

THE SOUTHERN
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW,

CONDUCTED BY

AN ASSOCIATION OF MINISTERS

IN

COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA.

Vol. XIX. JANUARY, MDCCCLXVIII. No. 1.

COLUMBIA, S. C.
PRINTED AT THE OFFICE OF THE REVIEW.

1868.

CONTENTS.

ARTICLE	PAGE
I. Congregational Temporalities. By the Rev. W. H. RUFFNER, Lexington, Va.,	1
II. Shakespeare,	19
III. Inauguration of the Rev. Dr. Plumer,	29
IV. The Paradise of the Levellers,	48
V. Jones's History of the Church. By the Rev. GEO. HOWE, D. D., Columbia, S. C.,	68
VI. Sketch of the Life of the Rev. Stephen Frontis. By the Rev. Prof. E. F. ROCKWELL, Davidson College, N. C.,	87
VII. The General Assembly,	98
VIII. Critical Notices:	134
1. Schaff's Person of Christ. 2. Tenney's Manual of Zoology.	
3. Perry's Elements of Political Economy. 4. On Both Sides of the Sea.	

In the last number we sent bills to all of our subscribers who were in arrears. From about one-fourth of them we have received prompt and gratifying replies. We hope the reception of the present number may remind the remaining three-fourths of the importance (to us) of immediate payment. We would be glad to receive payment for the current volume also.

Money may be sent at our risk and expense in registered letters or in the form of post office orders; but we cannot assume the risk when the money is sent in unregistered letters.

THE SOUTHERN
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW,

CONDUCTED BY

AN ASSOCIATION OF MINISTERS

IN

COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA.

VOLUME XIX.

COLUMBIA, S. C.
PRINTED AT THE OFFICE OF THE REVIEW.

1868.

THE LIBRARY
THE UNIVERSITY
OF TEXAS

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Congregational Temporalities. By the Rev. W. H. RUFFNER,	1
Shakespeare, - - - - -	19
Inauguration of the Rev. Dr. Wm. S. Plumer, - - -	29
The Paradise of the Levellers, - - - - -	48
Jones's History of the Church. By the Rev. GEORGE HOWE, D. D., - - - - -	68
Sketch of the Life of the Rev. Stephen Frontis. By the Rev. E. F. ROCKWELL, - - - - -	87
The General Assembly of 1867, - - - - -	98
Popular Revivals. By the Rev. JOHN S. GRASTY, - -	153
The Formation of the English Language, - - - -	170
Right and Wrong; or, A Check to Atheism. Part II. By the Rev. F. A. ROSS, D. D., - - - - -	184
Ritualism. By B. T. W., - - - - -	238
The Future of the Freedmen, - - - - -	268
Hodge on the Atonement. By the Rev. A. A. PORTER, D. D.,	313
Technical Development of Attic Tragedy. By Prof. A. SACHTLEBEN, - - - - -	357
Canonicity and Inspiration of the Sacred Scriptures. By the Rev. B. GILDERSLEEVE, - - - - -	370
Powers of the General Assembly. By the Rev. I. J. LONG,	395
The Reviewer Reviewed; or, Dr. Ross on Right and Wrong,	404
The General Assembly of 1868, - - - - -	430
The History of the Spiritual Kingdom. By the Rev. JAS. B. RAMSEY, D. D., - - - - -	465
The Attitude of the Ancient Mind with respect to Truth,	502
The Scriptural and Divine Right for Using Mechanical as well as Vocal Instruments in the Worship of God. By the Rev. THOS. SMYTH, D. D., - - - - -	517

BIBLIOPHILE'S

The Great Commission. By the Rev. JOHN S. GRASTY,	PAGE 556
Critical Notices:	

Schaff's Person of Christ, 134. Tenney's Manual of Zoology, 139. Perry's Elements of Political Economy, 142. On Both Sides of the Sea, 148. Ecce Ecclesia, 295. Palmer's Book of Praise, 298. Bridges' Christian Ministry, 300. Ecce Deus-Homo, 302. Macduff's Memories of Olivet, 303. Tanner's Apology for African Methodism, 305. Lindsay's Lectures on the Epistle to the Hebrews, 449. Spiritual Progress 450. Lord's Old Roman World, 453. Stephens's Constitutional View of the Late War, 458. Alfriend's Life of Jefferson Davis, 461. Smyth's Ecclesiastical Catechism, 588. Scott's Centurions of the Gospel, 595. Hart's In the School-Room, 598. Keith's Lectures on Calvinistic Doctrines, 601. Bonar's Light and Truth, 604. Baird's History of the New School, 605.

THE SOUTHERN
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XIX.—NO. 1.

JANUARY, MDCCCLXVIII.

ARTICLE I.

CONGREGATIONAL TEMPORALITIES.

The whole subject of the temporalities of the Church should be elaborated into a science, which might be called Ecclesiastical Economy; and should occupy the place in ecclesiastical literature that Political Economy does in civil. It is a subject worthy of the best efforts of the best minds in the Church, and is susceptible of a thoroughly philosophical treatment. It is of almost fundamental importance when considered in its spiritual aspects; and yet it has generally received only an empirical treatment. It is a subject whose abstract doctrines grow out of the profoundest ideas of religion, both natural and revealed, and also have intimate relations with metaphysics, ethics, history, political economy, and the relations of Church and State; and until it is understood, systematized, and taught in its breadth, the temporalities will continue to be the "evil genius" of the Church, instead of a source of comfort, stability, and spiritual prosperity.

VOL. XIX., NO. 1.—1.

JAN 1 0 1938
S. L. ...
1.25 4F

The Church first needs to be relieved of that latent impression that her houses and lands, her revenues and investments, have something of a contraband character about them; that they are a kind of painful incident of Christianity, and not a part of its organic life. It is easy enough to show, from the Scriptures, and from the history of the Church, that the handling of these temporalities must accompany ecclesiastical work; but it is not easy to show to the apprehension of all, that these temporalities are not simply artificial vestments required for comfort and decency, but may be better represented by the physical organism in which the soul of man resides, and by means of which its life is fed and its activities put forth. In our present sphere, spirit must utter itself through material agencies. All through the Bible, in a thousand forms, is the alliance proclaimed between the temporal and the spiritual. The God-man teaches it in the very constitution of his nature, and in his life. What he denounced, and what alone the Church ought to denounce, was not the subjection of matter to spirit, but the subjection of spirit to matter: it was the looking at the seen and the temporal as the end of the heart's desire, instead of the instrument of the unseen and the eternal; it was making mammon a god instead of a servant. Christ distinctly teaches us to use mammon aright, declaring that he may be made a friend who will conduct us to the everlasting habitations.

The Church itself is but a corporation in the original sense—a body—a body formed like many vegetable bulbs, which consist of an aggregation of small bulbs united to form a single large one, and each part possessing a complete organism, capable of independent life, and the united whole requiring for its growth exactly the conditions required by each separate part.

All the considerations which render it necessary for the individual Christian to have temporal affairs, apply with equal force to the body of individual Christians, which is called the Church. The Church has to gather a support for herself. She has to provide herself with accommodations, to pay her current expenses. She has to educate her children. She has to help the needy, and to do good in the world generally. If such re-

marks seem to degrade the Church by giving it a secular aspect, it is only because, in all the earth, and in all ages, God's temporal gifts to man have been secularized, abused, and perverted. "The gold is mine, and the silver is mine, and the cattle upon a thousand hills," saith the Lord; and yet every man has been saying, "My money is my own, I will do what I please with it;" and so the rich blessings of the great Father of us all have become so associated with the impiety and wickedness of mankind, that they have lost their heavenly aroma, and smell of the earth.

This is all wrong; and a part of the Church's work is to correct public sentiment upon this subject, and to restore the wealth of the world to its rightful ownership and uses—but of this we shall speak presently.

The point in hand just now is the fact that the Church needs the use of temporal things for much the same reasons and uses that her individual members need them; namely, as necessary incidents of the mundane existence.

The next remark is, that with the Church, as with individuals, the getting, the managing, and the disposing of these temporal things, have deeper and more important uses in the spiritual economy of God's kingdom than in the temporal. "The life is more than meat, and the body than raiment." You that seek after these things only as the nations of the earth seek after them, have need of a deeper insight. "Labor not for the meat that perisheth, but for that meat that endureth unto eternal life, which I shall give you." The feeding of the inner man is the paramount concern. You must have carnal food, of course—even the lilies had to draw nourishment from the earth—but in your strivings remember that it is your heavenly Father who feedeth you, and let this fact bring your soul into its true relations, and teach you that the life of faith with its peaceful trust and its constant discipline of self, in order to fulfil the wishes of the Parent of good, is the real, true, paramount, unending life of every man; and that all these temporal things are meant to serve the spiritual.

If we study the principles which underlie success in temporal

TxU

affairs, we shall see that they are so entirely opposed to any immoral or atheistic tendency, as to furnish one of many illustrations of the resoluteness with which man perverts the provisions God has given for his spiritual culture. They are all virtues worthy of imitation, and furnish an excellent and elevating discipline to human character. The practical evil among men of the world in their secular affairs is their neglect or violation of these principles; and this comes partly from ignorance and partly from evil example, but chiefly from a low moral sense in relation to the whole matter. For this state of things, existing so long under the light of Christian intelligence, the Church is in part responsible, because, owing to unsettled views in the Church itself, there has been a failure on her part in teaching society right principles in reference to this matter.

Now it must be evident upon a close examination, inasmuch as the relations of the Church to temporal affairs are similar to those of individuals, that the teaching office of the Church was meant to cover this whole subject. Of necessity she must have principles for her own action, and these principles are the same which should regulate individual action; and consequently, she must occupy the position either of a teacher of the world or of a learner from the world; and we can hardly suppose the latter to be becoming. In either case, she must give her mind studiously to the subject, and at least not be behind the world in intelligence, wisdom, and all necessary practical virtues. She should be prepared to show, by precept and example, how the temporal may receive its proper share of attention, and yet remain ancillary to the spiritual.

Let us now bring these principles to bear specially upon *congregational finances*.

The congregation is the first ecclesiastical remove from the individual—hence has more in common with him than the higher bodies have, and has need to refer more directly to the principles needed in daily private life. When a number of gentlemen organise a banking or a railway company, they do not find it needful to seek out new principles of business, but only to apply the ordinary principles to new subjects. Thus should it be in

congregational affairs. The fundamental principles of business are the same in all temporal matters, whether ecclesiastical, civil, or private. And this fact being obvious, it is astonishing that the Church has been so long in finding it out, and has so long been managing her business in a style that would have disgraced an individual, or ruined a State.

Manifestly then, every congregation should sharply recognise the fact that it *has temporal business* committed to it as a part of its Christian organisation and current duty; and that this business requires to be managed on exactly the same principles with their own private business. It is not meant by this that the congregation should be actuated by worldly motives, or should follow bad examples in private life, where even good men are often negligent, often worldly-minded, and sometimes a little given to the "tricks of trade," and also to mean and penurious habits of economy; nor indeed that she should follow examples at all, but right principles, eliminated from the Scriptures and from the world's experience, and purified from all contaminations. The Church needs this for herself, and she needs to learn this, in order to teach her own members and the world how to conduct their private affairs successfully, without detriment to their religious character and influence. For what other purposes can we imagine the Church to have been intrusted with temporalities at all?

If these remarks be just, we should next inquire what are the true, sound, scriptural principles on which men, individually and collectively, should conduct their temporal affairs. In determining these, it must not be expected that for every business maxim we can find a text. Christianity, as taught by our Saviour, and as spread upon the pages of the New Testament, is something very different from a code of laws. The few special practical instructions are incidental and illustrative, not systematic or exhaustive. Christianity is a spirit, not a set of statutes. It has but one law—the law of love—and under the inspiration of this divine affection, and the guidance of the scattered way-marks left us in the Scriptures, we may surely find our way into all the paths of duty.

But whilst we may not expect to find in the Scriptures, even in detached fragments, a complete system of business, we may and do find there given all the cardinal features of a wise business economy.

The main features of a good business character are industry, attention, system, calculation, self-control, prudence, economy, punctuality, perseverance, and greater than any, integrity and honor; and then, at the bottom of all, a high motive.

Now it would be easy to take these points in detail, and show by either express precept or easy application of general principles, that these are all Christian virtues, which every man's religion requires him to cultivate; and that he who neglects any one of them in his daily business is living in sin, and would properly be amenable to the censures of the Church, if the Church herself had not been so remiss. But the time has come for judgment to begin at the house of God.

Let the judicatories insist then upon every congregation taking up its temporal affairs with the same zeal and under the guidance of the same principles which every man brings, or ought to bring, to his own private affairs. Ring in the ears of every slothful servant the words of the Master, "Occupy till I come;" "If you are unfaithful with the mammon of unrighteousness, who will commit to you the true riches?" Will you persist in representing the unjust steward, who was far more careful to provide for himself individually than to protect his Lord's interest? Will you rise early, and sit up late, and eat the bread of carefulness, that you may add field to field; and only spare a hurried hour now and then to the Lord's business? Will you be very watchful and sharp at a bargain for yourself, but consider it quite out of the question to do a little financiering for the Church? Will you be very careful to protect your business honor, and yet see the congregation to which you belong *disgraced* by the neglect of such as you? You are not content to put clerks behind your counters, foremen in your workshops, and managers in your fields, and let them carry on your business in any sort of fashion, you neither knowing nor caring what they are about; but you are quite willing, perhaps you are very

glad, to find men willing to take the deacon's office, in order that your conscience may have a perpetual holiday. Hereafter you will neither encourage them to do anything, nor look to see what they are doing, nor even come for one hour in a year to hear what they have done.

Is it a wonder, then, that great rich churches do not pay their debts, and have not credit enough even with their own moneyed members to borrow a hundred dollars without personal security?

Surely, surely it is time our congregations were waking up to the disgraceful aspect which many of them present—time that the honor of Christ and the prosperity of his Church lay as near to their hearts as their private interests and reputation.

Could we only get our congregations to see the importance of this subject, and to lay hold of it seriously, forms and methods would readily follow. Give them line upon line, and precept upon precept, until the people and their office-bearers shall be made to understand that they, as a congregation, must be an example in temporalities as well as spiritualities, and that they are falling short, until in this particular their congregational characteristics are those of the very best man of business.

In all congregational obligations, however, there is an element which elevates them above ordinary pecuniary obligations—they are *debts of honor!*

There are persons in the Church who incline to methods of congregational pecuniary reform which would throw all church obligations into regular legal form, so that delinquents may be coerced by the machinery of the civil law. In our opinion, this is an error, calculated to degrade the Church. The law was made for the lawless and disobedient, the unjust and the covenant-breaker. The Church's true and proper code is the moral, and should never descend to the tribunal of Cæsar when it is possible to avoid it. Her sphere is higher, her controlling forces are stronger, and her punishments more severe, than those of the civil law; and if in temporal matters she has not thus appeared, it is only because she has failed to comprehend, and hence to inculcate, the right principles in the matter.

The fact that her discipline is purely moral, gives her an over-

whelming argument wherewith to bear down on the conscience and self-respect of her members; and more than that, it places her claims among that class of obligations which are above law and are self-enforcing, when made a part of public moral education.

The older philosophers divided all sorts of obligations into two classes, viz., those which could be enforced by legal or physical coercion, and those which could not be so enforced. The former they unfortunately denominated *perfect*, and the latter *imperfect* obligations; and these terms expressed the views they entertained of the character and completeness of the two classes respectively. But in process of time, it was seen that the obligations called perfect, or rather a large portion of them, were in their nature of so inferior a grade that they required for their enforcement the supplementary appliances of statutory law and physical compulsion; whilst those obligations called imperfect, were generally of so subtle, so sensitive, so superior a grade, as not to be appropriate subjects for the action of the coarse machinery of human law; and so sure and spontaneous in their natural autonomy, that they demanded for their enforcement only the proper natural conditions, together with moral education. For example, undoubted as is the high obligation in a man to fulfil a pecuniary contract, to avoid trespassing on his neighbor, and to aid in bearing the public burdens, all feel that the obligation of a man to honor his Maker, to be grateful to his benefactor, to love and cherish the members of his family, belong to a higher class than the former, and lie beyond the range of human legislation. And to attempt to make them subjects of civil coercion, would be to degrade those high sentiments, to weaken those natural and moral forces by which they are regulated, and to bring the law itself into contempt.

Now, it is clearly the policy of the Church, as it is clearly the right philosophical analysis of the subject, to place religious pecuniary obligations among the *imperfect* obligations; that is, among those obligations which do not, or at least ought not, and under right moral training certainly would not, need the help of human law, and which would be degraded, and practically weak-

ened by attempting to bring them under it. The mere fact that an obligation can not be enforced by law, does of itself enhance the moral obligation to pay it, and we all feel that when a man gives up to his creditors property which the law could not reach, he is entitled to more respect than he who does no more than he could be compelled to do. Under the Jewish law, a man's cloak was exempt from the distress-warrant, because it could be used for a coat by day and a bed by night; but the simple coat might be levied on by the officer of the law. Hence our Saviour, in order to give a poor man a chance to show his conscience and to elevate himself in public estimation, even while stripped by his debts of the very clothes on his back, he said, "If any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, give him thy cloak also."

In this and other similar counsels, our Saviour enunciated the law of *His* kingdom as a higher law than human law, as what might be called, by eminence, "the law of so-called imperfect obligations;" because it deals originally and specially with those subtler and superior impulses and sentiments which lie without the province of human law, and which carry the principles of justice and honor beyond the point where civil law ceases to urge its claims, and yet form the germinating principles of all law, justice, and honor. And the Church should be taught to understand that in this, as in other things, she represents her great Teacher and her spiritual Lawgiver. She should appeal to higher sentiments than even those of common legal justice and routine honesty; she should wield heavier penalties than civil judgments and sheriff's executions; she should teach the people that their pecuniary obligations to the Church are obligations of peculiar delicacy and sacredness, and that the credit and honor of the congregations to which they severally belong ought to be dearer to them than even their individual honor; and that all individuals and congregations who fail to act upon these higher sentiments, and who permit themselves and their congregations to be penurious and unfaithful, are justly amenable to a sentence of aggravated moral condemnation. Is not this the moral teaching in the terrible judgment upon Ananias and Sapphira—

“You have not lied unto men, but you have lied unto the Holy Ghost.” This is not a mere worldly transaction, in which you try to hide your property to avoid carrying out a contract with a fellow-man—but you have brought your dishonesty into the Church; you have lightly esteemed the honor of Christ and his disciples; you have broken your religious vows, in order to save your money; and now, by the stroke of God, your lifeless bodies shall teach all generations that it is a deadly crime to hold back the money you have vowed unto God!

If, then, the temporalities of a religious congregation grow from the same root as the spiritualities; if, indeed, in a certain sense, they embody the spiritual life of the Church, and give it its outward manifestation in the presence of the world for honor or dishonor; and if, as yet, our congregations have failed to understand the high principles involved in this matter, and hence have been derelict in practice, then, without doubt, and without need of controversy, these congregational temporalities, in all their ramifications, form a proper subject of presbyterial review and control.

It is really a surprising fact, that heretofore the higher authorities have exercised almost no supervision over our congregations in these matters of vital import. And yet, of late years, a beginning has been made in that direction. Formerly, a Presbyterian congregation might give nothing to general objects of Christian benevolence, and might fail constantly to pay the salary promised to the pastor, until the arrearages would amount to hundreds, perhaps thousands of dollars. The pastor might die or remove, and the debt remain forever unliquidated. There are congregations who owe dead pastors enough to support for years their suffering families, and probably their consciences are quite easy on the subject. But now, in some portions of the Church, they are very properly called to report to presbytery in regard to this matter, and since the adoption of the rule there has been a wonderful improvement in the matter of paying the pastor's salary. Even in this, however, there is great room for improvement, whilst in other matters all is in confusion. Congregations may still contract all manner of debts, and be as

TxU

careless in regard to paying as they were in contracting; they may still disregard the calls of their creditors, and be utterly bankrupt in mercantile reputation, whilst at the same time they may manage to raise money for objects of far less importance than paying their debts. They may still leave their church buildings dilapidated and unenclosed, and their graveyards in a state of wild desolation; they may even be indifferent as to the validity of the title by which they hold their church property; they may be without deacons, or, having deacons, leave them to do nothing, or do anything; they may neglect the poor; they may have no system in the whole matter, and feel no desire to have any; and all this may be going on year after year to the spiritual detriment and public disgrace of the congregations, and yet nothing be known and nothing be done by the presbytery to protect the honor of religion, and promote the prosperity of the delinquent congregations.

In these particulars, too, and even without presbyterial solicitude, there has been within a century a great improvement, and a few congregations have reached a highly creditable grade of system and punctuality; but for this they are indebted to their own wisdom and conscience, more than to any instruction they have received from without; and such cases will always be exceptional, until some well-considered, uniform plan of congregational organisation and responsibility is made a part of our presbyterial system.

We have now fairly reached the question, *What should be done?*

In reply, it might be answered truly that we have undertaken to deal with and try to settle the great principles underlying this neglected subject, rather than to propose methods which must grow up into a general system under the modifying influence of actual experience. We shall feel that our labors have been most important if we secure a clear recognition of the principle that all the temporal, as well as the more strictly spiritual, affairs of our several congregations, form a proper subject of presbyterial supervision. Before closing, however, we will venture to make some suggestions which may serve as a beginning to-

ward the practical application of the principles for which we contend.

The first step manifestly is, to gather facts and statistics, to see to it that every congregation has its board of deacons, who are the scriptural financial officers. The movement made upon this subject some years ago by the Synod of Virginia, had some effect, but its partial failure was owing to the double reason that the appointment of deacons was not made a *sine qua non*, and the duties and responsibilities of deacons were not embodied as a part of the congregational economy.

Connected with the duties of the deacon, there is an open question in the Church, which ought to be thoroughly discussed and finally settled, viz., whether or not deacons ought to be the trustees of all church property. The practice of the American Church has been against this arrangement, but the question is too complicated and important to be mixed up with other, however cognate, branches of inquiry. There should be a special and deliberate examination of this whole system of resigning our church property to the control of mere civil officers. Practically, however, in the Southern States, the trustees have been nominal characters, who have allowed the congregations to do very much what they pleased with their church property. Therefore, the way is still clear among us to proceed with our congregational organisations very much as if no trustees existed, although we cannot tell how long this liberty will remain.

Deacons being appointed, they should have a very clearly defined programme of duties.

The general definition of the duties of the deacons given in our Form of Government is sufficiently comprehensive, viz., the care of the poor, and the management of the temporal affairs of the Church. The question yet to be fully answered is, what is the detailed working plan of the diaconate; what particular things are included in, and under what form of accountability should the deacons execute, the duties of their office.

In this discussion it should be borne in mind that the deacon is not an ecclesiastic. Unlike the minister and elder, he is exclusively a local officer, the servant of the particular congre-

gation which appoints him, and that only within the range of the temporalities: and yet, narrow as seem to be the limits of this office, and insignificant a part as it has played in modern Church history, it has in it the germ of a splendid development, in a direction presently to be mentioned.

Every officer of every grade in Church and State, should not only have clearly defined duties, but should feel the pressure of a supervisory authority, and the system of responsibility should be so arranged as to make it pleasant, interesting, and improving to all parties concerned. The direct responsibility of the deacons should be to the parochial consistory, or church session; but inasmuch as they administer the affairs of the congregation, they should, with regularity and great particularity, report to the congregation; and their report should in substance be laid before the presbytery.

As to the character of the duties of the deacon, these should be studiously elaborated into a working programme, which should form a part of every congregational constitution and by-laws, if not of the general Form of Government. The plan should be earnestly studied, discussed, and adopted by the congregation, and be frequently revised. It should also be a subject of presbyterial consideration, the presbytery taking advantage of the experience of individual congregations, and aiding in the perfecting of the system.

Let us look finally at some of the items which should be included in the diaconate.

One grand division of deacon-work is—"to take care of the poor, and to distribute among them the collections which may be raised for their use."

This is the direction alluded to above, in which the diaconate is destined to grow grandly in the future developement of the Church's organism. When the Church shall at length comprehend her mission to the weak, ignorant, and destitute classes of society, she will be surprised to find embodied in her own organization an office which she will then see was meant specially for this very thing: an office as wide in its scope as the wants and sufferings of humanity; an office which was meant to represent

the human and temporal life of Jesus Christ in its brotherly sympathy and benevolence, just as the eldership and ministry represent his divine and spiritual mission. So that the Church of the future is destined to walk through the earth as her Master walked, as full of sympathy with the earthly life of man as with the heavenly—in other words, to make just the impression on society that he made by his personal life.

But inviting as is this larger aspect of the deacon's office, we must turn to those practical views which accord more nearly with our present estimate of the office. At present, it is not generally expected that the deacon should look beyond the limits of the congregation in relieving the wants of the poor. It is to be hoped that in now reconsidering the subject, our congregations will give a special study to the parable of the man who went down from Jerusalem to Jericho and fell among thieves, and thus learn the answer to the question, "Who is my neighbor?" It is also to be hoped that they will distinctly recognise the fact that the proper "care of the poor" includes a good deal more than a little food and raiment. Let them learn, too, that Christ never meant any church officers to be the proxies of the congregation in the sense of relieving them from personal activity; but rather as guides and agents to direct the labors of individual Christians.

But whatever be the congregational idea of the deacon's duty to the poor, that idea should be expressed in definite terms.

The other grand division of the deacon-work lies more in the line of this train of thought, which refers to the temporal business of the congregation, rather than to its benevolence. This, we should think, ought to include everything where property and money are concerned, including care, purchases and sales, hiring, building, investments, raising and disbursing of all money, keeping all accounts and doing all the financiering of the congregation; and all this on an established system, and under instructions general and special from the congregation.

Analysing these subjects, we should put into the schedule—

1. *The Real Estate.*

Even if the legal title is placed in the names of other trustees, the care of the property should be made a special branch of the deacon's duty. Ordinarily trustees do not, in our section of country, regard their office as anything more than a form, and commonly the real estate, (ground, buildings, plantings, and enclosures,) has no special officers to look after its condition; and hence our church property is generally 'badly kept and uninviting in aspect. But so far as this disarray results from the negligence of trustees, it is much the less of two evils. The other alternative—and the one frequently seen among the Northern churches—is an active trustee-board, which, whilst taking good care of the property, are almost sure to transcend their proper jurisdiction, and by usurping ecclesiastical prerogatives, trouble and corrupt the churches. If, then, we do have extra-ecclesiastical trustees, let the policy of the Church be such that they will find nothing left for them to do, unless the title of the property should be called in question, or some trespass be committed. Let the property be put under the practical control of the Board of Deacons.

In first assuming the care of a church property, let the deacons do as they would do in case of a purchase or inheritance for themselves—go at once to original sources, and examine titles and boundaries, see that there are no flaws or liens, no interlocks, nuisances, or trespasses; take possession of title papers, with carefully executed plats, or better still, maps of the tract or tracts. It would also be a useful work to make out and file a history of the ground from the first settlement of the country. With what interest do we read now, nearly four thousand years after its occurrence, of the negotiation between Abraham and Ephron the Hittite for the purchase of the field and cave of Machpelah! And with greater interest still do we read of the transaction between David and Ornan the Jebusite, by which the king bought the threshing floor of the latter: the spot where Abraham had prepared to sacrifice his son Isaac, the sacred spot which became the great church property of the Jewish nation, whereon was erected the *Temple*.

Apart from the legal value of a recorded chain of title, there

is a sentiment belonging to the history of sacred places which ought to be cherished.

The entire custody of this property should be committed to these deacons, with instruction to look after the buildings, enclosures, grounds, furniture and utensils, and see that all are protected from abuse, kept in good repair, and rendered more and more comfortable and attractive as the means are furnished for doing so. Remembering that in this class of things, as in others, the Church is exhibiting her own inner character, and by the aspect she presents to the world is conveying to the minds of all observers lessons which must be for their good or for their injury, the deacons should seek to connect every thing in this department directly with the religious sentiment and life of the congregation.

2. *The existing financial condition* of the congregation should next be looked into by an incoming Board of Deacons.

A list should at once be made of debts due *by* and *to* the congregation, and of annual income and expenditures; and on the basis of all the facts in the case, there should be a carefully matured system of finance, prepared by the deacons, and submitted to the congregation for discussion, amendment, and adoption. In this, of course, a leading item will be the raising of the pastor's salary, but it is not certain that the method of raising this should differ from that of raising what is required for other needful expenditures. The same principle applies to all, and the same motive should be appealed to in all cases. The collection of arrearages from delinquent subscribers or pewholders will offer a point of great difficulty; and in the doing of this, it may be remarked, that harsh measures are not the best; nor is it best to press most prominently the mere commercial motives. Reliance should chiefly be placed on the education of the public sentiment of the congregation, and habitual delinquents should, in the least offensive way possible, be brought under the influence of that public sentiment.

3. Where the regular income of the congregation does not pay current expenses, or paying them, leaves old debts unpaid, the deacon should not cease to devise and carry out extraordinary

methods of restoring or preserving the honor of the congregation. He should agitate, and continue to agitate, until the object is accomplished. He should do the same in regard to needed purchases or improvements. But every congregation should be brought up to annual contributions which would not only pay current expenses, but leave a margin for other purposes: and also be taught to avoid contracting debts, and to maintain so high a character for punctuality, that there will be no difficulty in obtaining means, when borrowing is proper.

4. Whether or not the deacons should have charge of the raising and applying all funds given by the congregation for objects of general benevolence is a question about which there might be difference of opinion, and we do not propose to discuss it on this occasion; but will only remark that we can see no sufficient reason for making a distinction among the offerings of the people; and many reasons might be given why all should be under the same management.

5. It is essential to systematic action in these matters that the Board of Deacons should keep a set of record and account books, in which there should be kept a record of all their official acts, and a business-like account of all receipts and disbursements; also, a list of assets and liabilities, and also lists of members of the congregation complete, a list of pews and pew-holders, a list of beneficiaries, etc.: these books to be submitted to the congregation once a year, and examined by committee; just as sessional records and treasurer's accounts are examined by the Presbytery.

6. Lastly, the deacons should, at least once a year, submit a *report*, which should be prepared with great fulness and particularity, and read to the congregation. This report should contain a minute history of their doings during the past year, accompanied by a complete financial statement, so simply and lucidly presented that every member of the congregation may understand exactly the existing condition of affairs; and in connexion therewith, a statement of wants unprovided for, and suggestions of all kinds for the future. Deacons should not feel that they have discharged their duty when they have simply presented the

financial *wants* of the congregation: they should have so earnestly studied the subject as to come before the people with plans of relief. that will at least awaken inquiry and prepare the way for some successful movement.

This annual report would also furnish the proper occasion for bringing the public sentiment of the congregation to bear upon delinquents. Nothing more, however, is recommended than reading aloud their names, and the extent of their delinquencies.

The substance of this report, as before remarked, should be sent by the session to the presbytery, so that the financial condition and habits of the congregation may be duly reviewed. If, as a whole, it has been conducting its business imprudently, or without system or punctuality, let it be admonished as in the case of delinquency in pastor's salary. If it has become insolvent, let it be assisted by other congregations, and at the same time be duly warned against future entanglements. But in no ordinary case, leave a congregation in that most disgraceful of all conditions—one of practical repudiation. Let not the children of ministers be allowed to transmit to future generations the fact that this congregation and that still owe to their fathers so many hundreds—possibly so many thousands of dollars—for pastoral services; nor the children of mechanics and merchants have it in their power to bring similar charges. Even if common honesty did not require the payment of debts, public decency and ordinary commercial honor require that the last vestige of the former habits of congregations in some parts of the country should be swept away; by instruction and exhortation, if that prove sufficient; if not, by the most trenchant discipline.

The most difficult step in any reform movement in this matter is to interest the people sufficiently in their own congregational affairs to induce them even to attend the business meetings. It is not very wonderful that this should be so, when the calling of a congregational meeting has generally implied some desperate state of affairs which was to be laid before the people, and they to be called upon for some large and unusual sacrifice. Badly managed affairs will engender a dogged and despairing state of

mind in the congregation, which will be hard to deal with, until there is some encouragement to hope that there is to be a better state of things hereafter. When they are made parties in all that is done, and when they find that there is such a condition of things as may be called "easy circumstances" in a congregation, and above all, when they fully comprehend the spiritual import of these temporal affairs and adopt these duties as a part of their religion—then our congregations will come up as easily, as fully and as heartily to the measure of their duty in these, as they do in more directly spiritual matters.

ARTICLE II.

SHAKESPEARE.

Memoirs of the Life of William Shakespeare, with an Essay towards the Expression of his Genius, and an Account of the Rise and Progress of the English Drama. By RICHARD GRANT WHITE. Boston: Little, Brown & Company. 1865.

This is one of the best books of its kind, and one of the most enjoyable books of any kind, which we have had the opportunity of reading. The author, Mr. Richard Grant White, is not wholly unknown to us. It was, we think, in 1860 that we first met with his edition of Shakespeare, only seven volumes of which were then published. These had appeared in 1859 from the press of Little, Brown & Co. It was in crown octavo and was the *avant courier* of that series of superb issues which have excited the admiration even of English booksellers, and have added so much to the laurels of the best publishing house in Boston. It is now conceded that the printing in America is often as good as the best in Great Britain, and this result we owe largely to the labors of Messrs. Little & Brown. The work before us is one of the handsomest which has yet appeared in the

United States. It is on heavy, ribbed paper, with broad margin, and somewhat antique letters. The letter-press has seldom been equalled in this country. The title page, which is partly printed in red ink, is beautiful to behold. The preface is modest and well written. The book consists of three parts, viz., a new and copious life of Shakespeare, an elaborate estimate of his genius, and an account of the English drama. The work is a single post octavo volume of four hundred and twenty-five pages. There is no appendix, though there are a number of excellent foot notes.

Mr. White has latterly risen to the unquestioned position of preëminence among cisatlantic Shakespeare scholars. If there were a chair of "Shakespeare" in any of our American Universities, as there is at Bonn, Mr. White ought certainly to fill it.

We confess that we have risen from this book with a feeling of disappointment. We had expected not only a fresh recital of facts, but a recital of fresh facts. Mr. White has added little in the way of new material to what was already to be found in the pages of Jonson, Betterton, Rowe, Digges, Holland, Warburton, Johnson, Malone, Steevens, Dyce, Singer, Halliwell, Collier, and the rest. It is very certain, however, that he has purged the current traditional notions about the historic Shakespeare, of many errors, and has fixed a number of most interesting or important facts which were before held to be doubtful, or were else denied outright. He has settled the spelling of the name beyond all peradventure, though he still leaves a cloud over its derivation. Mr. White has also ventured, with happy audacity, upon a number of strong original views, and a yet larger number of felicitous conjectures. In his researches he discards the wild *a priori* method of the Germans, and pursues the strict Baconian method, under the constant guidance of sound English common sense.

But the chief value of the book after all lies in this, that it has gathered up all that is really known or really probable about this "foremost man of all the world," and has presented it to us in the rich and copious style of modern biography. Mr. White, in short, has performed very much the same office for Shakespeare, which Mr. Forsyth has performed for Cicero.

The way in which the author has vitalized his materials, and something too in his diction, remind us of the "Personal History of Lord Bacon." *That*, however, is one-sided and inconsequential, and though piquant, affected; whereas the work under review is in the main sound, wholesome, catholic, and comprehensive. The structure is reared upon deep-laid and broad foundations, and its fretted cornices and Corinthian chapters are mere superficial decorations, and not a principal part of the design.

The style is a model of correct, vigorous, and graceful English, well befitting, in its occasional Elizabethan flavor, the delightful topic to which the writer's pen has been devoted. The book is an astonishing mine of antiquarian learning, as well as of linguistic and other attainment, and approves the accomplished gentleman who wrote it as a scholar and a ripe and good one. The following may be taken at once as a sample of the style, and as a specimen of the curious erudition, to which we have referred :

"Warwickshire, in Old England, seems to have been the favorite haunt, if it were not the ancestral soil, of a family whose name more than any other in our tongue sounds of battle and tells of knightly origin. It is possible, indeed, that *Shakespeare* is a corruption of some name of more peaceful meaning, and therefore mayhap (so bloody was ambition's very lowest step of old) of humbler derivation; for in the irregular, phonographic spelling of antiquity it appears sometimes as *Chacksper* and *Shaxpur*. But upon such an uncertain foundation it is hardly safe even to base a doubt; and as the martial accents come down to us from the verge of the fourteenth century, we may safely assume that a name thus spoken in chivalric days was not without chivalric significance." P. 6.

Then in a note, he says :

"The manner in which the name is spelled in the old records varies almost to the extreme capacity of various letters to produce a sound approximating to the name as we pronounce it. It appears as *Chacksper*, *Shaxpur*, *Shaxper*, *Schaksper*, *Schakesper*, *Schakspeare*, *Schakespeyr*, *Shagspere*, *Saxpere*, *Shaxpere*, *Shaxpeare*, *Shaxspere*, *Shaxspere*, *Shaxespere*, *Shakspear*, *Shakspeare*, *Schakspear*, *Shackspeare*, *Shackespeare*, *Shackespere*, *Shakspeyr*, *Shaksper*, *Shakespere*, *Shakyspere*, *Shakeseper*, *Shakespire*, *Shakespeire*, *Shakespear*, *Shakespeare*, *Shakaspeare* :

and there are even other variations of its orthography. But Shakespeare himself, and his careful friend Ben Johnson, when they printed the name, spelled it Shake-speare, the hyphen being often used; and in this form it is found in almost every book of their time in which it appeared. The final e is a mere superfluity, and might with propriety be dropped; but then we should also drop it from Greene, Marlowe, Peele, and other names in which it appears. There seems therefore to be no good reason for deviating from the orthography to which Shakespeare and his contemporaries gave a kind of formal recognition. As to the superior martial significance of this name to all others, we have indeed Breakspere, Winspere, Shakeshaft, Shakelance, Briselance, Hackstaff, Drawswerde, Curtlemace, Battelman, and some others of that sort; but in this regard they all must yield to that which was an attribute of Mars himself as long ago as when Homer wrote:

“Μαίρω δ', ὅς ᾽στ' Ἄρης ἰχίσατόν·—ILLIAD, O. 605.”

After referring to Stratford,* our author says:

“It was in such a town and amid such a country that William Shakespeare passed his early years; and a glance at them has been worth our while; for when he left them for a wider, busier, and more varied field of observation, marvellous as were the flexibility of his nature and the range and activity of his thought, his memory never lost the forms, nor did his soul cast off the influences, which had surrounded him in boyhood. As to the people of Stratford, they were much like others of their class and condition: simple folk, contentedly looking after their fields, their cattle, and their little trade, not troubling themselves about the great world which lay beyond their ken, but somewhat overready to take the law of one another upon small provocation, and strongly inclined to Puritanism. If they had one trait which seems more prominent than any other, it was a great capacity for liquor, which they tested on every possible occasion. The suns which they spent in providing themselves and each other, and the strangers within their gates, with ale possets, claret, and sack and sugar, must have been no small proportion of the yearly outlay of the town. And yet perhaps in this respect they were but of their day and generation.” P. 26.

There is some exquisite irony in this book, as where it is proven

* We are informed by a young friend who has visited the spot, that the word *Stratford* in *Stratford on Avon* is in England universally pronounced *Stratford*.

on premises furnished by George Steevens, that the poet must have been a *tailor!* Mr. White ridicules the tradition that Shakespeare was at one time a butcher, and makes it almost certain that he was not. He, however, leans strongly to the story about the deer-stealing in Sir Thos. Lucy's preserves, and even to the authenticity of the lampoon in which the poet castigated the testy and unpopular baronet. Yet he throws such a chivalric and romantic air over the incident, as almost to deprive it of its rudeness. He says on p. 60:

“In Shakespeare's day, as well as long before, killing a gentleman's deer was almost as common among wild young men as robbing a farmer's orchard among boys. Indeed, it was looked upon as a sign of that poor semblance of manliness sometimes called spirit, and was rather a gentleman's misdemeanor than a yeoman's; one which a peasant would not be presumed to commit, except, indeed, at risk of his ears, for poaching at once upon the game and sin-preserved of his betters. Noblemen engaged in it; and in days gone by the very first Prince of Wales had been a deer-stealer. Among multitudinous passages illustrative of this trait of manners, a story preserved by Wood in his *Athenæ Oronienses* fixes unmistakably the grade of the offence. It is there told, on the authority of Simon Forman, that his patrons, Robert Pinkney and John Thornborough, the latter of whom was admitted a member of Magdalen College in 1570, and became Bishop of Bristol and Worcester, seldom studied or gave themselves to their books, but spent their time in fencing-schools and dancing-schools, in stealing deer and conies, in hunting the hare and wooing girls. In fact, deer-stealing then supplied to the young members of the privileged classes in Old England an excitement of a higher kind than that afforded by beating watchmen and tearing off knockers and bell-pulls to the generation but just passed away. A passage of *Titus Andronicus*, written soon after Shakespeare reached London, is here in point. Prince Demetrius exclaims:

“What, hast thou not full often struck a doe,
And cleanly borne her past the keeper's nose!”

“Whereupon Steevens, wishing to discredit the play as Shakespeare's, remarks: ‘We have here Demetrius, the son of a Queen, demanding of his brother if he has not often been reduced to practise the common artifices of a deer-stealer,—an absurdity worthy of the rest of the piece.’ Probably Steevens had never read in the old chronicle of Edward of Caernarvon, the first

Prince of Wales, that King Edward put his son, Prince Edward, in prison because he had riotously broken into the park of Walter Langton, Bishop of Chester, and stolen his deer. The Prince did this at the instigation of his favorite, that handsome, insolent rake, Piers de Gaveston: and he had previously begged Hugh de Despencer to pardon his 'well-beloved John de Bouynge,' who had in like manner broken into that nobleman's park. What was pastime for a Prince of Wales and his companions in the fourteenth century, might be regarded as a venial misdemeanor on the part of a landless knight, and a mark of spirit in a yeoman's son, in the sixteenth.

"But he with the 'three louses rampant' on his coat makes much more than this of Falstaff's affair. He will bring it before the council, he will make a Star-Chamber matter of it, and pronounces it a riot. And in fact, according to his account, Sir John was not content with stealing his deer, but broke open his lodge and beat his men. It seems then, that, in writing this passage, Shakespeare had in mind not only an actual occurrence in which Sir Thomas Lucy was concerned, but one of greater gravity than a mere deer-stealing affair; that having been made the occasion of more serious outrage. * * * Here are all the conditions of a very pretty parish quarrel. A puritanical knight, fussy about his family pretensions and his game, having hereditary disagreement with the Stratford people about rights of common.—a subject on which they were, like all of English race, sure to be tenacious,—after having been left out of Parliament for eleven years, is reelected, and immediately sets to work at securing that privilege so dearly prized by his class, and so odious to all below it,—the preservation of the game for the pastime of the gentry. The anti-Puritan party and those who stand up stoutly for rights of common, vent their indignation to the best of their ability: one of their number writes a lampoon upon him, and a body of them, too strong to be resisted, break riotously into his grounds, kill his deer, beat his men, and carry off their booty in triumph. The affair is an outbreak of rude parish politics, a popular demonstration against an unpopular man: and who so likely to take part in it as the son of the former bailiff, who, we know, was no Puritan, and whose father, ambitious, and, as we shall see, even pretending to a coat of arms, had most probably had personal and official disagreements with, and received personal slights and rebuffs from, his rich, powerful, arrogant neighbor,—or who so likely to write the lampoon as young Will Shakespeare? There could hardly have been two in Stratford who were able to write that stanza, the rhythm of

which shows no common clodpole's ear, and which, though coarse in its satire, is bitter and well suited to the occasion. That it is a genuine production,—that is, part of a ballad written at the time for the purpose of lampooning Sir Thomas Lucy—I think there can be no doubt: it carries its genuineness upon its face and in its spirit. That Shakespeare wrote it I am inclined to believe. But even were he not its author, if he had taken any part in a demonstration against Sir Thomas Lucy, and soon after was driven, by whatever circumstances, to leave Stratford for London, where he rose to distinction as a poet, rumor would be likely soon to attribute the ballad to him, and to assign the occasion on which it was written as that which caused his departure; and rumor would soon become tradition. That Shakespeare meant to pay off a Stratford debt to Sir Thomas Lucy in that first scene of *The Merry Wives*, and that he did it with the memory of the riotous trespass upon that gentleman's grounds, seem equally manifest. That he had taken part in the event which he commemorated, there is not evidence which would be sufficient in a court of law, but quite enough for those who are satisfied with the concurrence of probability and tradition; and I confess that I am of that number." P. 67.

There is a most interesting disquisition in this volume on the probable extent to which Shakespeare was allowed to push his education. It is rendered morally certain that he had a pretty intimate knowledge (of the kind possible to school boys) of Latin, and a tolerable acquaintance with Greek; and reasonably likely, that he read Italian, had a smattering of French, and had studied law. It is a Chief Justice and Lord Chancellor* of England who says: "While novelists and dramatists are constantly making mistakes as to the law of marriage, of wills, and of inheritance, to Shakespeare's law, lavishly as he propounds it, there can be no demurrer, nor bill of exceptions, nor writ of errors." The same species of evidence will certainly prove that Mr. White has himself been no stranger to Lord Hale and Coke upon Littleton.

The verbal and ideal coincidences between Shakespeare (in *Othello*) and Berni's *Orlando Innamorato*, (a work which to this day has never been translated into English,) that are pointed out for the first time in this book, and on which our author mainly

* Lord Campbell.

relies for his proof of the poet's acquaintance with Italian, though truly marvellous on that supposition, *may* be accidental. It is quite certain that Bunyan never read "Pvreach His Pilgrims." We ought not to build too much on such slight evidence. Still it must be admitted that there is no counter-evidence of equal force, and that the probabilities incline more than ever to the view that is cautiously adopted by the American biographer.

We wish we had room for Mr. White's remarkable dissertation on the theme that blood not only tells, but tells on the father's, rather than the mother's side. The catalogue of illustrious names which he gives us in support of this position is very surprising.

It would have been interesting to have had a fuller presentation of the views of this distinguished critic on the question that has been so long mooted, and that has recently been noticed so ably by Mr. Froude, viz., whether Shakespeare was a Roman Catholic or a Protestant. Mr. White contents himself with showing that the great dramatist was an anti-Puritan, but that nothing conclusive can be gathered on this or any similar subject from his plays. He evidently leans to the opinion that the favorite poet of Protestant England was himself a Protestant, though in no such way as to exclude him from the sympathy of Catholics. His remarks on the total absence of the author's personal character in his *dramatic* compositions, are not original, but are very striking. He agrees with those who find the man Shakespeare, with his true feelings and opinions, in the sonnets. "Indeed," he says on p. 279, "from all of Shakespeare's plays we can gather little more as to his personal tastes than that he had a great aversion to high voices, false hair, and painted checks in women. Yet this is an indication, not of his individuality, but of his manhood."

There is in this volume a plain though fascinating account of the Mermaid and its glorious coterie, but too little is said about Shakespeare's relations with the Queen, and with other important characters of the period.

Mr. White thinks that Shakespeare wrote entirely for money and position, and not at all for posthumous fame, and he over-

turns some very pretty German theories on this subject. We think, however, he is rather too unqualified in his statements on this point. He proves, also, incontestably that Shakespeare's supreme genius was sufficiently recognised by his contemporaries, and has always been acknowledged by the mass of the people. It is pleasant to be assured that the meanest of us can understand and appreciate Shakespeare. He also leaves it sadly probable that Shakespeare, like Alexander, died from the consequences of an excess.

Mr. White crushes Mr. Holmes's theory, that Bacon wrote these plays, between his finger and thumb. The evidence (if any were needed) is overwhelming and decisive.

We are tempted to pronounce that the "essay towards the expression of Shakespeare's genius," which is contained in this volume, is worth all that has ever been written on this subject, not even excepting Coleridge, Lamb, and Schlegel. The motto prefixed to this admirable performance is most fit and worthy: "May I express thee unblam'd?"

The estimate of the English poet in comparison with Homer and Dante is perhaps extravagant, though not uncommon. These three are his demi-gods. There are traces here, we think, of the peculiar intellectual and religious culture of Harvard. Mr. White is reticent on theological (would that he had been on political!) topics, and may be a Unitarian, a Pantheist, a Freethinker, or a mere æsthetic hero-worshipper. It is fair to say that though he places Shakespeare in some sense among the divinities, he yet puts him second on the score of instruction to our Saviour! Mr. White, for aught we know to the contrary, may be a believer. We greatly fear that he is indifferent on such subjects, and that he worships a poor weak mortal as his God.

What he says about Homer would be very distasteful to Mr. Gladstone or to Mr. Froude, as it will be to many metaphysicians and theologians, but will find many hearty admirers:

"Homer saw with placid mental eye the people and the deeds that he describes, as clearly as if they had passed before him in the flesh: Astyanax shrinking from his father's flashing helm

and threatening crest: Hector striding across the battle-field, his huge shield rattling, as he walked, against his neck and ankles; the opposing hosts, assembled upon the plain, whose swaying spears and waving plumes, seen from afar, showed dark broad ripples, like cat's paws on the water. Dante, with more incisive word-touch, if not more penetrating vision, puts before us Ugo-lino and his boys dying one by one of hunger; the Centaur with an arrow parting his beard upon his jaws before he speaks; or those two tormented alchemists who leaned against each other like pans set up to dry, and scraped the scales from their leprous bodies in prurient agony. But Shakespeare's imagination was more than this. Homer and Dante saw; he not only saw, but was. His art is more than imagination, more than fancy, more than philosophy, more than their aggregation. It is their union in one nameless faculty. Indeed it is only after recurring to Homer and Dante, and to Milton, Virgil, and Horace, that we know how far, how immeasurably far, is the step from the lofty cumulation of all their qualities to Shakespeare's quality. It is almost like that from the finite to the infinite. As we add number to number, until numbers cease to have significance, and then at last spring to the idea of the infinite, to which we cannot otherwise approach, so we put together all the qualities of all other poets, and then, seeing our failure to reach the Parnassian summit by heaping Pelions upon Ossas, we break off and leap to Shakespeare.

“Shakespeare worked all his wonders with the lordliness of a supreme master; yet, we may be sure, not without labor. Certain men have higher tasks, and for them higher faculties, than others: he, highest. But nothing is attained by human powers, however transcendent, without paying for it man's-price,—toil. There is no such thing as real *impromptu*. There is only the ready use on present occasion of the fruits of past exertion:—

“*Che, seggendo in piuma,*

In fama non si vien, ne' sotto coltre.”

We regret to have to say in conclusion that this truly valuable book is marred by a most unhappy dedication. Partisan politics should have been here excluded, as they are in the body of the work itself.

• Inferno, Canto xxiv. 147.

ARTICLE III.

INAUGURATION OF THE REV. DR. PLUMER.

[On the 27th of November, 1867, the Rev. William S. Plumer, D. D. LL.D., was duly inaugurated as Professor of Didactic and Polemic Theology in the Theological Seminary at Columbia, S. C., by the General Assembly in session at Nashville, Tennessee. The Moderator, the Rev. T. V. Moore, D. D., presided and received the Professor's subscription. The Rev. James A. Lyon, D. D., gave the charge to the Professor; and Dr. Plumer then delivered his inaugural address.]

DR. LYON'S CHARGE.

MY BROTHER: It would be presumption in me to attempt to charge *you* in reference to the duties and responsibilities of the high office into which you have just been inducted, were it not that I do so by the command of the General Assembly, whose servants we both are. You are not only venerable with years, and accomplished in the varied experience of a pastor's life, but you are at the meridian height of your intellectual prime, having at your facile command the rich stores of a long life of unwearied industry and devotion. You have had large experience even in the highest of all earthly callings, that of teaching teachers, prophesying to prophets, and training Christ's young ambassadors to go into all the world and preach the gospel! What, therefore, can *I* say to *you* in reference to the duties devolving on you in the high position in which you have been placed by the unanimous voice of the Church?

But, my brother, as the duty has been imposed upon me by the General Assembly, I will endeavor to discharge it just as though you needed the counsel and encouragement which I now propose to give.

1. In the first place, I charge you not to take it for granted that all those young men who come to you for instruction are *converted* men. The heart is deceitful above all things as well as desperately wicked. It is therefore very possible, and sadly

true, that some men presume to take upon themselves the holy office of the ministry without sufficient examination as to their faith and hopes. It is but too true that after all the watch and care of Presbyteries, unconverted men do sometimes gain admittance into the holy office. Hence it will be your duty to "try the spirits" that wait upon your tuition—probe them thoroughly as to the reality of their vital piety. In imitation of that great and good man, the late Dr. Archibald Alexander, at whose feet it was your happiness, as well as mine, to sit, let your preaching and conversation search deeply into their hearts and consciences, so as to make them feel alarmed at the prospect of pretending to be ambassadors of the Lord Jesus Christ, when, in truth, they have not the root of the matter in them! The interests of Christ's Church do not require the services of unconverted men at her altars—"strange fire" is not acceptable unto the Lord.

2. Again, do not take it for granted that all, even of the converted, are *qualified* to become ministers of the gospel. Piety is a *sine qua non* it is true, but it is not *all*. The candidate must be "apt to teach;" he must have a certain degree of talent: he must have capacity; he must have that greatest needed of all mental qualifications, *common sense*; he must be devoid of such eccentricity of character and habits as will mar his usefulness and bring his calling into ridicule and contempt. And in this matter you must not trust entirely to the recommendation of Presbyteries. It is next to impossible for each individual member of Presbytery to become familiarly acquainted with their candidates; so that Presbyteries have not the same opportunity to become intimately acquainted with their candidates that you have. Moreover, it is true—and I am sorry that it is true—that Presbyteries do not always evince that firmness and moral courage which should characterise them in receiving young men under their care. It is hard for a pastor to discourage a young man belonging to his own congregation; and it is hard for a Presbytery to refuse to receive one introduced by his pastor. Besides, the wants of our great field are so pressing, that the temptation is great to recommend even *inferior* men, and men of doubtful qualifications, to enter the sacred office. Your position

gives you great advantage, and affords you a fine opportunity in detecting the want of qualifications in such students of divinity as may resort to your chair for theological instruction. Consequently, I charge you to be firm and decided, without the fear of man, but with the fear of God only before your eyes, in discouraging those whom you may know to be disqualified, from taking upon themselves the high and holy office of the gospel ministry.

3. Once more, do not countenance *haste* on the part of theological students, in entering the ministry. God required Moses to spend eighty years, out of the one hundred and twenty of his life, in preparing for the great work he designed him to do. It most frequently happens that what is supposed to be gained in *time* by a precipitate entrance upon the ministerial work, is more than lost in *deficiency* of qualification. Haste in preparation is a great evil, and in these dark days of our poverty and extreme pecuniary depression, one of our great dangers. I charge you, therefore, not to favor, except in very peculiar cases, in which your own discretion must decide, a partial course of theological training.

4. Still further, it is palpable to all who can discern the signs of the times, that we are entering upon an age of INFIDELITY! IRRELIGION! ATHEISM! The dark and portentous cloud is rolling up with fearful rapidity, and threatens in a short time to spread over the whole heavens! This is the inevitable consequence of that most terrible of all scourges, *civil war*. Even now, in many parts of the country, the house of God is not only forsaken; many false professors have not only gone back to the world; the ministry left to starve or resort to secular pursuits for bread; but it is becoming fashionable to scoff and to rail against providence, and even to call in question the very existence of God! The distinguishing doctrines of our Church are peculiarly odious, and they are generally caricatured and misrepresented by such as are taking the first steps towards infidelity. Hence there is a great temptation to keep in the back ground, or to "tone down," so to speak, and soften some of the distinguishing doctrines of our Confession of Faith, which are called

“hard doctrines,” and “unpopular;” and so they are, because they are not in accordance with “man’s wisdom,” but are directly antagonistic to the depraved heart and to the “world’s wisdom,” which knows not God. I charge you, therefore, to yield to no possible temptation to soften or to veil those great and distinguishing doctrines, hard though they may be, but to teach them to those who may sit at your feet, and admonish them also to be fearless and faithful in declaring them to their dying fellow-men. God is competent to take care of his own truth. His word shall not return unto him void, but shall accomplish that whereunto he sends it.

5. Again, the great enemy of the Christian religion is changing his tactics in his warfare upon the Church of Christ. The fight is not now in open field under a “black flag,” as in days of yore—in the times of Hobbes, and Herbert, and Collins, and Volney, and Voltaire, and Tom Paine, and infidels of that class. Such have been fairly driven from the field. But the enemy has become “an angel of light;” the “wolf” has put on “sheep’s clothing.” These insidious foes, like Colenso and Renan, and the German neologists, have become theologians, commentators, writers of the life of Christ and of the apostles, expounders of the word of God, and invested with gown and bands, have even entered the sacred desk as preachers; so that the learning of your youth, however extensive and thorough it may *then* have been, it is not sufficient qualification to meet the enemy of the *present* day. It will become you, therefore, my brother, to *study* and to keep up with the age and times in the new phases which infidelity and atheism are assuming, in order that you may be fully competent to discharge the duties pertaining to your chair.

