the scale of being, and throws around his name a halo of moral glory, which the world must admire, and which time cannot soon efface. A bold advocacy of truth and justice for the national weal, against the prejudice and fanaticism of party or faction, is, in truth, an exhibition of the sublime of human character. It forms the true heroic of practical life. It points to the statesman as a benefactor of his race. Few, there may be, who have the moral daring to incur the hazards of such a career; yet some have displayed in their public conduct this sterling courage; and their characters stand out as bold promontories on the dangerous sea of political strife to guide the adventurous statesman, and to excite the admiration of all lovers of virtue and public liberty. The sublime spectacle thus offered to view, casts itself before the philosophic eye in beauty and splendor—throwing upon the historic figure of the gifted statesman the bright colors of a pure fame, and fixing his name deep in the affections of mankind. Who can behold, without admiration, the noble daring of the Earl of Chatham, when deserted by his countrymen, he stood almost alone among his compeers in the House of Lords in a bold advocacy of the cause of America? Who can view with no emotions of pride and delight the heroism of our own Calhoun as, singly and boldly, in the Senate of the United States, he manfully breasted the storm of public opinion, in

his opposition to an unwise and unnecessary war with Mexico? Here was exhibited a display of genuine independence, a bright type of moral heroism, which the world cannot soon forget.

In disenthraling himself from party shackles and pursuing a fearless, independent course, the statesman will rise above dissimulation and all attempts to act the demagogue. He will employ no tortuous means to obtain a station in which he might even enlarge his public usefulness. With scorn he rejects this selfish philosophy of the political empiric. Candor and sincerity will characterize his every movement; whilst, indeed, the frank avowal of his sentiments will be limited, under the dictates of prudence, to suitable occasions and to proper terms.

In fulfilling all the delicate relations of public life, he should have a heart full of sensibility. He ought to love and respect his kind and fear himself.\* He must gain a mastery over his passions, and learn to check the lust of power within him, which, like foul weeds, obstructs the growth of patriotic effort. A clever writer has said—"The truly great seek first to do the will of God; then to secure the approbation of their conscience; and, thirdly, the favor of their fellow-citizens." Different is the conduct of small men, and especially small politicians. They seek the very reverse. They first strive for the approbation of their fellow-men, and this they do not so much for public, as for their own private ends. The statesman always aims at the higher good. Though ambitious, he is a patriot. Ambition is with him a means, not an end. Lust of power is, in truth, not the mark of a great mind. The lofty desires of a noble nature expand the feelings and sublimate, as it were, the selfish passions of the bosom into the exalted virtues of benevolence and magnanimity. "All great, lasting, noble, or heroic desires," says a great man,† "strengthen and enlarge the powers of the mind." And it is a principle of human nature, that as great objects fill the mind, small and mean ones escape from it. The statesman, continually working

---

\* Burke.

† Lord Bacon.

out the great problems of human destiny, and considering the various systems of organized society; holding, as it were, in his mind's eye, the movements of nations and the progress of humanity, forgets his little self; or, if he seek wealth and power, it is only to give him vantage ground in moving the machinery of government and the actions of men toward the great ends of human society. The true statesman trusts little to factitious influences. Give him space, and he will create ends and carve a destiny for himself.\* The riches of his intellect, the creative force of the genius within him, will give him power and ability to effect the grand objects of his life. On these he builds his tower of strength, and regards all things extraneous as mere menial helps to the more important objects of his high mission. With him, as among philosophers, merit alone makes distinction.

The union of these several virtues presents to view a character of no ordinary worth—the *patriot* and the *statesman*, above the lust of power and of wealth, suppressing the selfish passions of his nature, and dedicating all his best energies to his country's good:—some Cincinnatus, quitting the labor of his fields at the call of his countrymen, to assume the highest magistracy of his native State, and after restoring his country's liberty, and returning in triumph to Rome, stepping down again, of his own accord, from the height of power into the humble walks of private life:—some *Washington*, led with regret from the enjoyment of domestic life, struggling with a bold energy, and without recompense, under every kind of toil and sacrifice for the rights of Britons which belonged to these Colonies; building up a gigantic empire, at the head of which he might, probably, have remained for life, then magnanimously retiring from his exalted station to seek again the peace and quiet of a home from which he had been drawn for his country's good.

But the character of the statesman is not complete without

---

\* Der seltene Mann will seltenes vertrauen :

Gibt ihm den Raum, das Ziel wird er sich setzen.

*Schiller—Wallenstein.*

the ornament and polish of graceful speech. "Every statesman," says Mr. Burke, "ought to sacrifice to the graces." An ornate style, a polished address, a magnanimous temper, a manly eloquence, are like precious jewels set in the crown of his wisdom, making the latter an object of attractive beauty, and giving it power over the minds of men. Among a practical, business people, like ourselves, with whom the stirring affairs of life leave little time for reflective reading—with whom almost every impulse and passion are awakened by the glowing warmth of intelligence thrown out orally, *dum feret opus*; genius and wisdom, laid up in the written records of time, or concealed in the graver works of the day, can exert but a comparatively limited influence. To make them live and glow and animate, require the heat and freshness of the tongue, the charm and power of eloquence. Though, therefore, in all free countries, eloquence has been the wonder and admiration of the people, in no country more than in our own, could its seductive powers be usefully employed if animated by the wand of knowledge and high character.

Plutarch, in his comparison between Demosthenes and Cicero, remarks:—"It is necessary, indeed, for a statesman to have the advantage of eloquence, but it is mean and illiberal to rest on such a qualification, or to hunt after praise in that quarter." So strongly was the great Grecian orator impressed with the importance of an eloquent delivery, that he thought it a small matter to premeditate and compose (though these he did with the utmost care) if the enunciation and propriety of gesture were not attended to; and it is matter of history that he bestowed years of toil in attaining to grace and dignity in his action. With this acquired charm of delivery, he gave to his finished compositions those wonderful attractions of oratorical power, which, in the language of Longinus, seemed like the dashings of a tempest or a thunderbolt, or like the terrible sweep of a vast body of cavalry. But eloquence like this could not have consisted in the delivery alone. It is true that "the look, the tone, the every movement, serve greatly to indicate the internal emotions and the honesty and sincerity of the speaker;" but it is alone in the conceptions of the mind,

in the profound depths of the heart, from which must issue those living streams of powerful thought and sentiment which move and control at will the minds of men. "Eloquence," says a distinguished orator,\* "is not a production of genius only—it is a work of the heart. It is there that is formed this intrepid love of truth, this ardent zeal for justice, this virtuous independence of which the world are so zealous; these generous sentiments which elevate the soul and fill it with noble pride and magnanimous confidence—and pushing glory even beyond eloquence, causes the world to admire in the speaker the virtuous man much more than the orator."

How to acquire this magic power of speech may well afford an interesting inquiry to the generous youth of the country. The classic phrase, "*orator fit*," is true only in a qualified sense. It is true in regard to those external acquisitions,—the well-trained mind, the logical arrangement, the copious illustration, the charm of style, the magic of action, which give the form and finish to true oratory; but the genius of inspiring sentiment, the intense feeling, the impassioned thought, the burning love of right and justice, by which alone the orator is to achieve a brilliant success, must be inborn in the heart. Of these *nature* must be the author and the giver.

For the true scope and province of the orator, and for the rules which disclose the secrets of his power, abundant suggestions may be found in the admirable treatises of *Cicero de Oratore*, *Quintilian's Institutes*, and *Tacitus' Dialogue concerning Oratory*. Briefly may it be said, that to achieve eminent success as an orator, intense application is demanded. "He alone deserves the name of orator who can speak in a copious style with ease or dignity, as the subject requires; who can find language to decorate his argument; who, through the passions, can command the understanding, and while he serves mankind, knows how to delight the judgment and the imagination of his audience." † And can any attain to this degree of excellence without first arming themselves, at all points, with the sciences and the liberal arts—without profound medi-

---

\* Chancellor D'Aguesseau, *Dial.*

† Tacitus.

tation and a style formed by constant practice, added to a close study of the models? In every age in which these essential requisites have been pursued, eloquence has flourished; but, to borrow again the language of Tacitus, "a love of finery, and the ambition to shine and glitter, will soon destroy all true eloquence."

Have we not, as a nation, arrived at this stage of decline? With us the tinsel of language and the pomp of metaphor have almost driven from our public speaking the noble simplicity in which truth and sublime sentiment love to clothe themselves. The false glare of a spurious fame, the eager pressing on of active life, the hot haste of the young ambition of the country, and an unfortunate readiness of speech, interpose, it is to be feared, serious obstacles to any speedy improvement in this divine art. All arduous training is with us wholly abandoned, and the public mind is rapidly falling off in its appreciation of the sublime effects of severe oratory. It may, in truth, be a question whether, as a people, we have not quite lost our admiration for the more profound and masterly efforts of the mind.

Deep must be our regret at this decline, if we reflect upon the elevating tendencies of true oratory when exerted for the public good. Open the book of history. Behold the striking figure of the mighty thunderer of Greece, as with his impetuous, stormy eloquence he arouses his countrymen from the fatal lethargy into which ease and luxury had placed them, to the most heroic actions against the Macedonian invader! To such a purpose, how impotent would have been the wisdom even of a Socrates, or the logic of an Aristotle! The eloquence of a Tully, spreading "like a conflagration of wild fire," shook the multitudes of Rome, and terrified the most daring cabal that ever conspired against the liberties of a country. Chatham poured forth his vehement, fiery eloquence, and the British Senate stood aghast till re-assured by the strong arm of the crown. When Patrick Henry spoke to the cause of liberty, the pulse of the people beat high in responsive throb—the public mind was kindled into action, and the great energies of the nation, awakened by the strong

reasonings of the statesman, were not allowed to evaporate in mere heroic resolves. Had the staunch appeals of the illustrious Burke for American liberty been poured forth in the stormy eloquence of a Demosthenes or a Tully, how deep must have been their impress! And what must the masterly efforts of our own Calhoun have achieved, if accompanied in their delivery by the same inspiring action!—particularly that great speech on the Force Bill, the greatest of his oratorical efforts—a speech which surpasses all but one which the ancient or modern world can present, and which surpasses that one in every particular, except in its impassioned declamation!

Will it be contended, however, that statesmanship and eloquence are incompatible?—that the character here drawn is one which cannot be successfully imitated? “What man has once achieved, man may again achieve.” The towering spirit, the proud model, which more than fills the measure of all these requirements, has actually lived and discoursed upon the arena of political action. The faint sketch above given is a just, though feeble outline of an actual statesman and orator. Need I inscribe on the portraiture the name of the illustrious PERICLES—the man who, by his great abilities, his exalted dignity of character, his consummate statesmanship, his bold eloquence, his probity and unblemished reputation, drew from his contemporaries the god-like appellation of OLYMPIUS!

How happy for us could we now boast of a few such men to exert their abilities and their eloquence for the good of our great but unfortunate country! What power might they not display in arresting the downward tendency of the Republic—in checking the wretched spirit of speculation and fraud so rife in the land—in destroying the pitiful worship of the money-god and of dexterous politicians, so rapidly growing up among our people—in calling back the public mind from its trivial occupation in the chaos of insulated data to a study of principles, and to some comprehensive, systematic efforts for the public weal; in short, in teaching us to think and speak and act once more as *men*—as statesmen and Republicans, putting forth the energies of our nature, as did the patriots and statesmen of earlier days, to the benefit and glory of the commonwealth.



In so far, *reform* should be our watchword—yes, a recasting of our characters, a going back to the virtues and greatness of former times, when dignity, simplicity and virtuous wisdom ruled in our public councils. Have we the spirit to undertake this more than Herculean task and to engage in it under circumstances the most unpromising? A sage Philosopher\* has said, "*Glory and honor are the spurs to virtue*;" but they who assume this exercise of virtuous effort must do so without the charm of these inspiring hopes. There, are, now-a-days, no smiles of encouragement, no public acclaims, no "well-done" plaudits to cheer on the faithful student, who, amid toil, and poverty and obscurity, steadily treads the paths of knowledge, under an earnest and profound ambition to serve his country. All jubilations are now made, all *peans* sung to the facile, dashing politician, who, in the bright sunshine of honor and office, handles with skill the light weapons of his trade; who, by mingling a deal of pleasant speech and soothing flattery with the sharp turns of a cunning diplomacy, rides on the whirlwind of politics and directs the storm of public opinion. We might almost exclaim, in the bitterness of the poet:

—————"Own we must, in this perverted age,  
Who most deserve can't always most engage.  
So far is worth from making glory sure,  
It often hinders what it should procure.  
Whom praise we most? The virtuous, brave and wise?  
No: wretches, whom in secret we despise."

Under this withering simoom in the public mind, our fountains of intellect seem to be fast drying up. Manly effort has almost ceased among us. Few now have the courage to sit down to that deep, constant study which alone can form the mind for great and arduous undertakings. That masterly ambition which, in former days, made our heroes statesmen, is extinct among us, and we are fast growing up a race of smart striplings, too polished and delicate for the coarse, hard work of intellectual greatness. "Of modest worth and ancient manners almost nothing remains." Eloquence and statesmanship, as if in their last gasp, seem to be fast yielding to the

---

\* Lord Bacon.

shabby rule of stump oratory and political empiricism. Freedom is beginning to totter in her strongholds, and genius is dying with the public liberty. Who among us are prepared to look at this picture undauntedly, and to nerve our hearts for the great work of reform? There is but one way by which to turn back this current of decline, and that is by a profound study and a constant emulation of the bright models of the early days of our Republic.

---

ARTICLE III. \*

THE FULLNESS OF TIME.

The Cross of Christ is the centre of all history. For that, all preceding events prepare the way and to it they all converge; from that all succeeding events diverge—securing thus their character, their impulse, and their direction.

It is our purpose, at this time, to take a position near this, the point of convergence and divergence for all time, and to point out the mighty march of causes by which Jehovah was preparing the world for the advent of his Son;—to point to the often unconscious workmen who were executing this august plan—levelling the hills and elevating the valleys to prepare a highway for our God. To accomplish this task, we must give a bird's-eye view of the chief events in the intellectual, civil and religious progress of man in the old world. The scene may be likened to an all absorbing contest. But in it the powers are empires—the kings wear the diadems of universal dominion—the stake is the subjugation of the world—and the hand which directs the movements is the hand of God.

The night of sin settled down on the very dawn of our race. But the dawn of Redemption was well nigh as early. The promise of a Saviour shone like a star on the brow of that night. It was the morning-star—the day-spring from on high—

---

\* The author of this article takes pleasure in acknowledging his indebtedness in the preparation of it to Schaff's *Apostolic History*, and to Coneybear & Howson's *Life of Paul*.

foretelling and ushering in the Sun of Righteousness that, in the fullness of time, was to arise with healing in his beams.

The course of this preparation, as developed in the Bible, need only be hinted at. Those who wish to understand it more thoroughly can consult Edwards' History of Redemption—a magnificent torso—which, though unfinished as it is, shows in every part the hand of a master. The early promise of the seed of the woman—the preservation of a line of true worshippers amid the giant wickednesses of the Antediluvian world—the covenant with Noah—the choice of Abraham—and all the main events of the advancement of the elect people, winding up in the deliverance from the Babylonish captivity by Cyrus, will readily recur to the well informed reader of the Scriptures. Beyond this we enter the domain of profane history—where the light, though dimmer, still reveals the same mighty worker who is preparing the way for the coming of Him who is the “desire of all nations.”

As there are three forms of philosophy, and three forms of religion, so there are three representative nations—elect peoples, who are seen performing essential parts on this vast arena. There were the Greeks—the Romans—and the Jews—to each of whom a work was assigned, and who performed it well.

It would be a great and radical mistake to suppose, that heathenism had nothing to do in this preparation for Christ. Man, in his great degradation, has felt his estrangement from God, and has blindly striven for re-union with the source of life and light. Hence all men have a religion—a *relegatio*—a re-binding to God. It is the scene of a blind man groping in darkness—feeling after support and crying for light. Hence we find in heathen mythologies, strange and startling principles—human guesses at Divine and saving truths. There are some of them—the various hints at the Fall, Incarnation and Atonement—seen in the fable of the sin and punishment of Prometheus, and his deliverance by Hercules, the son of a divine father and a human mother; also, in the rites of Bacchus, and in the Hindoo Avatars. So great is the natural sense of God, that Plutarch, in his reply to The Epicurean,

could say—"There has never been a State of atheists. If you wander over the earth, you may find cities without walls, without king, without mint, without theatre or gymnasium, but you will never find a city without God, without prayer, without oracle, without sacrifice. Sooner may a city stand without foundations, than a State without belief in the Gods. This is the bond of all society and the pillar of all legislation." The train of thought, by which those who had no revelation but the law written on their hearts, and no interpreter but conscience, reached such conclusions, is beautifully set forth in a passage which Cicero has preserved to us from a lost work of Aristotle. "If there were beings who had always lived in the depths of the earth, in dwellings decorated with statues and pictures, and with every thing which those who are deemed happy possess in the greatest abundance; if, then, these beings should be told of the government and power of the Gods, and should come up through opened fissures from their secret abodes to the places which we inhabit; if they should suddenly behold the earth and the sea and the vault of heaven; perceive the extent of the clouds, and the power of the wind; admire the sun in its greatness, its beauty, and its effulgence; if, finally, as approaching night veiled the earth in darkness, they should behold the starry heavens, the changing moon, the rising and setting of the stars, and their eternally ordained and unchangable courses; they would exclaim with truth—there are Gods, and such great things are their works." Thus it was that blind heathenism was feeling after God, if haply it might find him. And yet the effort, though correct and protracted, was unsuccessful—for even refined, philosophical Athens, when visited by Paul, had its altar for "the unknown God." But the attitude of heathenism is strikingly unlike that of Judaism. The former is a reaching up toward God—in the latter, God is seen handing down a revelation to man. But they were both alike fore-runners of Christ, though with different degrees of nearness to him.

An eloquent writer says—"we may compare Heathenism to the starry night, full of darkness and fear, but also of mysterious forebodings and unsatisfied longings for the light of

day—Judaism, to the dawn, full of cheerful hope and certain promise of the rising sun—Christianity, to the perfect day, in which stars lose their light, and the dawn its splendor.”

These remarks will prepare the way for a specific examination of the three classes of men of whom we have spoke.

1. The Greeks. They belong indisputably to the highest style of the heathen man. The central ideas of Greek civilization were intellect and imagination. Greece was young, immortally young. Her civilization was gay and glad as the opening dawn, full of high hopes and brilliant fancies and grand imaginations—while that of Rome befitted manhood, stern, cold, practical; and, we may add, selfish—and that of the Hebrews was grandly religious, every where pregnant with awful conceptions of the infinite majesty of Jehovah.

The Greek mind claimed the field of beauty and refinement as all its own, and ran riot in poetry, eloquence, art and philosophy; thus giving birth to a language at once copious, flexible and expressive—well calculated to embody religious truth in its profoundest mysteries; while putting theology into Latin, is like dressing a giant in a straight jacket.

But the Greeks were not only intellectually active, but physically restless. Hence commerce and colonization characterized their progress. They scattered their achievements over the isles of the beautiful *Ægean*, and were soon found encroaching on the borders of the mighty and mysterious East—the cradle of our race and the birth-place of speculation. Just at this point the finger of God is manifestly seen. When its arts and literature were at the highest—when its achievements had been won, and yet it had not grown grey with age, or been weakened by indulgence,—and when, consequently, the experiment of human perfectibility had all its elements in fullest exercise, and in the best proportions,—God called from Macedonia the man who was to make the Greek language, as well as arts and refinements, universal. Alexander's task was to take “up the meshes of the net of the Greek civilization, which were lying in disorder on the edges of the Asiatic shore, and spread them over all the countries which he traversed in his wonderful campaigns.” And well did he accomplish it. Yet what was

the result? What are the great fruits of this gigantic effort to work out the problem of life? All history replies—a failure—a disgraceful and confessed failure. For what was their religion but a deification of corrupt humanity, instead of a purification of it. Olympus, the lofty seat of the Grecian god, was no more than a council chamber for men and women. Heraclitus says, indeed, that the Gods are immortal men. (Lucian, v. 1, p. 226.) The wrath of Jupiter—the jealousy of Juno—and the lust of Venus—tell us that they are of the “earth, earthy.” Greek refinement, only beautified and systematized sin. Antioch, Paphos, Corinth, as well as Athens, became the centres of a religion full of poetry and illustrious for its art; but, after all, neither more nor less than a “deification of lust”—in which the vilest passions and the most degrading customs had at once the example and the sanction of the divinities. To do as they did at Corinth was, proverbially, to be guilty of all manner of debauchery and prostitution. Woman is an index of the condition of society. And Greek women could be divided into but two classes. The one obscure, ignorant, simple and forcibly virtuous—the other highly cultivated and openly profligate. Their religion had no moral power. In fact, it was not moral itself, and how could the people be so. Hence the best thinkers lost all respect for their mythology—some denied the existence of the Gods—and others their interference with human affairs. The immortality of the soul was doubted—the very possibility of knowing the truth was denied, and the popular religious belief, turned into ridicule, was handed over to women and children, as fit only for such as they.

The system of Plato was, undeniably, the highest form of Grecian wisdom. He it was who reasoned his way through errors and doubts till he stood in the august temple of truth, but could not lift the veil that concealed the holy of holies within. Yet even he confessed the impotency of his doctrine. He taught that there was above all the mob of deities that crowded the Pantheon, a “father and creator of the universe, whom it is *hard* to discover, and whom, being found, it is IMPOSSIBLE to make known to all.” Now, as *all* men need a

deliverance, this was a confession that the true religion had not been found.

We need not pause here to show the worthlessness of Stoicism, that taught that the world is governed by a pitiless fate, that crushed alike the innocent and the guilty, and under which prayer was as vain as resistance: or of Epicureanism, which held that pleasure was the only good, and that the highest happiness and wisdom was in eating and drinking, for to-morrow we die—or, still less of Cynicism, which, true to its name, was essentially doggish, and which consisted in snapping and snarling at all the world from out of a mean and sordid kennel.

That once noble people, under such influences, became frivolous and trifling. Paul found the Athenians degenerated into a mere herd of lounging, lazy news-mongers—"spending their time in nothing else but in hearing and telling some new thing," and who, when he told them of that unknown God whom they had ignorantly worshipped, could find no better name for him than "this babbler," who seemed to them "to be a setter forth of strange Gods."

Byron's indignant address to those of his day might have been addressed to the nation of old:

" You have the Pyrrhic dance as yet,  
Where has the Pyrrhic phalanx gone—  
Of two such lessons why forget  
The nobler and the manlier one."

Yes, Greek civilization was a failure. Bright and beautiful and exquisitely proportioned as it was, it did not attain to that for which it sought, and confessed its failure in language at once eloquent and mournful—a sort of philosophic Jeremiad, pronounced amid the wreck of exploded theories and perished hopes.

At other times it gave a still sadder expression of this conscious discomfiture in words of mockery and scorn—which sound like the derisive laugh of malignant fiends. Of this spirit the case of Lucian is an excellent example. In order to show his utter contempt of the whole tribe of Philosophers, he represents Jupiter as setting them up at auction as a lot of

trumpery, fit only to be disposed of in that way. Pythagoras is knocked down at £32 5s. 10d. Diogenes sells at two pence. Aristippus will not go off at any price. Democritus and Heraclitus—the laughing and crying philosophers—though offered together, meet with no better fate. Socrates goes off readily at two talents. Epicurus commands £6 9s. 2d. Chrysippus, of whom his admirers used to say, “were there no Chrysippus there would be no Stoa,” is purchased at £38 15s. The great Aristotle is happier, reaching as high a figure as £64 11s. 8d. And Pyrrho, the doubter, closes this mock auction by going off at £3 4s. 7d.

It is in such biting jests as these we see the estimate which the reflective had formed of all those high speculations which were to reveal to us the true good.

But lame and impotent as is this conclusion, the devout student of history will not fail to perceive that the Greeks had acted a most important part in this great drama—the successive scenes of which we are now reviewing. Grecian art and arms had provided for the world a common language, noble and copious enough to be a fit vehicle for the truths of religion, and well enough known to convey the wonderful things of God, as spoken by Christ and his Apostles, to the cultivated of all lands.

It enabled Paul to speak alike in Antioch, Ephesus, Athens, Corinth, and even Rome herself, in a tongue intelligible to the leading minds of the world. And thus, though they meant it not, neither did their hearts think so—under the wise and powerful Providence of God—Homer wrote, Demosthenes spoke, Apelles sculptured, Plato philosophised and Alexander fought, for the furtherance of the Gospel.

But again, it was needful that this grand Greek language should be baptised by the spirit of revelation—that its forms of speech should be vitalized by the living truth of God—and so, about fifty years after Alexander’s conquests and two hundred and seventy before Christ, God moved Ptolemy Philadelphus, to have the Old Testament Scriptures, which had been to this time locked up in the Hebrew and confined to the Jews, translated into the Greek. Thus it came to pass that what Moses



in the Law and the Prophets did write concerning Christ and his salvation, might be known and read of all men. Thus prophecy and fulfilment stood side by side in the view of the world; and the Apostles' appeal to the law and the testimony could be appreciated by Gentile as well as Jew.

But Greece has now done her part and passes off the stage with her bright-eyed children, to give place to other and very different actors. Their coming is announced by the soldier's measured tread, and the clank of arms, and the Roman legionary, clad in impenetrable armour, appears before us.

The Greek empire, as prophecy foretold, did not hold together. It had no element of permanency. No sooner was Alexander dead than his vast empire broke into four pieces. There was need, therefore, of a more permanent rule to prepare for that universal peace and supremacy, or rather omnipresence, of the law, which was necessary for the protection of the Ambassadors of Christ in whatever land they might proclaim the Word of Life.

Hence God sent his secret mandate to the hardy Romans, who had been growing into strength and consolidating their power for seven centuries, on the banks of the Tiber, and had at length become what Daniel said they should be, "strong as iron." It was God who sent the Roman Eagle on his flight of victory, in order that when Christ came, there might be one sceptre recognised by every nation—that there might be free intercourse between nations, and that the Christian preacher might, as Paul did, plead his Roman citizenship alike in Jerusalem and in Thessalonica, and thus find a shield from the wrath of his enemies.

For this important work the Roman was precisely adapted. His central idea was the supremacy of law—coupled with a thirst for universal conquest and permanent possession—things of which the versatile Greek never dreamed. The latter might be likened to the changeable winds of the equinoxes—the former were regular as the trade winds. Hence the Greek advance was the sortie of an undisciplined mob—that of the Romans was the march of the marshalled legion. They carried Rome with them. Roman citizenship asserted its prerogative

everywhere, and its assertion from the pale lips of one bleeding from the cruel scourge, made the proudest tyrant tremble. Their very name was significant. Rome—strength—stability. And they were pre-eminently successful. Their power extended from the Euphrates to the Atlantic, and from the Lybian desert to the banks of the Rhine. The dismembered and undisciplined masses or fragments of the Greek empire fell before them, and twenty-four years before the birth of Christ, Augustus Cæsar, the first Roman Emperor, closed the gates of the Temple of Janus, in token that the world was prostrate at his feet and peace reigned. It was the peace of universal despotism—the quiet of paralysis, the stillness of death. Yet, thus was the will of God fulfilled, and the wings of the Roman eagle sheltered infant Christianity. It was not till that infant became a full grown man that the Roman power was arrayed against it. And then it was able to grapple with and overcome this persecuting power, and soon the disciples of Jesus are found sitting on thrones, and clad in the purple of the Cæsars.

It was a strange spectacle upon which the eyes of Jesus opened. The old barriers against intercommunication had been broken down—national antipathies were held in check, and they had built those wonderful roads, the Appian and Flaminian way, moved only by thoughts of conquest and commerce, and little thinking that along those very roads, the fragments of which remain to this day to excite the wonder and envy of modern engineers, the Apostles Paul and Peter would pass in establishing an empire broader and more permanent than their own—even a dominion that should be acknowledged by all kindreds, and peoples, and tongues, and nations, and, surviving the wreck of time, live throughout eternity.

But having thus opened a highway from nation to nation for the unobstructed progress of the Gospel, which we conceive to have been the great object for which it was to labor, Roman civilization added another tribute to the truth, by demonstrating its own utter worthlessness so far as the highest interests of humanity are concerned. The moral and social, and, indeed, the civil condition of the people, was worse than in the worst

days of Greek licentiousness. Niebuhr thus describes her state: "As regards the manners and mode of life of the Romans, their great object at this time was the acquisition and possession of money. Their moral conduct, which had been corrupt enough before the social war, became still more so by their systematic plunder and rapine. Immense riches were accumulated and squandered upon brutal pleasures. The simplicity of the old manners and mode of living had been abandoned for Greek luxuries and frivolities, and the whole household arrangements had become altered. The Roman houses had formerly been quite simple, and had been built of brick or peperino, but in most cases of the former material; now, on the other hand, every one would live in a splendid house and be surrounded by luxuries. The condition of Italy after the civil and social wars, was indescribably wretched.—*Lectures on the History of Rome, vol. 1, 421–422.*

The exquisite grace and refinement of vice were gone—the grossness of sensuality remained. At the period of the very highest power and wealth, Rome had lost her once boasted virtue. There was rottenness in that great heart of the world whose passionate and lustful throbbings were felt to the ends of the earth, and those mighty arms which were stretched out over society were strong only for rapine and wrong. Their religious condition was no more hopeful than their civil. Cicero, who had written so much about virtue and the worship of the Gods, said that in his day one haruspice could not look another in the face without laughing. The history of Tacitus is something between a tragedy and a dirge. He begins it by saying: "I enter upon a work full of misfortunes, atrocious wars, discords, seditions; nay, hideous even in peace." Again (3rd chap.), "Besides the manifold accidents of human things, there were prodigies in heaven and earth, threatening flashes of lightning, and forebodings of the future, joyful and gloomy, doubtful and plain. Never by more grievous miseries of the Roman people, or more just tokens of the divine displeasure, was it proved, that the Gods wished not our welfare, but revenge." When Brutus had lost the battle of Philippi, and in the silence of the dark night was about to fall on his sword and

die, he cried "O! virtue, I *did* think thou wert something, but now I see thou art a phantom!" But why need we spend time on such a theme, when it is known that such monsters as Caligula, Claudius, Nero and Heliogabalus, not only occupied the imperial throne, but passed from them to a place among the Gods! Paul has given us a picture of the time in the first Chapter of Romans.

Philosophers were in no more hopeful condition. The speculative world was divided between Stoicism and Epicureanism. The existence of truth was doubted or denied, virtue was considered a sham—and even Seneca, whom an enthusiastic admirer, John Arndt, (1556–1621) claims as having written by special inspiration of God, gives up the hope of immortality, the very sheet anchor of the soul. "Once trusting to the word of others, I flattered myself with the prospect of a life beyond the grave and I *longed* for death; when I suddenly awoke and lost the beautiful dream." And Pliny, in his Natural History, argues that it is beyond the power of God to confer immortality on man. Hence, he thought, that the best thing a man could do was to die. Suicide was gravely defended as a right. And the pithy proverb, "If the house smokes, leave it," was in the mouths of men called the wisest and best. This, then, is the sad, cheerless result of the grand Roman experiment. Her imperial pride does not prevent the humiliating confession: "Salvation is not in me. There is no hope."

The last great laborer in this field was the nation of the Jews. Their central idea was not intellect, as the Greek—nor law, as the Roman—but religion, open to all—binding on all—having no esoteric doctrines—and maintaining, in all its history, the idea of one spiritual God, as a continual protest against Polytheism and idolatry. Their position was anticipative and expectant. Prophecy was their polar star. Their whole history is an acted prophecy. Their religion was one of hope of good things to come. Unlike the Greeks and Romans, their golden age was in the future. Their mission was to let the true light shine in darkness—though often the darkness comprehended it not. Their geographical position was eminently suited to their appointed work. They had Egypt on the one

side, and Syria and the East on the other, and they were carried captive into both, diffusing as they went, the knowledge of the wondrous revelation that God had vouchsafed to them. They were just in the line of Alexander's march of conquest, and in the centre of the four fragments into which his empire broke. And on the west the Mediterranean (middle of the earth) opened to them Europe and Africa.

And their dispersion, whether produced by the national passion for trade, or by the will of some conqueror, was for the furtherance of the Gospel. For they carried their faith with them, and maintained it alike in the busy marts of Corinth and by the waters of Babylon, where they hung their harps in silent and tearful remembrance of Zion. Thus it came to pass that both the cupidity and the wrath of man worked out the plans of God. A witness for him was found in every land. So that in the days of Paul it could be said, "For Moses, of old time, hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues every Sabbath day."—Acts 15: 21. Thus prophecy and fulfilment could stand side by side, when the Apostle argued the claims of Christ. Again, a fringe of proselytes surrounded every synagogue—men of inquiring minds and earnest spirits, who having Jewish knowledge without Jewish prejudice, were at once fitted to receive the truth and to communicate it to the heathen.

But, lest it should be thought that Judaism was the full and final faith adequate to the wants of a diseased humanity, it had lost its power—was waxing old and was ready to vanish away. Malachi had closed the canon of Old Testament Scripture—the light of prophecy went out, and there was silence in heaven for four hundred years—till the expectant world was startled by the voice of one crying in the wilderness—Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight.

To determine, then, the success of the Jewish experiment, let us look in on them during that interval when they were left to themselves. And the scene presented is sadder than the others, because of their great but abused privileges. Their condition manifested the old trine division of the human intellect; and, as applied to religion, produced the Pharisees, the Sadducees and

the Essenes—the Stoics, the Epicureans and the Cynics of the Jewish growth. Their civil condition can be given in one sentence of Josephus. After describing their wars, internal and external, despite all his prejudices in favor of his beloved nation, he is compelled to say: “I believe that had the Romans not come upon this wicked race when they did, an earthquake would have swallowed them up, or a flood would have drowned them, or the lightnings of Sodom would have struck them. For this generation was more ungodly than all that had ever suffered such punishments.” To this sad statement all history agrees. This also was a failure, signal and complete. It was, indeed, the hour of the world’s extremity. Diseased humanity had been allowed four thousand years in which to heal itself, and the disease had only become more virulent and deadly. The principalities and powers of hell had broke loose on society; the possession of devils was no rare occurrence; the wild scream of the demoniac, mingled with the revelry of Saturnalian orgies; and the snarl of the Cynic, and the thoughtless laugh of the Epicurean, and the proud self-sufficiency of the Stoic, filled up the scene of chaotic confusion into which society had fallen. The solution of a problem thus complicated, called for the intervention of a God. The promised deliverer must come now or never, unless he would come to a hell on earth—a mighty and universal pandemonium, where the base passions of all nations were seething, and all jealousies and hatred were clashing. And now the sceptre is departing from Judah and the lawgiver from between his knees—the predicted hour for Shiloh to come. And God was true to his word. The very edict that humbled Herod in the dust at the feet of his Roman master, and destroyed the last vestige of kingly power—the registration of the tribes of Israel for a Roman taxation, called Joseph and Mary to Bethlehem the city of David; and *then* and *there*, in the fullness of time, surrounded by the concentrated light of history and prophecy—heralded by rejoicing angels, and adored by the shepherds and the wise men—the representatives of the Jewish and Gentile world—Christ, “the desire of all nations,”—the Saviour of men, was born.

And these things were not done in a corner, where imposture

might play its tricks of deception. All eyes were turned in anxious expectation to Judea at the time. Expectations of a coming Messiah, in various forms and degrees of clearness, were at that time by the political, intellectual and religious contact and collision of the nations, spread over the whole world, and like the first red streaks on the horizon, announced the approach of day. The Persians were looking for their Sosiach, who should conquer Ahriman and his kingdom of darkness. The Chinese sage, Confucius, pointed his disciples to a holy one who should appear in the West. The wise Astrologers who came to Jerusalem to worship the new born King of the Jews, we must look upon as the noblest representatives of the Messianic hopes of the Oriental heathens. The western nations on the contrary looked towards the East, the land of the rising sun and of all wisdom. Suetonius and Tacitus speak of a current saying in the Roman empire, that in the East, and more particularly in Judea, a new universal empire would soon be founded.

The Jews also were on the tiptoe of expectation; and, it is a singular fact, that at the very time that Christ—the eternal word of God—was born, Philo, the greatest of Jewish philosophers, was speculating about the advent and work of a deliverer whom he called the Word of God. Attention then was awake. The philosophical habits of the people fitted them for scrutiny, and Greek, Roman and Jew, had each his own reason for scrutinising the claims of Jesus more closely.

Christ came in the Augustan age—the golden period of Roman literature. Horace, Tacitus, Juvenal, Seneca and Cicero, were still blazing in their hemisphere as stars of the first magnitude. And the greater lights of Grecian learning, Socrates, Aristotle, Homer and Demosthenes, were shining upon the world with scarcely diminished lustre.

That religion that could stand the test of such scrutiny and pervade the world in one generation, must be divine.

Thus it was that “the city of God was built at the confluence of three civilizations” most strangely blended. Herod, as if to symbolize this wonderful conjunction, had rebuilt the temple—thus presenting the Jewish element; within its walls had reared a theatre—representative of Greek culture; and in a

neighboring plain had built an amphitheatre, for the exhibition of Roman games.—*Jos. Ant.*, Lib. xv, Cap. 8, § 1, *B. J.*, Lib. i, Cap. 21, § 8.

Greeks, Romans and Jews were, we have said, representative people, commissioned to prepare the way for the coming of Christ. So his Cross, which was the hope of all, was surrounded by all three. And over it was written, so that each could read it in his own tongue, in Hebrew and Greek and Latin: "This is the King of the Jews." There they found or might find, what they severally needed so much, and had sought so long in vain—the true philosophy, the true liberty and the true religion. Thus Greek and Roman and Jew found, or might find, Christ to be "all in all."

Our task is now done. We have sketched the preparation of the world for the coming of Christ, and must now be silent. But there is another coming of the same deliverer of which this advent reminds us, and for which it is a pledge. The veil that covers it, it is not our province to lift. But God has said it and will hasten it in its time. Christ shall come a second time without sin unto salvation. We may not see that period of millennial glory, and yet we may. But if another night of error and apostacy should settle down on this earth, we may lie down to sleep in Jesus as well assured of that glorious dawn as if we saw its first rays gilding the horizon, or heard the glad shout, "The kingdoms of this world have become the kingdoms of our Lord and his Christ." How glad the jubilee of humanity!

"One song employs all nations: and all cry  
Worthy the lamb for he was slain for us!  
The dwellers in the vales and on the rocks  
Shout to each other, and the mountain tops  
From distant mountains catch the flying joy,  
Till nation after nation taught the strain,  
Earth rolls the rapturous hosanna round."



## ARTICLE IV.

## MORALITY OF THE LEGAL PROFESSION.

The prominent influence which lawyers exert in the community, makes it a question of vital interest what are the ethical principles upon which the profession habitually regulate the performance of their professional duties. Their social standing is usually that of leaders, in every society. As a class, they are almost uniformly men of education; and their studies of the science of the law, (which is a great moral science,) with their converse with all conditions of men, and all sorts of secular transactions, give them an intelligence and knowledge of the human heart which cannot but make them leaders of opinion. It is from this class that the most of our legislators and rulers, and all our judicial officers, must be taken. They are the agents by whose hands nearly all the complicated transactions are managed, which involve secular rights, and interest the thoughts and moral judgments of men most warmly. But more; they are the stated and official expounders of those rights, and not the mere protectors of the possessions or material values about which our rights are concerned. In every district, town, or county of our land,—we may say with virtual accuracy, monthly, or yet more frequent, schools are held, in which the ethical doctrines governing man's conduct to his fellow man, are publicly and orally taught to the whole body of the citizens, with accessory circumstances, giving the liveliest possible interest, vividness and pungency, to the exposition. Ot these schools the lawyers are the teachers. Their lessons are presented, not in the abstract, like so many heard from the pulpit, but in the concrete, exemplified in cases which arouse the whole community to a living interest. Their lessons are endlessly varied, touching every human right and duty summed up in the second table of the law. They are usually intensely practical, and thus admit of an immediate and easy application. They are always delivered with animation, and often with an

impressive eloquence. It is therefore obvious, that this profession must have fearful influence in forming the moral opinions of the community. The concern which the country has in their professional integrity, and in their righteous and truthful exercise of these vast powers, is analogous to that which the Church has in the orthodoxy of her ministers. Nor are these influences of the legal profession limited to things secular; for the domains of morals and religion so intermingle, that the moral condition of a people, as to the duties of righteousness between man and man, greatly influences their state towards God. It may well be doubted, whether an acute and unprincipled bar does not do more to corrupt and ruin many communities than the pulpit does to sanctify and save them. These things at once justify the introduction of the topic into this Review, and challenge the attention of Christian lawyers and readers to its great importance.

In describing what is believed to be the prevalent (though not universal) theory and usage of the bar, we would by no means compose our description out of those base arts which are despised and repudiated as much by honorable lawyers as by all other honest men. There is no need to debate the morality or immorality of the various tricks; the subornation of witnesses; the bribing of jury-men; the falsification of evidence in its recital; the misquotation or garbling of authorities; the bullying of truthful and modest persons placed in the witness' stand by no choice of their own; the shaving of the claims of clients in advance of a verdict by their own counsel: by which some lawyers disgrace their fraternity. This class are beyond the reach of moral considerations; and, concerning their vile iniquity, all honest men are already agreed. Nor, on the other hand, can we take the principles of that honorable but small minority, as a fair exemplar of the theory of the profession, who defend in the bar no act or doctrine which their consciences would not justify in the sight of God; and who say and do nothing officially which they would not maintain as private gentlemen. This class, we fear, are regarded by their own fraternity rather as the puritans of the profession. It is believed that the theory of the great mass of reputable lawyers

is about this: "That the advocate, in representing his client's interest, acts officially and not personally; and, therefore, has no business to entertain, even as an advocate, any opinion of the true merits of the case; for this is the function of the judge and jury; that the advocate's office, to perform which faithfully he is even sworn, is, to present his client's cause in the most favorable light which his skill and knowledge of law will enable him to throw around it; and that if this should be more favorable than truth and justice approve, this is no concern of his, but of the advocate of the opposite party, who has equal obligation and opportunity to correct the picture: that not the advocate himself, but the judge and jury who sit as umpires, are responsible for the righteousness of the final verdict. That according to the conception of the English law, a court is but a debating society, in which the advocates of plaintiffs and defendants are but the counterpoises, whose only function is the almost mechanical, or, at least, the merely intellectual one of pressing down each one his own scale, while an impartial judge holds the balance; that this artificial scheme is found by a sound experience to be—not, indeed, perfect—but on the whole the most accurate way to secure just verdicts in the main; and that this fact is the sufficient moral defence of the system."

Now, it is not our intention, in impugning the morality of this theory, to charge the profession with immorality and dishonor, as compared with other professions. While the bar exhibits, like all other classes, evidences of man's sinful nature, it deserves, and should receive, the credit of ranking among the foremost of secular classes, in honorable and generous traits. Lawyers may urge with much justice, that other professions habitually practise means of emolument strictly analogous to their official advocacy of a bad cause. The merchant, for instance, says all that he can say, truthfully, in commendation of his wares, and is silent concerning the *per-contras* of their defects. "To find out these," he says, "is the buyer's business." The farmer praises all the good points of the horse or the bullock he sells, and leaves the purchaser to detect the defects, if he can. It is not intended then to assert, that the

practice of this theory of the advocate's duty is more immoral than other things commonly supposed reputable in other callings. The question to be gravely considered is: whether the greater importance of the advocate's profession, as affecting not only pecuniary and personal rights, but the moral sentiments and virtues of the commonwealth, does not give a graver aspect to the errors of their theory of action. It is not that the bar is more immoral than commerce or agriculture; but that, if the bar acts on an immoral theory, it is so much more mischievous. Nor, again, is it asserted that the individual advocate is necessarily a vicious man, because the professional idea into which he is betrayed is a vicious one. It is not doubted that many men of social honor act out the idea of their office above described, who, if they were convinced of its error, would repudiate it conscientiously. It is not questioned that the professional intercourse of lawyers with each other is usually courteous, generous and fraternal, above most of the secular professions; that many magnanimous cases exist where peaceful counsels are given by them to angry litigants, so as to prevent controversies which would be extremely profitable to the advocates, if prosecuted; that there is no class of worldly men who usually respond more nobly to the claims of beneficence than lawyers; and that they deserve usually their social position in the front rank of the respectable classes. But, to recur to the truth already suggested, it should be remembered that their profession is not merely commercial or pecuniary in its concerns: it is intellectual and moral: it affects not only the interests but the virtues of the people: lawyers are their leaders and moral teachers. Therefore, they act under higher responsibilities than the mere man of dollars, and should be satisfied only by a higher and better standard. The merchant may, perhaps, lawfully determine his place of residence by regard to his profits: the preacher of the gospel may not; and should he do so, he would be held a recreant to his obligations. Why this difference? In like manner we may argue that should the lawyer act on a moral standard no higher than that of the mere reputable man of traffic, he would violate the obligations of his more responsible profession. But if this were not so, the

obvious remark remains, that, if all other secular professions act unscrupulously, this is no standard, and no justification for the bar: To "measure ourselves by ourselves, and compare ourselves among ourselves, is not wise." The only question with the answer to which true integrity will satisfy itself, is this: *whether the above theory of an advocate's functions is morally right.*

We shall begin a diffident and respectful attempt to prove that it is not, by questioning the accuracy of the plea of beneficial policy; in which it is asserted, that the administration of justice is, on the whole, better secured by this artificial structure of courts, than by any other means. We point to the present state of the administration of justice in our country; to the "glorious uncertainties of the law;" to the endless diversities and contradictions, not only of hired advocates of parties, but of dignified judges; to the impotence of penal law, and especially to the shameful and fearful license allowed among us to crimes of bloodshed; and ask, can this be a wholesome, a politic system, which bears such fruit? Is this the best judicial administration for which civilized, Christian, free nations may hope? Then, alas! for our future prospects! But it is notorious among enlightened men, that there are States, as for instance Denmark, Wurtemberg, Belgium and even France, where the general purposes of order, security and equal rights (not, indeed, as towards the sovereign, but between citizen and citizen) are far better obtained in practice than they are among us; and that, in some cases, without our boasted trial by jury. Our system, judged by its fruits, is not even politic: it is a practical nuisance to the State. It may be well doubted whether, in spite of all our boasted equal rights, the practical protection this day given to life, limb and estate, by the unmitigated military despotism of the Governor-General of Cuba, not to say by the tyrannical government of Louis Napoleon, is not, on the whole, more secure and prompt and equitable, than that now enjoyed in many of the United States. And the worst feature is, that as the legal profession has increased with the growth of the country, and gotten more and more control over legal transactions, these defects of judicial administration have

increased. It is urged in favor of this system of professional advocacy, that great practical injustice would frequently result from the inequality of knowledge, tact, fluency and talent in parties, if they did not enjoy the opportunity of employing counsel trained to the law, and exercising their office in the spirit we have described. It would often happen, it is said, that a rich, educated, skillful man, might contend with a poor, ignorant and foolish one; but, by resorting to counsel, all these differences are equalized. It may be justly asked, whether there are not inequalities in the skill and diligence of advocates, and whether the wealth which would give to the rich suitor so unjust an advantage over his poor adversary, if they pleaded their causes in person, does not, in fact, give an equally unjust advantage, in the numbers and ability of the counsel it enables him to secure, when those counsel are permitted to urge his cause beyond their own private convictions of its merits. We do not, of course, dream of any state of things in which professional advocates can be dispensed with wholly: minors, females, persons of feeble intellects, must have them in some form. But it is very doubtful whether as equitable results would not be reached in the main, were all other suitors, except the classes we have mentioned, obliged to appear *per se*, extreme as such a usage would be, as those reached under our present system. Cases are continually occurring, in which verdicts are obtained contrary to right, in virtue of inequalities in the members, reputation, talents, or zeal of opposing counsel, or of the untoward prejudices under which one party has to struggle. Especially is this assertion true of a multitude of cases in which the commonwealth is a party; for when this unscrupulous theory of an advocate's functions is adopted, it is universally found that the personal client on the one side is served with a different kind of zeal and perseverance from that exerted on the other side in behalf of that distant, imaginary, and vague personality, the State. This theory, therefore, probably does as much to create unfair inequalities as to correct them. And it usually happens that the advocate derives his warmth, his strongest arguments, and most telling points, from his conversations with the eager client, whom self-interest has impelled

to view the controversy with all the force of a thoroughly aroused mind ; that, in a word, the client does more to make the speech effective than his counsel.

But we are disposed to attach comparatively little importance to these considerations. Policy is not the test of right, on which side soever the advantage may lie ; and we have too much faith in the immutable laws of rectitude, and in the providence of a holy God over human affairs, to believe that a true expediency is ever to be found in that which is immoral. In the final issue, that which is right will always be found most expedient. If, therefore, the theory we oppose can be shown to be immoral, there will be no need to reply to the assertion of its expediency.

We remark, then, in the second place, that it is a presumptive reason against this theory of the lawyer's functions, that so constant a tendency is exhibited by individuals of the profession, to descend to a still lower grade of expedients and usages in the pursuit of success. While the honorable men of the profession stop at the species of advocacy we have defined, there is another part, a minority we would fain hope, who show a constant pressure towards practices less defensible. To that pressure some are ever yielding, by gradations almost insensible, until the worst men of the body reach those vile and shameless arts which are the *opprobrium* of the bar. It is greatly to be feared that this tendency downwards is manifesting itself more and more forcibly in our country as the numbers of the profession increase, and competition for subsistence becomes keener. Now, our argument is not so much in the fact that the profession is found to have dishonest members ; for then the existence of quacks and patent medicines might prove the art of the physicians to be immoral ; but in the fact the honorable part of the bar are utterly unable to draw any distinct and decisive line, compatibly with their principles, to separate themselves from the dishonorable. The fact to which we point is, then, that men who practise in their clients' behalf, almost every conceivable grade of art and argument unstained by their own secret conscience, short of actual lying and bribery, consider themselves as acting legiti-

mately under the theory of the profession ; and their more scrupulous brethren, who hold the same theory, cannot consistently deny their claim. If the advocate may go farther in the support of his client's case than his own honest judgment of its merits would bear him out ; we ask, at what grade of sophistry must he stop ? Where shall the line be drawn ? If he may with propriety blink one principle of equity or law, in his behalf, may he not for a similar reason blink two ? If he may adroitly and tacitly, but most effectively insinuate a sophistry in his favor, might he not just as well speak it boldly out ? The *suppressio veri* not seldom amounts to a *suggestio falsi*. And if the duty to the client, with the constitution of the court, justify the insinuation or assertion of a sophistry, by what reason can it be shown that they will not justify the insinuation of a falsehood ? A sophistry is a logical falsehood ; and if he who offers it comprehends its unsoundness, we cannot see how he is less truly guilty of falsehood, than he who tells a lie. To speak falsehood is knowingly to frame and utter a proposition which is not true. He who knowingly urges a sophistical argument does in substance the same thing ; he propagates, if he does not utter, a false proposition, namely, the conclusion of his false argument. But we may fairly press this reasoning yet further. No one will deny that when the advocate, as an advocate, suppresses truth, or insinuates a claim more than just to his client, or less than just to his adversary, any such act would be insincere, and therefore immoral, if it were done as an individual and private act. The circumstances which are supposed to justify it are, that he is not acting for himself but for another, not individually but officially ; that there is an antagonist whose professional business it is to see that he gets no undue advantage for his client, and that the lawyer is not bound to form any private opinion whatever about the question, whether the advantages he is procuring for his client are righteous or not, that being the business of the judge and jury. These circumstances, it is claimed, make that professionally innocent which would otherwise be a positive sin. Why, then, may they not justify the commission of any other sin which would be profitable to



the client; and what limit would there be to the iniquities which professional fidelity might demand, provided only the client's case were bad enough to need them? If it is right, for his sake, "to make the worse appear the better cause," why not also falsify testimony, or garble authorities, or bribe jurors, or suborn perjurers, if necessary to victory? It would be hard to affix a consistent limit; for the greater urgency of the client's case would justify the greater sin. It is no answer to this to say, that the latter expedients would be wrong because the opposite party is entitled to expect that the controversy will be conducted with professional fairness, and that no advantage will be sought, which professional skill and knowledge may not be supposed able to detect and rebut if the party seeking it is not fairly entitled to it. For, according to the theory under discussion, this professional fairness is itself a conventional thing, and not the same with absolute righteousness; and any conduct which was conventionally recognized for the time being would come up to the definition. So that, the party secretly contemplating the employment of some of these vile expedients, would only have to notify his antagonist in general terms, to be on the look out for any imaginable trick, in order to render his particular trick professionally justifiable. And it is wholly delusive to urge that the advantage sought by one party is legitimate, because it is only such a one as the opposing party may be expected to detect and counteract by his skill, if competent for his professional duties, as he professes; for the reason why the given artifice called legitimate, is used in any case, is just this, that it is supposed the opposing party will not have skill enough to detect and counteract it. Its concealment from him is the sole ground for the hope of success in using it; and it is a mere evasion to say that it is such a legal artifice as the opponent's legal skill may reasonably be supposed competent to meet; when in that particular case, it is used for the very reason that it is believed his skill will not be competent to meet it. It is used because it is hoped that, it will remain as much undetected, and unanswered, as would the illegitimate tricks of falsification and bribery. We believe therefore that, if the advocate may

transgress the line of absolute truth and righteousness at all, in his client's behalf, there is no consistent stopping place. No limit can be consistently drawn; and the constant tendencies of a part of the profession with the various grades of license which different advocates, called reputable, allow themselves, indicate the justice of this objection.

We may properly add just here that, even if the theory we oppose were in itself moral, it might yet be a grave question, whether it is moral to subject one's self to a temptation so subtle and urgent, as that which allures the advocate to transgress the legitimate limit. The limit is confessedly a conventional one at any rate, and not absolutely coincident with what would be strict righteousness, if the person were acting individually and privately: it is separated from immoral artifices by no broad, permanent, consistent line; the gradation which leads down from the practices called reputable, to those allowedly base, is one composed of steps so slight as to be almost invisible; and the desire to conquer, so vehemently stimulated by the forensic competition, will almost surely seduce even the scrupulous conscience to transgress. No sinner has a right to subject his infirm and imperfect virtue to so deadly a trial.

In the third place, we respectfully object to the lawfulness of the attitudes in which this theory of the profession places the advocate. It claims that the court is but the debating society, in which the function of the two parties of lawyers is, not to decide the justice of the cause, (that being the function of judge and jury,) but to urge, each side, all that can be professionally urged in favor of its own client: and that out of this *ex parte* struggle, impartially presided over by the listening umpire, there will usually proceed the most intelligent and equitable decision. But the fatal objection is: that even if the latter claim were true, we might "not do evil that good might come." And truth and right are a sacred thing, which carry an immediate, universal, inexorable obligation to every soul in every circumstance, if he deals with them at all, to deal with them according to their reality. Man is morally responsible for every act he performs which has moral character or conse-

quences; and no circumstance or subterfuge authorizes him to evade this bond. His maker will allow him to interpose no conventionality, no artificial plea of official position between him and his duty. Every act which has moral character, man performs personally, and under an immediate personal responsibility. The mere statement of this moral truth is sufficient to evince its justness: the conscience sees it by its own light. And it is obvious that unless God maintained his moral government over individuals in this immediate, personal way, he could not maintain it practically at all. Some form of organization might be devised to place men in a conventional, official position, in which every thing might be done which a sinful desire might crave, and thus every law of God might be evaded. In a word, whatever else a man may delegate by an artificial convention of law, he cannot delegate his responsibility; that is as inalienable as his identity. And it is equally impossible for man voluntarily and intelligently to assume the doing of a vicarious act, and leave the whole guilt of that act cleaving to his principal. His deed, in consenting to act vicariously is his personal, individual deed, lying immediately between him and his God; and if the deed has moral quality at all, it is his own personal morality or immorality.

Now, truth and right are concerned in every legal controversy. But these are things to which moral character essentially belongs. If a man speaks, he ought to speak truth—if he handles a right, he ought to handle it righteously. Lawyers seem to feel as though this conventional theory of the courts of law had no more moral quality attaching to it than the apparatus by which the centre of gravity of a ship is restored to the middle, as she leans to one side or the other. The honest sailor seizes the lever by which he moves his ponderous chest of cannon balls or chain cable, and when the sliding of some heavy part of the cargo in the hold, or the impulse of wind or wave causes the ship to lurch to the larboard, he shoves his counterpoise to the starboard side. He tells you that his object is, not to throw the ship on her beam ends, but to maintain a fair equilibrium, by going as much too far on the one side as the disturbing force had gone on the

other. And this is all right enough. The forces which he moves or counterbalances are dead, senseless, soulless, without responsibility. But it is altogether otherwise when we come to handle truth and right. For they are sacred things. They can in no case be touched without immediate moral obligation; and to pervert a truth or right on the one hand, in order that a similar perversion on the other hand may be counterbalanced, is sin, always and necessarily sin; it is the sin of meeting one wicked act by another wicked act, or, at best, of "doing evil that good may come." An attempt may be made at this point to evade this clear principle of morals by means of the confusion of thought produced by an appeal to a false analogy. Perhaps some such illustration as this may be presented: The soldier obeys his officer; he honestly, fairly and mercifully performs the tasks assigned him in his lawful profession, and yet sometimes takes life in battle. Now, suppose the war to which his commander leads him is an unrighteous war? All must admit that every death perpetrated by the unrighteous aggressor, in that war, is a murder in God's sight. But we justly conclude that this dreadful guilt all belongs to the wicked sovereign and legislature who declare the war, and not to the passive soldier who merely does his duty in obeying his commander." Hence, it is asserted, "the principle appears false; and there may be cases in which it is lawful for a man to do vicariously, or officially, what it would be wrong to do individually."

We reply that the general proposition thus deduced is one essentially different from the one which our principle denies. To say that a man may lawfully do some things vicariously or officially, which he may not do privately and individually, is a totally different thing from saying, that if an act would be immediately and necessarily wrong in itself, whenever and however done, the agent who does that act for another may still be innocent in doing it, because he acts for another. But the latter is the proposition which must be proved, in order to rebut our principles. We remark further upon the illustration above stated, that there are several fundamental differences between the case of the soldier and that of the advocate who

professionally defends his client's wrong-doing. One is, that the soldier, in the case supposed, has not volunteered of his own free choice to fight in this particular war which is unrighteous. If he has, then we can by no means exculpate him from a share in the guilt of all the murders which the wicked sovereign perpetrates in battle by his hand. It is only when the soldier is draughted into this service without his option, and compelled by the laws of his country, that we can exculpate him. But the advocate has chosen his own profession freely in the first instance, and he chooses each particular case which he advocates, with whatever injustice it may involve. For, whatever fidelity he may suppose his professional oath (perhaps thoughtlessly taken) compels him to exercise, in behalf of his unrighteous client, after he has made him his client, certainly he is not compelled to undertake his case at all unless he chooses. Another minor difference of the two cases is, that the soldier, not being a civilian by profession and habit, is competent to have very few thoughts or judgments about the abstract righteousness of the war to which his sovereign has sent him; whereas, it is the very trade and profession of the lawyer to investigate the righteousness or wrongfulness of transactions; so that if, indeed, he is aiding his client to perpetrate an injustice, he is the very man, of all others, who should be most distinctly aware of the wrong about to be done. But the chief and all sufficient difference of the two cases is: that all killing is not murder; but all utterance of that which is known to be not true, is lying. The work of slaying may, or may not, be rightful; the case where the lawful soldier, obeying his commander in slaying in battle, commits murder, is the exceptional case, (not indeed in frequency of occurrence perhaps; but in reference to the professed theory of legitimate government.) But to the rule of truth and right there is no exception: all known assertion of untruth is sin. How comes it that the profession of slaying as an agent for the temporal sovereign, as a soldier or sheriff, for instance, is in any case a righteous one? Only because there are cases in which the sovereign may himself righteously slay. And in those cases, it may be that this right to slay, which the sovereign himself possesses, may

be held properly by another person by delegation. But no man can delegate what he does not possess. The client cannot therefore delegate, in any case, to his lawyer, the function of making his wrong-doing appear right; because it would be in every case, wrong for him to do it himself. And here we are brought to a point where we may see the utter absurdity of all the class of illustrations we are combatting. For, lawyers will themselves admit that if they acted individually and privately when they present pleas which, they are aware, are unjust, it would be sin. Their defence is that they do it officially. Well, then, if the client did it for himself, it would be sin: how can the lawyer, his agent, derive from him the right to do what he has himself no right to do? Or, will it be said that the official right of the advocate to act for a given client is not delegated to him from that client, but from the State which licensed him as an advocate? We think this is a doctrine which clients would be rather slow to admit. And again, the State is as utterly devoid as the client of all right to misrepresent truth and right. God has given to the civil magistrate the right to slay murderers and invaders; but he has given to no person nor commonwealth under heaven, the right to depart from the inexorable lines of truth and right.

This great truth brings us back to the doctrine of each man's direct and unavoidable responsibility to God, for all his acts possessing moral character or moral consequences. Now, in performing our duty, God requires us always to employ the best lights of reason and conscience he has given us, to find out for ourselves what is right. It is man's bounden duty to have an opinion of his own, concerning the lawfulness of every act he performs, which possesses any moral quality. God does not permit us to employ any man or body of men on earth as our conscience-keepers. How futile, then, is the evasion presented at this point by the advocates of the erroneous theory: "that the lawyer is not to be supposed to know the unrighteousness of his client's cause: that it is not his business to have any opinion about it; but, on the contrary, the peculiar business of the judge and jury: nay, that he is not entitled to have any opinion about it, and would be wrong if

he had, for the law presumes every man innocent till after he is proved wicked: and when the advocate performs his functions, no verdict has yet been pronounced by the only party authorized to pronounce one. The fatal weakness of this feeble sophistry is in this: that these assertions concerning the exclusive right of the judge and jury to decide the merits of the case, are only true as to one particular relation of the client. The judge and jury are the only party authorized to pronounce the client wrong or guilty, as concerns the privation of his life, liberty or property. It would, indeed, be most illegal and unjust, for lawyer or private citizen, to conclude his guilt in advance of judicial investigation, in the sense of proceeding thereupon to inflict that punishment which the magistrate alone is authorized to inflict. But this is all. If any private, personal right or duty of the private citizen, or of any one, is found to be dependent on the innocence or wickedness of that party before the court, it is a right and duty to proceed to form an opinion of his character, as correct as may be, by the light of our own consciences, in advance of judicial opinion or even in opposition to it. Yea, we cannot help doing so, if we try. Now, the question which the advocate has to ask himself as to an unrighteous client, is: "Shall I professionally defend his unrighteousness, or shall I not?" And that question involves an unavoidable duty, and constitutes a matter personal, private and immediate, between him and his God. In deciding that he will not lend his professional assistance to that man's unrighteousness, he decides a personal duty: he does not touch the bad man's franchises, nor anticipate his judicial sentence. Let us illustrate. Many years ago an advocate, distinguished for his eloquence and high social character, successfully defended a vile assassin, and by his tact, boldness and pathos, secured a verdict of acquittal. When the accused was released he descended into the crowd of the court house, to receive the congratulations of his degraded companions, and almost wild with elation, advanced to his advocate offering his hand with profuse expressions of admiration and gratitude. The dignified lawyer sternly joined his own hands behind his back and turned away, saying: "I touch no man's hand that is foul with

murder." But in what light did this advocate learn that this criminal was too base to be recognized as a fellow man? The court had pronounced him innocent! It was only by the light of his private judgment—a private judgment formed not only in advance of, but in the teeth of, the authorized verdict. Where now were all the quibbles by which this honorable gentleman had persuaded himself to lend his professional skill to protect, from a righteous doom, a wretch too vile to touch his hand? as that "the lawyer is not the judge: that he is not authorized to decide the merits of the case? Doubtless this lawyer's understanding spoke now, clearly enough, in some such terms as these: "My hand is my own, it is purely a personal question to myself whether I shall give it to this murderer; and in deciding that personal question, I have a right to be guided by my own personal opinion of him. In claiming this, I infringe no legal right to life, liberty, or possessions, which the constituted authorities have restored to him." But *was not his tongue his own*, in the same sense with his hand? Was not the question whether he could answer it to his God for having used his tongue to prevent the punishment of crime, as much a private, personal, individual matter, to be decided by his own private judgment, as the question whether he should shake hands with a felon? Let us suppose another case: a prominent advocate defends a man of doubtful character from the charge of fraud, and rescues him by his skill from his well deserved punishment. But now this scurvy fellow comes forward and claims familiar access to the society of the honorable lawyer's house, and aspires to the hand of his daughter in marriage. He immediately receives a significant hint that he is not considered worthy of either honor. But he replies: "You, Mr. Counsellor, told your conscience that it was altogether legitimate to defend my questionable transactions professionally, because the law did not constitute you the judge of the merits of the case, because the law says every man is to be presumed to be innocent till convicted of guilt by the constituted tribunal, and because you were not to be supposed to have any opinion about my guilt or innocence. Now, the constituted authorities have honorably acquitted me, (at your



advice!) I claim, therefore, that you shall act out your own theory, and practically treat me as an honorable man." We opine the honorable counsellor would soon see through his own sophistry, and reply that those principles only applied to his civic treatment of him as a citizen; that his house and his daughter were his own, and that he was entitled, yea, solemnly bound, in disposing of them, to exercise the best lights of his private judgment. So say we: and nothing can be so intimately personal and private, so exclusively between a man and his God, as his concern in the morality of his own acts. Since God holds every man immediately responsible for the way in which he deals with truth and right, whenever and in whatever capacity he deals with them, there can be no concern in which he is so much entitled and bound to decide for himself in the light of his own honest conscience. The advocate is bound, therefore, to form his own independent opinion, in God's fear, whether in assisting each applicant he will be assisting wrong, or asserting falsehood. This preliminary question he ought to consider, not professionally, but personally and ethically. Let every man rest assured that God's claims over his moral creatures are absolutely inevitable. He will not be cheated of satisfaction to his outraged law by the plea that the wrong was done professionally; and when the *lawyer* is suffering the righteous doom of his professional misdeeds, how will it fare with the *man*?