6. There is one other suggestion which I cannot pass over. It is this: We must keep in view the fact that the age is *progressive*. The times change and are changing, and manners also change. We must therefore avoid being too antiquated—too “old timey,” if I may be pardoned for the expression. Truth never changes, but the manner of presenting it does. Hence there is danger of our pulpits becoming repulsive, or, at least,

not attractive, because they are behind the the times. The manner of sermonizing characteristic of the seventeenth century, and which was suited to the tastes and manners of that age, is not suited to the present age. The long sermons, long prayers, long hymns, long chapters, long services, and the endless divisions and sub-divisions of a subject that characterised the preaching of that day, will, in these days of rapid progress, steam-presses, and telegraphic wires and cables, render a pulpit *repulsive* rather than *attractive*. There is many an able and learned minister whose popularity wanes, and whose usefulness is greatly curtailed, solely on account of the wearisome length of his sermons, prayers, and services. Therefore I suggest the propriety of your teaching your disciples to keep up with the age, and to adapt their preaching and their manner of preaching to the present times.

7. In conclusion I would venture to say, that in the discharge of the duties and high responsibilities that belong to your chair, you are not to feel restricted in your teaching to a mere system of didactic and polemic theology in its naked and scientific forms; but at the same time you are to allow yourself that latitude which will embrace the *manners* of the man as well as the *matter* of his preaching. While it may not be proper for you to assume the duties that properly belong to the chair of pastoral theology—a department of theological learning of unusual importance in these times, but sadly neglected in some instances—yet you are, nevertheless, to instruct and train your pupils in those accomplishments which will enable them to become acceptable ministers of the gospel in whatever field providence may cast their lot. We have Paul's authority for becoming all things to all men, that "by all means he might save some;" and amongst the "*all things*" in Paul's category, we may include *good breeding* and *genteel manners*, the want of which is often a stumbling block in the way of the success of the gospel.

In addition to this, let your candidates be taught that *moral courage* is an essential qualification in an ambassador of Christ. All men are bold in fair weather, and in calm seas where there is no danger. But it is the storm of obloquy, and the fierce

tempest of a vitiated popular clamor, that reveal what kind of spirit they are of. That ambassador of God, wanting in moral courage, who shrinks from crying aloud and sparing not when Zion is in danger, because he fears personal detriment to himself by so doing, is not fit to be the ambassador of the "King of kings," and ought to doubt his call to the great work of the gospel ministry.

But, my respected brother, I must ask your pardon for charging you in relation to the multiplied and varied duties of your office, concerning which you know vastly more than I do. May God bless you with every necessary qualification to discharge in all things and in all respects the weighty obligations you have, in these solemn ceremonies, taken upon yourself! And may your life be long spared, and richly endowed with grace, to be in the future, as you have been in the past, a pillar and an ornament in the household of faith!

DR. PLUMER'S INAUGURAL.

THE RIGHT TEMPER FOR A THEOLOGIAN.

MODERATOR AND MEMBERS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, AND THIS RESPECTED AUDIENCE:

Every one must have observed that very different degrees of success attend the studies of those engaged in inquiring into sacred things. Nor is this difference always decided by natural talents, nor by literary acquirements. Wholly sanctified to the glory of God, these are truly important; but relied upon, they augur but a splendid failure. The history of the Church abounds in mournful illustrations of the danger of leaning on these things, and of forgetting the necessity of other and higher qualifications.

That the study of religious truth, conducted in a wrong temper, will be productive of little or no profit, is a truth commonly admitted by serious people. Surely the Scriptures so teach. Moreover, a wrong temper is itself criminal, and should be

avoided, if it were no hindrance to one's progress in knowledge. The want of a right temper produces more miscarriages in the lives of theologians than all other things united. The whole history of theological studies does not tell us of one, who kept his heart with excessive diligence. The reason is that out of it are the issues of life.

There is reason for believing that many fail in their studies because of the power of *prejudice*. Nothing is more opposed to docility, or to our advancement in learning than a state of mind fore-armed against the truth. Impartiality, essential to high success, is difficult of attainment. Prejudices are judgments for or against things proposed to our minds without investigation, or at least without sufficient foundation. They result from education, from temperament, from sectarianism, or from some sin indulged. Even when prejudices are in favor of the truth, they have no saving efficacy. Sanctification is not through the strength of our prejudices, but through the belief of the truth. Prejudices against the truth often prove fatal, overriding strong convictions, and causing the entire and sometimes the bitter rejection of doctrines essential to salvation. When one is in such a state that he will not examine evidence and truth with a good degree of impartiality, it is certain that he will go astray. When men come to God's word, not to be taught, but to teach, not to learn the mind of the Spirit, but to find some way of supporting error, or of evading unwelcome truths; when with avidity they seize any thing favoring their dogmas, but carefully avoid whatever wars against their preconceived opinions, they effectually exclude themselves from the high way to any large attainments in theology. The light that is in them thus becomes darkness. Except so far as sanctified, the human mind is enmity against God, against his nature, his will, his word; so that "the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." Some indulge prejudices against particular books of Scripture, and others against particular doctrines of God's word. Such are often found following vain and wild notions. One says: "The Scrip-

ture is so penned that they, who have a mind to know, may know; they, who have a mind to wrangle, may take occasion enough of offence, and justly perish by the rebellion of their own minds; for God never intended to satisfy men of stubborn and perverse spirits." Richard Baxter says: "Fame and tradition, education and the country's vote, do become the ordinary parents of many lies; and folly maketh us to fasten so fearlessly in our first apprehensions, that they keep open the door to abundance more falsehoods; and it must be clear teachers, or great, impartial studies of a self-denying mind, with a great blessing of God, that must deliver us from prejudice, and deceive us." It requires no humility, no faith, no grace of any kind, to be an earnest partisan of any dogma or sect. Whatever our education may have been, we will find it no easy task to eradicate prejudices. It is a great mercy when God enables us to lay aside "foretaken opinions," and to sit down with prevailing candor to the study of God's truth.

Such are the weakness of the human mind and its liability to err that nothing is more reasonable than unaffected *modesty* in every theologian. The greatest proficient in every branch of knowledge have been tenderly conscious of their own weakness and liability to err. The books are full of commendations of this virtue in all the walks of life. Bruyère has well expressed the views of many when he says: "Modesty is to merit, as shades to figures in a picture, giving it strength and beauty." This is true. But modesty is not a mere ornament. It is of essential use in the conduct of our studies. It should therefore be unfeigned. The Scriptures lay great stress on this matter. "Seest thou a man wise in his own conceit? there is more hope of a fool than of him." "Trust in the Lord with all thy heart; and lean not unto thine own understanding. In all thy ways acknowledge him, and he shall direct thy paths." Our Lord chiefly refers to this modest estimate of ourselves, when he says: "Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, shall in no wise enter therein." He, who is grossly ignorant of his own faults and deficiencies, who greatly overestimates his abilities and attainments, will hardly advance in any thing

good or great. He, who has real piety and much knowledge of himself, must be lowly, far removed from flippant self-conceit.

When the celebrated Hermann Witsius delivered his inaugural as professor at Leyden, October 16, 1698, his discourse was *DE THEOLOGO MODESTO*. A short extract from that address is here pertinent. "Monstra mihi hominem, qui sui neque contemtor. neque admirator sit; qui divinae munificentiae dona, procul invidiâ, aequo pretio in aliis aestimat; qui affectus in ordinem cogere, et animum, linguam, stilum moderari didicit; qui res quasque suis prudenter momentis librat, easque ita prosequitur uti singularum genio convenit; qui neque rigidus neque mollis est, sed tractabilis; sine pusillanimitate lenis, sine latitudine patiens, sine tetricitate gravis, sine jactantiâ fortis, sine contumaciâ constans; talem, inquam, mihi monstrato hominem, et eum ego vere *MODESTUM VIRUM* appellabo. Qui idem si omnes hasce virtutes ad rerum divinarum tractationem conferet. iisque reverentiam addet quae tremendis religionis nostrae mysteriis debetur, eundem ego *MODESTUM* salutabo *THEOLOGUM*: illi assurgam, in illius complexus ruam, illum exosculabor. illius pectori admovebo meum, arctoque amoris nexu comprimam, donec venerabilem istum characterem menti meae impressero. exprimendum moribus." Such subjects as God's nature, counsels and government; as man's dependence and freedom, his obligation and destiny; such themes as time and eternity, life and death, sin and holiness, heaven and hell, are not to be justly understood by the proud and self-sufficient. Let men hear and read, "not to contradict and confute, nor blindly to believe and take for granted, nor to find talk and discourse, but to weigh and consider." We might almost as well not meditate on divine things at all as to think in the self-sufficiency of a proud heart. If one has a great idea of himself, the presumption is that it is the only great idea he is likely ever to have.

But let not these remarks be misunderstood. Let no theologian cultivate servility of mind. Contempt for the faculties God has given us is as unfriendly to success as self-conceit. Dr. Taylor of England gave to his students this wholesome advice:

"I. I do solemnly charge you, in the name of the God of

truth, and of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is the Way, the Truth, and the Life, and before whose judgment-seat you must in no long time appear, that in all your studies and inquiries of a religious nature, present or future, you do constantly, carefully, impartially, and conscientiously attend to evidence, as it lies in the Holy Scriptures, or in the nature of things, and the dictates of reason; cautiously guarding against the sallies of imagination, and the fallacy of ill-grounded conjecture.

“II. That you admit, embrace, or assent to no principle, or sentiment, by me taught or advanced, but only so far as it shall appear to you to be supported and justified by proper evidence from revelation or the reason of things.

“III. That, if any time hereafter, any principle or sentiment, by me taught or advanced, or by you admitted and embraced, shall upon impartial and faithful examination, appear to you to be dubious or false, you either suspect, or totally reject such principle or sentiment.

“IV. That you keep your mind always open to evidence.—That you labor to banish from your breasts all prejudice, prepossession, and party-zeal.—That you study to live in peace and love with all your fellow-Christians, and freely allow to others the unalienable rights of judgment and conscience.”

If any man would be a master in divinity, let him at all hazards maintain *independence of thought and freedom of inquiry*. It is a miserably jejune interpretation of our Lord's prohibition to call any man master, father, or Rabbi, that he was forbidding us to give literary titles to men eminent for their learning, age, or services. He designed to warn us against blindly following the opinions of men, as many in his day did. We have but one Master, even Christ. Implicit faith is due to the words of God alone. When he speaks, it is the height of wisdom to bow down our souls, and receive every declaration as true. He, who made the mind, has rightful authority over all its powers. But all propositions set forth for our embrace by men, however many, learned or venerable, are fit matter of inquiry, not only as to their import, but as to their accordance with the truth of God. Let every man cautiously settle and firmly hold all his religious

principles. The Bible encourages modesty, not servility of mind. Paul says: "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good." Think for yourself. Be firm as a rock; but be not stubborn as a mule. Embrace truth and yield to evidence. David says: "I have *stuck* unto thy testimonies." In theology merely human authority cannot have too little, as divine authority cannot have too much weight. Lord Bacon well says: "Disciples do owe unto masters only a temporary belief, and a suspension of their own judgments, till they are fully instructed, and not an absolute resignation, or perpetual captivity." The theologian cannot exalt Christ too much. He is King and Prophet. He is God's beloved Son. HEAR HIM. But beware of blindly following any man, any body of men, any school, any Church. In malice be children, but in understanding be men. When a truth is settled, be not easily moved to surrender it, nor even to doubt its truth. And let no one allow himself to be beguiled into a fickleness respecting even the terms of theology. A late writer says: "The progress of language is uttering aloud against 'them that call evil good and good evil, that put bitter for sweet and sweet for bitter.' And in view of the evils which the use of language can produce by weakening or confounding moral distinctions, does it not become the sober, honest, religious portion of the world, to stick to the old terms by which the indignation of men against sin has been conveyed from of old, instead of diluting the power of truth and blunting the edge of reproof by an inoffensive, but inane word, which circulates in good society?" What is here said of terms to express our ideas of right and wrong is fully applicable to all religious subjects, and particularly to the terminology of the only sacred science known to men.

There is not a more important qualification of a student of divine things than *profound reverence* for all that is sacred. Seriousness is not enough. Solemnity is necessary, and that united with holy fear. He who jests, he who trifles, he who feels no solemn awe, may well doubt not only his fitness for the sacred office, but also the reality of his piety. When God was about to call Moses, and make him a great prophet, he first ap-

peared to him in the burning bush. And when Moses "turned aside to see," God said, "Draw not nigh hither," *q. d.*, remain at a reverential distance; "put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place where thou standest is holy ground." "And Moses hid his face." So let every theologian do. Divinity is holy ground. "Sanctify the LORD of hosts himself, and let him be your fear, and let him be your dread." "To this man will I look, even to him that is poor and of a contrite spirit, and trembleth at my word." Two classes of persons commonly show a shocking irreverence for divine things. One is composed of fanatics, the other of the authors or abettors of fundamental heresy. Their tempers led to their errors and their errors are best supported by their tempers. Too much solemnity and holy reverence cannot be exercised by any who would advance in the knowledge of the truth. In such studies as are essential to the minister of Christ, irreverence is profaneness. God's truth will profit no man who is incurably addicted to levity of mind respecting divine things. Of all dispositions none is more unfriendly to the successful study of religious truth than a fondness for jesting with sacred things. Luther said: "Whom God would destroy, he first permits to sport with Scripture." When Pilate said, "What is truth?" he could not have asked a graver question. But his conduct immediately after showed that he could have asked no question in a less reverent state of mind.

In Jewish Bibles the frontispiece has that saying of Jacob upon his vision of God at Bethel: "How dreadful is this place! This is none other but the house of God, and this is the gate of heaven!" Remarking on this Owen says, "So ought we to look upon the word with a holy awe and reverence of the presence of God in it."

In his Judgment of Scripture, Cranmer says: "I would advise you all, that come to the reading or hearing of this book, which is the word of God, the most precious jewel, and most holy relic that remaineth upon earth, that ye bring with you the fear of God, and that ye do it with all due reverence, and use your knowledge thereof, not to vain glory of frivolous disputation,

but to the honor of God, increase of virtue, and edification both of yourselves and others."

It is, I think, Palgrave, who says: "It is of great importance that we should resist the temptation, frequently so strong, of annexing a familiar, facetious, or irreverent idea to a Scripture text or a Scripture name. Nor should we hold ourselves guiltless, though we may have been misled by mere negligence or want of reflection. Every person of good taste will avoid reading a parody or a travestie of a beautiful poem, because the recollection of the degraded likeness will always obtrude itself upon our memories when we wish to derive pleasure from the contemplation of the original. But how much more urgent is the duty by which we are bound to keep the page of the Bible clear of any impression tending to diminish the feeling of habitual respect and reverence toward our Maker's law."

Of all the dispositions requisite to success in the study of religious truth, none is more important than a sincere, constant, and ardent *love of truth*. No qualification is before this. He, who loves his own opinions because they are his, or is greatly attached to views which are of high esteem in his sect or party because they are a Shibboleth, is a candidate for shame and error. Without strong love for the truth no man has ever made any considerable progress in knowledge. It is indispensable. Nothing can compensate for the want of it. It has been a prominent trait of every good man's character. Job says: "I have esteemed the word of his mouth more than my necessary food." David says, "My soul breaketh for the longing it hath unto thy commandments at all times." "How sweet are thy words unto my taste! yea, sweeter than honey to my mouth." "I love thy commandments above gold, yea, above fine gold." Solomon says: "Buy the truth, and sell it not." "If thou criest after knowledge, and liftest up thy voice for understanding; if thou seekest her as silver, and searchest for her as for hid treasures; then shalt thou understand the fear of the LORD, and find the knowledge of God." Peter says: "As new born babes, desire the sincere milk of the word, that ye may grow thereby." The love of truth is a sure pledge that God will bless and guide us in our

quest after stores of knowledge. When one is ready to "receive the engrafted word with meekness," then it is both easy and pleasant to teach him. This is one of the most pleasing characteristics of those who have been recently and thoroughly regenerated. Genuine young converts greatly love the truth. It is their chief qualification for advancing in discoveries of the way of life and the rule of duty.

Another state of heart very important to the theologian is *patience*, producing caution and deliberation. A hasty spirit is wholly unfriendly to sound learning. The minds of many rush with impetuosity toward conclusions. They seem to be impatient of all delay, or to regard it as a derogation from their just estimate of themselves to ask them to tarry long in the premises of any subject. Yet observation shows that conclusions hastily adopted are often as hastily abandoned. Even if we reach the truth, but in a rash manner, it can hardly be as a pillar of beautiful proportions in our thoughts, nor can we be half so sure that it is truth to be relied on in all exigencies, as if we had reached it by more careful steps. Let reasonable doubts produce uncertainty, and let us suspend our judgments, until time has been given for further prayer and investigation. Such a habit may leave us for a while unsettled about some matters of great interest. Very well. Jesus said: "What thou knowest not now, thou shalt know hereafter." And Paul said: "We know in part, and we prophesy in part. But when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away."

In all lawful pursuits a *spirit of diligence* is of great importance. Thus spake God of old: "The book of the law shall not depart out of thy mouth: but thou shalt meditate therein day and night, that thou mayest observe to do according to all that is written therein: for then shalt thou make thy way prosperous, and then thou shalt have good success." The Bereans are commended because they searched the Scriptures *daily*. The great law of acquisition in knowledge is, a little at a time and often repeated. "The hand of the diligent maketh rich." Pious men of old have set us a good example in this respect. One says, "O how love I thy law! It is my meditation all the day."

“Meditation, to the book of revelation, is like the microscope to the book of nature; it is sure to discover new beauties.” Many a difficulty is cleared up by diligence, while the slothful finds himself daily plunged into greater embarrassment on many points. Are not theologians of all degrees of culture often tempted to think too high a price, in the way of diligence, toil, and hardship, is exacted of them? But the fact is that after all that is done to arouse them many are but half awake. Look at the life of a cadet at the military academy at West Point, and see how much more rigorous his service than that required in any theological school. He sleeps in the barracks, in a room with one other; at five a. m. in summer, and at half past five in the winter, the reveille awakens him; he immediately arises, doubles up his blanket and mattress, and places them on the head of his iron bedstead; he studies until seven o'clock; at that hour the drum beats for breakfast and the cadets fall into rank and proceed to the mess hall. Twenty minutes is the usual time spent at breakfast. Guard mounting takes place at half-past seven, and twenty-four are placed on guard every day. At eight o'clock the bugle sounds, and the recitations commence. At one o'clock the bugle again sounds, the professors dismiss their respective sections, the cadets form ranks opposite the barracks and march to dinner. Between eleven and one a part of the cadets are occupied in riding, and others in fencing daily. After dinner they have until two o'clock for recreation. At four the bugle sounds and they go either to battalion or light artillery drill. This exercise lasts an hour and a half. After that they devote the time to recreation until parade which takes place at sunset. After parade they form into rank in front of the barracks, and the names of the delinquents are read by an officer of the cadets. Supper comes next, and after supper recreation until eight o'clock, when the bugle sounds to call to quarters, and every cadet must be found in his room within a few minutes at study, and must remain there thus employed until half-past nine. At half-past nine the bugle again sounds; this is called tattoo; and at the drum taps every cadet must be in bed, having his light extinguished, and must remain there until morning.

Through the months of July and August the cadets are encamped, and during the encampment the instruction is exclusively military. The only furlough allowed to cadets is two months when they are in the third class.

See too how officers in the army endure hardness, not only in middle life, but down to old age. Let him, who would have religious truth dwell in him richly, spare no pains, but maintain severe habits of thought and inquiry, denying himself all luxuriousness and effeminacy, and subjecting all his powers to a wholesome discipline.

It is no less true that *genuine lively faith* in the divine testimony is essential to any large success in the theologian. It is true that theology may and ought to be taught and studied as a science. Through this process it is quite possible to carry an unbelieving mind. But such a mind will all the time be feeding on forms and losing the substance; it will be gathering shells and losing the kernels of things. All improving theologians "walk by faith." In proportion as any human character has shone illustriously, it has been remarkable for freedom from blind credulity on the one hand, and on the other from carping scepticism. There never was a truly great, nor any safe mind, that believed without evidence, or refused to believe upon sufficient evidence. One of the greatest perils in the way of any student of religious truth is just here. The principle of faith is as easily vindicated as any other principle of our nature. The right exercise of it is a solemn duty enjoined by God in many ways. He, who does not firmly believe and hold what he has learned of divine truth, will be like a wave of the sea, tossed to and fro, a poor unstable thing.

It is of the utmost importance to the theologian that he maintain habits of *just moderation* in his judgments of divine things. He, whose mind is fond of rank extremes, and who believes that repulsiveness is a mark of truth, will pretty certainly hold and teach error. I am free to say that any view of divine truth, which disinclines those, who abound in godly fear and humbleness of mind, to admire and adore, is not safe or true. Even the grand and awful doctrine of the divine sovereignty, when

rightly viewed, is well suited to beget thanksgiving and adoration, as we learn from that saying of our Saviour—Matt. xi. 25, 26; Luke x. 21. It is but candid that I should say to the Assembly that the system of doctrine sometimes called Calvinistic, sometimes Augustinian, sometimes Pauline, ought to be styled scriptural, for it agrees with *all* God's word. Yet even it should be taught in the guarded and moderate manner adopted by John Witherspoon, Thomas Scott, John Newton, John Matthews and Archibald Alexander. Harsh statements are no mark of unflinching fidelity.

If one would become mighty in the Scriptures and rich in the truth, he must have the spirit and delight in the duty of prayer. No act that man can perform is more capable of full vindication before the bar of reason than that he should pray for divine illumination. His intellectual dependence on God is absolute. Left to himself, he must fatally err. How often did David cry, "Teach me thy statutes;" "Open thou mine eyes that I may behold wondrous things out of thy law;" "Give me understanding;" "Incline my heart unto thy testimonies." The pious Thomas Boston thus lets us unto the secret of much of his success in theological studies: "I spread the Hebrew Bible before God, and cried to the Father, that, for the sake of his Son, he would by the Spirit shine on it, into me, give light into, and discover his mind in the word; that he would give me life, health, strength, time and inclination to the study, and a blessing thereon; that he would teach me how to manage that work, and would pity me as to sleep, having been somewhat bereaved of sleep since I was determined to that work." "If any man lack wisdom, let him ask of God, who giveth to all men liberally and upbraideth not." Even great poets often open their works by crying for help from God. Thus Milton says:

"And chiefly thou, O Spirit, that dost prefer
Before all temples the upright heart and pure,
Instruct me, for thou know'st. . . .
. . . . What in me is dark,
Illumine; what is low, raise and support."

From the life of the venerable Thomas Scott it appears that.

over every passage of Scripture he has lifted up his heart in prayer. The result is a very remarkable commentary, which has been read with profit by millions of people. McCheyne says: "*Turn the Bible into prayer.* Thus, if you are reading the first Psalm, spread the Bible on the chair before you, and kneel and pray, 'O Lord, give me the blessedness of the man that walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly. Let me not stand in the way of sinners. Let me not sit in the seat of the scornful.' This is the best way of learning the meaning of the Bible, and of learning to pray."

In prayer be not faithless but believing. "The breath of prayer comes from the life of faith." Let your prayer for light and teaching be fervent. "God hears the heart without words; but he never hears words without the heart." "Never expect to go to the throne of grace without having some stumbling block thrown in your way; Satan hates prayer, and always tries to hinder it."

Bishop Hall, who made such progress in the knowledge of divine things, tells us how he gained by prayer:

"After some whiles meditation, I walk up to my masters and companions, my books; and sitting down amongst them with the best contentment, I dare not reach forth my hand to salute any of them, till I have first looked up to heaven, and craved favor of him to whom all my studies are duly referred; without whom I can neither profit nor labor. After this, after no over great vanity, I call forth those which may best fit my occasions, wherein I am not too scrupulous of age; sometimes I put myself to school to one of these ancients, whom the Church hath honored with the name of fathers; whose volumes I confess not to open without a secret reverence of their holiness and gravity; sometimes to their later doctors, which want nothing but age to make them classical; always to God's book:—that day is lost, whereof some hours are not improved in those divine monuments; others I turn over out of choice—these out of duty."

Let the theologian never forget that religious truth is not merely to fill a niche in his system, nor to furnish the means of entertainment to himself and his friends. It is all intended for

practice. It must first be proposed to our minds, then loved, embraced, and finally reduced to practice. Practice makes sure our knowledge in a way that nothing else does. This is true in the exact sciences and in the useful and ornamental arts: above all is it true in regard to divine things. A malicious mind cannot be expected to make rapid progress in an understanding of the boundless mysteries of love. A worldly mind is ill suited to scan the glories of spiritual things. Practice is not only the life of piety, but it is essential to any sure progress in wisdom. There is no greater folly than that which stalks to hell with the lamp of truth burning before it all the the time. Well did David say, "I will keep thy statutes." And Jesus Christ has informed us that practice has much to do with progress in learning, when he says: "If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God." That is a truth illustrated in the life and experience of every converted man. The apostle James also says: "Be ye doers of the word and not hearers only, deceiving your own selves. For if a man be a hearer of the word, and not a doer, he is like unto a man beholding his natural face in a glass: for he beholdeth himself, and goeth his way, and straightway forgetteth what manner of man he was. But whoso looketh into the perfect law of liberty, and continueth therein, he being not a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the work, this man shall be blessed in his deed." How can he understand the place charity should occupy in a system of practical theology, who carries grudges and old hatred in his bosom? How can he know the connexion between Christ's poverty and our riches, whose soul is never drawn out to the needy, but trusts in uncertain riches?

Of course the whole spirit and temper of the theologian should be evangelical. A mere legalist in theology is as wide of the truth, as he is far from holy living. If Jesus Christ is not the Alpha and the Omega of our theological system, it matters little what else is in it. A "Christless Christianity" is as false in theory as it is powerless in practice. But on this subject I have said so much in writings which are before the public, that it is needless at present to say more.

It would be discourteous in me not to notice with expressions of gratitude the great kindness manifested towards me by the last Assembly as well as by this venerable body, and by the whole Church interested in the success of our Seminary. If I had the command of words more expressive than any in my vocabulary, I might well employ them in making acknowledgments to those friends in the South who have given me so hearty a welcome to my present post of toil; and not less to those friends in the North and West who advised me to accept the professorship, and gave me assurances of their good will, hearty prayers, and substantial support in this new field of labor.

Brethren, pray for me.

ARTICLE IV.

THE PARADISE OF THE LEVELLERS.

The present writer is a firm believer in what is called the pre-millennial theory of the prophecies; that is, he believes that the kingdom of Christ upon earth is to be inaugurated by the second coming of Christ to the world. This interpretation appears to be demanded by the course of events in the second chapter of Daniel. The metals in the great image deteriorate in the progress of the development of the figure, until that stone cut out of the mountain without hands crushes them all. This great emblem of the earthly ages contains no metal which represents the amelioration of the times as a preparation for the erection of the kingdom of Christ in the world. This interpretation appears to be demanded by the course of the empires with the well known beastly emblems, in the seventh chapter of Daniel. The series of beasts which represents the well known four universal kingdoms of antiquity, passes over the sphere of vision, with those ghastly emblems of subsidiary or parasitic kingdoms, the horns, in a perfectly manifest process of deterioration, until those

bestial thrones are cast down, and the Ancient of days assumes that political judgment-throne of the nations, which the fact that nations must be judged and punished in this world, if at all, makes a necessity, in any scheme of political divine justice. Then the last bestial horn is destroyed with great power, and the divine Son of Man comes in the clouds, and receives dominion, glory, and a kingdom. The same interpretation seems demanded by the sudden catastrophe with which, in the pride of triumphant power, the last of the series of the bestial thrones is cast down, in the end of the eleventh of Daniel: "He shall plant the tabernacles of his palace between the seas, in the glorious holy mountain; yet he shall come to his end, and none shall help him;" together with that awful sequel, that mingling of death and glory, of resurrection and trouble, in the twelfth chapter.

The same mode of interpretation is required in the Apocalypse. There is not there, nor any where in the Bible, we firmly believe, anything like a description of a gradual process of this world's *growing better* to become ready for the coming of her King, unless the preaching of the gospel for a testimony to all nations may be esteemed such a description, attending both the coming of Christ at the destruction of Jerusalem, and that of which men now speak. That preaching of the gospel to all nations was not a perfect sanctification of the nations *then*, to prepare them for the coming of their King: "This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations." Matt. xxiv. 14. And it will not be so in any future coming of Christ. If the language did not require it *then*, in that earlier second coming, in the destruction of Jerusalem—concerning which he plainly said that that generation should not pass till all these things be fulfilled, and which stood in the relation of an Old Testament type to that coming now expected—neither does the language require it *now*. As the deep and felt darkness of the sinner's heart, immediately before his regeneration, is intended to teach him that without the Lord Jesus he can do nothing, so the darkness of the world, and its evident and rapid rush to a worse and worse condition, is intended to show that man is as

completely at fault in true political and social wisdom as he is in the power to make himself holy.

In the rolling series of trumpets, in the Apocalypse, it is said : "The second woe is past : and, behold, the third woe cometh quickly." And amid that rolling series of the woes of the world, "the trumpet of the seventh angel sounds ; and there are great voices in heaven, saying : The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ." And with the fulfilment of this prophecy concerning the kingdoms of this world, with any just measure of fair grammatical interpretation with which any Christian heart would be satisfied in any matter in which the prejudices of opinion were not at work ; with the conversion of the kingdoms of this world into the kingdoms of the Lord and his Christ, in any sense which is fully and fairly just to the words, just to their meanings in other places, just to their complete sense, just and reverent to the word of God, and just and reverent to the Spirit which inspired them—with that interpretation, both we and our theory will be completely satisfied. And the same method of interpretation is obviously required by the incessant streaming of the vials of wrath from heaven upon men, (Rev. xvi.,) and those fearful civil and social convulsions probably signified by voices, and thunders, and lightnings, and a great earthquake, and a great hail ; and the sudden bursting in upon that lurid scene of the vision of the judgment of the great whore that sitteth upon many waters, and the mighty cry of an angel through the air, that Babylon the great is fallen, (Rev. xvii.,) and the lamentations of the paramours of Babylon among the nations over her fall, (Rev. xviii.,) and the chorus of the voices of much people in heaven, ascribing "salvation, and glory, and honor, and power, unto the Lord our God," because what had been doubted was now demonstrated, that, as he had "judged the great whore which did corrupt the earth with her fornication, and avenged the blood of his servants at her hand," therefore all men may now see that "true and righteous are his judgments." Especially will that song of much people in heaven contain much of the zest of happy hearts, once sorely desponding, as if eternal justice had been consumed with

the flesh of the martyr by his fagot at his stake; if other great oppressing powers, as beasts ridden by meretricious women, be judged with the same judgment as their elder sister, and meet the same merited doom with their great prototype, and synonym, and representative.

How obvious it is, from a collected view of any particular chronological prophecy, and from the connexions and coincidences of these different chronological prophecies with each other, and from the analogies, civil and religious, that "as a snare shall that day come on all them that dwell on the face of the whole earth." Luke xxi. 35.

There is nothing more deeply interesting to the human mind than the patient study of the deeds of divine Providence; how he sometimes permits a caricature, or parhelion, of one of his own most illustrious deeds, works, or events, to be played off to the eyes of men—as when the Lord Jesus, the true son of the Father, was caricatured, in the "passion-history," by that other BAR-ABBAS, that son of his father, the devil, whom Satan procured to carry a majority of the voices among men over the son of God. The four universal empires of the prophecies are such caricatures of the true kingdom of Christ—such parhelions of the true sun. Those kingdoms have beasts for their emblems. The emblem of the true, real, and rightful kingdom is the divine Son of Man. The kingdom of the Son of God has a grade of superiority over the kingdoms of men, such as a model man has, in the science of symbols, over a beast.

And as these parhelions and caricatures of the kingdom of God appear in prophecy, so do they also appear amid the gloomy phantasms of facts in this world, when it seems most forsaken and left to itself. But men do not always see them clearly.

The empire of the perfect papacy, the vast dominion of Gregory, (Hildebrand,) being a religious empire, having its authority, in great part, in men's consciences, and governing them through their superstitious fears with that tremendous power which marked the middle ages, which governed Europe by interdicts and bulls of excommunication, and which was in its noonday when Europe was in its midnight, was a rival and a

caricature of the kingdom of the Son of God. It was one which satisfied many a Christian of that day of its genuineness. It must have almost satisfied the arch-fiend himself. He must have permitted himself to indulge a little in glorying that he had shut out the Lord Jesus from his earthly kingdom, and taken that kingdom to himself; that he had changed that kingdom from a kingdom of righteousness to a kingdom of sin; and that he had wrapped those fearful cords of superstition and misbelief so firmly around men's memories, and around men's imaginations, and around men's reasoning powers, and around their patriotic and homely affections, that there was as little danger of a popular revolt against his authority as there was to the Roman Empire in the reign of Trajan, or to the British Empire in its firmest and strongest hour. There must have been something like this kind of glorying by Satan in the perfectness and security of his empire, when the Pope sent Tetzels into Germany to sell sin by weight and measure.

We firmly believe a caricature of the kingdom of Christ was intended by Satan in the spirit of the old Greeks and Romans—in the stoic virtues of Brutus, of Cato, of Mutius Scaevola, and of Horatius Cocles: every observing man well remembering how the man of his acquaintance, who has acquired extensive fame as a man of honor, of integrity, and of incorruptible principle, *out of Christ*, is pointed to as a *refutation* of religion as necessary to virtue; and how his fair outward seeming furnishes unbelief with its keenest arrows with which to wound Christianity. And this we say of the intention of Satan in the moral culture of the Greeks and Romans, without forgetting or endeavoring to gain-say that eternal overruling wisdom caused that culture to subserve another and a better purpose, as the real preparation of the soul of man, as the instrument to prepare men for the clear thought and the true and pure spiritual life of Christianity when it should come.

We firmly believe that a caricature of the claims and rights of the kingdom of God over the souls of men was attempted to be set forth in the feast of Belshazzar at Babylon, when “he commanded to bring the gold and silver vessels which his father

Nebuchadnezzar had taken out of the temple which was in Jerusalem, that the king, and his wives, and his concubines, might drink therein. And they drank wine, and praised the gods of gold, and of silver, of brass, of iron, of wood, and of stone."

There is the same remarkable feature, well adapted to cheer the faith of the righteous, in this case, that appeared when Tetzal came into Germany to sell sin: and the man of sin thought his kingdom so well established that its strength would bear any strain. Tetzal's auction of indulgences to sin awoke the terrible protest of the Augustinian friar, Martin Luther. Belshazzar's feast and the revelry of his lords and ladies called forth in the same hour those words of doom, written by "the fingers of a man's hand over against the candlestick upon the plaster of the wall of the king's palace; and the king saw the part of the hand that wrote."

There is no richer subject among the treasures of the sacred volume than this of types, typical prophecies, and typical events. It is a grand feature of the word of God, that, as might be expected, in the connected thought and counsel of a *single mind*, though communicated to man by many writers and many speakers, it speaks words, utters prophecies, and narrates events, that, from the moment of their first utterance, fly forever through the world, seeking and finding repeated fulfilments. And when the familiar proverb declares that "history repeats itself," it does but assert a great principle of God's government, especially recognised in type and prophecy, that, like the famous echoes at a certain place in Italy, where a pistol shot reverberates in echo and reëcho a hundred times, certain shapes and forms of events underlie all the chief prophecies, and receive an ever-reverberating fulfilment amid the events of time and history.

When the people of Israel demanded a king of their old and venerable judge, Samuel, "the thing displeased Samuel when they said, Give us a king to judge us. And Samuel prayed unto the Lord. And the Lord said unto Samuel, Hearken unto the voice of the people in all that they say unto thee: for they have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me, that I should not reign over them. According to all the works which they

have done since the day that I brought them up out of Egypt even unto this day, wherewith they have forsaken me and served other gods; so do they also unto thee. Now, therefore, hearken unto their voice: howbeit, yet protest solemnly unto them, and show them the manner of the king that shall reign over them." I Sam. viii. 6-9.

There was once, then, a theocracy; and in its day, the people rejected God from reigning over them. And from that day to this, stumbling and staggering among the dark mountains of different political theories, each having the same dark spot, the depravity of man, and each having the same dreadful flaw, the impossible problem of bridling the malevolent passions of a sovereign one or a sovereign many, by moral restraints, or restraints of their own imposing upon themselves, the nations have gone on, through dark ages and through ages of rich culture, in the small religious light of the Old Covenant, and in the full religious light of the New Covenant, working out the problem whether governments which reject God can stand the trial of the stern realities of sin and evil passion. And as the experiment commenced in the rejection of one theocracy, so we believe it must conclude with the correction and renunciation by man of the sin of man in the rejection of God as his king—in a willing return from a weary wandering through an interminable forest of human experiments, and human failures, and human woes, and human follies, and human crimes, to another theocracy, and to a willing subjection to divine authority in civil affairs, as the only solution of the great problem from age to age, What constitutes good government.

And we submit it to those readers of the prophecies who derive their views of prophecy from prophecy itself, and their views of the chains of prophetic events from the chains of prophetic events themselves, of which the links glitter so brightly in the chronological prophecies, whether every single chain of such prophecies, and every single sketch of any length in Isaiah or in Micah, whether strictly chronological or not, does not end in something like a return and repetition upon earth of the old

Jewish theocracy, expanded from the limits of a single nation to those of a world.

The rejection of Saul from being king over Israel, and the anointing of David to that office, seems, in some measure, to have brought back the kingdom to God;—David appearing in that awfully bright altitude in history, as the most illustrious human and royal type of the Son of God—not the rival of God's authority, but a bright foreshadow, the highest, richest type of the true David, the true beloved, David's greater Son, who is, and was, David's Lord.

And this restoration of Israel to the favor of God under David, moved the hostile powers of darkness, and Satan stood up against Israel and provoked David to number Israel. And when in the light of the source of this temptation, the god of this world, and also in the light of the displeasure of God afterwards shown, we come to inquire what was the sin of numbering Israel, (1 Chron. xxi.) we shall see that it was simply a provoking of a reliance on itself instead of on God, a turning from the attitude of a theocracy, as manifested in David's fight with Goliath, in which small and weak things were made mighty by the blessing of God, to sink down to the position of those nations whose emblems were the beasts; a perversion of the nation from a theocracy, whose motto was, "not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord," to a caricature of the kingdom of God, a kingdom of Satan, under the robes, and under the forms, and with the name of a kingdom of God. No other idea, it seems to us, will adequately explain David's confession that he had done very foolishly, or God's fearful triple alternative offered him as his punishment: "Either three years' famine, or three months to be destroyed before thy foes, while that the sword of thine enemies overtaketh thee; or else three days the sword of the Lord, even the pestilence, in the land, and the angel of the Lord destroying throughout all the coasts of Israel."

It was that crime of perverting the nation from being the kingdom of God to being a caricature of the kingdom of God, which caused the angel of the Lord to stand between the earth and the heaven, having a drawn sword in his hand stretched over

Jerusalem, visible to the eyes of the erring king, in gorgeous and fearful vision, in that sacred spot at which, thereafter, should stand the altar of a yet more distinct acknowledgment of God.

We now steer backward to primeval ages, when events were simple and seminal in their character, and the records we have of them are marked by a significant and simple brevity. Among typical events, with deep meaning for bodies politic in all ages, is to be classed, in the very nature of the case, that undertaking on the plain of Shinar, when men were journeying from the east, and came thither, being hitherto of one language and of one speech, and resolved to build there "a city and a tower whose top might reach unto heaven; and so make them a name, lest they should be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth." Gen. xi.

It is commonly believed that there had been some express command of God to the progeny of the sons of Noah, to send out colonies, to spread their wings over the broad earth, and to found different states and nations. In contravention of this divine precept, this building upon the plain of Shinar was avowedly to prevent their dispersion; to provide a universal centre: to procure for them a world-wide renown; and to make themselves equal to what ideas they then had of God; perhaps to provide a place to rival that eastern gate of Eden, the vision of which still lingered in the traditions of the race, where God's cherub guards had kept the way of the tree of life with flaming and many-edged sword.

And on that plain of Shinar God came down and scattered them upon the face of all the earth. And they left off to build the city. And this is the origin of Babylon! Strangely and nakedly, like the mountain pile with which the Titans attempted to scale heaven, stands this deeply significant apologue in the primeval story.

There is a certain deep connexion in the minds and thoughts of men between certain cities and certain great ideas.

ROME means strength, might. She streams over the ancient world as strength, might. She beats down with ruthless iron foot, in that dark post-meridian of the night of pagan times in

which she flourished, every voice, whether that of Cato, of Marcellus, or of Brutus, who might have assumed to speak of or to think of her deeds with the voice or the thought of justice. Rome means forever that might tramples all laws of God, and manufactures its own right, and that only such right as might can make is hers.

JERUSALEM is the city of God. It is the name borne by a city on earth. It is a name which is but another word for the capital city of the kingdom of God. It is the name to be hereafter borne by that holy city, which shall come down from God out of heaven in shining glory, showing the reality of the brightest of all the dreams of poet and of prophet concerning the golden age: "as a bride adorned for her husband."

BABYLON is the enemy of Jerusalem: the capital of the combined enemies of God. When there are to be caricatures of the kingdom of God and of the strong tower of the saints, it is on the plain of Shinar or of Dura, or on the walls of Babylon, as Nebuchadnezzar walks and boasts upon those walls: or in the palaces of Babylon, as Belshazzar and his lords and ladies revel within those palaces. If Jerusalem is threatened, it is by the king of Babylon. If God's people are called to weep and welter in the sorrow of captivity, it is by the rivers of Babylon. And when Rome comes to be, in the later times, what Babylon had been in the earlier times of ancient history, then the Apostle Peter, writing from Rome, mystically says, "the church that is at Babylon, elected together with you, saluteth you." 1 Peter v. 13.

Few productions of recent times are as suggestive of deep and grave historical reflections as the letter of Thaddeus Stevens to Doctor Pfeiffer, published not long ago. Of course it exhibits the strange ferocity of the Radicals towards the white people of the South, for which ferocity there is no other way to account than on the principle that men naturally most deeply hate those whom they have most deeply injured. And in that case, every manifest virtue, every undeniable honor, every inalienable right, of those who are hated, is a new vexation, a new provocation of fresh rancor, because it is an accusing voice, rising in the universe

of truth, to condemn not only the ferocity with which men hate their victims, but the injuries themselves, in whatever artful robes and cunning pretexts they may be cloaked, which have caused the ferocity.

We wish we knew more than we do of the contest between Michael the archangel and Satan, about the body of Moses, upon which such a brief flash of light, as if of lightning, is thrown in Holy Writ. It is certain from the word used—*δυσζητητο*—*disputed*—that it was a war of words and not of swords, between the holy and the unholy archangel. And no doubt the fiend, on that occasion, employed intensely bitter words, railing accusation, ingeniously conceived misconstruction and misinterpretations, and pertinacious refusals to see the light, or to understand things fairly, justly, or correctly. For if Satan had fairly understood the reason of Michael, and of Michael's God, for hiding the body of Moses from the Jews, and thus saving them from idolatry, then Satan's justification in his own eyes, for hating Michael, and Michael's God, would have been taken away. In all such cases all exculpation, all defence, all well-doing, all virtue, all patience, all religion, add but fuel to the rage of those who hate us; because they take away the poor apology which unjust misconstructions create for that hatred, by setting their own consciences, if they have them, against themselves. It is an instructive circumstance, that in such a "fierce encounter of their wits" as this must have been, the holy archangel *durst* not bring a railing accusation against the arch-fiend, however manifest to the pure intelligence were his corrupt and subtle evasions, and equivocations, and perversions. When the temptation came, to reply to all those subtle insinuations against heaven, and heaven's Lord, and heaven's law, we must suppose to have been then thrown out, a thought from God came into the mind of the archangel that all such things were said in the ear of God, infinitely more sensible to such sounds than the still deep ether which was the ear of the great Pan; that he, Michael, was not commissioned to inflict divine vengeance upon fiendish tongues; that there was an arrangement contained in the deep complications of divine providence, for the rebuke of such tongues, to which appeal, with

due submission, could not be in vain for every righteous being stung by such a tongue. And so the righteous and unmalevolent archangel simply said to the wicked and malevolent archangel: "The Lord rebuke thee."

We mean to say, with Bengel, and the synopsis of Sohar, from which Bengel quotes, that "modesty is an angelic virtue." "The greater was the victory at length given to Michael." "It is not permitted man ignominiously to rail at a race opposed to him, that is, evil spirits." And of ourselves, that modesty is not a proof that those who practise it are under the curse of God, or a proof that no reserves of justice, in the masses of the treasured events of the solemn future, are laid up for those who despise it, and despise also those who practise it. When the author of the letter to Dr. Pfeiffer hurls at the heads of the Southern people the fierce accusation that they are "despots, rebels, and murderers," we shall endeavor to imitate Michael and not Satan. We shall let the charge ring through the ether and the ages, not in any doubt that it has already met the ear of the great God, but waiting only his good pleasure and his sovereign will as to the time when it shall please him to speak his answer to the charge in an intelligible voice, as we doubt not he is able well and easily to do, so that it may be definitely and distinctly understood. We cannot be wrong to borrow the meek mild words of Michael the archangel, whom Satan could probably have beaten at the game of fierce railing, and say to the accusers: *The Lord rebuke thee!* Much other reply we might make, and do now restrain with difficulty at the memory of such names as Butler, and McNeil, and Hunter, and the *moral* approval of their deeds by our accusers. But all blood shed by man cries with heaven-piercing voice to the ear of God, and we content ourselves cheerfully with the words of Michael the archangel, in their meanings, their resignations, and their implications: **THE LORD REBUKE THEE.**

In these ends of the earth we had not heard of the fame of M. D. G. PFEIFFER, M. D., LL.D. But a single name with three capitals before it, one upon it, and five following it, flames upon us like a comet or a pacha of five tails, as the spiritual

confidant, counsellor, and sympathizer of Thaddeus Stevens. He is "sometime of the German Universities," "for the last fifty years and more an inhabitant of America."

Hermann Olshausen is, or was, we believe, of the University of Erlangen. Rudolf Stier is chief pastor and Superintendent of Schkeuditz. Doctor Augustus Neander is, or was, ordinary Professor of Theology in the University of Berlin. Doctor Paul Henry, the author of the masterly life of Calvin, was minister and Seminary Inspector in Berlin. Of these Germans we did know something, and of a few others also, who might be named. But Doctor Pfeiffer was "sometime of the German Universities." That seems to mean that he was *of them all*. He appears to have taken them as a wild friend of ours once took the toll-gates on a turnpike, on horseback in a gallop. But all this was long ago. He has been, he says, "for the last fifty years and more an inhabitant of America." He "left his native country for the sake of enjoying entire freedom of thought and action." It is well that he went from the German Universities to Pennsylvania and there chanced to become a Radical, or else at last, even in America, he might peradventure have failed, after all, of that entire freedom of thought and action, whose fame brought him from the fatherland and its universities to the American shores. He now writes to the great Radical "with the familiarity of ancient times" as to "whether we are now likely to approach any nearer to the true principles of liberty than our fathers did under their old, constrained Constitution." He did not and does not like that old Constitution of our fathers. He speaks of "a great blot and heinous crime" of that old Constitution which he found in operation in this country when he arrived. In his view the Constitution was *a spotted criminal*. Fifty years ago would bring us back to the times of James Monroe, just about ten years after the legal prohibition of the slave trade, and the consequent diversion of such a large mass of the capital of New England from commerce. But two years more than fifty years ago, would bring us to that splendid and stirring era in the history of one, indeed many, of the German States, at which it seems difficult to find any apology for any one "of the German Universities"

for quitting his native land to seek any where else any real and becoming boon for himself. It was just a few years more than fifty years ago that, feeling deeply the habitual insult and degradation with which Napoleon the First had treated his master, the King of Prussia, and still more, his dear mistress, the heart-broken Queen of Prussia, and lifting himself to a noble strain of patriotism which makes him one of the few European figures of that day whom we can heartily admire, Field Marshal Blücher appeared in the view of those "of the German universities." The clarion call which he addressed to summon them to the field contained in it everything which could affect a noble spirit—the independence of their country, the overthrow of a galling oppression, a fearful tyranny, the redress of the wrongs and insults of an injured king and queen. Every thinking man must have admired many things in the first Napoleon. But it is from a nobler and a purer stand-point that we admire Marshal FORWARD. We care little for Wellington and his British at Waterloo. But it is with fond imagination that we follow old Blücher on the day before Waterloo, when he finds that Grouchy has been detached to keep him in check. It is with thanks to God that we interpret the firm purpose of his heart to give the checking Frenchman the slip, and appear with his brave Prussians on the fated field. And it is with tears of admiration for the grand old patriot-hero, that we stand at Waterloo and behold the first distant dust of Bulow's cavalry, and learn that Blücher has arrived, and the insulter of Prussia's queen, the tyrant of Europe, falls that day.

Just then Doctor Pfeiffer, "of the German universities," left his native country for the sake of enjoying entire freedom of thought and action! We have often thought that many of the famous people of the Mayflower and of Plymouth Rock might have done better and acted more bravely, to have stayed in England and fought for English liberty with Hampden and Manchester, than to have sought radical *liberty to hate* in America. So Doctor Pfeiffer might peradventure have acted a better and a braver part to have rallied under Blücher, if he was a Prussian: or under whatever liberating leader the State produced, if he

belonged to any other German State, than to have left his native land, to become an agitator against the venerable Constitution of ours.

It is no part of our purpose to follow the reasoning of Thaddeus Stevens in this famous letter to Doctor Pfeiffer, in which he claims "suffrage by ballot to be due to every being within this *realm!* (*sic*) to whom God has given immortality." The wise and virtuous among the Northern people are beginning to see into these wild ravings of the levellers. They must allow us to say, that with the example of the course of *levelling*, and its issue, in the English revolution in the seventeenth century, before them; and with the course which levelling ran in the French revolution before them; with the remark of old Doctor Samuel Johnson, that "every leveller is a scoundrel," before them; and with the aid of their own calm reflections as to their own true interests, it is far more surprising to us in the South that their eyes have not been opened before to the dark designs of the levellers, than that they have been now opened at length.

We can spare room to quote barely so much of Stevens's letter to Pfeiffer as will set before the reader an adequate idea of the new levelling empire of universal suffrage—universal to the most low and ignorant, but not universal to the educated white man—which has entered the conceptions of modern Radicals:

"Traverse her twenty thousand miles from the Russian possessions around the Isthmus of Darien, up the Gulf Stream to the bold shores of the Granite State, which, with the islands of the Gulf, soon, I hope and believe, will be added to this mighty nation, to which they naturally belong; thence up to where the Esquimaux roam, and where we have lately employed the protection of the mighty walrus, on the strait which no hostile foot will ever attempt to tread, around to where the herring, the codfish, and the whale, are seeking to find a permanent refuge; but no time which the eye of man shall ever see or his imagination depict, can screen them from the hearty enterprise of this mighty empire—and you have such a vast, impregnable, and sea-girt domain as the world never saw. If anything more were wanting, more iron-clads than all Europe could send to this distance could be brought into active operation in any time necessary for the defence of the nation. Then take your route northward

from the southern isthmus, and you cross every latitude necessary for the production of all the industrial products of civilisation. No mineral, no vegetable, that ever God created for the wealth, comfort, or ornament of man would be wanted. Her southern climate, never more to be polluted by the unholy and infamous institution of slavery, bears upon every breeze the balmy odors that delight the senses. Its soil is filled with burning sapphire, its rivers run sands of gold, while its more rugged parts bear quartz equal to the fabled Ophir, and lodes of silver.

“If its more northern climate is held in firm delight by the hardy sons of ‘Greenland’s icy mountains,’ its moss-clad granite will always be protected by the Goddess of Liberty. How much better than the delicious isle over which continually blow the soft breezes of spicy Ceylon, where,

“Though every prospect pleases,
Man alone is vile.

“The ingenious artist of the gods, when procured by the mother of Achilles to engrave coast surveys and geographical delineations upon his invincible shield, never depicted a land so glorious and so variegated with gold and silver and every precious metal, and so bewitching to the senses with the odors of God’s happiest creations. Its enchanting products grow in abundance on every inch of her variegated soil, and since the curse of slavery is removed, if we do the justice which the Declaration of Independence proposes and we now propose, will soon contain a greater abundance of riches than either Europe, Asia, or Africa.”

We are mistaken, if this is not a *récho* of the act of the men who met on the PLAIN OF SHINAR more than four thousand years ago to “build a city and a tower, whose top should reach unto heaven, and to make them a name lest they should be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth.”

1. This “vast, impregnable, and sea-girt domain, such as the world never saw,” from which “more iron-clads than all Europe could send to this distance, could be brought into active operation in any time necessary for the defence of the nation”—would be the DIREST DESPOTISM upon which the eye of heaven has looked down during the flight of time. By the terms, it is to be founded upon the suffrages of the ignorant, the base, the former slave, and the malignant sectionalists. Let any adequate temptation arise to place, for instance, religion under the ban of the

voters—let it appear to be the road to popular favor to deride the Sacred Scriptures, and to insult all who are able to read them. and to proscribe, by degrading test-oaths, all who can intelligently explain them—let only as much liberty be taken in interpreting the Constitution of the United States in that “vast, impregnable, and sea-girt domain,” on the subject of the freedom of religion, as has been taken in interpreting that instrument in relation to *civil* freedom, in the Union that now is—let the Supreme Court of the United States be only as timid in the maintenance of the religious liberties of the people, as they have recently shown themselves in defence of those “golden and perpetual liberties of the civil law” which have been esteemed the precious heritage of all Anglo-Saxon nations—let the President of that “impregnable and sea-girt domain” be kept speaking “with bated breath,” intimidated by threats of impeachment; speaking the just and noble convictions of his honest judgment only when he *dare*: half resisting usurpation, yet often forced into a silent support of it: let these circumstances concur with the depravity of the human heart, directed into the channel of persecution for religion, and fanned by some accidental prejudices, artfully harped upon by such men as Brownlow and Hunicutt, and a religious persecution may yet be witnessed in this “sea-girt domain” of the levellers, to which those in which John the apostle was banished to Patmos, Ignatius was thrown to the wild beasts. Coligny was murdered in cold blood, and John Brown of Priesthill died for his holiness, and Joseph Alleine was imprisoned for preaching the gospel, will be models of mildness. The vast numbers of “iron-clads” are intended to shut out foreign help from this “vast, impregnable, and sea-girt domain.” There is to be no appeal for help to any power below the skies from any interpretation of the statutes for religious liberty which an angry, artfully inflamed, and fanatically-led majority of the ignorant, blind, and infuriated rulers, cherished by statute, and preferred because they are ignorant, blind, and infuriated, may choose to impose. It is to be settled that they shall be their own judges of their own interpretations of the Constitution of the United States. The Supreme Court is to *avoid* political questions: and

it is to be understood to be a political question to pronounce any interpretation of the statute for religious freedom unconstitutional, which extensive popular passion, especially the popular opinion of some preponderant section of the vast domain, artfully inflamed by demagogues against some other smaller section, may have generally adopted. There is then to be a renewal of the ten primitive Roman persecutions in this paradise of the levellers, this "vast, sea-girt and impregnable domain." There is to be no power on earth to help a Christian if he should happen to believe that the prejudices of the preponderant section are not of as high authority over a man's conscience as the word of God. We firmly believe it to be the intention of the levellers that neither man NOR GOD shall be able to give help. This will explain the fate of the original Babel; of David's numbering Israel; of the kingdom of Belshazzar; of the domain of Gregory (Hildebrand;) and of that of the modern Antichrist, whoever or whatever that may be. There is the vision of a man's hand, writing doom against such powers, "over against the candlestick, on the plaistering of the wall." Some drops of the vial of that doom must come upon the State of Missouri for what has already occurred. Happy shall they be upon whom no drops from that vial shall fall!