Our fourth consideration is but an extension and application of the great principle of personal responsibility which we have attempted to illustrate above. We would group together the practical wrongs which evolve in the operation of this artificial and immoral theory; we would invite our readers to look at their enormity, and to ask themselves whether it can be that these things are innocently done. Let the conscience speak; for its warm and immediate intuitions have a logic of their own, less likely to be misled by glaring sophistry than the speculations of the head. And here we would paint not so much the judicial wrongs directly inflicted by suitors unrighteously successful; for here the lawyer might seem not so directly responsible. We might, indeed, point to the case in

which plausible fraud succeeds in stripping the deserving, the widow, the orphan, of their substance, inflicting thus the ills of penury; or to that in which slander or violence is enabled to stab the peace of innocent hearts, undeterred by fear of righteous retribution; and ask the honest, unsophisticated mind, can he be innocent who, though not advising, nor perpetrating such wrongs in his individual capacity, has yet prostituted skill, experience, and perhaps eloquence, to aid the perpetrator? Can it be right? But we would speak rather of those evils which proceed directly from the advocate himself in his own professional doings. Here is a client who has insidiously won subtle advantages over his neighbor in business, until he has gorged himself with ill gotten gain. He applies to the reputable lawyer to protect him against the righteous demand of restitution. The lawyer undertakes his case, and thenceforth he thinks it his duty (not indeed to falsify evidence, or misquote law, or positively assert the innocence of injustice, but) to put the best face on questionable transactions which they will wear—to become the apologist of that which every honorable man repudiates. Now, we speak not of the wrongs of the despoiled neighbor; of these it may be said the client is the immediate agent. But there stands a crowd of eager, avaricious, grasping listeners, each one hungry for gain, and each one learning from this professional expounder of law, how to look a little more leniently on indirection and fraud; how to listen a little more complacently to the temptations before which his own feeble rectitude was tottering already; how to practise on his own conscience the deceit which “divides a hair between north and north-west side;” until the business morality of the country is widely corrupted. Can this be right? Can he be innocent who produces such results, for the selfish motive of a fee? But worse still; a multitude of crimes of violence are committed; and when their bloody perpetrators are brought before their country’s bar, professional counsel fly to the rescue, and try their most potent arts. See them rise up before ignorant and bewildered juries, making appeals to weak compassion, till the high sentiment of retributive justice is almost ignored by one-half of the

community. Hear them advocate before eager crowds of heady young men, already far too prone to rash revenge, the attractive but devilish theory of "the code of honor:" or assert, in the teeth of God's law and man's, that the bitterness of the provocation may almost justify deliberate assassination; or paint, in graphic touches, which make the cheek of the young man tingle with the hot blood, the foul scorn and despite of an unavenged insult, until the mind of the youth in this land has forgotten that voice pronounced by law both human and divine, "vengeance is mine, I will repay;" and is infected with a dreadful code of retaliation and murder; until the course of justice has come to be regarded as so impotently uncertain, that the instincts of natural indignation against crime disdain to wait longer on its interposition, and introduce the terrific *regime* of private vengeance, or mob-law; and until the land is polluted with blood which cries to heaven from the earth. Can it be right that any set of men, in any function or attitude, should knowingly contribute to produce such a fatal disorganization of public sentiment; and that, too, for the sake of a fee, or of rescuing a guilty wretch from a righteous doom which he had plucked down on his own head? Can it be right? And now, will any man argue that God hath no principle of responsibility by which he can bring all the agents of such mischiefs as these into judgment? That such things as these can be wrought in the land, and yet the class of men who have in part produced them can, by a set of professional conventionalities, juggle themselves out of their responsibility for the dire result? Nay, verily: there is yet a God that judgeth in the earth. But if such a theory as the one we have discussed were right, while bearing such fruits, His government would be practically abdicated.

The fifth and last consideration is drawn from man's duty to himself. The highest duty which man owes to himself is to preserve and improve his own virtue. Our race is fallen, and the reason and conscience which are appointed for our inward guides are weakened and dimmed. But yet God places in our power a process of moral education by which they may be improved. The habit of acting rightly confirms their uncer-

tain decisions, and a thorough rectitude of intention and candor act as the "euphrasy and rue" which clarify our mental vision. How clear, then, the obligation to employ those high faculties in such a way that they shall not be perverted and sophisticated? There is no lesson of experience clearer than this, that the habit of advocating what is not thoroughly believed to be right, perverts the judgment and obfuscates the conscience, until they become unreliable. No prudent instructor would approve of the advocacy of what was supposed to be error by the pupils in a debating society. Such an association was formed by a circle of pious young men in the country; and once upon a time it was determined to debate the morality of the manufacture of ardent spirits. But it was found that all were of one mind in condemning it. So, to create some show of interest, one respectable young man consented to assume the defence of the calling "for argument's sake." The result was, that he unsettled his own convictions, and ultimately spent his life as a distiller, in spite of the grief and urgent expostulations of his friends, the censures of his church, and the uneasiness of a restless conscience. Nothing is better known by sensible men, than the fact that experienced lawyers, while they may be acute and plausible arguers, are unsafe judges, concerning the practical affairs of life. They are listened to with interest, but without confidence. Their ingenious orations pass for almost nothing, while the stammering and brief remarks of some unsophisticated farmer carry all the votes. The very plea by which advocates usually justify their zeal in behalf of clients seemingly unworthy of it, confesses the justice of these remarks. They say that they are not insincere in their advocacy, that they speak as they believe; because it almost always occurs that after becoming interested in a case, they become thoroughly convinced of the righteousness of their own client's cause. Indeed, not a few have said that no man is a good advocate who does not acquire the power of thus convincing himself. But there are two parties to each case. Are the counsel on both sides thus convinced of the justice of their own causes, when of course, at least, one must be wrong? Fatal power: to bring the imperial principles of

reason and conscience so under the dominion of self-interest and a factitious zeal, that in one-half the instances they go astray, and are unconscious of their error! It has been remarked of some men famous as politicians, who had spent their earlier years as advocates, that they were as capable of speaking well on the wrong side as on the right of public questions, and as likely to be found on the wrong side as on the right.

Now, it is a fearful thing to tamper thus with the faculties which are to regulate our moral existence, and decide our immortal state. It may not be done with impunity. Truth has her sanctities; and if she sees them dishonored, she will hide her vital beams from the eyes which delighted to see error dressed in her holy attributes, until the reprobate mind is given over to delusions, to believe lies. Were there no force in any thing which has preceded, duty to ourself would constitute a sufficient reason against the common theory of the advocate's office.

We conclude, therefore, that the only moral theory of the legal profession is that which makes conscience preside over every official word and act in precisely the same mode as over the private, individual life. It does not appear how the virtuous man can consistently go one inch farther, in the advocacy of a client's cause, than his own honest private judgment decides the judge and jury ought to go; or justify in the bar any thing which he would not candidly justify in his own private circle; or seek for any client any thing more than he in his soul believes righteousness demands. "Whatsoever is more than these, cometh of evil." It may be very true, that if all lawyers practised this higher theory, the numbers and business of the profession would be vastly abridged. If the fraudulent exactor could find no one to become the professional tool of unjust designs; if the guilty man, seeking to evade justice, were told by his advocate that his defence of him should consist of nothing but a watchful care that he had *no more than justice* meted out to him; it is possible clients would be few, and litigation rare. But is it certain that any good man would regret such a result? It might follow, also, that he who under-

took to practise the law on this Christian theory, would find that he had a narrow and arduous road along which to walk. We, at least, should not lament, should Christian young men conclude so. Then, perhaps, the holy claims of the Gospel Ministry might command the hearts of some who are now seduced by the attractions of this attractive but dangerous profession.



#### THE SUPPORT OF SUPERANNUATED MINISTERS—AND THE INDIGENT FAMILIES OF DECEASED MINISTERS.

The Scriptural law, enforcing the duty of the Church to furnish an adequate support to the Christian Ministry, has recently been so fully discussed, and, not long since, so eloquently pressed before the Synod of South Carolina by one, who was never heard by it without respect, and, on that occasion, not without profound emotion, that it would be unnecessary now to advert to it, otherwise than as furnishing the principle upon which the subject of the present address is based. While, however, the general obligation to afford the Ministry a comfortable sustenance has been freely canvassed, the specific duty of supporting superannuated preachers of the Gospel, and the indigent families of deceased Ministers, has not been presented to the Church as fully as it might have been. It seems to have been tacitly assumed that, according to the commercial maxim of rendering an equivalent for value received, the preacher of the Gospel may only claim a subsistence during his actual term of service; and that when, from whatever cause he ceases to discharge the active functions of the Ministry, the obligation of the Church to sustain him comes to a corresponding close. A due regard to the Divine statutes touching this matter, to reason, and to the instincts of our nature, will, we apprehend, convince us that this principle is falsely applied in the case before us.

I. From the tenor of the enactments embodied in the Leviti-

cal Code, respecting the support of the ministry of the ancient Church, it is clear that the possibility of the aged or disabled Levites being left to want was never contemplated. The mode by which they were supported was such as to enable them to live comfortably during their time of active service, and, by the exercise of ordinary economy, to make provision, if they pleased, against the exigencies of disability or age. It is not necessary to exhibit statistics in proof of this position, though that might easily be done. Some of the old writers upon the Mosaic Institute have furnished tables of figures descending to curious details, showing that, if the Levitical Minister ever suffered from privation, it was not because an almost sumptuous provision was not yielded him by law. Indeed, one cannot but be struck with the affluence of this provision, which seemed to render it possible for the Jewish Minister to live in little less than palatial splendor. It must, however, be remembered that drafts upon the generosity and hospitality of the Levitical priest were frequent and heavy. The entertainment of strangers, for example, devolved chiefly upon him; and the God, who had inculcated upon His Ministers the obligations of an unstinted and ungrudging beneficence, so that they might become marked and illustrious exemplars of the loveliest graces as well as the sternest duties, made full and generous provision for the cultivation of these traits and the discharge of these obligations. If the means of being generous, hospitable and charitable, were necessary, those means were furnished by Divine enactment. The fact that the Old Testament history not unfrequently mentions the poverty of the Levites, does not prove that the Divine law did not render their support obligatory upon the Church, but only that that law was disobeyed in times of idolatrous defection. And it is a fact not now unworthy of attention, that the poverty of the ministry was always contemporaneous with, and evidential of, an unspiritual and rebellious condition of the ancient Church.

It ought to be remembered, moreover, that by law *a home* was provided for the Levite, which could not be perpetually alienated from him. It was his, as well during his age and feebleness, as when his sinewy strength lugged the bullock to

the altar, and piled the wood for sacrifice. He was never, at any period of his life, whether in active service or not, left without a shelter for himself and his family. Nor are we anywhere informed that when he ceased to discharge the active duties of his office, he ceased to receive the regular stipend yielded by tithes. In fine, there is nothing to show that he did not receive, in time of disability and age, precisely the same salary which he had worked for before.

There is another consideration, too, which ought not to be overlooked, in attempting to settle the question—What provision was made for superannuated Ministers in the ancient Church? We allude to the fact that the office descended from father to son; and that, as a consequence, were no special allowance made to the superannuated Levite and priest—he could partake of the provision amply made for the support of his son and successor. Unless, therefore, the Levitical ministry, as a class, were characterized by monstrous filial ingratitude, the aged father, who had spent his prime in the service of the Church, could not be reduced to penury and want. So that it would appear that, in proportion to the increased infirmities and necessities of age, was a correspondingly increased provision made for the sustenance and comfort of the disabled Levitical Minister.

In view of these facts, it seems to be clear that the Head of the Church did not, under the Old Dispensation, leave his servants in the ministry without a comfortable maintenance under the pressure of decrepitude. On the contrary, an examination of the ancient code would lead us to believe that the aged Levite, in the home of his youth and bosom of his family, passed the evening of life without care for himself, and, certainly, without an anxious apprehension in regard to the temporal prospects of his children. And, when he came to die, no bitter reflections on the ingratitude of the Church, and no disturbing anticipations of a hard future for his family mingled with his last counsels to his sons, and the last act of worship by which he committed his departing spirit into the hands of his God.

And must the Christian preacher, whose duties it might easily



be shown, press more onerously upon him than did those of the Levitical Minister upon him; upon whose time and talents, mind and body, there is an incessant and, at times, almost an intolerable drain,—must the Minister of Jesus look forward to an old age of poverty and want—an evening of clouds and storms? Must he work the marrow out of his bones, and the breath almost out of his body; must he preach, study, visit, watch, pray; in short, do what might fill an angel's hands, and more than fill a mortal's capacity; must he do this, and mourn at the last that his old friends look strangely upon him, and that while another drinks of the milk and eats of the butter of his former flock, he must, with a gourd of water and a crust of bread in hand, wait patiently until he is summoned to the heavenly banquet and his eternal rest?

Surely the *spirit* of the ancient law touching this matter is not departed. Nor can the Christian Church plead, because the letter of that code is not enforced in the New Testament, and tithes are not expressly required; that, therefore, she is not bound by an obligation equal to that which Christ imposed upon His ancient people. If He has not told his people now to pay tithes for the support and propagation of the Gospel—and many regard that obligation as unrepealed—He hath said, “*freely ye have received, freely give,*” and when *the love* which beat in His heart, and led Him to sacrifice Himself for the salvation of sinners; when that love shall pervade the souls of His people—as one day we trust it will, even on earth—they will perceive the reason why gratitude to Him, and generosity to the needy and the dying, were not tied to metes and bounds, but left to give as they list.

In no respect can the obligation to sustain the institutions of the Gospel be less now than it was under a more imperfect and shadowy dispensation. If the Jew was required to contribute to the support of his aged Minister—much more is the Christian. If the man who had spent his life in instructing his people in the principles of that incomplete economy, in sacrificing bulls and goats whose blood could not take away sin, and only foreshadowed the great sacrifice; if he was maintained in comfort when age disqualified him from further service, shall he

who has worn out his life in preaching a crucified and risen Saviour, in toiling and watching for souls, and in serving the Church, shall he be left, in weakness and age, to feel the pinch of poverty and the dread of want? Has the King of the Church so intended? Is the obligation to support His aged Ministers less stringent now than under the former dispensation? No, reader, no! Christ has written the law of justice and of love upon the heart of His Church, and it is to her infinite shame if she render not obedience to that law in all that it requires. It was not necessary that He should have said, "let not my aged servants in the Ministry die in want." He supposed that the Church, to whom He has bequeathed them as ascension gifts, would be prompted as well by gratitude to Him as by the very instincts of Christian love, to afford them sustenance in feebleness and age.\*

II. If the questions be pressed—What do we *pay for*, when we are required to give of our substance to the support of the ministry? and why should men be salaried when they cease to work? we reply, that the answer to these inquiries, even on the principle of rendering an equivalent for value received, is obvious. The Christian ministry, as the exponent and distributor of the priceless blessings of the Gospel of Christ, exerts a signal and inestimable influence for good upon the in-

---

\* NOTE.—It has been suggested to the writer as a question worth considering whether, if the terms of the covenant, made with the ancient Church, had been faithfully observed by that Church, there could have been any such thing as a superannuated or disabled ministry. The promises of the covenant seemed to provide against it. If that were the case, the foregoing considerations would not, *for substance*, be divested of force. The form of the argument would be changed, and it might then be put thus: "If God, by special promise, mercifully guaranteed to His ancient Ministers, security against the infirmities and distresses of decrepid age, but is now pleased, for wise reasons, to suffer His servants in the Gospel to undergo them," then the temper of the Christian Church ought, in this respect, to conform to the *spirit* of the ancient code. Christ *does now* permit His Ministers to linger with His Church in a disabled condition. The Church is, therefore, under obligation *actually* to furnish them the provision demanded by their necessities, in conformity to the *spirit* of that beneficent covenant which, had it been faithfully observed, would have *entirely* spared the Levitical ministry the pressure of these necessities.

terests of society, considered in any of their main aspects as material, social and spiritual. It will scarcely be disputed by candid minds, that the stated assemblage of men for the decent and orderly worship of God, and the regular inculcation of the salutary doctrine and holy precepts of the Gospel, tend to advance even the *material* interests of a community. It is stated as a fact that, during the first year of the pastorate of Dr. Asa Burton, in a New England town, real estate increased in value three-fold. A community without a Church would be one of which few respectable business men would like to become members. A town, without the Gospel, would scarcely be deemed reputable enough to induce an honest man to make it the abode of his wife and children. It is too true to be denied, notwithstanding the cant about priestcraft and priestly domination, that the presence of a Christian Church, and the dispensation of Christian instruction in a place, are not considered valid objections to the establishment of business, or the investment of capital there.

But the beneficial influence of the Gospel, and, by consequence, of the Christian ministry, is more conspicuously exercised upon the *social* interests of the race. We do not intend to affirm, as has sometimes been thoughtlessly intimated by its apologists, that Christianity is the only civilizer of mankind. A nation may become civilized without a knowledge of the principles of the Gospel. The early history of Egypt, Greece and Rome, furnishes proof of the fact, that a certain intellectual type of civilization may exist, and exist in a high state of advancement, where the scheme of Christianity is unknown. The admission may be cheerfully made, that the pure intellect of man has never reached a higher stage of development than in ancient Greece. The writings of Plato and Aristotle, the poetry of Homer and Euripides, and the statuary of Phidias, will extort the homage of mankind as long as a generous sympathy with genius shall exist. Without pausing to inquire how far the higher thought of Greece and Rome may have been affected and stimulated by contact with those articles of Natural Religion, which God originally revealed to man, and which it is one office of the Gospel to republish under new and peculiar

sanctions, it may safely be assumed that an attentive examination of the specific differences of the ancient and modern types of civilization will evince the infinite superiority of the latter, especially as it passes under the moulding influence of a pure Christianity. It would, of course, be impossible in an article like this to attempt a discussion of a subject so fertile in reflection. A few of the distinguishing characteristics of Christian influence upon society may, however, be noticed in passing. It is chiefly in the *moral* aspects of modern civilization that we discover the immediate and specific effect of the Gospel. The corporeal and mental nature of the ancient Greek and Roman were subjected to an elevating discipline, while his moral constitution was dwarfed or ruined by neglect. It is the peculiar office of Christianity to induce a parallel culture of all the elements of the man. While, consequently, the social state of the ancients received a one-sided and dangerous development, Christianity infuses into society those great moral principles which at once ennoble it and render it stable.

It is, for example, peculiarly its province to inculcate upon the masses the salutary truth that obedience is due to government as an ordinance of God. Destitute in great measure, if not entirely, of the conviction of this truth, the ancient States, to which allusion has been made, contained within themselves an inherent proclivity to disintegration and decay. Christianity, by enforcing this regulative principle, opposes a barrier to this downward tendency, moderates the excesses of popular passion, and checks the sudden and violent impulses of the popular will. The Christian patriot of our own country, while he contemplates with apprehension the disturbed condition of a confederacy composed of so many States, characterized by diverse and often conflicting interests and sentiments, looks to this great principle of Christianity as a break-water to arrest the furious tide of fanatical excitement and political caprice. Much, doubtless, of the future stability and prosperity of this Republic, will depend on the degree in which obedience to this law of the Gospel pervades the hearts of its people.

It is the distinguishing office of Christianity, moreover, to impress upon society the wholesome influence derived from the

fact, which it alone clearly reveals, of the brotherhood of the race, and from the implantation in the heart of man of the catholic attribute of love to his fellows. The Gospel re-affirms the truth of nature, that God hath made of one blood all nations to dwell on the face of the whole earth; and adds to it the new and distinctive enunciation, that as there is one God and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, all classes and conditions of human society are bound together by their common relation to this one God, by the nexus of that one glorious mediation.

So, moreover, does a preached Gospel tend to achieve for society what never was, and never could be accomplished under the ancient civilizations, its *purification and safety*, by inculcating the true theory of morals; by teaching men that a good life originates in an inner principle, and develops itself from within; and by providing the agencies by which that principle is engendered and matured. The social relations are thus guarded from violation. The family tie is sacredly maintained, and men are not compelled to regard each other with everlasting suspicion and distrust.

Lastly, the full knowledge of the sanctions of the Divine law, and of a future state of retribution, is alone imparted by the Gospel of Christ; a knowledge without which there can exist no effectual restraint upon the evil passions of men, and by which a stronger police is erected in society than that of standing armies, and a firmer check imposed upon license than the dread of the the gallows or the guillotine.

It is impossible, now, to form any just and proper estimate of the benign influence of a preached Gospel upon the social interests of man. We know it only in its tendencies. Were it exerted in all its legitimate force, society would be remodelled, and its whole aspect changed. In that case every human soul would become a temple vocal with the praises of God; every power of the intellect, and every affection of the heart, according to the exquisite picture of Whewell, would meet together in harmony around the Divine altar, and minister there in sublime acts of Divine worship; while the will, an obedient attendant, would spring with alacrity to the fulfilment of the

Divine commands. Society, as a whole, would be a glorious church-state; the communion of men would be a perfect communion of saints; and we should come to Mt. Zion, and to the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem; and to an innumerable company of angels; to the General Assembly of the Church of the first-born which are written in heaven; and to God the Judge of all; and to the spirits of just men made perfect; and to Jesus, the Mediator of the New Covenant; and to the blood of sprinkling, which speaketh better things than the blood of Abel.

The *spiritual* benefits conferred upon man by a preached Gospel, we shall not attempt in this presence to describe. They can only be measured by the infinite price which was paid for their acquisition, and the boundless duration in which they shall meet their full and legitimate expansion.

Now, it will be conceded that whatever influence for good is exerted upon the interests of society by the Gospel of Christ as a recuperative and conservative moral scheme, is exercised mainly through the instrumentality of the Christian ministry, an order of men appointed and commissioned by the Saviour for this very purpose. It is their business, their only proper avocation, adopted at the call of Christ, and prosecuted in view of extraordinary sanctions. With them stand or fall Gospel worship, Gospel ordinances, Gospel instruction and Gospel churches. This argument may possibly be devoid of force to those who acknowledge no allegiance to Jesus as King upon His holy hill in Zion, but surely it is not without weight to those who do. These men ought not to be left to struggle with the hardships of poverty. Justice and gratitude alike demand that they who have exhausted their strength and worn out their lives in the one simple duty of promoting the blessings which the Gospel is suited to confer upon society, should not only be sustained during the period of active service, but should not be forced to drag out the weary remnant of their days in dependence and privation.

It must be remembered, furthermore, that it is not alone the precise amount of labor which is, from week to week, expended by the Minister of the Gospel, in study, in preaching and in

pastoral visitation, which is to be considered in the adjustment of this question. The inquiry arises when this ceases? does the obligation to support the laborer likewise cease? We must take into account *the whole influence in all its extent*, which a faithful minister of the gospel exerts. That influence, be it observed, is by no means limited to the precise time of the actual discharge of the functions of his office. It survives those functions. It lives and acts, when his mouth is sealed by age, and his ministry on earth by death. The whole influence of a godly, devoted Christian minister!—who can calculate its value? Who can measure the influence of the ministry of a Richard Baxter, a George Whitefield, a Jonathan Edwards, an Edward Payson, a Samuel Davies, a William Barr, and a host of others, whom time would fail us to mention; who, we repeat it, will measure the influence of the labors of such men in their effects upon society, and in their spiritual and everlasting results? Every brick in the old Kidderminster and Northampton Churches, shall have mouldered—every beam in Upper Long Cane shall have rotted—every foot of Commons in Moorfields be occupied by the advancing tide of the great capital of Britain, ere the influence of these men shall cease to be felt. The very name of the faithful Minister is sacredly handed down from pious father to son as the symbol of all that is holy and noble in the sanctified nature of man; and, like a talisman, exerts a certain magical spell long after the record of it on the sepulchral stone has been obliterated by the weather of centuries. It is said by physical philosophers that nothing which impinges upon the atmosphere—not even a word spoken at random—fails to make itself felt in the undulations it causes, as long as the atmosphere itself shall last. So the impression upon the world made by the labors of a true Gospel Minister shall never fail to stir the hearts of men. The young student who, at the present day, pores over the lives of such men, feels within him the pulse of a strong resolve to follow those who, through faith and patience, have inherited the promises, and falling on his knees prays that the Holy Ghost may pour into his heart the spirit of these departed heroes of the truth, and inspire him for a kindred career of usefulness.

Now, the same kind of influence, though mayhap in a less degree, is exerted by every true godly Christian minister. And those who are benefitted by it are bound in justice, as well as by the instinct of love, to pay for it, during the whole life-time of him who, through grace, was the medium of its diffusion. His influence yet speaks as well when he is laid aside from active service in the earthly house of God by age or affliction, as when upon his removal to the upper sanctuary, the voice from heaven cries: "Write, blessed are the dead who die in the Lord from henceforth: Yea, saith the Spirit, for they rest from their labors, and their works do follow them." It may not be extravagant to suppose that Christ allows His servants to linger with the Church in weakness and decrepitude, in order to test her appreciation of the preciousness of His ascension gifts to her, and of the value of that influence exercised in her behalf, of which He has made them His chosen vessels and dispensers. As a loving and grateful family of children would regard it as not only a sacred duty, but a cherished privilege, to nurse and comfort an aged and venerable parent in the helplessness of age and even of drivelling dotage, so ought the Church to soothe the declining years of the man who has bound the energies of his youth and prime as a willing sacrifice upon her altar. She cannot cast off her aged ministers in the time of their sorest earthly need without exposing herself to the charge of ingratitude before God and man. The disabled servant of the Church might be content to bear the indifference of the world often manifested much in the same way as men look upon an old worn-out cart horse grazing on a common. The reproaches of those who have reproached his master may alight upon him without awakening an emotion of surprise, though for them, too, he toiled and wept, and would have died. He may look for no gratitude from those who, without a thankful ejaculation, can contemplate the sacrifice of his Saviour on the Cross; but it is not in his nature to be insensible to his abandonment by the Church, of whom he may have often sung:

"For her my tears shall fall,  
For her my prayers ascend;  
To her my toils and cares be given,  
Till toils and cares shall end."



As the stab of Brutus inflicted on the great Roman "the most unkindest cut of all," so do the indifference and desertion of the Church gather around the declining life of her disabled Minister its deepest shadows and its bitterest storms.

III. But it may be asked, why should not the Minister of the Gospel be governed by the ordinary rules of prudence, and, by the exercise of economy, make provision for the necessities of age and the wants of his family? Why should not he, as well as other men, act in accordance with the common adage, and "lay up something for a rainy day?" Several reasons may be given why, ordinarily, it is not possible for him to do it. It is not seldom the case that the pittance, miscalled a support, which he receives, is wholly insufficient for the present wants of his household. And to require a man in such a case to lay up money for the future, is like attempting to wring blood out of a stone. We have often thought that if a Minister so circumstanced could make up his mind, instead of ploughing or teaching for his bread, to die of starvation on the hands of his congregation, while his death under *those* circumstances might, perhaps, fix an everlasting stigma upon that particular batch of Christians, his martyrdom, like that of those who have died at the stake, would confer an immense benefit upon the Church at large. In this age of newspapers, the Philistines would hear of it, and the probability that any other preacher of the Gospel would die under *those* circumstances would be exceedingly remote. O, that some one had the faith to do it! His poor brethren would gather from Dan to Beersheba, have a grand jubilee, take up a handsome collection, and erect a monument to his memory out of the surplus of their salaries! But men do not usually fancy death by starvation, and it is questionable whether the Church will ever have the benefit of that species of martyrdom.

There is, too, another difficulty in the way of a Minister's making a comfortable provision for the future wants of himself or family. His congregation expect him to be an ensample of generosity, hospitality and charity. When, in accordance with their own expectations, he is generous in his dealings with his fellows, hospitable to strangers and charitable to the poor, how

much of his salary remains to be laid aside for the demands of the future? The fact is, the same thing is required of him by the Scriptures and by his own noble instincts. But it is plainly impossible for him conspicuously to exhibit these graces, the exercise of which suppose the possession of a comfortable home and a competent salary, without either one or the other. And when without either one or the other, he *does* manage to be hospitable and charitable, is it any marvel that, having been kept poor all his active life *by* his hospitality and charity, he should in his age be destitute of a comfortable maintenance? And is it precisely right that he should, at that season of his need, be taunted with having failed, like other men, to act according to the prudential maxim, "lay up something for a rainy day?"

The worst of the case is, that the same people who require him to be a model of these expensive graces, and give him never the means to cultivate them, and yet press upon him the old saw, which has been quoted, are not a little outraged if the Minister *does* save his money and make a comfortable provision for the future. "No preacher of the Gospel ought to be rich. He should be poor, like his Master, and live by faith in the promises!" They who thus sagely and tenderly counsel the servants of Jesus to live on air, forget that the Master himself neither wrought miracles, ordinarily, for his own support, nor toiled in a manual occupation to earn a livelihood, but looked for, and actually received, a maintenance from His disciples, such as they were able to give. He evidently acted on the principle upon which He directed the twelve and the seventy, to proceed in fulfilling the duties which He assigned them; a principle everywhere affirmed in the Scriptures—that "the laborer is worthy of his hire." It is true that He felt not the sorrows of a superannuated preacher, for "He was cut off out of the land of the living" after a brief but consummate ministry. It is, nevertheless, an affecting thought, that He is represented in the persons of His aged and disabled Ministers; He feels their griefs and shares the loneliness and bitterness of their time of desertion; and He regards whatever is done unto them—even the least of them, the most infirm, the most

decrepid, the most drivelling,—as done unto Himself. Do they not fill up what is behind of his sufferings in the Church which is His body? Ah, if the Church could but realize this, she would treat His aged and disabled servants as she ought to have treated Him, if it had been a part of His mediatorial work, and His estate of humiliation, to have lingered with her as an aged and disabled Minister of His own glorious Gospel.

Besides those already mentioned, there are other expectations which a Christian congregation often entertains in regard to its pastor, which enhance the difficulties lying in the way of his making provision for the future.

He must maintain his family decently, and he must live decently himself. Otherwise he would be a standing libel upon them, and to the eyes of all beholders would reflect, as in a glass, a horribly faithful picture of their own stinginess and neglect. That would never do. It would be little less than outrageous that such insinuations upon their justice and generosity should be conveyed by the very appearance of their pastor, and his household. His house must not be mean; his study must not lack a goodly supply of costly theological literature: his furniture must not too roughly shock the sensibilities of his fashionable visitors: his family must not promenade the streets, or attend Divine worship in unseemly apparel; nor must his own coat be thread-bare, and his aspect slovenly. If that were the case, persons would be apt to suspect that his first and most pressing wants are not very handsomely provided for by his own decent congregation; or, that if they were, such a pastor, and such a pastor's family, are not worthy of the very respectable Church to which he has the honor to minister. But, if his house must not be mean, nor his study meagrely supplied, nor his furniture shabby, nor his wife and children poorly clad, nor his own coat thread-bare and his aspect slovenly, nor the tastes of his congregation violated, nor the public led to surmise that his congregation behave badly towards him, it would seem to be clear that he must have *the means* of living in a good house, the means of supplying his study, the means of furnishing his home, the means of clothing his family, the means of doing what snakes are said to do once a year, shed.

ding their skin, and indulging in the luxury of a new coat. But if he has not the means, he has the *expectations*; and, after all, since ministers and ministers' families ought to be examples to their congregations in all respects, not omitting hospitality, charity and respectability, they ought not be too rich, but live a life of simple, strong and lively faith in providence and in the promises! Masterly logic! But if it should happen to be true that these expectations do not furnish the Gospel laborer bread, clothing and shelter, during his term of active service, it may be feared that they would have no very decided influence in enabling him to provide bread, clothing and shelter, against the winter of his own infirmity and age, and for his dependent family when he is dead and gone. But we dismiss this unpleasant train of thought by simply repeating its conclusion: it *is* hard to "get blood out of a stone!" It *is* hard for a man, during the time he is actually serving others, to live on *little*, from *that little* to lay up a supply for his future wants and those of his family, and, during the season of old age, when he might expect a harvest of thank-offerings, to live on *nothing*. Yes, it is hard!

IV. There is but one other consideration touching this subject, which remains to be presented. The commonest lessons of *analogy* tend to show that the superannuated Minister of the Gospel should not be abandoned to want.

The soldier who has fought the battles of his country, and worn out his energies in her service, is not left in a crippled condition or amidst the infirmities of age without a pension—at once a testimony of that country's gratitude and a means of enabling him, without anxiety or disquietude, to pass his declining years. But the faithful soldier of Christ who, having girded on the panoply of God, and, harassed by bitter inward conflicts, has waged, on behalf of the Church, incessant warfare against the powers of darkness, against the wiles of the Devil, the deceitfulness of the flesh, and the blandishments and oppositions alike of an ungodly world, when he pulls off his armor and yields to the pressure of infirmity or age, has nought to console him but the honorable marks of past battles and the hope of heavenly rest. Why should *he* not receive his pen-

sion? Is the country more just and grateful than the Church? The member of a charitable association, a Masonic or Odd Fellow's lodge is not left without maintenance in infirmity and age! Is the Church less just and charitable than a Masonic or Odd Fellow's Society?

The horse who has borne his master on his back, when his tread was elastic and his neck was clothed with thunder, is not left in his age to feed on a common, but has a softer bed and more comfortable stall than ever. Shall he who, like his Saviour, has carried the burdens and griefs of the Church, and borne on his soul the unutterable responsibility of preaching the Gospel to deathless souls—shall he be left at last to take up the touching plaint of “the Man of Sorrows”—“the foxes have holes, the birds of the air have nests, but I have not where to lay my head?”

The very dog who has faithfully guarded his master's premises in his prime, is not left without his kennel and his daily food when his teeth are worn out and his bark is hoarse. Shall the Minister of Christ, who has watched for souls as one that must give account, and has spent his active energy in sedulously guarding the spiritual and eternal interests of his charge, shall he, in his age, be deprived of the attention which is gratefully rendered to a dog? It is oftentimes even so. Statistics show that while the dogs cost this country something like eleven millions of dollars annually—the Christian Ministry costs it only six millions. The very dogs of the land have expended for their maintenance almost double the amount which is devoted to the support of the Ministers of the Gospel! And, if the comparison could be exposed in figures between the sustenance of aged dogs and aged preachers of Christ, it is to be feared that the showing would still be worse.

Yes, oftentimes, the very brute, the horse, the dog, the ox, the ass, which have spent their strength in their master's service, are better supported when their vigor is gone, than the men who have toiled, and prayed, and wept, for the edification of the Church which Jesus hath redeemed, and the salvation of souls for whom Jesus hath died. It is not unfrequently the case, that when they are least able to help themselves, they

receive least help; when most they need sympathy and sustenance, lo! none are at hand. Look in at the humble lodging place of that infirm, aged Minister of Christ. His hair is thin and white; his once firm step is unsteady; his hands, which once broke the sacramental bread, which not seldom rested in blessing on the head of children, and wiped the sweat from the brow of the dying, are tremulous; his once strong voice which, like the trump of jubilee, heralded the tidings of redemption, is feeble and broken. Go near to his closet door and listen.

He has nought now to give but his prayers and tears—they he is pouring out freely; and, hark! he pleads with his Master that he would not lay to the charge of the Church, and the world he loved and served, the sin of abandoning him in his last days to penury and want. Would to God this were merely a picture of the fancy. Alas! it is too often realized.

But, it cannot always be so. The Church of Christ needs but to be faithfully reminded of her duty in this matter, and her sense of justice, as well as her love to her Master, will lead her to discharge it. We may not venture to indulge in the language of crimination towards her. She has not been fully taught her obligations in this respect, or long ere this the reproach, which the neglect of her disabled Ministers and the needy families of her deceased Ministers has entailed upon her, would have been wiped away. Let her know her duty and she will begin to do it.

ARTICLE VI.

THE PROPHEPIC PERIOD OF 1260 YEARS.

Solomon tells us that God hath made everything beautiful in his time. And it is a fine idea, of a certain writer, that as in the elementary particles of matter, in chemical combinations, the Creator has established the law of definite proportions, which is the basis of the science of chemistry; and as he has arranged the sizes, times and distances of the heavenly bodies, according to certain numerical relations, on which the stability of the system depends—so, in the conduct of his moral government; in the fulfilment of prophecy; in directing all things, both the vast and the minute, by his holy Providence, he is acting according to a great and harmonious scheme of times and seasons, mapped out before him from eternity. All is law, order, Divine art, whether we understand it or not.\* “The times and the seasons He hath put in his own power.” “He hath determined the *times before appointed.*” Christ appeared on earth when “the fulness of time was come;” Anti-Christ was “revealed in his own time.”†

And so, in a multitude of instances, the acts of God, as well as of men, are connected with certain measured periods; with the revolutions of the material bodies of our system of planets and suns. And many corresponding periods, counterparts of each other in this great economy, are discovered, which make, as it were, “the days of Heaven;” “the years of the right hand of the Most High.”

The material universe constitutes a great system of clock work, not only for regulating our time, but also for spiritual beings above. The same author quotes Bishop Butler, who says: “the determined length of time, and the degrees and ways in which virtue is to remain in a state of warfare and discipline, and in which wickedness is to have its progress; the times appointed for the execution of justice; \* \* \* all par-

---

\*Browne, *Ordo Saeculorum*, pp. 16, 366, 430.

† *εν τῷ ἑαυτοῦ καιρῷ.*

ticular instances of Divine justice and goodness, and every circumstance of them, may have such respects to each other as to make up altogether a whole, connected and related in all its parts; a scheme, or system, which is as properly one as the natural world is, and of the same kind.”\*

We have already alluded to the fact that there were certain periods marked in the Bible, with counterparts of the same length. The seven years of plenty, and the same of famine in Egypt, may be mentioned. The crucifixion of Christ, according to the prophecy of Daniel, is generally believed to have been in the middle of a week of years, the first half of which was occupied by his public ministry; and the latter half by the preaching of the Apostles to the Jews before the offer of the Gospel was made to the Gentiles; before the conversion of Cornelius, or the appearance of our Saviour in a vision to Paul in the temple, saying unto him: “Depart, for I will send thee far hence unto the Gentiles.”

The famine, in the days of the prophet Elijah, which continued “three years and six months,” must have had a corresponding half of a sabbatical year connected with it; and, from the use made of it in the synagogue at Nazareth, Luke 4: 25, it seems to have some peculiar significance.

The call of Abraham was at about the dividing point between the destruction of the old world by the flood, and the exode from Egypt, when, in like manner, the enemies of the Church were drowned in the sea.

From 2d Chron. 36: 21, we learn that the 70 years of the Babylonian captivity were “that the land might enjoy her Sabbaths,” as provided for in the law of Moses. Lev. 25: 4, 5. The sabbatical years then had been neglected at 70 returns, and this must now be made up. And this period of the captivity was to be followed (though not immediately subsequent) by another like period running on to the death of the Messiah. As it was preceded by  $70 \times 7$  years—so it was followed by  $70 \times 7$  years. Many other correspondencies of this kind are given by the author above referred to.

---

\*Analogy, Part 1, ch. 7.



Now, we have a famous prophetic period variously denominated by Daniel and John in connection with the domination of Anti-Christ, as "A time, and times, and the dividing of a time;" "A time, times and a half;"\* "A thousand, two hundred and threescore days;" "Forty-two months;" and these all are generally interpreted to mean 1260 years, and to apply to the same or contemporary events; as when the beast domineers over the Church, and the Man of Sin sitteth in the temple of God; when the Gentiles tread under foot the holy city, and the woman sojourns in the wilderness, where God hath prepared a place for her.

But this is a half of seven, so often used in the Bible as a perfect number. It is a *broken period*, and we should naturally expect a corresponding part somewhere else. And this cannot be after it, for Christ is then to come, and, by the brightness of his coming, destroy Anti-Christ, and set up an everlasting kingdom.

Let us then look for a counterpart before the beginning of it, and applying to a like power. We will remount to Nebuchadnezzar, the head of gold in the prophetic image, to the time when he took Jerusalem and plundered the temple.

The reign of this powerful monarch makes one of the most important eras in the history of the world. He is the first in the series of world-powers that, in the old world, have ruled over the Church. The Theocracy then ceased; his reign was the culminating point of idolatry. "Except that preserved in the sacred writings, every written history of mankind which ascends much higher than the era of Nebuchadnezzar, is justly deemed fabulous."† He reigned 43 years, and Servius Tullius, the second founder of Rome and nearly contemporary, 44 years.

"The seventy years' captivity in Babylon, began in the fourth year of Jehoiakim, which Jeremiah calls the first year of Nebuchadnezzar. *This is the earliest recorded synchronism between sacred and profane history*, and it introduces a series

---

\* As the word for *year* does not occur in connection with this period, the unit of time may be from a higher sphere.

† Davidson's Con. vol. 1, ch. 1.

of such synchronisms. \* \* It is by means of these double dates that we are able to settle the chronology of the Old Testament with anything like precision, in terms of our own.”\*

He is called by Jereniah the “servant” of God, who, in a dream, revealed to him, in connection with the great image, “what shall be in the latter days.” Though an oppressive monarch, and an idolator, he is told by Daniel that “the God of Heaven had given him a universal kingdom, power and strength, and glory”—that he is the head of gold, of that image of various metals which was to make one whole body of a man, and to continue till destroyed by the Rock, or the kingdom of Christ; an event that synchronizes with the destruction of Anti-Christ, and of Babylon in the Book of Revelation. Of course, then, the 1260 years of the domination of the Beast in Revelation, (chapter 13) must run parallel with the latter part of the existence of the image. There would then be a high probability that another course of 1260 years would measure out the other period of its existence, from the head of gold down to the rise of Anti-Christ.

The whole duration of the image is one complete period, seven times three hundred and sixty years, of a series of world-powers, tyrannizing over the Church, called altogether in Luke, 21: 24, “The times of the Gentiles,” filling for the most part that place in relation to it which God did in the old Theocracy. The first half is the heathen world-power, until the great birth of ages is complete, even to the ten toes; and the second, a corrupt Christian power *sitting in* the temple of God, which then succeeds and measures out the duration, the life of the symbolical man; at whose destruction “the kingdom shall not be left to other people,” but the saints shall take it.

There has been a great deal written to show when Babylon will fall, and deliverance be effected; and, of course, when this terrible power, that has drunk the blood of so many saints, began. Let us, then, see where our present plan will carry us. Nebuchadnezzar began to reign 606 B. C. But let us not reckon

---

\* Ordo Sæcl. 161.

from that point, but from some event connected with the Jews. In 2d Kings, chapter 24, we have such an one in the eighth year of his reign, when he took the king, and a large body of the people, captive to Babylon, and stripped the temple of every thing of value.

This, then, will be about 598 B. C., which, taken from 1260, will carry us down to A. D. 662, which differs but little from the number 666 in Revelations 13: 18. Or, if we come down to 588 B. C., when he took the city and burnt the temple, we shall then end our first period of 1260 years at A. D. 672. Or as the *birth* of Christ is not an era in the Bible, while Daniel's seventy weeks extend to his death, if to 598 we add 33 for the years of his life,\* we shall have A. D. 631, which nearly divides the first 1260 years in the middle. And if to 662, when our first period ends, we add another 1260 years, we have A. D. 1922 for the termination of the whole: and if to that we add the 75 years by which Daniel's 1335 exceeds 1260, we get 1997. And A. D. 2000 is believed by many to be the limit of the seventh seal, the seventh vial, and the third woe of John.

It may be difficult to fix upon any one prominent event, at or about 662, A. D., by which it may be said the Man of Sin is revealed, and the mystery of iniquity is brought to light; but Popery grew imperceptibly, and was gradually developed. And, doubtless, there is often frequent allusion, not only in the words but in the symbols used in reference to this power, to the literal meaning of *Rome*, from the Greek word for strength, and to that of *Latin*, from the Latin word, to conceal.† It was forming, and its elements combining, when not open to human view. And if we cannot fix upon any definite point of time for the rise of that great system of error, we know that it was established when providential impediments were removed, and the set time had come. And "what constitutes

---

\*From Revelation, chapter 5, we infer that the following events date from the Ascension.

† Rome had a secret name, Valencia, Kitto's Encyc. art. Rome. Force and fraud characterize Rome.

the glory and certainty of prophecy, is just the simultaneous concurrence of a multitude of little events, of trifling circumstances, improbable, unforeseen, undesigned, insignificant, if taken alone, but by their union rendered powerful and irresistible. It is herein that God shows His power, and His word its truth.\*

The event is sufficiently marked in prophecy, for Daniel 2: 40-43, places it after the ten toes are formed of Roman iron and barbarian clay: and in 7: 20-25, "that horn that had eyes, and a mouth that spake very great things, whose look was more stout than his fellows," "came up" *after the ten horns*, and was a power diverse from them.

Paul is generally supposed to signify, in 2d Thess. 2: 3-8, that the Man of Sin, whose description there, and in 1st Tim. 4: 1-3, exactly characterizes Popery, is to be revealed in *his own time*, when the old Roman Empire was removed.†

In Rev. 12: 3, the Great Red Dragon, the same power as the nameless monster seen by Daniel, has seven *crowned heads*, not given by that prophet, and he drives the Church into the wilderness. But in chapter 13: 1, &c., the Beast that rises out of the sea, has the same *seven heads*,‡ but the *crowns* have passed to the ten horns. In the former case the old Empire had not been broken up, and in the latter it was divided into separate sovereignties: the Dragon had resigned his seat, his power, and great authority, and *after this ten crowned beast* is established, another two horned one arises, which exercises all the power of the former, one of whose heads was killed, but revived again. All these symbols indicate *some one great change in the government* of western Europe, and in the bounds of the old Roman Empire.

As already remarked, the rise of the Papacy, the masterpiece of Satan, depends on a great variety of circumstances. Bishop Whately contrasts it with Mohammedanism.

\* Gausen's Lectures on Daniel, p. 103.

† For probable proofs, by being added, not only increase the evidence, *but multiply it.*—Butler's *Analogy*, chapter 7.

‡ See Jer. 27: 7. Ex. 12: 41.

§ Bellua multorum capitum.—Hor.

“The tree, which he (Mohammed) planted did, indeed, find a congenial soil; but he planted it at once, with its trunk full formed and its branches displayed: the Romish system, on the contrary, *rose insensibly*, like a young plant from the seed, making a progress scarcely perceptible from year to year, till at length it had fixed its root deeply in the soil, and spread its baneful shade far around. It was the natural offspring of man’s frail and corrupt character. \* \* \* No one accordingly can point out any precise period at which this ‘mystery of iniquity’—the system of Romish corruptions—first began.”\* The author of “Ancient Christianity” remarks, that it “combines the main principles of every anterior false religion.”† Machiavel informs us that “the Emperor of Rome quitting Rome to hold his residence at Constantinople, the *Roman Empire* began to decline, but the *Church of Rome* augmented as fast.”‡ This was in A. D. 330. The same emperor opened the way for corrupting the Church by establishing Christianity as the religion of the State, conferring civil office on its ministers, and modeling it after the form of the civil government. “The power exercised by the Emperors in calling and influencing ecclesiastical councils, gradually passed into the hands of the clergy; and the Bishop and Church of Rome at last carried it to an enormous length, magnifying themselves above every God.” The division of the Empire into east and west, by Arcadius and Honorius, A. D. 395—and the government of Italy afterward by a deputy of the Eastern Emperor residing at Ravenna, opened the way for the Pope, the great Patriarch of the West, to rise in importance. He had no such rivals as the Bishop of Constantinople had in the patriarchs of Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria, who were above the Metropolitans and Bishops in their provinces; but he aspired to be the prince of all the patriarchs; and to become in relation to the Christian Church what the High Priest had been among the Jews.

---

\* Errors of Romanism, p. 11.

† Page 248.

‡ Quoted by Newton on Proph. p. 406.

The barbarians who made inroads into the Roman territory, adopted the religion of their conquerors, and transferred to the Christian clergy that reverence which they had before paid to their heathen priests, whether Druids or others. How great this was, we learn from Cæsar and Tacitus. The former tells us, that "if any man does not obey their decree, he is excluded from the sacrifices, and that this is the severest punishment among them. They who are thus forbidden, are regarded as impious and wicked. All persons separate from them, and avoid their company and conversation, lest they should receive damage by contact."\* Hence we see where the Popes obtained such a tremendous power of excommunication that they wielded with such effect even against the most powerful Emperors, as, for example, Henry IV. As the barbarians had worshipped the chief Druid, so they supposed that the Bishop of Rome must also be worshipped. "Every where was heard the voice of this demon-god. The worshippers of the Most High trembled, and retired from the busy haunts of men; the meek followers of the Lord Jesus fled to the wilderness, and there sojourned 1260 years." "We cannot well conceive the horrors of excommunication." Monkery abounded more and more, till in the sixth century monks flooded all the western countries; they received special favor from the Popes, to whose glory and exaltation they were especially devoted.†

Veneration for the cross and for relics came in early; saints and martyrs were worshipped. Gibbon says that "the use, and even the worship of images, was firmly established before the end of the sixth century."

The Western was called the Latin Empire, and the Catholic the Latin Church; but the Latin language ceased to be spoken in the sixth century; it went gradually into oblivion from the

---

\* Cæsar *Bel. Gal.* Book 6, c. 13, and Tac. *Ger. Sec.* 7 and 11. See, also, Murdock's Ed. of Mosheim, Vol. I, p. 388.

† Mosh. Vol. 1. p. 386. "These monks contributed much, perhaps more than any other cause, to subvert the ancient discipline of the Church, to diminish the authority of the bishops, and to *increase, beyond all bounds,* the power of their patrons." They were not admitted as clergy till the 7th century.

reign of Justinian. It was retained, however, as the language of the Church. "They Latinize in everything." It is said that Pope Vitalianns ordered all public worship to be conducted in Latin in A. D. 666. In all countries, whether the people understand it or not, "mass, prayers, hymns, litanies, canons, decretals, bulls, are conceived in Latin. Women pray in Latin. Nor is the Scripture read in any other language, under Popery, than Latin."

In the eighth century, by the gift of Pepin, confirmed by Charlemagne, the Roman pontiff began to wield a temporal as well as a spiritual sword.\*

"The *mutual obligations* of the Popes and the Carlovingian family, form the important link of ancient and modern, of civil and ecclesiastical history."† "Charlemagne elected the Pope, and was, therefore, supreme; but the Pope had anointed Charlemagne, and was, therefore, supreme also."‡ They naturally played into each other's hands; "and it is by these transactions between the Kings of France, and the Popes, that this period of history is forever rendered memorable to the nations of Europe."|| The slow and successive steps by which despotism advanced to its meridian, may be compared with the course of the sun; we cannot see it move, but, when we take two points of time a little distance apart, we can perceive that it has moved.

But we need to look, also, in another direction, and not to confine our view altogether to the Papacy, in order to learn the era of its rise.

There were seven main migrations of barbarians into the Western empire, from about 100 B. C. to 568 A. D., or in 700

---

\* Smith's Lec. p. 671.

† Gibbon, Vol. 5, p. 27.

‡ The Pope may be regarded as a temporal Prince in 726, when made the head of a kind of a Republic at Rome.

§ Guizot, Vol. III, p. 387, speaking of the Merovingians, in the sixth century, says: "The Frank Kings are, and wish to remain, Chiefs of Warriors—at the same time they take advantage of their barbaric religious descent. \* \* They call themselves, and make the clergy call them, *the images and representatives of God upon earth.*"

years; not that these inroads then ceased, but while they continued on to the tenth century, most of those that settled down in the empire had arrived before the end of the sixth century. These tribes were mostly German. The effect of their devastations was terrible. The historians of the period call it "an inundation;" "a dreadful convulsion;" "a memorable crisis of the Western World;" "a memorable epoch;" "a chaos;" "an entire dissolution of society;" such are specimens of the language on the subject, found in the pages of Smith, Gibbon, Taylor, Robertson, Butler and Guizot.

"There is no period in the annals of the human race which presents to the historical student a greater scene of confusion than the century succeeding the overthrow of the Western Empire."

"If a man were called to fix upon the period in the history of the world, during which the condition of the human race was most calamitous and afflicted, he would, without hesitation, name that which elapsed from the death of Theodosius the Great, to the establishment of the Lombards in Italy." From A. D. 395-571. "The contemporary authors \* \* \* \* compare the ruin brought on the world to the havoc occasioned by earthquakes, conflagrations or deluges, the most formidable and fatal calamities which the imagination of man can conceive."

"But no expressions can convey so perfect an idea of the destructive progress of the barbarians as that which must strike an attentive observer, when he contemplates the total change which he will discover in the state of Europe after it began to recover some degree of tranquility, towards the close of the Sixth Century."

"New forms of Government, new laws, new manners, new dresses, new languages, and new names of men and countries, were everywhere introduced." "In the obscurity of the chaos occasioned by this general wreck of nations, we must search for the seeds of order, and endeavor to discover the first rudiments of the policy and laws now established in Europe."

Again, Robertson says, "the first effect of the settlement of the barbarians in the Empire was to divide those nations that



the Roman power had united. Europe was broken into many separate communities."

Guizot remarks, "that the Roman Empire struggled against the dissolution which was working within it, and against the barbarians who attacked it from without. But \* \* \* in the fourth century, all the ties which had held this immense body together, seem to have been loosened or snapped."

"The Roman Empire, at its fall, was resolved into the elements of which it had been composed.\* "The remarkable crisis, when the Romans and Barbarians were contending for the Empire of the world, should be well comprehended by the student." "Wave followed wave in the great migration of nations—a movement which continued to roll tumultuously over Europe for more than three centuries after the downfall of the Western Empire." As Milton says :

"A multitude—which the populous north  
Poured from her frozen loins, to pass  
Rhene or the Danaw, when her barbarous sons  
Came like a deluge on the South, and spread  
Beneath Gibraltar to the Lybian sands;"

And Thomson :

A boisterous race, by frosty Caurus pierced,  
Who little pleasure knew, and feared no pain,  
Prolific swarm'd. They once relum'd the flame  
Of lost mankind, in polished slavery sunk,  
Drove martial horde on horde, with dreadful sweep,  
Resistless, rushing o'er the enfeebled South,  
And gave the vanquished world another form."

And Gray, quoted by Tytler :

"Oft o'er the trembling nations, from afar,  
Has Scythia breathed the living cloud of war ;  
And where the deluge burst, † with sweeping sway,  
Their arms, their kings, their gods, were rolled away.  
As oft have issued, host impelling host,  
The blue-eyed myriads of the Baltic coast ;

---

\* "The greatest, perhaps, and most awful scene in the history of mankind." Gibbon, Vol. VI, p. 541. "The last rude shock which overthrew the crumbling edifice of the Old World's grandeur and glory."—*Procter*.

† How natural for these authors to use the metaphor in Rev. 12: 15.

The prostrate South to the destroyer yields  
 Her boasted titles and her golden fields;  
 With grim delight, the brood of Winter view  
 A brighter day, and heavens of azure hue,  
 Scent the new fragrance of the blushing rose,  
 And quaff the pendant vintage as it grows."

The author of the "History of Civilization" is ever reminding us of the "*great crisis*" which introduced the principles of individualization and personal independence;—of the great changes which occurred from the sixth to the eighth century, and which led on to the feudal system, in which "society necessarily fell into little knots and divisions."\*

"Dissolved like Roman society, German society in like manner furnished to the society which followed it, nothing but wrecks." "Society never dissolves itself, but because a new society is fermenting and forming in its bosom;" the *concealed work is there going on*, which tends to separate its elements, in order to arrange them under new combinations."

"The obscure and irregular fermentation of the wrecks of former society, German as well as Roman, and the first labors of their transformation into the elements of the new society, constituted the true condition of Gaul, during the *sixth and seventh* centuries, and this is the only character we can assign it."

"This is the character of the dark age; it was a chaos of all the elements; the childhood of all the systems; a *universal jumble*, in which even strife itself was neither permanent nor systematic."

"Everything shows the difficulties of the transition from the wandering life to the settled life; \* \* \* during this transition all was confused, local, disordered." "States were created, suppressed, united and divided; no Governments, no frontiers, no nations; a general jumble of situations, principles, events, races, languages." "Let us now fix the limits of this *extraor-*

---

\* "Here we have the feudal system oozing at last out of the bosom of barbarism." It is remarkable how often Guizot, in *Hist. Civ. Vol. 2, Lects. 12, 13, &c.*, mentions the epoch, "from the 5th to the 8th century;"—the epoch of the formal establishment of the Papacy.

*dinary period.* Its origin is strongly defined—it began with the fall of the Roman Empire.” The author then goes on to speak of several attempts to draw European society from the barbarous state into which it had fallen, and these were between the fifth and ninth centuries.

“The first of these was the compilation of the barbarian laws: \* \* Between the sixth and eighth centuries, the laws of nearly all the barbarous nations were reduced to writing. \* \* This was evidently a commencement of civilization—an attempt to bring society under the authority of general and fixed principles.”

Let us stop now for a moment and see where we are, and what we have established from the pages of men who seem to have been providentially directed to record facts and results exactly illustrating Scripture.

We see the old Roman Empire, *not only* broken up into *ten parts*, according to the prophetic symbols, where the ten toes of the image and the ten horns of the beasts, both in Daniel and Revelation—Daniel 7: 16–24; Rev. 17: 12, according to the interpretation of the hierophantic angels, in each case “are ten Kings that shall arise;”—*but* divided up indefinitely. Nor do we think that this previous dissolution, preparatory to the formation of ten distinct sovereignties, is excluded from the meaning of the symbol, notwithstanding the seemingly express language of the angels, “The number ten is the representative of the whole numerical system, and, as number is employed to symbolize being in general, *ten* must denote the complete perfect being; that is, a number of particulars necessarily connected together and combined into one whole; so that ten is the symbol of perfection and completeness itself—a determinate whole, to which nothing is wanting.” \* There was a multitude of causes and principles of division introduced by the inroads of the barbarians when “society necessarily fell into little knots and divisions;” and this is no doubt included in the scope of the symbol; † though, in general,

---

\* Baehr Symbolic I, p. 175. Fairbairn Typ. Vol. II, p. 72.

† See Guizot His. Civ. Vol. I, p. 85.

after the commencement of civilization and the re-construction of society, there were ten kingdoms formed in Western Europe, and in the bounds of the Roman Empire, and so they have continued till this day.

We see the clay mingled with the iron in the toes of the image, when the Romans and barbarians united in the renovation of society; as if the extremities, which are first stricken with death, had began to oxidize and decay preparatory to the time when "the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver and the gold," should become "like the chaff of the summer threshing floor," and the wind should carry them away.

We see the sixth head of the seven-headed monster wounded to death; if not in other cases, at least by the sword of Odoacer in 476, by that of Theodoric the Ostrogoth, in 493, and in 554, when Italy was conquered by Narses, and made a Province of the Eastern Empire.

And we see by comparing Rev. 13 : 3, with verse 14, that it was not only *one head* of the beast, but the *beast himself*, that was wounded with the sword. He is destroyed by war. "*The sword*" points to the instrument of the mortal wound. And this we have seen was the case with what the beast and the symbolical man represented. The old Babylonian kingdom, the head of gold, lasted seventy years from B. C. 606 to 536, the natural term of a man's life; but now the image is complete, and as to one aspect or form of existence, it ends and yields to something else. The beast undergoes a transformation—*he was* and is not, and yet is. Here, then, is a marked crisis. The form is changed, the spirit is there. It goes through a chrysalis, and the same principle of life continues.

Let us then examine this point where the Heathen persecuting power assumes a Christian form:

1. Though the civil Government was dissolved, the fragments remained. The Roman laws were perpetuated. A most singular state of society existed for a time, showing the mixture of the iron and the clay, when "the Romans were judged by the old Roman laws, the Franks were judged by the Salian or Ripuarian code; in short, *each people* had its separate laws, though united under the same Government, and dwelling

together in the same Territory." This was in the sixth century. And, again, Guizot observes: "The Visigoths, at the commencement of the sixth century, were in the same situation as the Burgundians and the Franks; the barbarous law and the Roman law were distinct, each nation retained its own." But, he goes on to say, that their King "*fused the two laws into one*, and formally abolished the Roman law, 642-652. There was from that time but one code and one nation." Here is the metamorphosis going on. And, further, "the fusion of the two societies becomes more general and profound, and in this fusion, in proportion as it was brought about, the *Roman element, whether civil or religious, dominated more and more.*"

"Just now we were in the last age of Roman civilization, and found it in full decline, without strength, fertility or splendor—incapable, as it were, of subsisting; conquered and ruined by barbarians. Now, all of a sudden, it re-appears powerful and fertile, it exercises a prodigious influence over the institutions and manners which associate themselves with it: it gradually impresses on them its character—it dominates over and transforms its conquerors."\*

Thus we see that the Roman laws passed through the wreck and chaos, and made the continuity of the Empire. They made

---

\* It is a significant fact that the languages of the barbarians, for the most part, were not reduced to writing; they wrote their laws in Latin after their settlement in the Empire, and the new languages, formed by mixture with Latin, were not written before the seventh or eighth century.—Guizot's Hist. Civ. Vol. II, pp. 191-202.

"The newly formed languages were hardly made use of in writing, *Latin being still preserved in all legal instruments and public correspondences*; the very use of letters, as well as of books, was forgotten."—Hallam Mid. Ages, p. 459-542.

Of the Alani one solitary relic has been preserved.—Dic. Gr. and Rom. Geo. p. 85.

The Goths had a translation of the Bible in the middle of the fourth century—the most ancient specimen of the written Germanic dialects in the old English black letter. But they have left little trace in Western Europe. The language of the Lombards was never written, and no one can tell what it was—their laws were written in Latin.—Ency. Brit. Art. Lombards.

In England, in 1362, the pleas in Courts of Justice were in English, but the record was in Latin. There was a prejudice against the use of English as a written language.—Hallam p. 541.

the connection of what preceded with what followed the great flood of barbarism; so that while the Teutonic races predominated, the Roman institutions prevailed. Thus the modern Governments were organized. Exactly the reverse of what the Romans had done, in their conquests, the barbarians found better laws and manners among the conquered than their own, and adopted them.

2. Just as the ark of Noah, and the contents of it, connected the Old and the New World, so the Church survived, in this instance, the general wreck.\* “Singular phenomenon! It was at the very time that the Roman Empire fell to pieces and disappeared, that the Christian Church rallied and definitely formed herself. Political unity perished—religious unity arose.”

“To us the Church, in the fifth century, appears as an organized and independent society.” And, “in the chaos of Church and State” that followed, the spiritual encroached more and more on the temporal power, so that by the time the ten kingdoms were organized, the Clergy had assumed immense power, and their Chief raised his head above them all. A Theocracy was set up as a successor to the old Empire, and which formed the connecting link between that and the new Germanic Empire—which it claims to have created without parting with any of its own power—but, while it retains it all, keeps this new created Empire subject to itself. It is a mere image or shadow of the old Empire. Hear what a Roman writer says: “The Empire having been overthrown, unless God had raised up the Pontificate, Rome, *resuscitated* and restored by none, would have become uninhabitable. \* \* \* But, in the Pontificate it *revived*, as with a second birth, its Empire, in magnitude not equal, indeed, to the old Empire—but its form not dissimilar—because all nations, from East and from West, venerate

---

\* Religion alone made a bridge, as it were, across the chaos, and has linked the two periods of ancient and modern civilization.”—Hallam Middle Ages p. 461. “If we considered in its entirety the history of the human mind in modern Europe, from the fifth century up to our days, we should find, I think, that the seventh century is the lowest point to which it has descended, the nadir of its course.”—Guizot His. Civ. Vol. III, p. 31.

the Pope, not otherwise than they before observed the Emperors."\*

Thus we find a great convulsion in Europe, a great era, a memorable epoch, a total change, at about the time that our first period of 1260 years should terminate,—a period that measures the duration of a series of civil governments, mostly heathen, that God raised up, and permitted to fill, in relation to the Church, almost the place of the theocratic kings that preceded Nebuchadnezzar. It was really the throne of the Messiah, the place filled by him in the tabernacle, before any visible monarch was set up as a vice-gerent to represent His rights. When we read the second chapter of Daniel, we find the kingdoms represented by the metals set up by "the God of heaven," just as is the kingdom of the rock that is to succeed.† In Jer. 27: 5-8, very extensive dominion is given to Nebuchadnezzar, and he is repeatedly called the "servant of the Lord." So in Isa. 45: 1, Cyrus is expressly called the Lord's anointed. Hence, in Rev. 12: 5, the man-child, as the vice-gerent representative of Christ, is caught up to the throne of God. And if we cannot mark the exact epoch when one series ends, and another begins, like it in some respects, but different in that it is a mixture of Jewish, Pagan and Christian theocracy, usurping not only the kingly, but the prophetic and priestly offices of Christ—the reason is, that one gradually slides into the other: that the main, living principle is unchanged; the dragon is only metamorphosed into a lamb: and as the whole period has a fixed beginning and ending, there was no need of such a break as was when the series began, or as

---

\* Quoted by Barnes on Rev. 17: 3.