2. There seems to be no assurance that the political morality of this Paradise of the Levellers will conform, for any considerable length of time, to those divine and immutable laws of God and nature, which say, "Thou shalt not steal," and "Thou shalt not kill." In this "vast, impregnable, and sea-girt domain," all will go well as long as it is popular to think in conformity to the divine law on these subjects. Should the divine laws not be subjected to severe and real trials, all may go conformable to them for a century, or even two centuries; but in the tangled web of political events, suppose it should occur that the avaricious lust of some vast section (more than half) of the sea-girt domain should be deeply aroused against the remaining and inferior section, concerning the proper interpretation and observance of those two divine commandments, "Thou shalt not kill," and "Thou shalt not steal." Suppose that the Southern sec-

tion of the sea-girt, omnipotent domain shall have become by far the most populous and consequently the most militarily powerful. And suppose that the Northern section, in that late day, shall have fully adopted the maxim, instinct with fearful retributions, that the end justifies the means, and shall have made a god out of the majority, and have come to hold and teach avowedly and boldly in her schools, colleges, and seminaries, that there is no higher morality than expediency—that there is no higher eye regarding than the earthly highest: suppose the once pious, populous, and prosperous North, having plunged freely into the seething social cauldron of semi-infidel societies, projects, and *isms*, shall be then withering under such a divine curse and deterioration from her former smiling prosperity, as men tell us old Palestine now lies under from God for the blood of his Son. “until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in.” And suppose that, mistaking that curse of God on account of social crime, for the oppression of the government, the North-eastern States, east of the Hudson River, should again produce the old theory which Massachusetts did so boldly produce in 1845, that the Union could be peaceably dissolved by the withdrawal of that consent of the individual States which constituted it, and which was necessary to a government founded on the consent of the governed, as the best and purest men had always called our government. And suppose, then, that from that “vast, impregnable, and sea-girt domain,” these Northern States should resolve to withdraw, rolling over upon eloquent tongues, and with eloquent pens, the hallowed and ancient sentiment: “When in the course of human events it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political ties which have bound them to another, a decent regard to the opinions of men requires them to declare to the world the reasons which have impelled them to the separation.” and suppose that for that act of withdrawal the residuary Congress should pass an act declaring that all the property of the North-eastern States should vest simply in the people of the other States, and that the inhabitants of those North-eastern States had no right, not even that of life, which the armies or the civil authorities of the “vast, impregnable, and sea-girt domain”

were bound to respect. Now, the question is, would these acts of Congress not be intended to be, and, so far as man could enforce them, would they not be in fact, a repeal of the moral law of God which says "Thou shalt not kill:" "Thou shalt not steal"? Suppose that many thousands of millions of property was destroyed or changed hands, and some five hundreds of millions of lives were lost; would these things be any less or any more violations of the divine laws, "Thou shalt not kill," "Thou shalt not steal," than if the "sea-girt domain" were weak and easily assailable by human power?

And if that "sea-girt and impregnable domain," fortified by the possession of the West India Islands in the Atlantic, and by the possession of the shores of Russian America in the Pacific, so as to be out of danger of any human power, could be as thoroughly guarded on the UPPER SIDE as it is laterally; if there could be "iron-clads" invented for the navigation of the abysses of the skies, through which descend the messengers and the vials of God, so as to make us as safe from them as from the fleets and armies of Europe; and if we could erect fortifications and purchase island-outposts to protect us against the descending God who came down and "twisted the lips" of the builders at Shinar; or if we could keep out of our fields the angel with drawn sword, appearing in terrible vision over the threshing-floor of Ornan; or if we could forever barricade our banquet-halls against those terrific "fingers of a man's hand-writing over against the candlestick upon the plaister of the wall of the king's palace;" or if by fearful bulls of interdict and excommunication, we could forever silence the bluff, unwelcome tongue of every turbulent Augustinian monk, sounding upon the waiting ear of the ages, and upon the meridian hour of man's power on earth, the sudden, and strange, and irrestrainable voice, which shows that God has unabdicated rights over the nations of the earth—then, and not till then, might some one of the many schemes of PALACES OF SHINAR, which from age to age have entered the minds of the children of men, become successful, and the Paradise of Earthly Power at length appear undoomed among earthly things.

ARTICLE V.

JONES'S HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

The History of the Church of God during the period of Revelation. By Rev. CHARLES COLCOCK JONES, D. D. The Old Testament Dispensation. "The Lord is great in Zion."—Ps. xcix. 2. New York: Charles Scribner & Co., 654, Broadway. 1867. Pp. 558. 8vo.

This History of the Church of God is the fruit of the labors of Dr. Jones as Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Church Polity in the Theological Seminary at Columbia. He held this office twice—from 1836 to 1838, and again from 1848 to 1850. It is well known that he had devoted his labors, from his entrance upon the ministry, to the religious instruction of the bondmen of the South; that these labors were prosecuted by him with his characteristic zeal, ardor, and self-sacrifice, and were crowned with great success. It was expected that by his position in the Seminary, through the students he might assist in educating, he would be able still further to advance this work; nor was this expectation disappointed, though he retained the office but for two academic years. After an interval of ten years, which he spent in the employment to which he felt himself especially called, he was reëlected to the chair he occupied before, and for two years longer continued his instructions in the Seminary. While here, his dwelling was consumed by fire; the manuscripts of twenty years were burned up, and the lectures he had prepared among them. Looking over the ruins of his study after the war, he says: "I picked up a part of a volume of John Howe's works, compact, but charred to a coal, upon whose face was to be read the title of his sermon on "The vanity of man as mortal!" Discouraged by this untoward event, and receiving an appointment as Corresponding Secretary of the General Assembly's Board of Domestic Missions, he removed to Philadelphia and entered with his characteristic industry and zeal upon the

discharge of the duties of this office, in which again he was eminently successful. He had been previously elected as Agent or Secretary of this Board for the South and Southwest, with special reference to the religious instruction of the colored people, and had attempted in some measure to discharge its duties. Immediately after the fire which consumed his dwelling, from which his family barely escaped with their lives, he made a digest from the notes of the students of the substance of the lectures the flames had destroyed, and this has served as an outline of the work now before us. The eminently practical character of Dr. Jones had been previously shown in "The Catechism of Scripture Doctrine and Practice," which was prepared by him while engaged in his missionary labors, which was translated by Dr. Adger into the Armenian and Armeno-Turkish, and by the Rev. John Quarterman into the Chinese, as a book of instruction in the doctrines of Christianity for the missions with which they were then connected. He was one of the most intensely laborious men we have ever known. After three years of confinement and labour in his office of Secretary, his health gave way, and he was obliged to retire to the privacy of his own home. "Here," says he, "thrown out of active and regular employment in the ministry, I turned my thoughts to a favorite purpose—the recovery of the History of the Church, trusting that it would please God to strengthen me for the effort, and render it of some benefit to his people. In executing this purpose I would be furnished with employment, which so many years of activity rendered essential to my happiness. I was also comforted with the hope that I would still be usefully employed in the kingdom of our Lord.

"Through the kind providence of God, in much weakness, and amid many and sometimes long interruptions, I have lived to complete the first volume. Its preparation has been a source of constant enjoyment. I have had God's Holy Word always open before me, and have sought the illuminating and sanctifying influence of the Holy Spirit, that its inspired and heavenly pages might be full of wondrous and instructive things to my mind and heart. Aid has also been sought from human helps—the best

authors within my reach—that I might be instructed by them, and led to a better understanding of the divine word, wherein lay the history of that Church for which Christ shed his precious blood.”

The object the author had in view and the character of his work are thus explained in his own words :

“To have a Church history for the families of the Lord’s people,—a history which parents and children can use intelligently and profitably,—is certainly a thing to be desired. Such a history would serve as a reference book in the family.

“It would be presumption to suppose that every fact in history, every date in chronology, every place in geography, every doctrine in theology, every question in church government and discipline, and every difficulty of every kind could be accurately and finally determined in such a history. Human imperfection and weakness forbid the idea. The literary and theological world is much divided.

“It becomes me to advertise the reader that the work is not what is commonly called “A Bible History,” nor is it a connexion of sacred and profane history, nor is it a history of the antiquities of the Jews, nor a history of that people as a nation. Their history is necessarily given, but as the visible Church of God. Nor is it a work on chronology, or prophecy. It is strictly what it purports to be:—a History of the Church of God; and nothing is introduced but what we have thought essential to the proper composition of such a history.” Pp. 6, 7.

The method which the author has pursued differs from that which is ordinarily found in writers upon the history of the Church. “Uninspired writings,” he says, “are sources of information respecting the Church as it exists and advances on earth, and possess the authenticity and authority of such writings; but they rise not above a mere testimony. They cannot, of themselves, add anything to the constitution, doctrines, order, and government of the Church. Their opinions and conclusions are human, and may be wise, and just, and good, and deserving of veneration; yet, to be conclusive, they must accord with the standard. Hence, we may quote heathen and Christian writers, even the best of the fathers; but they are witnesses only, and we pass by them for the settlement of our faith, and ‘search the

Scriptures.' Upon inspired ground, and with inspired testimony, we fight all our battles and win all our victories in the history of the Church of God."

"What is the Church but the creation of God? What know we of the Church other than as God has revealed it to us? The Scriptures, then, are the first and the last book of ecclesiastical history. Therein God has revealed his Church upon earth in its origin, covenants, constitution, doctrines, ordinances, members, officers, government, and discipline. No mortal of his own wisdom or power dare attempt the furnishing of any one portion, however insignificant, of this building of God. Aside from the Scriptures, he knows nothing of it. Begin our inquiries and our controversies with what and when we may, we are forced to ascend and drink, that we may be satisfied from this true and only source. The writings of men, in so far as they contain anything valuable in relation to the Church, do but draw forth and exhibit that which they have first learned out of God's lively oracles. And it follows undeniably, that as the Scriptures are the only authoritative, all-sufficient source of the history of the Church, so they are the all-sufficient source interpreted in the manner already indicated.

"The Scriptures have not always existed in their present complete form, but have been composed in separate and consecutive parts, and from first to last extend over a long tract of time. This fact does not, however, at all militate against their all-sufficiency. For, as far as they were at any time composed, so far they were an all-sufficient source of the history of the Church." Pp. iii., iv.

Where should the "history of the Church" begin? "Properly only with its first existence. It naturally descends the stream from the gushing fountain to the ocean. To compose history backwards is to invert the course of nature. To begin history in the middle, without some truthful and well-digested sketch of all that occurred before, is to labor without precision, and to leave the mind of the hearers in much doubt and perplexity."

"History may be written in two modes. The first, which is the natural and only mode, is to collect and chronologically connect the facts and events which compose its matter and staple, and then, by careful consideration and comparison, advance to our conclusions and add to our stock of wisdom. This may be termed the inductive method. The second is: first, to elaborate

our theories, and then so to collect, and arrange, and color our facts and events, as to unite them into the support of our theories. It may, indeed, happen that our theories are correct; but we have taken a wrong method to demonstrate that they are so. If incorrect, how pernicious our influence over our inconsiderate and trustful readers? What is called the philosophy of history is too frequently groundless speculation. * * * We are not wanting in ecclesiastical histories of this theoretical and speculative cast. They reason out philosophically, and reason up to facts, instead of originally searching out and establishing the facts, and then reasoning from them. Such historians are not of much value beyond their discovery and accumulation of veritable material for the use of judicious minds.

“With scarcely a notable exception, our leading ecclesiastical historians, ancient and modern, begin the history of the Church of God in the middle, if the expression may be allowed. Where, and at what period? At the birth of our Lord. And, without giving even a sketch of the history of the Church prior to that event, they proceed to lay the foundations and to build thereupon, chiefly out of the New Testament alone, uniting thereto Apostolic Fathers, and fathers, and councils, and canons, and usages without number. Nay, more: all prior to the birth of our Lord is sometimes summarily disposed of as shadows, and little else, no recognition being made of the original foundation, and constitutions, and doctrines of the Church, and no distinction drawn between that which, prior to the birth of Christ, was real and essential to the very nature and existence of the Church, and therefore necessarily abiding, and that which was merely typical and prophetic, and which, coming to fulfilment, necessarily passed away, yet leaving us in clear possession of the substance, which previously we held and enjoyed under the shadow. The truth of the matter is, that the Lord Jesus Christ is the Lamb of God ‘slain from the foundation of the world.’ Rev. xiii. 8. The covenant of grace was as real and efficacious in operation before, as it was after, his incarnation; and his spiritual body, the Church, enfolded in this covenant, was called out and separated from the world, from generation to generation, and had as real and as organised an existence before as after that wonderful event. No new Church, distinct from the old, was set up by our Lord at his coming. The child that attains his majority at the time appointed of his father, and is no longer under tutors and governors, but is lord of all, is not a new man altogether. He is the same, but advanced to higher dignity, and privileges, and powers, and enjoyments. The sun

partially obscured in mist and clouds, yet giving light over all the earth, and emerging visibly and effulgently into the clear blue expanse of the heavens, is the same sun still. So the Church, passing out of the Old into the New Dispensation, is the same Church still; and to sunder the Church under the one dispensation from the Church under the other, is not only an error, but a presumptuous dealing with the mind and will of God. We are to attend to the things written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning the Church, as well as to the things written in the New Testament. The Church is founded on the apostles and prophets both, 'Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone.' Eph. ii. 19-22.

"The student, consulting the historians, or sitting at the feet of professors who write and lecture of the Church in the manner now adverted to, if he be a man of reflection, and one that searches into the foundation of things, will, sometimes at least, feel himself unsettled in respect to the truth or falsehood of many important facts and principles; and, when in after-life, with heavy responsibilities resting upon him, he is brought into contact with the conflicting dogmas of contending sects, not having been thoroughly instructed and grounded in the truth, he is liable to be driven about by every wind of doctrine; and finally, perhaps, in order that he may find some rest, takes refuge in an authority impudently usurped and blasphemously asserted and exercised, and not in convictions the result of patient and thorough inquiries after truth." Pp. v.-vii.

The divisions which are usually adopted in Church history, Dr. Jones acknowledges to be convenient, a help to composition, and a help to memory. But as they do not suit his design, he adopts a three-fold division natural to his plan—the first extending from the foundation of the Church after the fall to the call of Abraham—a period in which the Church existed without any clearly revealed and defined external organisation; the second from the call of Abraham to the coming of our Lord—a period in which the Church had a visible and organised form; the third from the coming of our Lord to the close of the New Testament—a period when the Church in her visibility and unity passed out of all types and shadows into the substance, and assumed her final and perfect state. A more general division would cover, the first, the inspired and authoritative part of Church history; the second,

the uninspired part of Church history from the close of the New Testament canon till the present time. The first is inconceivably the most important of the two; possessing a true knowledge of which, we are enabled to navigate safely that sea of ecclesiastical history of the second part, which has been facetiously called by one of our English historians, Dr. Jortin, "a sea without a bottom or a shore." He confines himself to the first of these divisions, viz., the Scriptural period. And the history he has written is not a bare and rapid narrative of the events which have occurred, but in connexion with the statement of the time and circumstances in which any doctrine, rite, or office of the Church is first announced, he brings forward, once for all, the entire testimony of the Scriptures on the point, whether found in the earliest or latest books. In this manner, far away in the depths of the earlier history of the Church, serious and long-established errors and exhausting controversies are met and settled with a few but effective blows of the sword of the Spirit.

Thus the creation of Eve, and the fact that God brought her unto the man that they might be "one flesh," leads him to discuss the institution of marriage, which lays the foundation for all societies and governments; the nature of the union, the laws regulating it, and to show that it is no sacrament of the Church. The paradisaical state leads to the consideration of the covenant of works, its conditions, seals, and sanctions, and the consequences of its violation. The seventh day's rest brings up the institution, perpetuity, change, and design of the Sabbath. The work of the tempter suggests the existence and agency of other accountable beings than man, the trial and fall of the angels, and the Scripture doctrine concerning them. With the narrative of the fall is considered its consequences, and the salvation thereupon provided, the common origin of the human race, notwithstanding the varieties found in the family of man, and the origin and significancy of sacrifices. There follows this a discussion respecting the covenant of grace, the parties to it, its promises, the analogies and differences between it and the covenant of works. He shows that the difference between the sacrifices of Abel and Cain was not so much in the sacrifices themselves, as

in the state of heart with which they were offered. He discusses the rise of polygamy, and considers that the text Leviticus xviii. 18, refers to it in the way of regulation in the particular there mentioned. He thinks that the names occurring in the antediluvian genealogies are not always those of the first-born son, but of those who were in the direct line of descent between Adam and Christ, whom these genealogies, the existence of sacrifices, and Enoch in his prophecies proclaimed. He brings forth the scripture doctrine of the Holy Spirit in connexion with Gen. v. 3, sums up the knowledge of God, man, the angels, the future state, the Church, and the world, which Noah, the preacher of righteousness and a prophet, proclaimed before the flood, and transmitted to postdiluvian generations. The miracle of the flood; the prohibition of blood still binding; the law of murder covering as it does in its principle the whole ground of civil government; the confusion of the original language and the gift of new ones; the expression of an opinion that Noah and his sons *may* have brought more than one tongue from the old world; the rise of pagan idolatry, the offspring of depravity, in the life-time of Scrug, 200 years after the flood, are distinctly set forth. He places the patriarch Job, who is not registered in the line of spiritual descent, Gen. xi. 10-26, at a period anterior to Abraham, and considers him the author of the book which describes his life and is a rich depository of patriarchal religion. He sums up the doctrines set forth in the book, which are none other than those pervading the whole Scriptures, touching God, the angels, man, and the plan of salvation. He expresses it as no improbable opinion that revelations of God, the history of the creation and fall, of the flood, the re-peopling of the earth, the lines of spiritual descent, and the promise, were already a matter of record. Job asserts the existence of the art of writing, and speaks of the law of God as something known and fixed. Moses, too, decided causes according to "the statutes of God and his laws," before the publication of the ten commandments from Sinai.

At the call of Abraham, who was born A. M. 2008, almost precisely midway between the Creation and the birth of Christ,

a change takes place in the organisation of the Church. Previous to this, it was "a visible body, enjoying her Sabbaths, her sacrifices, the ministry of the word through patriarchs, prophets, and preachers of righteousness; confined to no particular tribe or nation." Yet what was its original constitution as to its membership, in what manner its officers were called and set apart, how government was administered, by what rite its members were admitted, how public worship was conducted, and whether the word of God was written or unwritten, can never be known. Now, however, she becomes perfectly distinct in her visibility, progress, and development. It is now the will of God that the Church should be restricted for a season to one people—to Abraham namely and his descendants in the line of Isaac, the son of promise. It is now, and in Job xxxi. 13-15, xix. 15, that we first meet in the history of the Church with the ownership of man by his fellow-man. Dr. Jones takes occasion to point out the various teachings of Scripture respecting slavery, viz., that it arose from conquest, by purchase, by the voluntary transfer by the poor man of himself to another in payment of debt, and by inheritance; that the ownership had respect to the *service* of the slave; that yet he was to be respected and treated as a man, and to enjoy all the privileges compatible with his station; that the tenure was temporary if the slave was of *Hebrew* origin, unless he preferred otherwise, but permanent if the slaves were of foreign origin; that since the days of Job, the Church of God has had connexion with this institution, and that it is sanctioned in the Old Testament and in the New; and that masters and servants were admitted to full and lasting membership in the Church in all ages; and that though, as one of the many forms of civil government ordained of God, it is not as desirable as some others, while it exists, it must be honored and supported by all who live under it. "The chief concern of the Church is with the religious, and not the civil condition of men. 'Fear God, honor the king,' 1 Pet. ii. 17, is the command of the Apostle. The command of our Lord, whom he follows, is, 'Render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and unto God the things which are God's,' Matt. xxii. 21. And the instance is

yet to be adduced from the Holy Scriptures wherein the Church has arrayed herself in hostile attitude against any form of civil government whatever, as a form of civil government. She has never received any command of God, neither has she been self-moved by either her own wisdom or philosophy at any time, so to do. She founds religion, not empires. She dethrones iniquity, not kings. She comes not with observation to establish her dominion with fire and sword; but she comes in meekness and in love, and with the unseen and irresistible leaven of grace: and thus she leavens and purifies the corrupt masses of mankind, and the fruit is righteousness and peace. 'Jesus answered, My kingdom is not of this world.'" John xviii. 36.

Whatever be the changes of human opinion, these are positions, we are persuaded, which cannot be overthrown. If there ever has been a true friend of the black man in this country, Dr. Jones was that friend. If it is possible in these days for a man to contemplate this entire subject with candor, we commend to him this argument of Dr. Jones, drawn, as it is, wholly from the Scriptures, that he may ponder it, and decide whether the domestic slavery of the South, which no longer exists, was defensible or not. Many is the poor, wretched, starving negro, who is mourning over the paradise he once enjoyed, when his bread was sure, his health and comfort cared for, and his daily labors cheerfully performed. Those who have so suddenly changed his relative position, have assumed a fearful responsibility, the breadth and length of which they have never realised. They have displaced from power the intelligent population of the South, which, from Washington down, has contributed so much to the glory of our land, and have moved a second Africa up to the confines of their own abodes, that its semi-barbaric chiefs may take the place of Washington, Jefferson, Calhoun, and Clay, in the affairs and councils of the nation.

The picture of Abraham engaged in war leads to a consideration of the justifiableness of war, offensive, defensive, and judicial; his interview with Melchizedek, to the institution of a priesthood and its relation to Christ. The Abrahamic covenant as to its parties, conditions, rewards, penalties, and seal, is discussed

at length; the identity of the Church in both dispensations as built upon it is shown, and its permanency maintained. The subjects of the covenant were believers and their infant offspring then, as is now the arrangement in the New Testament Church. Infant baptism is maintained as consequent upon infant circumcision, and the objections against infant membership are considered and fairly met. The baptism of John, and that administered by Christ's disciples during his ministry, are explained as being preparatory and introductory to the full revelation of Christ, and not the baptism instituted by our Lord. The apostles who partook of the Lord's Supper at its institution were never baptized with this baptism, so far as we are informed, though authorised to administer this rite afterwards to others. The choice of Jacob over Esau gives rise to a discussion respecting the doctrine of election and reprobation. "Election," he says, "runs through the entire Bible. All prophecy is of God's foreordination: to reject foreordination is to reject prophecy. The thousands and millions of agents concerned in bringing about predicted events were from eternity elected to their several necessary parts, constituting a vast and infinitely minute network of causes and effects in the world of matter and of mind, each individual agent acting and being acted upon by others, and contributing an appointed portion, till in the lapse of ages the counsel of God is perfected.

"Take, for example, the prediction of 'the seed of the woman' to the Saviour of the world. Of the seventy-five progenitors recorded in Luke's genealogy of him, a line of succession of four thousand years, every one came into that line by the election of God. Of the forty-one in Matthew's genealogy, every one came into it by the election of God, that election making two lines—one the natural, the other the legal. The hand of a sovereign God appears at every step. Seth is chosen in preference to all Adam's other sons. Shem, in preference to Ham and Japheth; a portion of Shem's posterity, in preference to all his other posterity, and to the posterity of Ham and Japheth; Abraham, in preference to his brothers Nahor and Haran; Isaac, to Ishmael; Jacob, to Esau; Judah, to Simeon; David, to his seven brothers;

Solomon, to all the other sons of David, and so on to the end. Then, behold how the choice runs on in the maternal line. Why should Messiah come of Sarah, when he might have come of another? Why of Rebecca? Why of Leah? of Tamar? of Ruth, the Moabitess? of Bathsheba? of Mary of Nazareth? And then mark the foreordination and election of God in innumerable particulars concerning him. He made choice of the time when, and the town where he should be born, the city he should be brought up in, the work he should do, the treatment he should receive—elected the very man who should betray him. the kind of death he should die, and the very people who should inflict it upon him—wrote the very words they should speak at his cross, described the very wounds given him, (and none others,) the parting of his garments, his own bitter cries, the rich man who should bury him, and the time he should lie in the grave.”

“The time of the sojourning of the Church in Canaan and in Egypt was 430 years,” [Kurtz makes it 430 years in Egypt itself,] “215 of which was in Canaan and 215 in Egypt.” As a basis for the multiplication of Israel in Egypt, Dr. Jones mentions as “the mustard seed from which the great tree sprung.” first, the family of Leah, thirty-three individuals, throwing out Er and Onan, who died in Canaan, and counting the patriarch Jacob and his wife, and Dinah, his daughter; second, Zilpah’s family, sixteen in number, counting his daughter Serah; Rachel’s family, all sons, fourteen; third, Bilhah’s family, all sons, seven—making a total of seventy persons. The martyr Stephen, Acts vii. 14, adds five to this number—probably counting five male children born in Egypt about the time of the arrival. This number would be largely increased by the addition of his sons’ wives, and the wives of his sons’ sons and his sons’ daughters. To this is to be added the Shechemites, conquered and incorporated with the Israelites, and all the servants attached to their households, amounting to many hundreds, and perhaps falling little short of a thousand. [Kurtz says “possibly thousands.”] Dr. Jones supposed the Israelites to have lived in a state of freedom in Egypt for one hundred years, and to have been in bondage for one hundred and fifteen. At the time of their

exceed the fighting men were 600,000, and the whole number, including proselytes and servants, about 3,000,000, the population of our own country at the commencement of the Revolutionary struggle. "The calculations made by learned men," says he, "of the possibility of so large an increase from so small a beginning, are curious, and not at all necessary for the satisfaction of the pious mind; for the astonishing increase, while wholly according to the laws of nature, was nevertheless a manifestation of the special intervention and blessing of God. 'This is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes.'" The miraculous deliverance leads him to discuss the subject of miracles and prophecy. Miracles were either for the confirmation of the truth, or like the Flood, were miracles of judgment, or like the dividing of the Red Sea, miracles of mercy and deliverance. Their succession was not continuous, but broken by intervals of time. Little is seen of them between the days of Elijah and Elisha and the captivity. There were more between the restoration and the coming of Christ. "The signs of a true miracle are," he says, "that it be such an act or work as none but God can perform; that it be performed in attestation of some one or more truths emanating from God and worthy of God; that it be plain, intelligible, open to observation, and performed for benevolent ends. These signs do not meet in spurious miracles. Since miracles have ceased in the Church, no more to be revived, to pretend to work them is a mark of apostacy."

Though miracles and prophecy have ceased, their evidence grows stronger and stronger with the lapse of time. "Time is not a universal destroyer. He is a votary of truth. His busy hands are ever employed in adding to the strength and beauty of the pillars which support the precious word of God." Pp. 284, 286.

In connection with the institution of the Passover, its fulfilment in the Lord's Supper is brought to view, the consecration of the first born also, and the substitution of the tribe of Levi for the first born of all the tribes. The pillar and cloud of fire leads him to consider the theophany of "the angel Jehovah," "the angel of the covenant." The giving of the law leads to its con-

sideration under the heads of, first, the *ecclesiastical* law, with its divisions, the moral, the ceremonial, the constitutional, and the disciplinary law; and second, the *civil* law. The ceremonial law he shows "holds in its bosom the gospel." The constitutional has respect to the organisation and order of the Church: the officers, members, places, times, seasons, and modes of worship. In the civil government God was absolute King, consulted ofttimes by Urim and Thummim. There were officers extraordinary, as Moses, Joshua, the judges, Samuel, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Zerubabel; or ordinary, as the elders, (all whose functions are not definitely understood,) and the great representative council of the seventy. "The minister of religion had nothing to do with civil cases, beyond inquiring through the high priest for the supreme judge or judges whenever it should be necessary to do so."

Chapter XXII. treats of the erection and maintenance of houses of worship, and the provisions for the support of the ministry.

Chapter XIII. gives a condensed view of the mission of Moses: inquiring what he found ready to his hand with the people of God as a *Church*, and what he found ready to his hand with the people of God as a *State*; and then what he added either to the Church or the State. In speaking of this dispensation, he says:

"The dispensation of Moses is not, therefore, a legal dispensation in any such sense as to propound a method of justification different from that of faith in the Lord Jesus Christ; nor is it in any sense opposed to the gospel. On the contrary, it is but a continuation and further revelation of the covenant of grace, and embosoms the gospel.

"When the law of Moses is spoken of in the Scripture as 'unprofitable,' 'a yoke,' and 'to wax old and pass away,' reference is had directly to so much of it, and to that part only, which was 'but the shadow of good things to come, not the good things themselves;' and could not, in its sacrifices and services, which were onerous, take away sin. The Lord never had any such design in its institution. It was profitable, in the highest degree, for the times then present. It taught countless multitudes of lost sinners the way to heaven, who are now at rest in that glorious abode, with Abraham, Issac, and Jacob, and

all the prophets of God. And lo! what a list of the greatest worthies is given in the Epistle to the Hebrews, attesting the greatness of its power and the riches of its grace! If such was the power of the grace of the Sun of Righteousness shining through shadows, what shall be the effect of his unobstructed effulgence? If such was the effect of the 'hearing of Moses and the prophets,' what shall be the effect of the hearing of Christ and his apostles?"

Dr. Jones maintains that notwithstanding the seemingly rigorous laws of the Mosaic code, liberty of conscience was still enjoyed in that ancient commonwealth. It was indeed the case that "law and religion leaned upon each other. The people's king was their God, and their God was their king. Hence every act upon their part which tended directly or indirectly to dethrone their king or deny their God, (which amounted to the same thing,) was a crime in law." "What, then, was that liberty of conscience? 1. A native born citizen might" (if he offered no open opposition to the specific law of the land, we suppose,) "renounce the faith of the commonwealth, become 'uncircumcised,' embrace idolatry, cease to observe the Sabbath religiously, and neglect to frequent the temple. He might train his family in the same way, and stay in the country, or move out of it. No one would molest his person, or property, or family, or dispossess him of any civil right or protection of law whatever, as a citizen, except that he would necessarily be excommunicated from the Church. 2. A stranger, or a foreigner, might move into the commonwealth, and live and die there as an idolater, so long as he abstained from overt acts of idolatry, and from such sins as have been referred to. He would be recognised in Israel, and be treated and protected as a heathen man and a stranger; for the laws made provision for such. He might marry and give in marriage, buy and sell, hold property, plead and be impleaded, go and come, frequent the court of the Gentiles in the temple, and avail himself of instruction in the true religion laid open to him. All these things, in common with all other citizens, he might do or not do, according to his pleasure. In the settlement of his faith he was left to his own conscience. He came into the commonwealth, knowing its constitution and laws, of his own free

will. That free will might take him out again, and none would **hinder.** He could neither expect nor justly desire that the **people** among whom he had come to dwell, and who secured him **in many and great blessings and privileges,** should, upon his own **motion,** or that of a thousand like him, set aside a sacredly **believed, ordained, and cherished constitution,** for the introduction of his own faith and practice, directly antagonistic to and **destructive** of that constitution, and of course subversive of **public peace and order.** It is a right inherent in all commonwealths to uphold their own constitution and laws, and to protect themselves from whatever they deem injurious and destructive.

“There was, then, let it be said, no persecution for conscience sake ordained in or practised under the commonwealth of Israel. What is persecution? It is an assault by force upon the lives, persons, property, or just rights and privileges of men, on account of their religious belief, with the intent of compelling them to renounce that belief, and acknowledge another, or flee the country. Persecution differs from prohibition or restraint. Men may be prohibited or restrained in the propagation and practice of religious tenets contrary to the general faith, and the laws founded on it, and yet be entirely protected in person and property, and in all rights and privileges common to all citizens. If they cannot submit to the prohibition, they must make up their minds either to endure it, or remove out of the country. The citizens of a commonwealth say to them, “We have our constitution and laws; we do not compel you to adopt them—to believe as we believe. We have nothing to do with your faith; that is your own affair. We only say you cannot practise it in our territories; we consider it injurious to the State, and a **crime** against our peace and order. Stay if you will, and retain your faith, but practise it you cannot.” Such was the state of things among the Israelites. The constitution and laws given them of God, were defensive and preservative; not offensive and destructive. As King in Zion our Lord never propagated religion by force. There were no inquisitions, no tortures, no dungeons in Palestine. He repudiated fire and sword as well before as after his coming, Luke ix. 52-56; Matt. xxvi. 51-54. His kingdom never was of this world, and therefore he never in any **age** sent out his servants to destroy heretics, or to conquer countries for him; nor did he allow them to take it upon themselves to do so, John xviii. 33-38. The Israelites in all their history

were never a persecuting people. When they took up their abode in foreign countries, they demeaned themselves as good citizens, and only asked toleration in the exercise of their religion. If it was denied them, they removed; if they were subjected to persecution, they endured it. Although opposed to idolatry and never practising it, (that is, the true Israelites,) or its attendant abominations, and consequently hated by the heathen as an unsocial, morose, and sanctimonious sect, they obtained, with little interruption, liberty in all the heathen countries where they sojourned, to exercise their religion and observe their own peculiar customs—a liberty allowed them by all the heathen nations that ruled over them in their own country, with the exception of Antiochus Epiphanes, for a brief period of his reign in Syria. Their superior intelligence, probity, and virtue, commended them to their heathen rulers. The wars of extermination carried on by the Israelites against the inhabitants of Canaan were not religious wars, but wars of divine judgment, of which they were the appointed executors.”

We had intended to quote what he has said on ordination, in connexion with the ordination of Joshua, on pp. 392–394; to have referred to what he has said of the Samaritans; to what he has presented respecting the so-called “lost tribes” of Israel, which he maintains were not lost in the captivity but returned in due proportion with the rest and became incorporated with the remainder of the nation. “The whole earth has been travelled over,” he says, “and searched, and they have not been found yet, and never will be, since they never were lost.”

We had intended also to give a specimen of his narrative style in the strictly historical parts of the work, which is simple, rapid, and direct, skilfully, yet with becoming brevity, relating the historical facts in their natural order, which are scattered far and wide over the sacred volume.

The extracts we *have* made from this book, and the resumé of topics thus far given, sufficiently declare the object and plan of the writer. It was, as he said at the commencement, to prepare a Church History for the families of the Lord's people. And he has done it ably and well. It is a system of theology, a discussion, not exhaustive, yet sufficient, of many points connected with the well-being and interests of communities and states, and

a history, at the same time, of the Church of God from Adam to Christ drawn from the wells of inspiration. Profane sources of knowledge, though not unknown to the author, are passed by. The speculations of ingenious and learned men are accounted of inferior worth. To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is nought in them. The book is intensely scriptural, and its positions are fortified by continual reference to the divine volume, as the multiplied proof-texts show. Few ministers of our acquaintance have been more diligent students of the Old Testament Scriptures, both in the original and the version of King James, than the writer of this history. Sceptical doubts are dismissed without ceremony. That direct and business-like manner of dealing with whatever he undertook, and that good judgment which was rarely at fault, that characterised the lamented author, reigns throughout the book.

It may be questioned by some whether he was justified in carrying back over the earlier days of revelation that knowledge resulting from the more perfect development of the divine plan, which is derived from the fuller revelation of the New Dispensation. In his justification, it may be said that God is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever. The plan of redemption was the self-same plan from the beginning. Adam was saved in the same way that must be resorted to by the last of his descendants that will stand upon the earth. He was no more an infant in knowledge and in the development of his intellectual powers, than he was in physical strength and manhood. He may have known more than any of his posterity of the things of God, and have poured forth this knowledge upon his descendants, with multitudes of whom his long life must have brought him in contact. The third person of the Godhead is spoken of in the second verse in Genesis, and the second appears in those divine theophanies which began in Eden, and were often repeated in the Angel of the Covenant after the deluge. The sacrifice itself was a typical salvation, without efficacy, save as it pointed to a real expiration, a true atonement, and a mighty Saviour. Where the history of 2000 years is

rehearsed in a little more than 2000 words, the details of antediluvian knowledge could not be given. The method adopted by Dr. Jones was adopted with more strictly theological ends by President Edwards, in his "Work of Redemption," who had planned a body of divinity, in the form of history, and whose heart was so set upon the execution of this plan that he hesitated to accept the presidency of Princeton College, lest the duties of that office should put it beyond his power.

His independence and self-reliance are manifested throughout. "So far as our acquaintance with ecclesiastical history extends," says he, "and we pretend to no extensive learning in the matter, there is no work in any language that we have seen or heard of, which directly and fully covers the ground. It is not pretended that this idea of the true history of the Church is anything new: far from it. It is older than all the thoughts of man and all the writings of man on the subject. It is an original revelation itself. It is found in Moses, and in David, and in Isaiah, and in all the prophets, when they speak of the Church and write her history, and prophecy her progress in after ages. Distinguished divines have suggested and affirmed it, and have founded able arguments for particular ends upon it; the Protestant confessions of faith affirm it; and one eminent historian, Frederick Spanheim, after his own manner, has carried it through." The very creditable work of Kitto appeared in 1841, and the *Manual of Sacred History*, by Kurtz, first reached us in an English dress in 1854, but we cannot see that either of these works or the earlier history of Stackhouse (1732) caused any divergence from the plan he first conceived.

This book too breathes the devoted and pious spirit of its beloved author. His piety, from his earliest conversion deep and ardent, became increasingly attractive as his bodily strength abated. He lived a pure and exalted life. The paralysis which seized more and more upon his enfeebled body, left his mind unimpaired. To compose and perfect the history, the first volume of which is now before us, was the work and solace of these last years and days of life. As long as his trembling fingers could grasp the pen, he continued to write. The volume which is yet

to appear shows, we doubt not, in the original manuscript, in the characters he traced, once so clear and beautiful, the signs of his increasing malady. He had brought it nearly to a close when his Master called him away. He passed from his favorite study to his chamber, and reclining on his bed as if for repose, in a few moments, in a gentle slumber, he was translated from the Church militant to the Church triumphant. "And Enoch walked with God, and he was not; for God took him."

The volume which has occupied us with profit to ourselves we trust will give satisfaction to the reader and do credit to the author. It was his last offering to the Church, and will be followed, as soon as practicable, by the second and concluding volume, embracing the History of the Church under the New Dispensation.

ARTICLE VI.

SKETCH OF THE LIFE OF REV. STEPHEN FRONTIS.

The Rev. Stephen Frontis, the only person of that name in the United States so far as known, was the son of John Baptiste Jehoachin Frontis, who was born in the city of Nantes, France, on the 3d day of July, 1760. The father lost his parents when a child, and was brought up in the Catholic faith by an aunt, who treated him very harshly. When he was of a suitable age, he was put to the trade of a tailor; and at the end of his apprenticeship, he went to the island of St. Domingo, about the year 1783. Here he settled in business as a merchant tailor, and rapidly accumulated property. Here also he married Etienne Borel, who was born of Protestant parents in Geneva, Switzerland, about the year 1756. Her father's name was Cæsar Borel,

NOTE.—This sketch of an eminently useful and venerable minister of the gospel we publish in compliance with the wishes of several respected members of Concord Presbytery.

a descendant of French Huguenots; a man of eminent piety, and who died very suddenly when his daughter was yet a child. And she related to her children that on a Christmas eve, her father, being in perfect health, was, according to his custom, engaged with his family and some of his neighbors in reading the Scriptures and in singing psalms and hymns. After singing several, he said: "*C'est assez; demain nous chanterons 'A toi, mon Dieu, mon cœur monte.'*" That is, "It is enough; tomorrow we shall sing, 'unto thee, O Lord, do I lift up my soul;'" which is the first line of the twenty-fifth Psalm, he quoting the words of the French metrical version. That same night he died in his sleep and went to Him whom he had served in his life. This daughter, Etienne Borel, mentioned above, came to Port-au-Prince, and became acquainted with Mr. Frontis, her future husband, in a singular manner. A lady of Geneva, named Archer, of some wealth and distinction, was engaged to be married to a gentleman named Marie, living at Port-au-Prince. But it was found that his circumstances in business were such as to prevent his going to Europe to consummate the marriage, and the lady consented to go to him. Desiring to take a female friend with her, she proposed to Etienne Borel, then twenty-eight years old, to accompany her. She consented, and they came together. This was in 1784; and two years after, in 1786, she was married to Mr. Frontis.

They remained in the island of St. Domingo, at Port-au-Prince, till the insurrection of the blacks took place. Meanwhile, four children were born into the family—two sons and two daughters. When the negroes set that city on fire, in the fall of 1791, they, with most of the white inhabitants, fled on board the shipping then in port. They lost all their property, with the exception of what money, clothing, and other valuables they saved from the conflagration. They then sailed to Bordeaux, France, in 1792; and from this post they removed to a little town in the interior named Cognac, in the department of Charente. Here the family lived in as retired and economical a way as possible.

It was in that town, on the 18th of July, 1792, that the sub-

ject of this memoir was born, and two days afterwards was baptized in the Roman Catholic Church, and named Etienne, (Stephen,) after his mother, whose first name was Etienne. His baptism in that church could not have been the choice of his mother, who was a Protestant, and during her residence at Cognac attended worship in that church. Owing to the scenes of alarm, desolation, and slaughter through which she had passed, her health was so much impaired that the mother was unable to nourish the infant Stephen; and according to the custom still prevalent in France, he was put out to nurse, a few miles from town, where he was left till he was near two years old. Whenever his mother visited him, she found him asleep under the influence of some narcotic, as she believed. It was, then, in consequence of the care of a heavenly Father, that he did not die in infancy like so many thousands both before and since.

In 1793, his father left Cognac to go to St. Domingo, by the way of Philadelphia; but as there was then war between England and France, the vessel in which he sailed was taken by a British cruiser and carried into Port Royal, in Jamaica, where he remained a prisoner of war about two years, and at the end of that time was permitted to visit the United States. As during this time, for several years, his wife did not hear from him, and as she was living in a country of strangers in the reign of terror in France, she longed to return to her native city, Geneva; a Protestant city, where her mother, two sisters, and other relatives were still living, and where, in the event of the death of her husband, she would find more friends. She therefore undertook a very fatiguing journey of five hundred miles, through a mountainous country, with four children—the oldest only seven, the youngest two years old, who was then taken away from his nurse, but so pale and sickly that he was unable to speak a word or to walk a step, his head falling on one side and then on the other, from inability to hold it up.

After a detention of six weeks before she was permitted to leave the French territory, she reached Geneva the 12th of January, 1794. In his autobiography Mr. F. says: "For myself I bless the Sovereign Disposer of all events that I was brought

up in the city of Geneva; for although my mother would no doubt have brought up her children in the Protestant faith, had she remained at Cognac, yet it would have been difficult for her to prevent the sad influence which a Roman Catholic population and associates would inevitably have had upon her children."

It was six years after the family, without his knowledge, came to Geneva, that the father visited them, and four before he gave them any aid. During this time, when young Stephen was a child at Geneva, and was playing in the street near the house with his sisters and other children, an ox, which had been led to the slaughter and had escaped, came furiously towards them. On account of a turn in the street the ox could not be seen, but they heard the cries of the people. Fearing danger and wanting to get nearer home on the other side of the street, Stephen set out to cross, but fell at full length in the middle of the street. Just then the ox came and leaped over him, followed by all the butchers, boys, and dogs in pursuit. But by the good providence of God the child was untouched and unhurt. At another time, when he was twelve years old, there was also a marked providence in his preservation. He went to bathe in the lake about a mile from the city, where there is a large rock rising out of the water a quarter of a mile from the shore, to which boys would often swim. With some other boys, though he had never gone so far before, he swam to this rock. It was about sundown, and he was quite chilled, but as the water was warmer than the air, he kept under the water till ready to return. But not having rested sufficiently, he became tired out before reaching the shore, and came near drowning.

He had never seen his father till his visit to Geneva in 1800. And on the 4th of January, 1807, his father visited the family at Geneva, the fourth and last time. Before this he had written home that Stephen must learn a trade, but left it to the son to choose which one; and he finally selected that of a cabinet maker. Previous to this, his father had made him promise never to contract any debt nor to use tobacco, a promise which he kept all his life; for he never used any tobacco, and seldom bought anything without ready money. He left no debts unpaid when he died.

His mother taught all her children to commit to memory some prayers, and to repeat them when going to bed, together with the Lord's Prayer, and the Apostles' Creed; also to attend church on the Sabbath. Stephen attended a singing school, which was a great benefit to him, and also, by the advice of his teachers, he attended a weekly prayer meeting. There were two night schools, kept by the clergy, where religious instruction was given. He next entered the College of Geneva in the lowest class and studied grammar and the rudiments of Latin. Here he continued two years, reading some of the Latin books, and then attended to drawing, first with a private teacher and then at the public school. It was subsequent to this that he learned the trade of a cabinet maker, which, though an advantage in many respects, yet morally speaking, was a disadvantage, as it removed him from the influence of his former associates and brought him into contact with low and vulgar society.

In the autumn of 1809, his father, who was then at Philadelphia, fearing that he would be swept into the army by the law of conscription, wrote to his wife to obtain a passport to leave France and come to the United States. She did not succeed in obtaining it. But afterward, when engaged in drawing at the public school, he was overheard to speak to a fellow student on his want of success in the matter of a passport, when his father had written to him twice to come to America. One of the teachers happened to be behind him, and hearing what he said, promised him that he would speak to the Mayor on the subject, and would let him know in about a week. At the expiration of that time he said to young Frontis, "You can go to the Department, and you will obtain a passport." He went, and by a most remarkable interposition of divine providence, at a time when Napoleon I. was at the zenith of his power, and when no young man was permitted to leave France, left his native land without hindrance. He bade farewell to his mother and sisters on the 10th of March, 1810, and on the 10th of April he embarked for America at LaRochelle, and on the 10th June reached Philadelphia. Here his father, who in the meanwhile had acquired property in Cuba and had lost it, told him that he must support

himself by his trade. Accordingly he worked as a journeyman, and after two years paid his father over one hundred dollars above all expenses. He took pains, at the same time, to acquire a knowledge of the English language. During this time, too, by the influence of a fellow-workman, he was led to attend the preaching of Rev. Mr. Burch, in which he became deeply interested. Here he heard the doctrines of total depravity, the fallen state of man, and the necessity of a new birth, which he had never heard at Geneva. They were new to him, and impressed him much. He was now led to attend to secret prayer and reading the Bible, and was greatly benefited by associating with pious young people in prayer meetings. He also took boarding with a pious private family, the mistress of which exercised a good influence over him. This family lived next door to Rev. Mr. Burch, with whom he now formed a personal acquaintance, and whose church he joined in the autumn of 1813. As already mentioned, he had been, in infancy, baptized in the Roman Catholic Church, and he had also been a member of the church in Geneva, but was now received on examination, upon his Romish baptism. Before approaching the table of the Lord, misled by his spiritual adviser, the lady with whom he boarded, he expected by prayer and fasting for a week previous to obtain some sensible token of his acceptance with God. At the close of the week, when no token came, as he had expected, he was left in great darkness and distress of mind. This continued through the administration of the ordinance and some time after, when he went and conversed with the pastor, who removed some of his doubts and fears, and lent him a volume of Witherspoon's works, containing a chapter "On the Degree of Sorrow for Sin in true Penitents." The reading of this nearly relieved him; and finally coming upon the passage in 1 Cor. xii. 6, "And there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God which worketh all in all," he says, "This was accompanied with such a flood of light and joy as I cannot describe. I saw clearly that there may be diversities in the experiences of God's people, yet all springing from the same heavenly source, and leading to the same blessed end. Never did I enjoy so much the communion of saints, and all the privileges of

God's house, as for two or three years from this time. It was truly a season of my espousals to Christ and of my first love."

In the spring of 1815, Mr. Burch, to his great surprise, directed his attention to the gospel ministry. Deeply impressed with the idea, on the 19th of July of that year, he left his trade, and commenced reciting Latin to Mr. Burch, of which he had gained some knowledge at Geneva. He boarded in various families gratuitously, and had his other wants supplied, until, in the spring of 1816, he went to an academy in the vicinity of Philadelphia, kept by a Mr. Jones, who gave him his board and tuition for a whole year. In the meanwhile, he had letters from his father in the West Indies dissuading him from his present course, but he felt it to be his duty to persevere, especially as he was now twenty-three years old. He preferred to incur the displeasure of his father to the neglect of duty to God. Early in 1817, Mr. Burch resigned his pastoral charge, and accepted an invitation to take charge of an academy at Oxford, N. C., and to preach to the churches in the vicinity. He invited Mr. Frontis to assist him in the Academy—a proposition which he accepted, and left Philadelphia on the 13th of May, 1817, and came on to Raleigh. Here he became acquainted with Mr. (afterwards Rev.) Alfred Wright, teacher in the female academy, with Miss Susan D. Nye, (afterwards Mrs. Hutchison,) also a teacher in the female academy—a lady, as he says, "of eminent piety and talents; * * one whom I can never forget, and whose conversation, letters, and holy example were of immense advantage to me." He also became acquainted with Dr. William McPheeters.

From Raleigh, he went to Oxford, on the 25th of June, where Mr. Burch continued in the school but one session, and he the same time. After this he returned to Raleigh, and taught French both in the male and female academies, and boarded in the family of Dr. McPheeters, until, in the autumn of 1820, he went to the seminary at Princeton. In the meanwhile, he had been received under the care of the Presbytery of Orange, and had become acquainted with its members. He returned from Princeton, and was licensed to preach the gospel by that Pres-

bytery, at the Red House, Caswell County, October 10, 1823, and was ordained as an evangelist November 4, of the same year; and June 23, 1824, he was naturalized as a citizen of the United States at Raleigh.

It is supposed that he spent the summer of this year on a mission to the western part of the State, and in November entered on a mission to the eastern counties. He preached at Tarboro', Greenville, Washington, Plymouth, etc. In some places he was the first Presbyterian minister who had preached there. In 1825 he was the delegate of that Presbytery to the General Assembly, which met in Philadelphia. After that meeting, being appointed by the Philadelphia Missionary Society, he went on a tour into the State (then a territory) of Michigan. He preached at Detroit and various other places in that State, and sometimes in Canada, in both English and French. The following October his mission ceased, and he remained and preached in Monroe in the same State, and in that year he proclaimed the gospel one hundred and eighty-one times.

In May of the next year, he returned to Philadelphia and accepted a mission to Delaware and the eastern shore of Maryland from the Pennsylvania Missionary Society, but did not enter upon his duties till the first of November, 1826, and ended it the 11th of December. From here he returned to Philadelphia and took an appointment to Somerset, Pennsylvania, from the same society. He fulfilled this mission by the end of 1827, during which year he preached one hundred and seventy-eight times. Before he left Somerset he received an invitation to visit the church of Bethany, Iredell County, N. C. Accordingly he came on the following spring and attended the meeting of Presbytery at Third Creek church. Some of the Bethany people met him there and conducted him to that church. This was in April, 1828. He preached his first sermon at Bethany on Sabbath, April 13. He continued to act as stated supply to this church till the meeting of the Presbytery at Lincolnton, April 1, 1829; when, having been dismissed from the Presbytery of Orange, he was regularly received into the Presbytery of Concord. A call was then presented from the congregations of Bethany and Tabor

for him to become their pastor on a salary of four hundred and fifty dollars. This call was put into his hands and accepted. The Presbytery adjourned to meet at Bethany on the 15th of May to attend to his installation. After this he remained with this people with great usefulness and success seven years, when, at his own request, the pastoral relation was dissolved, and in March, 1836, he left these churches and went to Salisbury, but was not installed pastor there till Sept. 12, 1839. Here he remained till June 24, 1845, nine years and two months, and preached one thousand three hundred and seventy times. After laboring in various places in the interval, Mr. Frontis commenced in October, 1846, supplying the pulpits of Thyatira and Franklin in Rowan County. About this time he also taught school at his own house in Salisbury, assisted by his wife. In November of this year he removed to Centre, and officiated there and at Thyatira as stated supply; the latter church, however, he left in the spring of 1851, and confined his labors to Centre. In closing his connexion with Thyatira (at this time) he makes this record: "My connexion with the people of Thyatira has been a very pleasant one. Nothing has occurred to mar our friendship, and we part with feelings of mutual regret and affection on both sides."

His connexion with Centre continued seven years and three months, when, on the 7th of December, 1856, he left that church and retired to a farm which he had purchased in the bounds of Prospect congregation, with funds in part derived, after long delay, from his father's estate in Cuba, and in part with funds belonging to a maiden sister, who came a few years ago from Geneva to live with him. Though comparatively strong and vigorous, he thought that his advanced age and feeble health did not permit him to perform the more active duties of the pastoral office. He did not, however, cease his ministerial labors, but assisted the brethren in various places on sacramental occasions, and attended prayer meetings and funerals. He also supplied some churches steadily for short periods, as Prospect, Bethesda, Thyatira, etc. These services he continued, often without remuneration, and with much trouble to himself, up to near the time

of his death, for a period of ten years. During a portion of this time, he taught French at Davidson College. Though he retained through life something of a foreign accent, yet to one accustomed to hear him speak, this was nothing unpleasant. He was five feet and three inches in height, and had a pleasant and agreeable countenance. He wrote and spoke the English language with purity and propriety, was a good theologian, and had a library of seven hundred volumes. He read over the commentaries of Scott and Henry alternately, twice in the latter part of his life. He was a man of prayer and of devoted piety. Those who prepared his body for burial found his knees callous from constant kneeling. He was deeply interested in everything that pertains to the advancement of the Redeemer's kingdom. He promoted every good cause, and was ready for every good work. His preaching was plain, pointed, and practical, without the ornaments of rhetoric. He was unswerving in performing duty and in declaring the whole counsel of God. * A polite, Christian gentleman, he was equally agreeable in the cabin of the humble and the halls of the rich. He was specially diligent in pastoral duties, and paid particular attention to the children of his charge, always distributing catechisms and other little books among them. He wrote many of his sermons, and prepared them with great care, but we have seen nothing of his sent to the press but a paper, in 1834, on the duty of the Church to support missionaries to the heathen.

He was twice married—the first time to Miss Martha Dews, of Lincolnton, the 2d of February, 1830. She was the mother of five children, three of whom survive. She died at Salisbury July 10, 1849. His second marriage was to Miss Rachel Beatty, of Prospect congregation, who has been the mother of three children, one of whom survives with her—a most estimable lady.

* In one of his congregations, the young people had the habit of engaging in sinful amusements. He preached on the subject. One of the elders, who did not disapprove of dancing, went to his house to remonstrate with him, and told him that the congregation were very much exasperated, but he hoped they would soon forget it. Mr. Frontis replied: "I hope they will not; if they do, I will preach the sermon over again."

The results of the ministry of Mr. Frontis, of more than forty years in this region of country, will not be fully known till the last great day. And on the 12th of April, 1867, at his home in Rowan County, retired from the world, in the arms of his wife and daughter, he passed in triumph through the jaws of death to his reward on high. The revilings of the world, the reproaches of enemies, cannot disturb him now, nor flattery soothe the dull cold ear of death.

It is a singular fact that the grave of the Rev. John Thompson, the first missionary who visited this region of country, a native of Ireland, buried at what is called Baker's Grave-yard, in Centre congregation; that of the Rev. Lewis F. Wilson, the pastor of Concord and Fourth Creek congregations, a native of England, buried at Bethany church; and the grave of the Rev. S. Frontis, a native of France, buried at Prospect church, should all be in the same region of country, and not very remote from each other. The present generation of Christians does not realise how much they owe to the labors of honored ministers, who, having first seen the light on the other side of the ocean, have here helped to lay the foundations of many generations; they have borne the burden and heat of the day. Their bones repose beneath the soil where they labored, and we have entered into their labors.

ARTICLE VII.

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY.

ORGANISATION.

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States met in the First Presbyterian Church, Nashville, Tennessee, at eleven o'clock, a. m., November 21st, 1867, and was opened with a sermon by the Rev. A. H. Kerr, D. D., Moderator of the last Assembly, from Psalm xlviii. 1, 14: "Great is the Lord, and greatly to be praised in the city of our God, in the mountain of his holiness. For this God is our God for ever and ever: he will be our guide even unto death."

The Rev. T. V. Moore, D. D., was chosen Moderator, and the Rev. J. E. C. Doremus, D. D., Temporary Clerk.

The Stated Clerk reported that he had been officially notified of the formation of the following new Presbyteries, viz., *Macon* and *Atlanta*, (which take the place of *Flint River*,) and *Abingdon*. This officer also reported changes in the names of several Presbyteries, viz., *Hopewell* into *Augusta*, and *Georgia* into *Savannah*.

The Permanent Clerk then read the names of the enrolled commissioners. There were present on the first day forty-three ministers and twenty-four ruling elders—sixty-seven in all. Before the Assembly was dissolved the names of forty-eight ministers and thirty-seven ruling elders were enrolled, making a total of *eighty-five*. It may be useful here to record the total number of commissioners in attendance at the several Assemblies, from the first. In December, 1861, the Assembly met at *Augusta*, and was there organised with fifty-five ministers and thirty-eight ruling elders: total, *ninety-three*. In May, 1862, it met at *Montgomery* (amid circumstances of peculiar difficulty, owing to the exigencies of the war,) and was composed of thirty ministers

and sixteen ruling elders: total, *forty-six*. In May, 1863, it met at Columbia, and was constituted with thirty-nine ministers and twenty-three ruling elders: total, *sixty-two*. In May, 1864, it met at Charlotte, with thirty-seven ministers and twenty-eight ruling elders: total, *sixty-five*. In December, 1865, it met at Macon, with forty-three ministers and nineteen ruling elders: total, *sixty-two*. In November, 1866, it met at Memphis, with fifty-four ministers and forty-three ruling elders: total, *ninety-seven*. The average attendance of ministers has, therefore, been 43 5-7, and of ruling elders 29 1-7; total, 72 6-7. Or, leaving out the small Assembly at Montgomery, the average has been as follows: ministers, 46; ruling elders, 31 1-3; total, 77 1-3.