† In the speech of Agrippa to the Jews, (Jos. B. J. Bk. II., Cap. 16., Sec. 4.) he says, "What remains, therefore, is this, that you have recourse to Divine assistance; but this is already on the side of the Romans: for it is impossible that so vast an Empire should be settled without God's Providence. See Rev. 17: 17,— "For God hath put in their hearts," &c. Livy, the historian, Bk. I. Sec. 4, nearly contemporary with Josephus, says, "I am of the opinion that the origin of so great a city, and the founding of an Empire, next in greatness to that of the gods, was owing to the fates. So, I, 16, "*Coelotes ita velle ut mea Roma caput orbis terrarum sit.*

will be when it ends, and is succeeded by a theocracy with Christ at the head, and the saints take the kingdom. For when they reign, he reigns. Compare Dan. 7 : 14, with verses 23 and 25.

The period makes one whole, because the unity of idea in the image of four metals, and the last beast in Rev 13 : 2, corresponding, in one aspect, to the fourth metal, combines the three preceding beasts of Daniel.\* And it is on account of this unity and identity, and the same principle of life perpetuated, that the same prophetic title continues; it was Babylon at first, and continues so to the end.†

Now, it is not probable that the time of a part of this whole would be given, and the other part not indicated in some way.

If, then, we take the first period of 1260 years, from the time that literal Babylon began to domineer over the Jewish Church, till the time that death struck the extremities of the image that symbolized that tyrannical Power: and the beast that represented the same under another aspect, was wounded to death; but when life was again infused into that Image, and that deadly wound was also healed, (See Rev. 13 : 3, 5, 12, 14, 15,) the time when spiritual Babylon sets up her authority over the Christian Church; and the second period of 1260 years, to extend to the final destruction of this power, we shall have one round complete period: each will be the counterpart of the other. We shall have, then, the time of Babylon, 70 years; Daniel's 70 weeks  $70 \times 7$  years: the whole period before us,  $360 \times 7$ , or 2520 years.‡

---

\* Comp. Daniel 7 : 4-6, 12, and Rev. 13 : 2, and the commentary of Ewald on the latter.

† The name alludes to the original Babel, and the confusion of tongues from barbarian inroads.

‡ The Celtic gave place in the Gaulish and Spanish provinces of Rome to the general employment of Latin, and even the Germans beyond the Rhine acquired the speech of their enemies. The confusion or, indeed, the obliteration of tongues, was further accelerated by the collection, within the Roman Empire, of soldiers or slaves, from nearly every region of the world."

Smith's Dic. Gr. and Rom. Geog. p. 868.

‡ In Daniel 2 : 37-44. This is one unbroken period. See 7 : 3-9, 17-27. Scarcely two interpreters agree upon the same epoch for the rise of Popery.



ARTICLE VII.

THE EARLY PRESBYTERIAN IMMIGRATION INTO  
SOUTH CAROLINA.\*

“The parts of human learning,” says Lord Bacon, “have reference to the three parts of man’s understanding; which is the seat of learning: History to his memory, Poesy to his imagination, and Philosophy to his reason.” Our own individual history is invested with the deepest interest to each of us; and to retrace the path by which God has led us that we may remember His faithfulness, and profit by our own success and failures, is rewarded with the richest fruits of knowledge. If the Church could be regarded as a person, possessing one unbroken life and one uninterrupted consciousness, whose memory did not fail with growing years, how rich would the stores of her experience become; how wise would she be; how circumspect and strong with each revolving century. Instead of this she is a community of persons, themselves dwelling here but for a little season, no small portion of their lives spent in becoming men, and no small portion waning away in the decay which at last is completed in the grave. Yet is it instructive to them; instructive to us to survey and perpetuate her history, whether, to use the words of Bacon again, “she be fluctuant as the ark of Noah; or moveable as the ark in the wilderness; or at rest as the ark in the temple: the state of the Church in preparation, in remove, and in peace.” And because there is one and the same God, whose plan spans all duration, and the laws of whose working are constant, like his own nature; in the past, we may often behold, as in a mirror, that future which is hastening to meet us. For all our present purposes the Church of God *is* a person; she is incorporated not by the acts of any human

---

\*A Historical Discourse delivered before the General Assembly at New Orleans, May 7th, 1858, by the appointment of the Presbyterian Historical Society, and now published at its request.

legislation, but by her holy and divine vocation into the fellowship of Jesus, as the body of Christ, as his chosen bride. History is her memory. Let her explore its treasures, revive the scenes through which she has passed, and adore that Angel of the Covenant who has been her cloudy and fiery pillar, through the sea and the desert, to every land of rest she has ever occupied.

Our own has been pre-eminently a witnessing and a wrestling Church. She was so in the Apostolic period, and has been, from the time of her restoration among the Alpine Mountains by the Lake of Geneva, on the sunny plains of France, in Holland wrested from the sea, among the hills and glens of Scotland, and in the northern provinces of Ireland. She has wrestled with flesh and blood, with the principalities and powers of earth, and with spiritual wickedness in high places. She has borne aloft the banner of the Covenant, and raised her voice of testimony for God's truth and Christ's kingly crown, both as witness and martyr, and has watered the soil of many lands with the blood of her sons and daughters. In her struggles for the supreme headship of Christ over his own body, the Church, she has wrought out, to a large extent, in connection with those who held her truth, the problem of individual freedom and civil liberty. Her traducers are indebted to her more than they know, for constitutional law, representative government and freedom from oppression.

The Presbyterians of France, of Switzerland, of Holland, of Scotland, England and Ireland, disciplined in the fires of persecution, and tossed by the waves of innumerable calamities, guided by Christ, their King, to these savage wilds, have built here their altars and planted their institutions of religion and learning, and we, their descendants, are banded together to cherish their memories, and to strengthen ourselves in our love of truth and hatred of wrong by their example. Our own history cannot be truly understood till we understand theirs. True is this of our Church at large, especially true of every portion of it planted in those thirteen States occupying the Atlantic coast,—themselves settled by direct emigration from Europe,—which wrought out the problem of American independence.

And we propose to consider now those streams of Presbyterian emigration which flowed into one of these States, that of South Carolina, within whose bounds our lot is cast.

It is hardly necessary to premise that the Presbyterian Church maintains that system of truth advocated by Augustine against Pelagius and his disciples, and more purely set forth by Zuingli and Calvin in the sixteenth century, and that discipline and order which re-appeared in the post-Apostolic period among the Waldenses of Piedmont, and the Hussites of Bohemia, and was more fully proclaimed by Calvin, at Geneva, who, however, was not able to carry it forth in its perfection in the Cantons of Switzerland. In his own native France, and, after a season, in Scotland, under the teachings of his disciple, Knox, did it reach its highest existing perfection. It is the only form of polity, except the Papacy—that invasion of the prerogatives of Christ—in which the Church can exhibit an outward unity answering to its real oneness. In Independency it is separated into elemental particles without cohesion; in Prelacy unity is only obtained in an earthly head, who professes to be the Vice-Gerent of Christ; in Presbyterianism, the Church is a unit, its members are under a succession of courts rising one above another, and these, if the necessities of Christ's kingdom should ever so require, might be made amenable to a General Assembly of the National Synods of all countries, which should bind together, in a visible unity, the entire Church of Christ throughout the world.

South Carolina has been called "the Home of the Huguenots," and this leads us to speak of them first in the land of their origin. France was the first to embrace the Gospel at the period of the Reformation. Zuingli, in Switzerland, began to preach the truth in 1516. Luther had discovered the way of peace, and preached it, earlier than this; but his first public act, the nailing of his theses against indulgences to the door of the Church at Wittemberg, was on the 31st of October, 1517. But before 1512, says D'Aubigne, Lefevre had proclaimed the doctrine of justification by faith—Luther's "doctrine of a standing or falling church"—in the midst of the very Sorbonne itself. Farel and Olivetan had already embraced it before

Zuingli commenced his first study of the Bible, and while Luther was on his journey to Rome, on the business of his monastic order: so that, as Beza claims, if there was priority among the nations embracing the doctrines of the Reformation, this priority is due to France.\* Its doctrines took possession of many minds in the higher walks of life. They found adherents in the court of Francis the First: they won the gentle, truth-loving heart of Margaret of Valois, sister of the king, and subsequently Queen of Navarre, who exerted all her influence to promote their progress and protect their professors. Berquin, "the most learned of the nobles," Bricconnet, Bishop of Meaux, who, however, recanted; Calvin, a young student of theology, even then exhibiting, in all he did, the superiority of his genius; Beza, who had devoted himself to the law, but became an eminent Minister of Christ, were among those who embraced them.

Even thus early did this portion of the church of our fathers receive her dreadful baptism of blood. There were many martyrdoms; and in the Canton de Vand, two and twenty villages were levelled to the ground, 4,000 of the inhabitants massacred,† and many, whose lives were spared, condemned to the galleys. Calvin, Beza, and others fled to Geneva for refuge. Still the doctrines of the Reformation spread. These persecutions themselves gave occasion to the noble Institutes of Calvin, written to make known the doctrines of his persecuted brethren,‡ which, for its intrinsic excellence and its historic importance, we have restored again to its place as a text-book in theology. Gaspard de Coligny, Admiral of France, a noble of illustrious name, of exalted character and great abilities, became the active promoter of the Protestant cause, while Anthony, duke of Vendome and titular king of Navarre, and Louis, Prince of Condé, both of

---

\* D'Aubigne, *History of the Reformation*, Vol. III., Book XII. Théodore DeBèze, *Histoire Eclésiastique des Eglises Reformées au Royaume de France*, Tome I, pp. 1-42.

† 3,000, Maimbourg, *Histoire du Calvinisme*, Livre 2. *Vide* Gerdesius IV, p. 160. *et seq.* Bèze, Livre I, p. 28-42.

‡ See his dedication to Francis I, *Anno* 1536.

the royal house of France, lent their influence, the first with that wavering purpose which ever characterised him, and the other with that boldness, and daring, adventurous courage, which made him one of the most influential men in France, to this same holy cause. And thus did the Presbyterian faith rise and spread itself in France, so that from the year 1555, when the first Protestant Church was founded at Paris, in seven years' time, they had increased to 2,140 congregations. So great were their numbers in Paris, that 30,000 or 40,000 would assemble for worship in the meadows without that city,\* returning within the walls in open day. At the VIIth National Synod at Rochelle, in 1671, at which Beza presided as moderator, they numbered 2,150 churches, some of them formed in the castles of the nobles, but others with 10,000 members, most having two ministers, and some of the largest five collegiate pastors.† Their polity was, in all respects, the same as our own. The Anciens or Elders, and Deacons, (Diacres,) formed the Consistory or Session, or the Senate of the Church at which the pastor was to preside; and their duties were ordered as in our own book of discipline. The Colloquy answered to our Presbytery, the Provincial Synod to our Synod, the National Synod to our General Assembly; and the trials for proposants for the ministry, and the efforts to establish and maintain schools and colleges were much the same as have ever characterised the churches of our faith in all lands.‡ But Presbytery slept on no bed of roses in the kingdom of France. She was then bearing her testimony against Papal corruptions and wrestling for the truth. "I returned, and behold the tears of the oppressed, and on the side of the oppressor was power, and they had no comforter." Calvin had inculcated on them the doctrine of non-resistance to the powers that be, since they were ordained of God; even, says he in his Institutes, "if they were inhumanly harassed by

---

\* The Pré aux Clercs, where now is the Faubourg Saint Germain. This was the rendezvous of the Protestants, where they would spend their Summer evenings in singing Marot's psalms, and in friendly conference.

† Smedley 1, 188. Quick's Synodicon, Vol. I, p. lix.

‡ Quick's Synodicon I, p. vi.—lviii. Aymon, Synodes Nationaux, Tome I. Beza, I, p. 109.

a cruel prince; if they were rapaciously plundered by an avaricious or luxurious one.”\* But the tide of persecution was so cruelly turned against them in the last part of the reign of Francis I, and still more systematically under Henry II, that men accustomed to arms, and bold and unshrinking in danger, sought to wrest from the hands of power that liberty to worship God which had been so tyrannically denied them. Frequent were the conflicts in arms with their cruel oppressors, and scanty the privileges they gained, even under the guidance of the brave Coligny and the Prince Condé.

As they were the first to embrace the truths of the Reformation, so were they the first of all the Protestants to turn their eyes to this American Continent to find an asylum from oppression; first to conceive the idea of planting here the institutions of the Gospel, and adding a New World to Protestant Christendom. De Coligny, with an anxious eye, saw the increasing troubles of the Huguenots of France, and turned to the project of planting colonies in America as places of refuge. Nicholas Durand de Villegagnon, a Knight of Malta and Vice-Admiral of Brittany, moved rather by avarice and ambition than by any virtuous impulse, offered, in 1555, to plant a Protestant colony on the coast of South America, to people the country and convert the heathen nations. He represented it to the king as an enterprise which would greatly promote the commerce of France, and, by these representations, obtained the Royal assent and the means necessary. Care was taken by Coligny, whose confidence Durand had gained, that the colony should consist of a large majority of Protestants. Durand wrote back for a larger number of colonists, and, above all, for “two discreet and active Ministers of the Gospel;” and gave a glowing account of his success. Calvin and the Synod of Geneva manifested great interest in the enterprise, and sent out two clergymen, Richer and Chartier, as missionaries. But Durand threw off the disguise he had assumed to obtain his ends, changed his conduct towards those whom he had drawn thither, persecuted them according to the edict of

---

\*Institutes B. IV, c. xx. p. 29

France, and ordered four of them to be thrown into the sea. Disheartened at these events, the ministers, and many of their flock, obtained leave to return. But they were sent home in an unseaworthy vessel, which many of them refused to enter. Those who entrusted themselves to the mercy of the elements, after nearly perishing with hunger, from the deficiency of their naval stores, at length reached the coast of France, and delivered a sealed packet to the nearest magistrates, which Durand had assured them would secure to them hospitable treatment; but which denounced them as heretics, and commended them to the secular arm that they might be destroyed. Fortunately, the magistrates of Hennebon, on the coast of Brittany, the place where they touched, were of their own faith, and revealed the perfidy of Durand to the miserable fugitives.\* But the divine Nemesis did not long delay. His colony which remained was attacked and expelled by the Portuguese, in 1565, who founded there the present town of Rio Janeiro, the capital of Brazil; so near did this wealthy kingdom come to being a colony of France, and, perhaps, a Protestant rather than a Papal country.

Before these events were fully known, Coligny sent out another band of emigrants, under Jean Ribault, in two vessels of the Royal Navy, with a company of veterans, and several gentlemen, all of the Huguenot faith, to found another colony, and on our own shores. They sailed from Havre on the 18th of February, 1562, and landed in the St. John's river, in Florida, on the 1st of May, giving it the name of May river on this account. Here he set up a pillar engraved with the king's arms, and took possession of the country in the name of his king. Thence he sailed northward for four weeks, till he came to a deep and spacious bay, forming an entrance to a noble river, which he called Port Royal, "one of the fairest and greatest havens in the world," as he says, and which still bears the name he gave it. Here, on the coast of South Carolina, he erected another pillar similarly engraved, and again took possession of the

---

\* Bèze, *Hist. Eccles.* I, pp. 100-102. Smedley, I, 66. *Henry's Life of Calvin*, II, p. 360.

country in the royal name. Here, also, he built a fort which he called Fort Charles, the traces of whose entrenchments are yet seen;\* and having supplied it with tools, provisions, and warlike stores, and left in it a small garrison of thirty men,—gentlemen, soldiers and mariners, who had volunteered to remain,—he returned to report to Coligny what he had accomplished, and to bring out other colonists to people a land clothed with fertility and beauty. Thus was planted by the Huguenots of France, in South Carolina, the first Protestant colony in America, forty-five years before the settlement of Virginia, and fifty-eight before the landing of the Pilgrim Fathers at Plymouth Rock. How Ribault, on returning home, found France involved in civil war, and no one at leisure to attend to the newly planted colony; how they, relying upon supplies from abroad, took no measures, by cultivating the soil, to obtain them; how they were reduced to straits and became dependent on the friendly Indians for supplies; how dissension arose among them, and their commander was put to death; how they at length constructed the first vessel built by European hands on this continent, and after dreadful hardships at sea, reached the shores of Europe; how Coligny fitted out a new expedition, the king providing three armed vessels for the enterprise, the command of it being given to Laudoniere, Coligny having advised him to take none with him who were not of his own religion; how officers, soldiers, mariners, flocked to him, and he left with a picked company, among whom were many young men of ancient and noble families; how, on the 24th of June, 1564, he entered the St. John's river, in Florida, which was regarded by the French as a part of Carolina or New France, and there built a new fort, *Arx Carolina*, and how troubles and dissensions arose among them also; how, in the following year, January, 1565, Ribault again sailed with four vessels and a large company, many of them with their wives and children, seeking that freedom in religion which was denied them at home; how he was followed by a Spanish fleet under Don Pedro Menendez, who landed at

---

\*On Paris Island, below Beaufort.—*Rivers' South Carolina*, p. 52.



the site of St. Augustine, which was then founded by him, and who had orders to propagate the Roman Catholic faith, and destroy all heretics,—all these things are matters of history.

The disastrous issue is well known. Ribault placed the women and children in Fort Carolina, leaving there with Laudoniere a garrison of eighty men, only twenty of whom were effective, and, crowding nearly all his force aboard the few ships he had, resolved to attack Menendez, and deliver Fort Carolina from so dangerous an enemy. But while he was waiting for the tide to favor, a storm arose and drove the armament of Ribault down the Florida Gulf. Menendez immediately took 500 well armed men, and came on Fort Carolina before Laudoniere knew of his leaving St. Augustine. The Huguenot settlement had been doomed to destruction from the very commencement of the expedition. There were zealous Papists enough at the French Court to inform their Spanish neighbors of the whole armament and expectations of the Huguenot colony. And now, before his attack on the feeble garrison, his men were summoned to an act of worship of the most high God. From their bended knees they rushed to immolate their victims. The garrison, after a short defence, was forced to surrender. So sudden, however, was the attack, that some were slain in their beds, and others in the act of flight. Women, and boys under fifteen, say the Spanish writers, were spared; but the French speak of the massacre as indiscriminate. After the battle was over, the living and dead were hung alike on the branches of one tree, and their bones left a prey to the birds of heaven. At the root of the tree Menendez set up a stone with the inscription: "I do not do this as to Frenchmen, but as to Lutherans." Laudoniere, and twenty more, leaped from the parapet, and escaped to the woods, and, at length, on board some small vessels yet in the stream. Menendez hastened back to St. Augustine with a part of his force, to defend it against Ribault, was received with triumph, and with chaunts of *Te Deum* at his victory. But the unfortunate Ribault was in no condition to attack him. His vessels were dashed in pieces on the Florida coast, their arms and a supply of provisions alone being

saved. Their only hope was to thread the shore and reach Fort Carolina, of whose fate they were not aware. The first party arrived at a stream about twelve miles below St. Augustine, when Menendez heard of their situation. Negotiations were entered into, and they resolved to surrender. Menendez had them brought over the river by tens, with their hands tied behind them, and marched to a line drawn by him in the sand with his cane, and there slaughtered in cold blood. "Seeing they were Lutherans," says Mendoza, the priest, "the general condemned them all to death." After some days, Ribault, with the rest of his party, were met at the same stream by Menendez with a large escort. Negotiations were entered into, and the French writers tell us that Menendez promised to spare their lives; that the promise was in writing under his hand and seal, and confirmed by an oath. Ribault and his followers advanced to the bank of the river, and were taken across, ten at a time, with their arms pinioned. Ribault was asked whether they were Catholics or Lutherans. He replied, "that he and his companions were of the new religion." Orders were immediately given for their slaughter. The whole number of French, men, women and children, slain by the Spaniards, is stated in the petition to the king, by the widows, children and relations of the victims, to have been more than 900. The Huguenots plead with Menendez that their sovereigns were at peace, and that they should not be treated as enemies. He replied, "The Catholic French are, indeed, our allies and friends; but it is not so with heretics. With these I wage a war of extermination, and in this I serve both monarchs." Though the knowledge of these events aroused the indignation of the people, and touched the national honor, and the friends of these murdered men approached the throne with supplications, the court looked upon the whole with perfect apathy. The rumor even became current that this infamous perfidy was perpetrated with the connivance of the king. Certain it is that no remonstrance was ever sent to the Spanish court.\*

---

\* See on this subject, the following authorities: *Histoire de la Nouvelle France*,

But while the King refused to redress this great wrong, the Chevalier de Gourgues, a gentleman of Gascony, of an ancient family, and attached to the Papal faith, roused and indignant at the apathy of the court, undertook with his own hand to punish the enormous perfidy. By the sale of his property, and by borrowing from his friends, he fitted out an expedition, keeping his purpose secret until he arrived at the island of Cuba. He then addressed his men, told them of the great wrong which he had come to avenge, and roused their enthusiasm to the highest pitch. Thence he sailed for Fort Carolina. He found that the Spaniards had erected three forts of different degrees of strength. Having arranged with the native Indians, who lent their assistance, each of these was taken in succession. And now came the last act in this drama of retaliation. Gourgues took his prisoners to the place where the companions of Ribault and Laudoniere had been hung, reminded them of that act of treachery, and that he had come to avenge it, and hung them on the same tree on which his own countrymen had been hung by Menendez, leaving behind an inscription on a pine plank, "I did not do this as to Spaniards, nor as to infidels, but as to traitors, thieves and murderers." After demolishing the forts, Gourgues returned to France. Instead of being rewarded and honored by his own government, he was persecuted by it. Though himself a Roman Catholic, and bent only upon revenging the wrong done to Frenchmen, and to himself *as a citizen of France*; he had, in fact, avenged the wrong of those persecuted Huguenots whom his government hated. He was pursued, too, with bitter malice by Spain, and

---

par Marc Lescarbot, Avocat en Parlement, Témoin Oculaire d'une Partie des Choses ici Recitées. Trois. Edition. Á Paris, MDCXVIII., pp. 40-225.—Mémoire, par Francisco Lopez Mendoza, Chapelain de l'Expedition de Pedro Menendez de Abiles, from a manuscript in the Bibliothèque Royale, with other original narratives, edited by H. Ternaux. Paris, MDCCCXLI.—Hackluyt's Voyages, III., pp. 300-360.—Sparks' American Biography, Vol. XVII; Life of John Ribault, and the authorities there quoted. According to Mendoza, who learned the fact from one of the French captives, there were in the expedition two Protestant clergymen.—Ternaux p. 214. One of these appears to have borne the name of Robert, who is mentioned as the chaplain; the other was Challeux, whose narrative is found in Ternaux, Comp. Barcia, *en sayo*.

impoverished by the expenses of the expedition he had fitted out.\*

Meanwhile, the affairs of France underwent a great change. Weary, apparently, of civil war, peace was concluded at St. Germain in 1570, three years after the events just described, on the basis of amnesty for the past, the free exercise of the Protestant religion in the suburbs of two towns in each province, restoration of confiscated property, and the possession of four cautionary cities for two years. It had been the policy of government to persecute the Huguenots. Now, all is flattery and pretended affection. A marriage was projected between the King of Navarre, the Protestant Prince, and Margaret, sister of the King, which was urged by the King upon the Protestants as the means of cementing the amity between the two dissentient parties, and, at the same time, apologized for to the Pope as the only means of avenging himself on his and God's enemies, and chastising these great rebels. The facts of this consummate treachery are all well known. How the Queen of Navarre, with her children, were drawn to Paris to be present at the august ceremony; how the admiral de Coligny, in spite of many warnings, also was drawn there with the chief nobility attached to the Protestant cause, and was received with every demonstration of friendship by the King and the Duke of Guise, his ancient enemy; how troops were introduced into the city, ostensibly to protect the Huguenots, but, in truth, for another purpose; how the gentlemen were invited to gather around the hotel of Coligny for his greater security, and the King of Navarre was advised to strengthen himself by assembling in his apartments the gentlemen attached to his service. These preparations, for the most consummate perfidy that is found on the pages of history, were duly made. At two o'clock on Sunday morning, the 4th of August, 1572, the church bell of St. Germain's, which was the concerted signal, was rung. The Duke of Guise, attended by his brother and other gentlemen, went to Coligny's house, which was broken open, the Swiss

---

\* *La Reprinse de la Florida.*—Ternaux I, p. 301.

guards at the foot of the stairs were killed, and the hired assassins of Guise, penetrating to the chamber of the Admiral, put him to death, and threw the corpse from the window at Guise's feet, who wiped its face to recognize it, spurned it with his foot, and ordered the head to be cut off. Then was one branch of our Presbyterian Church receiving its baptism of blood. The great bell of the Louvre rang, and all the bells of the city followed; the city was illuminated by numerous lights placed in the windows, and the defenceless Huguenots were slain as they rushed into the streets. Armed men, and priests with a crucifix in one hand, and a sword in the other, preceded the murderers, urging them to spare neither relatives nor friends. When daylight came, headless bodies were falling from the windows, the gateways were blocked up with the dead and dying, the streets were filled with carcasses, which were dragged along the pavement to the river. The palace of the Louvre was itself filled with blood. The Protestant gentlemen whom the King of Navarre and the Prince of Conde were advised to assemble around their persons, were called forth into the court-yard, one by one, and killed. Most died without complaining, others appealed to the public faith, and the promise of the king. "Great God!" they cried, "be the defence of the oppressed!" "Just Judge! avenge this perfidy." For three days, and to some extent for a week, the massacre continued. The body of Coligny was tossed into a stable, then drawn through the streets for two or three days, then thrown into the Seine, then drawn out and hung in chains by one foot from the gibbet of Montmorency, where it was viewed with satisfaction by the King. Even the ladies of the court were seen to descend into the square of the Louvre to view the dead bodies of the gentlemen who had cheerfully conversed with them the day before, which they did with unfeeling merriment and wanton curiosity. This massacre was repeated in other cities till 30,000, or, as some say, 100,000 were put to death. Yet at Rome there were great rejoicings. The Pope went in grand procession and performed high mass. A *Te Deum* was sung, and a medal struck, bearing on one side the head of Gregory XIII, and

on the other the Destroying Angel smiting the Protestants, with the legend *Huguenotorum Strages*, 1572. And so ended all efforts of the French to plant a colony on the Atlantic coast of what is now these Southern States.

No wonder that the health of Charles IX declined after the night of St. Bartholomew, that sleep often fled from his eyes, and his nights were disturbed by horrid dreams of the blood, murder and perfidy of those awful scenes. It may be true, as is recorded, that blood started from every pore, and his frame was torn with strong convulsions, and that he died the victim of remorse in the 24th year of his age and the 13th of his reign. "The wicked shall not live out half their days." We should deem it a sad thing for *us* if we could reckon the average of a hundred martyrs in this happy country to every Church. Yet such is the computation made in the *Cabinet du Roy*,\* a book printed in the year 1581, and dedicated to Henry the Third, in reference to our Presbyterian ancestors of France. "It is clear as noon-day," says the writer, "that the sum is vastly more. For 'tis a truth incontestable, that there have been cut off from the Church of Caen about 15 or 16,000; from the Church of Alancon, 5,000; from the Church of Paris 13,000; from the Church of Rheims 12,000; from the Church of Troyes 12,000; from the Church of Sens 9,000; from the Church of Orleans 8,000; from the Church of Angers 7,500; from the Church of Poitiers 12,000 persons!"

For 100 years, however, after the sad fate of Ribault and his companions, the territory of South Carolina and Georgia was trodden only by savage feet.

Meanwhile great events were passing in Europe, in which our Presbyterian ancestors, in the various countries of their birth, were actors and sufferers, witnesses and martyrs. In France they were shut up in their strongholds and besieged. Of their deeds of valor; of their sufferings by famine and pestilence in their beleaguered cities—how in Sanscerre, for instance, as we are informed by De Lery, pastor of La Charité, who was among the besieged, the skins of animals macerated in water,

---

\* Liv. I. pp. 274—277, quoted in Quick's Synodicon, Vol. I. pp. 59—60.

were in great esteem for food, and parchments, title deeds, and books made of parchment, contributed to sustain life, so that literary repasts, not figuratively but literally, were often indulged in, and "the characters, printed or manuscript, could still be read on their fricaseed tripe which was on the plate ready to be eaten;" how the voice of prayer and praise was mingled with the clangor of arms, as often among our Scottish ancestors; how at the battle of Yvry, when Henry the IV was contending for his crown, he harangued his soldiers in the presence of an army double in number to his, and told them: "If you lose sight of your standard, bear my white plumes in view—they will ever be found in the path of honor and duty;" how, when they were drawn up in line of battle, they raised the 118th Psalm, in the translation of Marot and Beza, and then knelt down, while a short and fervent prayer was offered; how the younger cavaliers of the opposing army construed this as an act of fear and cowardice, till an officer, turning to the General, Joyeuse, assured him it was the precursor of a desperate battle; how D'Ancerres, the Minister, when he had concluded this act of devotion, assumed the weapons of a carnal warfare, drew his sword and mingled with the foremost combatants, with his head uncovered, and no other defensive armor than a corselet, as an example to his flock; how Henry exhibited the greatest coolness and valor, and was ever in the thickest of the fight; how 400 men of honorable birth, and 3,000 soldiers, were left dead on the field of battle, and victory perched on the Presbyterian banners; how Henry afterwards, perhaps to preserve peace in his dominion, professed the religion of Rome, but, in the edict of Nantz, proclaimed liberty of conscience, equal civil rights and eligibility to office, to his former friends, and how this edict was honorably observed by him till his lamented death by the hand of the assassin,—these, and much more, can history tell.

It was on this soil of France, let us never forget it, that the Presbyterian faith sustained its severest shock of conflict with the Roman hierarchy, to which it was then opposed; and that, though overborne at last by tyranny and power, and driven forth from their native soil, their nobles and gentlemen were,

as a class, without fear or reproach, and among the most illustrious men of France. Their adherents among the people were of that intelligent middle class, the artisans, tradesmen, manufacturers and merchants, who are the bone and sinew, and wealth of any nation, and a more illustrious, able and learned clergy than that which embraces the name of Calvin, Beza, Farel, Viret, Pictet, Turretine, Bochart, Claude, Drelincourt, Daillé, Saurin, and many others, cannot be found in the annals of any church.

The scene now changes to another country. It was on the soil of Scotland that the Presbyterian Church chiefly bore her testimony and wrestled unto blood, for Christ's Crown and Covenant, against royal tyranny and prelatical domination. During the twenty-five years in which James VI reigned over Scotland, before he ascended the English throne, he showed himself as great a tyrant as has ever cursed a people. Possessed of the most ridiculous notions of the Divine right of kings, he was perpetually, and most vexatiously, interfering with the freedom and independence of the Kirk. On one occasion the Moderator of the Presbytery of Glasgow was dragged from his chair, insulted, beaten and cast into prison. But the Church was firm to her trust. An extraordinary meeting of the Assembly was called, and a solemn remonstrance drawn up and adopted. "In your Highness' person," said they, "some men press to erect a new Popedom, as though your Majesty could not be full king and head of this Commonwealth unless as well the spiritual as temporal sword be put in your Highness' hands, unless Christ be bereft of his authority, and the two jurisdictions confounded which God hath divided, which directly tendeth to the wreck of all religion." "Who dares subscribe to these treasonable articles?" said the Earl of Arran, when they were presented to the King in Council. "WE DARE!" replied Andrew Melville, and seizing a pen, immediately subscribed them, and was followed by his brother commissioners.

Melville was arraigned for these and other declarations, and fled for his life. These conflicts, for the spiritual independence of the Church, became more and more severe, and many clergymen sought safety to their persons in the neighboring country



of England. The Church of Scotland stood nobly, amid severe contendings and sufferings, up to her testimony for the sole Headship of Christ. Yet she made common cause with James against those schemes entered into by Popish sovereigns of Europe, for the utter extermination of Protestantism, which, as to France, reached their acme in the massacre of St. Bartholomew's, and as to England and Scotland in the Spanish invasion. These distinguished services drew forth from James his famous panegyric on the Church of Scotland in the General Assembly of 1590. "He blessed God that he was born in such time as in the time of the light of the Gospel, and in such a place as to be king of such a Kirk, the sincerest Kirk in all the world. The Kirk of Geneva," says he, "keepeth Pash and Yule. What have they for them? They have no institution. As for our neighbor Kirk in England, their service is an evil said mass in English; they want nothing of the mass but the liftings. I charge you, my good people, ministers, doctors, elders, nobles, gentlemen and barons, to stand to your purity, and I, forsooth, so long as I brook my life and crown, shall maintain the same against all deadly." \*

Thus, full and clear, were the declarations of the King, under the influence of probably his sincere convictions, united with a grateful remembrance of the assistance and loyalty of the Church in the past season of peril. But when, in 1603, on the death of Elizabeth, James was proclaimed King of Scotland, England, France and Ireland, though he had but the year before lifted up his hand, and in the presence of God and the Assembly, vowed "that he would, by the grace of God, live and die in the religion presently professed in the realm of Scotland, and defend it against all adversaries," his views on the polity of Christ's Church took a wondrous change. His maxim at the Conference at Hampton Court, more than once emphatically pronounced, was "no Bishop, no King." "A Scot's Presbytery" said he, with profane levity, "agrees with monarchy as well as God with the devil;" and to Dr. Reynolds, who represented the Puritan party, "If this be all your party

---

\* Hetherington, pp. 93-94.

have to say, I will make them conform, or harrie them out of the land, or else do worse."\*

By means of bribery, treachery and persecutions, by raising sectional jealousy among clergymen themselves, and by over-awing the Assembly, which met at Perth, in obedience to the royal mandate, the King and his adherents partially accomplished their object. The *Five Articles* of Perth authorized innovations upon the discipline of the Church of Scotland, making it conform to that of England, and were the precursors of still greater innovations. On Saturday, the 4th of August, 1621, they were ratified in the Parliament of Scotland by a small majority—an act ominous of evil, and not without singular coincidences, noted at the time, and long remembered in Scotland. "The morning," says the historian, "had been dark and lowering, and clouds piled on clouds, gathered over the capital. At the very moment when the Marquis of Hamilton and the Lord High Commissioner rose, to touch the Acts with the royal sceptre, in token of their ratification, a keen blue flash of forked lightning blazed through the gloom, followed by another and another, so bright as to blind the startled and guilty Parliament in the act of consummating their deed. Three terrific peals of thunder followed in quick succession, hailstones of prodigious magnitude descended, and sheeted rains, so heavy and continued as to detain in durance the perpetrators of this treason against the King of Kings, by subjecting His Church to an earthly monarch. This disastrous day was known for long years in Scotland as 'the black Saturday,'—black with man's guilt and the frowns of Heaven."† "The sword is now put into your hands," writes the King to Spotswood, Archbishop of St. Andrews, "go on, therefore, to use it, and let it rest no longer, till ye have perfected the service entrusted to you."‡

Three years after these events, on the 27th of March, 1626, James I departed this life, leaving behind him, in England and Scotland, a misgoverned people, a country harrassed with reli-

---

\* Neal I, p. 252

† Hetherington p. 126.

‡ Calderwood p. 784.

gious differences, and with party feuds, and possessing in active operation the elements of change and revolution. In Scotland he had been decent in conduct. In England, "the land of promise," he yielded himself up to luxury and licentiousness. His language was often obscene, his acts indecent, his speech profane, nor was he free from the crime of drunkenness. Two acts of his alone remain fruitful in good, which, however, were not of his own original suggestion. One was his setting on foot the English version of the Sacred Scriptures, which Dr. Reynolds, in behalf of his Puritan brethren, requested might be undertaken, and which had been suggested by the Assembly in Scotland two years before, and cordially entertained by him.\* The other was his project of colonizing the northern provinces of Ireland with a Protestant population, which has had so salutary an influence on Ireland itself, and had so much to do with the planting of Presbyterianism in America, and especially in the State we here represent.

The forty-five years intervening between the death of James and the first settlement of South Carolina, were replete with great events. Charles I, the son and successor of James, was not wanting in intellectual gifts and refined culture. In his religious belief he was an Arminian, in church government a zealous promoter of Episcopacy, and in private life unblemished; but, as a King, his life was a series of wretched blunders. "He had an incurable propensity to dark and crooked ways," and "was perfidious from constitution and habit, and on principle also." A season of great trial was now approaching the Church of Scotland, and to prepare her for it her Lord and Head poured out upon her his gracious spirit. For a period of five years, from James' death, at Irvin and Stewarton, there was what Fuller calls "a great spring-tide of the Gospel," so that "like a spreading moor-burn the power of godliness did

---

\* "The Scottish divines of all parties adhered to the Geneva Bible, until about the year 1640, when the present translation, originally designed only for the English Church, and too partial to Prelacy, was at length silently established in general use." Memorial for the Bible Societies in Scotland, p. 87, (published anonymously, but written by Rev. John Lee, D. D., F. R. S. E., quoted by Reid, Pres. Ch. of Ireland, I, p. 289.)

advance from one place to another." In the Kirk of Schotts, in 1630, there was a still more powerful demonstration of the Spirit, under the preaching of John Livingstone, then but a licentiate, and but 17 years of age, when 500 persons experienced conversion under a single sermon.

The attempt of Charles and Archbishop Laud to force the English service on the Kirk of Scotland, the story of the indignant Jenny Geddes and her stool, and the confusion, sorrow and lamentation, throughout Scotland, which the tyrannical and ill-advised attempt produced, are well known.

The people, clergy and nobles, rallied in behalf of an oppressed Church, and it was agreed that Scotland should resume and renew her solemn covenant with God. The scene is equally well known to all proficients in Scottish history. When in the Church of Grey Friars, at Edinburgh, Feb. 28, 1638, after prayer by Henderson, and an address by the Earl of Loudon, Johnstone unrolled the vast parchment which was to be subscribed, and read it aloud, it was a critical moment in Scotland's history, and in ours. It was a moment of deep and solemn stillness, when all felt themselves in the dread presence of that God to whom they were all about to renew their allegiance. At length the aged and venerable Earl of Sutherland stepped forward, and with great solemnity, and a hand trembling with emotion, subscribed Scotland's covenant with God. Name after name followed, till the entire congregation within had subscribed it. The roll was then taken to the church-yard, spread upon a tombstone, and subscribed by the assembled multitude. The emotion deepened every moment. Some wept, some broke forth in exultation, some added, after their names, *till death*; some opened a vein and subscribed it with their own blood,—sad prophecy of what was to come! As the space on the parchment became less, many wrote their names in a more contracted form, others subscribed with their initials, till not a spot was left. "Again," says the historian, "they paused. The nation had formed a covenant in ancient days, and violated it. What if they should prove faithless too! With heartfelt groans, and flowing tears, they lifted up their right hands to heaven, and called God to witness, in solemn

adjuration, that they had joined themselves to the Lord in everlasting COVENANT, which shall not be forgotten."

Thus "the first performance of the foreign ceremonies produced a riot: the riot rapidly became a revolution." The King despatched a fleet to Scotland, and marched at the head of an army to coerce his ancient dominion. The Lords of the Covenant were ready for him. They encamped an army on Dunse Law, a conical hill, in sight of the royal forces, and about six miles distant. In a few days it numbered 24,000. The hill bristled with field-pieces. The regiments were encamped, each in its own cluster, around the sides. At the tent door of each captain, a banner staff was planted, from which floated the Scottish colors, displaying also the inscription, in letters of gold: "For Christ's Crown and Covenant!" Regularly as morning dawned, or the shades of evening drew on, the beat of drum or clangor of trumpet summoned each regiment to their worship, which was conducted mostly by the same pastors who ministered to them at home. Even a Balaam might have said, "How goodly are thy tents, O Jacob! and thy tabernacles, O Israel!" Before such a host Charles recoiled, and negotiated, with his accustomed perfidy.

These attempts, and this resistance, was the beginning of English and American liberty. The King could not carry out his measures without an army—nor have an army without treasure—nor impose taxes contrary to law any longer. It became necessary to summon a Parliament. On November, 3d 1640, met at his summons, the Long Parliament, so famous in English history—so much reviled and ridiculed—but which, in spite of its minor errors in judgment, has laid so widely the foundations of British freedom.

This Parliament called the Westminster Assembly, which met on the 1st of July, 1643, and during the 1,163 sessions of this venerable body, through a period of *five years, six months and twenty-two days*, were framed the Confession of Faith, Catechisms and form of Government—under whose provisions we are here assembled this day—which constitute the Church symbols of so many branches of the Presbyterian Church, and whose doctrinal articles are the bond of union in a greater or

less degree of the larger portion of all the Protestant Churches who worship God in the English tongue.

Of the Solemn League and Covenant, which was the basis of the union between England and Scotland at this time, of the contest between the King and the Parliament, while these documents of our Church were maturing, until it was taken out of the hands of Parliament by the army they had called into existence, who arraigned the King for high treason against his country, and on January 30, 1648, put him to death; of the adoption of the Westminster Confession as to its doctrinal articles by both Houses of Parliament; of their introducing an Erastian element into the discipline of the Church by making an appeal lie from every Presbytery to Commissioners of Parliament appointed in every province, and from the National Assembly to Parliament itself, and by making an Assembly legal only when summoned by Parliament, against which the Presbyterians loudly exclaimed as derogatory to the Supreme Headship of Christ over his Church; of the important, and in many respects, glorious period of the Commonwealth under Cromwell, when the name of England struck the tyrant and persecutor with dread, and filled God's people with joy, even on the Alpine Mountains of Piedmont; of the partial establishment of Presbytery in England; of the proclamation of Charles II as King by the Scotch, who, although they delivered the person of Charles I into the hands of the English, consented not unto his death; of the defeat of the Scotch army at Dunbar, and afterwards at Worcester by Cromwell; of the flight of Charles, and his hair-breadth escapes until he found refuge in France; of his recall by a new Parliament, and his enthusiastic reception by the people; of all these thickly coming events attended with such important issues, history must speak.

But, although the King was invited back, not only by Parliament, but by the leading clergymen who dissented from the Prelatical Church, his return was the signal for the most bitter persecutions. The old ecclesiastical polity was revived, receiving the sacrament according to the forms of the English liturgy was necessary to a seat in Parliament, and Episcopal ordina-

tion to ecclesiastical office. More than 2,000 Ministers of the English Church, mostly Presbyterians, were ejected from their churches and deprived of their livings in one day, and all who were destitute of private property were reduced to the extremest sufferings and want.\* They were forbidden to come within five miles of their former charges, and it was made a crime to attend their worship, of which the punishments were fines, imprisonments and banishment. A traveller from a foreign country would have supposed that these men so treated were persons guilty of the greatest crimes, who deserved to be hunted and exterminated as wild beasts. Yet they were the men who were active in the restoration of the perfidious house of Stuart, whose representative, the second Charles, had pledged himself to them; but, once in power, had turned upon them the horrors of a bitter persecution. Of their true character one may judge when the names of Calamy, Bates, Owen, Howe and Baxter, are mentioned as examples, though illustrious ones, of the remainder of their persecuted brethren. Bishop Burnet and John Locke have given their testimony to their learning, ability and worth. In the reigns of Charles II and James II, 70,000 families were ruined in England itself, of whom about 8,000 persons died in prison. The majority of these were of the Presbyterian faith.

It was in the year 1670, while these persecutions were rife, that the first colonists who permanently occupied the State of South Carolina arrived upon its coast. They sailed from England in the month of January, arrived at the Bermudas in February, landed at Port Royal, the scene of Ribault's first colony, for which they were destined; but in the month of April removed to the Western bank of the Ashley river, nearly opposite the present site of Charleston, and commenced the settlement of old Charlestown. They had subscribed the celebrated constitutions drawn up for the government of the colony of South Carolina, by John Locke, under the superintendence of the Earl of Shaftesbury, which granted them the

---

\* £8 or £9 per annum was all which the united industry of some of these families could gather for their support.

utmost freedom in the enjoyment of their religious opinions—a freedom which the proprietors sought afterwards to abridge. The large majority were dissenters from the Church of England, and, under their charter, immediately organized a free and republican government, that was utterly unfriendly to the aristocratical element which the constitutions of Locke vainly sought to introduce. Surrounded by savage foes, almost like the Jews when Jerusalem was to be re-built, they wrought with their weapons in one hand and their implements of labor in the other, vigilant in defence, yet industrious in their pursuits. The reservation of a Church site in their little town plot, showed that the institutions of religion were not quite forgotten. Suffering on the Old Continent for conscience sake, and removing to this to escape persecution, they could not be unmindful of their former faith. So far as we know, their religious observances were private and domestic, rather than social and public, and their contest with the wild nature by which they were surrounded, and their anxieties and many cares for the meat which perishes, may have led them proportionably to neglect that which endureth forever. Yet the fundamental constitutions of Locke declared that “no man shall be permitted to be a freeman in Carolina, or to have any habitation or estate within it, that doth not acknowledge a God, and that he is to be publicly and solemnly worshiped;” nor could any person above 17 years of age have the protection of law, or be capable of any place of profit or honor, who should not be a member of some church or religious profession, which provisions, had they been wise, would seem to mark this colony as peculiarly religious. The next year brought other colonists from England, and emigrants from the Dutch settlement of New Belgium, afterwards New York, who were soon joined by others from Holland, and the next year by emigrants from Ireland, who stipulated for the free exercise of their religion. The French Huguenots began to find their way into the new colony, and in 1680 a large number were sent out by Charles II in two public vessels.

In the first half of the second decennium of Carolina's history, great events were occurring, which had a potent influence



on this as well as other colonies of these United States. The spirit of persecution was abroad in the countries from which our population was derived. The miseries endured by the dissenters of England, and their dread of greater sufferings in the prospect of a Popish successor to the British crown, in the person of James II, drove many to these shores. Some of these were men of good fortune, and of high standing in society. One of them was Joseph Blake, brother to the celebrated Admiral of that name, who sat in the English Parliament under Cromwell, and, as a naval officer, was the antagonist of the Dutch Admiral Van Tromp, in the most brilliant period of the naval history of Great Britain. He first taught English ships to despise castles on shore, and first infused into English sailors that extraordinary courage and contempt of danger, which has given to Old England her empire over the seas. Admiral Blake was a Presbyterian in faith, a staunch republican, singularly fearless, straightforward, upright and honest. In these high qualities his less illustrious brother shared. He was a wise and prudent person, of a heroic but well balanced mind, a Presbyterian of the English stamp, sincere in his religious convictions without bigotry. The remains of his brother, with those of Cromwell's mother and daughter, and others, buried in Westminster Abbey, had, in paltry and impotent revenge, been exhumed, and cast into a pit in St. Margaret's Church Yard. He was willing enough to escape from a sovereign who had shown himself a perfidious tyrant, and from a country where freedom to worship God was denied him. He led a colony of Presbyterians from Somersetshire in 1683, who became incorporated with the early settlers of Carolina. About the same time they were reinforced by an emigration from Ireland, under the guidance of Ferguson, which mingled with the other inhabitants. In this same year the majority of the ministers in the Presbytery of Lagan intimated to the other Presbyteries of Ireland, their intention of emigrating to America, on account of "the bitter persecutions and general poverty, their great straits, and the little success of the gospel." It was in the midst of these troubles that Francis Makemie came to America, who has been called the first Presbyterian minister ever in the British-American

colonies, which is not the fact, since he himself speaks of another who had preceded him at Lynnhaven, Va. He, too, visited South Carolina in 1683, and actually sailed from Virginia in 1684, with the design of settling on Ashley River, but was driven back by contrary winds, which discouraged him in his attempt, and so the new colony of South Carolina lost those services of this most active and resolute minister, which conduced so much to the early founding of the American Presbyterian Church.\*

The new persecutions in Scotland contributed now a new element to the population of the infant colony. Charles and Archbishop Land had undertaken to coerce the Kirk of Scotland to the adoption of the liturgy, and the sincerest portion of them had been driven to the moors, glens and hills, for the worship of God. The bloody Claverhouse, and his dragoons, had been let loose upon them, and many were the horrible murders they perpetrated. Then came the skirmish at Drumclog, when the worship of the congregation was interrupted by armed troops, and so sturdy a resistance was offered, that Claverhouse was routed. The battle of Bothwell Bridge followed, in which the Presbyterians were defeated in a great measure by their own divided counsels. Four hundred were slain on the field of battle, and twelve hundred were taken prisoners. The country was now ravaged by military commissions; and, if any one would not condemn the rising at Bothwell—if any had attended conventicles or baptisings in the field—if, though they had attended at the Prelatical Churches, their wives had gone elsewhere, they were punished by impoverishing fines, by imprisonment, by torture, by the gag, thumb-screws, and the boot, by banishment to the plantations, or by death. Neither sex were spared. Isabel Alison and Mary Harvey were hung for hearing Cargill preach. Margaret McLaughlin and Margaret Wilson were fastened to stakes, between high and low water mark, and left to drown by the gradually rising tide. 1683 was known in Scottish history as

---

\* Reid II, p 425; Webster, Hist. of the Pres. Church in America, p 297.

“the killing time,” so numerous and bloody were these executions of those who persisted in adhering to their religious faith.

An attempt was now made to provide an asylum for those persecuted men in South Carolina. Several Scotch noblemen and gentlemen, who had suffered deeply in these persecutions, contracted for an entire county of 12,000 acres, and proposed to settle there some 10,000 colonists from the Presbyterians of Scotland. In 1683, Lord Cardross conveyed a band of emigrants to Port Royal, and a ship's load of sufferers, from the prisons, were transported at the same time to these distant shores, solely for their resistance to prelatical and religious oppression.\* Lord Cardross had himself been a sufferer: the royal troops had been, for a long time, quartered upon him; he had been heavily fined because Lady Cardross retained a Presbyterian minister as chaplain in her house. His house had been broken open, his papers seized, and the chaplain, Rev. John King, taken out of the house and afterwards hung. Lord Cardross founded a town at or near the present site of Beaufort, which he called Stuart Town, in honor of his wife, a daughter of Sir James Stuart—an illustrious name. William Dunlop, then a licentiate of the Church of Scotland, son of the Rev. Alexander Dunlop, a man of great shrewdness and activity of mind, accompanied him. Even at an early age he had obtained a great influence with the Presbyterian party. This influence was increased by his marriage with Sarah, sister of Principal Carstairs, a name dear to Scotland, and widely honored for his shining piety, his universal and polite learning, his candor and integrity, all of which qualities could not save him from imprisonment and cruel torture.

This William Dunlop was, as far as we know, the first Presbyterian Minister ever resident in South Carolina. In connection with Rev. Robert Wylie, he drew up the Declaration, which

---

\* Their treatment on board the vessel which brought them over, was cruel in the extreme; and, on their arrival, so many of them as could not pay their passage, were sold into bondage in Carolina. One of their neighbors, Elizabeth Living, who had come down to the dock to bid them farewell, was forcibly seized by the captain and transported with them, and only released by the interference of the Colonial Governor in the port of Charleston.

it was hoped would be adopted by the army, and conveyed it to the camp at Bothwell on the eve of the disastrous battle; and, had his paper been put forth, it would have announced only those very principles on which were based the great revolution of 1688, which brought in the house of Hanover, and displaced the perfidious house of Stuart, and which were set forth in the Declaration of American Independence. During his whole residence in America, he continued deeply interested in the affairs of Scotland, but was extremely useful to the infant colony at Port Royal, not only performing the functions of his sacred office, but acting as Major of Militia, and promoting, in various ways, the prosperity and security of his place of refuge. When, in 1690, the colony of Lord Cardross was destroyed by the Spaniards, he returned to Scotland, when he was made Principal of the University of Glasgow, and died greatly lamented in March, 1700.\*

The accession of James II, the Popish successor of Charles II, for a season but increased the sufferings of the persecuted Church. "He hated the Puritan sects," says Macaulay, "with a manifold hatred, theological and political, hereditary and personal." "He who had expressed just indignation when the priests of his own faith were hanged, drawn and quartered, amused himself with hearing Covenanters shriek, and seeing them writhe while their knees were beaten flat in the boots. In this mood he became king." Under him Baxter was brow-beaten, abused and insulted by the demoniacal Jeffreys, the most iniquitous of judges, who converted a court of law into a tribunal not less tyrannical and bloody, and far less decent than the Spanish Inquisition. The invasion of Monmouth, in concert with the Duke of Argyle, was followed by the most sanguinary vengeance. The courts held immediately after by

---

\* He left behind him two sons, Alexander—who became eminent as Professor of Greek in the same College—and William, who filled the chair of Divinity and Church History at Edinburgh. Cardross himself took up his abode in Holland and went over to England with William, Prince of Orange, who landed at Torbay in 1688. His death, which was the effect of his sufferings in the cause of religion, occurred in 1693. For the preceding facts, see Woodrow, *Sufferings of the Church of Scotland*, Vols II, III, IV.

Jeffreys, are known in legal history as "the bloody assizes." "I can smell a Presbyterian," says the judicial blackguard, "for forty miles." "Show me a Presbyterian," says he to a witness, "and I will show thee a lying knave." The condemned were hung in irons, or hung, drawn and quartered, or banished to the West Indies, being purposely sent to an unhealthy climate and an unsympathising people.

Meanwhile in France, the distressed Huguenots were visited with every kind of indignity and suffering. During the period of their toleration, one after another of the higher nobles had deserted their cause. The inferior nobles had followed, and many of the gentlemen also discovered that the path of lucrative and honorable employment was only to be found and continued by adopting the religion of the State. The ruin of the Protestants was now resolved on, and Madame de Maintenon, who, sad to say, was the grand-daughter of D'Aubigne, the famous Huguenot captain and soldier, but now the mistress of Louis XIV, lent all her influence to this ignominious cause. "If God spares the king," says she, "there will be only one religion in the kingdom." \* Soldiers were quartered upon the Reformed, and the privacy of their families destroyed. Children were permitted to enter the Church of Rome from the age of seven years, and if a child, by the terror of the rod or the offer of an orange, could be brought to express the slightest desire to join the Romish Church, or even to enter its place of worship; if it could be shown that he had joined in prayer, made the sign of

---

\* By special decrees many of the houses of worship were closed, and ministers convicted of holding unauthorised assemblies were led, by the public executioner, with a rope around their necks, and banished the kingdom. In 1670, schoolmasters were forbidden to teach the children of Protestants beyond reading, writing and arithmetic. In 1671, it was decreed that they should have but one school or teacher in any place, however large. Mixed courts, half of Protestants and half of Roman Catholics, were abolished, and the accused Huguenot must always appear before tribunals prejudiced against him. A fund was created for the conversion of Protestants, and placed under the direction of Pelisson, a convert from the Huguenot ranks, who bought his converts for six livres per head; and the "miracles of Pelisson" were a standing jest of the Court, where he was represented to be less learned, but more persuasive, than Bossuet. Protestant nobles were deprived of their nobility, which, perhaps was, in some instances, but recently conferred.

the cross, or kissed the image of the Virgin, he was taken away from the society and care of his parents, and educated in the faith of Rome, at their expense. Churches were demolished which were in the vicinity of those of the dominant faith. Greek, Hebrew and Theology were successively struck off from the curriculum of instruction in colleges and schools of the Reformed faith. The college of Sedan was destroyed in 1681, that of Montauban interdicted in 1685, and that of Saumur suppressed. At length the soldiery were sent to undertake the conversion of the Huguenots. As they entered the houses of the district of Poitou, sword in hand, they would cry, "Kill! kill!" to frighten the women and children. As long as there were money or valuables, they pillaged them of all. They would then seize them by the hair, and drag them to church, or they would torture them at slow fires by roasting their hands or feet. They would break their arms or ribs with blows, or burn their lips, or throw them into dungeons to rot. In the Canton of Berne these "booted apostles," instructed by their leader, would keep the head of the family, and other members of the household awake by noise of drums, by compelling them to maintain an erect position, pricking them with sharp instruments, pulling them about, suspending them by cords, blowing tobacco smoke up their nostrils till they were completely exhausted, and would promise any thing to escape from their complicated tortures. The soldiers offered indignities to the women. Then officers were no better. "They spat in their faces, made them lie down on burning coals, forced them to put their heads in ovens, the vapors of which were enough to suffocate them." Their study was to invent tortures which should be painful without being mortal. They affirmed that everything was permitted them by the order of their superiors, except murder and rape. The greater part of the commerce and manufactures of the nation were then in the hands of the Huguenots. Their richly furnished houses were rifled, and their stores, filled with goods, plundered. The dragoons made their horses lie down on the fine linens of Holland, and stabled them in the shops of the merchants, filled with bales of silk, wool and

cotton. At Bordeaux some were cast into the dungeons of the castle, the walls of which were arranged in the form of retorts. The miserable victims of imprisonment in these could not continue standing, lying or sitting. They were let down into them with ropes, and drawn up daily to be scourged. Many, after a few weeks of confinement, came forth from the dungeons of Grenoble without either hair or teeth. At Valance they were cast into deep pits, noisome with the stench of the decaying entrails of sheep. These combined enormities filled whole communities with terror. Many feigned conversion, to escape them. News was constantly borne to the court of Louis, of the result of these diabolical cruelties.\* Madame de Maintenon writes to her confessor, "The king is well; every courier brings him great cause for joy: news of conversions by thousands." At length he gave the finishing stroke, as he supposed, to the French Protestant Church, and signed at Fontainebleau, on the 22d of October, 1685, the Revocation of the Edict of Nantz. The Protestant temples were ordered now to be demolished, and their religious worship, both private and public, was prohibited. The ministers were to leave the country, within 14 days, on pain of the galleys. The people were not permitted to leave, and any attempt was punished by the galleys if they were men, and imprisonment if women, and by confiscation of their goods. Refugees were to return within four months, and if they did not so return, their property was to be confiscated. The day the Edict was registered, the demolition of the Church at Charenton, built by the architect Debrosse, and capable, it is said, of containing 14,000 persons,

---

\* Lonvois writes: "60,000 conversions have been made in the District of Bordeaux, and 20,000 in Montauban. There remains only 10,000 religionists in the District of Bordeaux, where, on the 15th of last month, were 150,000." The Duke of Noailles announced the entire conversion of Nismes, Uzès, Alais, Villeneuve. "The most considerable men of Nismes," he wrote, "apostatized in the church the day after my arrival." Again, he writes, "the number of religionists in this province is about 240,000; and when I asked from you till the 25th of next month for their complete conversion, I took too long a time; for I believe that will be finished by the end of the present month."

was begun and finished in five days.\* Other churches, where the eloquence of some of the noblest men of France had defended the truth, and called men to repentance, structures famous for their magnitude or architectural beauty, were levelled with the ground. The temple of Nismes was soon a heap of ruins, which was long marked by a stone in the the midst, bearing the inscription, "Here is the House of God : Here is the Gate of Heaven."† The ministers immediately left the kingdom, in haste, not knowing whither they went. They were sometimes detained on the frontiers, that they might be prevented from escaping within the appointed time, and so be doomed to the galleys. Multitudes of the people attempted their escape, were arrested, sent to the galleys, and chained for life to the benches on which they ate and slept. Among these were often men of intelligence and of illustrious descent.‡ Many were sold as slaves to the West Indies. Multitudes, notwithstanding the frontiers were guarded, escaped by night or in the day time, in innumerable disguises, or in boats, and every kind of procurable craft by sea. "600,000," says Voltaire, "fled from the persecutions of Louis, carrying with them their riches, their industry, and their implacable hatred against their king."§

The commerce and manufactures of France were crippled

\* The Rev. Thomas Cotton was an eye-witness of this desecration. "The sight of the vast assembly, there convened," says he, "was not transporting; but the thought of such numbers being devoted to banishment, to slavery, and to the most barbarous deaths, some of which I witnessed, was more than I could bear."

† "The Protestants," says Weiss, "were steeped in a lethargy of grief. They had admired Louis XIV as the greatest king of the age, obstinately believing in his good faith, his wisdom, and his humanity." They had reposed, also, on the remonstrances of the Protestant powers. Every illusion ceased, however, when they saw fall, even to the last, the eight hundred temples they possessed." Vol. I, p. 102.

‡ See lists of the sufferers in Coquerel, *Histoire des Églises du Désert*, Appendix.

§ Methods of Escape, De Felice, p 415, *et seq.* Southern Lit Gaz, p 165; and Zurich Letter, Weiss, Vol I, pp 109, 110, Comp, also, Browning's Huguenots, and Smedley.



by the departure of her most industrious and valuable citizens, and her arts and manufactures transferred to those countries where the persecuted fugitives found refuge. At this time, and from this cause, Carolina received many valuable citizens from the French Huguenots, who brought their pastors with them, and at an early period set up their worship according to the Presbyterian Faith and Order. The sufferings which they underwent in escaping from their own country to this, may be conceived by the letter of Judith Manigault to her brother: "During eight months," she says, "we had suffered from the contributions and the quartering of the soldiers, with many other inconveniences. We resolved on quitting France by night, leaving the soldiers in their beds, and abandoning the house and its furniture. We continued to hide ourselves at Romans in Dauphiny, for two days, while a search was made for us; but, our hostess being faithful, did not betray us. We passed on to Lyons, to Dijon, to Metz, to Treves, to Coblenz, to Cologne, to Holland and to England, and thence to Carolina." Of the hardships she endured, of the disease, pestilence, famine, poverty and severe labor, she graphically speaks.\* Another, who became the mother of an important family, was conveyed in her childhood over the frontier of France in a large milk-can in the pannier of a beast of burden—for the parents had assumed the guise of dairyman and dairy maid, as if going to the nearest market town to supply milk to the inhabitants for their morning meal.† A few refugees, also from the valleys of Piedmont, were among her earlier settlers. And the ill-fated project of the Scotch, which had dazzled the whole nation, of forming a New Caledonia on the Isthmus of Darien, and making it the transit of trade across the Isthmus to the East Indies, which was the noblest project since the days of Columbus, and has been revived in this our day, and will be eventually accomplished, redounded in a measure of good to the interests of Presbyterianism in South Carolina. In this project the Scotch

---

\* Yet her son, Gabriel, became wealthy in the next generation, and loaned 220,000 dollars to the American Congress to carry on the war of Independence.

† See also the escape of La Fontaine, "Huguenot Family," from p. 111 to p. 121.

nation expended 1,000,000 of dollars, and lost 2,000 men. The nobility, gentry, merchants, the people, the royal burghs and the universities, subscribed to the stock—young women threw their little fortunes into it, and widows sold their jointures to command funds for the same purpose. Six ships were built in Holland of from 36 to 60 guns, and 1,200 men, among whom were the younger sons of the noble and ancient families in Scotland, and 60 disbanded officers, who carried their tenants and retainers with them, constituted the band of emigrants which sailed from the port of Leith, amidst the tears, prayers and praises of their excited countrymen, in July, 1698. Two Presbyterian Ministers accompanied these first colonists, Messrs. James and Scot, one of whom died at sea, and the other soon after their arrival. King William ordered all Governors in the West Indies and America to refuse aid and encouragement to the colony, which he looked upon with displeasure. In about eight months the colonists, worn with sickness and want, abandoned the expedition; before learning of which the Scotch sent out another colony of 1,300 men. Three Presbyterian Ministers were with the second emigration, who were ordered by the Commission of the General Assembly to erect forthwith, a Presbytery in the colony, with Moderator and Clerk, to appoint ruling Elders and Deacons, and hold regular Kirk Sessions. These Ministers were Alexander Shields, Francis Borland and Archibald Stobo. These were joined by Captain Campbell, with the people of his own estate, in his own ship. They effected their landing at the site of the new colony, but the Spaniards came upon them with a large force, to whom, after a long and vigorous defence, they were obliged to capitulate in March, 1700. They then commenced their homeward voyage, making their way in seven vessels to the nearer British colonies. Many died on the homeward passage. Two students of Theology, who had joined the expedition, died at Jamaica. The *Rising Sun* was their largest vessel—a ship of 60 guns. She encountered a gale off the coast of Florida, which brought them into great distress, and made for the port of Charleston under a jury mast; and, while laying off Charleston bar, waiting to lighten the vessel that she might be got into port, a storm

arose, in which she went to pieces, and every person on board perished. Lieutenant Graham, Rev. Mr. Stobo and his wife, with several others, fifteen in all, had gone up to town in the ship's boat, and so were saved. This Mr. Stobo was the fourth Minister of the Church in Charleston in which the Congregationalists and Presbyterians worshipped together, and became the founder of several Churches of the Presbyterian faith along the Atlantic coast in the early part of the eighteenth century.

Of the other settlements of Presbyterians in our little State, through the eighteenth century, who came chiefly from the North of Ireland in two streams—the one by direct emigration through the port of Charleston, the other through Pennsylvania, by the Mountains of Virginia and the Up-country of North Carolina into the Upper Districts of South Carolina; of the emigrants from Switzerland and the Palatinate of Germany, who, though chiefly of the Reformed or Calvinistic faith, are now incorporated with the Lutherans; of the further emigration of the Huguenots; of the stirring period of the Revolution, when the soil of Carolina was stained with fraternal blood, in contests between the Royalists and Whigs, beyond any other State in this Union, time does not permit us specially to speak.\* Of the Huguenots and the Scotch-Irish, all, with hardly an exception, men and women, contended on the side of liberty. The muster rolls of each company are thick with the names of Presbyterian men, and every battle-field on Carolina's soil is moistened with Presbyterian blood. Several of the officers who fought in her battles were elders in the Presbyterian Church,† and it is still within the memory of some few survivors of the revolutionary period, that the men went armed to church, and sentries were posted, and marched their rounds during the time of Divine worship. The men of our Church were not wanting in that trying period.