THE PATAPSCO PRESBYTERY.

The Stated Clerk presented a memorial from the Presbytery of Patapsco, in the State of Maryland, composed of ministers and churches whose connexion was formerly with "The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America." The memorial is as follows:

Whereas, 1. The ministers and churches of this Presbytery originally dissolved their former ecclesiastical connexion, because of the numerous and persistent violations of the Constitution of the Church by the highest court thereof; and

Whereas, 2. This separation was to continue as long as these violations of the Church's Constitution continued; and

Whereas, 3. There now remains no good ground of hope that the Church of our former connexion will soon return to the old ways—the divine Constitution of the Church, so faithfully set forth in the standards under which we were ordained, and which we solemnly vowed to uphold, and to which we always held ourselves bound; and

Whereas, 4. It was the direction of our churches and sessions to form other ecclesiastical connexions—whenever it became necessary from the perpetuation and establishment of the aforesaid violations—with all Presbyterians who uphold the Constitution of the Church in its purity; and

Whereas, 5. This Presbytery was formed in obedience to this direction of the churches and sessions; and

Whereas, 6. We hold it to be the imperative obligation of all

God's people, according to the will of Christ, the sole King in Zion, to manifest the invisible unity of their faith in the unity of a visible Church, as far and as fast as it can be done consistently with the purity of the first, *the essential* unity of the Church of Christ; and

Whereas, 7. We believe that it is now high time to make visible our unity with all the Presbyterian people of God, further than is now done by our union in this Presbytery; and

Whereas, 8. We believe that the Presbyterian Church in the United States, whose General Assembly is to meet in the city of Nashville on the 21st day of November next, is the largest body of Christians in the land whose faith and government are identical with our own, and pure according to the standards of the church: Therefore,

Resolved, 1. That the Presbytery of Patapsco appoint, at its present meeting, commissioners to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, and order the said commissioners to ask the said Assembly to take Presbytery under its care and government, and to unite Presbytery with such Synod under the Assembly's jurisdiction as may seem to the Assembly most beneficial to the Church of God in the world.

Resolved, 2. That in seeking this ecclesiastical connexion with the aforesaid Presbyterian Church, we solemnly declare that we are actuated by the one desire to unite with all Christians of like faith with ourselves, ignoring all sectional and political distinctions whatever.

Resolved, 3. That we will greatly rejoice whenever the time shall come when an organic union of all Presbyterians in the land may be effected consistently with the purity of our standards.

After a brief discussion as to the best manner in which to respond to this memorial, a motion to the effect that the Presbytery of Patapsco be received under the care and government of this Assembly, that it be attached to the Synod of Virginia, and that the commissioners therefore be enrolled as members of this body, was unanimously and heartily adopted: whereupon the Rev. J. A. Lefevre and ruling elder Thomas Dixon took their seats as the persons regularly commissioned to represent this Presbytery. Then ensued a truly interesting scene. Mr. Lefevre arose, and, in a manner the most sincere and touching, declared his gratification with the reception his

Presbytery and its commissioners had received at the hands of the Assembly. He was followed by the Moderator, who, with great feeling, and in most appropriate language of welcome, greeted the commissioners, whilst the whole Assembly gave token, by a profound stillness, of their entire sympathy with Dr. Moore in his tender words of affectionate greeting.

THE CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

It will be recollected that the Assembly of 1866 appointed a Committee, composed of the Rev. Drs. Stedman, Kerr, Gray, Waddel, and Lyon, and the Rev. T. D. Witherspoon, to confer with a similar Committee from the General Assembly of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, (which was afterwards found to be composed of the Rev. Drs. Burney, Baird, Burrow, and Bird, and the Rev. Messrs. Poindexter and Woods,) with reference to the possibility of securing an organic union of the two bodies. On the second day of the sessions, this Committee laid before the Assembly the papers which had been prepared relating to the whole subject. They are somewhat long, and we must refer our readers to the Appendix to the Minutes, where they are spread forth in full. Having been referred to a special Committee of seven, a minute was subsequently brought in by them, which was unanimously adopted, and is as follows :

“The Assembly hereby records its devout acknowledgment to the great Head of the Church for the manifest tokens of his presence with the Committees of Conference during their deliberations, as evinced by the spirit of Christian candor, forbearance, and love, displayed by both parties in their entire proceedings.

“The Assembly regards the object for which that Committee was appointed as one fully worthy of the earnest endeavors and continued prayers of God’s people in both branches of the Church represented in the Committee. But at the same time, it is compelled, in view of the terms for effecting any organic union suggested by the Committee of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, to declare, that, regarding the present period as one very unfavorable for making changes in our standards of faith and practice, it is more especially so for effecting changes so materially modifying the system of doctrine which has for centu-

ries been the distinguishing peculiarity and the eminent glory of the Presbyterian churches both of Europe and the United States."

It will thus be seen that the principal objection of the Assembly to an organic union between these two bodies, lay in the fact that the Committee of the Cumberland Church felt constrained to insist upon certain changes in our doctrinal standards which could not be entertained. It is true they candidly confessed that, after "a calm and dispassionate investigation," the Cumberland Presbyterians had "been brought to see that it was not the design of the Confession of Faith to teach the doctrine of fatalism," an interpretation of our doctrines touching divine sovereignty and free agency which they had long believed to be sustained by the language of our symbols. But yet, it was insisted upon that *their* Confession of Faith and Catechism should be adopted in lieu of our own; or, failing this, they would accept of our standards so modified as to reduce them, in various specified particulars, to something so near their own as to make them substantially the same: or, this not being acceptable to us, they would consent to "a new compilation upon the basis of the Westminster Standards, which new compilation shall exclude all phraseology and modes of expression which can be plausibly construed to favor the idea of fatality or necessity." It must, however, be confessed that the Cumberland Committee, in the changes they proposed in our received symbols of doctrine, showed that they at least were free from the charge so often made against the Church, of Arminianism in any gross sense of that descriptive term. Still, they wished for alterations which could not be allowed without endangering the integrity of that system of revealed truth, the strict maintenance of which has always characterised the orthodox Presbyterian Church, and constituted it the chief defence of sound doctrine in our fallen world. The Assembly undoubtedly acted wisely, therefore, in bringing the negotiation to an end. Had it been continued, a wide field would have been opened for endless logomachy, on both sides, and after all the only result would have been to render wider than ever the breach of separation. Whilst many in

that Church are unquestionably orthodox, according to our belief of saving truth, there are certainly many more who could never be brought to see eye to eye with us, and who would not consent to a union of the two bodies upon any other ground than that of a patched-up theology which could satisfy nobody long. Better, therefore, remain as we are. Besides, there are two other points upon which the two Churches could not agree. The one is thus expressed by the Committee of the Cumberland brethren: "They respectfully ask that, in the union of the two churches, the amicable adjustment of the political and sectional issues touching slavery and rebellion, made by the Cumberland Presbyterian Church in May, 1867, shall be accepted." Having mislaid our copy of the minute referred to in this extract, we are unable to state the precise import of the terms of "amicable adjustment" to which allusion is made. But it sufficeth to say, that they constitute such a compromise between Northern and Southern opinion upon the subject of "slavery and the rebellion" as our Church could never consent to endorse, implying essentially, as it must, that we shall regard slaveholding as a sin and ourselves as guilty of "rebellion." But whether this "adjustment" would meet our views, as individuals, or not, it would be a violation of our principles to express as a Church any opinion on political questions. A large portion of the ministry and members of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church were abolitionists, and still are fierce Radicals in politics, and a union with this element would, if it were possible to consummate it, subject us to untold evils, which the cause of righteousness does not compel us to undergo.

The other point has reference to a very grave matter, which would affect us even more vitally than the one just dismissed. We allude to the subject of qualifications for the ministry. This was one of the original causes of the separation of the two churches. It is estimated that not more than one in five come up to the requirements of our standards on the score of education. Now, what could be done with this large, this overwhelming element of imperfectly trained men, even supposing that no more such preachers should be admitted in the future? Dr.

Lyon, in his letter to the Committee, places the reply to this question in a strong light, when he says that a union would constitute no certain guarantee against the evil in question, and when he further says in proof of this: "Many of the Presbyteries would be wholly composed, and many others would include a majority, of men whose education did not come up to our standard. It would be unreasonable, therefore, to suppose that such Presbyteries could be as cautious in granting dispensations, and as zealous in requiring strict compliance with our rules on this subject, as educated men would be. Indeed, some Presbyteries, it is to be presumed, would be wholly incapable of exercising such vigilance, even were they so disposed, for the want of qualifications themselves. . . . Such a union, under present circumstances, would certainly *lower* our standard and *weaken* our prestige as an educated denomination; at a time, too, when the present advanced state of learning and the character of the times imperiously demand that we should take a step *forward* instead of one *backward*."

We have dwelt the longer upon this subject, because the times have seemed to demand that we should be clearly understood when we as a Church assume the responsibility of declining ecclesiastical union with another large body of Christians holding the same views of church government, and maintaining many of the same doctrines. The cry for "union" has for some time been resounding through this land. In obedience to it, Presbyterians of every name in the North are endeavoring to adjust terms with one another so as to bring about a general coalescence into one great church organisation. And our backwardness here in the South to imitate them, has already brought down upon us the contents of certain vials of displeasure, of which that people have always an abundance in reserve for our devoted heads. But what we desire is, not mere uniformity of outward seeming, but union in the only right sense of that mistaken word: a real wedlock between parties whose religious views are the same, and whose tempers are compatible; a spiritual interfusion which time cannot cool; a locking together of common interests which no future exigencies are likely to unloose. Whenever this can take

place among the now severed members of the great Presbyterian family, we shall hail the day with unaffected gladness of soul.

THE SYNOD OF KENTUCKY.

A large share of the Assembly's attention was occupied, in the most pleasing manner, with the reception of commissioners from this body of noble Presbyterians, hearing their long and admirable memorial, and discussing the paper which was finally adopted in response to that able document. The commissioners—the Rev. Drs. Hendrick, Matthews, and Robinson, the Rev. Messrs. Davies and Barnes, and ruling elders Samuel Casseday and Glass Marshall—were announced by the Stated Clerk on the second day of the sessions, and, upon motion, were immediately introduced and heard. Stuart Robinson was their spokesman, and well did he acquit himself of his responsible charge. In as few sentences as possible, and without the least excitement of manner, although evidently speaking under a profound sense of the importance of the occasion, did this distinguished champion of the truth present the views and purposes under which the commission to which he belonged had been delegated by the Synod. He then laid upon the Moderator's table that memorial which will pass into the history of these excited times, and which no true Presbyterian can now read without emotions of almost tearful interest. After such a portion of it had been read aloud by the Temporary Clerk as put the Assembly in possession of its great leading points, it was, together with other communications handed in by the Kentucky commissioners, referred to a special committee of nine. The commissioners from the Synod were requested, by a motion, to meet with this Committee for conference. The Committee and the Commissioners had frequent and long meetings of great interest, that resulted in the preparation of a paper, which, after several unimportant amendments, was heartily and unanimously adopted. It is as follows :

“ The letter contains a statement of the doctrines and principles for which this Synod and its Presbyteries have been contending for the last seven years, and lays this statement before

the General Assembly as the basis of a covenant upon which this Synod may form an organic union with us. It is, of course, not desired by this Synod that this paper should constitute any part of our doctrinal symbols or our written constitution, these being already established in such a form as the Assembly have, in other cases of union, either formed or proposed, distinctly declared its unwillingness to disturb. Nor is it desired, we presume, by the Synod, that the Assembly should enter into the controversies that have disturbed this body during the past seven years, or pronounce upon them in detail. The desire of the Synod, as we apprehend it, is the very natural and proper desire—to be assured that we are in such substantial agreement with them in the principles and doctrines for which they have been contending, that they will not be likely to have a recurrence of the difficulties from which they have already suffered so much. This agreement the Assembly can declare without any difficulty, since the whole existence of our Church as a separate organisation has been an assertion of these principles, and a protest against those acts and doctrines that tend to subvert them. In the first official announcement, at Augusta, of our ecclesiastical existence, in the pastoral letter issued by the Assembly at Macon, and in the action of the last Assembly at Memphis, these great principles have been declared in the most solemn and emphatic manner, as among the fundamental principles of our ecclesiastical organisation. And we have looked on the struggles of our brethren in Kentucky with a deeper sympathy and a livelier interest because we felt that they were contending substantially for the grand principles which have ever been the rallying cry of our Presbyterian ancestry in the best days of the Church's history—the supremacy of Christ's Crown and Covenant. And we are sure that should our brethren see fit to enter into organic relations with us, they will find that substantial agreement in all these great doctrines and principles which is necessary to a cordial and a happy union. We therefore recommend the adoption of the following resolutions, viz. :

“*Resolved*, 1. That this Assembly express its deep sympathy with our brethren in Kentucky in the troubles through which they have been passing during the last seven years, and its admiration of the firm stand which they have taken for the spiritual independence of the Church of Christ.

“2. That this General Assembly declines now, as heretofore, to make any utterance concerning the acts of the body against which the Synod protests. Yet the Assembly feels free solemnly to assure the Synod of Kentucky not only of our cordial approval

of, and sincere concurrence substantially in, the Synod's statement of doctrine and constitutional principles, as contained under the four heads of the third division of their letter, but of our sincere joy to find our brethren of Kentucky so ready to unite with us in solemn covenant, with a view, among other things, to the advancement and maintenance of these doctrines and principles as against the apparent Erastian tendencies of our American Protestantism.

"3. That the Letter of the Synod of Kentucky be admitted to record, as they suggest, as a part of the historical acts and monuments of the Church, by publishing it in the Appendix to the Minutes of this Assembly.

"4. That this Assembly cordially approves of the determination of the Synod of Kentucky, as expressed in the fourth resolution of its minutes of June 28th, 1867, communicated by its commissioners to this Assembly, to assert fully all its legal claims as a part of the 'Presbyterian Church in the United States of America,' and to reserve all its legal rights of property as a Synod in any union which may be formed with this body.

"5. That this Assembly assures the Synod of Kentucky of a cordial welcome. And its Standing Committee on Commissions is hereby instructed to receive and enroll, without further order, commissioners properly accredited from the Presbyteries of Ebenezer, Louisville, Muhlenburg, Paducah, Transylvania, and West Lexington."

The discussion of this paper was brief, and confined to a few. The speakers urged, *pro* and *con*, the propriety of making no allusion whatever to the Northern Assembly; but the remarks of no one of them failed in the matter of extending a most cordial welcome to our Kentucky brethren, or in the matter of commending them for the self-sacrificing stand they had taken throughout the history of their conflict with that Erastian body. The entire Assembly stood ready to receive them, not only with unaffected satisfaction, but with something akin to enthusiasm. So, when the vote was taken, not a tongue was silent, but all united in thundering forth a tremendous concentrated "aye" such as is seldom heard in a church court. After the paper was adopted, several of the commissioners from Kentucky addressed the Assembly, Dr. Robinson leading the way. He said that he had been regarded as a man fond of controversy, but this was

not true. The controversy had been forced upon him. He had had no choice in the matter, if he would stand by the crown rights and headship of Jesus.

“During all this seven years’ war, he had felt like the school-boy who longed for a holiday, and now he felt, in the enjoyment of the scene around him, that Christmas times had come. He felt now that, on his part, the controversy had ended, and he would turn it over to his brethren of the Southern Church. He might be considered High Church, but he could not but regard this as the true Old School Presbyterian Church of the United States, the Presbyterian Church, and we desire union with no other. There was a time when he feared that the representation in this Assembly from Kentucky would be small. He had thought it possible that the *Synod* would not come; and, indeed, at one time, he was not certain that the Presbytery of Louisville would come, but he knew that there was one *church* that would be with you—the Second Church of Louisville—for they had said so. But his brethren had stood up manfully for the truth—the truths of Presbyterianism held more in their purity by the Southern Church than any other in the land—and he thanked God that to-day we have here represented all the Presbyteries and the whole Synod of Kentucky.

“Rev. J. D. Matthews, D. D., next arose, and remarked that Dr. Robinson had expressed his views. Dr. Robinson has been our leader, so far as is proper for us to call any man *leader*. Dr. R. had been in the well, but the rest of us had held the rope for him.

“The occasion reminded him of an anecdote related of Benjamin Franklin. At the close of the convention that framed the Constitution of the United States, Dr. Franklin said, that during the sessions of the convention he had observed a picture behind the Speaker’s desk, and that he had been at a loss to decide whether the scene represented a *rising* or a *setting sun*. but as the convention had so happily ended its labors, he concluded that it was a *rising sun*.’ So, said Dr. M., I think the sun is just rising over this Church, and will yet go forth with meridian splendor. It is *not* a setting sun.

“He proceeded to refer with much feeling to the separations caused by adherence to the truth. He was compelled to part with many dear brethren, with whom, in former times, he had taken sweet counsel—not that he loved them the less, but the truth more. Even his loved, his only brother, stood on the other side in this controversy. Yet a recent utterance of that

brother gave him some comfort, viz., 'that he much regretted that the *second* Declaration and Testimony (alluding to the Synod's letter to this Assembly) had not been in the stead of the first. If it had been so, there would not be much to object to.'

"Dr. Matthews closed by expressing his happiness at the evident good feeling that pervaded the Assembly.

"Rev. D. O. Davies followed, and remarked that he scarcely knew how to control his feelings in these Christmas times. He begged to express his congratulations in view of the result reached by the Assembly. Your people, Moderator, and our people are one, and your Church and our Church are one, not merely in sympathies and sentiments, but in high and sacred principles also; principles, to wit, of a pure ecclesiasticism. It is a union on *truth*, under the divine headship of the Lord Jesus Christ.

"One word, now, in conclusion. Let us drop all terms associated with the strifes and bitterness of the past. This Church is neither Old School nor New School—it is *the* Presbyterian Church of this broad land of ours. The Synods of Kentucky and of Virginia, as others, are composed of those who, for Christ's crown and covenant, came forth from both these bodies. Let us use our proper name, THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

"Rev. G. O. Barnes said that during the few days he had been in attendance upon the Assembly, his heart had warmed with the happiest feelings. He could not in such circumstances make a speech, but the feelings of his heart were summed up in three little words: '*Joy—Rest—Home!*' Thank God."

The Moderator replied, in substance, as follows:

"It would be an impertinence, dear brethren, after the expressions of affection that you have heard on the floor of the Assembly, for me to attempt to give any formal utterance of the feelings of this body toward you. You have heard from the lips of the members of this body, how entirely they concur with you in the principles for which you have been battling, how deeply they sympathise with you in the trials through which you have been passing, and how cordially they are prepared to welcome you to an organic unity with us on the ground of our common faith and feeling. We have seen the faces and heard the voices, and received the greetings of Kentuckians before, under circumstances that have imprinted them indelibly on our hearts. We know you as a people whose faces have often been seen by both friend

and foe, never your backs; and we look in your faces to-day with peculiar emotions, as we call to mind the fact, that when we met two years ago in the midst of desolation and sorrow, one of your members came down to us, not only with generous material aid, such as saved many a struggling pastor from actual suffering for bread, but also with loving words of brotherly cheer that still thrill our hearts with their kindly greetings. And we also call to mind the fact, that but for the generous opening of your granaries in our time of famine, many a Southern mother and child would probably have perished of hunger. These things are imprinted indelibly on our memories and constitute a part of the warmth with which you have been greeted on the floor of this Assembly.

“In regard to your organic union with us, the action of this Assembly, just passed, gives you the amplest guarantee of such substantial agreement in the faith once delivered to the saints, as must give assurance that this unity will be an inward reality and not a mere outward show. It is true that we have but little to offer you in the way of worldly inducements to cast in your lot with us, for our territory has been desolated and our people impoverished by war. But although we have but little worldly wealth, we have what is better than gold and silver, or houses and lands—we have a united and loving Church, in which there does not exist one element of discord, in which, as we meet in our church courts, we meet in the confiding love of brothers, not to dispute and wrangle, but to confer in that mutual confidence and affection which leads us to such remarkable unanimity in all our conclusions. We believe that there is not on earth a portion of the visible Church more entirely pervaded by the unity of the Spirit and the bonds of peace than our own, and this is better to us than the stalled ox and strife therewith; and in the midst of our privations we are contented and happy in the peace and quiet that pervade our borders, and we hope ever to be characterised by that wisdom that is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without hypocrisy.

“We then desire you to carry back to your people our warmest fraternal salutations, and tell them, when the time arrives for their closer identification with us, they will find us ready to meet them with open arms and open hearts as brothers, and that our prayer for them and you is, that the God of peace, that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant, may make you perfect in every good work to do his will, working in you

that which is well pleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ; to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen."*

The Moderator then called upon the Rev. G. O. Barnes to lead in prayer; after which the Assembly, still standing, united in singing the hymn beginning,

"Blest be the tie that binds."

Thus ended this delightful episode in the proceedings of the Assembly; and those who were present will not soon forget it. We doubt not that the Presbyteries in Kentucky will be received next May, by the Assembly of 1868, in a manner that shall represent the cordial welcome which the entire Church, throughout all its membership, is disposed to extend to them.

THE SYNOD OF MISSOURI.

This body was represented by the Rev. A. P. Fornan. We are sorry that we cannot, on account of their great length, copy into our pages the well-considered remarks of this excellent brother. He won all hearts by the mingled firmness and modesty with which he presented the views of his Synod, both as they differed from ours in some respects and from those of the Northern Church in nearly all respects. He stated, with great clearness, the reasons which prevent the Missouri ministers and churches from seeking an immediate union with our Assembly. In the first place, it had not been possible to secure a full meeting of the Synod since the last Assembly; nor was it convenient to hold a convention for conference at any time during the summer; so that they had had no opportunity to act as a body. In the second place, an immediate union might put in jeopardy very important interests. For example, Westminster College is already in litigation, claim having been laid to it by those who

* We have copied these abstracts from the *Free Christian Commonwealth*, to which paper they were communicated by the Rev. Robert Morrison, of Kentucky, to whom, we take this occasion to say, the Nashville Assembly owes a debt of gratitude for the patient and wise manner in which he superintended the reports of the debates, etc., and gave to them the shape they assumed in the *Union and Dispatch* of that city.

adhere to the Northern Assembly; there are also presbyterial academies and a great deal of other church property, the possession of which is sought by the enemies of peace. The Missouri brethren must therefore move cautiously in the matter of their ecclesiastical relations. In the third place, this Synod hopes, by maintaining its independency a while longer, to gather around itself those conservative elements in the Northern Church which must soon be compelled to seek connexion with it, and which are, at the same time, in some sympathy with us of the South. In the course of his remarks upon this point, Mr. Forman said:

"I know we have been charged by our opponents with a want of principle in this contest, and have been assailed with the convenient imputation that we are actuated by *political sympathy* for the South in her recent struggle for independence of the Federal Government. Now, I cannot believe that such a charge would by any means, of itself, keep our Synod in a state of independency, or deter us one moment from uniting with you. No, sir; we have been doing battle for the great doctrine of the headship of Jesus Christ. We have been contending for a strict interpretation of the Constitution of the Church, and a firm adherence to its excellent provisions. And many of us believe that in our present position we can probably best carry on this contest to its final issue. . . . Our Synod appointed a Committee to go to the next Assembly, and lay before that body our views and the reasons that actuate us in our present course. That Committee is not authorised in any way to make any concessions as to the great principles for which we have been contending. It goes there once more, in a most respectful and loving manner, and yet with firmness, and in the name of our King, to unfurl the banner of the Constitution of the Church, and display in golden letters the scriptural doctrine of the headship of Jesus, and that he alone is Lord of the conscience. We do not desire or intend to remain in a state of independency. We know that you are one with us now, as you were in those blessed days of the past to which memory will be ever carrying us back; and therefore our hearts turn to you, brethren. It will not be long before we shall meet you as co-commissioners in the supreme councils of the Church. Whatever may be the issue of our present contest, I feel assured that the Presbyterians of Missouri will never consent to a final ecclesiastical separation from their brethren in the South. . . . Already are we beginning to introduce your publications among our people, and

doubtless they will receive a ready sale in all our congregations."

The response by Dr. Moore to Mr. Forman's admirable address was well conceived and touchingly expressed. A committee, moreover, was appointed to consider and report upon the matters brought out by the commissioner from Missouri, so that more formality might be given to the Assembly's reception of his communication than was possible through a Moderator's reply. This Committee brought in the following minute, which was unanimously ordered to be placed on record:

"This Assembly has heard with profound interest the communication made by the Rev. A. P. Forman, on behalf of the Synod of Missouri, and desires to place on record its high appreciation of the principles and conduct of that venerable Synod, as set forth by Mr. Forman.

"The Assembly expresses its deep sympathy for the brethren in Missouri, both officers and members of the Church, in the great fight of affliction, through which they have not yet fully passed, though it is hoped they have successfully encountered the greatest trials, to which the great Head of the Church has been pleased to call them.

"The Assembly feels entire confidence in the full and cordial attachment of the ministers and members of the Presbyterian churches in Missouri, as represented in the Synod, for the principles of doctrine and church order set forth in the time-honored standards of our Church; and is entirely persuaded, that should that Synod be prepared to form an organic union with this Church, no difficulties could arise owing to discrepancies of opinion on any fundamental or important doctrines of the gospel, or any theories of church government which find a practical expression in our standards.

"As to the future relations of this Synod, the Assembly does not feel prepared to express any opinion, whatever it may desire. But it is due to us and to them to say that this Assembly cordially sympathizes with the Synod of Missouri, as represented by Mr. Forman, in expressing a longing desire for the day when throughout our land all who agree with us in the great truths of the "Gospel of the grace of God," and especially who fully sympathize in our position as a truly simply spiritual body, ever testifying for the supreme and sole authority of the divine and

exalted Head of the Church, shall constitute one organised Christian communion, prepared by the spiritual weapons of her warfare to contend earnestly "for the faith once delivered to the saints," and successful in "casting down imaginations and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ."

RECEPTION OF DELEGATES FROM CORRESPONDING BODIES.

Some of the most pleasing recollections connected with the proceedings of this Assembly relate to the reception of these delegates. The Associate Reformed Synod of the South sent the Rev. D. Pressly, and the Cumberland Presbyterian General Assembly sent the Rev. Dr. A. J. Baird. No more suitable men could have been selected for discharging the delicate duties intrusted to them. Their addresses were carefully prepared, and were listened to with the greatest interest by all who had the privilege of being present. We are, indeed, sorry to know that Mr. Pressly felt authorised to discourage all future attempts at union, as between the body he represented and our Assembly. He read the action of his Synod, which ought to be inserted here as a matter of history:

"Whereas, the subject of union between our Synod and the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States has been pending for some years past; and whereas, after the maturest deliberation we are capable of giving the subject, we are not prepared to give an assent to the basis proposed; and whereas, no good can result from the continued agitation of the matter; be it, therefore,

Resolved, That we respectfully decline further agitation of the subject."

This brief but comprehensive paper, the respected delegate informed the Assembly, was adopted after a season of unusually solemn prayer for divine guidance, by a vote of twenty to twelve. The terms of union proposed to that Synod were substantially these: that the Psalms of David, in Rouse's or the Scottish version, be embodied in our book of praises, and that the Associate Reformed churches should be protected in their time-honored Psalmody. These terms Mr. Pressly proceeded to discuss, in

the spirit of manly candor, showing that they would, in his judgment, and in that of many of his brethren, work unequally, and to the detriment of the Church he represented. In concluding his remarks on this subject, he said: "Although I come with no overtures on the subject of union, yet we wish ever to bear in mind that we are brethren endeared by the pleasant associations of past history and by the power of the faith divine. Exercising forbearance in love, we hope always to follow the things that make for peace and whereby one may edify another." He closed his excellent address by quoting from "one of the fondly-cherished Psalms," commencing with the lines:

"Pray that Jerusalem may have
Peace and felicity;
Let them that love thee and thy peace
Have still prosperity."

The reply of the Moderator was characterised by an elegance of phraseology, a Christian temper, and a fervor of fraternal love, which, we may here say, distinguished all of the utterances of that officer on each of the interesting occasions when he was called upon to address the responses of the Assembly to corresponding delegates. These replies were models in this kind of difficult oration. In addressing Mr. Pressly, Dr. Moore said, among other things:

"In regard to the termination of all negotiations with respect to an organic union with us, which you have officially announced, on the ground that the basis proposed would involve practical difficulties in the matter of Psalmody that you cannot overcome, I have to say, that whilst we would gladly have welcomed you to an absolute union with us, we shall not love you the less, or take a diminished interest in your prosperity, because you have seen fit to decline this union. . . . We accept your decision in the matter, with the assurance that we can appreciate the tenacity with which you cling to your book of praise. The rugged strength and antique simplicity of those old Psalms are mingled with the earliest recollections of your childhood, in the songs of the family, of the house of God, and of the communion table: and these time-honored lays of Zion come down to you hallowed by the memories of your martyred fathers in the land of Richard Cameron and Margaret Wilson; when they mingled with the

roar of the waves that swallowed up the heroic confessor who refused to abjure her divine King, and awaked the echoes of the lonely glens where the hunted Covenanter sought refuge to worship God. And we have expressed our appreciation of these renderings of the Psalms of David by incorporating fifty of them in our present collection. But our appreciation of your preference for these Psalms arises from the same fact in regard to our own; because we have heard them from the lips of those whose tongues are now silent in the grave, because they are mingled with our holiest memories of sick rooms, and dying beds, and gatherings for prayer, and hallowed seasons of holy communion, and all that is most sacred in the memories of the past, with which they are now inextricably interwoven. . . . You will bear back to your Synod our most fraternal greetings, and our assurance that we shall still endeavor to cherish that unity of the spirit and that bond of peace that is better than all mere outward unity when this is wanting; and we include your body in our fervent prayer and love when we sing in one of our own beautiful Psalms:

“ I love thy kingdom, Lord.
 The house of thine abode.
 The Church our blest Redeemer saved
 With his own precious blood.”

We have not the space to notice at length the interesting scene which occurred when the Rev. Dr. Baird delivered his very appropriate and eloquent address to the Assembly, in behalf of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, and when the Moderator replied to him in his felicitous response.

SUSTENTATION.

The First Annual Report of the Executive Committee of Sustentation was read on the third day by the Rev. J. Leighton Wilson, D. D., the honored Secretary. It was listened to with intense interest, the Assembly feeling that this was, indeed, the great subject to which all its members must give their best thoughts and their strongest affections. We wish it were possible, in these pages, to reprint the entire report, which is so replete with important matter of fact, and with grave matter of suggestion. We can, however, only beg our readers to obtain each a copy for himself, to study its contents with the greatest care, and to allow

the power of its wise utterances with reference to the future to arouse their hearts to renewed devotion in the cause which is so ably and touchingly argued. Especially would we call attention to the necessity, set forth in this report, of entire and absolute *unity* among the Presbyteries, in adhering to and carrying out the provisions of the plan of sustentation as inaugurated by the Assembly of 1866, and administered with such encouraging success during the year 1867. Thirty-seven of the Presbyteries have formally adopted it in full; six in part; one has not been heard from; and one has chosen an entirely independent course. So that there is an almost perfect unity already secured, so far as the action of the several Presbyteries is concerned. But what is needed still, is a closer union of heartfelt interest in this highly important cause: a determination which no difficulties can lessen, on the part of every one of these courts of the Lord's house, to do its utmost to achieve success in this direction, and a coöperation which no local issues can weaken, that shall exhibit but a single will, strong as life, in the Church to overtake her abounding desolations everywhere. We have fallen upon evil times. The next year will try our patience, and test our faith, and torture our hopes, far more than did the last; for our Southern country is in even deeper waters of affliction than heretofore. Instead of augmented wealth, we have increased poverty. Instead of growing light we have deeper darkness, as to our prospects of returning financial prosperity. But shall we yield to despair in matters connected with the CHURCH, in this the hour of her midnight troubles? Shall we withdraw our hands from the work of sustaining her ministers and rebuilding her houses of worship, because our hands are emptier than they were of this world's goods? Have we not enough left, and more than enough, if we would use it wisely and well, for all our purposes? Has not the time fully come, when, laying a firmer hold than ever before upon the promises of God touching his earthly kingdom, every lover of Zion should renew his vows of consecration to her welfare, and, retrenching in all other matters of expense, devote his savings to the furtherance of her growth? Let, therefore, each voice be raised to mingle with the voices of all, in calling

upon the entire Church to put forth a strong, a steady, and a united effort, in behalf of the vital cause of sustentation. If this cause fail, all must fail with it.

The receipts from all sources, last year, sum up to the amount of \$30,343.33. Nearly two-thirds of this total were gathered from the contributions of our own churches; nearly one-third came from sympathising friends in Baltimore and Kentucky; whilst small sums were contributed by brethren whose hearts are with us elsewhere. The increase over last year, from our churches, is about fifty per cent. But, more encouraging still, the number of contributing churches is more than double that of 1866: being 450 for the closing year against 217 for the one previous. Now in view of the fact that there are still at least 750 churches whose members have given nothing in the past to the cause of sustentation, may it not be supposed, that, if these would only come up to the smallest measure of their duty, the treasury would, in 1868, be fuller than it was in 1867, even though the 450 contributing churches should fall off from the measure of their former liberality? If the whole body of our churches could be prevailed upon to do each its best, there would be no fear of a diminished income, notwithstanding the smaller pecuniary resources of the country and the appalling poverty of its Christian people. It cannot for a moment be believed that a single member of the Presbyterian Church in the South can now be found who is unwilling to contribute something to this precious cause, if only our ministers will feel its importance as deeply as they ought, present it as they should to their people, and trust, as they are warranted to do, to the Christian liberality of their flocks. In the language of the report, "the various Presbyterial committees of missions, and especially the chairmen of these committees, must awake to the full responsibilities laid upon them, and use every legitimate means to bring all their churches into hearty coöperation in the great work. . . . *General* contributions, instead of large ones, are what are particularly needed. An average of one dollar for each church member would not only meet all the wants of this particular cause, but, in a great measure, those of all the other schemes of general benevo-

lence. If ministers, church sessions, and committees of missions, will only do their duty, there will be no lack of funds, and the Church will at once be raised up from her low and prostrate condition. The remarks of Dr. Brown, made during the evening session devoted to the consideration of this cause, we here append, as deserving of attention:

“The time has now come in which we should feel the whole idea of self-dependence as to our fellow-men. It is right under severe providences to receive aid, but if we carry this beyond the exigencies of the hour we become degraded. The Secretary says he must have \$40,000. Suppose \$100,000 will meet every want—why should we tremble? Would it be any oppression to ask ten cents a week from every member? The amount would be \$364,000. Put the average at $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents per week, and you would get \$91,000. Why can't we get this amount? We have the best organisation on earth for gathering the contributions. The difficulty must be in the want of presentation by the ministers, elders, and deacons. He greatly admired the scheme of the Secretary for it has its model in the word of God. We have the body fitly joined together; let us then work together.”

It is remarkable that the Assembly did not think proper to *recommend* this great cause in a series of resolutions, as has been usual. This omission furnishes the best proof possible of the confidence felt by the commissioners in their own purpose to further a scheme, the successful prosecution of which at this time is absolutely essential to our very existence as a Church, and also of their kindred confidence in those they represented with reference to the same matter. Such resolutions on the part of our ecclesiastical courts are very well in their place. They serve to embody, in a convenient form, the expression of the mind of the members, and what they believe to be the mind of the whole people. They are useful in assisting to gain and arouse the attention and concentrate the action of the Church at large. But there are some subjects that now and then rise into signal prominence above all others, in regard to which the mind of the Church is quite made up, so as to require nothing of the language of formal resolution to add to their importance, or to call attention to their demands upon the sympathies, the prayers, and the efforts of God's people. The cause of sustentation consti-

tutes one of these; and the significant omission of the customary recommendatory resolutions we therefore hail as an omen for good.

We must add, that it was in connexion with the discussion of this cause, that Dr. Robinson, who was invited to speak, suggested to the Assembly the importance of appointing a sort of "apostolic commission to go out all over the Northern country, from Missouri to Boston, and proclaim everywhere the existence and the acts of this branch of true Presbyterianism," and sound the appeal for sympathy and for coöperation in the ears of conservative men. This suggestion met with much favor from some, and it was afterwards embodied in a resolution or two, whose object was to give it practical shape. But the Assembly, upon a fuller consideration of the subject, refused its consent to the measure as being impolitic at the present time; and acted wisely, no doubt, in so doing.

FOREIGN MISSIONS.

This subject, always old, always new, excited a great deal of interest, and occupied a large space in the deliberations of the Assembly. The Sixth Annual Report of the Executive Committee was read by Dr. J. Leighton Wilson, and was heard with absorbing attention by all. It embraces the history, during the past year, of Indian Missions, and of our missions in foreign lands; and contains a number of important practical suggestions touching the best modes by which the Church can continue to prosecute the schemes and enlarge the operations of the Committee. The receipts for this object from all sources during the year 1867, amounted to the sum of \$13,121.62. But more than this was needed, and, by consequence, the full salaries of our Indian missionaries had not been paid. In view of this state of facts, the report earnestly appeals to the Church for an augmented interest in this cause, and for enlarged contributions. It says:

"This deficiency in the contributions was not necessary and ought not to have occurred. An average of a quarter of a dol-

lar to each church member would have more than met the demands of this cause. At the same time, it is questionable whether there is a single church within our whole bounds that could not have given as much, or twice as much, if its claims had been properly brought to their attention. Are ministers of the gospel and church sessions never to be aroused to their responsibilities in relation to this matter? How can they expect the blessing of the great Head of the Church to rest upon themselves or upon their labors, so long as they disregard or overlook the claims of this great cause? Can that church be in a healthful spiritual condition, that feels no interest and joins in no effort to spread the knowledge of the gospel among the perishing nations of the earth? How surpassingly strange is it that more than half of our thirteen hundred churches have not contributed one dollar the last year to sustain this great cause? Is this not a matter that claims the serious attention of the General Assembly, as well as that of all the inferior courts?"

The report calls, also, for laborers to occupy the stations in the Indian country lately occupied by Messrs. Byington, Stark, Fiske, and Dr. Hobbs. It invites attention to the interesting fact that "Miss Christina Ronzone, a native of Italy, but for a number of years past a resident of South Carolina, and a member of one of our churches there, sailed for her native country in August last, with the expectation of taking charge of a large Protestant school in the city of Naples;" to act there "under the general direction of the Waldensian Table, or Committee of Missions, but deriving her support from the Executive Committee of Foreign Missions of our Church." Besides these, we have under our care a mission in China, now occupied by the Rev. Elias B. Inslee and his wife, with encouraging hopes. This mission, it is expected, will be still further enlarged, in the spring of 1868. by associating with Mr. and Mrs. Inslee two young men, who will then be ready to devote their lives to the work of spreading the gospel in that land of heathenish darkness. It will therefore become the duty of our people to make greater efforts than ever to replenish the treasury of the Committee; and we trust that God will put it into the hearts of all to give of their poverty to so holy a cause. We commend the wisdom of the Committee in the appeals they have made, and are still making, to our vari-

ous Sabbath-schools, to secure the coöperation of the children of the Church, "especially in sustaining the educational operations that must necessarily be carried on in connexion" with the general work of Foreign Missions. This appeal has not been made in vain, and will doubtless continue to yield abundant fruits, both of permanent good to the children themselves, and of lasting benefit to the cause of heathen evangelisation. The time has come when we should study "the power of littles" more closely than ever before. A few cents given week after week by a multitude of children, will amount to a great sum in the course of a year, and every proper means ought to be employed for gathering them in. Would that the practical wisdom of this scheme had already come to be seen by the whole membership of our churches, with reference to their own giving, as it has begun to arrest the attention and enlist the feelings of a large proportion of our more thoughtful people. This branch of the subject of giving was brought out in the report on "systematic benevolence," and in the discussion that ensued on its presentation—issuing in a resolution, on the part of the Assembly, to recommend Sabbath-day contributions as a regular plan for the adoption of all the churches.

The night whose hours were devoted to the full consideration of this subject of Foreign Missions, will long be remembered by those whose good fortune it was to be present. The remarks that were made on this occasion by the several speakers were unusually appropriate and stirring, especially those of the Rev. J. G. Shepperson, of Virginia. An added element of excitement was thrown into the discussion by the introduction, at the opening of the meeting, of an extraordinary resolution. It was offered by the Rev. Dr. B. M. Smith, and was to the effect that the Executive Committee of Foreign Missions be instructed to inquire into the expediency of our withdrawing altogether from the work in other lands, and of confining our contributions and our efforts exclusively to our own country! It is difficult to ascertain the motive that could have induced Dr. Smith to offer such a paper; but probably he desired in this novel manner to draw out more fully the mind of the Assembly by bringing be-

fore its members a startling view of the alternative of their devoting more of their energies to this great work, or of giving it up altogether. For, after the discussion was closed, during which many were affected to tears, he himself brought forward the strong resolution, which was enthusiastically and unanimously adopted, viz. :

“*Resolved*, That, inasmuch as the work of extending the gospel through all the world is the great work for which the Church has been instituted by her great Head, and to which all other parts of its work are subordinate, the Committee of Foreign Missions be directed to press the enterprise intrusted to it with renewed energy and effort; assured that the means both of men and of money will be adequately supplied, in the all-wise providence of God, in proportion to the liberal method devised by the Church.”

PUBLICATION AND EDUCATION.

We have, unfortunately, left ourselves but little room in which to speak, as we had intended, and as their great importance demands, of these two indispensable arms of our Church's efficiency. The reports of the Executive Committees which have them in charge, were read by the Rev. Dr. Baird, the Secretary of Education and of Publication, and proved as interesting as they were elaborate. We commend their close perusal to every minister and member of our Church.

The most important action that was taken with reference to this subject was to authorise the removal, should the Committees think it expedient after further inquiry, of the seat of their operations from Richmond to Baltimore. Dr. Baird presented a number of arguments favoring this change of locality, which, by the majority of the Assembly, perhaps by all, were deemed conclusive. It is to be hoped that the Church, throughout its whole extent, will awake to the feeling of a fresh interest in behalf of these two branches of its work. How many incentives there are to such a reawakening!

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES.

For some reason, there was no report from Union Theological

Seminary; but the Assembly learned, through unofficial sources, that this institution is enjoying as high a degree of prosperity as under the circumstances could have been expected. It is still laboring under the disability of pecuniary straitness; but even in this respect its friends have cause to be hopeful, seeing how much has already been done for the reëstablishment of its war-lost endowment. Its professorships are ably filled, and their occupants are deserving of the high commendation of the whole Church for their arduous self-sacrificing labors. This Seminary still continues under the immediate management of the Synods of Virginia and North Carolina.

The usual full reports of the Faculty and Directors of the Seminary at Columbia, (which for several years has been the exclusive property of the Assembly,) were received, discussed, and acted upon in the usual manner. The whole number of students in attendance during the year was fourteen; which has been increased this year already to twenty-three, with the prospect of more. Every chair is filled, with the exception of that of Pastoral Theology, made vacant a few years ago by the failing health of the venerable Dr. Leland. The duties of this professorship are divided between two of the other chairs, and are well discharged by Drs. Adger and Plumer. Pastoral Theology falling to the latter, and Homiletics to the former. It is probable that, for some time to come, this seeming vacancy cannot be filled, owing to the lack of endowment. Meanwhile, the cause of theological education in so important a branch will not suffer in this institution, we may believe, whilst strength is continued to Dr. Plumer and his coadjutors. The only professorship which now enjoys anything like an adequate salary is that occupied by Dr. Woodrow—the “Perkins Professorship.” This has an independent and inalienable endowment, secured by investment in bonds that are now yielding an income, though an income not equal to what it was in “gold-times” before the war. It is a matter for gratitude that the remaining Professors have not been permitted actually to want during the year just closed; but yet the Church should take shame to herself for allowing three such men to labor in her behalf with

wholly inadequate salaries. The income from the broken fragments of the old endowment, together with what has been directly contributed by the churches, has not half paid them their promised dues, and they have been forced to rely in great measure upon their own private resources, meagre at best, for their daily bread. We do not know that they have loudly complained of this treatment, but we who are in the ministry ought to complain for them to our churches, and see that they shall henceforth want for nothing which in justice they ought to have. The report of the Board of Directors makes this statement, which ought to arouse every feeling of our souls in an effort to relieve this institution from its present and prospective embarrassments :

“The salaries and current expenses of the Seminary are pressing and hard to meet. The report of your Treasurer, herewith submitted, shows a deficiency of \$4,040.93 to pay the salaries of the Professors up to the 1st July, 1867. The prospective view of the means and wants for the next year shows a still larger deficiency. This we trust will be supplied by the Church. While some of the churches have done well, many of them have done little or nothing. The Board has not lost all hope of meeting these wants from contributions of the churches and liberal-minded individuals, and has resolved to persevere in the plan commenced a year ago.”

We must here call attention to the fact that the Rev. Wm. S. Plumer, D. D., LL.D., was duly inaugurated Professor of Didactic and Polemic Theology, in the presence of a large audience. It was an occasion of great interest. The “charge” was delivered, in excellent taste, by the Rev. Dr. Lyon, who was appointed by the Assembly to perform this difficult duty. The “Inaugural Address” itself was a production which fully sustained the high reputation of its distinguished author. We hope that both Dr. Lyon’s charge and Dr. Plumer’s address will be given to the public in a pamphlet form, with a record of the religious and other exercises that helped to render the whole scene so solemn and so touching. The selection by the Memphis Assembly of Dr. Plumer as the successor of the lamented James H. Thornwell was eminently wise. He has thrown his whole energies—the energies of a deeply cultivated heart and a highly improved

understanding, both naturally vigorous and characterised by uncommon traits of superiority—into the work assigned him; and the result of his single-eyed coöperation with his fellow-professors is daily being seen in the increasing prosperity of the Seminary. May he long be spared to the suffering Church with which he has cast in his lot!

At this point, we may speak of what was done by this Assembly in the matter of a third theological seminary desired by some to be established in the South-west. Upon this subject there was, unexpectedly, but little debate, as there proved to be but little difference of opinion. It was evident, almost as soon as it was mentioned, that the Assembly did not feel prepared to favor such a scheme; a new seminary being regarded as wholly unnecessary at the present time. The discussion of this point, however, naturally and inevitably involved the consideration of the cognate question, Should the *Columbia* Seminary be removed to the South-west, if two only are needed for the wants of the entire Church?

Dr. Lyon stated that, so far as he knew, few of the brethren desired a South-western seminary; yet he felt that there should be a seminary in the South-west. Many felt that the removal of the Seminary from Columbia would be expedient, and the subject was discussed. A memorial was drawn up on the subject; it was suggested that a sectional seminary would not produce good results. The subject of a third seminary was no longer discussed, but the removal of the Columbia institution to the South-west. It was not now a well-endowed institution, and he felt that it should be removed to the growing South-west. He wished to discuss the question mildly; he would not wound the feelings of a brother there. But he would move the Columbia Seminary, with its splendid library and able faculty, to the prolific South-west, and make it the pride of the section.

Dr. J. R. Wilson said that in his understanding of the remarks of Dr. Lyon, the latter thought that at some future time the Columbia Seminary would be removed to the South-west. He had no personal feelings in the matter; he was a Director of the institution, and was warmly attached to it. He doubted not

that if the entire Church would declare that it was expedient to remove it to the South-west, the Synods of South Carolina, Alabama, and Georgia would consent to it; but if the voice of the Church said it was inexpedient now to remove the institution, then the decision should debar further agitation of the subject as injurious to the Seminary. If the Church now, through its General Assembly, decide upon its inexpediency, then he hoped that this would be regarded as a final decision for the present generation.

Here the Moderator suggested that the question was as to the expediency of establishing a third seminary, and not the removal of any; and hence it was not in order to discuss the latter.

Dr. Wilson thought that this was a point of order hardly well taken, inasmuch as the whole subject, whether of a new seminary or of the removal of the Columbia Seminary, had been opened up by Dr. Lyon in his remarks. However, he would explain that he wished to convey the idea in what he had said, that if the Assembly should now decide against the expediency of a third seminary, then he reasonably desired that such a decision should be regarded on all hands as equivalent to determining that it was also unwise to agitate further the removal of the Seminary at Columbia: as both of these questions seemed to hang together.

Dr. Lyon rejoined, that the Assembly had not reached the point of infallibility, and he trusted that no demand would be made upon members forestalling calm and deliberate discussion of questions pertaining to Church interests.

The matter ended in the Assembly by the unanimous adoption of a minute, declaring it inexpedient, at present, to establish a third theological seminary in the South-west. Whilst our Southwestern brethren will, no doubt, generally acquiesce in this decision, we are left to infer, from the tenor of Dr. Lyon's concluding words, that the agitation of the question touching the removal of the Columbia Seminary, will not necessarily cease on the ground of the aforesaid decision. But sure we are, that the Assembly felt with Dr. Wilson, and appreciated the propriety of having this whole matter put to rest for some

time to come; inasmuch as no good could be done, but much evil might accrue, by further exciting the Church with reference to a removal which after all depends not upon any action of the General Assembly, but alone upon the say-so of the Synods which originally made the transfer of this valuable property to that high court, incumbering that transfer as they did with the single condition, accepted by the Assembly, that the institution should never be removed without their consent. No one can, indeed, reasonably object to the desire felt by some in the Southwest, and calmly expressed by Dr. Lyon on the floor of the Assembly, to have a theological seminary established within that broad region, to which their sons might have ready access. And we think it altogether probable, perhaps quite certain, that at some future day these desires will be gratified. It may even, in truth, be deemed advisable, by a future Assembly, to request the Synods now having practical control of this subject of removal, to forego their claim, and submit to seeing the Columbia Seminary transferred to that country, so rich in all natural resources. But for a number of years to come, it is perfectly evident that things will remain as they now are with reference to this important matter. Meanwhile, let no jealousies spring up between that section and the one which seems to be the most favored in point of the advantages of theological education. The Church is one. Her interests are indivisible. The seminaries already located belong alike to all her membership, and are open alike to all her sons. They are easily reached by rail from every part of the country; and we are sure that the benefits resulting from their prosperity will accrue alike to all.

We must incur the risk of extending this notice of the Assembly's proceedings on the subject of theological seminaries, by inviting our readers to examine for a moment a very singular resolution which passed without exciting the least remark, so far as we have been made aware, from more than one or two of the commissioners; and yet a resolution which ought to have been looked into narrowly. It is this:

“The Assembly would earnestly impress on the minds of all having in charge the government and instruction of our theo-

logical seminaries, the vital importance of training our future ministers, not only to be able and faithful ministers of the word of God, but also to be fully imbued with an implicit faith in the plenary and literal inspired authority of the Sacred Scriptures."

Now, to say nothing as to the intention of the mover in using the words "plenary and literal inspired authority," we submit that if such a resolution was called for at all, it must have been because the danger here warned against had, in one or other of the seminaries, been threatened. Now, which of all our theological Professors needed this caveat, that he may stay proceedings in the premises? We know of none. Did the mover know of one? Who is he that has disputed the plenary inspiration of God's word? If any one has committed this crime, the criminal ought to be named, be tried, and be removed. Or was the resolution intended simply to commit the Assembly afresh to the true theory of inspiration as presented in our Confession? If so, could this not have been better done than by holding up to the world our seminaries as containing, within one of them, some instructor who is employing his high place in misguiding the faith of our future ministers?

THE FREEDMEN QUESTION.

The insertion of the following resolutions, which were unanimously adopted, will clearly show the attitude of our Church in regard to this knotty subject. It calls for no comment. There can now be no difficulty in ascertaining the position we have all along maintained—though perhaps not hitherto so unmistakeably defined—with reference to a matter touching which the Southern Church has been so wickedly maligned, both at home and abroad:

"The Committee on Bills and Overtures report Overture No. 7, from the Synod of Virginia, proposing a revocation of the acts of the last Assembly on the relation of our Church to the colored people, and Overture No. 8, from the Presbytery of Mississippi, proposing such a modification of said action 'as shall authorise the Presbyteries, in the exercise of their discretion, to ordain to the gospel ministry, and to organise into separate congregations, duly qualified persons of the colored race, and so declare that

VOL. XIX., NO. 1—9

mere race or color is not regarded as a bar to office or privilege in the Presbyterian Church in the United States.' Your Committee report the following minute:

"*Resolved*, 1. That believing the resolutions of the last Assembly, pp. 35 and 36, were evidently designed to be of temporary operation, and that they contain many clauses which do not adequately express the sentiments of our Church on the subject contemplated, they be and are hereby revoked.

"2. That inasmuch as, according to our Constitution, the duty of admitting candidates to the office of the gospel ministry devolves solely on the Presbyteries, and that of electing elders and deacons solely on the congregations, all male persons of proper qualifications for such offices, of whatever race, color, or civil condition, must be admitted or elected by these authorities respectively, in accordance with the principles of our church government and in the exercise of a sound Christian discretion.

"3. That the Assembly declines, on the ground of constitutional incompetency, to make any declaration respecting the future ecclesiastical organisations of such freedmen as may belong to our communion, believing that the responsibility, as well as the course to be pursued, devolves on those persons, who are both politically and ecclesiastically free, as all others, to serve God according to the dictates of their own consciences.

"4. The Assembly earnestly enjoins on all our ministers and people to use all diligence in affectionate and discreet efforts for the spiritual benefit of the colored race within reach of their private and public ministrations, and to seek, by all lawful means, to introduce them into a permanent connexion with our Church: and for this purpose, the Assembly recognises the lawfulness of measures such as have long been used, in various portions of our Church, contemplating the judicious selection and employment of the more pious and intelligent persons among colored communicants in suitable official capacities for the spiritual benefit of their own race."

It is but fair to state that the discussion upon this subject brought out some diversity of opinion as to the best mode of disposing of it. But all at last substantially agreed, and voted for the above paper without serious hesitation. Perhaps the only exceptions to this remark were the Rev. Mr. Mack, of Charleston, and the Rev. Dr. Doremus, of New Orleans, both of whom desired something which would seem, to their minds, more positive and less open to angry animadversion on the part of our

enemies. But the Assembly wisely thought that those enemies deserved not to be consulted in a matter which they either would not, or could not, understand, and so proceeded to discharge its duty in the premises with reference only to that fear of God which casteth out all other fear.

THE BOOK OF CHURCH ORDER.

It is a little remarkable that the subject here indicated attracted but little of the attention of the Assembly. We presume that this was because the action of the various Presbyteries had become notorious by wide publication in the newspapers: and, the conclusion being foregone in the minds of the commissioners that the new book would be thrown out, there was felt to be no need of saying anything about it. But yet, we would have looked for some one to move that the Revision Committee should be continued, or that a new one be appointed, in whose hands the answers of the Presbyteries would have been placed, with instructions to conform their future revision thereto, so far as practicable, and report to the next or some subsequent Assembly. The only voices that were heard upon the floor with reference to it at all, were those of Dr. Wilson, Chairman of the Committee to report upon these answers, and of Mr. Lefevre, who moved that the report be unanimously adopted as a whole. That report was accordingly so adopted, and is as follows—constituting a singular sequel to the action of the last Assembly in relation to this subject:

“The committee appointed to examine the answers to the overtures sent down to the several Presbyteries by the last General Assembly, touching the “Form of Government,” “Canons of Discipline,” and “Rules of Parliamentary Order,” and to recommend action to this Assembly with reference to the whole matter, beg leave to report as follows:

“1. A careful examination of the answers to said overtures sent to the Assembly by forty of the Presbyteries, reveals the fact that *thirty-five* of these Presbyteries do answer all the overtures with an unconditional negative, that *four* of them answer with a conditional negative, whilst only *five* adopt the

overture with reference to Rules of Parliamentary Order, and but *one* adopts the whole three absolutely.

"2. These answers nearly all reveal the fact that the Presbyteries are impressed with the importance of the labors that have been performed by the Assembly's Committee on Revision, and express their desire to have the result of these labors preserved.

"3. These answers also bring out the fact that there is a great diversity of opinion in the Presbyteries with respect to the changes proposed by the overtures, very few of them coinciding in the same objections, or concurring in the same criticisms.

"In view of these facts, your committee submit to the General Assembly the following resolutions :

"*Resolved*, 1. That in the judgment of the Assembly, it is inexpedient to continue the Committee on Revision, or to appoint another at this time.

"*Resolved*, 2. That the answers to the overtures be all carefully filed away with the overtures themselves, for future reference and use.

"*Resolved*, 3. That this Assembly feels that it is due to the Committee on Revision to express its sense of the value of their long-continued and laborious work, and to offer them its thanks for what they have done in their endeavor to set forth the great principles of the Constitution of our Church."

PRESBYTERIAN UNIVERSITY.

The Rev. Dr. Lyon took occasion to introduce, during the night sessions devoted to the consideration of the subject of ministerial education, his views of a scheme, inaugurated by himself and some others several years ago, that looked to the establishment of a great Presbyterian university in the South. He rehearsed the history of the scheme, and supported his views as to its expediency in a long (but not too long) and capital speech. After concluding, he introduced a paper whose object was to obtain the sanction of this Assembly to the plan of making an immediate move in the direction indicated by his remarks. This having been objected to, and the hour being late, Dr. Lyon withdrew his paper, for the purpose of submitting it again the next day.

This review of the Assembly's proceedings would be incomplete were we to leave out the minute which was finally adopted

on this subject. The original paper was considerably modified by the Assembly and passed in the following mild form :

“Whereas, the Presbyterian Church has at all times been distinguished for the high degree of mental culture of its ministers and people—an honorable precedence which it will be commendable for us to try still to maintain : Therefore,

“*Resolved*, 1. That in the judgment of this Assembly it comes clearly within the province of the organised Church of God to look after the mental as well as the moral culture of the people of God, with the view to their highest attainments in active and vital piety.

“*Resolved*, 2. That in view of this fact, this Assembly deems it of the utmost importance that the Church elevate its standard of learning and widen its domain in prosecuting the educational interests of the people over whom it exercises a controlling influence.

“*Resolved*, 3. That the Assembly request the Presbyteries throughout the bounds of the Church to take this subject into consideration at their next regular meetings, and report their action to the next General Assembly.”

CRITICAL NOTICES.

The Person of Christ: The Miracle of History. With a reply to Strauss and Renan, and a Collection of Testimonies of Unbelievers. By PHILIP SCHAFF, D. D. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1866. Pp. 374. 12mo.

The whole fabric of Christianity, well says Dr. Schaff, stands or falls with its divine-human Founder: and if it can never perish, it is because Christ lives, the same yesterday, to-day, and forever. The person of Christ is the great central miracle of history. The perfection of his humanity is a proof of his divinity. The indwelling of God in him is the only satisfactory solution of the problem of his character. From his person considered as miraculous, his miraculous works follow as an inevitable consequence. A miracle himself, miracles must be to him as ordinary doings to ordinary men. I believe in Christ, and therefore I believe the Bible and all its wonderful words and works.

Infidels, again well says Dr. Schaff, are seldom convinced by argument, for the springs of unbelief are in the heart, rather than in the head. But honest inquirers and earnest sceptics, like Nathanael and Thomas, who love the truth and wish only for tangible support of their weak faith, will never refuse to embrace, with grateful joy, evidence laid before them concerning the incarnate God, nor to worship him as such.

The work of Dr. Schaff actually consists of three parts, in the first of which he presents the testimony for the divine-human person of Christ which may be derived from the history of his childhood and youth; his training; his public life; his freedom from sin; his absolute holiness; the union in him of virtue and piety; the completeness and universality of his character; the harmony of all graces and virtues in him; his passion and cru-

cifixion; and from Christ's own testimony concerning himself. The conclusion to which the reader is brought by a consideration of all these points is, that the character of Christ is the greatest moral miracle of history.

The second part of the book is an examination of the false theories respecting the person of Christ; as the Unitarian theory, the Rationalistic theory, the mythical hypothesis of Strauss, the legendary hypothesis of Renan, and some others of similar character to these. Many very valuable notes are appended to these first two parts of the work.

The third part, consisting of 125 pages, presents the testimony of various distinguished unbelievers to the preëminent excellence of the character of Jesus. "It seems to be felt more and more that he is without controversy the very best being that ever walked on this earth, and that an attack on his character is an insult to the honor and dignity of humanity itself." "The impression of Christ upon the world, far from losing ground, is gaining new strength with every stage of civilisation, and controls even the best thinking of his enemies." Yet these very testimonies expose the inconsistency of unbelief in admitting the absolute purity and the truthfulness of Christ, and yet refusing to receive his own account of himself.

Amongst these testimonies is the celebrated one of Napoleon Bonaparte at St. Helena. Dr. Schaff gives us some interesting particulars relative to the question of the authenticity of this testimony. It has been extensively published by religious tract societies both in Europe and America. Napoleon's American panegyrist, John S. C. Abbott, of course embodies it in his work. A respectful letter from Dr. Schaff, asking for his authorities, received no answer. Generals Bertrand and Montholon, companions of the Emperor's exile, who after his death returned to Europe, would be proper vouchers, and so would Las Cases, Antommarchi, and O'Meara, who all wrote accounts of their sojourn at St. Helena. But the three last named give us nothing amounting to this testimony, nor do the two Generals in any of their writings, so far as known to Dr. Schaff or to us. Prof. G. de Felice, of Montauban, vouches for the authenticity

of this testimony, but gives no proof. There is a French work by Robert Antoine de Beauterne, published in Paris in 1843, under the title, "*Sentiments de Napoleon sur le Christianisme : Conversations religieuses recueillies a Sainte Helene, par le Gen. Comte de Montholon,*" which Dr. Schaff could not find, however, in any of the public libraries of New York, (and which is not in either of the extensive libraries in this city, containing near 50,000 volumes :) nor does he know whether this book claims to be based upon personal communications from Montholon or any other sufficient evidence. Upon the whole, we think Dr. Schaff has left very slender support to this celebrated "testimony:" but we agree with him, nevertheless, that it does have the genuine "Napoleonic ring," and is marked by the massive grandeur and the simplicity which always characterise the best utterances of that marvellous genius. And no matter who was the author of this "testimony," it is both true and weighty in the highest degree.

Dr. Schaff's examination of Strauss's mythical hypothesis, and of the legendary one of Renan, is both thorough and able. The former, he tells us, was educated and "unfitted" for the ministry at the University of Tübingen, under his greater master Baur. He was the first in his class, and exhibited unusual talent and industry. His "Life of Jesus" caused him to be removed from the service of the Church in 1836. Since that time, he has led a rather unsteady and apparently unhappy life. He married a famous actress, Agnese Schebest, but incompatibility of temper and his own extreme selfishness of disposition led to a divorce. Strauss has a remarkably clear, methodical, logical, and acute mind, (says Dr. Schaff,) and a rare power of critical analysis, but no constructive power whatever. He can destroy, but not build up. He is an unscrupulous advocate and special pleader, who can tear to pieces the testimony of witnesses, but he is unable to effect a positive result. In one word, he is a skilful "architect of ruin." As to his moral character, he is correct, temperate, and studious, but cold, selfish, and heartless. When a student, he was quite superstitious, believing in all the ghost stories and demoniacal possessions which then

agitated Württemberg. Such is frequently the close affinity of superstition and infidelity, and the facility of a transition from the one to the other. Amongst the ablest opponents of Strauss, such as Tholuck, Neander, Ullmann, Lange, Ebrard, Julius Muller, Hoffman, and Hug, Dr. Schaff ranks Prof. George P. Fisher, of Yale College, author of sundry "scholarly articles" in the Quarterly Reviews on the "*Conflict with Scepticism and Unbelief.*" Since the publication of Schaff's book, Prof. Fisher has put forth these articles in a volume of great excellence.

Strauss does not deny the historical existence of Jesus, but merely resolves all the supernatural elements of Christ's person and history into myths. The philosophical foundation of his hypothesis is the alleged impossibility of a miracle, which again has its root in the pantheistic denial of a personal God and Creator. This fundamental principle of his book Strauss simply assumes, with no attempt to prove it. Thus the philosophic ground-work of his hypothesis is a begging of the question.

Secondly, the critical foundation of the mythical theory is as unsafe as the philosophical. He undertakes to date the canonical Gospels at least a century later than Christ. Here he encounters an overwhelming mass of testimonies by which it is incontestably proved that, at that time, they were already acknowledged universally, and used in the Christian churches as Scripture. At one time, feeling the force of this unanimous voice of Christian antiquity and modern critical investigation, he was disposed to admit the authenticity of the Gospel of John; but seeing the fatal effect of this concession, withdrew it in the third edition of his larger work. Since that time, however, the discovery of Hippolytus's "*Philosophumena*" has much increased the evidence for the fourth Gospel. In fact the whole controversy respecting the four Gospels has assumed half a dozen different phases since Strauss first laid his critical foundations, and they are now quite out of date and relied on by nobody. Thus there is a second fatal weakness in the basis of Strauss's whole theory; and his own master, Baur, censured him for attempting to write a criticism of the gospel history without a criticism of the Gospels themselves.

There is a third fundamental error of Strauss, viz., the radical inversion of the natural order and relation of history and poetry as it exists in any historical age like that of Christ. Facts give rise to songs, not *vice versa*. Prophecies foreshadow events, but cannot create them. The object precedes the artist's picture; the hero precedes the poet's epic.

The mythical hypothesis is so complicated and artificial, says Dr. Schaff, that it cannot be consistently carried out. At the most critical points, as in the miracle of the resurrection, it is driven to the alternative of admitting the truth or else relapsing to the vulgar hypothesis of intentional fraud, from which it professed at the start to shrink back with horror and contempt.

JOSEPH ERNEST RENAN was born in Brittany and educated for the Romish priesthood. His book has all the charm of a religious novel of the sensation type, and has had all the success of such works, and doubtless it will share their fate before it is ten years old. There are multitudes of Frenchmen who never knew that Jesus was so interesting a character, and will be induced by Renan to study the New Testament, so that good may come out of evil. As a critical or scientific work it has no value whatever. Renan is a mere dilettante and a charlatan. He no where makes a serious attempt to prove any of his novel and arbitrary positions; refers for details once for all to Strauss and half a dozen inferior infidel books; ignores their refutation and the whole apologetic literature of the last thirty years; and deals in oracular assertions and eloquent declamations for artistic effect. His book no where rises to the dignity of solid science and scholarship. He differs from Strauss, however, in admitting the essential authenticity of the chief portions of the four Gospels, including even the most contested of all, that of John—a concession nearly as fatal to his own as to the cognate mythical theory, and which Strauss pronounces the one essential error of Renan. His hypothesis differs from that of his German confrère and leader in that he considers the term *myths* to belong to the fictions of India and primitive Greece, rather than to the ancient traditions of the Hebrews and the Semitic nations in general. So he prefers the name *legends* and *legendary narra-*

tives, "which, while they concede a large influence to the working of opinions, allow the actions and the personal character of Jesus to stand out in their completeness." His "Life of Jesus" is moreover interspersed with truly eloquent and enthusiastic tributes to Jesus—concessions which must either overthrow his whole legendary hypothesis, or else resolve themselves into empty declamation. So far, we may regard the French child as an improvement on its German parent, and a progress in the sceptical world towards the acknowledgment of the truth. But in point of learning, (as Dr. Schaff quotes from Prof. H. B. Smith,) intellect, and consistency, the Teutonic work of Strauss is immeasurably superior to the light and airy French romance.

Dr. Schaff justifies his naming Renan a charlatan when he proceeds to point out how disingenuously he insinuates that Christ was an impostor in league with Lazarus and his two sisters; and then how he eclipses this wretched invention with another which is entirely original, in which he both outrages the feelings of all Christendom, and disgraces himself by profaning even the sacred agony in Gethsemane with the sensuous picture of a Parisian love tale. Dr. Schaff prays God to forgive this frivolous writer his wanton fancy, which so nearly approaches not only the blaspheming of the Son of God, but that other unpardonable blaspheming of the Holy Ghost.

After all we have quoted from this interesting volume, the reader will require no direct commendations from us in its favor.

Natural History: A Manual of Zoology for Schools, Colleges, and the General Reader. By SANBORN TENNEY, A. M., author of "Geology," etc., and Professor of Natural History in Vassar College. Illustrated with over five hundred engravings. Fifth edition. New York: Charles Scribner & Co., 654 Broadway. 1867. Pp. 540. 8vo.

There is no science that has for us a greater fascination than natural history. From Goldsmith's "Animated Nature" to this the latest production with which we are acquainted in this department of literature, we have suffered few of the zoological works

which were at all popular to escape us without obtaining at least a random glance at them. The work before us is a successful attempt to give a view at once comprehensive and minute of the science as at present taught in our highest schools; so far, at least, as this could be done in the compass of a single octavo volume. While it has not the fulness of treatment, under any one head, which characterised some of the best papers on this subject in the serial issues, on a similar principle, of the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge; or the scientific precision and value of such books as the *Bridgewater Treatises*, bearing on this part of the teleological argument, and as Kirby and Spence's *Entomology*; or the profound generalisation of the works of Cuvier, Buffon, Owen, Agassiz, and Guyot; or the copious descriptiveness of Audubon; or the indescribable charm of Pliny, Goldsmith, Izaak Walton, Wilson, or Gilbert White in his *Natural History of Selborne*: it has this merit peculiar to itself, viz., that it gives a bird's-eye view of the whole subject, and in a manner that is intelligible to the general reader, while it conforms to some of the highest exactions of science.

The religious principles of the author seem to be decided, and so far as they are disclosed, sound. He appears to be a disciple and warm admirer of Agassiz. His motto is, "O Lord, how manifold are thy works! in wisdom hast thou made them all: the earth is full of thy riches." Ps. civ. 24. If he were to say more, we apprehend he would be found to be a little loose on some points. The book is appropriately dedicated "To those who believe that the leading facts and principles of natural history should be taught in all the schools of this country." We are of those who think that too many branches are already taught in our schools and smaller colleges, but certainly have no disposition to turn a deaf ear to the claims of a study so useful and engaging as zoölogy. The author brings forward those claims in his first chapter.

"Zoölogy," he says, "is a science of the highest importance, not only on account of its direct practical relations to the material interests of human society, and its inseparable connexion with the great problems of geology, but especially as an educa-

tional branch, securing to its true votaries a spirit of earnest inquiry, habits of accurate and careful observation, vigorous and logical thought, and power of broad generalisation; and dealing, as it does, with the highest expressions of matter and of life, its study is eminently adapted to enlarge our ideas of creation and its great Author. It makes known to us the Plan of Creation, as exhibited in the highest department of nature, and thus we are led to know more of Him who suffers not even a sparrow to fall without his notice."

The second chapter is on the Vertebrates, including mammals, birds, reptiles, batrachians, and fishes; the third on Articulates, including insects, crustaceans, and worms; the fourth on Mollusks, including the cephalopods, the gasteropods, and the acephals; the fifth on the Radiates, including the echinodermata, the jelly-fishes, and the polyps.

The sixth chapter is on the geographical distribution of animals. This is a most interesting chapter indeed. We quote a portion of a single paragraph:

"A few facts will serve to illustrate the above principles. The white bear, the walrus, the seal, the whale, the narwhal, the auk, and the jaegar, have their true home in or near the Arctic regions. The bats and moles; the bears, the wolves, the foxes, the lynxes, the martens, the weasels; the squirrels, the beavers, the woodchucks, the rabbits, and the porcupines; the wild boar, and the ass; the various kinds of deer, the sheep, the goats, and oxen; the birds of prey, the perching and singing birds, the pigeons, the grouse, the waders, and the swimming birds; the fishes and the reptiles; the insects and the shells, and other lower forms of life of the North Temperate zone,—are unknown in all the Arctic regions. Not only so, but the animals which bear these names are not of the same species in North America that they are in Europe or Asia. The grizzly bear is confined to western North America; the brown bear, to the northern parts of the Eastern Hemisphere. The American sable, fisher, and weasel, inhabit northern North America; the Russian sable and true ermine inhabit Siberia, and the beach marten is found in Europe. A species of reindeer inhabits Lapland, but in northern North America are two species of reindeer, both of which are different from the European one. The moose of Maine and Canada closely resembles the elk of Europe, but is not identical

with it; the stag of Europe and the American deer are two species; and the noble wapiti, with antlers six feet in length, and the curious musk-ox and bison belong exclusively to North America; though in the forests of Lithuania the latter has an analogue in the European buffalo."

The whole chapter is attractive, and comprises everything the mere general reader would care to know on the subject. Mr. Tenney adheres to Agassiz's definition of species. We should have been better pleased if he had adopted that originally presented by Dana and afterwards approved by Dawson and others. There is no favor shown in this book for the Darwinian hypothesis, and the kindred or identical vagaries of Herbert Spencer and Professor Huxley. Mr. Tenney is a believer in the revealed doctrine of special creation, as opposed to the figment of an origin of species by the process of natural selection.

We think the author somewhat vague and unsatisfactory in his expressions about the gorilla. He says it is an inhabitant of tropical Western Africa, which would not be likely to suggest the fact (asserted by M. Du Chaillu) that the gigantic creature is found only in a strip of territory stretching six hundred miles inland, or thereabouts, from the coast, an extent of country forming an ellipse of which the equator is the transverse axis! Again, Mr. Tenney says that this ape is "*one of the most formidable*" of the troglodytes, whereas it is notorious that the gorilla is immeasurably more formidable than any other of the anthropoids.

This book is remarkable for its good print and its copious illustrative woodcuts. The bird part is very enchaining. On the whole we can very heartily recommend it to all who love to see a thing done *secundum artem*.

Elements of Political Economy. By ARTHUR LATHAM PERRY, Professor of History and Political Economy in Williams College. Third edition. Revised. New York: Scribner & Co. 1867.

This is a very creditable performance. It is at once popular and scientific; and while not adding much that is original to the

results obtained by Say and Mill, is yet a valuable contribution to this important and intricate subject. The style is natural, simple, forcible, eminently perspicuous, and well suited to the nature of the investigations. The table of contents will give some idea of the course of the argument: "Chapter I.—On the History of the Science; page 1. Chapter II.—On the Field of the Science; p. 25. Chapter III.—On Value; p. 35. Chapter IV.—On Exchange; p. 77. Chapter V.—On Production; p. 91. Chapter VI.—On Labor; p. 105. Chapter VII.—On Capital; p. 137. Chapter VIII.—On Land; p. 153. Chapter IX.—On Cost of Production; p. 172. Chapter X.—On Money; p. 194. Chapter XI.—On Currency in the United States; p. 283. Chapter XII.—On Credit; p. 324. Chapter XIII.—On Foreign Trade; p. 360. Chapter XIV.—On the Mercantile System; p. 435. Chapter XV.—On American Tariffs; p. 447. Chapter XVI.—On Taxation; p. 467."

To say that the book is well printed and beautifully got up in every way, is only to say that it has been recently issued by the Scribners. The first two chapters are particularly interesting to the general reader, and contain more useful information about the history and field of the science than we have found in any similar work. Professor Perry defines Political Economy to be "the science of exchanges, or, what is exactly equivalent, the science of values." This definition may seem obvious enough, but it has taken years of practical experience and heaps of metaphysical rubbish to arrive at it. "To unfold this science," continues Mr. Perry, "in an orderly manner will require an analysis of those principles of human nature out of which exchanges spring; an examination of the providential arrangements, physical and social, by which it appears that exchanges were designed by God for the welfare of man; and an inquiry into those laws and usages devised by men to facilitate or impede exchanges. The science of value will be soundly based and properly unfolded when its propositions systematically arranged are shown to be deducible from acknowledged principles of human nature, and consonant with the providential structure of the world and of society; and when, in the light of these propositions, human

institutions and laws relating to exchanges are explained and correctly estimated. An attempt to base and to develop the science of value thus will be made in the following pages; but before that work is fairly entered upon, it will be well to take a preliminary glance at the history of the science, and to trace the steps by which successive inquirers have brought Political Economy to its present stage of development.

“While labor is as old as the race, and exchanges are as old as society, and while doubtless in all ages individual inquirers have tasked their minds with some portions of the subject, Political Economy as a science can hardly be said to have existed till within a period comparatively recent. Men exchanged among themselves services and commodities, and found their account in exchanging, long before the dawn of authentic history. The first commercial transaction on record dates back about two thousand years before Christ. It was the purchase by Abraham of the cave and field of Machpelah.” The transaction is then described. “All this implies at that early day fixed conditions of trade.”

“From Abraham’s time to the present, traffic has employed a portion of the activity of every people not utterly savage. Nineveh ‘multiplied her merchants above the stars of heaven.’ Tyre became ‘the royal exchange of the world.’ Athens, Carthage, Alexandria, Venice, Amsterdam, London, and New York, have each in turn not only engaged in domestic exchanges, but also ‘have ploughed the deep and reaped the harvests of every land.’” Then follows an account of Xenophon’s tracts “On the Revenues of Athens” and “The Economist.” “There is nothing else on economical topics in the whole range of Greek literature that approximates in liberality and soundness to these little works of Xenophon. Plato sketches one important principle of the science in his ‘Republic,’ but actually proposes to banish artisans and merchants from his imaginary commonwealth. Aristotle, however, has sometimes been called the father of political economy. He was not the father of the thing, but only of the name.” The author then discusses the “Economics.” Aristotle did little to advance the science. Cicero did

less, or rather nothing. "It is pitiful to hear" him "declaim against the noble rights of labor. In the *De Officiis* there is a whole paragraph" against the most important branches of manufactures and commerce. "One sweep of his pen pushes out of the pale of respectability the whole class of mechanics. 'All artisans are engaged in a degrading profession,' says he. Again, 'there can be nothing ingenuous in a workshop.'"

It occurs to us just here to say that such citations ought to have been verified either in the text or in the foot-notes. But this book has few notes. This omission makes it perhaps more entertaining, but impairs its scientific value. Quotations *ad verbum et ad literam* should always be accompanied by references to the volume, chapter, and page, or at least by local references of some kind, where it is expected that they will make any impression as part of a line of evidence.

Mr. Perry accounts for the stupidity of the Romans in this science from the circumstance of the prejudice of class, a prejudice inherent in every aristocratical system. During the Middle Ages the science suffered under the general cloud of ignorance and superstition, the prevalence of the Roman Catholic religion and of the scholastic philosophy. "But the world moves on." We are not so sure that it is moving on to anything better. Of course Christianity is spreading the blessings of the gospel, but that is not what our author means. We are very tired of this poor stale platitude that the world moves on. So it did in the days of Phæton. We are sometimes tempted to think that the world moves *off*. "The time came when men got a glimpse of the truth that the end of sciences is principally a practical end, and that their utility consists in their power to improve the condition of mankind." The controversy will never end. We are not material-utilitarians, as is the writer of this book. It may be admitted that the end of science is chiefly a practical one, but in a very different sense from the one here intended. The grand virtue of *knowing* is not that it helps to advance a material civilisation. This is the miserable fallacy of the nineteenth century. These utilitarian ends are not to be despised; but they are far from being the highest. Bacon and

Newton would have been immortal, if such men as Watt, and Fisk, and Morse, had never been born. The fling at the schoolmen, and perhaps indirectly at psychology, which follows, is *smart*, but hardly worthy of a Professor of History and of a grave treatise on Political Economy. Thomas Aquinas is at least as great a name as that of the object of this author's special admiration, John Stuart Mill. But to return. The earliest general theory of value was the *Bullion Theory*. This was succeeded by the celebrated, and for a time universally accepted, *Mercantile System*. These erroneous theories our author ably explodes. We wish our space was sufficient to enable us to present his historical outlines and very striking exposition. The cardinal blunders were, that gold was wealth, and therefore should, so far as possible, be kept at home. Exports must exceed imports, and the balance will be wealth. "Hence the great and only care was to preserve the balance of trade, as it was called. A famous phrase this, the balance of trade! The legislation, the diplomacy, the politics, of the two centuries preceding the present were full of it." On the other hand, the author shows that a difference of value in favor of the *imports* is precisely the motive of the importation. No country would exchange its exports for its imports, unless it perceived that the exchange would be a profitable one; in other words, that *to it* the imports were worth more than the exports. For if not, why go to the trouble of the exchange?

The author devotes due attention to the rise of the science in England, and notices the writers of "the last three decades of the seventeenth century." Of these he mentions only three: Sir William Petty, whose views are remarkably sound, Sir Dudley North, who was also liberal and in advance of his time, and John Locke. Locke all but established the principle that value is the birth of effort, and not the gift of Providence. The last century drew out in England a great number of tracts and treatises, the ablest of these being the Political Essays of David Hume, which, though not always sound, are always interesting. But it was, of course, Adam Smith who first attempted to analyse value, or to ground comprehensively the science of Political

Economy. His great work on the "Wealth of Nations" appeared during the same year with the Declaration of Independence, 1776. Professor Perry thinks Smith fairly entitled to his honors, which he handsomely justifies, but also points out his well known deficiencies and mistakes. "These defects and some others have been pointed out, and valuable additional contributions to the science made, by succeeding English writers. The principal of these are Mr. Ricardo, Mr. McCulloch, Mr. De Quincy, Mr. Senior, and especially John Stuart Mill. The work of the last mentioned writer, while sharing in the fault common to all these English books, namely, a too exclusive attention to the material over other forms of value, is the best single treatise on the subject in the English language." He probably means *original* treatise. More persons will pronounce the translation of Say's "*Traite d'Economie Politique*" equally good, if not better: though it must be conceded that Mill has extended the applications of the science.

Perry's is a more popular and readable book than either of them. There is also a full account of French, German, and American treatises in this department. The Germans, however, have done little or nothing. This account might have been a little more discriminating. The praise of Carey, for instance, some will think should have been somewhat more guarded, if not more strongly qualified. The author greatly lauds M. Bastiat, and thinks Bastiat may have derived light from Carey; but he lauds no one so much as that arch-nihilist Mill, the man who, notwithstanding his noble services in the cause of applied science, and even in pure science, is nevertheless an infidel, a Jacobin, and a marvelling dupe of a greater than he, Auguste Comte; a man withal who has dared to utter the nonsensical definition of matter, that it is "the permanent possibility of a sensation." He has undoubtedly wounded Sir William Hamilton between the joints of his harness. He is also unquestionably the great English authority on Political Economy. But he is a man to be perpetually watched; to be admired, not trusted or loved.

There is a very valuable analysis of chapters prefixed to this volume.

On Both Sides of the Sea: A Story of the Commonwealth and the Restoration. A Sequel to "The Draytons and the Davenants." By the author of the "Chronicles of the Schönberg-Cotta Family." New York: M. W. Dodd, 506 Broadway. 1867. Pp. 510, 12mo.

This book is a worthy successor to "Mrs. Kitty Trevelyán" and the "Schönberg-Cotta Family." The pure and healthful tone of this writer; the spirit of fervent Christian piety which shines through every sentence she pens; the warmly tinted pictures she gives of womanly sweetness and loveliness, and of manly strength tempered by tenderness, equally manly in the highest sense of that honorable word; and the quiet humor which a true knowledge of human nature has always linked to it, attract us to her writings at all times, and do not permit us to fear that she will "write herself out." A love for the blessed out-door nature which God has given for our joy and refreshment; a sensibility, poetic enough to create pathos as true as her scenes of gladness are; a simple grace and freshness in the form which her art takes, that is the rarest gift in story-telling; a kindly spirit that blesses whatever it touches, because it must love all that is human, whatever error may deform its reflexion of the image of God—fill with their pure atmosphere the rudest ages and the most frightful scenes of which she treats, and bring into bud and bloom and fruit the divine seeds of faith, hope, and charity. The chief trait of her writings, indeed, is that largeness and sweetness of soul, informed by the Gospel of Peace and moved by the Spirit of Love, which rejoices over all evidences of faith in the name of Jesus, wherever found in all the many branches of the Christian Church. This is the charm which gives to her works all the beauty and grace and exquisite tenderness which so enrich them. Her manner, too, is natural and unaffected, and her books are eminently easy to read. It is a gift that women have, to write their mother tongue with that familiar ring of the idiom, native to head and heart and lip, which makes the truest music of speech. It is because they talk so much to children, that they seem so fresh from the fountains

of language. Few men have ever shown this mastership of the style that reaches through sense to the soul of childhood. John Bunyan, Jonathan Swift, and Daniel Defoe, almost exhaust the list of English writers who have done so. Even leaving out of view the higher claims to love and admiration which her works possess, the musical flow of her English, the glow and lilting melody of her poetic thoughts that spring up along the pathway of her narrative like summer flowers in the meadows on the roadside, and her touching womanly instinct divining every throb and pulsation of the pure and gentle hearts she paints with so deft a hand, must give us delight and win our warm approval. In delicacy of feeling, purity of thought, feminine softness and grace in expression, finely tempered imagination, scholarly taste, enthusiasm consecrated to God's service, and noble earnestness in the cause of truth, she is very like Miss Manning. The writer of "The Household of Sir Thomas More," too, is not inferior to the author of "The Davenants and Draytons" in that warm charity which the apostle has placed first among Christian virtues. But, as artists, the two are essentially different. Mrs. Charles gives us the past translated into the dialect of the present: a very faithful translation, but still a translation. Miss Manning gives us the past itself, just idealized enough to satisfy the requirements of art.

In this book, containing the history of those two neighboring families, the Royalist Davenants and the Parliamentary Draytons, we have Puritans and Anglicans, Port Royalists and Huguenots, Independents, Presbyterians, Covenanters, Quakers, and Anabaptists, with all their errors, whether of doctrine or of party passion, to her vision freed from the entanglements of human fallibility by the outstretched arm of the same Saviour, because through the darkness and intricacy of human motives and human impulses they yet look to him for salvation. With fine skill in representing that complex thing, the human heart, and with a delicacy and truth of portraiture which daily life around us verifies, she shows us these different souls, as they live on more fully the Christian life, growing in charity toward one another. Tolerance is the grand lesson she loves to teach, the liberality that is born of faith in the promises of God and love for all who trust in the

Saviour, and so are the children, however imperfect and erring, of our Father in Heaven; and not that false spirit of latitudinarianism which so often usurps the name of liberality.

The age, with all its strange, dramatic events, its widely diverse parties, creeds, and characters, is very fairly put before us. The general historic accuracy of the book will only be questioned by extremists. Ample justice is done to the best men of all sides; and one of the most delightful features of the book is the delicate humor with which the inconsistencies of each of these good and honest partisans are portrayed. Justice above all is done to Oliver Cromwell, that great captain and wise statesman, the most princely ruler England ever had, and a thinker far in advance of his age. A glimpse is given of John Bunyan, and more than a glimpse of Richard Baxter, that good but pragmatical autocrat of Kidderminster, who was so bitter against Oliver. We hear of John Owen and John Howe and Jeremy Taylor, of Milton and Pascal and Dr. Gauden of "Ikon Basillike" memory, and of Falkland, Hampden, and Pym. But these are shadows that move outside the field of vision. The real panorama that moves before us is framed from Lettice Davenant's "Diary" and Olive Drayton's "Recollections." The sweet, yet strong, characters of these pure, loving, trusting, and Christian maidens, will please all readers. The other characters are well drawn, the fathers and the lovers worthy and noble men, yet nicely discriminated the one from the other. Rigid and uncompromising, but tender-hearted, Mistress Dorothy is charmingly true to nature. Annis Nye, the Quaker maiden, who is such a thorn in Mistress Dorothy's side with her odd scruples of conscience and perverse resoluteness against all sorts of conformity, and who finally wins so complete a victory over the old lady, is also a *finé* picture. Job Forster, the rough and fanatical trooper, so true to those he loves and so zealous in what comes to him in the shape of duty, adds one more to the gallery of life-like conceptions.

We quote one or two brief passages, the first showing the feeling of the family just before emigrating to the New World:

"Still we lingered. It was not so easy to despair of the

re-awaking of an England in which John Milton was still living and thinking, and John Bunyan, and John Howe, and Dr. Owen, and Richard Baxter, and through which thirty thousand of Cromwell's soldiers were still scattered, working at their farms and forges throughout the land. Nor was it easy to leave such an England, so few years before a Queen of Nations, as long as she would but give us a little space to work for her, and a little reason to hope. But slowly the necessities which pressed us from her shores gathered closer and closer around us, until we could linger no more."

The great fire in London at last decided them. The last evening came, and they sailed away toward the western world.

"There were clouds over the wooded slopes of the dear old country as we looked our last at her, which broke ere we had been long on board, blending earth and sky in a wild storm of rain. But before we lost sight of the shore, the clouds were spanned by the rare glory of a perfect rainbow, bridging the storm with hope.

"Then, as we sailed on, the clouds rose slowly and majestically, detaching themselves from earth in grand sculptured masses, like couchant lions guarding the land; until at sunset they had soared far up the quiet heavens, and hovered like angels with folded wings over a land at rest.

"And as we looked, Lettice said to Roger,—

"See, is it not a promise of the better sunshine hereafter to come?"

"It is a witness of the sunshine *now* behind,' he said; 'of the unquenchable sun which shines on both the Old England and the New.' And he added in a low voice, in the words of Oliver Cromwell, '*Jesus Christ of whose diocese we are, on Both Sides of the Sea.*'"

We know of few books so glowing with that radiance shed by the lifted soul of the enthusiast, yet toned into sober truth by strong, sound sense.

ERRATUM.

The date of Dr. Plumer's inauguration, on page 29, should read "On the 28th of November," instead of "27th."

SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN DEPOSITORY,

COLUMBIA, S. C.

ESTABLISHED, JULY, 1865.

This DEPOSITORY was established with the design of furnishing a point from which persons residing in this and the adjacent States could readily procure

SUNDAY-SCHOOL

AND OTHER

RELIGIOUS BOOKS.

All the *BOOKS, TRACTS, ETC.*, published or recommended by the EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF PUBLICATION at Richmond, Va., are kept on hand and sold at the *retail price* of the Publishers.

In addition to these, a general assortment of

THEOLOGICAL AND RELIGIOUS WORKS,

And also of

SCHOOL BOOKS, STATIONERY, ETC.,

Will be kept for sale at very reasonable rates.

Large additions have recently been made to the Stock on hand.

When the amount of an order is \$20.00 or upwards, the package will be sent to any Express Office in South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, or North Carolina, *free of cost* to the purchaser. And a proportionate reduction will be made on packages sent to more distant States.

A liberal deduction will be made to ministers, and to teachers and others who buy to sell again.

Orders should be always accompanied with the money.

Address,

**SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN DEPOSITORY,
Columbia, S. C.**

THE
SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW

Is published Quarterly, in January, April, July, and October.

TERMS.—Three Dollars per Volume, payable in advance. Single numbers, One Dollar.

✎ All Communications should be addressed to the Rev. JAMES WOODROW, Columbia, S. C. No subscription discontinued until a special order is given, and all arrearages are paid, or after the first number of a volume is published.

✎ A few complete sets of the back volumes can be had at Three Dollars per volume. Single back volumes, when they can be furnished without breaking a set, Two Dollars per volume.

✎ 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, One Dollar for each new subscriber.

✎ 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 Editors of the SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW think it is due to themselves and to their subscribers to announce that they do not endorse in every particular what is uttered in their pages. Each author is responsible for the views he expresses. This is a matter of convenience where there are minor differences between editors themselves, or between them and their brethren. Free discussion, too, is important to the interests of truth, if kept within just limits. These limits must be strictly observed. Editors would be worthy of censure, should they allow opinions to be expressed, subversive of any doctrine of the gospel; nor would it be becoming to allow their own views, or those of their contributors, to be rudely attacked in their own pages.

Their desire is, to make the REVIEW worthy of the Presbyterian Church in the United States—the representative of its views and its literature, the means of disseminating sound doctrine, and a stimulus to the genius and talent of our ministers and people.

THE SOUTHERN
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW,

CONDUCTED BY

AN ASSOCIATION OF MINISTERS

IN

COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA.

Vol. XIX.

APRIL, MDCCCLXVIII.

No. 2.

COLUMBIA, S. C.

PRINTED AT THE OFFICE OF THE REVIEW.

1868.

CONTENTS.

ARTICLE	PAGE
I. Popular Revivals. By Rev. JOHN S. GRASTY, Shelbyville, Ky., - - - - -	153
II. The Formation of the English Language, - - -	170
III. Right and Wrong; or, A Check to Atheism. Part II. By the Rev. F. A. ROSS, D. D., Huntsville, Ala., - - - - -	184
IV. Ritualism. By B. T. W., - - - - -	238
V. The Future of the Freedmen, - - - - -	268
VI. Critical Notices: - - - - -	295
1. Ecce Ecclesia. 2. Palmer's Book of Praise. 3. Bridges' Christian Ministry. 4. Ecce Deus-Homo. 5. Macduff's Memories of Olivet. 6. Tanner's Apology for African Methodism.	

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XIX.—NO. 2.

APRIL, MDCCCLXVIII.

ARTICLE I.

POPULAR REVIVALS.

We would observe once for all, that the following observations upon "Revivals" are designed for no one denomination exclusively, but are addressed to the candid judgment and prayerful consideration of Christians of every name. An especial appeal, however, is made to the thought, serious and earnest, of any brother who has ventured to engraft "means" and "measures" confessedly of human origin, upon an economy explicit, inspired, and unmistakable.

True revivals are very ancient. David prays for one in his day, but he clearly indicates the way to it. "I will hear what God the Lord will speak; for he will speak peace unto his people and to his saints; but let them not turn again to folly. Surely his salvation is nigh them that fear him." But old ways, which prevailed in David's time, require too much genuine toil and self-denial for the present impatient generation. Every thing and every body in our time must travel fast. The masses, as well as certain professed teachers, love excitement. The "revivalist" is greatly in favor with the public. A sprightly brother distils his entire stock of discourses down to fifteen or twenty, and then sets out on a journey of spiritual knight-errantry. He has a special sermon for every class, and certain results are to

VOL. XIX., NO. 2—1

follow inevitably in the course of five or six days. His arrival in every community is heralded from press and pulpit. Persons of every description, and from every conceivable motive, turn out to hear. Discourse No. 1 is usually devoted to a narrative of the wonders performed by this Boanerges in communities recently visited. A meeting was held at Mt. Horeb or Mt. Zion, and scores were converted. A series of sermons preached in such a city or village shook Satan's kingdom to the very foundation. Night after night the congregation increases. The preacher waxes warm, and his discourse abounds with frightful anecdotes, death-bed scenes, pathetic stories, and brimstone appeals. By and by, this heaven, such as it is, begins to work. Young persons are terribly alarmed, old ladies cry out, and at the auspicious moment, "the revivalist" claps his hands and calls for "mourners." When a liberal response is made to this appeal, the sensation greatly deepens. Persons in the back of the room crowd forward to see, others nearer the pulpit stand on their feet, whilst all over the house expectation is on tip-toe. The congregation are now exhorted to sing "something lively," and at this juncture a song is often sung remarkable neither for its rhythm nor its Christian sentiment. A brother furnishes the following couplet, in substance, as a specimen :

"The Devil, Calviii, and Tom Paine,
Assault the mourner's bench in vain ;
Their doctrine shall be downward hurled—
The mourner's bench shall take the world.
Glory hallelujah."

Frequently, a "mourner" is taken through a wonderful ordeal. Two or three whisper in his ear at once, whilst a third beats time on his back ; and if this plan fails to bring the distressed party "through," he is sometimes held up by several of the brethren and manipulated in diversified ways. Finally, nature is exhausted, and the half distracted soul feels prepared to say any thing that may be put into his mouth. Accordingly, questions asked at this juncture are answered to the satisfaction of the inquirer, and the announcement is forthwith made triumph-

antly to the whole congregation that one more soul has been "happily converted unto God." This swells the volume of phrensy, and for a few moments there is an intermingling of songs, prayers, groans, and shoutings, with many *et ceteras*. The meeting continues until sensible men have their doubts, simple ones grow weary, and the "revivalist" himself thinks it prudent to announce "the farewell sermon." At the closing service, there is a goodly share of self-glorification, as at the beginning. The spoils are now gathered, material as well as immaterial, and the remarkable preacher goes forth to other fields. Newspapers publish the wonderful revival, and the millennium seems to be coming on apace.

But the so-called revival over, what then ensues? We desire to speak in the fear of God and as we must give account. The experience and observation of the writer extend over twenty years, and the opportunities for judging during that period have been large; and it is his deliberate and profound conviction that every congregation is deeply injured that tolerates in its bosom, almost in any form, these popular excitements, yecept "revivals." Reaction is sure to set in speedily. The meeting over, and multitudes think that religion has occupied time and space enough, and that the house of God can be safely neglected now, while secular affairs come in for their share of attention. And thus it is a natural, not to say unavoidable, consequence that mental and moral drowsiness should supervene upon such a long period of wakefulness and nervous exhaustion. The plain gospel, without "measures," loses its charms; and when the pastor resumes regular labor among the flock, he finds out to his sorrow that poison, and not wholesome food, has been administered. In a little time all parties feel discouraged. True Christians are bewildered, spurious professors turn back, scepticism comes in like a flood, the pastor himself is often complained of and sometimes dismissed, while a church which, under faithful, regular, sensible gospel teaching, would have steadily and healthfully grown, is scorched and desolated by strange fires kindled on her own altars. Against all such fanatical contrivances, and every approximation thereto, the writer would enter his solemn and earnest protest.

Now, what is a revival? Let this question be settled in the first place, and the path becomes plainer. "To the law and the testimony." It is clear, from the etymology of the word, that the term revival cannot be applied to a religious interest which exists among *unconverted* persons. To *re-live*, one must have *lived* before, which is not true in regard to the unregenerate. The term revival, therefore, can be applied properly only to God's elect. Unconverted people may be *awakened*, but are never revived. A genuine revival must be sought in the church. It occurs when believers of the present day, like Daniel of old, "set their faces unto the Lord God to seek by prayer and supplications, with fasting and sackcloth and ashes." Dan. ix. 3, 20. David says, "Thou shalt arise, and have mercy upon Zion; for the time to favor her, yea, the set time, is come. For thy servants take pleasure in her stones, and favor the dust thereof." Ps. cii. 13-15. Hear also the testimony of Isaiah: "For thus saith the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is holy: I dwell in the high and holy place, with him also that is of a contrite and humble spirit, to revive the spirit of the humble and to revive the heart of the contrite ones." Is. lvii. 15. It is also found in every genuine revival that the hearts of parents are turned to the children. Luke i. 17. The present age, however, is impatient, and machinery and quick work is the fashion in everything. But it will be demonstrated after a while that the mind and soul of man cannot be turned like a piece of wood. Excitement can only reach up to a certain point. After that comes paralysis. And hence many who once seemed to be consumed with zeal, are now rarely ever seen in the sanctuary. The most callous souls are those who in past days made the noisiest profession. These results are in accordance with established law. He who sows the wind must reap the whirlwind. To apply the term "revival" to a company of excited, half-distracted sinners, is a misnomer. There is nothing in such persons to revive. A true revival is the gracious, orderly, holy working of the divine Spirit in the hearts of *believers*. Of course, where this holy influence is experienced by the faithful, unconverted persons feel the power. We would not on any account utter a word of

discouragement in regard to those seasons of special interest which often occur where the gospel is faithfully preached, (and it may be necessary at such times to increase, prudently, the regular services,) but our purpose is to condemn extemporized, "gotten up" "revivals."

The following marks always accompany a *genuine* religious interest: 1. Faithful self-examination. Says Jeremiah, "Let us search and try our ways and turn again unto the Lord." The Psalmist prays, "Search me, O God, and know my heart; try me, and know my thoughts; and see if there be any wicked way in me, and lead me in the way everlasting."

2. Secret prayer. Dan. ix.

3. Careful study of the word. It was for this that the Bereans were commended above them of Thessalonica.

4. Godly conversation in connexion with fixedness of purpose. Malachi iii. 16.

5. Systematic labor and self-denial. Phil. ii. 12.

From these acts and experiences there arises, as a consequence, the joy of the Lord, and the Church is *revived*. We can more certainly calculate the conditions of spiritual law than we can the laws which regulate physical nature. In the latter disturbing elements cannot be foreseen, and calculations are baffled. But in the spiritual world all is harmony; we reap what we sow. There is never an exception. To limit the Eternal, as is sometimes virtually done, to any month or season of the year, is blasphemous; for all seasons are his and the Church's power should be distributed through every period the year round. Better, like Enoch, to walk with God continually, than to drive six months furiously like Jehu, and then follow after the sins of Jeroboam the remainder. No shrewd sensible man of the world ever attempts to build up a permanent trade by spasmodic efforts. A genuine revival is a blessed thing, and its fruits like the "clusters of Eschol," but those popular agitations which fire the feelings only are greatly to be deplored. It is true that the wisest pastors are oftentimes at a loss when the pressure from without and within becomes very great. Many church members love novelty, prefer a different preacher every Sunday, and are ever

ready to find fault with any minister who advocates a constant adherence to a "form of sound words." But let the pastor be firm, even if he drives off permanently these "foolish and unlearned" intermeddlers. The Holy Spirit dwells richly in the hearts of a few in almost every congregation whose coöperation with the faithful minister will bring matters to a proper basis by and by. There are crises in the history of many pastorates when heroic courage is demanded, and at such a period cowardice is not only sinful and degrading, but extremely impolitic.

In the conversion and salvation of the elect, the Almighty appoints a bound, and there is no margin for improvement. The gospel is "*the power of God*" to this end. A faithful proclamation of the "glad tidings" is all the machinery that is needed in the salvation of those who are "ordained unto eternal life." The great commission distinctly indicates this: "Go ye into all the world and *preach my gospel.*" The true minister is an ambassador for God to proclaim Christ and him crucified. Here is a *perfect remedy* for every diseased soul: A certain moral effect is to be produced, and the gospel alone is the agent; it is "*the power.*" Let us reason just here by analogy. Suppose disease of a certain type fastens upon a human frame and the physician prescribes calomel. This dose and only this will arrest the sickness. But when the physician goes away a conceited nurse throws out a portion of the prescription and adds adulterations to the remainder! Is it any wonder in such a case if the sufferer dies, or else recovers so slowly and imperfectly that he remains delicate for life. For sin-sick, lost, dead souls, God prescribes a specific cure, *the gospel*; but religious quacks are for substituting every conceivable nostrum: revival songs, mourner's benches, with other clap-trap, are brought in as appendages. The "revivalist" understands the necessities of man better than that God who made and redeemed him! Who can imagine without a shudder the apostles Paul or Peter or John introducing such measures as have distinguished, not to say, disgraced, the "modern revival?"

And it is because of these spiritual adulterations that so many professed Christians of the present day are weak and sickly. Their

wounds have been healed slightly, for the medicine was diluted and deprived of its power. The truth, be it said, needs no adjuncts. It is simple, solemn, grand, and powerful. This weapon, which the Master has perfected for the pulling down of strongholds, is far better adapted to the purpose, when its own metal is depended upon, aside from and independent of all human devices. For the word of God, thus wielded, is sharper than a two-edged sword, and pierces even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart. All armor beside, offensive or defensive, only adds to the warrior's burden, and will be as likely to damage the bearer as the enemy.

He who preaches mainly to the imaginations and fears of the people, and brings in certain unwarranted "measures" to his aid, will produce results, but the fruit in these cases will be like the seed. But let it be remarked that neither the Bible nor good men are responsible for that harvest of spurious conversions which is invariably reaped from such incautious sowing. The amount of gospel truth proclaimed by some public teachers is astonishingly small; and if any one should be converted at such times, it is in consequence of the Holy Spirit's operations through the word received into the mind at other places and in days gone by, and in spite of the present distracting disabilities.

If it is vulgar applause and newspaper renown that the itinerant "revivalist" seeks after, we would by all means advise "measures." It matters not that the fire which consumes the sacrifice burns up the altar likewise—it is but a trifle after all that the Master is wounded in the house of his friends; the end of the preacher has been gained—popularity with the multitudes, accompanied by certain tangible appurtenances!

We say that the gospel is a power that no creature, however great his influence, has a right to tamper with. A curse is pronounced upon the man that adds to or takes from its inspired teachings. Rev. xxii. 18. It is perfect and final as a revelation. It unfolds man's corruption and inability, but it provides an all-sufficient atonement, and points to the interceding Saviour, while the promise is distinct, that wherever the cross of Christ,

in its deep and broad significance, shall be proclaimed, there the Holy Spirit will set his seal. If, therefore, those hours consumed in bootless songs and senseless ravings were devoted to sound scriptural instruction, the results would indeed be permanent, as well as valuable to the Church of God. How long will it take the world to learn that the *gospel* is *the* sword of the Spirit, and that it is the truth, and the truth alone, that convicts and makes alive? Hence a revival is to be judged by the amount of gospel power that lies at the bottom. The gospel goes straight to its mark, and leaves a distinctive and distinguishing imprint. Man-devised and extraneous "measures" leave an impression too, but it differs from its counterpart as night differs from day. All effects produced by the artifices of men are ephemeral, but the word of God "endureth forever." In the Scriptures, the preacher is instructed, limited, and warned. He is commanded to preach the gospel, glory in the cross, and know nothing save Jesus Christ and him crucified. Any amendment to the divine charter is the dictation of a worm to its Maker, and shall be punished fearfully in the end. For the preacher thereby imperils himself and the souls of those who hear. Let the minister never forget that the saving of souls is the primary aim of all preaching, and that to accomplish this the gospel is God's specific. The "revivalist," in catering to his own ease and ambition, may substitute a few sensational discourses, in the place of those "things new and old" which are furnished to a congregation, in sweat and toil, through a series of years, but it will be found at the last that human hosannas and a purse of gold are miserable subterfuges when an angry judge shall make inquisition for blood.

We entreat the young minister to lay the foundations deep and broad. To this end *occasional* effort not will suffice. Hard work in the study and closet, faithful pastoral visitation, and systematic Bible teaching for all classes; these are the indispensable conditions of permanent success. The word of life—from the pulpit, in private conversation, by catechetical instruction, and through the use of judiciously conducted inquiry meetings—must be carried in its tenderness, simplicity, and authority, to every one, from the highest to the lowest. For by this process

alone the *congregational* conscience can be reached and thoroughly aroused. Let it be understood, therefore, that enlistment in this service is for life, and that no straggling, either among officers or privates, will be tolerated. It must be distinctly taught, too, that a dispensation of some sort is intrusted to the very feeblest even, and none are to stand idle in the market-place or elsewhere. The Scriptures should be expounded so fully as to develop all truth, experimental and practical, as well as doctrinal. The people are to be taught what they are to DO, as well as what they are to believe. The *whole circle* of human duties is to be unfolded and insisted upon. The faithful pastor should sound the trumpet and set the people, after their families, with their swords, their spears, and their bows, every one to repair over against his own house. Nehemiah iii., iv. Not the preacher alone, but every member must work.

God's gracious power is manifested through the Church. Ye are the light of the world—the salt of the earth. Every Christian is a lamp-bearer appointed to a post of danger. Officer or private, he must let his light shine, or the blood of those who perish shall be required at his hand. A true disciple should bring the savor of a holy life to bear upon a gainsaying and God-defying world. What is said unto one is said unto all—watch! An army is composed not simply of officers, but of non-commissioned soldiers likewise, and when the gage of battle comes, *every man* is expected to do his duty. Pastors are to lead, but the *entire* flock must do valiantly at his side. There should be no drones in this hive. When the Church, not simply in its ministers, but all its members, is sanctified and revived through the truth, then the shout of victory shall be heard along her lines in every direction. The ark of God, in one sense, is intrusted to the believer; and if the Church militant shall ever spoil principalities and powers and make a show of them openly, triumphing over them, then she must walk worthy of the Lord unto all pleasing, being fruitful in every good work, and increasing in the knowledge of God, strengthened with all might, according to his glorious power, unto all patience and long suffering, with joyfulness. No man, however feeble or humble, is to live unto himself.

The people—*all the people*—must praise God by the gifts and labors which they bring to his altars. For it is through the Church, by its life, its spirit, its light, and its truth, that the world is to be saved. In view of this, therefore, let each professed Christian solemnly consider his own individual responsibility.

The gospel thus expounded is quick and powerful—the sword of the Spirit—and will pierce the enemy's harness, and be mighty, through God, to the pulling down of strongholds. This Bible method, however, requires faith, patience, labor, and constant self-denial. But with many professed ministers there is no mind and no heart for such work. An ostentatious plan is adopted. But it is a great mistake to suppose that the so-called "revivalist" abounds in true zeal and good works more than a discreet and quiet brother, because there is noisy parade in the one case over against unobtrusive labor in the other. The apostle says that the elders that rule well are to be counted worthy of double honor, especially they who labor in the word and doctrine. For such a one does not enter the harvest to reap furiously for an hour, but engages for the entire day, to bear manfully its heat and burdens. The popular "revival" is *cheap and lazy*. It proposes to shorten the "old paths" by instituting methods through which seed-sowing, germination, and harvest, shall all be simultaneous. Hot-beds are prepared and stimulating "measures" resorted to, and mankind called upon to wonder and admire. The "revivalist" insinuates to a congregation that he can accomplish more in a few days than the pastor has effected in a score of years. And verily, in one sense, he can! But here, as elsewhere, like begets its like. The plant forced violently to maturity shows signs of decay even in its budding, while the leaf "sear and yellow," the fruit dwarfed and tasteless, are suggestive not of life in its vigor and wealth, but of a death whose presence was artfully insinuated in the very seed that was sown. Where might have been rich foliage and precious "clusters," had God's laws been observed, there remain to us now only disease and barrenness, the product of man's folly.

Jesus Christ was both educator and redeemer. He went about

Galilee and taught in their synagogues. He did the same in Jewry. He sat daily in the temple and taught. And in accordance with this is the great commission, "Go ye therefore and teach" (that is instruct, train, educate, disciple,) "all nations. . . teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." And hence we find Paul and Barnabas *teaching* at Corinth and Antioch, and afterwards at Rome. Of course their teaching was the public and private proclamation of the gospel. In no case, however, does it appear that any stimulus was ever used aside from the essential power of the truth. To disciple the world, or any part of it, training and education must be called into exercise. Faith must have an object, and the heart be fed through the understanding. The disciples therefore are commanded to go through the nations and hold up man's ruin, guilt, and inability on the one hand, but God's willingness to save on the other, provided the sacrifice of his divine-human Son is cordially accepted as a propitiation for sin.

The whole story was told not only of God's mercy and love, but of his sovereignty and justice likewise. Man's total corruption, his just liability to all the miseries of this life, to death itself and to the pains of hell forever, were distinctly pointed out. The preacher reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come; and when any asked the way of life, justification was held up as an act of God's free grace, wherein he pardoneth all our sins and accepteth us as righteous in his sight, only for the righteousness of Christ, imputed to us and *received* by faith alone.

Now, intelligently to comprehend these lessons, an individual or congregation should be still and solemn. All things must be done decently and in order. Thorough teaching cannot be effected amid noise and confusion, and even reverence itself seems to command silence and awe when an authorised ambassador is speaking for God. For if it is the *truth* that saves, how important to observe the divine injunction, "Take heed how ye hear!" That preacher, therefore, will be most honored of God, and instrumental in the salvation of the greatest number of souls, who teaches the gospel lesson so plainly that the wayfaring

man, though a fool, need not err. There should, however, be propriety and composure among the pupils whilst the educator gives line upon line and precept upon precept.

Be it remembered then that the minister's chiefest work is to preach the gospel, to preach it earnestly as a seraph if he can, but to preach it plainly and tenderly—from the pulpit—at the hearthstone—by the bedside—to the rich—to the poor—to the sick—to the sorrowful—to inquirers, many or few—to preach it in his dark days as well as in his bright—in his life as in his words—to preach IT with conviction growing deeper and deeper as he nears the judgment, that “if our *gospel* be hid it is hid to them that are lost.”

It is a melancholy and often fatal blunder when an ambassador of God so far loses confidence in the message of his Master as to resort to falsehood in any form to awaken or deepen religious impression. God is stronger than Satan, and if we sail by the compass of our great pilot no fear need be entertained of wreck; the haven shall be reached safely at last.

The influence of every thoughtful Christian man is invoked to bring back the popular mind, on this subject, to the old landmarks. Our congregations should be taught that there are but three instrumentalities warranted by the word of God: the preacher, the gospel, and the Holy Ghost. The powers of the first are limited and guarded; the teachings of the second, in everything essential, easily understood; whilst the mighty influences of the third are promised whenever and wherever the conditions annexed shall be faithfully observed.

With many earnest reflecting minds, religion has been brought into discredit by the imprudence and fanaticism of its professed friends. Refined and sensitive minds shrink back from those scenes of confusion which rival everything of that description this side pandemonium.