---

\* Of the Presbyterians, the Scotch, who were far the smaller number, for the most part, though not all, sided with the king, and withdrew with the British forces.

† Generals Morgan and Pickens, at the battle of the Cowpens; Colonels Campbell, Williams, Cleveland, Shelby and Sevier, at the battle of King's Mountain; Colonel Bratton and Major Dickson, at Huck's defeat. Major Morrow and Major James were Presbyterians; and all, we believe, except Colonel Campbell, were, or became subsequently, elders in the Church.

They had learned to understand the value of a just and regulated liberty in their contests for freedom to worship God, with tyrannical Sovereigns, and persecuting hierarchies, whether of England or Rome. Her church polity suggested to her the beautiful theory of a representative government and confederated States; and if she learned, on European shores, the idea of "a Church without a Bishop," she has finished her lesson on these shores in the idea of "a State without a King," and a Church wholly sundered from political organizations. As she has been a witnessing Church for God's truth, she has been a witnessing Church for the right of private judgment and freedom of worship, and the language of her frequent and solemn Covenants, sometimes signed with blood, are reiterated in the Mecklenburg Declaration, and in the Declaration of our Nation's Independence.

But the Presbyterian Church has also, at times, held those who were unfaithful to her own engagements, and her testimony has been obscured and her glory has departed. Truth is always an importation from heaven to the human breast, and grows as an exotic there, while error is its native growth. In all countries there have been aberrations from the strict path of orthodoxy, into the regions of doubtful speculation, which, however attractive to human reason, have been fraught with evil more or less disastrous to man's salvation, and more or less offensive to Christ our Head. Those peculiar modifications of Calvinism which, in New England, have been called Hopkinsianism, and Moderate Calvinism, were long before set forth by some of the Divines of Huguenot France. Arminianism arose among the Presbyterian Churches of Holland. Moderatism, which at one time threatened the purity of the American Presbyterian Church, arose and spread its blight over the Church of Scotland. In its latitudinarianism and pretended charity, it extended the *Ægis* of its protection over the advocates of error, tolerating, for a long time, Simpson, its Professor of Divinity, in his Arminianism, Pelagianism and nascent Socinianism, giving free course for the spread of Neonomianism in the Kirk of Scotland, condemning the Marrow Men for their adherence to the Marrow of Modern

Divinity—a work containing a few unguarded expressions, but holding forth the heart of the Gospel, and which was now re-published by Thomas Boston; poisoning the minds of men\* against evangelical religion; becoming, at length, as Wither-spoon, in his inimitable characteristics says, exceeding fierce for moderation; imposing ministers upon congregations without their consent, and in spite of their determined opposition; substituting in the instructions of the pulpit, a cold, legal morality instead of the warm pulsations of spiritual life; restrained with great difficulty from abandoning subscription to the Confession of Faith at the ordination of ministers; invading the right of private judgment, and converting the Church into a subordinate yet civil organization; ruling, however, with a rod of iron, prohibiting ministerial communion with other Protestant Evangelical Churches, and so denying the existence of a “Church Universal;” and resisting, towards the close of the eighteenth century, through which all these lamentable changes took place, the rising spirit of Christian missions. In Switzerland the decadence of spiritual religion, and the growth of Rationalism, and at last of Socinianism, was even more rapid and universal, and only in our own day has a counter-revolution been first effected through the influence of Haldane, and now through D’Aubigne and his associates. In the Church of Ireland, in the first quarter of the eighteenth century, latitudinarianism crept in. The innocency of error, unless it was wilful, was maintained by a great portion; and the Deity of Christ was held to be a doctrine not essential to Christianity. The errorists refused to subscribe the Confession of Faith, when pressed by the orthodox, and the Church became divided into subscribers and non-subscribers. Indeed, strict subscription to the Confession was discontinued, for nearly half a century, in nine out of the fourteen Presbyteries of the Synod of Ulster. And the Presbyterian Church of England also passed through a rapid decline. Beginning with Baxter, who, with all his piety, had a proclivity to loose theological opinions, and never having thoroughly adopted nor carried out into practice, the

---

\* *e. g.*: Of the poet Burns, and others.

organization of the Presbyterian Church, with its Sessions, Presbyteries, and Provincial and National Synods, and with its strict subscription to the Confession of Faith, it rapidly declined through Baxterianism to Arminianism, and through Arminianism to Arianism, and from this to Socinianism, and finally almost to entire extinction.

These things are sad commentaries on the proclivity of even the best and noblest communities to error, and solemn warnings to us to be watchful against incipient heresies, and to require the strictest adherence to the form of sound words, and to the order of God's house, as embodied in our standards. Our fathers have left us a rich heritage of truth and virtue. The testimony they announced should be by us clearly uttered, and their wrestling for Christ's Crown and Covenant, and, as connected with this, for civil liberty, be imitated. We should not, in our seasons of prosperity and peace, become tolerant of error, and negligent in the rule and discipline of the Church, for God has placed us, we trust, in this New World, and in the midst of this mighty nation, and on a Continent across which is to be the path of commerce, which looks towards Europe on the East, and Asia on the West, that we may do our full share in filling it with education, with Heaven's truth, with a sense of individual responsibility and regard to law, and that we may bear forth to nations, now benighted, those rich blessings which our system of doctrine and government brought to Geneva, France, Holland, Scotland, Northern Ireland and England, in their purest and most heroic days. We have a noble, though, by the world, a despised ancestry, and we cannot desire to transmit to our children a more exalted heritage than we have received from them. Let us revive in our own minds the memory of their sufferings, their heroic deeds, and their virtues, and by our own historic labors be the medium through which a clear and distinct knowledge of our own times, and those which immediately preceded us, shall be handed down to future generations. Whether our own country continues to present the spectacle of a united, prospering people—which, may God grant!—or is divided into many and rival nations, there will still be a holy seed, which shall be the substance thereof, to bear witness to

the truth, and wrestle still for Christ's Crown and Covenant. Let us see that they enjoy a full and truthful record of the past, so far as it relates to this our heritage, that they may take up the song of Israel, and of the aged Moses, the leader of Israel, and say :

“There is none like unto the God of Jeshurun,  
Who rideth upon the Heaven in thy help,  
And His Excellency on the sky.  
The eternal God is thy refuge,  
And underneath thee are the everlasting arms :  
Happy art thou, O Israel !  
Who is like unto thee, O people saved  
By the Lord, the shield of thy help,  
And who is the sword of thy excellency !”

---

ARTICLE VIII.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

1. *The Acts of the Apostles Explained.* By JOSEPH ADDISON ALEXANDER. In two volumes. New York: Charles Scribner, 1858; 12mo., pp. 452 and 498.
2. *The Gospel according to Mark Explained.* By JOSEPH ADDISON ALEXANDER. New York: Charles Scribner. 1858; 12mo., pp. 444.

The Seminary at Princeton is yielding constantly valuable fruits of the long-continued labors of its professors. The volumes of commentary, which have been received in quick succession from the pens of Drs. Hodge and J. A. Alexander, are acceptable contributions to our theological literature, and are the more prized because they are known to be the mature result of the study of years bestowed upon the sacred Scriptures.

If any men ought to be competent interpreters of the word of God, it is those who have made the original text their constant study; who have investigated the meaning of its words and phrases again and again, as they have gone over them with successive classes, using all the means of information which the research of scholars, ancient and modern, has supplied to their hand. In whatever form such men present their exegetical labors, whether in the more critical or the more popular, whether with or without allusion to the many opinions which others have maintained, we are always interested in the judgments they give, and while we know that these are not infallible as authority, are ready to accord to them the consideration which is due them.

Dr. Alexander has been fortunate in the selection of the books of the New Testament on which he should write his first commentaries. The Book of Acts and the Second Gospel have been less frequently the subject of such works in our own language than the other historical books. The first is especially interesting to us, at the present day, in its bearing upon the great topic of Ecclesiology, which is attracting so much attention; and the materials at hand, furnished by Neander, in his *History of the Planting and Training of the Church*; by Conybeare and Howson, in their work on the *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*; by Schrader; by Baumgarten, in his *Apostolical History*; by Smith, of *Jordanhill*; and by Ols-hausen, DeWette, Meyer and Wieseler, would be likely to render a commentary on this book, by such a hand, rich and suggestive. The Gospel of Mark—brief, graphic and comprehensive—presents a field comparatively untrodden. Dr. Alexander contends for the “individuality and independence” of Mark as a writer, and, indeed, for the independent character of each of the Gospels. We have always regarded him as exceedingly happy in those general views he has given of the character and plan of those books of Scripture which have been the subject of his critical labors. He informs us that after the first chapter of his *Commentary on the Acts* was in type, he was induced to re-commence the work on a new plan, in hope of making it more generally useful. This



accounts for "the prominence given to the English version, to the exclusion of the Greek text, and the absence of any detailed reference to other writers." Experience has, no doubt, led to the conclusion that this course is more remunerative to the publishers, and secures a more extensive popularity and usefulness to such writings. We confess, however, our partiality for the other method. The Scriptures, in the original languages, are our rule of faith, and, to the scholar, it is both more instructive and interesting, when the critical process is more fully presented by a reference to the original text and the labors of others.

- 
3. *The Power of Prayer, illustrated in the wonderful displays of Divine Grace, at the Fulton Street and other Meetings in New York, and elsewhere, in 1857 and 1858.* By SAMUEL IRENÆUS PRIME. Fifth Edition. New York: Charles Scribner; 1859.

This volume has been issued from the press but a few months, and has already reached the fifth edition. It will be read with intense interest by the friends of Christ, of every name, as a record in part of the wonderful revival of the power of religion during the past year. The materials were furnished chiefly by Rev. L. G. Bingham, a constant attendant upon the meetings in New York from their inception, who also wrote several of the chapters. Drs. Plumer and Murray wrote another portion. The whole has been compiled and presented to the public by one of its favorites, the Rev. Mr. Prime. We trust the reader will share in the blessed influence which the writer of the volume seems to have enjoyed during its preparation. "Never," says he, "was my own mind so filled with *awe* as it has been while grouping these facts into consecutive pages and chapters. Never was the connection between prayer and the answer, the relation of the Asker to the Giver, so revealed to me as in the prosecution of this work."

4. *Discourses on the Common Topics of Christian Faith and Practice.* By JAMES W. ALEXANDER, D. D. New York : Charles Scribner. 1858; 8vo., pp. 453.
5. *Sermons on the New Life.* By HORACE BUSHNELL. Third Edition. New York : Charles Scribner. 12mo., pp. 456.

We are happy to know that volumes of sermons are resuming their place among the religious publications of the day most widely sought for. How much the fame of celebrated preachers, as Spurgeon and others, has contributed to this, we are not informed. No small portion of every sermon consists of direct appeals to the heart and conscience, and he who is in search only for knowledge would sooner go to writings of a more didactic character. Minute learning, and abstruse reasoning, is misplaced in discourses designed for a popular assembly. But those commanding truths of religion, which nerve the hearts of men, and furnish the staple of all Divine theology, must be handled by every preacher ; and the pastor who makes these truths the study of his life, and "seeks to find out acceptable words," and the most impressive modes of presenting them to the minds of men, is more likely to clothe them in the language of living eloquence. Barrow, though he occupied a mathematical chair in an English University—in which he was succeeded by his illustrious pupil, Sir Isaac Newton—caught no small portion of that flowing eloquence, by which he was afterwards distinguished, from the homilies of Chrysostom, which he had read in his earlier days in the Byzantine metropolis, the seat of that preacher's labors. And William Pitt is reported to have made the sermons of Barrow (few of which were delivered actually to any audience) his careful study, copying them out with his own hand, and endeavoring to form his style on the model of this great sermonizer. These things we mention to redeem the sermon from the neglect into which it has fallen, in the esteem of many.

In the sermons of Dr. Alexander there are beauties of style,

terseness and directness of expression, appropriate imagery, and depth of feeling, which make them attractive. They were all delivered in the city of New York within the last ten years, and are now sent forth, we hope, on a wider ministry.

The discourses of Dr. Bushnell are also on the common topics of practical religion, but in a wholly different vein. There is in them less of tenderness, but this is replaced by a masculine vigor of style and striking originality of expression. There is an occasional lifting up of a common and inelegant phrase into the current of discourse—sometimes, it must be admitted, with effect,—and a venturesome urging of analogous illustrations of the supernatural in religion, from the realm of nature and providence, one of which we note as a blemish; the other, unless in safe hands, as fraught with danger to the cause of truth.

The ability of the author is undoubted. But in his speculative writings he has heretofore wholly disregarded the voice of authority, and proceeded on the principle that nothing has been settled in the discussions of the past. There are some traces of the same spirit in these otherwise interesting pages. As a minor criticism, we remark that “the power of an endless life” in Heb. vii: 16, on which the sixteenth sermon is founded, we conceive to be, not the soul’s immortal being and activity, but the power of the Redeemer’s own indissoluble life and priesthood.

These two volumes of sermons are from men of different schools of theology, of different but allied denominations, and are placed by us together under the same notice, simply because received at the same time and from the same publisher. It is instructive to all who are themselves preachers, to see with what truths earnest and successful pastors have fed their own flocks, and in what form they have presented them to others. The preceding publications of Charles Scribner, are for sale at the book store of R. L. Bryan of this city, where a large assortment of books in the various departments of literature may be found.

6. *The Children of the Church, and Sealing Ordinances.* Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, No. 821, Chestnut Street; pp. 110, 16mo.

This is an article re-published from a late number of the Princeton Review. It presents a history of various theories that have prevailed amongst the various parties that occupy the ground lying between the Baptists on the one hand, who deny the children of believers any place whatever in the Church, and, on the other hand, the whole Ritual School, who hold that infants are regenerated by Baptism. The Catholic doctrine on this subject, viz: that the children of believers are members of the Church, and are to receive baptism as the badge of such membership, and seal of the duties and privileges pertaining to it, is held up in contrast with the vague opinions of many Pedo-Baptists; with the theory that these children are only *quasi* members of the Church; with the theory of Dwight, that they are members of the Church universal, but not of any particular organized Church; and with the theory of the Half-Way Covenant, which prevailed in New England in the days of Edwards, and which it cost him so much trouble and sorrow to demolish, viz: the theory that persons baptised in infancy, and free from scandal, though not members of the Church in full communion, were to have the privilege of baptism for their children. The evil consequences of this latter theory are depicted at considerable length. It is seen how "vital, experimental piety constantly decayed, and a dead formalism supervened. A decent morality, and a respectful regard for Christianity, were, in many cases, the great results expected and achieved among the mass of the congregation. Such persons were seldom competent or disposed to give their children a faithful Christian training. Ecclesiastical discipline was paralyzed; the standard of morality was itself vague, fluctuating, elastic to every demand of expediency. The system tended to ceaseless degeneracy."

This treatise urges the revival of the old practice of cate-

chizing by the pastor, and whatever else may manifest a kindly and efficient recognition by the Church of her connection with, and interest in, these lambs of the flock. We quote the concluding paragraphs :

“ We conclude with the following from the Life of Philip Henry by his son Matthew, author of the celebrated Commentary on the Bible, as showing the views, practical and theoretical, of these devout men. If we cannot see our way clear to follow them, so far as there is any appearance of requiring authoritatively what ought to be the free act of the child, we think all pious parents should rejoice and labor to bring their baptised children to such views and feelings, as would lead them freely and intelligently, in this or equivalent ways, to fulfil their baptismal obligations.

“ He drew up a short form of the baptismal covenant for the use of his children. It was this :

“ ‘ I take God the Father to be my chiefest good and highest end.

“ ‘ I take God the Son to be my Prince and Saviour.

“ ‘ I take God the Holy Ghost to be my Sanctifier, Teacher, Guide and Comforter.

“ ‘ I take the word of God to be my rule in all my actions ; and the people of God to be my people in all conditions.

“ ‘ I do likewise devote and dedicate unto the Lord my whole self, all I am, all I have, all I can do.

“ ‘ And this I do deliberately, sincerely, freely, and for ever.’

“ This he taught his children ; and they each of them solemnly repeated it every Lord’s day in the evening after they were catechized, he putting his *Amen* to it ; and sometimes adding, ‘ So say, and so do, and you are made forever.’

“ He also took great pains with them to lead them into the understanding of it, and to persuade them to a free and cheerful consent to it. And, when they grew up, he made them all write it over severally with their own hands, and very solemnly set their names to it, which he told them he would keep by him, and it should be produced as a testimony against them in case they should afterwards depart from God and turn from following after Him.

“ He was careful to bring his children betimes (when they were about sixteen years of age) to the ordinance of the Lord’s Supper, to take the covenant of God upon themselves, and to make their dedication to God their own act and deed ; and a great deal of pains he took with them to prepare them for that great ordinance, and so to translate them into the state of adult church membership.

“ In dealing with his children about their spiritual state, he took hold of them very much by the handle of their infant baptism, and frequently inculcated upon them that they were born in God’s house, and were betimes dedicated and given up to Him, and therefore were

obliged to be His servants. Psalm cxvi. 16. 'I am thy servant, because the son of thine handmaid.'"—*Miscellaneous works of Rev. Matthew Henry*: Vol. 1, pp. 51—2.

---

7. *The Last Days of Jesus, or the Appearances of our Lord during the Forty Days between the Resurrection and the Ascension.* By T. N. MOORE, D. D., Richmond, Virginia. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, No. 821 Chestnut Street; pp. 300, 12mo.

In the preparation of this work, Dr. Moore has eschewed all formal criticism and learned discussion; but has sought, nevertheless, to present us with the results of the most careful and laborious investigation. The book which he has produced is both attractive in the style and method of it, and instructive in its matter. The author discusses separately each separate appearance of our Saviour, and is led to handle many collateral subjects suggested by the various circumstances of each. We regard the work as a very valuable contribution to our popular religious literature.

---

8. *Annandale, a Story of the Days of the Covenanters.* By the author of *Marion Harvey*; pp. 196, 16mo.
9. *The Widow's Sixpence; or, Go Thou and do Likewise.* By JOSEPHINE NOLL; pp. 204, 16mo.

These are among the latest juvenile publications of our Board. The former is a well-told tale, full of pathos, and rich in its use of those Scriptures which are for the consolation of the Lord's afflicted and persecuted people. It will also serve to warm the hearts of our children towards our old mother, "wild-traditioned Scotland, with her brierly burns and braes,"

“ Whose mountain glens are tragedies,  
Whose heathy hills are song,  
Land of the Bruce and Wallace,  
Where patriot hearts have stood,  
And for their country and their faith,  
Like water poured their blood ;  
Where wives and little children  
Were steadfast to the death,  
And graves of martyr warriors  
Are in the desert heath.”

Of the other little book we cannot say anything very favorable. The conception and the execution are both very indifferent. We think the Board should never put forth any book for children that does not possess very decided merit. Writers of tales for children are so plentiful now, that the Board can surely be supplied with a sufficiency of such as are excellent.

---

10. *A Plea for the Higher Culture of Woman.* An Address delivered on Commencement Day of the Laurensville Female College, July 1, 1858. By Rev. THOMAS A. HOYT, of Abbeville, S. C. Published by request of the Trustees. Laurensville, S. C., Robert M. Stokes, Printer. 1858.

A discourse which does its author great credit for his just views on the education of woman, his finished style, and his acquaintance with the writings of men moving in the highest realms of thought.

---

11. *Music and Woman.* An Address delivered at the Commencement of the Laurensville Female College, June 30, 1858. By GUSTAVUS JAEGER, Professor of Music in L. F. C. Published by request of the Trustees. Laurensville, S. C., Robert M. Stokes, Printer. 1858.

There is music in the very language of this address, and we must congratulate its author, who is not native to this soil, on

his mastery of the English tongue, and on his felicitous style and fine imagination. The practical suggestions at the close will command the assent of the judicious. But whether his conception of the mission of woman is not in part ideal, and whether music is altogether so potent in this inharmonious, fallen world, as he enthusiastically represents, may well be doubted. We, of course, believe that there is no remedy for moral infirmity but true godliness, and though the means are varied, there is no other agent who can bestow and maintain it but the personal, Divine Spirit, the Holy Ghost. If there is something in this discourse of those mists and clouds, amidst which the German speculative mind has chosen to establish its peculiar domain, the mists are tinged with golden light, and the clouds float before us in forms of beauty. The Laurensville School was favored in enjoying, at its first anniversary, two such addresses as this and the one we have already noticed.

---

12. *The Sheepfold and the Common; or, the Evangelical Rambler.* New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, No. 530 Broadway. 1859; pp. 530.

This book blends instruction with amusement in a way which indicates the hand of a skilful writer. The events of every day life are used to illustrate the doctrines and spirit of genuine Christianity; and the dramatic form which the author has chosen to adopt, imparts freshness and vivacity to the contrasts of truth and error, and to the diversified instances of the power and energy of a living faith. The real nature of experimental religion, the essential doctrines of the Gospel, the communion of the saints, the office of the ministry, the right use of Divine ordinances, are all discussed in a way which, while it presents the truth with clearness, earnestness and sober zeal, at the same time detects and exposes the manifold forms of practical heresy and schism. It is a book of no common merit, and we sincerely wish that it may meet with a general circulation.



We have also received from the Messrs. Carters the following new publications, which we can do nothing more than advertise, as we have not been able to peruse them with the degree of care necessary to justify either praise or censure. The name of the Carters is a good endorsement.

1. *The Voice of Christian Life in Song; or Hymns and Hymn-Writers of Many Lands and Ages.*
2. *Sydney Grey: A Tale of School Life.* By the Author of *Mia and Charlie.*
3. *Sunday Afternoons in the Nursery; or Familiar Narratives from the Book of Genesis.* By the author of *Ministering Children, &c.*
4. *A Light for the Line; or the Story of Thomas Ward, a Railway Workman.* By the author of *English Hearts and English Hands, and Memorials of Captain Hedley Vicars.*
5. *The Earnest Christian. Memoirs, Letters and Journals of Harriet Maria Jukes, Wife of the Late Rev. Mark R. Jukes.* Compiled and edited by Mrs. H. A. GILBERT.

To which must be added a splendid illustrated edition of the *Pilgrim's Progress.*

- 
13. *Nature and the Supernatural, as together Constituting the One System of God.* By HORACE BUSHNELL. New York: Charles Scribner, 124 Grand Street. 1858, pp. 528.

Having received this book too late to read even a single chapter, before going to the press, we can only speak of the mechanical execution, which is in the highest style of the art, and give notice to our readers that it may be found at the book store of Mr. R. L. Bryan, of Columbia. The subject is one of immense importance,—it involves the whole controversy between science and faith, reason and revelation. If Mr. Bushnell has adjusted the relations of these conflicting parties, and brought them into harmony and reconciliation, without

concessions to prejudice and error, or unmanly compromises of the truth as it is in Jesus, he has done a great work. It would be ungenerous to utter apprehensions in advance, and therefore we shall not indulge in the language of fear, though Mr. Bushnell's antecedents might seem to justify a little suspicion.

---

14. *Progress of Philosophy in the Past and in the Future.*

By SAMUEL TYLER, of the Maryland Bar. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. London, Trübner & Co. 1858, pp. 232.

This book is a book of thought. Mr. Tyler, we have no scruple in saying, is the first philosopher in America. The work before us is itself sufficient to justify the assertion, and we congratulate the South Carolina College on having had the sagacity to discern his great merit, and the public spirit to reward it by the highest honor which a college can confer. We hope that the little volume before us—little in point of size, far from little in point of matter—is only the first fruits of what we may expect from his philosophic labors. We are proud that such a book has been written in America. We cannot now particularize its excellencies: they would require a review and not a notice; but we must single out his contributions to the philosophy of induction as among the finest specimens of modern speculation. Our hearts burned within us when we read his tributes to Bacon and to Locke. It is a treat, too, in these times, to read a book written by a man who understands logic.

---

15. *The Theology of Christian Experience, designed as an Exposition of the "Common Faith" of the Church of God.*

By GEORGE D. ARMSTRONG, D. D., Pastor of the Presbyterian Church of Norfolk, Virginia. New York: C. Scribner, 124 Grand Street. 1858; pp. 342, 12mo.

Here is another work from the house of Scribner, and one of the very best, in our judgment, ever put forth by that enterprising publisher. The author had a three-fold object in its preparation :

1. To meet the cavils of Infidels and Romanists, grounded on the lack of outward unity amongst Evangelical Christians.

2. To exhibit the "Common Faith" to thoughtful men not in the communion of any Church, and to answer the enquirer who seeks to know what is this "Experimental Religion" spoken of by all Evangelical Christians.

3. To guide young Christians in the study of God's truth, and to edify, also, the more mature believer.

These are all very desirable ends. It might be said, perhaps, that the first is of minor consequence, for who can hope ever to silence cavillers? Of the third end none can doubt the value and importance, and we feel sure that Dr. Armstrong's book will, with the blessing of God, render very great service to the Church, by ministering to the edification of her members, both old and young. But there is no lack of good books prepared to this end; and, therefore, we base our strong commendation of this production rather upon its adaptedness to secure the second end proposed by its esteemed author. We have felt the want of books prepared for intelligent and thoughtful enquirers—persons over whom the pastor's heart so often yearns with something like our Saviour's feeling towards the young man in the Gospel, that came asking, "what must I do to be saved?" We suppose there may be in every congregation through all the land, persons of this description, with whom the Minister of the Gospel loves to speak in private, confidential intercourse, concerning the interests of the soul, and for whom he oftentimes anxiously searches through his library to find a book which shall impress what he has said still more deeply; or which, it may be, shall find a closer and a more free and open reception from the individual in question than he is prepared to give to words spoken to him in conversation. We strongly recommend Dr. Armstrong's book to our brethren in the Ministry for this particular use. It covers the

whole ground of experimental religion. We are especially pleased with the contents of Book 2nd, on Sin and the Ruin it has Wrought, and on the History of Man's Ruin. The style of the book is simple, clear and forcible, and we must especially commend the author for his mode of employing illustrations. Many of the religious writers of our day seem to write their books for the illustrations, and, accordingly, these illustrations are far-fetched and overstrained. Our author seems never to go out of his way for an illustration. He is earnest, and so he never, in this matter, "oversteps the modesty of nature."

---

16. *Christian Education in its principles. A Sermon preached before the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in New Orleans, La., May 12th, 1858, in behalf of the Board of Education.* By Rev. Jno. N. WADDEL, D. D., Professor of Languages in LaGrange College, Tenn. Philadelphia: Printed by C. Sherman & Son. 1858; pp. 20, 8vo.

A very able discourse, setting forth the doctrine of the Church's duty to engage in the work of secular as well as religious education. Our difference of opinion with the respected author, upon the question he here argues, does not blind us to the merits of his argument. We have not been convinced by it, however, that the Church Courts have any authority, or that it is expedient for them to launch forth into the scheme of parochial schools and colleges, which the Board of Education urged so earnestly upon them. We have often known these Courts to be unable to command that amount of the time of their members which was requisite for the calm, thorough and patient consideration of the *ecclesiastical matters*, that imperatively called for their attention. The introduction of secular education as an affair to be *really and earnestly* managed by these Courts, would, we firmly believe, banish all strictly ecclesiastical business from our Presbyteries and Synods.

17. *The Great, the Beautiful and the Good. An Address delivered at Erskine College, Due West, August 11, 1858, before the Philomathean and Euphemian Societies.* By Rev. W. A. McSWAIN, of the South Carolina Conference. Abbeville Independent Press Print. 1858; pp. 19, 8vo.

This is an eloquent address, and well delivered, as it doubtless was, must have been highly effective. We must criticize the taste of the printer in respect to his superabundant use of marks of exclamation.

---

18. *Darkness in the Flowery Land, or Religious Notions and Popular Superstitions in North China.* By the Rev. M. SIMPSON CULBERTSON, of the Shanghai Mission of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church. New York: Charles Scribner, 377 and 399 Broadway. 1857; pp. 235, 12mo.

A thorough and careful exhibition of the Chinese religion, as found amongst the people, rather than in the writings of their sages, by Mr. Culbertson, eleven years Missionary of our Church in China. The Bhuddist religion is the chief subject of consideration, and we have one chapter devoted to a detail of the resemblances between that worship and the worship of the Romish Church. The author also furnishes an account of ancestral worship, and of necromancy, astrology and geomancy, as they are practiced among the Chinese.

---

19. *History of the Christian Church.* By PHILIP SCHAFF, D. D., author of the History of the Apostolic Church. *From the birth of Christ to the reign of Constantine, A. D. 1-311.* New York: Charles Scribner, 124 Grand street. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 38 George street. 1859.

We have here the first volume of the general history of Christianity, promised several years ago by this accomplished

author. Written in his native German, it has been translated into English, like his *History of the Apostolic Church*, by Rev. E. D. Yeomans. The translator certainly deserves again the praise awarded to him before, for the idiomatic vigor and freshness with which he has done into our tongue the German of Dr. Schaff. There is a charming vivacity and clearness in the work as we have it presented to us in its English dress. This volume carries the story of the Church down to the close of the Dioclesian persecution, and the accession of Constantine. We have had time to read only a few chapters of the work, which, however, have satisfied us that it will do no damage to Dr. Schaff's reputation for ability and scholarship. Our eye has not yet rested upon any expressions indicative either of a Pantheistic or of a Romanizing tendency. He states the history of doctrines as having for its object to show how "the mind of the Church has gradually apprehended and unfolded the Divine truth given in the Holy Scriptures; how the teachings of Scripture have come to form the dogmas of the Church, and have grown into systems stamped with public authority;" (p. 6)—a very unexceptionable mode, we should think, of stating the doctrine of Developement. He also speaks of the Books of the New Testament, as being "to this day not only the sole reliable and pure fountain of primitive Christianity, but also the infallible rule of Christian faith and practice," (p. 93.) He says: "Roman Catholicism is pagan Rome baptized;" p. 49—and he says of the Epistle to the Romans, that "it is remarkable that this thoroughly evangelical epistle was written to the mother congregation of that Roman Church which, in her subsequent development, has wandered so far from its soteriological doctrines into Jewish legalism and ritualistic form," p. 104. We trust that the fears and doubts reasonably awakened amongst the Protestants of America about Dr. Schaff, on account of some of his antecedents and associations, are not to be realized, and that our more thorough examination of the work cannot contradict the favorable impressions which a cursory glance, here and there, through this elegant volume, has made upon us.

20. *The Giant Judge; or, The Story of Samson, the Hebrew Hercules.* By Rev. W. A. SCOTT, D. D., of San Francisco. San Francisco: Whitton, Towne & Co. 1858; pp. 324, 12mo.

Dr. Scott has given to the public an interesting volume, with the above title, on that enigma of sacred history, Samson, the Giant Judge, the Hebrew Hercules, the scourge of the Philistines. The topics presented in the life of this man of weakness, and of faith, are illustrated with that various knowledge which few accumulate so successfully, amid the duties of a laborious pastorate. The motives which prompted the publication, are thus expressed:

"I frankly confess that I have an earnest desire to preach from the press to those who are scattered and toiling *far from home*, through our mountains and valleys, that I cannot reach with my voice; and to those who may hear it, I would preach again after it is silent in death. Life is uncertain, and at best will soon be spent. The mere utterances of the mouth are necessarily circumscribed in the hearing, and even when received, they are lodged in a treacherous memory. But what is *printed* remains, and has a chance to *live*. Firmly persuaded that the purity and sacredness of marriage, and the social elevation and well-being of families, and the more thorough *training and home education* of children, especially in new States, lie at the foundation of all true national prosperity, I have labored earnestly in the following pages to explain the history of Israel's Giant Judge with fidelity to the text, and to make such reflections thereon, as I humbly hope may, with the Divine blessing, promote domestic happiness, family piety, sound learning and true religion. My only hope of my country and of the world, is the Bible. An earnest faith in it, and a sincere adoption of its principles, are a present and an eternal salvation."

The appearance of this book, from the pen of an honored servant of God, and from a publishing house *on the shores of the Pacific*, when it first reached us some months ago, filled our minds with a vivid idea of the progress of Christ's kingdom. By a sudden leap, in a period of time incredibly brief, a Christian empire is established in front of Asia, the kingdom of Heaven is proclaimed, and a Christian literature is rising and finding its way to the hut of the miner, hard by the abodes of the savage of the forest.

The following recent issues of the Board of Publication have been received :

1. *Obedience the Life of Missions.* By THOMAS SMYTH, D. D.; pp. 170, 18mo.