The root of all this mischief is to be found in the neglect on the part of parents and guardians of the old fashioned plan of *home* instruction. The mind of the present generation was sadly turned to waste in its youth, and the soil made ready for the seeds of every vile and noxious plant. Hence the field is inviting

to every travelling empiric. Let reform therefore begin in the family, let the hearts of parents be turned to their children, and let every pastor guard well his flock, *taking oversight thereof himself*, and a harvest of precious fruit shall appear in due time. Let it be understood thoroughly by preacher and people that no amount of excitement constitutes Christianity, but the existence of this last is evidenced by faithful labor, self-denial, and holy living. Every day has its duties, and the Christian must learn to work and wait; for there is a period of seed sowing and germination, as well as of harvest. First the blade, then the ear, and after that the full corn in the ear. Let no one feel discouraged because results are not discernible at once. All great deeds demand time. That which comes to perfection in a day will perish in a night. But while bread cast upon the waters may be lost to view for many days, yet the sure years of God shall reveal it at the proper time. Let it only be steadfastly settled in the mind, once for all, that it is the chief end of man to glorify God, not by spasmodic efforts, at long intervals, but by a daily consecration, whose blessed light shines more and more till life's solemn close and the great victory has already begun. Let the Church work *each day* as though it were her last, and Jehovah's time, yea, the set time to favor Zion is come; for, with the joys of this salvation restored and upheld by that princely Spirit, then shall she teach transgressors his ways and sinners shall be converted unto God.

Moreover, let it be borne in mind that the gospel has a distinct aim, and that its purpose is best accomplished when the instrument is least encumbered. Each word that it utters, every blow that it strikes, is designed to shake the soul's confidence in all sublunary refuges. The Scriptures are rich in assurances that Christ is the only foundation. We venture to affirm that no inspired apostle ever invited an anxious soul to any half-way place or authorised a sinner to go anywhere in the universe but to an almighty Saviour, and that immediately. Said the prodigal, "I will arise and go to my *Father*, and he arose and went." The Philippian jailer exclaimed, "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" And the reply was explicit and immediate, "Believe on

the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." Said Paul, in his letter to the Corinthians, "I determined not to know *anything* among you save Jesus Christ and him crucified." The moment the gospel is preached, it is the sinner's duty to believe, and intervening measures of any kind are impertinent. The soul should be pointed directly to the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world. He must be directed to arise and go *at once to Christ*, and no "bench" or "seat" should be provided for the journey. In this way the reverential minister relies solely upon the simplicity that is in Christ; for this is God's plan. No other measures are revealed, and none others are necessary. Christ and his apostles depended wholly upon that truth which is the power of God unto salvation. Paul writes to Timothy and enjoins him "*to preach the word.*" Abraham replied to the rich man in hell, when petitioned to send Lazarus back to earth, "Thy brethren have Moses and the prophets; and if they believe not these, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead." Not even a miracle then can add to the saving power of the gospel, much less the trickeries of poor weak man.

It is vain to say that good has resulted from the use of empirical measures of any kind. This remains to be proved. A faithful induction of facts on this subject, as the writer humbly believes, would be startling and melancholy. Cases of conversion do occur, no doubt, in spite of extravagances and unwarranted means, for the Eternal is sovereign, and can make the very wrath of man to praise him; but if God's plan were carried out in a meek and submissive spirit, the divine agent would always demonstrate by the results the infinite superiority of the simple gospel over every measure of "human devising."

Besides, any encroachment in this direction is dangerous. For if one unauthorised measure can be introduced, so may another; and when we place our feet upon the first round of [this descent, there is no obstruction down to the very bottom. If one man uses "anxious seats" and the "mourner's bench," why may not another introduce both fiddle and banjo? And if A adds appendages to the preached word, why cannot B be permitted to

bring in a few supplements to baptism or the Lord's Supper? It will therefore be seen at once that if a precedent of the nature described be admitted at any point, the field lies wide open for the introduction of every experiment that folly shall suggest. True wisdom indicates, therefore, a strict adherence to the "old paths." Beyond the law and the testimony, no teacher, in the pulpit or out of it, should dare to go. For He who made the human heart knows its necessities and has provided for them; and when the Scriptures say that *the gospel* is THE power of God unto salvation, they do not mean the gospel *and* human "measures," but the gospel, *simple, alone, and unencumbered*. Every effort to improve on the divine economy is futile and presumptuous. Said the apostle: "Christ sent me to *preach*, not with wisdom of words, lest the cross of Christ should be made of none effect. For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness; but unto us which are saved it is the power of God. For it is written, I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and will bring to nothing the understanding of the prudent. Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world? For after that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of *preaching*" (not, however, by foolish preaching, but by *gospel* preaching,) "to save them that believe."

"*Obsta principiis*" is a maxim of true wisdom. The confessional, image worship, extreme unction, the real presence, together with other gigantic superstitions, are all the outgrowth of the first human invention engrafted upon the divine commission. The first departure might have been apparently insignificant; but a wrong principle once admitted, and the pathway leads direct to Rome or infidelity, or any where else that folly and presumption choose to go. Century after century adds its "wood, hay, and stubble," until the solid foundations are covered up and disappear altogether. Nothing now but fire and flood—a convulsive reformation, with its Luthers and Calvins—can move away the drift and bring to view clearly the elementary basis. We ought therefore to oppose error at its fountain head, and every effort, from whatever pretext, to obscure the sure foundations, should be sternly rebuked and inexorably

resisted. The only safety for the Church in this or any other age is in cleaving to "the old paths" which are revealed in the Scriptures. To the law and the testimony—thus far can we safely go and no farther.

The hearts of parents must be turned to their children, and those precious hours, consumed hitherto in frivolity and self-indulgence, must be devoted hereafter perseveringly to Christian nurture in the household. The present "distress" in Church and State had its origin in the nursery. For the sake of ease or covetousness, offspring are handed over to mercenary teachers or else turned out at large, or by some other process deprived of that entertainment and sound instruction in the home circle so indispensable to mental and moral health, and as a consequence children grow up untamed like the "wild ass's colt." But duty repudiated is only sorrow put out to interest. The day of payment may be delayed, but will surely come by and by. A portion of these neglected children in health, character, body, and soul, perish speedily. Another part live longer and spread the virus of wilfulness and bad example throughout society and government, in all their ramifications, whilst the parental heart, if not seared and impervious, is lacerated and broken at the last. Domestic feuds and terrible national conflict begin their race in the passions of men who were never made to "bear the yoke in their youth." "From whence," says an apostle, "come wars and fightings among you? Come they not hence, even of your lusts, that war in your members?" Neglect of faithful training in the family accounts for a large part of the sufferings which afflict us at the present moment. We are ruled tyrannically, in society and every where, by natures that are wayward now, because the period of discipline and government was permitted to pass by unimproved. For such deep-seated disease, it must be seen at a glance, that no annual or semi-annual so-called "revival" is a fit remedy. Time-serving and ease-loving parents may quiet conscience by dependence on the "big meeting" as a universal panacea. One single week or day is to rectify the guilt and accomplish the work of years! But it will be seen that God does not pay a premium for self-indulgence and neglect.

If any are soundly converted, the Holy Spirit selects, usually, those who have been diligently educated in the family. Other professions at "popular revivals," to a large degree, are spurious. If impending ills are to be averted, the Church and society must work at the roots. "Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it." So testifies Solomon, who also bears witness that "the curse of the Lord is in the house of the wicked."

The present aspect of affairs, social, political, and religious, affords food for deep and solemn thought to every earnest mind. The *cheap and hasty* system which now obtains in the household, the school room, not to speak of civil government, has borne its sad, but legitimate results. This superficial cultivation yields a harvest scantier and more scant every year. We must return speedily to subsoiling and fertilizing, or there will be a fearful famine in the land. No man can alter the divine decree: "In the sweat of thy face thou shalt eat bread;" and every effort to improve on God's plan only adds to our perplexity. The condition of mankind in this fallen world is probationary and disciplinary, and there are duties to discharge, burdens to bear, and great hard lessons to be learned. The mind of the country needs to be brought to serious reflection. Every family, and congregation, and individual, should be organised with a view to Christian instruction and labor, not during certain seasons of excitement, but the whole year round. Each sermon, speech, or book, in which religion, education, and human duty, are made *cheap and hasty*, should be sternly and steadfastly rejected. There is no time to lose. The elements are already wild. If another generation is taught as the present has been, a storm will gather which no man can rule. Transcendentalists may prate of the golden age and the "good time coming;" but to the Christian philosopher, the future of this country is dark exceedingly, unless good men betake themselves at once to the armory of God, and use faithfully and powerfully those weapons which divine wisdom has prepared.

ARTICLE II.

THE FORMATION OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.

The Origin and History of the English Language, and of the Early Literature it Embodies. By GEORGE P. MARSH, Author of "Lectures on the English Language," etc., etc. Third edition. New York: Published by Charles Scribner & Co. 1867. Pages 574. 8vo.

Studies in English; or, Glimpses of the Inner Life of our Language. By M. SCHELE DEVERE, LL.D., Professor of Modern Languages in the University of Virginia. Second edition. New York: Charles Scribner & Co., 654 Broadway. 1867. Pages 365. 8vo.

We purpose not so much to discuss the merits of the works named at the head of this article as to make them our text for a brief paper on the formation of the English language.

Speech is perhaps the greatest gift which God has conferred upon man as a member of the animal creation. Many qualities upon which we pride ourselves may perhaps be latent in the brutes around us, only needing this faculty as the means of their development. The first poet of antiquity seizes upon this fact as the distinctive feature by which man is separated from the inferior tribes of living organisms, and invariably terms the human family "articulate-speaking men." By the aid of speech we marshal the objects of perception, conduct the process of reflection, compare our ideas, store memory, and arm reason with its weapons. By its precious service as the vehicle of ideas, intercourse between man and man becomes possible; and society owes its very existence to the fact that we have this bridge over the chasm between souls prisoned in flesh and furnished with but slender means of communication other than this. By its genius searches the secrets which God has hidden in nature

for man to profit by, if he will labor to find them. By it, God having implanted in the soul a longing after ideal beauty, art links love and sense and skill in the effort to realise in its creations forms of that beauty, and thus strains nobly to elevate and refine human tastes. From it we draw that wealth of sweet words in which we seek to embody those human affections which so enrich and beautify the short span of life allotted to us in this sphere of probation. Through its subtle atmosphere alone can soul embrace soul and enjoy a foretaste of the harmony which is to prevail in heaven. By it we commune with God, sending its weak words up that ladder which is Christ the Intercessor. By it we breathe into being all pure thoughts and holy desires that are created by the Spirit within us. But alas! in it also we clothe our worst passions and our wickedest wishes. "Therewith bless we God, even the Father; and therewith curse we men, which are made after the similitude of God. Out of the same mouth proceedeth blessing and cursing." From the lips of him who is pure of heart, it comes like a refreshing balm to cool and soothe the sores and bruises that flesh is heir to in this life which sin has cursed. From those wicked hearts that are "raging waves of the sea, foaming out their own shame," it comes to blight all that it falls on and blisters into festering gangrenes the souls from which it issues. Language is then a great blessing, which the fall of man has converted, as it has all human powers, into a great curse, wherever the mercy of God has not guided it to good ends.

It has been well said that the history of language is the history of a people's growth. Its development is synchronous with the culture and advancement of the race that speaks it; and it is not only the expression of its life, but it modifies in no small measure the tenor of that life, and becomes a mighty agent in moulding its destinies. There is power in words; for they have a vital force, and wherever life dwells there also is active energy.

"Some words are deeds, and make or mar
The fate of nations more than war."

Language is the form in which the past life of a people perpet-

uates its memory. It keeps up the chain of national identity, and helps to preserve that transmission of hereditary traits from generation to generation which makes so prominent a part of the scheme of God's moral government, and serves at once to explain and justify his law of condemnation and justification by vicarious representation. All the lessons of human experience illustrate the logical method of his revealed will in regard to our government. In this point of view alone, we find the largest encouragement for the study of the whole family of human languages, since, so close is the relation which they bear to the history of the human race, no science perhaps can teach us so much of the harmony between his historical providence and the truths revealed in his word, as this of philology when fully developed. But candid philologists, like Mr. Marsh, frankly confess that comparative philology is yet in its infancy, and that so far from penetrating into all the mysteries of ethnology and being a sure guide into the labyrinthine ways of that dark science, there are instances in which its deductions would certainly mislead. He cites as a case in point the language of the Armenians as now spoken, which, though it retains its ancient vocabulary, has to some extent adopted the structure of the Turkish tongue, a process of transformation quite contrary to what philologists have ascertained to be the usual action of one language upon another.

The English language is one of peculiar importance to the Christian student in any land. Not only does it embody one of the grandest literatures the world has ever seen; not only is it the mother tongue of some of the most civilised nations of modern times; not only has it been the vehicle of some of the noblest efforts in the cause of free thought; not only is it remarkable in itself for its unique simplicity as the result of a combination which we would have supposed would insure complexity; but it is more than all worthy of study as having been ever in the forefront of battle with Romish error, and the vanguard of missionary labor. It is the language in which Wycliffe wrote and Latimer preached; in which Chillingworth, and Butler, and Edwards, reasoned; which rang out the pulpit eloquence of

Hooker, Jeremy Taylor, Baxter, Whitefield, and Chalmers; which was freighted with the rich imagination and the fervent zeal of Bunyan; which flowed with kindred grace in John Newton's letters and Cowper's poems; which expressed the vigorous thought of Owen and Howe. A thousand more than we have space to mention have associated it forever with Christian thought and Christian feeling, Christian aspirations and Christian prayers. A noble form of the first, the most varied, and the most comprehensive of the arts, it has had the high privilege of uttering in spoken and printed words a larger body of oratory and literature consecrated to God's service than any other in the world.

Respecting its relative merit as a language among languages in point of flexibility, copiousness, grace, softness, strength, harmoniousness, delicacy, and other qualities by which languages are judged, there are many opinions; but we agree warmly with Archbishop Trench, who describes it as "a fit organ for expressing the subtlest distinctions, the tenderest sentiments, the largest thoughts, and the loftiest imaginations, which at any time the heart of man can conceive." Hear also the testimony of Sir Philip Sidney in his famous "Defense of Poesy," that delicious essay, so eloquent in diction, so glowing in spirit, so rich in learning. Urging the right use both of matter and manner in writing, he goes on to say:

"Whereto our language giveth us great occasion, being, indeed, capable of any excellent exercising of it. I know some will say, It is a mixed language: And why not so much the better, taking the best of both the other? Another will say, It wanteth Grammar. Nay, truly, it hath that praise that it wants not Grammar; for Grammar it might have, but it needs it not, being so easy in itself, and so void of those cumbersome difference of Cases, Genders, Moods, and Tenses, which, I think, was a piece of the tower of Babylon's curse, that a man should be put to school to learn his mother tongue. But for the uttering sweetly and properly the conceit of the mind, which is the end of speech, that hath it equally with any other tongue in the world, and is particularly happy in composition of two or three words together, near the Greek, far beyond the Latin, which is one of the greatest beauties can be in any language."

We have unhappily lost in a great measure the last trait men-

tioned by this acute and discerning thinker; and German as well as Greek takes the lead of us in this matter, as Italian does in softness and melody, Spanish in sonorousness, and French in tact and point. But English has excellences which are lacked altogether by other tongues, and is second only in præminence to each of these in the peculiar excellence which belongs to it. The eulogy passed by Sir Philip upon our tongue as the only one untrammelled by the complexities of grammar will not be readily understood, so long as the false systems of grammar used in our schools confuse the minds of men in their earliest years as to the true genius of the English language. We cannot pause on this topic longer than to instance the absurdity of erecting huge artificial verb-systems, when there are really but two verb-forms in the regular and three in the irregular verbs, excluding the present participle, which is an adjective formation from the verb, and no more a part of the verb than the gerundial substantive which the grammars call a verbal noun, and which is precisely the same form put to a different use. Their error is in modelling their systems upon languages of a totally different structure.

The Anglo-Saxon tongue, out of which English mainly grew, belonged to the great Indo-European family of languages, of which Sanscrit is considered to be the oldest type, and is said by those who have mastered it to be the purest and most symmetrical. It was allied most nearly, however, to the tongues of Northern Europe, spoken by those races who poured out from the great *officina gentium* of Scandinavia to overrun the Roman Empire. Its copiousness was greater even, say students of these dead languages, than that of these kindred tongues. This feature it owed in a large degree to its mixed character. Mr. Marsh surmises, with some plausibility, that the dialectic differences were great among the adventurers who followed Hengist to the British shore, though there was doubtless a general affinity of race.

Though there are undoubtedly many words in the English language traceable ultimately to Celtic roots, of those directly derived from the Celtic there are so few that they may well be

left out of account altogether. The great body of the words composing the language as now spoken are of Teutonic origin, brought into Britain by the Saxon invaders. The incursions and temporary empire of the Danes seem to have had no great influence upon the language. A few names of places and families almost exhaust the traces of the Danish element. The language remained almost purely Teutonic until the period of the Norman conquest, when it was overlaid and for some time kept in complete subordination by the dialect of the French tongue, which the conquering race brought over with them. The Latin element, however, had meanwhile been largely infused into the English vernacular, anterior to the introduction of Norman French. This fact is a disputed one amongst philologists; and Mr. Marsh even ignores any allusion to it. But we are disposed to side with those who assert it, and this as much on grounds of antecedent probability from the nature of the case, as in view of the arguments adduced in support of the opinion. It must be remembered that the missals of the Church, the learning of the great Alfred, and the chronicles of the Venerable Bede and others, had tended to impress the dialect of the court and the cloisters at least, with many expressions which conveyed ideas new to the spoken tongue. It therefore had no equivalent for the terms borrowed from Roman lore, and readily received the imported word. Hence most of our abstract conceptions are embodied in forms of speech drawn from the language in which Cicero reasoned and Seneca moralised, in which Boethius painted the consolations of religion and Augustine set forth the grand doctrine of salvation by faith; while the words that express the objects of nature and the habits and sentiments of mere existence in man's domestic or social relations are mostly the old Saxon words with little change in their form.

The Normans, very soon after their settlement in France, had put off with their Paganism their Scandinavian speech, and taken in its stead that idiom of the great Romance tongue which prevailed along the Northern shores of France. The Romance was the vulgar speech (*lingua volgare*) into which all the barbarian races had corrupted the Latin spoken by the imperial people

they overthrew, (which was itself, however, widely different from the Latin of literature,) and was the common speech of early mediæval Europe, though from the beginning separated into many dialects. In France, it was discriminated into two idioms, the *Langue d'Oc* and the *Langue d'Oïl*, the former the speech of South France, allied to the Spanish, the Catalan, and the Italian, and afterwards put to a noble service in Provençal song; the latter the speech of North France, destined to develop into modern French. This branch of the Romance tongue, introduced by the Normans into England, continued for many generations to be the language of the sovereign's court and the barons' castles, while the speech of the despised and disregarded Saxons remained the same as their fathers had spoken it. Two distinct languages long continued in use in the island. But, when the Saxons gradually rose to eminence in the Church (which never has been a class or race institution) and gained wealth and power slowly but surely amid the bickerings of monarchs and barons, and the changes in property and social rank brought about by the Crusades, the despised language regained its lost influence and ultimately made its way into feudal hall and monastic cell, receiving it its true large accessions from its rival's vocabulary, but retaining still most of its distinctive features. Simultaneous with the amalgamation of the two races was the amalgamation of their languages; but the Saxon speech did not so much coalesce with the Norman as master it, and reached a success in the struggle far greater than that which the race itself attained. The process was very gradual and the ultimate changes not very marked, amounting simply to three distinctive points: a modification of the form of words, a relinquishment of almost every trace of inflection, and an introduction of derivatives of French origin.

Let us now look a little more closely into the nature of the two languages at the time of their contact with each other, and mark more definitely the effect produced by the absorption of the Norman French in the qualified manner stated above, upon the Anglo-Saxon that formed the basis of the new tongue.

The best linguists now regard grammatical structure as the

fundamental characteristic of a language, rather than mere vocabulary. It is true that it will not do to apply this principle too rigorously in ethnological inquiries, as the case of the Armenian tongue before referred to shows. Still, it is the general law, established upon a pretty large collection of inductions, and it is safe to apply it where we know the history of a people. Now, the grammatical structure of the English language is remarkable. Its regularity and consistency is a fact often overlooked, so much stress being laid upon the absence of analogy in the pronunciation of words. This latter feature, however, is merely a characteristic of orthography. Syntax is the essence of language; spelling only indicates at best the origin of words and is a purely conventional and arbitrary notation of sounds. The orthoepy of vocables is certainly not more important an element in linguistic lore than word-endings; indeed, it is not by many degrees so much so; and yet the discrepancy between written and spoken English in this particular is not nearly so great as that existing between different dialectic usages on the Continent in the matter of inflections. What then is the cause of this invariableness and consequent ease of the English tongue? It results from a most fortunate abrasion to which the parent Saxon was subjected. We have stated that it sprang from the forced marriage of the Anglo-Saxon and the Norman-French. Both of these were inflected languages; and each had such a cumbrous syntactical structure as it is the property of inflection to impose upon a language. In the friction, however, between the two speeches, the excrescences of inflected forms were rubbed off; and the modifications and relations of prominent words grew gradually to be expressed by connecting particles, a far simpler mode of bringing an idea with all its ramifications and limitations before the mind. The tendencies in most of the languages of modern civilisation are towards simplicity of construction. English has gone farthest in this tendency, and may therefore, on this score at least, be fairly placed at their head. So perfect in this respect was it, when it first issued from the chaos of conflict with the Norman, that since the days of Chaucer no marked structural change has taken place in it. The grammar (of the language,

not of the grammarians,) is in its grand outlines the same. The changes have been merely rhetorical.

The Romance languages, French, Spanish, Portuguese, and Italian, with their dialects, of which the intruding Nôrman was one, were, as has been stated, homogeneous in character; for they were all of direct descent, not indeed from the literary Latin of Rome, but from that *lingua rustica*, to which we find perhaps the nearest approach in the comedies of Plautus and Terence, in the dialogue parts of Petronius Arbiter's "Satyricon," and in the barbarous style of Apuleius, and which was used with various dialectic differences over the whole of the western half of the Roman Empire. In the East, Greek was the universal tongue. Now, the Roman type of inflectional changes was indelibly stamped upon all these various dialects; and to this day the iron rule of inflection fetters the freedom of the Continental tongues. In this fact lies the distinctive difference between the structure of these and that of the English tongue. Syntax prevails in the latter without impediment. The logical order of thought governs the form of expression. In the Continental languages it is warped by the necessities of inflection. Hence we find Biondelli complaining (Mr. Marsh quotes the passage) that to speak and write Italian correctly, Italians themselves must go through a long and laborious study, little less so than in learning Latin or French; thus, confirming what Sir Philip Sidney said centuries ago about being put to school to learn one's mother tongue. French is pronounced with but little regard to the inflected forms, and as a spoken language bears but little resemblance to its written characters. The various dialects used in Germany differ so greatly from one another and from the language of literature that they are almost so many different languages. The grammar of the English tongue is certainly simpler and more natural.

Up to the time of the Norman conquest, the insular position of England, fostering and fortifying that spirit of independence which was already a strong element in the races that made up the English people, tended in no small degree to preserve their speech from the introduction of extraneous elements. After

that event, as we have seen, the long conflict that ensued between the languages terminated in the partial mingling of the two, the Saxon retaining its structure, but receiving into its vocabulary a large number of Norman words. Just here, however, let us remark, that Chateaubriand, acutely and perhaps not without probability in his favor, suggests in his *Litterature Anglaise* that the Norman French itself retained many Scandinavian expressions, not rejected by the followers of Rollo when they parted with their native tongue to assume that dialect of the Romance speech used north of the Loire. Hence, if there be weight in this idea, the English tongue in receiving Norman words into its vocabulary was in many instances simply recovering its birth-right. However this may be, after the formation of the English tongue proper, as it gradually grew into permanent shape, the insular position of the country again operated favorably in keeping the language from being fettered by a foreign syntax. Into its vocabulary it freely received, from time to time, from continental sources a large proportion of the words it now uses; and it is thus enriched with countless synonymes, chased as it were with the most delicate shades of meaning. But the structure remained almost entirely unaltered. It was like the human body assimilating food to itself rather than changing its native tissues to suit the foreign substances introduced.

We return now to the topic of the union of the two tongues, which produced our English. It was not until about the time of Edward the Third that the mixed tongue settled down into anything like a clearly defined language; and this *fixing* into an ascertained form it owes to Geoffrey Chaucer, who in this reign wrote those delightful poems which by their racy humor, tact in the choice of words, and energy of expression, drew the disorderly speech of his day into the sphere of literary discipline, and may be said to have created English language and English poetry, just as Boccaccio about the same time created Italian prose. Anterior to Chaucer, the prose chronicles and legends were in Latin, the minstrel poetry in Norman French. Knights and princes were eminent amongst the cultivators of the latter, the great crusader and redoubtable knight, Richard Cœur de

Lion, being in addition to his other gifts no mean troubadour also, and his mother revered in her native land as its most impassioned poetess. Just when various causes tending to fuse into one people the rival races on the English soil reached their full measure in the sympathy of glorious victories won side by side against a common enemy; just when Crécy and Poitiers shed a new splendor on the name of Englishman; just when the brotherhood of battle and the fellowship of trade were exerting alike their powerful influences upon the separate races and tongues, Geoffrey Chaucer, gentleman and soldier, found time in the midst of his stirring life to show his countrymen what a noble language genius could make of the English they spoke so rudely. True, he had predecessors, who had chiselled into some shape the half-formed block, which he was soon to mould into forms of undying grace and beauty. Langlande and Gower and a few more had done something towards disclosing to their contemporaries the richness of the material; but it was reserved for John of Gaunt's friend to work such wonders with it as to make English thenceforth the only vehicle for literature in England. We say, John of Gaunt's friend, using that title advisedly, because undoubtedly the manliness which preferred to employ his native English and the freedom of thought which prompted his fearless satire of the clergy, were strengthened and nourished by the favor and friendship of that English-hearted prince, who also protected Wycliffe, the first earnest preacher of English sense and honesty and Christian purity against the corruptions of the Church. Wycliffe's English Bible, indeed, struck the same heavy blow at the Latin of the Ritual, that Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales* struck at the Norman French of Literature. "It is a noteworthy circumstance in the history of the literature of Protestant countries," says Mr. Marsh, "that, in every one of them, the creation or revival of a national literature has commenced with, or at least been announced by a translation of the Scriptures into the vernacular, which has been remarkable both as an accurate representation of the original text, and as an exhibition of the best power of expression possessed by the language at that stage of its development. Hence, in all those countries, these versions

have had a very great influence, not only upon religious opinion and moral training, but upon literary efforts in other fields, and indeed upon the whole philological history of the nation." But, as before Chaucer smooth English verse had glided from Gower's pen, so before Wycliffe sterling English prose had taken a sturdy stride forward in the book of that wonder-loving old traveller, Sir John de Mandeville. But the superior genius of the father of English poetry and the forerunner of the English reformation fixed the taste of the nation and set up models for future emulation; and with them therefore English language and English literature may be fitly said to begin. From this time, aided greatly by the rapid increase of libraries from the zeal with which Caxton worked his printing-press, the language took a great stride forward, showing its richness and force in the Book of Common Prayer, and in the charming poems of James the First of Scotland and the Scottish Dunbar, together with the numerous and beautiful ballads of that period, the chief of which are those of *Chevy Chace*, *Childe Waters*, and *Sir Cauline*, with some of the best of the *Robin Hood* romance-ballads. Surrey, singing sugared sonnets of the fair Geraldine and imitating Petrarca; Wyatt, also following the Italians; Bishop Latimer preaching colloquial and idiomatic English; Holinshed, Hall, and Hakluyt, writing chronicles and travels; Lord Berners, translating Froissart; Sackville, writing *Gorboduc*, the first drama in English; obscure or anonymous laborers, enriching the storehouse of English letters for the use of future genius by countless versions of Plutarch, Dares Phrygius, the Continental romances, the *Gesta Romanorum* and *Cento Nouvelle*—all drilled the language into new uses, swelled its vocabulary, and helped to preserve much that might otherwise have perished. Reckless as the writers of mediæval times were in regard to accuracy of style, they were rich in picturesque expression, fresh and life-like pictures, and inventive imagination. Through these tendencies all the modern tongues were stocked with a plenteous supply of graphic and poetical words. The magnificence of Gothic architecture, the variety of mediæval costumes, the romantic character of the events which those stirring ages produced, the

marked distinctions of class, all tended to give richness and copiousness to the vocabularies they used. The legends grouped around Arthur and his Round Table Knights and Charlemagne and his Paladins; the luxuriant fiction supplied by the presence of the Moors in Spain and by the contact of the Crusaders with the waning splendor of the empire of the Comneni and the Saracen civilisation, so different from their own; that awe-struck belief in Heaven and Hell and Purgatory, so intense in its literalness, from which sprung the legends of the Sangreal, of Ezzelino, of Doctor Faustus, the Miracle and Mystery plays, and Dante's *Divina Commedia*: these sources of literary art, filled with the pomp of tourney and the glory of war, the adventures of knights errant and the praise of lovely woman, with necromancers, fairies, and devils, with all the wonders that straining imagination could devise, enriched all the tongues of Christendom with such an exhaustless treasury of life-painting words, that the colder rhetoric of Hellas and ancient Italy, in this point at least, falls far behind them.

This flush and exuberant diction fell into Chaucer's hands, and from his judicious taste received such an orderly setting and wise training to ensure the richest and most delicate fruitage, that it has flourished since his time with unrivalled excellence in the garden of English intellect, as well in quality as in quantity, for ornament no less than for use. It was there in great plenty before Chaucer wrote, but growing in wild luxuriance in an uncultured confusion of tongues. To him the English language, moulded into clear existence by his use of it, owed grace, delicacy of expression, the development of that flexibility which was inherent in it, and sweetness and purity of diction. Such was his felicity in the eclecticism he used, such his tact in combination, that he seized all that was truly idiomatic, racy, and picturesque in the hybrid language spoken around him. Before we pass beyond Chaucer, it may be fitting to remark, that, whatever Mr. Marsh may say about his imitating the French romance writers rather than the Italians, the idea and general form of the "Canterbury Tales" was unquestionably borrowed from the "Decameron." But the dramatic power with which he gives

individuality to each of his personages is all his own. In this great excellence Boccaccio is altogether wanting; and indeed it is an art foreign to the genius of the Italians, Metastasio and Alfieri, who perhaps may rank foremost amongst them in this branch of literature, lacking the very essence of dramatic power.

We have seen that in the long lapse of time between the light that Wycliffe and Chaucer shed upon English thought and English language, and the brightness of the Elizabethan era, few and for the most part far inferior minds caught up the lamp of genius to illumine the dark and stormy age that intervened. At last dawned the age of Elizabeth, so fruitful in intellectual activity; and now the language reached its maturity in the prose of Bacon, Sir Thomas More, and Sir Philip Sidney, and in the poetry of Spenser, Shakespeare, Ben Jonson, Marlowe, Massinger, Webster, Beaumont, and Fletcher. While we linger a moment in reverence, as we breathe these great names, we may be pardoned if we take advantage of the pause to resent an unworthy criticism of Mr. Marsh's. We allude to that noble and high-toned romance of chivalry, Sir Philip Sidney's "Arcadia," which Mr. Marsh has the bad taste to call "tedious." We will only say that we are sorry for him, and wish him improvement in his æsthetic faculty.

Since this grand period, upon which we have not space to expatiate, both fruit and flower of delicious flavor and richest fragrance have bloomed and ripened on the many branches of our rich language; but its grace and grandeur were given it then, and it had attained its full growth surely and triumphantly. In this last age we are worthily striving to revive the use of some of the richest and most expressive terms of our older literature, which had been unhappily allowed to pass out of circulation; and a forgotten vocabulary, thus quickened into new life, is proving to us how exhaustless and ever fresh is the wonderfully copious language that is our heritage. We trust that the mine will be kept open, and that new treasures from the old veins may be brought up from time to time, to rescue us from that sense of staleness which is so apt to drive a people to vicious corruptions

of style and a counterfeit glitter. We have always been strong believers in the wisdom of that aphorism of Horace :

“ Multa renascuntur quæ jam cecidere, cadentque
Quæ nunc sunt in honore vocabula, si volet usus
Quem penes arbitrium est et jus et norma loquendi.”

A word, before closing, as to the English of modern literature. The style of Macaulay and his followers has tended to injure the purity of the language. The grace that belongs to simplicity, the freshness and sweetness of the mother speech are wanting. Brilliant rhetoric, epigrammatic keenness, the charm of antithesis, apt allusion, cogent argument, the sharp steel of logic at a white heat, are fascinations that may well beguile us into untempered admiration; but all these enchanting qualities cannot atone for the absence of that naturalness which goes to the heart. Idiomatic English is the best English; and for this high excellence we commend Thackeray almost as much as for his all-pervading humor and the delicate, half-reserved pathos that lurks like the modest violet in the shady spots of his later works.

ARTICLE III.

Right and Wrong; or, A Check to Atheism; Being a Review of a Work by Rev. ALBERT BARNES, entitled Faith in God's Word.

PART II.

The above named work is based upon the following positions, affirmed to be “maxims or settled principles bearing on a revelation from God:”

- “1. There is such a thing as truth.
- “2. There is that in man which responds to truth, or which is a just ground of appeal in regard to truth.

NOTE.—To this and to the former article of Dr. Ross on the same subject there will appear a reply in our next number.—EDS. S. P. R.

"3. Truth depends for its reception by the mind on its being perceived as truth.

"4. There is a distinction between right and wrong, and this distinction is founded in the nature of things.

"5. There is that in man which responds to the distinction of right and wrong.

"6. A revelation from God will not contradict any truth, however that truth is made known.

"7. A pretended revelation which should contradict established truth, could not be received by mankind.

"8. A revelation on the same line of subjects will, so far as coincident, carry forward the truth already known; not contradict it.

"9. A revelation will not, in its teachings, be a violation of the constitutional principles of our nature."

We accept these maxims, so far as we can make them accord with the scriptural truths we have given. The examination of them will reveal the difference between our idea and the sense in which they are held by the author of the book. The reader then must decide for himself upon that difference.

REVIEW OF THE FIRST MAXIM.

"There is such a thing as truth."

We admit this. But we ask, what does man know of TRUTH *in its essential reality*? His conceptions must be infinitely far from the absolute fact. God only has knowledge of what truth is in its fulness of meaning. When, therefore, we agree in the maxim, "There is such a thing as truth," we desire to be understood as believing that *God has freely and eternally CONCEIVED certain ideas, which HE MAKES TO BE TRUTH.* These ideas, in their perfect meaning, can exist only in his mind, because that absolute sense is *infinite thought.* The finite mind cannot comprehend it as it is in the thought of God. Therefore every human conception is necessarily partially an *untruth.* The angels even are guilty of folly in their notions of things. We believe then as to man, that he, being made in the image of God,

a thinking or conceiving spirit, was endowed with power to *give birth* to ideas of truth, *after the manner of his Maker*; but that when he became depraved in nature, his conceptions were less and less in resemblance to those of his Creator.

So, then, when we admit "there is such a thing as truth," we intend to affirm that in God it is that which *he makes to be truth*, and for that reason it is such, and is perfect. And we affirm that, in man's estimation, *truth* is to him just what *he believes* to be reality, whether it is in harmony with the divine will or not.

We do not mean, however, that the conception of man, *when not in agreement with the mind of God*, is reality at all; but we intend to teach that *truth*, as a thing believed, is wholly *mental conception, idea*, in God, and in man; and if *mind* did not exist, and first in a personal God, there would be no such thing as verity; or, in other words, if we could imagine a universe purely material, there might be such and such adjustments of things, but *there would be no TRUTH*. There are two other notions on this subject: the one, that truth exists in the nature of things, distinct from the divine and all other minds. To assert this of one thing, as we have examined, (in Part I.,) is to declare it of all, and that is plain *atheism*. The other position is, that truth is not the eternal *voluntary conception* of God, but exists *in his nature*, a PERFECTED IDEA, *antecedent to his will*: and that *he only perceives it there as such*. This idea is simply modified atheism, since the Supreme Creator is therein represented as a sort of Jupiter, reading and obeying an eternal fatality or law in his own nature, yet not of his will.

The difference, then, between this author and the view we present, will be seen as we establish his meaning to be either this naked atheism, or this fatality, which are the only alternatives to the idea that truth is wholly the MENTAL CONCEPTION OR THE WILL OF GOD.

The author, after some illustration of the maxim before us, sums up in these words :

"These facts make it certain that there is such a thing as truth, truth in the reality of things, or as the basis of a repre-

sentation—and truth as a representation. Truth is not arbitrary, fluctuating, vacillating; truth is not the subject of *creative power*; truth is not capable of being changed by mere power; for no power could make two and two equal to seven, or the angles of a triangle equal to four right angles; and no power could make such a representation conformable to truth. *It is not needful to inquire how it is that things come to be true.* All that is affirmed is that there is such a thing as truth, and that this is of such a nature that it cannot be changed by mere power or will." P. 7.

The writer, in the last two sentences, takes for granted, or passes over, *the very question* which contains the *thing* that decides the whole subject. He says "it is not needful to inquire how it is that things come to be true." But, we respectfully say, it is needful; for, if truth be the free mental conception of the mind of God, *then it is the subject of creative power*, and it is what it is just because God made it such, and while we cannot easily believe that truth in some relations could have been conceived *by him* otherwise than he has *thought* it, that fact does not negative the position that truth even in such relations is simply his free thought, *i. e., the creation of his will.*

Neither does that fact negative the position that, in all other relations, truth, as revealed to us from God, is, (not indeed "arbitrary, fluctuating, and vacillating," in the ordinary sense of the words; but is, at the same time,) not fixed; but it *is made* by God to be contingent upon changing circumstances, which are always simply his *will*. There is, then, no such fact, as truth in the nature of things, as a *something* eternally fixed above the will of God and controlling it. If any truth is simply his free and holy will, then all truth must be such. Yes, God has freely made his own mental conception of one, and two, and all other numbers; and as he has created man to form similar mental conceptions, therefore, and only for that reason, man holds these numerical relations to be truth.

We said, just now, that we cannot easily believe that truth in these relations, could have been conceived by God, otherwise than he made it to be. But, if the question be asked, whether we can imagine that God, as an exertion of creative

power, could have made the mind of man to conceive numerical combinations other than they are conceived by him, we reply: Yes; for God could (as to his mere power) have made the mind to think infinitely differently from what it does, and *to hold any of its conceptions to be truth.*

To sustain this position, we now affirm that God has in fact so made the mind that things can be conceived to be truth, and then believed to be false, in the very science of mathematics.

Astronomy is a mixed mathematical science. Yet there had been many theories of astronomy before the Copernican; built upon ideas conceived to be true, and regarded as established science, all of which were afterwards believed to be false. The system of Ptolemy was held for more than twelve hundred years, and then demonstrated (as we now believe) to be false. But, Tycho Brahe did not accept the demonstrations of Copernicus. Nay, even the reasoning of Newton was not received, for a time, in France. This history establishes our position, that the mind, even as to the facts of science, may conceive anything as truth, and build thereon a vast system of the universe, and believe it firmly, in despite of all counter supposed demonstration. All this goes to show, that truth, as a mental state in man, is nothing else than what he conceives and believes to be such. If his conceptions agree at all with the reality God has made to be in his divine mind, then man holds it, so far as his Maker does. If, on the contrary, his belief does not agree with the divine thought, still it is his belief of truth, and as such it abides in his mind as really as the former conception.

This brings us back to reaffirm that it is "needful" to inquire "how it is that things come to be true." And that it is needful to know that it "comes to be," simply as the mental conception, first of the mind of God and then of the mind of man.

He who holds this view of the subject has an impregnable fact against atheism; which will be the more clearly seen when we bring forward the proof, (under the examination of the author's fourth maxim,) that all ideas are conceived and accepted by effort of the WILL, in man, and in God.

REVIEW OF THE SECOND MAXIM.

“There is that in man which responds to truth, or which is a just ground of appeal in regard to truth.”

We fully accept this proposition in the meaning which harmonizes with what we have written. Thus, (1) there is that in the nature of man which enables him to form finite ideal conceptions of truth, responsive to the infinite ideas of God; and, (2) there is that in man which responds in emotion to whatever he believes to be truth. But, we also hold, that there is that in the fallen nature of man which influences him to form conceptions, and hold them as truths, which are not realities; also that there is *that* in man which responds to such false conceptions of truth.

Let us expand this statement. We hold, then, that it is the nature of man to feel emotionally and spontaneously, in response to all ideal conceptions of his mind, (without noticing in this connexion what may be merely physical or instinctive.) This emotional state is in harmony with whatever may be the conceptional idea.

Thus, when the eye enables the mind to form the idea of scenery, there is the response in the feeling of beauty, sublimity, or any of the mental pulsations to which the eye gives rise; and in like manner of all the senses. Thus, too, in the higher ideas on all subjects whatsoever—husbandry, trade, mechanics, science, politics, religion. Yea, this ocean of the soul rises and swells under all the infinite ideal influences acting upon it. But, while it is always the same in its nature, as emotion, it has different phases and names, as it varies in response to different ideas or states of thought. It is fear, hope, joy, sorrow, satisfaction, peace, in their many and various impulses. CONSCIENCE, according to this view, is never A MORAL SENSE, perceiving instinctively the truth and right, but is simply one state, and that the highest, of this emotional nature, giving its response to the ideal conception of moral truth in the relations between man and his God and his fellow-creatures. In fine, whatever man believes to be true, this emotion responds to it as true. Whatever he

believes to be right, this emotion rises in harmony with that ideal right. It matters not if he is ever so much mistaken as to truth and right, his belief absolutely controls the mental tide. He feels what his intellect says is truth. He sanctions, in pulsation of conscience, what his understanding conceives to be right. But that understanding may be under control of the heart or will, good or bad. In this sense, then, we accept this second maxim, "There is that in man which responds to truth, or which is a just ground of appeal in regard to truth." But we are constrained to think our author holds it in very different meaning.

He teaches, if we understand him, that truth is a something not having its birth in the intellectual creation of God, but is that in all the relations of the material and moral universe which attracts mind, whether the infinite or the finite, and that mind responds to it like iron to the loadstone.

Now, we will admit that if there were no God, and if there was nevertheless a universe of material things and moral beings, (however hard to imagine it,) then such a notion of truth and man's responsive nature, might, perhaps, be the highest reach of reason, since all truth in the universe would be in fact from atheistic law; and that atheistic law had made the mind of man, as well as everything else. But, if there is a God, and if the universe of matter and mind is the reproduction of that eternal creation in his mind—if everything is of his free will, then we totally reject the notion that truth is this magnet in material and moral relations, and that there is that in man any more than in God, which, like iron, responds to it by necessity of nature.

That we do not mistake the writer we quote him thus:

"The human mind is so made as to perceive truth, or to receive an impression corresponding to *its nature*, to be affected by it as truth. *It is so constituted that an impression is made upon it by truth different from the impression made by error.* It is so constituted that it may be an element of calculation in endeavoring to influence others that they may be and will be affected by truth if it is fairly brought before their minds; so constituted that it is fair to presume that there will be a uniform result in

regard to the same individual, and in regard to different individuals, by the proper presentation of truth. In other words, in reference to the same individual, so long as personal identity remains, whether in childhood, youth, manhood, or old age, and so far as truth produces its appropriate effects in the outward changes of life, in sickness or health, joy or sorrow, prosperity or adversity, ignorance or learning, the impression produced by truth is always the same; and so far as different individuals are concerned, the impression is the same on all." P. 8.

This statement shows that the writer regards truth as this fixed, eternal reality in the nature of things, and to be only seen, as such, by the human mind—nay, to be only seen, as such, by the divine mind. In this sense we reject the statement altogether; and even the meaning we give when we use the writer's words must be received with caution and abatement. For, when we admit that the human mind is so made as to perceive the truth, we only intend to acknowledge, as before explained, that the mind is so constituted as to conceive for itself ideas which it reckons truth, whether they be such or not; then to perceive them as truth, and also then to be impressed by the difference between that perceived truth and that which it believes to be error. But if, as is the case, the mind of the same person changes in its belief of truth, just to that extent the sameness of its perceptions is affected, and in like manner is the identity of the perceptions of truth between mind and mind the subject of variation.

This changeableness in the impressions regarded as truth is a fact, even as to material relations, no matter what may be the fixedness of these relations as established by God. And this changeableness is still more fully seen in the moral relations of things. What, then, if it be conceded that God has determined that the mind shall "always" make the same ideas in certain simple relations of material things, as to numbers and geometric figures, and hold them to be truths without changing them; this does not establish the author's broad position that the mind is so constituted as always to see truth as it really is, and the difference between it and error, and furthermore to have such impressions without change. And what if in the elementary moral relations

God has willed it that our minds should make and hold unalterably as true certain notions, that fact does not sustain the author's assumption that the mind is impressed always by the same thing as truth in all the moral relations. So far from it, we think we can establish the opposite to be the action of the mind whenever it forms conceptions above the simpler things of its belief, either in the material or moral world.

We have already shown how, in astronomy, what was received for ages by the learned world to be truth was then believed to have been not the truth. We might say the same thing in varied scope of meaning, as to every science, every art, every profession, every business, every matter of taste, as they have been the passing impression on the human mind. Nay, we might say this of the belief of truth, under the testimony even of the five senses.

Here, for example, are some three hundred millions of people, yea, Christian people, who have been taught, from infancy, to be certain that bread is bread and wine is wine. But more than half of these people have been instructed to believe that after a portion of this bread and wine has been submitted to the consecrating words of the priest it instantly becomes in verity flesh and blood, although it still looks like bread and wine. The Roman Catholic honestly holds that the change has been wrought, and that he then no longer sees bread and wine, but flesh and blood; while the fewer number of Protestants, although millions, believe that the bread is still bread and the wine is still wine. Now it matters not to our argument which of these millions believe the reality. The question we deem to be settled by this illustration is that Romanists and Protestants have different impressions of truth as to the same things, and those things the objects of sight, touch, smell, and taste, to both parties and at the same time. And let it be remembered, too, that the Roman Catholic has a response to supposed truth which has changed in a moment as to that truth: truth touching the same things. These things were a moment ago, he believed, bread and wine; they are now, he believes, flesh and blood. The consecrating act of the priest has caused him to make a different belief of

truth from what he had a moment before, in defiance of the testimony of four of his senses, and he rests his eternal salvation on this altered response to supposed truth, as to these material things, patent to sight, touch, taste, and smell. Is truth then a thing *per se*? and does it attract the mind in response to it as the loadstone draws the iron?

The answer must, we think, sustain our position that the impression of truth on the human mind is not a response to something existing *PER SE* as such, and that that response is necessarily and always the same, but that truth is a *mental* state altogether, and is always to the mind, at the time, just what it believes to be truth.

REVIEW OF THE THIRD MAXIM.

“Truth depends for its reception by the mind on its being perceived as truth.”

We readily agree to this statement, but as before, in our own sense; that is, truth, as conceived in the divine mind, depends for its reception by the human mind on its being conceived therein in harmony with the idea in God. In other words, man must think as God thinks to have the divine or real truth. The writer admits that truth is reached in the human mind, in most instances, after process of reasoning. Here we fully agree. But we demur when he teaches that there are axioms perceived to be truth by some minds without demonstration. We have, on the contrary, said, (in Part I., 2d proposition,) that one is a conceived, made, or generated thought, and that all the after combinations of numbers are processes of reasoning. This, we have said, is *work* for the boy; and that he talks about self-evident axioms only after his mind has formed the habit of such reasoning, so that no conscious effort is required; and then, indeed, he thinks these early impressions are self-evident. But they are not so. We decline, therefore, the author's belief “That Newton read the propositions of Euclid as if they were maxims or self-evident truths”—as being too plain and obvious to need demonstration. So far from this having been the fact, we think

the only difference between other minds and Newton's was, that he made the demonstrations with a rapidity of thought unattainable in duller minds. We think we can prove this to have been so from the instance of such a mathematical power existing here in our neighborhood.

There is, or was very recently, a negro boy not far from this city so much of an idiot that his master could not put him to work even among his corn-field hands. He was therefore permitted to be a sort of Davie Gellatley about the negro cabins and the great house; to amuse himself it might be in roasting eggs and singing songs. But our Davy woke one morning, and, like Lord Byron, found himself famous. For he happened the day before to be in the place where his master was beginning to calculate the number of rails wanted to enclose a field of fifty acres. Suddenly Davie said, "Massy, I tell you." Astonished, his master replied, "You, Davy, why, what do you mean?" "Massy, I tell you," was all his answer. So his master, to have a laugh at Davy's expense, with the other servants, stated to him the data for the calculation. When, lo, Davy gave the sum of the rails necessary, almost as soon as he was told the number to start with in a certain distance, and the length of the line of fence.

A friend of ours went to see Davy, and asked him, first, to tell what ninety-nine multiplied by ninety-nine would make. In a few minutes the answer was nine thousand eight hundred and one. He then put to him questions more difficult, and with the same result, in astounding shortness of time. We inquired whether Davy seemed to perceive his answer by intuition or power of self-evidence. "O, no," he said, "you saw from the curious distortion of his face that he was running up figures, and from the fact that he sometimes made a mistake which he had to correct."

Davy has a mathematical genius, although very much a natural fool in the other movements of his mind. Newton, we think, reached his results just as Davy did, by reasoning so rapidly that in some trains of it he took no note of its progressive steps, and imagined his result was not demonstration but intuition. We

doubt, however, if he ever thought so; for our author does not assert that Newton made this declaration as to Euclid, but only tells us "It is said," etc., etc.

We do not deny that the human mind has power to conceive combinations of numbers and geometric results, without process, and which will be developed hereafter. We only affirm that so far as we have evidence of the present action of the mind, man thinks out in successive ideas his results as to number, form, and all other truths.

REVIEW OF THE FOURTH MAXIM.

"There is a distinction between right and wrong, and this distinction is founded in the nature of things."

The author, in expanding this proposition, makes three averments: .1. That right and wrong are in the nature of things. 2. That they are not in the will of God. 3. That they are irreversible in that nature.

We answer, then, to the first affirmation, that the essential nature of matter and of mind is not understood. The phenomena of material things are known in limited comprehension, and certain results of the human or the divine nature constitute all which can be reached on those subjects. The whole of what we dare say of God, is, that he, from eternity, conceived in his nature IDEAS which, IN that conception, are his WILL, and therefore true, and therefore right.

We must reason thus, because our notion of God is derived from his image in man. What, then, is the nature of the human soul? In reference to the question before us, we can only reply, it is that mysterious substance from which ideas and their corresponding emotions are generated by effort of the will. Man knows this fact in CONSCIOUSNESS, which is his highest knowledge of himself. He feels assured, then, that he never looks into his nature to perceive there ideas of truth or error, of right or wrong, before he conceives them; or to find there emotions before he feels them in response to his conceived ideas. As, then, we know this of man, we feel that we do not think presumptuously

when we believe that ideas of truth, of right, and their eternal love, do not exist in the DIVINE NATURE, as perfected things, antecedent to God's free creation! Will it be asked, Did God exist before he thought? We reply, He thought from eternity. And this is the proper answer to that old cavil of the objector.

We can go no farther back than this eternal will. We start there, and declare that God created man in his mere pleasure—that is, in the counsel of his WILL (Eph. i. 11,) and in the same mere pleasure placed him in certain relations to himself and to his fellow men. This, then, required a RULE of obedience: that is to say, the LAW of right and wrong. And therefore it was ordained that man, in his conception of this rule, should know right and wrong in idea, while his WILL in submission should be his act of right, and his WILL in refusal should be his act of wrong. Every step in this creation and providence was RIGHT, simply because it was God's WILL. If it be said it was his will because it was right, we have only to answer back, he made it right in his free conception.

We will now examine whether this view will bear the test of our author's reasoning to the contrary. He says, "That cannot be made right to-day which in precisely the same circumstances was wrong yesterday." Here, in the beginning of his proof, he seems to abandon his self-evident principle. For, if a thing is right in its own nature, why is it not right under all circumstances? But if it is right in certain circumstances and wrong in other conditions, then the right and wrong are not in the nature of the thing, but in the circumstances. Who makes the circumstances? Surely, in the high and controlling sense, God makes them in the mere pleasure of his will. Therefore, even in this sense of our author, a thing is not right and wrong in its nature, but simply in the will of God.

To make this plain we will anticipate what we may have to repeat in another place, and illustrate the subject by the examination of a fact which seems to establish our position—we mean the right and wrong in the marriage of near relations.

In the day of Adam his sons married their sisters. And this they did by the command of God; yea, given before the fall.

Gen. i. 28. Now, if the writer says that God commanded this union because he saw it to be right in the nature of things; that is, in the nature of the relation of brother and sister, then, as that relation is precisely the same at all times, it must be always right in itself for brother and sister to marry, according to this writer. But, in the day of Moses, God forbade brother and sister to marry, and therein made it wrong. Then he made this thing to be wrong which was right in its nature! Observe, he did not change the nature of the thing, *i. e.*, the relation. But he now, by his mere will, made that to be wrong which this writer affirms was right in itself, and which he for that reason had commanded to be. How will the maxim before us accord with this fact? God seems to have disregarded it! Will our author say the marriage of brother and sister is still right in itself, and that God has only suspended it since Moses? He will hardly say that. For God has, since Moses, declared it to be wrong under the eternal death of his moral law. Will our writer say it was right in the circumstances of the day of Adam, and wrong in the circumstances of the day of Moses? Then the right and wrong have shifted from the nature of the relation to the nature of the circumstances. But who placed mankind in the new circumstances? Surely it was God who then, in his mere pleasure, placed man on a higher platform of social life. Will the writer contend that the relation of brother and sister, or the sexes in general, is "a thing in itself indifferent, and which may be therefore the subject of command or prohibition?" (See p. 15.) He will never say that. For he knows that the relation of the sexes is not a thing indifferent, but is the basis of the highest human happiness.

Then it appears, we think, the writer must abandon his maxim that right and wrong exist in the nature of things as to the marriage of brother and sister, and admit it is in the mere will of God. This fact is so plain we need not enlarge in this connexion of thought, as we shall want its use when presently we attempt to show that right and wrong are not irreversibly in the nature of the relations of any of the ten commandments.

The second position of our author under his fourth maxim is thus

expressed: "Every idea which we can form of the Supreme Being always implies this, that by his own eternal *nature* he is just, and holy, and true, and good; not that he has *made himself* to be just by an arbitrary act." We reply, the word "arbitrary" has in loose speech and writing an ill sense. Its primary meaning, however, is, "depending on no law—absolute—determined only by the will." With this understanding of the word, we make issue with the author and say, the Supreme Being has MADE himself to be just, and holy, and true, and good. We make this issue because, as we understand the question, it involves nothing less than the decision whether to believe there is a *personal God who wills, absolutely, truth and right*, or that truth and right are the results of the *impersonal law* of the nature of things; in other words, whether to believe in a PERSONAL GOD or in ATHEISM. That is the exact, and not to be disguised, issue between this writer and ourselves.

What, then, is atheism? It is divided into several ideas. We will not formally define them. All that we need to say is that atheism denies a personal Deity, and substitutes for God the impersonal law, the force or principle of the universe, which it affirms has ever operated to produce all things from eternally existing atoms; in other words, THE LAW OF THE UNIVERSAL NATURE OF THINGS.

According to atheism, then, that which is true, right, just, and good, exists, not in the voluntary conception of a personal God, but in the eternal nature of things. This is the result to which the idea of our author must come. Not that he will ever deny the personality of the Supreme Being. But he declares that truth and right are not of the will of God in the sense of his making them to be such, but exist in his nature as perfected realities BEFORE his will, and of course by a power in that nature which produces results of truth and right not of his voluntary action. The atheist, therefore, may say that this power, thus admitted to be not subject to the volition of God, is the very power he believes to be in the impersonal law of things. And that, as by the admission of this writer, it can and does give existence to truth and right, antecedent to the will of Deity, it is then suffi-

cient to develope everything else in the universe, without a divine will at all. He may further insist that if our author contends that such energy can only be in Deity, he begs the question; for he, the atheist, affirms the contrary, and finds no difficulty in conceiving such FORCE to be, not in a Supreme Being, but in the nature of things, especially if it be conceded to exist in such a being before and irrespective of his will. We think the atheist is right in his reasoning. For our faith in God is shaken if we must believe that he, from eternity, had nothing TO DO but to look into his nature to see all truth, all right, all love, existing there in perfect form before and irrespective of his voluntary agency in their being there, even as the astronomer gazes into infinite space to see the stars not made by him. Yea, we cannot avoid feeling the force of these words which the atheist might address to this writer: "What had God to do with the existence of all things in his own mind, if, according to your maxim, they necessarily, and not voluntarily, are there. I can imagine them in the nature of things simply, without supposing them first to be in the nature of God. For what necessity for such a God? He does nothing by his will, you confess, as to the conception of things in his mind. And what you claim to be done in the created universe by his will, I see effected by the impersonal power of nature. I disbelieve your idea of God."

Thus, it seems, this author's maxim resigns to the atheist his reasonable rejection of a Supreme Being. Will our view do the same thing? We think it has no tendency that way, but is a satisfactory CHECK to all such notions. For we can say to the atheist that he has his own confutation in his consciousness—first, that he is a personal self; and secondly, that all his ideas of truth and right are the creations of his personal mind under effort of his will. That he knows also that wherever he sees law, truth, and right in the things other men have made, these things had their origin from the same personal free conception and corresponding personal act. And thirdly, that therefore he ought to be consistent to believe all law, truth, and right, which he finds in works not of man, have their existence from a personal being higher than man, and that that being is God. In other

words, that when he asserts an impersonal law, he vainly imagines a notion which is a contradiction to what he knows to be the way law has come into his and all other minds, and by fair inference into the universe, namely, from the free conception of a PERSONAL BEING. Atheism, then, is nothing better than a depraved blunder in its very idea. For it puts sophistical reasoning in opposition to what is actually known to be the way truth and right have their existence. It is then false, tested by the highest authority of the human mind; that is to say, by consciousness. We thus require the atheist to do no more than to reason from what he knows of himself, the personal finite I AM, up to the infinite I AM THAT I AM. This reasoning, it is true, is human and therefore fallible. God only can reveal this highest faith in his existence, and the folly of the heart which puts the law of the nature of things in the place of his will. This highest testimony is of course no proof to the atheist. But it is to this author. We have thus fairly, we think, shown the writer's maxim to be atheistic.

Then, to the Christian thinker, it is false, and we have therein established our own position. Because, as we have already said, there is no other alternative. Right and wrong must be either in the nature of things, distinct from the will of the Deity, or in that will supremely. There can be no third suggestion.

It may give force to what we are saying if the reader will consider the definition of conception given at the opening of this treatise. It is this: "The act, or faculty of the mind, by which its ideas are originated." Again, from Reid the metaphysician: "Conception is the forming, or bringing an image, or an idea into the mind by an effort of will." The nature of man, therefore, is only the substance from which he generates ideas. His thoughts, then, are his own, and of his will in a double sense. First, they exist in his spontaneous conception of them. Secondly, they are his, because he then consciously chooses to have them to be his thoughts, with all their responsibilities. Permit us here to exclaim, how wonderful a being is man! And how glorious is he in his will! Yea, after all which has been written to degrade it to be a thing of necessity, it has been from the

beginning the alpha and omega, the first and the last, the *all* we know or can know of the *I*, the personal man; for while he is ever on his throne of SELF in a true sense unknown, he first gives existence to his ideas and then decides in his pleasure which to reject or prefer to be his, in mysterious SELF-DETERMINATION. Observe, we do not teach that the will decides. No; for that notion is to us not intelligible; but we hold that the determination is of the personal self. If any one asks, what determines the self so to decide? we reply self, in being pleased so to will, is the *ULTIMA THULE* of the conscious mind. That is the heart. All beyond that land is the shoreless, fathomless ocean of man's nature, from which, ever rising in spontaneous generation of thought, chimeras or forms of truth come up, to be accepted or rejected in the self-determined will. Such is the universal fact. This view of man's nature is in harmony with what we know of nature in general. Here is the diamond. In that crystallized state, we see its carbon in perfected result. Before that result, its nature was, so to speak, "without form and void." But in it there was the power to become the gem in the process or development of that energy.

Here is the oak. Who will affirm that it existed previously in any other sense than in the power of vegetable life to become that tree? Look at this mature animal. In that state we see its nature in perfected form. Will any one say that animal was such in its mere substance of being? Consider the serpent in its terrors. Who will teach that the snake, with its spotted skin, rattles, and poison-bag, was in the egg, except potentially, as explained? Let us, in fine, examine the human mind in its ideas, corresponding emotions and will, as we see it in its self-determined pleasure so to be. In that state the nature of mind is exhibited in its perfected result, and that is the free responsible man. Will any one tell us that that idea and its corresponding emotion can be sought and found lying back in the naked element of thought before the idea was spontaneously generated? No. The thing back of the will, before its first, as well as its last and highest action, is just that unknown essence in which man conceives ideas in his spontaneous energy, giving him in them his

objects of final choice. That nature is indeed fallen, evil, depraved, as set forth in all orthodox faith. But as such it does not cause volition in the sense of compelling the final choice, as the nature of the serpent causes the secretion of poison. It only solicits, tempts, entices, draws, while it is the person, it is the man, who responsibly and freely decides, and thus brings forth sin. This we take it is the sense of James i. 13, 14, 15. And thus we read our Presbyterian Confession where it speaks of all the "motions" of the corrupt nature being "truly and properly sin," because they are all of them first of the spontaneous, and then finally of the conscious will. We are persuaded that those who think truly, understand their nature to be what we have defined it. Hence they speak always of men as creators of thought. Preëminently they so regard the great thinkers of the world. Hence who ever imagined that the wrath of Achilles, the nod of Jupiter, and all the action of the Iliad, were a vision in the mind of Homer before he made it a living panorama of gods and heroes, the wonder and glory of all ages? Who ever thought that Hamlet, Shylock, and the Moor, were beheld by Shakespeare in scenic spectacle before he created them to immortal life? Who ever believed that the battles of the angels, the chariot of paternal Deity, the opening wall of heaven, the yawning gulf, the lost spirits on the burning marl, pandemonium, sin, death, Satan at the gate of hell, those shadowy wings struggling through chaos, Paradise, the first man and woman, Raphael, the fall, the expulsion, the flaming swords of the cherubim, were pictures Milton admired in the gallery of his nature before he conceived and painted them in colors of light on the canvas of his imagination? As well say all this as that anything whatsoever exists in entity or object of thought before its realisation in the will—first in spontaneous conception and then in the higher self-determination. If man, then, is declared to be the image of his Maker, we have in that revelation the highest sanction to believe that God is the infinitely perfect reality of that image. Will it be said we must not compare the nature of God with that of created things or of man? But we must make the comparison, for there is, in fact, no other way of forming any notion of it. And let us not be

startled from our propriety. Man was and is, however now without divine life, the image of his Maker, as a spiritual being. God, then, is man's infinite archetype. And while he is not to be considered "altogether" such a one as ourselves, yet if we try to conceive what he is at all, we must take the idea of what man is and fill out the conception with attributes of infinite and eternal perfection. There is absolutely no other way to think of God, even by possibility, as a personal being. As, then, all we know of nature in general is what we see in its result, and as this result in man is his will, we may hold that the divine will is the exhibition of all we can know of the nature of God. And now what does God unveil in the Bible of man's image in the Godhead? Just what we have affirmed! First, he tells that he has made his will to be all in all to us, even in his NAME! "And Moses said unto God, Behold, when I come unto the children of Israel, and shall say unto them, The God of your fathers hath sent me unto you; and they shall say unto me, What is his name? what shall I say unto them? And God said unto Moses, *I am that I am*: and he said, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, *I am* hath sent me unto you." Ex. iii. 13, 14. Professor Bush, in his Notes, explains the meaning of the Hebrew, *I am that I am*, to be literally, *I will be that I will be*. So other commentators. God thus reveals the supremacy of his will in his very name. Yea, it is remarkable that while philosophers (wise above what is written) talk much of the nature as such of the Supreme Being, as a something to be considered distinct from his will, the inspired writers never speak of it at all. The word, in fact, occurs but once in the New Testament, not in a single instance in the Old. And when the phrase—divine nature—is used, (in 2 Pet. i. 4,) it has no reference to the essential nature of God, but to his character. "Grace and peace be multiplied unto you through the knowledge of God, and of Jesus our Lord, according as his divine power hath given unto us all things that pertain unto life and godliness, through the knowledge of him that hath called us to glory and virtue: whereby are given unto us exceeding great and precious promises: that by these ye might be partakers of the divine nature, having escaped the cor-

ruption that is in the world through lust." This nature is, without question, the moral excellence of God, which we are showing to be solely in his will. Thus it would seem God veils his essential nature in darkness unapproachable, while he speaks from that cloud and commands us to know him only in his will. First, as just said, only in his name. Then in the wondrous fact that he, by his will, determines from the beginning his mode of existence as THE FATHER, THE SON, and THE HOLY GHOST.

This declaration will not startle our author. For he knows that the following doctrine is in the Presbyterian Confession of Faith: "In the unity of the Godhead there be three persons of one substance, power, and eternity: God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost. The Father is of none, neither begotten nor proceeding; the Son is eternally begotten of the Father; the Holy Ghost eternally proceeding from the Father and the Son." Chap. ii., sec. 3. This has ever been the doctrine of the Church universal. A different view we know has obtained in some quarters. But we adopt that which has just been copied from the Presbyterian standard, that "the Son is eternally begotten of the Father." That act is the conception of the divine will. Some of our readers may not be familiar with the subject of the eternal Sonship of Christ, and may think we have gone out of the path of argument to wander into unfathomable mystery. But this is a mistake. For if it be the doctrine of the Bible that God has made himself to exist in a Trinity by act of his will, then we have that eternal act as the highest possible vindication of our position. The Church, we have said, has ever held the doctrine of the "eternally begotten Son." Among the works on the subject there is an able and condensed statement in certain "Letters on the Eternal Sonship of Christ, addressed to Rev. Professor Stuart of Andover, by Samuel Miller, D. D., of Princeton," in 1823. In answering objections, Dr. Miller, after showing that the existence of the Son, while necessary, was also voluntary, quotes Stapfer, the writer so approved by President Edwards, to this effect: "But God is independent, and therefore can do nothing unwillingly, or by

compulsion, but always acts voluntarily; the generation of the Son, then, was voluntary."

If, then, God even constitutes by his voluntary act the relations of the persons of the Godhead, we may surely well affirm that all other truth exists in his mere will. Hence the Scriptures are full of such declarations as these: "Who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will." Eph. i. 11. "According to the good pleasure of his will." (v. 5.) "Therefore hath he mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will be hardeneth." Rom. ix. 18. Such passages every where in the Bible do teach us that God, by his absolute silence as to his nature lying back of his will, and by his unvarying commands to regard its supremacy, does give us to understand that we shall believe there is nothing lying back of that will which is ground of appeal from that will; but that it is to be held as that wherein abides from eternity, the right or wrong as he makes it to be, and the ground, and the only ground of his law to man.

Our author thinks very differently. His proofs to sustain his maxim will be noticed in the proper place.

The maxim (4.) which we are considering has, we have said, three parts. First, that right and wrong are in the nature of things; secondly, that they are not in the will of God; and thirdly, that they are unchangeable. Having for the present sufficiently noticed the first and second points, we will now consider the third.

The writer affirms this everywhere—thus (to complete the paragraph already quoted): "Every idea which we can form of the Supreme Being always implies this, that by his own eternal nature he is just and holy and true and good; not that he has made himself to be just by an arbitrary act. The mind of man at all events has been so made that it cannot take in the contrary idea, that he could have made the reverse of that which he has declared to be holy, true, good, and just, equally holy, true, good, and just; and this fact is a proof, since God made that mind, that there is that in the nature of things which is right and true. What is right and true to-day, was right and true yesterday, and will be forever." Pp. 14, 15.

Here the idea is that right is immutable; that God cannot reverse what is right and wrong. Our reply is that God makes some things unchangeably right; other things he reverses at his pleasure. Our proof shall be from the moral law itself. God has made right and wrong to be reversible in both tables of the law. Omitting (as more recondite) the first, second, third, and fourth commandments, we will examine the fifth and those following. "Honor thy father and thy mother." Why? Because God, in the pleasure of his will, and nothing else moving him thereto, made the family relation and gave to it his blessing. He then, to secure that good, ordained the law by which the right and wrong of obedience and disobedience were made to be. Our writer says this right is irreversible. "It is right to-day, was right yesterday, and will be forever." Now, observe, this fifth commandment includes in it the same love to all the members of the family. Well; but what saith God? "If thy brother, the son of thy mother, or thy son, or thy daughter, or the wife of thy bosom, or thy friend which is as thine own soul, entice thee secretly, saying, Let us go and serve other gods, which thou hast not known, thou, nor thy fathers; . . . thou shalt not consent unto him, nor hearken unto him; neither shall thine eye pity him, neither shalt thou spare, neither shalt thou conceal him: but thou shalt surely kill him; thine hand shall be first upon him to put him to death, and afterwards the hand of all the people. And thou shalt stone him with stones that he die; because he hath sought to thrust thee away from the Lord thy God, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt, from the house of bondage." Deut. xiii. 6-10. Again: "If any man come to me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple." Luke xiv. 26. Here God tells us that the honor of father and mother, and the love to family, in all its relations, are not unchangeably right in the nature of the relations or the things, but are right solely in his will or law, and have ever been and are reversible at his pleasure. If our author throws in here his proviso, *i. e.* that the right and wrong are irreversible "in precisely the same circumstances," (see his maxim, p. 13.)

then we have only to repeat what we have said, that such a restriction gives up his maxim: for the unchangeableness of the right and wrong is then admitted to be, not in the nature of the relation, but in the nature of the circumstances. But the circumstances or condition of the relation may be reversed, and are continually, for they are the ever varying providences of God. So that it might be literally right for the child to honor his father and mother to-day and to dishonor them to-morrow. The father and mother might to-day require him to attend in the house of the Lord, when he would be bound to obey them. To-morrow they might command him to worship in a Mormon temple, when he would do right to dishonor them by his disobedience.

This reversibility of the commandment has its limits simply in the divine pleasure. But inasmuch as God has made the rule to be permanent, (to secure, as said, his own free gift of the good in the relation,) he will reverse it only in exceptional cases. Let it be well considered, however, that the right and wrong are not in the nature of the relation, but in the will of the lawgiver. For if the right and wrong were in the nature of the relation, God could not reverse or in any way modify the law, since if he did he would himself do wrong.

“Thou shalt not kill.” Here, God to secure the good he has freely made to exist in the relation of life, gave the rule not to kill. Our writer avers that it is wrong to kill a man in the nature of things, and is irreversibly so. “It is wrong to-day, was wrong yesterday, and will be forever.” But what saith the Lord? “Whoso sheddeth man’s blood, by man shall his blood be shed.” Gen. ix. 6. This command is the rule in the Old Testament. The same is in the New. “For he” (the civil, or any governor) “is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain; for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil.” Rom. xiii. 4. To kill, then, is made to be wrong and made to be right by the will of God. He has reversed this law in many conditions in his changing providence: thus, he commanded life to be taken for violating the Sabbath; he reverses that obligation now. So he sanctions human law

in suiting the death penalty to the altering conditions of society. Hence what would be right in the lower would not be in the higher civilisation. Life, then, is a natural good, and to lose it is a natural evil. But the right and wrong of taking life is wholly made to be in the law of God, and in the law of man when in harmony with the divine pleasure.

“Thou shalt not commit adultery.” In this seventh commandment, God, to secure the blessing he granted to be in the relation of the sexes, made rule of right to restrain the emotion which was his own gift. Now our writer teaches that what is right or wrong herein is such in the nature of the relation, and is irreversible. But what saith the Lord? Why, that he has made this rule to be such that what he made to be right at one time he made to be wrong at another. He made it right for brother and sister to marry in the beginning. He reversed the right and made it wrong after two thousand years. So he made it right for a man to have more than one wife. He reversed it and made it wrong after four thousand years. And it may be well to say in support of our position, that the monogamic rule, which is now the obligation of the seventh commandment, in this particular is the law of Christendom, not from any direct enactment of the New Testament, but from the indirect influence of the Church in its requirement as to its ministry.

The right and wrong, then, of the seventh commandment are not in the nature of things, but in the will of God.

The eighth commandment is, “Thou shalt not steal.” In this God guards the property man may acquire. But property is the mere gift of Providence, and the giver may dispose of it at his pleasure. Hence, having given man the nature to acquire, he makes rule of right and wrong in regard to the things he permits man to call his own. Now our writer would have us understand that the right and wrong as to the taking of my neighbor's property are in the nature of this relation as to property, and are irreversible. But what saith the Lord? He says to steal is to take from our neighbor without right of law. But as he makes the right, he reverses it in his will as to nations and to persons. And he authorises man to give and to take

away, in a thousand modes of enactment, under his general rule. So that, in perfect harmony with this commandment, that which is stealing to-day is not stealing to-morrow. Let it be remembered that the word steal, like covet, and the idea belonging to it, has reference solely to the violation of law. The right and wrong under the eighth rule are then not in the nature of things, but in the will of God.

The ninth commandment is, "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor." In this rule God guards the good he has given to social life by forbidding man to depart from what he believes to be truth towards his "neighbor." Our writer avers that to vary from it at all "is wrong, was wrong, and will be forever." But what saith the Lord? That he has made this law irreversible under all circumstances in which my neighbor can be affected by oath, word, or act. But when he violates his obligations, that is, when he makes himself "unneighborly," God then reverses the rule of veracity to some extent, and makes it right for us to deceive the outlaw by word, or act, when we are in peril from him. So that the falsehood which was wrong yesterday may be right to-day. God likewise gives wide latitude to deception in time of war. He planned himself the deception at Ai. See Josh. viii. 2. And he approved a similar "ambush" in the destruction of the Benjamites. Judges xx. Moreover, he reversed the law of veracity in the case of Rahab the harlot. Josh. ii. and vi. 25. Hebrews xi. 31. Nay, what is military strategy but untruth on a grand scale; and what are tactics but the movements of battalions, brigades, divisions, and corps, in a magnificent combination of lies? Nevertheless, the law of truth is not wholly remitted towards enemies, public or private, because the neighborly relation is not entirely done away by the fact of such enmity. Right and wrong then are made to be, by the ninth rule, not in the unalterable nature of things.

The tenth commandment is, "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife, nor his man servant, nor his maid servant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything that is thy neighbor's." In this part of the law the rule is to enable man to watch over himself in the desires of his

nature. These desires are the gift of God. In themselves they are neither right nor wrong. But God herein tells us they need control under the rule of right. He therefore instructs us when we may and when we may not gratify them. Thus he commands me not to covet my neighbor's property; that is to say, I am not even to wish for it when he has forbidden me to have it, or when the owner may be unwilling to part with it to me. Our writer, however, affirms that to desire my neighbor's goods "is wrong in the nature of things, was always wrong, and ever will be wrong." But what saith the Lord? This: that he reverses the law always when my neighbor has the right or chooses to let me have his property, and that such reversal extends to all that is his, except the wife. Truly this reversal is to be understood, because man's wanting what others have is that which gives existence to much of the necessary interchange of goods among mankind. So that it may have been wrong yesterday to wish to have my neighbor's house, his man servant, his maid servant, his ox, his ass, or anything that was his, and to-day it may be right to desire to have any of them or all. Yea, we might desire to have them from the holiest motives.

So then the reason for the prohibition is that if God had made no law against the desire under the forbidden circumstances, man by voluntarily cherishing it might be tempted to violate his other commandments, and make the things his own by lying, stealing, murder, or to regard them in other evil states of the heart. We may add, too, that the rule is given to restrain the excess of the emotion, even when there is no interdiction in the circumstances as to other persons, for man may desire too much what already is his own. It seems, then, to desire is not wrong in the nature of things, but is made to be right or wrong in the will of God. Indeed, the word covet means in the law to desire under forbidden circumstances. It may be said that we have not shown the entire reversibility of any commandment. Our reply is, we have proved so much to be reversible that what remains unchangeable may fairly be seen to be so only in the will of God.

The condensed result of this examination of our author's fourth

maxim is that God, in his mere pleasure, placed man in certain relations of natural good which he has made to vary with the circumstances of his providence. His law, then, gives the rule of obedience, varying with these conditions. So that what he made right yesterday he may make wrong to-day, as he chooses to change the circumstances of the relations of men. But all the while there is an eternal principle ever unchangeably the same. What is that? Answer: the righteousness of the mere will of God, whatever that will may be. And what more ought man to ask? Ought he not to be satisfied with the mere will of his God? Ought he to require that his Maker should be under the control of a something he sees to be right, not originating in his pleasure, but antecedent to his will? We think man should confide in the will of his Creator as the very thing wherein he is just, and holy, and true, and good.

But it may be asked, do any who receive the Scriptures really not confide in the mere will of God? Yea, the maxim that right and wrong have their foundation in the nature of things is the evidence of this mistrust. What then, it may be further inquired, is the ground of this lack of confidence in man towards his Maker? We answer, it is the old pride of his heart. In other words, it is his will in opposition to that of God. Yea, he hates to submit to the mere will of his Creator, and therefore in the subtlety of self-deception he makes this demand—that his Maker shall stand upon the same level of duty with himself. This he secures when he establishes the principle that right and wrong are in the nature of things eternally, irrespective of the will of the Supreme Being. For, if that be so, then when he submits to right he does not yield to the will of God, simply as such, at all, but he obeys a law existing before that will in the book of eternal truth, common alike to his Maker and to him, and as obligatory upon his God as on himself. Nothing can show less of humility: nothing can exhibit more of pride than this. Do we pass a harsh judgment? We think not, for the argument has brought us fairly to decide whether to trust the word of God, which is just his will, or to trust the reason and intuitions of man, which are just his will. Yea, the ultimate analysis of the

subject is, that we must honor supremely the will of God or the will of man.

REVIEW OF THE FIFTH MAXIM.

“There is that in man which responds to the distinction of right and wrong.”

This principle is altogether in unison with the doctrine we are advocating. Having already shown this in the examination of the second maxim, (see page 189,) we will express the same in other words. There is that in man which responds to the distinction of right and wrong, first, as he conceives ideas in harmony with what God declares; and, secondly, as he feels response to such ideas. Moreover, man when ignorant of the revealed law may form notions of right and wrong in agreement with the divine idea, and have the conscientious sense thereof as really as he who is taught of God in the Scriptures. Not because he has a moral sense which, as such, discerns right and wrong as unchangeable things, but after this wise :

Life and the good belonging to it are the first gift of God, and constitute of course the reason of everything that follows. To secure this gift God makes rule of right. Man, on his part, when under the guidance of revelation, recognises the gift and the rule to be from his Creator. But when without the Scriptures, he, knowing the good there is in life and its manifold relations, makes for himself rule to protect life and its good. And as God has granted to him thoughts like his own, he, although depraved and ignorant, thinks in harmony with his Maker as to many things, in regard to wife, children, friends, neighbors, enemies, and the affairs of life, however little he may know of higher relations. He has then the corresponding feeling or conscience as to all these conceptions. Being, however, without the divine law to guide him, he conceives many ideas in reference to all these things not in harmony with the thoughts of God. Still he believes them to be true and right, and has the response to them as true and right in his feelings just as vividly as if they were the very announced will of God. Hence conscience, simply as conscience, is the same thing in the savage,

the heathen, the Turk, the nominal Christian, the ignorant or enlightened believer: that is to say, it is, as conscience, the same emotional response to what man believes to be right.

The Scriptures fully sustain this view of conscience. We read thus: "For as many as have sinned without law, shall also perish without law: and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law; for not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified. For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these having not the law, are a law unto themselves: which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another." Rom. ii. 12-15. This is conscience as we define it: thus, "which show the work of the law written in their hearts;" that is, their belief of truth by nature when in harmony with the law. "Their conscience also bearing witness;" that is, their emotional response in agreement with what they believe to be right. "Their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another;" that is, the verdict they bring for or against themselves, whether their moral walk has kept pace with their moral judgment. Once more, the Bible teaches, "He that doubteth is damned if he eat, because he eateth not of faith: for whatsoever is not of faith is sin." Rom. xiv. 23. Here again the principle we are advocating is clearly taught, that whatsoever a man does contrary to his belief is therein against his conscience, and is sin to him. Let it be borne in mind that Paul in this place is not affirming that whatsoever is not of faith in God or Christ is sin; for however true that is, in the proper sense, it is not the thing declared here. But he takes occasion from the question before him as to "meats" to teach the broad and general proposition just stated, and which is thus commented on by an esteemed scriptural interpreter: "In all cases, if a man does a thing which he does not believe to be right, it is a sin, and his conscience will condemn him for it." This commentator also adds, very justly, "It may be proper, however, to observe that the converse of this is not always true, that if a man believes a thing to be

right that therefore it is not sin." (Notes on Romans by Rev. Albert Barnes.)

The heathen, then, and all men, will be condemned, not only for not doing what they believed right, in harmony with the divine will, but also for not doing what they believed right, whether it was the truth or not.

Lastly, the word of God declares in reference to the heathen as of others: "For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold the truth in unrighteousness; because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath shewed it unto them. For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse." Rom. i. 18-20. In these three quotations the scriptural elucidation of conscience is completely brought out. First, that conscience is just the emotional confirmation of what man believes to be true and right, whether it be so or not. Secondly, that he will be judged for not doing what he thus believes to be true and right. And lastly, that he will be condemned without excuse for not having a higher conscience; that is, for not having the true conception of the things of God, which he might have from the Scriptures, or without the Bible, from the things that are made. We are now prepared to notice our author's reasoning to sustain his position, that there is that in man, etc., etc. He speaks thus: "This proposition is almost too plain to admit even of illustration. All men instinctively act on it in their treatment of each other; all legislators assume it to be true; all parents regard it as indisputable in their treatment of their children; all authors who write on the subject of morals take it for granted; and all preachers of the gospel make it the ground of their most solemn appeals and most earnest exhortations. As we always assume it to be true that men can be reasoned with, and can be made to see the force of argument; that a landscape will appear beautiful to the eye, and that melody and harmony will be attractive to the ear; that men are capable of friendship, and that there is that in the human soul which may be made the

basis of most enduring affection, so we assume it to be true that there is something in man which will recognise a distinction of right and wrong; which will perceive the beauty and the claims of the one and which will turn from and hate the other."

It would seem from reading this as if the author really thought that whoever denies the maxim before us, in the sense in which he holds it, does in fact therein reject all distinction of right and wrong! But we are persuaded that when God declares a thing to be right or wrong, simply because he wills it so to be, *that* is a distinction which ought to satisfy the human mind; for the mere will of God is, in itself, his infinite conception of the thing during every moment of its changing state in his providence. And, therefore, we are persuaded that when man responds to that distinction, however ignorant of any reason save the will of his Maker, he stands upon a gulf between right and wrong broader, deeper, and more fixed than any which exists in the imaginary distinction of the nature of things; for that notion we think we have shown to be at last only the thoughts and feelings of man's finite and fallible will.

Again, our author says, in continuation of the train of remarks above: "Even the man who would lead us into the paths of error and sin does not base his hopes on the fact that error is a thing that ought to be chosen, or that wrong is a thing that ought to be done, but he labors to convince us that the one is truth and that the other is right, or to lead us into sin contrary to our conviction of what is right and true. The great tempter approached our first parents, not on the presumption that there was nothing in them which would respond to the claims of right, or that there was no power recognising the distinction of right and wrong, but with the hope that he might either convince them that the evil which he proposed was, in the circumstances, right, or that he could induce them to do wrong knowing that it was wrong."

This, we think, an unhappy illustration for our author in several particulars. First, the fall of our first parents may be taken as a fair representation of all the after disobedience of mankind. If, then, our principle is true, it should find support

in what is told us of that first transgression. And it does ; for even this author will hardly deny that the distinction of right and wrong in that generic sin is to be found in the mere will of God ; in other words, that it was the mere interdiction of God which made it wrong to eat of the tree of knowledge of good and evil ! Again, in the examination of the facts in the case, it would seem it was the serpent who first affirmed that there is knowledge lying back of the divine will which ought to be the ground of that will, and on which it must be established as right or rejected as wrong. " And he said unto the woman, Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden ? And the woman said unto the serpent, We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden : but of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die. And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die : for God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil." Gen. iii. 1-5.

Here we have the earliest affirmation that right and wrong are to be sought in truth lying back of the divine will. It may be said this false statement of Satan does not disprove the fact itself. We admit it ; but it is unfortunate that the only intimation of such fact in all the Scriptures should be from the mouth of the tempter, and the very thing which constituted the deception of mankind. For, had the serpent said to the woman what he knew to be truth, that the mere will of God made his command her supreme and only rule of right, he would have established her in faith and innocence. This he would not say. What then ? Why, he must assert an untruth, *i. e.*, that her supreme obligation was not in the word of God, but in something behind it, which she had the right to regard as her higher law, and her Maker was also bound to obey, but had disregarded.

The deception, then, practised by the serpent, was not that he misrepresented the thing constituting the obligation, lying back of the word of God. No. But the deception was in asserting that there is any such thing above the divine will, to which the Creator is responsible, and to which man has right of appeal

from that will, or whereby to judge that will. We reach the same result by following the train of thought in the mind of Eve. She at first stated the law of her obedience correctly and exactly: "God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it." Her last reply then to the serpent ought to have been, I recognise nothing higher than the word of God as obligatory upon me; his mere pleasure is right because it is his pleasure; I know nothing else; get behind me, Satan. She would then have stood. Alas! she believed the adversary, and took of the fruit and did eat.

But there is another very conclusive idea suggested by our author's allusion to the first temptation. He says the tempter approached our first parents on the presumption "that there was something in them that would respond to the claim of right," etc. We think with him, but we feel sure Satan knew full well that that something was (what we are affirming) nothing else than her faith in the word of God. What then? Why, he reasoned with her, knowing that if he could change her belief he would secure her conscience. Yea, his triumph was just in this, that he persuaded the woman to change her belief and to eat the forbidden fruit, verily believing it was right so to do.

This first sin, then, in the circumstances of it, vindicates our position, that conscience is not a moral sense responding to right and wrong in the nature of things, but is the feeling which sanctions whatever is believed to be right in the moral relations of mankind. We may add that this, the first, was also the most profound and subtle of all the falsehoods which Satan hath given to men. For, knowing he could not persuade mankind to deny God altogether, he felt that the idea next in evil was that truth is not in the mere will of God, but in the nature of things. He was sure that wherever he could impress that notion, even on the most pious, he would lower their veneration for the Supreme Being; and in other minds make it, in various shades of thought, supplant God, either to the extent of atheism, or by giving them a rule of rectitude which might be studied without regard to the Creator.

And verily he hath shown his wisdom; for without dwelling upon the grosser conditions of heathenism, we may well ask who

were the philosophers of Greece and Rome but men who made the ideal of the true and right and good and beautiful, the object of their supreme regard, while the people were left to worship dæmons presiding in the sun and stars, in four-footed beasts and creeping things, in seas, springs, trees, flowers; in idols of gold, stone, wood—all the images of man in his good or evil passions. And verily the great tempter must have been satisfied when he saw in Athens, the seat of the wisdom of the world, the full result of his idea given to men, that truth lies back of the will of God. How grimly he must have smiled when he looked upon the altar "to the unknown God;" when he glided among idol temples and statues; reclined in the "painted Stoa" or on Epicurean couches; listened in the Academy; haunted the olive groves around the whispering Ilissus, and heard the philosophers asking each the other, generation after generation, "What is truth?" And how sardonic his laughter when he heard the wisest of them all exclaim in conscious ignorance, "It is not in me;" and the Platonist confess in idle fables, "It is not in me;" while the Epicurean claimed it in wine and revelry, and the Stoic in pride, denying all good or evil, making himself to be God! Finally, as to heathenism, how complete the consummation of the triumph of the tempter when he led the sceptic Pilate—fit representative of the Roman Empire and of "the world which by wisdom knew not God"—to stand face to face with the Incarnate Wisdom, and made him ask in sneer, "What is truth?" then go away, not deigning to wait the answer from the Word of God. But Satan had not exhausted his first and greatest idea of deception. For, since the Christian era, even before the death of the apostles, he tempted the Church with the same heathen philosophy, and when the inspired men were gone and the Book of Life was closed, he caused that philosophy to take possession of the Christian world, and to hold its sway in manifold form ever since.

Yea, he raised up Gnosticism, which was and is "the attempt to solve the great problems of theology by combining the elements of pagan mysticism with the Jewish and Christian traditions." Yea, Gnosticism was and is the *the philosophy of philosophy*—the SATAN OF SATAN. It is this: that God dwells infinitely unap-

proachable in the "abyss;" that from him have emanated many minor spirits; that he created man in malignity and consigned him to sin by uniting his soul with matter, made (by Jehovah) to be the principle of evil; that Jesus Christ was a good spirit who came into the world as the antagonist of Jehovah, to restore man to holiness and happiness; that this he does by appearing in a body not material—it being an illusion, a phantom; that his sufferings were, of course, not real, but in show; that he restores men to virtue—first, in the highest type, granted to the few, in rising above matter, through asceticism—that is, refined religious contemplation, away from the world, in celibacy among men and virginity among women; and, secondly, to the many in lower form and measure, provided they wear out matter in the observance of church penances, rites, and ceremonies.

This system, as we have said, took in what it pleased of all mystic charm, from the mud of the Nile, the Indus, and the Ganges; all in the gods of Egypt, all in the Buddha and Brahma of Hindooism, in the fire-god of Persia, in the Olympus of Greece; and thus gave all that is gorgeous, terrible, mysterious, fascinating, and polluting in heathenism, mingled in every mode of the imagination in mysterious oneness with distorted conceptions of Moses and Christ.

This wonderful conglomerate, although condemned by the Church, (for there was that within it which no conceptions of true religion could accept,) has, notwithstanding, lived in its deepest and worst principles, a leaven of deadly poison, through all the centuries and in all the forms of Christianity even until the present day. And now, what was the ground upon which this huge edifice was built? It was the old Satanic ground, said first by him to lie back of the will of God in the Bible—the ground of the *eternal truth and right in the nature of things*. And truly this ground was and is wide enough and deep enough, not only for Gnosticism in all its myriad combinations, but for all kindred systems of atheism; yea, for all that has ever been called *moral philosophy*. Let facts decide.

Who were the patristic writers, (that is, the early fathers after the apostles,) and all who followed them until the time of estab-

lished Romanism, but men who interpreted the Scriptures in conformity with the notions of Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, and other Greek seekers after wisdom—notions baptized in the mingled waters of the Ganges and the Jordan and called Christianity? There they are—Origen, Tertullian, Cyprian, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Augustine, yea, fifty others. Again, who were the writers under the recognised Papacy but men teaching Roman, Greek, Indian, Persian, Egyptian wisdom as the wisdom of God; yea, older than Christ or Jehovali—not indeed in so many words but in practical impression? There they are—Lombard, Aquinas, Scotus, Occam; there they are, the Jesuit Casuists, Bauny, Escobar, Molina, Sanchez—their name is legion—men consigned to immortal infamy in the pages of Pascal. There they are—heathen philosophers claiming to be Christian, and exhausting their ingenuity (had that been possible) in discovering infinitesimal distinctions of right and wrong in the nature of things.

Lastly, who have been the moral philosophers since the Reformation but men who were seeking just what Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Epicurus, Zeno, Cicero, Seneca, were seeking, viz., *the ultimate rule of life*; the rule, first, *objectively*; that is, without the mind; and, secondly *subjectively*; that is, within the mind. There they are, Hobbes, Grotius, Puffendorf, Leibnitz, Descartes, Malebranche, Spinoza, Shaftesbury, Wollaston, Hutcheson, Butler, Adam Smith, Stewart, Brown, Hume, Cudworth, Coleridge, Bentham, Paley, Whewell, Mackintosh, Condillac, D'Holbach, Rousseau, Kant, Fichte, Hegel, Mamiani, Gioberti, the two Edwardses, Wayland, Hickok, Hamilton. But time fails to name them all. Well, what have they discovered? Why, a few of these thinkers have, indeed, reached the result, (to be regarded as their mere speculation, however,) that the objective rule of right should be found in the will of God; while the many have supposed it to be in the state; other some in the greatest happiness; all, in a word, in the nature of things. Yea, all these commingling and conflicting thoughts have ever been the waves of that boundless bottomless sea of atheism, *the nature of things*, where Satan intended man should ever drift and never

find the shore of truth. While the subjective rule, meanwhile, has been placed in pride, in reciprocal sympathy in the inner sense, giving moral distinctions in immediate intuition, etc., etc.!

Satan, then, has given *this* to be the final result of moral philosophy—the consummation of the reasoning of six thousand years! Verily he has made it to be in final wisdom what it was all the time, what it was in his first revelation in Eden. There it is, the whole of it, in his first subtle denial that the mere will of God is the rule of right: “Yea, doth not God know” that lying back of his word is the truth and right to which he is responsible as really and fully as man! Yea, that is the beginning and the end! Yea, St. Peter’s chair at Rome, we are told, is the old throne of Jupiter. And verily, the chair of moral philosophy, stripped of the embroidery of ages, stands revealed “Satan’s seat.”

The Scriptures we think fully sustain this train of thought. They teach that Christ has come—the way, the truth, the life; and that he has declared that with God there is no objective rule; for that his will is the rule, because it is *his* will; and that *his word* is *itself* the alpha and omega of right, while man’s conception of it and submission to it is ever his inner principle of everlasting life. Moreover, Christ has taught that the Bible is its own highest witness, finding its explanation and development first in itself, and subordinately in creation and providence. This being so, it follows, that were men perfect like the good in heaven, they would ever receive the simple word in absolute faith, whether understood or not.

Moreover, Christ has taught that God never reasons to sustain his word, except when good men doubted it in their remaining depravity, or when bad men rejected it and could only be reached through appeals to what they already truly believed to be right in the moral relations of the world. But Christ has not only taught that truth and right are wholly in his will: he has directly given sentence against this very philosophy. He proclaims it to have been then, and to be now, the wisdom of the Greek—the wisdom of the world which knew not God. 1 Cor. i. 20. He condemns it as science falsely so called. 1 Tim. vi. 26. He

warns Christians to beware lest any man spoil them through this philosophy. He calls it vain deceit after the traditions of men, after the rudiments of the world and not after Christ. Col. ii. 8. He thus decides against moral philosophy in all time ; for in every age it has been neither more nor less than that same wisdom of the Greek which knew not God. Yea, he condemns not merely the deliverances of this philosophy, but the ground from which it speaks, *i. e.*, that truth and right are in the nature of things and distinct from the will of God. Yea, he condemns not merely the fruit : he passes judgment on the tree and the root. He warns not only against the stream : he bids you beware of the poisonous fountain.

To turn, then, from Christ to learn truth from moral philosophy, is as vain as it would be to despise the sun at noon-day and seek to find the source of light in studying the glimmering made by the ever-changing leaves in a boundless forest.

Then, since Christ has come, what need has there been for the speculations of moral philosophy ? There has been no use for it in man's relations to God : he had the Bible. There has been no call for it in his duty to himself : he had the Bible. There has been no necessity for it in his obligations to wife, children, friends, neighbors, enemies : he had the Bible. There has been nothing in it to reveal to him the origin of his authority over his fellow man : he had the Bible. There has been nothing in it to tell him his duty as a subject or a citizen, to help him enact laws or obey them : he had the Bible. There has been nothing in it to give him right to make war or to make peace : he had the Bible. There has been no use for it in any art, any science, any profession, any business : he had the Bible. Its only use has been *that good* which God brings always out of evil. Yea, he causes the wrath of man to praise him ; the remainder he restraineth. And even so he has permitted moral philosophy to praise him in unfolding to the intelligent universe the vanity and folly of that wisdom by which the world knows not God. Except this use, we may truly say, if all its volumes had been consigned to the flames, there would have been no greater loss to mankind than when "the books of curious

arts" were burned before all men at Ephesus, albeit the counted price was found to be fifty thousand pieces of silver. Will it be said that we herein evince the spirit of Omar the Caliph, when he ordered the Alexandrian Library to be destroyed as useless if it contained only what was already in the Koran, or mischievous if anything else? Well, we have just to say, that, if that collection had been simply books of moral philosophy, the command of the Arabian, (if he ever gave it,) was a blessing to the world.

But, Christ's condemnation of moral philosophy, warns us against it, not merely as useless, not merely as that broken cistern which can hold no water. No. He tells us it is one vast tank of pestilence, ever full and running over in streams of poison on all the face of the earth; the sea of Sodom, whose exhalations reach the heavens. Yea, see the deadly water ever oozing from all schools, all universities, all colleges, all lycæums, all books, and tracts, where men in every relation of truth and right find the Lethe which is forgetfulness of God. Yea, go to the closet of the king or the statesman, to the hall of the legislator, to the bench of the judge, to the bar of the advocate, to the observatory of the astronomer, to the laboratory of the chemist, to the desks of all learning: go into all families: go into all streets where men congregate in trade: go into all saloons of fashion, and hear men ask, "*What is truth, what is right?*" And listen whether they give in reply, "The will of Christ." No, the response is ever in some notion of *moral philosophy*. Yea, you have it concentrated in one sentence of Thomas Jefferson: "Jesus Christ taught what he deemed truth, but *I think otherwise*." Yea, there you have it. Christ so thought—"I think otherwise." Yea, you can feel the all-pervading evil everywhere. Just utter any truth, simply from Christ, and instantly, even among believers of the Bible, the compressed or the curled lip, or the averted, vacant eye, reveal the heart unwilling to submit to Christ. "*I think otherwise*" is the response in the mind, if not in open reply; or if the truth be admitted, you see at once it is received, not from Christ, but from the man, the woman, yea, the boy, the girl, just as it may please them to say—"I have

thought the same way." On the contrary, give out any thought not from Christ, but from Kant, or Coleridge, or Wayland, or some Father Bauny, or "Ecce Homo," and you are heard with respect; nay, you are at once in the Athenian market place, in the midst of the Epicurean and the Stoic, and may spend your time pleasantly in hearing some new thing.

The immeasurable evil of this vain science has been in this: that Christian men have sanctioned the idea that truth may be sought back of the will of Christ in the eternal verity of things; and therefore that there is law higher than God as he speaks in the Bible. That has ever given intensity to the curse of this all-pervading moral philosophy.

For, what would now be the scriptural mind of the Church and the world, in the knowledge of truth, had Christian men from the days of the apostles ever declared, clearly, fully, with unwavering heart, There can be no speculation in that imagined region lying back of the will of Christ, for he has said, there is no such world of truth? What if they had ever spoken in the words of God to Job and his philosophic comforters: "Who is this that darkeneth counsel by words without knowledge?" What if they had ever given the more awful rebuke: "Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus?" What if they had ever taught that Christ shall not be interpreted by imaginary maxims of truth and right in the nature of things; but that Christ shall interpret Christ, first, in his word explained by himself, and next in illustrations from the things he has made, and the unfoldings of his providence?

Yea, had this ever been the heart and life, ever the faith and works of Christian men, then the conflict between the seed of the woman and the serpent would have been fairly fought out, and every bruise of the head and every bruise of the heel clearly seen. Then Satan would never have come as an angel of light preaching another gospel in moral philosophy. Then, long ere this, he would have been seen falling like lightning from heaven.

We know, indeed, that false interpretations of Scripture would still have been given. But the Holy Spirit would have the more

easily revealed the truth from glory to glory, had this darkness of philosophy been driven away, and nothing left to obscure the light but the native shadow of the soul.

REVIEW OF THE SIXTH MAXIM.

“A revelation from God will not contradict any truth, however that truth may be made known.”

This the author sustains by the following “suggestions:” 1. “A revelation will not contradict its own teachings; that is, it will not deny in one place what it affirms in another; or will not state as a doctrine in one place what is palpable contradiction to what is stated in another. 2. A revelation will not contradict scientific truth. 3. A revelation will not contradict historical truth. 4. A revelation will not contradict any moral truth.”

We reply, if we have shown that truth is the mere conception of the divine will, then God must tell us what things he wills to be immutable truth, and what he leaves to be affected by his changing providence. In this sense, then, we admit that “a revelation from God will not contradict any truth, however that truth is made known.” That is, God will not ordain a thing to be doctrine—make it unchangeable—and then contradict it. He will not permit a thing to be historic fact, and then contradict it. He will not cause a thing to be immutable moral duty, and then contradict it.

This statement is in harmony with our principles. But as this sixth maxim is only another way in which our author affirms his controlling idea that truth is unchangeably such in the nature of things, irrespective of the divine will, we, of course, reject the maxim in that sense.

Observe, however, we do not hold that God ever contradicts truth. For, truth being just his will, a thing is unalterably true only as he pleases it to so be; while outside of what he ordains to be immutable, he makes to be true or not to be true as the progress of events may unfold his pleasure. We think we have established this in our remarks on the second table of the law. (See

on fourth maxim.) We need, then, only say, in this connexion, touching the author's suggestions, first on doctrinal and moral truth, that God from the beginning ordained the parental relation and its obligations, but so subject to his will, that he might modify, change, or annul it in his pleasure. Hence, when he commanded Abraham to sacrifice his son, he did not contradict the truth of parental duty. He only by the new command made void for the time the law not to slay a child. But this author teaches that the relation itself made it contrary to truth that Abraham should take the life of his child. Then we think the revelation from God to do that thing was a palpable contradiction of the truth of the parental obligation.

The writer, as we shall see in another part of this work, reasons to prove that that command does not affect his maxim. How far he succeeds will be understood in its place. We only now affirm what we shall then maintain, that if we are to believe that truth exists in the nature of things, then God did in that order to Abraham contradict the truth.

Secondly, the "suggestion" in relation to science as quoted, runs thus: "A revelation will not contradict scientific truth;" that is, it will not contradict *the law of nature*. We reply, the law of nature is the mere pleasure of God, that certain things shall be the uniform results of the action of cause and effect. That uniformity, however, continues wholly in the divine will. It is God's promise, so to speak, that that regularity of succession shall go on. Save for that promise, he might cause a different result in every action of nature. Yea, he might make it a fact, that men should gather grapes of thorns and figs of thistles. But he has never given a law of nature to be beyond his continued influence. So far from it, he has revealed from the beginning his constant control over it. Every miracle was such revelation. Take, first, the most startling—the promised resurrection of the dead. The whole subject of life and death reads thus. God made man immortal in body. After the fall his life was shortened to about a thousand years, as its highest reach, then to some hundreds, finally to threescore and ten, or fourscore, if by reason of strength. Life and death, therefore, are

in the mere pleasure of God. Hence he says: "It is appointed unto man once to die." What more? Why, God declares in relation to the whole race, "The dead shall rise." In saying this he does not contradict the truth that he had appointed unto man once to die. He simply reveals a new truth that the dead shall live again. Neither does he contradict what science ought to declare; for science ought merely to say, I teach only the fact that man lives, dies, and returns to dust. I do not know he will live again. I do not know he will not.

Now we are pleased to be able to quote this writer as agreeing with us in this statement. He says, (in his Notes on Hebrews ix. 27,) "Death is the result of appointment." (Gen. iii. 10.) "It is not the effect of chance or hap-hazard. It is not a debt of nature. It is not the condition to which man was subjected by the laws of his creation. It is not to be accounted for by the mere principles of physiology. God could as well have made the heart play forever as for fifty years. Death is no more the regular result of physical laws than the guillotine and the gallows are. It is in all cases the result of intelligent appointment, and for an adequate cause. That cause, or the reason of that appointment, is sin." Here our author denies as we do that truth is in the nature of things, on the all-important subject of life and death. He affirms with us that man lives and dies in the mere will of God. Then he must say also with us, that God, when he reveals the resurrection, contradicts no truth of science, if science speaks as she ought to teach. Once more, let us consult the Bible as to the nature of vegetable life. Here is a grain of wheat. It is sown. It dies, all save the germ. From that there is wheat again. But why is there wheat again? The Scripture says it is the mere pleasure of God. (1 Cor. xv. 38.) That is, God had at first commanded the earth to bring forth the herb, yielding seed after his kind. (Gen. i. 11.) Suppose there had been no such self-imposed obligation, and God had revealed that after a time wheat should yield barley, yea, sheaves of gold, that would have been merely his pleasure so to order it. He would have denied nothing true science could have said. She would have taught, I see that God in his pleasure has made wheat yield

wheat ; but he may for aught I can say to the contrary reveal that it should bring forth anything else.

We must again express our gratification that our author agrees with us here also. The passage in Corinthians referred to, reads thus : "That which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body that shall be, but bare grain, it may chance of wheat or of some other grain ; but God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him, and to every seed his own body." Our author in his commentary speaks thus : "Paul here traces the result to God, to show that there is no chance, and that *it did not depend on the nature of things*, but was dependent on the wise arrangement of God. There was nothing in the decayed kernel itself that would produce this result ; but God chose that it should be so." (Barnes's Notes, 1 Cor. xv. 37, 38.) Now it is known to all that the kingdoms of animal and vegetable life are the highest regions of science. If then all the results therein come into being simply as it pleases God, and are not dependent on the nature of things, then surely all in the mineral world, and in whatever else is called NATURE, must come to pass from the choice of the All-wise. So the Scriptures teach. They reveal that God created first the ESSENTIAL MATTER ; that this substance of all things (save spirit) was without form and void—that is, without *law of nature*, or *force of action*,—and therefore *without properties*. That then "the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters. And God said let there be light, and there was light." (Gen. i. 2, 3.) Thus by his mere will he gave the FIRST LAW OF MOTION. Then followed the first FIATS of the days of creation, each saying, "LET THERE BE" that which was the result solely of a new expression of WILL : the firmament in the midst of the waters ; the gathered waters ; the earth bringing forth grass and herb after his kind ; the lights in the firmament of the heavens ; the waters bringing forth the moving creature and fowl in the open firmament of heaven ; the earth bringing forth the living creature after his kind ; lastly, the "*Let us make man.*" Thus "the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them." The laws of nature were at that time ordained. But in all this God no where said that he would never will anything else than the results of the succession

of cause and effect then put in motion. He left himself perfectly free to act in his pleasure. In the flood, therefore, God contradicted no law of nature. It was simply his pleasure that the heavens and earth "by his word" that had been "of old" and then were, should "by his word" be overflowed with water and perish. (2 Peter iii. 5, 6.) So, when Moses stood before the burning bush, God contradicted no law of nature in the wonders he there wrought. He had willed Moses' rod to be a staff of wood; he then willed it to be a serpent, and then a rod again. So it had been his pleasure that the Nile should be a stream of water; then to confound Pharaoh, he chose it to run blood. So he had ever given the succession of day and night, but he at that time sent thick darkness for three days over Egypt, except on Goshen, where the Israelites had light in their dwellings. In all this there was no contradiction of science. These supernatural acts were only a new revelation of his pleasure. Thus, too, when he said "Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel," (Isa. vii. 14,) there was no contradiction of the law of generation, *i. e.* that birth should be from a human pair. He now in the birth of Christ was pleased that that child should be born under other conditions—be man and God in one person,—should live, be made perfect through suffering, die, rise from the dead, and ascend to heaven. What has science to say against all this, if, forsooth, nature is in her laws the mere expression of the divine will? Verily, science has nothing to object. Nay, we would like to persuade ourselves that this writer might be brought to respond—true science has nothing to say in denial. To conclude this train of thought. God has conceived mathematical numbers and geometric figures to be what they are, and made them to be permanent ideas in the conceptions of man. But, save for this divine arrangement, God could have made man to form ideas of number and figure different from what he now does. Yea, he has in fact, so constituted the human mind that it did believe for centuries, and until a few years ago, the Ptolemaic Astronomy as the true science. So he had made the mind of man to conceive and hold as truth ideas conceived through the senses. Yet this same mind may deny and does

deny (not in insanity merely, but in its free conception of supposed truth,) the testimony of the senses. Yea, God has so created the powers of thought, that more than half of civilised men believe, contrary to the evidences of their senses, that what all other men are certain is bread and wine, is not bread and wine, but is flesh and blood.

The conclusion of the whole statement is this: A revelation from God will not contradict scientific truth; that is, it will not contradict the *fact*, that, until such revelation, certain things had been truth in the divine will, and then should cease to be truth. With this explanation, God has no limit to what he may unfold to man, and therefore cannot contradict anything which true science has to unfold.

But is there not a *science* which assumes to say it is contradicted if a professed revelation from God proclaims things not sanctioned by its maxims? Yea, there is a science which holds truth to be in the nature of things—that is, truth from the impersonal law of atheism, which says that thing.

This LAW OF ATHEISM is held in many modes of statement. We need only give three. 1. That the elementary substance of all things is from eternity, and has LAW IN ITSELF, from which the universe of matter and what is called mind has *come into being*. This is naked unsophisticated atheism. 2. The idea that a personal intelligence did indeed give existence to this elementary substance, endow it with that same law to develop everything, and then withdrew himself forever into the unapproachable abyss. This is only a more specious and dangerous denial of the God of the Bible. 3. The notion of the writer before us, which is, that *all ideas* exist from eternity and of necessity in the divine nature, back of the will of God, that he there sees them ready made; and that that perception of all things present in his mind is his wisdom; that he then through his will merely declares and carries out in action what he thus perceives in his nature. This is the most subtle and mischievous form of atheism; because, while it pretends to affirm belief in a PERSONAL JEHOVAH, it teaches the same unwilling law of things, to be the eternal *fact*; first, indeed, in a divine nature,

and then in the nature of the universe. And thus it makes God in his will to be nothing more than that power or life which is the first and continued motion of the *impersonal law* of avowed atheism.

Observe, this law is the same in these three modes of atheism. And the scientific idea based upon it is the same; namely, that all things are results of the unchangeable succession of cause and effect. The Bible, then, does contradict this science. And this science consistently does deny the Bible. This contradiction is, of course, felt and affirmed by every avowed atheist. It is felt, too, by every man who holds that idea of science, although not a rejecter of the Scriptures. It is felt by every Christian who holds this notion of natural law. Yea, this author himself shows the contradiction in his writings; for, while in his book before us he holds that truth lies back of the will of God, first in the divine nature, and then in the nature of things, yet, in his "Notes" on the New Testament, he teaches as we do, that the nature of things is just the will of God.

REVIEW OF THE SEVENTH MAXIM.

"A pretended revelation which should contradict established truth could not be received by mankind."

In the examination of each preceding maxim, the question has been how far we could hold it in our views of truth, or should reject it on the writer's notion. This maxim we must treat differently; for we can receive it neither on our principles, nor on those of the writer. Nay, he seems timid himself under this seventh head, for he says: "How far it is to be admitted that truth in science, in morals, in history, is so certain as to come within this rule, is quite a distinct question, but the rule itself is perfectly clear." That is to say, the rule as an abstract proposition, is perfectly clear, but as a *concrete* every-day fact, in the actual workings of the human mind, he is not so certain of it! Very good; for when tested by what has been the contradictory faith of man, on all subjects whatsoever, the maxim is utterly without foundation. Observe, if the writer intended to say that a pre-

tended revelation which should contradict truth established in the certain knowledge of all men, could not be received by mankind, he would be only uttering the truth, that none of mankind could believe what all mankind knew to be false. But that is not the condition in which the maxim is to be tested. No; it must be examined under the state of things actually seen among men. Let us then so consider it. Take the belief which has existed in matters of science, and one test will do. What is it? This: the Christian world now believes that the modern astronomy is established truth. Yet the false science of astronomy is held, and has ever been, by the overwhelming majority of mankind, and as revelation from heaven. Nay, it was the faith of the Church itself for ages, as revealed science. But we will rise higher. How has it been in the interpretation of the Bible, as to theology? Let one illustration suffice. Many claiming the Christian name have contended, like this writer, that *one* cannot be believed to be *three*. And, therefore, if a pretended revelation should contradict the established truth, that *one* is not *three*, for instance, if it should teach such a thing as that God is ONE GOD in THREE PERSONS, such a revelation could not be received by mankind. But what is the fact? Just this. A majority of Christendom have ever received the Bible as the true revelation, and have ever affirmed that it *does teach* that God exists as ONE JEHOVAH in THREE PERSONS. It matters not a jot that Unitarians say such faith is in contradiction of the established truth; that *one* cannot be *three*, *three* cannot be *one*, in any sense, as held in reference to the Deity; still Trinitarians do hold, and have held from the beginning, the doctrine of the tripersonality of the Godhead as revelation from the Lord.

Once more: many think it is established truth that God would never have ordained the existence of moral evil; and therefore, a pretended revelation which should contradict that established truth could not be received by mankind. But on the contrary, many receive the Bible as teaching that "the providence of God extendeth itself to the first fall, and all other sins of angels and men."

Lastly: some are sure it is established truth that man cannot

rightly hold his fellow-man as his slave; and that a pretended revelation which should contradict that established truth could not be received by mankind. But very many of the wisest and best men of every age have held that the Bible does reveal that God commanded his people under the Mosaic Law to hold slaves, and regulates now, under the Christian rule of love, the duties of the master and his bondman.

These illustrations might be greatly extended. But the result of the criticism is clear: that this maxim is absolutely false, tested in every light in which the idea in it can be looked at.

REVIEW OF THE EIGHTH MAXIM.

“A revelation on the same line of subjects, will, so far as consistent, carry forward the truth already known—not contradict it.”