A sequel to his former arguments, "How is the World to be Converted?" "Faith the Principle of Missions," and prepared by him as Chairman of the Committee of the Synod of South Carolina on Foreign Missions. To the friends and associates of this indefatigable author, it is cause of thanksgiving that though "the outward man perishes, the inward man is renewed day by day;" and that, in his enfeebled health, he is yet able to do so much, and so well, for the kingdom of the Redeemer.

2. *Pride, or Six Months at my Uncle's in New England.* 18mo, pp 80.
3. *Talks about Jesus.* 18mo, pp. 67.

- 
22. *The Revelation of John the Divine; or, a new Theory of the Apocalypse, corroborated by Daniel and other prophets.* By SAMUEL S. RALSTON. Philadelphia: Smith & English, 1858; 8vo., pp. 208.

We can barely acknowledge the reception of this work, and must defer to another time any further notice.

- 
23. *An Inquiry into the Law of Negro Slavery in the United States of America. To which is prefixed an Historical Sketch of Slavery.* By THOMAS R. R. COBB, of Georgia. Vol. I. Philadelphia: T. & J. W. Johnson & Co. Savannah: W. Thorne Williams. 1858; 8vo., pp. 358.

This work reaches us as our last sheets are submitted to the press. It is to be followed by another volume, and will be noticed in our next.



## PERIODICAL LITERATURE.

## I. AMERICAN QUARTERLY REVIEWS.—CONTENTS:

- I. *Princeton Review*, October, 1858. Article I. Jonathan Edwards and the Successive Forms of New Divinity. II. DeTocqueville and Lieber, as Writers on Political Science. III. The Life of Cardinal Mezzofanti. IV. Harrison on the Greek Prepositions. V. Adoption of the Confession of Faith. VI. The Revised Book of Discipline. Short Notices.
- II. *Bibliotheca Sacra*, October, 1858. Article I. Meshakah on Scepticism. II. The Conflict of Trinitarianism and Unitarianism in the Ante-Nicene Age.—By Philip Schaff, D. D. III. Baptism a Symbol of the Commencement of the New Life.—By Rev. H. L. Wayland, M. A., Worcester, Mass. IV. Homeric Ideas of the Soul and a Future Life.—By John Proudfit, D. D., Professor of Greek Literature in Rutgers College. V. Caprices and Laws of Literature.—By Rev. Leonard Withington, D. D., Newburyport, Mass. VI. The Representative System in the Constitution of Moses.—Translated from the German of Dr. Saalschütz, by S. Tuska. VII. Sacred Traditions in the East.—By Rev. E. Burgess, recently Missionary of the A. B. C. F. M. VIII. Notices of New Publications.
- III. *Mercersburg Review*, October, 1858. Article I. Reformed Synods.—By Rev. Henry Harbaugh, Lancaster, Pa. II. Gnosticism.—By Rev. Philip Schaff, D. D., Mercersburg, Pa. III. Evidences of Centralization.—By A. K. Syester, Esq., Hagerstown, Md. IV. The Incarnation.—By Prof. J. A. Reubelt, Trenton, Tennessee. V. The Interpretation of the Parable.—By Rev. E. V. Gerhart, D. D., Lancaster, Pa. VI. The Ascetic System.—By Rev. Philip Schaff, D. D., Mercersburg, Pa. VII. The Influence of the Early Church on the Institution of Slavery.—By Rev. Philip Schaff, D. D., Mercersburg, Pa. VIII. Tertullian.—By Rev. Philip Schaff, D. D., Mercersburg, Pa. IX. Recent Publications.
- IV. *Evangelical Review*, October, 1858. Article I. Illustrations of the Wisdom and Benevolence of God Derived from the Science of Meteorology. II. Reminiscences of Lutheran Clergymen. III. Schmid's Dogmatic of the Lutheran Church. IV. Liturgical Studies.—Translated from the German of the late Dr. Hœfling, by Rev. Henry S. Lassar, Pastor of the Lutheran Church in Carrollton, Ohio. V. Educational Efforts of the Pa. Synod.—By Professor F. A. Muhlenberg, of Pennsylvania College. VI. Baccalaureate Address. VII. The Testimony of the Spirit. VIII. Hermeneutical Manual. IX. Notices of New Publications.
- V. *Theological Journal*, October, 1858. Article I. Christ the Saviour only of Mankind. II. Thoughts on the Revival of Eighteen Hundred and Fifty-Eight. III. Notes on Scripture—Matthew IX.—XIII. IV. The Sufferings and Death of Believers, their Disembodied Life, and their Resurrection. V. Expositions of Portions of Scripture, for the Aid of Bible Classes. VI. The Miracles and Preaching of the Day of Pentecost. VII. Dr. Barth's Travels in Africa. VIII. Dr. Rice's Objections to the Doctrine of Christ's Premillennial Advent. Literary and Critical Notices.
- VI. *Southern Episcopalian*, November, 1858. Article I. "Lovest thou me." II. Early Religion. III. Buckle's History of Civilization, and the Quarterly Review. IV. The Sunday School. V. Extract from Rev. J. B. Campbell's Sermon on the Death of Rev. H. M. Denison. VI. "A Voice from the Dead."—A Sermon by Rev. John S. Wallace, on the Death of Rev. H. M. Denison. VII. Natural System of Family Discipline. VIII. Success to the Missionary Cause. IX. Poetry. X. Editorial and Critical. XI. Religious Intelligence.
- VII. *New Englander*, November, 1858. Article I. James A. Hillhouse. II. The Number Seven. III. Translations, and their Influence upon Scholarship. IV. The Divine Love of Truth and Beauty exemplified in the Material Creation. V. Results of the Increased Facility and Celerity of Inter-communication. VI. Art

- Exhibition in Yale College. VII. Rational Cosmology. VIII. Dr. Cleveland's Anniversary Sermon. IX. Self-supporting Missionary Colonization. X. The High School Policy of Massachusetts. XI. Dr. Thompson's Memoir of Stoddard. Review of Periodical Literature. Notices of Books.
- VIII. *The Southern Baptist Review*, July—September, 1858. Article I. Avenging of the Elect.—By D. D. Buck. II. The Rise, Progress, and History of Infant Baptism and Rantism.—By G. H. Orchard, England. III. Report of the Committee on Versions. IV. The Hopkin's "End of Controversy" Centroverted.—By A. C. D. V. Review of Peter Edwards on Baptism.—By J. M. P. VI. Polygamy.—By "C." VII. Exegesis of John iii. 3, 5.—By J. W. King. VIII. Review of "The Evils of Infant Baptism."—By R. B. C. Howell, Georgia. IX. Hanserd Knollys in America—Christian Review. X. President Edwards' Resolutions. Book Notices.
- IX. *Christian Review*, October, 1858. Article I. The Authorship of the Epistle of Jude, Concluded, (Translated).—By the Rev. Edward C. Mitchell, Bockford, Illinois. II. Yoruba Proverbs.—By Rev. Thomas J. Bowen, Ogbomeshaw, Africa. III. Hackett's Acts.—By Rev. George W. Samson, D. D., Washington, D. C. IV. Plato on Atheism.—By Rev. N. M. Williams, Somerville, Massachusetts. V. Basil an Important Witness respecting Baptism in the Fourth Century.—By Rev. Irah Chase, D. D., Boston, Massachusetts. VI. The New American Cyclopædia.—Editorial, G. B. T. VII. The Religious Element in Human Nature.—By J. A. Smith, Chicago, Illinois. VIII. The Efficacy of Prayer.—By Professor Samuel Graves, Kalamazoo, Michigan. Notices of New Publications.
- X. *Methodist Quarterly Review*, October, 1858. Article I. Modern Materialism.—By Rev. Edward Thompson, D. D., Delaware, Ohio. II. Rev. C. H. Spurgeon.—By Rev. I. W. Wiley, M. D., Pennington, N. J. III. Berlin Conference (Second Article).—By Rev. William Nast, D. D., Cincinnati, Ohio. IV. Drugs as an Indulgence.—By Rev. J. Townley Crane, D. D., Jersey City, New Jersey. V. Charles Lamb.—By Professor W. H. Barnes, Baldwin University, Berea, Ohio. VI. Wyoming.—By Rev. Zechariah Paddock, D. D., Binghamton, New York. VII. American Missions.—By Rev. D. D. Lore, Newark, New Jersey. VIII. The Oldest Opposition to Christianity, and its Defence.—By Rev. Philip Schaff, D. D., Mercersburg, Pa. IX. Popular Dental Knowledge.—By Dr. G. F. Colburn, Newark, N. J. X. Religious Intelligence. XI. Synopsis of the Quarterlies. XII. Quarterly Book-Table. XIII. Miscellanea.
- XI. *Journal of Prison Discipline and Philanthropy*, October, 1858. Article I. Reformatory Schools of Ohio. II. Recent Reports upon the Condition of Prisons in Great Britain and Ireland. III. What is the True Test of the Efficacy of a System of Prison Discipline? IV. Crimes a Natural Retribution for the Omission of Social Duties. Brief Notices.
- XII. *The Home Circle*, November, 1858. General Articles. Poetry. Editorial Department.
- XIII. *Presbyterian Magazine*, November, 1858. Miscellaneous Articles. Household Thoughts. Historical and Biographical. Review and Criticism. The Religious World. Few Words to the Many.
- XIV. *The Historical Magazine, and Notes and Queries, concerning the Antiquities, History and Biography of America*, November, 1858. General Department. Societies and their Proceedings. Notes and Queries. Obituary. Notices of New Publications. Historical and Literary Intelligence.
- XV. *DeBow's Review*, December, 1858. Article I. Acquisition of Mexico, Filibustering.—By George Fitzhugh, Esq., of Virginia. II. State Liberties, or the Right to African Contract Labor.—By H. Hughes, of Mississippi. III. Origin of Civilization—What is Property—Which is the Best Slave Race.—By Geo. Fitzhugh, of Virginia. IV. North Carolina, her Wealth, Resources, and History.—Address of Senator Clingman, of North Carolina. V. The Mississippi and New Orleans.—By B. B. Dowler, M. D., of Louisiana. VI. State Rights and State Remedies. Department of Commerce. Department of Agriculture. Department of Manufactures. Internal Improvements. Miscellaneous Department. Editorial Miscellany.

XVI. *Home, the School, and the Church*, edited by C. Van Rensselaer. 1858. Article I. Household Religion.—By the Rev. James Wood, D. D. II. The Value of a Good Wife.—By the Rev. Thomas Brainerd, D. D. III. Motives that should Influence the Conduct of a Nurse.—By Mrs. Hoare. IV. A Proper Early Training and its Priceless Value.—By the Rev. Samuel K. Talmage, D. D. V. Mutual Obligations of Christianity and Learning.—By the Rev. Leonard Bacon, D. D. VI. Religious Education under the Care of the Church.—By the Rev. James Wood, D. D. VII. Physical Education.—By Samuel H. Pennington, M. D. VIII. True Principles in the Organization of a Christian Institution.—By C. Van Rensselaer, D. D. IX. A Plea for our Educational Operations, on the Basis of Scripture.—By the Corresponding Secretary of the Board. X, XI, XII. Inaugural Exercises at the Opening of the Western Theological Seminary, at Allegheny, Pa. X. Duties and Responsibilities of the Professorial Office in Theological Seminaries.—By the Rev. Elisha P. Swift, D. D. XI. Charge to the Professor, and Address to the Audience.—By the Rev. Matthew Brown, D. D. XII. Inaugural Address.—By the Rev. Jacob J. Janeway, D. D. XIII. Go, and Preach the Gospel.—By the Rev. James M. Macdonald, D. D.

II. BRITISH PERIODICALS.

- I. *London Quarterly Review*, October, 1858. Article 1. Publications of the Arundel Society. 2. Horace and his Translators. 3. Wiseman's Last Four Popes. 4. James Watt. 5. The Roman at his Farm. 6. Sir Charles Napier. 7. The Past and Present Administrations.
- II. *Westminster Review*, October, 1858. Article 1. France under Louis Napoleon. 2. Indian Heroes. 3. F. W. Newman and his Evangelical Critics. 4. Travel during the last Half Century. 5. The Calas Tragedy. 6. Realism in Art: Recent German Fiction. 7. Outbreak of the English Revolution, 1649. 8. Contemporary Literature. 9. Note to Article 1.
- III. *Edinburgh Review*, October, 1858. Article 1. Memoirs of the Court of England during the Regency, 1811—1820. 2. Report of the Trial of Madeline Smith at Edinburgh, June, 1857. 3. History of Ancient Pottery. 4. M. Guizot's Historical Memoirs. 5. Contributions to the Philosophy of Vision. 6. The Earls of Kildare and their Ancestors. 7. Studies of Homer and the Homeric Age. 8. Guy Livingstone or Thorough. 9. The London Cotton Plant. 10. The Edinburgh Review and Mr. Froude's History.
- IV. *North British Review*, November, 1858. Article 1. The Present State of France. 2. Translations from Sanskrit. 3. German Church Historians. 4. Oxford Aristotelianism. 5. Aquatic Zoology—Sir John G. Dalyell. 6. Decimal Coinage. 7. Novels by the Authoress of "John Halifax." 8. Popular Education in Britain and Ireland. 9. Decay of Modern Satire. 10. The Atlantic Telegraph. 11. Recent Publications.
- V. *Blackwood*, November, 1858. Article 1. Buckle's History of Civilization. 2. What Will He Do With It?—By Ptolemy Caxton—Part XVIII. 3. Edward Irving. 4. The Light on the Hearth—Part III. 5. Cherbourg—The Port and Fortress. 6. Lord Canning's Reply to the Ellenborough Despatch.

III. FRENCH.

- I. *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1 Septembre, 1858; Paris. I. L'Homme de Neige, Septième Partie.—Par M. George Sand. II. Poètes Modernes de la France—Auguste Brizeux, sa Vie et ses Oeuvres.—Par M. Saint-René Taillandier. III. Les Réformes Sociales en Angleterre—De la Moralisation des Classes Dangereuses—Écoles Industrielles, Logemens des Pauvres, Prisons.—Par M. L. Davésiès de Pontès. IV. Économistes contemporains—Frédéric Bastiat, sa Vie et ses Pamphlets.—Par M. Louis Reybaud, de l'Institut. V. Une Campagne dans l'Océan-Pacifique.—2. Les Escadres Alliées Dans les Mers du Japon et de Tartarie à la Poursuite de l'Escadre Russe en 1855.—Par M. Ed. Du Hailly. VI. Sciences—De l'Esprit de la Physique Moderne.—Par M. Auguste Laugel. VII. Poésie—La Fille du Tonnelier.—Par M. André Theuriot. VIII. Chronique de la Quinzaine, Histoire Peltique et Littéraire. IX. Bulletin Bibliographique.

- II. *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 15 Septembre, 1858; Paris. I. Souvenirs d'un Amiral, seconde partie—Les Épreuves du Commandement—1. La Course sous le Directoire.—Par M. E. Jurien de La Gravière. II. L'Homme de Neige, dernière partie.—Par M. George Sand. III. Ménine, Scènes de la Vie des Landes dans l'Armagnac Noir.—Par Eugène Ducom. IV. De la Liberté des Cultes en France.—Par M. Prevost Paradol. V. Historiens Modernes de la France—Augustin Thierry.—Par M. Edmond de Guerle. VI. La Question du Servage en Russie—III. Les Réformes Accomplies et les Réformes Projetées pour l'Émancipation des Serfs, dernière partie.—Par M. L. Wolowski, de l'Institut. VII. Du Sérieux et du Romanesque dans la Vie Anglaise et Américaine, a propos d'un Roman Anglais.—M. Arthur Dudley. VIII. Chronique de la Quinzaine, Histoire Politique et Littéraire. IX. Bulletin Bibliographique.
- III. *Revue Chrétienne*, 15 Septembre, 1858; Paris. Article I. La Philosophie de la Religion, par M. Matter.—Par Ch. Waddington. II. Guillaume III, par Macaulay.—Par L. Vulliemin. III. D'une Récent Discussion sur l'Apologie de Pascal.—Par Ed. de Pressensé. IV. Bulletin Bibliographique.—*Histoire des Trois Premiers Siècles de l'Eglise Chrétienne*.—Par Ed. de Pressensé.—2 vol. V. Revue du Mois.—Prétentions Ultra-montaines.—Conférence Pastorale de Berlin.—Synode du Vigan.—Conférence Universelle des Unions Chrétiennes de Jeunes Gens à Genève.
- IV. *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1 Octobre, 1858; Paris. I. Peintres Modernes de la France—Ary Scheffer.—Par M. L. Vitet, de l'Académie Française. II. Politique Coloniale de la France—1. Le Sénégal et la Guerre.—Par M. Jules Duval. III. Anouchka, Souvenirs des Bords du Rhin.—Par M. Ivan Tourguenef. IV. Le Crédit Foncier, ses Transformations et ses Progrès en France.—Par M. Bailleux de Marizy. V. Les Voyages et les Voyageurs en Chemins de Fer.—Par M. Lamé Fleury. VI. De la Poésie dans ses Rapports a l'Histoire—La Bataille de Lépante et le Poète Herrera.—Par M. Villemain, de l'Académie Française. VII. Souvenirs d'un Amiral, seconde partie—Les Épreuves du Commandement.—2. Les Croisières d'une Frégate.—Par M. E. Jurien de La Gravière. VIII. La Musique dans les Villes Rhénanes.—Par M. P. Scudo. IX. Chronique de la Quinzaine, Histoire Politique et Littéraire. X. Bulletin Bibliographique.
- V. *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 15 Octobre, 1858; Paris. I. La Philosophie et l'Histoire en Allemagne—Les Nouvelles Ecoles—Hermann Fichte, Théodore Mommsen, etc.—Par M. Saint-René Taillandier. II. Le Roman Radical en Angleterre a propos des Mœurs de l'Aristocratie et du Clergé.—Par M. Emile Montégut. III. Mos de Lavène, Scènes et Souvenirs du Bas-Languedoc.—Par M<sup>me</sup> Claire Sénart. IV. Politique Coloniale de la France—2. Le Sénégal et la Paix, les Progrès et les Ressources de la Colonie.—Par M. Jules Duval. V. Du Régime Commercial de l'Algérie.—Par M. Charles Lavollée. VI. Mac-fy, Episode de la Vie Écossaise.—Par M. P. de Castellane. VII. Souvenirs d'un Amiral, seconde partie—Les Épreuves du Commandement—3. Une Expédition a Saint-Domingue.—Par M. E. Jurien de La Gravière. VIII. Chronique de la Quinzaine, Histoire Politique et Littéraire. IX. Le Roman et le Théâtre.—Par M. E. Lataye. X. Bulletin Bibliographique.
- VI. *Revue Chrétienne*, 15 Octobre, 1858; Paris. Article I. Etude sur Quelques Mystiques du Moyen Age.—Par J. Sandoz. II. Les Poètes de la foi Évangélique en Allemagne.—Par C. Monnard. III. Causerie sur les États-Unis.—Par Th. Monod. IV. Lettre de M. de Pressensé. V. Revue du mois.—La Liberté Religieuse Défendue.—Par M. Prevost-Paradol. VI. Un grand Succès Littéraire.—Mort de M. le Professeur Roget.
- VII. *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1 Novembre, 1858; Paris. Article I. De La Civilization Moderne.—Par M. Charles de Rémusat, de l'Académie Française. II. Une Année dans le Sahel, Journal d'un Absent, première partie.—Par M. Eugène Fromentin. III. Les Contrebandiers du Noirmont, Scènes Jurassiennes.—Par M. Charles Toubin. IV. Les Chinois Hors de la Chine.—Par M. Alfred Jacobs. V. Les Derniers Momens de l'Empire Mogol.—2. Touka-dji-Holkar et Madhadji-Sindyah.—Par M. Théodore Pavie. VI. Souvenirs d'un Amiral, seconde

partie.—Les Épreuves du Commandement.—4. La Marine de l'Empire.—Par M. E. Jurien de La Gravière. VII. Le Roman Intime de La Littérature Réaliste.—Par M. Emile Montégut. VIII. Chronique de La Quinzaine, Histoire Politique et Littéraire. IX. Revue Musicale.—Par M. P. Seudo. X. Critique Historique.—Les Révolutions D'Italie. XI. Bulletin Bibliographique.

THE SOUTHERN  
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW,

CONDUCTED BY

AN ASSOCIATION OF MINISTERS,

IN

COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA.

---

Vol. XI.

JULY, MDCCCLVIII.

No. 2.

---

COLUMBIA, S. C.:  
STEAM-POWER PRESS OF R. W. GIBBES.

1858.

Digitized by Google

## CONTENTS.

---

ARTICLE	PAGE
I.—ALEXANDER VON HUMBOLDT, BY Prof. C. S. VENABLE, South Carolina Collège, - - - -	153
II.—THE TRINITY OF THE GODHEAD, THE DOCTRINE OF • THE HOLY SCRIPTURES, (CONTINUED,) BY THOMAS SMYTH, D. D. - - - -	175
III.—DR. WAYLAND ON THE LIMITS OF HUMAN RESPON- SIBILITY, ANONYMOUS, - - - -	194
IV.—POPULAR OBJECTIONS TO SCIENCE, BY Prof. J. R. BLAKE, LaGrange College, Tenn. - - - -	206
V.—THE MIND OF MAN, THE IMAGE OF GOD, BY JOHN T. L. PRESTON, Lexington, Va. - - - -	228
VI.—THE RELIGIOUS AWAKENING OF 1858, BY Rev. J. O. LINDSAY, - - - -	246
VII.—THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF 1858, BY Rev. GEORGE HOWE, D. D., - - - -	264
VIII.—CRITICAL NOTICES, - - - -	344
IX.—PERIODICAL LITERATURE, - - - -	351

## AGENTS.

Rev. A. W. Miller, . . . . .	Pe'ersburg, Virginia.
Rev. S. A. Stanfield, . . . . .	Harmony, North Carolina.
Rev. A. A. Morse, . . . . .	Andersen C. H., South Carolina.
Mr. J. Rosser, . . . . .	Camden, South Carolina.
Mr. John Russell, . . . . .	Charleston, South Carolina.
Mr. Wm. E. Mills, . . . . .	Mt. Clio, Sumter, South Carolina.
Mr. John R. Dow, . . . . .	John's Island, South Carolina.
Mr. W. G. Foote, . . . . .	Savannah, Georgia.
Rev. J. P. McMullen, . . . . .	Havanna, Alabama.
Rev. Wm. Flinn, . . . . .	Milledgeville, Georgia.
Mr. J. Whiting, . . . . .	Montgomery, Alabama.
Rev. R. S. Gladney, . . . . .	Aberdeen, Mississippi.
Nash & Woodhouse, . . . . .	Richmond, Virginia.
Rev. W. A. Scott, D. D., . . . . .	San Francisco, California.
Mr. Joseph M. Wilson, . . . . .	223 Chesnut street, Philadelphia.
Mr. James Armour, . . . . .	Memphis, Tennessee.
Rev. J. M. Becton, . . . . .	Larissa, Cherokee Co., Texas.
W. N. White & Brother, . . . . .	Athens, Georgia.
J. D. Ghiselin, Jr., . . . . .	Norfolk, Virginia.

N. B.—Mr. E. H. Britton no longer acts as collecting agent for this work.



THE  
SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW

Is published Quarterly, in April, July, October and January, at Three Dollars per annum, payable in advance.

☞ All Communications should be addressed to the Editors of the Southern Presbyterian Review, Columbia, S. C. No subscriptions taken for less than a year, and subscribers should remember that a subscription cannot be discontinued legally until all arrearages are paid, nor after the first number of a volume is published. The volume commences with the April number, and not at the beginning of the year.

☞ A few copies of the back volumes can be had at reduced prices, with the exception of vol. I, the first No. of which can not be furnished. Fifty cents will be paid for any copies of this number, (vol. I, No. 1,) which may be returned to our address.

☞ Subscribers in arrears will find their bills enclosed in the present number. Their attention is especially directed to them, as the necessities of our publication require prompt payment.

☞ Ministers of the Gospel, and others, who shall obtain three new subscribers, and remit the regular price, (Three Dollars each,) will be entitled to a copy of the Review for one year, or, if they so prefer, fifty cents for each new subscriber.

N. B.—Several persons, who are not subscribers, will receive this number as a specimen; we solicit their patronage and co-operation. Should they not desire to become subscribers, they are requested to return the copies sent.

☞ Subscribers changing their Post-Office are requested to give immediate notice of the same to the Editors, or their Review will be sent to their former office.

THE SOUTHERN  
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW,

CONDUCTED BY

AN ASSOCIATION OF MINISTERS,

IN

COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA.

---

Vol. XI.      OCTOBER, MDCCLVIII.      No. 3.

---

COLUMBIA, S. C.:  
STEAM-POWER PRESS OF R. W. GIBBES.

1858.

## CONTENTS.

---

ARTICLE	PAGE
I.—SYMMETRY AND BEAUTY OF GOD'S WITNESSING CHURCH, BY S. J. BAIRD, - - -	357
II.—A REASONABLE ANSWER TO THE SKEPTIC, BY Rev. W. C. DANA, D. D., - - -	386
III.—OUR DOMESTIC MISSIONS—THE TRUE THEORY OF THEIR CONDUCT AND MANAGEMENT, BY Rev. G. C. GREGG, - - -	402
IV.—HALSEY'S LITERARY ATTRACTIONS OF THE BIBLE, BY J. N. WADDELL, D. D., - - -	419
V.—THE CONVERSION OF THE WORLD, BY Rev. J. G. SHEP-PERSON, - - -	449
VI.—CHRISTIANITY—A DISCIPLINARY ELEMENT IN AN EDUCATION, BY Rev. J. A. LYON, - - -	470
VII.—STUART ROBINSON'S CHURCH OF GOD, ANONYMOUS, -	480
VIII.—CRITICAL NOTICES, - - -	500

## AGENTS.

---

Rev. A. W. Miller, . . . . .	Petersburg, Virginia.
Rev. S. A. Stanfield, . . . . .	Harmony, North Carolina.
Rev. A. A. Morse, . . . . .	Anderson C. H., South Carolina.
Mr. J. Rosser, . . . . .	Camden, South Carolina.
Mr. John Russell, . . . . .	Charleston, South Carolina.
Mr. Wm. E. Mills, . . . . .	Mt. Clio, Sumter, South Carolina.
Mr. John R. Dow, . . . . .	John's Island, South Carolina.
Mr. W. G. Foote, . . . . .	Savannah, Georgia.
Rev. J. P. McMullen, . . . . .	Havanna, Alabama.
Rev. Wm. Flinn, . . . . .	Milledgeville, Georgia.
Mr. J. Whiting, . . . . .	Montgomery, Alabama.
Rev. R. S. Gladney, . . . . .	Alberdeen, Mississippi.
Nash & Woodhouse, . . . . .	Richmond, Virginia.
Rev. W. A. Scott, D. D., . . . . .	San Francisco, California.
Mr. Joseph M. Wilson, . . . . .	228 Chesnut street, Philadelphia.
Mr. James Armour, . . . . .	Memphis, Tennessee.
Rev. J. M. Beeton, . . . . .	Larissa, Cherokee Co., Texas.
W. N. White & Brother, . . . . .	Athens, Georgia.
J. D. Ghiselin, Jr., . . . . .	Norfolk, Virginia.

N. B.—Mr. E. H. Britton no longer acts as collecting agent for this work.

THE  
SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW

Is published Quarterly, in April, July, October and January, at Three Dollars per annum, payable in advance.

☞ All Communications should be addressed to the Editors of the Southern Presbyterian Review, Columbia, S. C. No subscriptions taken for less than a year, and subscribers should remember that a subscription cannot be discontinued legally until all arrearages are paid, nor after the first number of a volume is published. The volume commences with the April number, and not at the beginning of the year.

☞ A few copies of the back volumes can be had at reduced prices, with the exception of vol. I, the first No. of which can not be furnished. Fifty cents will be paid for any copies of this number, (vol. I, No. 1,) which may be returned to our address.

☞ Subscribers in arrears will find their bills enclosed in the present number. Their attention is especially directed to them, as the necessities of our publication require prompt payment.

☞ Ministers of the Gospel, and others, who shall obtain three new subscribers, and remit the regular price, (Three Dollars each,) will be entitled to a copy of the Review for one year, or, if they so prefer, fifty cents for each new subscriber.

N. B.—Several persons, who are not subscribers, will receive this number as a specimen; we solicit their patronage and co-operation. Should they not desire to become subscribers, they are requested to return the copies sent.

☞ Subscribers changing their Post-Office are requested to give immediate notice of the same to the Editors, or their Review will be sent to their former office.

THE SOUTHERN  
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW,

CONDUCTED BY

AN ASSOCIATION OF MINISTERS,

IN

COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA.

---

Vol. XI.

JANUARY, MDCCCLIX.

No. 4.

---

COLUMBIA, S. C.:  
STEAM-POWER PRESS OF R. W. GIBBES.

1859.

## CONTENTS

---

ARTICLES	PAGE
I.—THE ASTRONOMICAL ARGUMENT AGAINST CHRISTIANITY, BY Rev. THOMAS A. HOYT, - -	513
II.—THE STATESMAN, BY W. C. MORAGNE, Esq., - -	531
III.—THE FULLNESS OF TIME, BY S. J. P. ANDERSON, D. D., - - - - -	556
IV.—MORALITY OF THE LEGAL PROFESSION, BY ROBT. L. DABNEY, D. D., - - - - -	571
V.—THE SUPPORT OF SUPERANNUATED MINISTERS, AND THE INDIGENT FAMILIES OF DECEASED MINISTERS, BY Rev. J. L. GIRARDEAU, - - -	592
VI.—THE PROPHETIC PERIOD OF 1260 YEARS, BY Prof. E. C. ROCKWELL, - - - - -	609
VII.—THE EARLY PRESBYTERIAN IMMIGRATION INTO SOUTH CAROLINA, BY REV. GEORGE HOWE, D. D., -	627
VIII.—CRITICAL NOTICES, - - - - -	665
IX.—PERIODICAL LITERATURE, - - - - -	682

## AGENTS.

---

Rev. A. W. Miller, . . . . .	Petersburg, Virginia.
Rev. S. A. Stanfield, . . . . .	Milton, North Carolina.
Rev. A. A. Morse, . . . . .	Anderson C. H., South Carolina.
Mr. J. Rosser, . . . . .	Camden, South Carolina.
Mr. John Russell, . . . . .	Charleston, South Carolina.
Mr. Wm. E. Mills, . . . . .	Mt. Clio, Sumter, South Carolina.
Mr. John R. Dow, . . . . .	John's Island, South Carolina.
Mr. W. G. Foote, . . . . .	Savannah, Georgia.
Rev. J. P. McMullen, . . . . .	Pleasant Ridge, Alabama.
Rev. Wm. Flinn, . . . . .	Milledgeville, Georgia.
Mr. J. Whiting, . . . . .	Montgomery, Alabama.
Rev. R. S. Gladney, . . . . .	Aberdeen, Mississippi.
Nash & Woodhouse, . . . . .	Richmond, Virginia.
Rev. W. A. Scott, D. D., . . . . .	San Francisco, California.
Mr. Joseph M. Wilson, . . . . .	228 Chesnut street, Philadelphia.
Mr. James Armour, . . . . .	Memphis, Tennessee.
Rev. J. M. Becton, . . . . .	Larissa, Cherokee Co., Texas.
W. N. White & Brother, . . . . .	Athens, Georgia.
J. D. Ghiselin, Jr., . . . . .	Norfolk, Virginia.
Rev. B. M. Palmer, D. D., . . . . .	New Orleans, Louisiana.

N. B.—Mr. E. H. Britton no longer acts as collecting agent for this work.



THE  
SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW

Is published Quarterly, in April, July, October and January, at Three Dollars per annum, payable in advance.

☞ All Communications should be addressed to the Editors of the Southern Presbyterian Review, Columbia, S. C. No subscriptions taken for less than a year, and subscribers should remember that a subscription cannot be discontinued legally until all arrearages are paid, nor after the first number of a volume is published. The volume commences with the April number, and not at the beginning of the year.

☞ A few copies of the back volumes can be had at reduced prices, with the exception of vol. I, the first No. of which can not be furnished. Five cents will be paid for any copies of this number, and may be returned to our address.

☞ Arrears will do us a great favor by remitting the necessities of our publication require prompt

the Gospel, and others, who shall obtain three copies, will remit the regular price, (Three Dollars each,) and receive a copy of the Review for one year, or, if they so desire, fifty cents for each new subscriber.

N. B.—Several persons, who are not subscribers, will receive this number as a specimen; we solicit their patronage and co-operation. Should they not desire to become subscribers, they are requested to return the copies sent.

☞ Subscribers changing their Post-Office are requested to give immediate notice of the same to the Editors, or their Review will be sent to their former office.