We acknowledge this maxim on our principles; thus, Truth is simply what God wills to be. And when he declares that the same truth shall pervade all his works, then a revelation on the same line of subjects will, so far as coincident, carry forward the truth already known, not contradict that word of God. But aside from such promise of God, we must reject the maxim. Take the writer's illustration suggested by the telescope. Suppose God had revealed before the discoveries of the telescope that the fixed stars were under other physical laws than those of our solar system; nay, that every one of them was under its own peculiar code of laws; there would have been nothing in such a revelation contradicting any truth already known. It would have been only the revelation of a new truth that laws which God willed to be in our heavens he chose not to be in other worlds. It is true, indeed, he has willed that all the physical laws with which we are acquainted should act, so far as we have learned, in the most distant stars. And in that fact he gratifies our sense of his unity of design. But had he revealed the infinite variety just imagined, the faith of man would instantly have received it as a new manifestation of the divine perfections. As some proof of this remark, we may say that the discoveries of the telescope have in fact disclosed so much difference in the physical condi-

tions of the other planets, from what prevails on our earth, that Whewell, of Cambridge, England, founded upon that difference, his remarkable book, "The Plurality of Worlds," to prove that the earth is the only one of the heavenly bodies which is or can be inhabited. The idea is briefly this: the telescope shows that Mercury, Venus, Mars, Jupiter, Saturn, Uranus, and Neptune, are so different from the earth in distance from the sun, in density, light, heat, day and night, the seasons, the year, that they could not be inhabited by animals such as are on the earth. And as we cannot imagine any other physical creatures than such as are on this planet, therefore the countless millions of fixed stars, and their satellites, if they have any, are nothing more than shining particles of matter without life, ever moving before the eye of God! Now, suppose God had revealed Whewell's idea, would such a message have been carrying forward truth already known as to the earth, in the author's conception of truth? Certainly not. And yet would mankind have been justified in saying that such a revelation contradicted any thing known before? No; it would have been only the will of God in a new communication of truth.

REVIEW OF THE NINTH MAXIM.

"A revelation will not in its teachings violate the constitutional principles of our nature."

We receive this maxim so far only as we find the following truth: that the constitutional nature of man is the mere gift of God; and therefore he instructs man when to yield to its suggestions and when not; nay, when to refuse its strongest emotions. The Bible teaches that this control was commanded when that constitution was in its perfect state. It follows, therefore, that if men were now in that unfallen condition, God would reveal when they should suspend, or do violence to the nature he has given. All, consequently, we have any right to believe, is, that in our present depraved mind, God having given such original nature will not suspend or reverse it utterly, or suffer it to be wholly changed; but will regard it as his pleasure that we shall

respect that nature, yet under all modifications of restraint, self-denial, rejection, disregard, violation, crucifixion, such as he sees fit to command. In this sense only we receive the maxim.

But this author's idea is, that man has a constitutional nature RIGHT IN ITSELF, irrespective of the divine will, to which a satisfactory appeal can be made as a test of the truth of the Bible. In that idea we reject the maxim wholly.

Indeed, the writer seems to have some misgivings himself; for at the outset of his agreement he tells us that by *constitutional* he means us clearly to understand that he refers "to man as he came from God; to the nature with which he was originally endowed." He then says: "It is difficult, indeed, now to determine exactly what this was; for no one in human form, save one, has ever shown since the first man was upon the earth what this was. We can infer what it was only from a few slight hints in the account of the creation of man in the Bible, and by endeavoring to detach from the idea of man all that is the result of corruption and sin, as we ascertain an ancient inscription or an ancient figure on a shield by removing the earth and rust which may have accumulated around it and over it." He goes on then to assure us, that, notwithstanding this difficulty, "there are underlying all that is depraved and impure, indications of the original constitution of man, and what may properly be regarded as his nature as he came from the hands of his Maker." * * * "There are accurate deductions of reason; there are just convictions of conscience; there is a moral sense which approves of what is right, and which disapproves of what is wrong." As the sum of his illustrations, he writes: "Thus, if in a book professing to be a revelation from God, a communication were found to treat our children with neglect, such a command would be a clear demonstration it could not be from God, and the race could not be bound to receive it."

Now we feel sure this statement cannot stand the test of any searching examination. For the first look shows that the writer *reasons in a circle*. He tells us his maxim is *self-evident truth*, founded on the original constitution of man as he came from the hand of God. And as such self-evident truth, he holds it to

be a satisfactory touchstone of the scripture revelation. But in the very assertion he confesses that without the Bible he has no proof on which to found a maxim, indeed, no proof at all, that man ever had any other nature than he has now. The Bible then, it seems, must first prove the maxim before the maxim can be brought to test the revelation. This is reasoning in a circle. Yea, without the Scriptures, it is the mere dream of poets, the sheer imagination of philosophers, that there was in the beginning of man's history a golden age, when men did not kill one another, and did not steal. But surely no maxim, no self-evident truth, can be brought from that fancied golden age as to man's original nature, wherewith to challenge the Bible. Our author then may well mistrust this maxim when he brings it to interrogate the word of God.

But my main objection is that the writer has made for himself a conception of the original nature of man ; calls it a maxim ; affirms it to be the universal belief of men ; and thereupon declares that a revelation will not in its teachings violate that idea of the constitution of human nature ! Verily he asks too much from our credulity. Verily he ought to know that the vast majority of the race, who are unenlightened by the gospel and yet are as wise as he without the Bible, laugh to scorn his maxim as a test of revelation, and still more as to rule of conduct. Let us inquire. Here are the Indian Rain Doctor, the Chinese Mandarin, the Brahmin Priest, the Turkish Mufti, all representative men, well qualified to decide *what is truth in the nature of things* without the Christian revelation, and how to test by unaided reason, by the moral sense, and intuitional emotions, whether a pretended revelation is, or is not, from God. Well, let us hear what sanction this writer obtains from these men, who speak for seven hundred millions of mankind. Here is the result. All of them admit, to a certain extent, his principles of human nature ; but they insist it is right to violate them by divine permission. Yea, they agree that proper regard should be had to life ; but they hold it must be taken in religious sacrifice, in revenge in social custom. They agree that parents should be honored and children cared for ; but they believe parents should

be abandoned to perish, and children to be killed under varied and venerated requirements. They agree that the wife should be loved; but she must be the slave, and be burnt on the funeral pile of her husband, under holiest obligation. They agree that womanly honor should be preserved; yet it must be yielded in many sacred rites and usages. They agree that truth does very well sometimes; but it is oftener better to suspend it, according to their scriptures. They agree men ought not to covet in some sense; but they give the history of their gods to establish the constant violation of the principle. This is what we hear in our attendance at the conference between this moral philosopher and the Magi of the Eastern and African world. His maxim evidently is not received by these men. Nay, when we come to believers in the Bible, this writer ought to know that his ideas of reason and the moral sense are rejected by men as able as he to understand that book.

We must think, then, that this maxim, this self-evident truth, is no truth at all, in the writer's idea; and that the notion we should have of man's constitutional nature is that which we have given—that it is the mere gift of God; and he makes it right for us to control, suspend, or reverse it, as he sees fit to reveal in his word and providence.

ARTICLE IV.

RITUALISM—FROM A LAYMAN'S POINT OF VIEW. *

The epithet Ritualism is applied to efforts, in and out of the Episcopal Church, to modify the ceremonial or form of worship in Protestant assemblies. In discussing it, the first question that arises is, what is the connexion of this movement in the Episcopal churches with the corresponding movement out of them? Some *data* for the solution of this question are afforded by the fact that the Church of England Ritualists declare that they attach importance to their ceremonial because it is an expression of some of their peculiar doctrines. As those whom newspaper paragraphists call by the same name in other Protestant churches, would utterly repudiate these doctrines, the connexion between the two classes must be merely superficial. Therefore, we shall treat of them separately, beginning with the Episcopalians.

1. The Ritualists form the extreme wing of the High Church party in the English Church. There are in that Church a variety of religious beliefs, High, Low, and Broad. But two, however, can find any definite foothold for their doctrines in the Prayer Book. As there is in the United States no connexion of Church and State, the Broad Churchmen scarcely exist here.

In discussing Church of England Ritualism, we shall treat in order of the following points: 1. The common doctrines of High Churchmen and Ritualists in distinction from the evangelical doctrine. 2. The tendencies of those views. 3. The effects

* The present writer, it may be well to say, was till middle life an Episcopalian, and for over ten years a communicant of that Church. We were early subjected to exclusively High Church influences, and were surrounded in youth by those who approved of the High Church (Puseyite) movement at Oxford, and were familiar with the writings of that party and its disciples, to which our early religious reading was almost confined. Until on the threshold of middle life, we never had a distinct understanding of the practical doctrines of evangelical Christians.

produced by the party. 4. The past history and present aspect of the party. 5. The best mode of opposing its advocates.

1. The common doctrines of High Churchmen and Ritualists in distinction from the evangelical doctrine. High Churchmen and Ritualists agree with evangelical Christians in believing that when men become Christians they receive an extraordinary influence of God's Spirit, called regeneration, or the new birth. High Churchmen believe that baptism is the means for its bestowal; Low or evangelical Churchmen, that it is bestowed through the truth and when a man is justified by faith. High Churchmen also believe that the validity of any minister's ordination depends on his ability to trace its authority through a succession of bishops up to Christ. The evangelical doctrine denies any such succession, and teaches that God's call is what makes a true minister.

We shall, to save space, merely refer to those parts of the Prayer Book in which the two parties find their doctrines. Any one who will take a Prayer Book can, by turning to the index at the end, find the places and verify our statements.

HIGH CHURCH DOCTRINE.

Baptismal Regeneration.

Catechism. Answers 2, 15, 18. (Answers are not numbered in the Prayer Book, but as there are only twenty-five they can easily be counted.)

Ministration of Public Baptism of Infants. Prayer beginning, "We yield thee hearty thanks."

Ministration of Baptism to such as are of riper years. Prayers beginning, "Almighty and immortal God," and "Almighty and everlasting God."

Apostolical Succession.

Form and manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating bishops, priests, and deacons.

Ordering of Priests. The ordaining words, "Receive the Holy Ghost," etc.

Consecration of Bishops. The consecrating words "Receive the Holy Ghost," etc.

EVANGELICAL DOCTRINE.

Articles of Religion. Articles X., XI., XII., XIII., XIX.

The following arguments show the inconsistency of the doctrine of baptismal regeneration with that of justification by faith alone:

1. All who exercise saving faith are justified. All justified persons are regenerate. *Ergo*, All who exercise saving faith are regenerate.

2. None but the regenerate can exercise saving faith. None but baptized persons are regenerate. *Ergo*, None but baptized persons can exercise saving faith. In other words, faith cannot justify a man until he is baptized.

The reader will observe that it is baptismal regeneration still more than apostolical succession which strikes at the root of truth vital to salvation.

2. We shall show what is the tendency of ritualistic doctrines, and that the evangelical view has a different tendency. If the sacraments are channels of grace, without which heaven cannot be obtained, (and this is the only consistent statement of the doctrine, more or less distinctly adhered to in proportion to the degree of High Churchism,) the men who have in their hands the power of administering the sacraments, are invested with an awful power and rule. The dogma of apostolical succession enhances the power, by deriving the authority of the clergy, independently of the laity, in outward succession from Christ. Thus the whole system is skilfully adapted to serve a love of priestly power, authority, and influence.

There is scarcely any feeling in the human heart which a man can have so strongly with so little consciousness of it as love of power, prestige, or importance. It always develops itself under favorable circumstances. Evangelical clergymen, even the best of them, sometimes give indications of it in a wish to subject other persons to the rule of their consciences. The history of the Church, whenever, quite contrary to her divine charter, she has been put in possession of temporal power, shows that the possession of authority develops the love of it in the very best.

men, in whom this love and the abuses of it are disguised by the fact that they wish to do good with it. Men in power do, all at once, forget that no good ever comes from infringing any man's just liberty under the delusive idea of benefiting him. Experience has proved that this is true even of the most pious men. The time was when mankind, in their first admiration of the goodness which Christianity (when out of power) had developed, rashly but confidingly thought that it would be a happy idea to intrust government to the good, and so placed it in the hands of the Church. So fearfully was the trust misused, that men have not yet recovered from their horror of priestly rule, and still think priests, if not Christians, of all men most ready to abuse power. While it was undoubtedly proved that good men and ministers have a tendency to love authority, and do abuse it, it is a mistake to suppose they are proved to love it better, or are more ready to abuse it than other men. The mistake originated in supposing that church members were necessarily good men. Men become church members by a not obviously false profession of faith in Christ, which is a thing voluntarily made, and of course open to be made by any bad man who loves power. As soon as temporal rule was placed in the hands of the Church, to enter which was a voluntary matter, bad men rushed in like a torrent, and the greater part of the evil was done by them in the name of the good. It is not proved that good ministers abuse power more than others; but it certainly is clearly, irrefragably, shown that it is a bad thing for them, *as a class*, to be intrusted with any rule or influence which would render the laity absolutely dependent on them for any right.

Perhaps some of our readers may be inclined to smile at any imputation of a wish to claim priestly power in this day when the temporal authority of the priesthood is, in all countries, so evidently tottering to its fall. This tendency of Ritualism, they will say, can amount to nothing. It will make no minister claim priestly authority for its own sake, since he can have no possible means of enforcing it. But that this is a mistake, the smallest observation will convince any one. A large part of the world is still ruled by a priesthood, by means of superstition.

Superstition is a belief of things so contrary to fact or the evidence of the senses, that they cannot be believed without some excitement of the imagination. To believe that any spiritual change is necessarily produced by baptism is thus contrary to fact. To believe that ordination in the line of the Popish, Episcopal, or any other succession, gives a minister any power to administer the Spirit through the sacraments, is contrary to fact, since no such spiritual change is produced by those agencies.

But, it may be said, this rule of the priesthood by means of superstition can amount to nothing, since, without temporal force, it can impose upon its subjects no serious inconvenience. In the Church of England laymen control the Church, and in this country there is, even amongst Episcopalians, lay representation adequate for protection. We admit that this is true nearly every where except in the Pope's dominions. But while superstition does not any where force man's will, it induces him to enslave himself. Thus, there certainly may be freedom for the lower part of man's nature, and yet slavery for the higher. Now, we are far from saying that those who thus seek to enslave the higher parts of man's nature do not profess, (and that very often without conscious insincerity, for love of rule rarely reveals itself to the man who feels it,) that they intend the higher parts shall rule the lower. They neither tolerate nor encourage known departure from a standard of morality not so high as to include real godliness, but high enough to avoid any tell-tale appearance of inconsistency in the eyes of ungodly people. Scandal may be avoided which would shock themselves as well as the world, by casting off (by excommunication) all those unprofitable subjects of their rule who cannot, within the bounds of conventional decency, control their lower natures; but as for making the higher parts of man's nature, (those higher parts themselves being enslaved,) control the lower up to any elevated standard of morality, much less to the high standard of godliness, it is simply impossible. And in proportion to the degree of slavery is the standard low.

We are at present concerned merely with the tendency of these doctrines. We have enlarged a little on this matter, to show

that this tendency is not one which we may in this day regard with mere speculative interest and curiosity, but that it is capable of producing the greatest practical evils.

On the other hand, the theory of the Church and ordination upon which evangelical Christians act, has no such tendency. The Church is the Church, not on account of a genealogical connexion with Christ, but because it possesses the Spirit, and is the agent for the direct administration of the Spirit. Ordination is the symbol by which the Church confers on men authority to preach and administer the sacraments. The minister is thus, indirectly through the Church, the agent of Christ; but since the minister is himself an integral part of the Church* which confers the agency, he is also directly the agent of Christ. But the Church designs only to confer this agency on those who are called to preach by the inward workings of the Spirit and providential circumstances. As the agents of the Church make inquiry into the evidence which the candidate adduces to prove this call, (in order to make as sure as they can that the ministry is not conferred on any man not called of God,) ordination is also indirectly an endorsement of the preacher's claim that he is called. The ordaining ministers are, in ordaining, indirectly the agents of Christ, because they are the agents of the Church which has the Spirit, and they are directly Christ's agents, if they have the Spirit, because they are an integral part of the Church. Where, without any fault of his own, a man called of God to preach cannot obtain this indirect concurrence with his own direct right to act as Christ's agent, he is entitled to act without ordination in administering the sacraments. Thus a layman, shipwrecked and cast among heathen, might feel called by the Spirit and providential circumstances to preach the gospel, and he need not hesi-

* Presbyterians generally would not reject this whole statement, although they would as generally prefer a higher view of the ministry than is here given. Ministers and ruling elders are agents directly of Christ, not only as being themselves "integral parts" of the Church, but also as being "office-bearers" therein, appointed and empowered directly by himself. This is not, however, to make them independent of the Church. For while Christ makes the office, with all its powers, the Church fills the office, and so in one sense makes the officer.—EDS. S. P. R.

tate to "start" a Church and administer the sacraments for want of the "succession," Episcopal or Presbyterian; nor, if communication were ever opened with Christian countries, could evangelical churches consistently refuse to hold intercommunion with this Church. And also, the layman aforesaid, thus called to preach, and without fault of his unable to obtain any concurrence of others in his assuming the responsibility, could ordain ministers who gave evidence of a call. The ministry are not dependent on laymen where, without fault of their own, they cannot obtain the concurrence of the laity authorising them to perform the acts of ministers. If they are truly called of God to preach, they will of course be able to convert sinners as God's instruments. Thus they are dependent only on God to bless their preaching.

Nor would the laity be at all dependent on the present order of ministers, if without fault of the laity, the present order would not administer the sacraments. A body of laymen (in other words *the Church*) under such circumstances could ordain a new set,—if only she could find men called of God who would be willing to be her agents. Of course, she is dependent on God to call men.

The Church always takes away the office of the ministry from men who prove immoral, but this does not vitiate the sacraments previously administered by them, since these men were the agents of the Church in administering the sacraments.

But, under ordinary circumstances, we require those who administer the sacraments to be ordained by ordained men, etc., because under ordinary circumstances, if a man cannot give this evidence that the Church sanctions him in assuming the responsibility of administering the sacraments, it is his own fault; and so where he does not actually give this evidence, we take it for granted it is because he is not really called of God.

A ministry called of God is certainly essential to the existence of a visible Church, since we are not sanctioned by Scripture in bestowing the ministry of the sacraments on any but those to whom God has granted the ministry of the word. Besides which, one of the objects of the association of Christians in a Church,

is to unite in the spread of the converting power of the gospel; and this can only be done by God calling men to preach the gospel. A visible Church could, however, be,—yes, actually “*begun*,” (let all superstitious people cross themselves, and say “*anathema maranatha*,”) without any *genealogical* and visible connexion with Christ through a succession of men.

Thus ordination is a symbol which appeals to human reason, and not to superstition. To say that it is a mark of the endorsement of the clergy *only*, to a minister’s belief that he is called to preach, is to give it a less high claim over human reason than if we regard it as also a mark of the endorsement of the laity; since the ministry cannot claim exclusive possession of all the wisdom, religion, or information in the Church. And it would not be true in fact. The laity *are* an *actual* power in the Church, as they could very easily show if they chose to leave it, or try the Commons’ remedy of “stopping the supplies.” And they have very generally a positive voice in the councils of the Church.

The value of ordination can be well illustrated by the use of the Great Seal of England. It is the doctrine of the common law, that corporations can only sign papers through their seals, and the Great Seal is used on state papers. To have or use more than one Great Seal on ordinary occasions, would cause confusion. Yet, when King James II. threw the Great Seal into the Thames, fleeing from England in 1688; and when the Great Seal was stolen a hundred years after to prevent Mr. Pitt from dissolving Parliament, a new one was made. But under ordinary circumstances, the same Great Seal descends from chancellor to chancellor, and no state paper not sealed with it is valid. Still, it is only the instrument of the people in England, who can have a new one made whenever circumstances require it.

As there is nothing to build up priestly rule in the evangelical view of church ordinances, so there is no superstition in their view of regeneration. Superstition is, as remarked above, a belief in things so contrary to fact that some excitement of the imagination becomes necessary in order to cause a belief in them. Scepticism, on the other hand, is a refusal to believe in facts. It is the Anglo-Saxon respect for facts which, humanly speaking,

preserves the great body of Englishmen in the golden mean between scepticism and superstition. They are looked upon as sceptics by the superstitious of other countries; as superstitious by the sceptics. But to show that there is no superstition in the evangelical view of regeneration: evangelical Christians call on no man to believe without evidence that men are regenerate, and the degree of belief is expected to be in exact proportion to the degree of evidence. No one is expected to believe it without some part of the following evidence; and the highest degree of belief is produced by the evidence of *all* the following facts, to wit: The person claimed to be regenerate professes to believe that God is a just God, whose holiness will not permit him to overlook the smallest transgression, and he professes to believe that it is his duty to love God with his whole heart and soul and strength; he professes to see that he is by nature utterly unable to fulfil this duty in any degree, and is therefore justly exposed to God's wrath; he professes to believe in Christ's atonement and to accept it; he gives evidence by his walk and conversation that he is in general enabled by divine grace to subdue his will into conformity to God's will, being able to obtain general mastery even over besetting sins of heart and life.

If it be said that evangelical Christians do not require this of persons whom they admit to baptism, we reply that it is sometimes said that faith in Christ is required of all who desire baptism, but this is a mistake, for the requisite is a *not obviously false profession of faith in Christ*. No one who observes the practice of our evangelical churches can fail to see that they act on the above theories. These theories neither minister to priestly rule, nor are founded on superstition.

3. We have thus far discussed the doctrines and the tendency of the doctrines of High Churchmen. We now come to speak of their success in gaining converts to their claim of priestly authority. Mere claims, unless somebody heeds them, amount to nothing, no matter how extravagant, how well or ill founded they are. The claims of the exiled Bourbons, of the exiled Stuarts, of the woman in the insane asylum who fancied herself Queen Victoria, perhaps gave some pleasure to the claim-

ants, but are not worth much consideration from the rest of the world. The question therefore is, How have the vast mass of the laity and the world viewed these things? The clergy exist for the laity. In fact, in their most palmy days of rule, they did not advance any claim to power or prestige for its own sake. It was all for the good of the laity.

Our first statement regarding the effect on laymen of the claims asserted in "apostolical succession," (and we have had an excellent opportunity of judging,) is, that they have had so little influence in creating respect, that "apostolical succession" is really hardly worth fighting. Now we are far from meaning to say that *no effect* has been produced by the system of which it is a part. A great effect has been produced; great accessions have been gained to the Episcopal Church; but this effect has not come from the claims to apostolical succession, which was of course that which the claimants intended. It will be the business of this third division of our subject to discriminate the effect actually produced, from that intended.

Several causes have rather misled observers as to the real effect. The main one is, that the whole discussion of this matter has rested with the clergy who make the claims, while the class intended to be affected have been comparatively silent. The very violence and arrogance with which the claims are sometimes made, have undoubtedly often been roused by the consciousness that they are producing a different effect from the one intended. On the other hand, all the active opposition which they have encountered has come from evangelical clergymen. Now without meaning to say a single word derogatory to our noble and self-denying evangelical clergymen, it must be admitted that in the Episcopal, or Presbyterian, or any other Church, they are *men*, and look at things from their own stand-point, with some unavoidable bias as to the way in which it affects them or their order. Thus, the clergy of the evangelical school in the Episcopal Church are disposed to be silent about apostolical succession, while Presbyterian clergymen, replying to sermons in which the necessity of a succession is assumed and the whole argument goes to prove merely that it descends through "bishops," will oftentimes practically

(though unintentionally) grant the assumption by trying to prove merely the validity of ministerial orders not descending through "bishops."

Another thing which has influenced both clergy and laity in mistaking the effect produced, is that sectarian spirit which is disposed to value or depreciate causes which lead to the increase or diminution of the membership in its own Church. Now this preaching of apostolical succession has not the *direct* effect intended of producing respect for its claims, but the system connected with it has had an *indirect* effect to enlarge the Episcopal Church. In order to make the real result understood, it will be necessary to say something of the character of the *hearers* of the gospel, the laity and the world.

The natural man is not altogether indifferent to the claims of religion or its ministers. Try as he will, he can not altogether quiet his conscience without their aid, and he wishes just enough connexion with them to ease its pangs. To any *excitement* of his conscience, he is, however, very averse, and to a religion which would probe it to the very bottom in order to administer an effectual remedy, he is bitterly hostile. To the natural man who knows nothing of the doctrines of true religion, a mixture of superstition and morality is the most effectual balm he knows. The Anglo-Saxon in general is both averse to superstition and knows something of the great and effectual remedy. He wishes just enough of the truth to *ease* his conscience; and a mixture of religion and morality is what pleases him best. But he is equally hostile to a religion which does not ease until it rouses the conscience with power. Morality, as far as it goes, he likes; but to supplement that, he accepts belief in Christ; not, however, faith in Christ so preached as to arouse the conscience; to that he is violently inimical.

Now the doctrines of High Churchmen are partly repugnant, partly agreeable to fallen man. The doctrines to which he is averse, are apostolical succession or the supremacy of the priesthood, and the *positive* doctrine of baptismal regeneration; that which he likes is the *negative* doctrine of baptismal regeneration. But let us here distinguish between the *positive* and the

negative view of baptismal regeneration. The positive view is that the regenerating Spirit is given in baptism. The negative is, that the regenerating Spirit is not elsewhere given. If this be so, then all probing of the conscience to produce conviction for sin becomes unnecessary. Thus the heart of the natural man is at once attracted and repelled by the preaching of Puseyites. But the positive dogma of baptismal regeneration is not very generally preached except among a very superstitious class. In fact, all but those who are advanced in superstition really try to think it consistent with justification by faith, though by the real inconsistency of the two, their preaching of justification is toned down; and besides, (probably often without being aware that they are not making a full straightforward exposition of their principles,) the advocates of baptismal regeneration find that the preaching of it without the preaching of faith with it does not conciliate Anglo-Saxon hearers, (who will not do without some of the sovereign balm to ease their consciences,) while attacks on those who hold the contrary view, in the form of stigmas on "*sudden conversions*," and reflections on the excesses (often real) of revivals, are exceedingly popular, as well as in unison with the feelings of those who make them. From all this it comes to pass that Puseyite preaching and arguments on the subject of regeneration are usually of a negative character.

The only disagreeable thing, then, which is really prominent, is the claim of priestly rule. But the laity reflect that there is no means of enforcing this rule over those who do not choose to submit to it, and therefore it can never amount to anything but talk, and mere talk hurts nobody; and thus the balance is struck in favor of the attraction of High Church views. The consequence of this is, that great numbers of people under such ministrations crowd into the Episcopal Church, not believing in apostolical succession or baptismal regeneration, (so far as the positive view is concerned,) but who are yet contented, unconverted people. The writer personally knows many such individuals, whom we have often heard declare that they did not believe in apostolical succession at all. We know others of the

class, who, we are satisfied, could not tell what baptismal regeneration is, though they could say very glibly that they do not believe in these "*sudden conversions*," these "*excitements*," but in "*gradual change of heart*." On an intimate acquaintance with many such men and women, we must say that though moral and often lovely characters, they give no evidence of godliness or real love to Christ. We know many of this class, who, if some zealous person preaches on apostolical succession, take great pains to express disagreement and disapprobation of such utterances.

We do not mean that such people are always entirely free from superstition. They sometimes have a little combined with the other feelings.

Nor do we mean to say that High Churchmen encourage or tolerate any known immorality. They do try to rouse the consciences of those who would be a scandal to them by living in any outward immorality. But from a long experience of their preaching, we must say that it has no tendency to arouse the conscience to the bottom or produce a deep and thorough conviction for sin. Now, Presbyterian ministers preach sermons sometimes in which there is no effort to produce conviction, and therefore hearers may listen to the preaching of High Churchmen and not observe the mere negative difference.

Nor do we mean to say that their preaching may not sometimes in an indirect way produce conviction. Where faith is preached at all, it probably does produce this effect; but this is not the direct tendency of their preaching, nor is it often the result.

Perhaps the difference between the two kinds of sermons would be more evident, did Presbyterians more generally preach with the intention of producing conviction. But they have to some extent imbibed the idea that the same style of preaching does not suit sinners and Christians. Now, even truly converted men, to the extent that they are not influenced by the Spirit, are, like sinners, more or less averse to any probing of their consciences—glad enough to have those monitors *quieted*, but very unwilling to have them *excited*. And unless the Spirit of God is afresh at work, their consciences go directly to sleep again. And both lay

Christians and ministers seem practically under the delusion that when a man's conscience is once probed, he is entitled to nothing but a perpetual stream of balm. Now, Christians and all others are entitled to balm, but not a single fresh drop of it except as relief to a fresh wound. Ministers often practically preach the gospel to sinners, and morality to Christians, only seasoning it with just enough gospel to quiet any fresh or old pang of conscience. The way to affect men's morals is *not by preaching on points of morality, but by the preaching of the gospel*. When ministers do try to probe men's consciences thoroughly to the bottom, they preach in a way which gives the impression, nay, often *plainly shows* they do not think it applicable to Christians; and as the old Adam in the renewed man is ready to be encouraged in such an idea, Christian hearers are often mainly concerned that *sinners* may feel it. It is often said that life to the Christian is a battle; but we act as if it were a war, with occasional battles and occasional retirings into winter quarters. But when we retire into winter quarters, Satan does not; he is busy all the time. Unless active efforts are all the time made to rouse the consciences of not merely sinners, but Christians, they relapse and consider that the work is complete, and that they have nothing to do henceforth but to leave the active interests of religion to the clergy, whom they will cheerfully pay and sustain,—if only ministers will preach Christ just enough to quiet the uneasiness caused by those sins of which a not stimulated conscience is aware. *

4. We come now to the past history and present aspect of the party. Here the limited space allowed to us in this review forces us to extreme brevity. Rather more than thirty years ago, there originated at Oxford a revival of High Church doctrine, which was called Puseyism or Tractarianism. Any gross excitement of the imagination through the senses was utterly repugnant to

* It is this leaving the interests of religion altogether in the hands of the clergy, (intended to be the conservative element of the Church, but therefore inevitably, unless balanced by the laity, seeing things from a contracted stand-point,) that gives such a narrow, sectarian air to all the religious and even educational enterprises of our churches.

the public sentiment of that day, and probably also in a great measure to some of the active agents of this movement. Those who have been trained by sound preaching of justification by faith have their consciences too much aroused for the opiates of superstition to relieve them. To the influence of such preaching in comparative purity, the public of that day had previously, in a great measure, been subjected. Besides which, general enlightenment indisposes a man to superstition, though this is an insufficient protection without the preaching of religious truth, as the present Ritualism and Romanism demonstrate.

But there was open to the originators of Puseyism a less gross excitement of imagination, sufficient to incline to a belief in superstitious claims that class of people whom love of rule interests in maintaining them, and to enable them also to arouse to their support another class of clergymen in whom any love of rule in a gross, repulsive form does not exist, but whose sectarian love of their Church disposes them to admit any arrogant claims which exalt that Church. The imputation to the active spirits of the party, in various degrees and mingled with other motives, of a decided share of the grosser impulses of our nature, will hardly be thought uncharitable by those who have met a class of Puseyites who seem to enjoy making these pretensions for the very sake of their arrogance; and who, when not directly calling on those who differ with them to admit these claims, employ themselves in so interweaving them into the language of their social intercourse, that peaceable and well-bred people may be forced into a seeming recognition of them. Our words will doubtless recall to most readers the recollection of some acquaintances who seem to be under a monomania which lets them think and talk of nothing else but these pretensions; and when good sense, good feeling, and good breeding, combine to silence open talk, seem to be only withheld from *bursting* by the relief of being able to insinuate.

That such people exist also among the laity, only proves that there is a class of laymen in whom these claims minister to some sort of personal arrogance,—generally to an aristocratic exclusiveness which they affect. Between the monomania of self-exal-

tation in their favorite channel, and the inconsequential nature of their reasoning powers, (for such laymen are generally persons of inferior intellect,) they are unable to see that these priestly claims may tend indirectly to exalt, but certainly do tend directly to enslave laymen,—or perhaps they have not the manliness to feel the depression. In fact, they are generally women.

Those of our readers who have heard the elevation of tone and language with which some High Churchmen love to descant on the antiquity of the "Church," and "the venerable succession of bishops reaching back through past ages," have had evidence that the *imaginative* aspect of these things is exhibited to gain adherents to claims founded on them.

The class of clergymen who were the original movers of Puseyism, desired only such a connexion with Rome as would give her sanction to their claims of rule through apostolical succession. They felt that her scorn of their claims was rather a hard argument against them. To submission to Rome, their English tendencies were averse, and they desired equal alliance. But the Pope also had his wrongs to remember, and was not disposed to advance a step towards alliance and union on the basis of English independence.

The limited use made of imagination failed to rouse the laity to a degree favorable to the recognition of these pretensions. Thus failing, some of the chief movers went to Rome; but they also failed to carry with them any large number of clergymen, because in rousing those ministers who did not feel the strong love of rule which actuated themselves, they had heightened the sectarian love of the Church of England by dwelling on the poetical and historical associations, (chiefly Protestant,) by which that Church commends itself to the imagination, until the warmed feelings were prepared to be pleased with the *imaginative* aspect of an antiquity of origin which would still further exalt the Church of their love.* But imagination was thus arrayed AGAINST Rome.

* All these agencies are found in Keble's Christian Year. Keble was originally impelled by a friend of vastly superior intellect, J. H. Newman, whom we have seen an English paper recently call the ablest Roman Catholic now living.

The latter class of High Church clergymen whom this conflicting feeling kept in the Church of England, strove to reconcile their new views with justification by faith, and were disposed to make only apostolical succession prominent. But their practical preaching of justification was in various degrees modified, and in the large number of cases ceased or became purely formal. For over thirty years the Church of England has been subjected to preaching in which this vital truth is absent or lifeless. And in the fulness of time, the connexion with State has brought into the Church a number of unsanctified clergymen who strive to promote the cause of priestly rule by the use of gross appeals to imagination through the senses; into a preparation for which a class of people have now been educated. They no longer appeal to imagination by any of the poetical or historical associations with the Protestantism of the Church of England. Union with Rome is their object. But they are still averse to submission, and prefer alliance. By the time they are convinced an alliance between Rome and the Church of England is impossible, it now seems probable that the most repulsive part of submission to English patriots, (*viz.*, subjection to a foreign temporal power,) will by the fall of the temporal Roman power be modified.

Meantime the blossoming of this bud from the old stock of Puseyism has aroused the attention of those people of worldly enlightenment who were not repelled by any but gross appeals to imagination through the senses. Thus some people already attracted to Puseyism will, seeing its ultimate goal, recede; those yet unattracted will be repelled.

Another cause will affect these movements. The days of the Church of England as a State Church, are evidently numbered, as any reader of the English papers with a particle of prescience can easily foresee. Thus the attraction which drew unsanctified men to the Church of England is to cease.

But this will do no good at all to the cause of evangelical truth, unless there is a general and powerful revival of the preaching of justification by all evangelical clergymen; otherwise, only the Broad Church sceptics will be benefited. What with the spread of Protestantism in Popish countries, and of Popery in Prot-

estant countries, there seems a prospect that these will be religions of classes rather than of nations. But unless the preaching of the truth fails to be revived, there seems no reason to apprehend any general success of Popery. Appeals through the senses can only be made attractive to the modern man when art aids imagination. But superstition cannot inspire any highly imaginative art in an enlightened age,* since in imaginative minds of the highest power, imagination is subordinate to reason, and cannot blind reason to facts which everybody in that age sees.

Some of the works of art, which were produced in the day when superstition inspired it, remain. They cannot have any great effect in aiding Ritualism, not being numerous enough, and imitation produces but bald, lifeless results. The art of music can be more largely employed, but it is a modern art, and has not been nor can be, in this day, inspired by superstition. Wherever its more exciting effects are attempted, it merely secularizes church music. Still it is the chief attractive agency of the Ritualists to the higher order of cultivated people; but this will only last till their opponents make a proper use of it.

Whether the class who will be attracted by Popery shall be large in England; whether England shall be reduced to the condition of continental Romish countries where women are superstitious, men sceptical, seems to depend entirely on the revival of evangelical truth. Where men in such countries are professed members of the Church of Rome, it does not seem to be from any real attraction to superstition. It is because they do not know the truth. When years and troubles rouse them to serious thought, and to realise that scepticism will only do for life and health, not for gloom and trouble, they seem to be led by women to superstition simply because they know nothing bet-

* Mr. Ruskin says in his "Stones of Venice," that the Church of Rome cannot claim the credit of the glorious works of architecture produced in the Middle Ages, because, as he says, such have not been produced since Protestants left her. It is certain that the truth which inspired Protestantism caused the downfall of Romish control over art, because they were undoubtedly affected by it. But it cannot be said that the principles of Protestantism (though not antagonistic to art) are favorable to any such use of it. Of this we shall speak further on.

ter. This is an unnatural state of things. Men should be brought to a *reasonable* religion, and lead women to it.

God grant that the truth may be so revived and preached in Anglo-Saxon countries as to lead to its spread on the continent. There are indications of a revival of it in England. The writer and the readers of this Review may never live to see the bright noon-day, but it is a consolation to see faint streaks of dawn on the mountain tops.

5. Our fifth point is the best mode of evangelical opposition to Puseyism and Ritualism. And here, first, let us say a few words about controversy. That controversy has served and may again serve the cause of truth, even where the angry passions of those who carried it on, were most bitterly roused, must be granted. But it is like war and individual fighting—a remedy which even when it does more good than harm, always does great harm, and therefore should be resorted to only in extremities. We must be sure that the false doctrines are really affecting the salvation of men, and sure that the success of the truth we advocate will prevent this. And a man must be pretty sure his love of truth is strongest, even when passion is roused, or he had better not engage in controversy. A man may not be disposed to get angry, but in exact proportion as he makes some truth appear which some opponent is interested not to see, the probability increases that his opponent grows both angry and insulting; and no man can safely reckon on keeping his temper under such circumstances.

Now we think it wise to avoid controversies about apostolical succession, simply because this is not the doctrine that is really affecting the salvation of men. He would greatly mistake the purport of this article who imagined we have spoken of priestly rule because we think evangelical clergymen ought to warn the laity against it. Anglo-Saxons are very averse to the grosser forms of priestly rule. It runs in their blood, and has made their history what it is. They need no warning against its rule over the lower parts of their nature, but they only object to its rule over the higher when their consciences are so aroused that the opiates of superstition fail to lull them. Just in proportion

as their consciences are awake, there is no *need* to warn them; and just in proportion as they are not, there is no *use* in doing it. We have spoken of the claim of priestly authority, simply because it is a part of our subject, and necessary to a thorough understanding of it. As for the small class of the laity who actually believe the succession dogma, they are under the influence of imaginations not controlled by reason. Of course it is a waste of words to reason with them. If there are any whose imaginations are not wholly so affected, they are probably best met through p̄rint. People in whom imagination controls or silences reason, are like children when they are affected by superstitious fears. It is perfectly useless *directly* to reason with them; but get them interested in something else, and their imaginations become quieted. Thus this class of people, if affected at all, can only be so indirectly, and we will presently indicate the style of preaching which is best for them and others.

While it is not wise directly to attack the doctrine as held by Episcopalians, it is right and wise to state the true view of the Church and ordination. But this should be done positively, not negatively, and without the smallest allusion to the opinions entertained by anybody in the Episcopal Church. If this causes a controversy to be forced on the man who does it, he has the advantage, and will keep it by confining himself as far as possible to self-defence.

But apostolical succession, by itself, would be a comparatively innocuous doctrine, if believed. The harm which Ritualism and Puseyism do, is to that vast mass of people whom it attracts, who do not practically believe in regeneration at all. An argument in favor of the scriptural view of the new birth will hardly command any attention until the conscience is roused to the utter natural inability of man to fulfil the commands of God. And the antidote to this fearful amount of indifference and semi-scepticism, is mainly in preaching so as to excite conscience to a sense of man's natural inability. The man who feels this deeply, feels that no religion which does not embrace a doctrine of regeneration can satisfy the wants of human nature.

An argument for the great Calvinistic doctrine of inability, to

be effective, must be drawn, not from theological systems of which it is a part, nor yet from the mere statements of Scripture, but from the view of man's own heart as it appears to his conscience when roused by the Spirit to a sense of sin: from a view of God's claims and man's inability to fulfil them. This preaching will break the crust of indifference which is the most fearful symptom of the vast class of people attracted by Puseyite preaching. Some, it will arouse to hostility; others will be really prepared to embrace the promises and feel the healing of the gospel. This is certainly the course for Presbyterian ministers.

Perhaps our Episcopalian friends, in what we have said, will imagine we are merely concerned at the inroads on our churches. It would be a very trifling matter if a mere change of church relations were all; not worth much concern. But persons brought under High Church influences, (which are daily increasing,) or even under stagnant evangelical influences, are brought into a position in which they do not hear the truth soundly preached. Owing to a mistake, whose cause we will discuss further on, both evangelical Episcopalians and Presbyterians are, from association with High Churchmen, affected with some temporary paralysis of their active energies; and evangelical Episcopalians are more affected than Presbyterians, because the connexion is closer. The responsibility for the vast mass of unconverted people who crowd into the Episcopal Church, will not rest with Presbyterians who have no opportunity to reach them. If they are ever roused to conviction, it will be by the preaching of Low Church Episcopalians; and it is by the preaching of the doctrine of man's natural inability that they will be roused. It is as sure as any future event can be, that some day this tide will be turned, and the instrument will be the preaching of that doctrine. The stagnation in the Episcopal and the Presbyterian Churches may perhaps continue, and may result in death, for it is not absolutely certain that either of those organisations will be the means of the revival; they may be shattered to fragments, (and if they cease to witness for the truth, God grant they may, because so sure as they are not, the devil will take possession of them and use them for his purposes,) but it is certain the tide will be turned.

This semi-scepticism is more alarming because it tallies so with the intellectual scepticism of the day, which stands on the ground of a denial of supernatural influences. Happily, there is not much of this in our Southern country as yet, simply because our political circumstances have directed the minds of thinkers into a practical and not an abstractly speculative channel. But we cannot wholly escape the effects of speculation in other and more fortunate (or unfortunate) countries.

The writer does not know much of Episcopalians at what have been usually considered the great centres and seats of evangelical influence. If they radiate hot rays from a flame of love for evangelical truth, it is very certain not much of it reaches the part of the world we do know. So far as our pretty extensive individual experience is concerned, about which we are certainly not mistaken, High Churchism in its negative aspect is gaining rapidly on evangelical doctrine, and we scarcely know an active Low Churchman. By Low Churchmen we mean not the class holding only negative principles, who will tell you they do not believe in apostolical succession; (and who are properly Broad Churchmen,) but those who believe that men are born again when they are justified by faith, men who consistently believe in the sound Calvinism of the Thirty Nine Articles. It follows from the very nature of things, that when evangelical Episcopalians are not gaining ground, they are losing it. We trust that there are some quarters in which they are gaining it, but certainly in all we know, and we are convinced in the Church at large, they are rapidly losing it. So long as Low Churchmen stand still, their influence tells against evangelical doctrine, and High Churchmen ask nothing of them but to be quiet. The influence of their very virtue and piety, of all their good qualities, their talents, their cultivation, tells against their cause. As an exemplification of this, the writer was confirmed while unconverted, in youth, by a Low Church bishop, a man of whose virtues, and indeed, of whose genuine piety, we believe, there is no reason to doubt. The class for confirmation was made up by a very High Church clergyman, rector of the parish. To the best of our belief, the majority of that class were unconverted, and we knew many of

them intimately. The bishop was perfectly aware of the kind of preaching usually heard in this church. We have heard him preach frequently in the same church, and neither on that occasion or any other did we ever hear him preach a single sermon directly calculated to rouse sinners. Now, *we know* that in our own case all the influence of this man's talents, piety, reputation, went to confirm us in the opinion that we were in a state of safety.

The revival of that style of preaching which has a direct tendency to produce conviction, will certainly come. As there are evident indications that the connexion with the State which has brought so many unsanctified men into the Church of England will soon or late come to an end, we are strongly inclined to believe the revival will not only be *out of* but *in* the Episcopal Church.

In those Low Churchmen, whose invincible repugnance to superstition is so great that in them a sectarian love of their Church could not be changed into a superstitious love of it, the sectarian love has still been useful to High Churchmen by silencing, to some extent, *active* advocacy of those truths to which Puseyism is opposed. Their sectarian love of their Church is gratified by its vast increase, and they are not disposed to scan too curiously the means by which converts are brought into it. Their Church is made attractive, and as the direct consequence of first being pleased at this, and then seeking to add to it, the disposition has abated to do that unattractive thing, viz., probe man's conscience to the bottom by the doctrine of inability, which repels until the Spirit makes it felt. As the present Ritualists have ceased to appeal to a sectarian love of the Church, nay, tread on and offend it, this affords a hope for the revival of zealous preaching of the truth by Low Churchmen.

But High Church views have not only had this effect among Low Churchmen; by affecting the mere spirit of sectarianism, they have had a somewhat similar effect on every Protestant denomination which appealed at all to people of educated and cultivated tastes; and as Presbyterianism has its influence chiefly among that class of people, Puseyism has affected it in this way more largely than any other Church. This attraction of men is *towards* the Epis-

copal Church as well as towards dangerous preaching; and is also an attraction *from* the Presbyterian Church as well as from sound doctrine; and many Presbyterians have had so much sectarian feeling that they have been more deeply affected by the mere loss to their Church than the injury to men's souls. This has begotten a desire to make Presbyterianism, and more especially its worship, attractive, and has by diverting effort into that channel had an indirect influence in toning down that repellent feature, the preaching of inability so as to rouse the conscience. Now, we do not in the least mean that the advocacy of Calvinism by metaphysical or scriptural arguments has abated. This is too much a part of Presbyterian sectarianism to allow of any efforts to be attractive being made even indirectly at the expense of it; and besides in its mere theoretic aspect, it is not repellent. The repellent thing is the practical preaching of it, the advocacy of it by the the appeals to the consciousness of the man who is obliged to see natural inability if he will fairly examine his own heart; and whose conscience preaching of this kind tends to excite.

II. Let us now directly consider what is called Ritualism in the Presbyterian and other Protestant Churches. This movement is an effort to render attractive the ritual of those Churches. By *ritual* we mean all parts of the direct worship of the sanctuary, which, of course, excludes the sermon.

In holding even the most important truth, it is the nature of man to run into extremes, and hold it so as to contradict some minor truth. In their views regarding their ritual, evangelical Protestants have generally done this. They have mainly taken the true view, but have so held it as to contradict another truth. It is to be hoped that the result of ritualistic movements will be to make evangelical Protestants hold the great truth without contradicting the small one. We will first state the great truth: *The services of public worship are a means, not of attracting men, but of worshipping God.* God we believe is pleased with the worship of the heart, and will accept no substitute for it. So far then as a ritual is properly a matter of deliberate arrangement, it must be so settled as to be a mere means to wor-

ship, and must embody nothing in the least calculated to attract the attention away from the direct contemplation of God. Let it not be said this is making a merit of ugliness. It is consistent with a very high, though severe beauty—the beauty of fitness. It is only inconsistent with ornament. *

It is very certain that ornaments of architecture or vestment or of anything addressed to the eye, do in churches have an effect to distract the attention. It may not be so generally noticed, because men get used to these ornaments, and thus do not attend to them. But just so far as anybody is not perfectly indifferent to them, (and nobody advocates them that is,) they do tend to distract attention. If it be said, as the Ritualists do say, "We have these things in honor of God, whose house it is;" we

* Perhaps some reader may here turn away contemptuously and say, "This is nothing but the same illiberal old Puritanical spirit which sets itself against beautifying the house of God." To which we reply, "Good friend, in your fancied superiority of taste, you are simply displaying your utter ignorance of the principles of æsthetics, the science of taste. One of its chief canons is that *ornament misplaced is out of taste*, or as Mr. Ruskin would say, '*meretricious*.' As the objectors to these views would perhaps be among the ladies and men of (shall we say, or will it make the ladies angry?) *feminine* minds, we will explain the canon by an illustration drawn from a branch of æsthetics with which they are well acquainted, the æsthetics of dress. The bonnet which is the elegant, delicate, exquisite production of a Parisian milliner is in itself in fine taste for a reception, but is utterly out of taste as a travelling hat for a trip to the mountains. You would all say, to use it so is in shocking taste. A thing may in itself be in fine taste, but out of place it is in bad taste.

"But there is another matter which can be illustrated by the art which all ladies understand so well. The people who wear ornaments out of *place* have utterly depraved tastes, and are quite unable so to order their misplaced ornaments, as to be *themselves* in good taste. If a rustic lass should be fired with ambition to wear such a bonnet as yours on a journey, she would in aiming to imitate you, attain only some horrible, barbarous imitation of a country milliner, which you would call a caricature, while she would not know the difference. Now this is a precise parallel to the style of music and ornamental architecture of a large number of our churches."

"But somebody says still, "Many of our most cultivated people think these things in fine taste." To which we rejoin, that the larger number of people who pass for cultivated, are cultivated more on the surface.

reply: To the exact extent to which they interest anybody, (and nobody desires them whom they do not interest,) we substitute for the worship of the heart mere external offerings and observances.

So far as music is not the mere expression of devotional feeling, it has an undoubted tendency to distract attention. And this is true, not only while hearing the music. No one has a feeling for the higher kinds of music without knowing that the impression remains some time after the music has ceased, and that it is only by degrees that we regain our power of thinking of other things.

Specially to criticise the particulars of our ritual would make this article too long. We hope to return to the subject on some other occasion, and would now merely indicate a few general principles. The truth lost sight of by our Protestant churches generally, is, that a ritual service (or any accessory of public worship) must, as an expression (or accessory) of worship to God, have nothing in it positively repulsive to the taste. If there is anything of that character, of course, it would distract attention as much as positive ornament. Perhaps many persons will think that after all there is nothing very striking in our overlooked truth. They never doubted *that*, they will say. But there is one corollary from it which considerably adds to the idea. To a person of cultivated taste, especially to a person whose eye and ear are cultivated, a ritual service or the accessories of worship would be positively disagreeable, and so distract the attention, unless it has all that positive but subordinate beauty whose absence is equivalent to positive ugliness. Thus, we must have fitness or else unfitness, proportion or else disproportion, harmony or else discord.

Somebody may exclaim just here: "You make these beautiful things suited to the Roman Catholic theory and to the Ritualistic so far as the two are identical, and unsuited to ours. Is then our Protestant religion utterly unfitted to affect the taste and imagination? If we can only render our services not repulsive to the eye and ear, sinners will not come to them." We answer: To attract sinners to come by means which will unfit them to receive the impressions for which alone we wish them to come,

would be a very bad plan. It would be giving up the end to attain the means. And this is done when you attract people by exciting music which to those who best appreciate it, distracts the attention so that the impression is not removed while they are in church; often not till long afterwards.

But it is not true that our Protestant worship makes no appeal to taste and imagination. It makes the very highest of all possible appeals. The highest attractive or æsthetic effects are never produced by the people who directly aim at them. This is but to say that nature is more attractive to the taste and imagination than art. Man, man's real feelings, are a million times more attractive than any ornament with which the expression of them could be overloaded.

We can in but a cursory manner allude to the effect of music as a mere expression of the feelings of a united assembly. Almost everybody has appreciated it when a crowded congregation, already profoundly aroused, (so that the music merely expresses, does not cause their feeling,) rise, and with a deep volume of sound sing the Long Metre Doxology.

But, leaving out the worship, there is one part of the service whose direct object it is to impress, not the eye and ear, nor the taste at all, but the feelings, nay, the highest of all feelings, the conscience; and which, when successful, does in a far higher degree than architecture or music or any art impress the imagination and the taste. In an assembly of men roused to united and strong feeling, there is something far more attractive than in any cathedral or fine music. If a man could see this but once in all his life, or see St. Peter's Cathedral but once, hardly a man of us would hesitate in the choice. We grow used to other things, but this is ever new. We are not so powerfully affected by a mere praying assembly, only because of the natural modesty which makes every man cover his face as well as close his eyes, but to one who stands where he can see the faces of a vast assembly, floor and gallery crowded, (and who says galleries deform a building then?) and eager faces lit up with a common emotion, eyes all fixed on the orator, there is no sight so profoundly affecting. We do not usually notice it, only because we are swayed

by it, and roused to the feeling which animates it. It attracts our presence, and does not distract our attention.

We shall probably be told, only great preachers can hope to produce such effects. But men possess various degrees of this power, nearly all men some degree. Besides which, to assert that God calls a man to preach, and of course follows his preaching by the Spirit, and to add, that the preacher does not possess any power at all over an audience, is to talk mere contradictory nonsense.

Perhaps some may say that we are inconsistent in representing preaching as productive of or possessing this great attractive power, when we have represented the chief theme of the preacher as being in so high a degree repulsive. There is both an attraction and a repulsion: a repellent element which only repels a man from submitting to the influence of the exhortations of the sermon, or, indeed, admitting that they are in the least applicable to him. But as soon as these exhortations tell on an assembly, the attractive effects tell on the world. It is an attraction to the world to come where human feeling is aroused. Nothing so powerfully affects men as human feeling. We do not refer to that exhibition of it which they make who have been educated to express it loudly in words. We refer to the effect produced by those who have (like our educated classes) been trained sternly to repress any public exhibition of it.

The Puseyites and the Ritualists will exclaim, "Ah, yes, mere appeals to the feelings"—"mere excitements!" If anybody understands us as recommending an appeal to the lower feelings—*fear*, for example—he mistakes and misrepresents. We would see an appeal to the highest of feelings—conscientious feeling. Now this is an appeal based on reason, since reason says that man should be governed by just that feeling. To those who fear lest we should disgust taste and imagination, we reply that this is the highest possible appeal to true taste and imagination, to which the highest appeal can only be indirectly made. As for the mere charge of excitement, no man can be acted on by any other man without being the subject or the object of excitement. To the extent to which men voluntarily seek the assistance of a priest—

VOL. XIX. NO. 2—8.

hood, they do it because they are already excited; excited a little in conscience by the haunting sense of sin, and excited in fear of its consequences. To produce any further effect, they must be excited in some way, from without, by the priesthood. Now we may take our choice between excitements of the imagination, excitements of the lower feelings—fear, for example—or excitements of the conscience; but *where any effect at all is produced*, you must have excitement; and you do have it from the bitterest railers against it.

To appeal to conscience is to appeal to human thought, which decides that men should be governed neither by imagination nor by feeling, nor yet by a combination of the feelings and the imagination, miscalled taste. If this be taste, all such taste is bad taste, and may be proved so on its own principles. The established principles of the science of taste would condemn nearly the whole art of it.

Mr. Buckle says somewhere, that Arminianism is the religion of men of taste; Calvinism, of thinkers. So far as there is any opposition between so called taste and true thought, such taste can be refuted on its own principles, since truth or thought underlies all taste.

The crowds who attend our churches are not, in attending church, governed by any independence either of thought or taste. They follow others, and in the long run, they follow the thinkers. Therefore to affect the thinkers, is in the long run to affect them.

Then let us Calvinists who believe the Confession of Faith, and believe the Thirty Nine Articles, (not *make believe* the last,) and all evangelicals who believe the practical evangelical faith, (which some of us insist is only consistent with metaphysical Calvinism, others with metaphysical Arminianism, but about whose practical doctrine of faith we all agree,) appeal through conscience to thought, let who will appeal to taste through imagination. It has been observed, that of late years our evangelical preaching affects only young people or weak people. Let us preach wholly to *conscience*, and we shall appeal to thinkers. It may take weeks, or months, or even years to affect them, but when they are aroused, the crowd will rush to our church meet-

ings; and our chief difficulty will be to keep the unconverted crowd out of our churches. Let us strike at the root of the matter, and success must come. It is certain. It is bound up in the nature of things as God made them, the nature of man, his conscience, his imagination, his feelings, his intellect. Only those shallow people doubt who want penetration to see below the surface of things.

But while bent on great appeals to man's highest powers, we Calvinists must no longer trample on the lower, by neglecting the secondary truth to which we referred. While worshipping God with the highest faculties, we must do it so as not to disgust the lower faculties, which are not opposed to the higher. A love of beauty of the eye and ear, is not inconsistent with its perfect subordination to the higher faculties to which we appeal; while a disregard for the demands of this feeling in those who possess it, is really inconsistent with the rule of those high faculties.

That the *preaching* of the gospel is our great weapon, and the great enemy of the Romanizers, is evident from the way in which they decry it. In our contests, let us not allow them to *choose our weapons for us*. If our success with it prompt them to try it, they will find it powerless, unless they also adopt our appeals to conscience, and to the extent to which conscience is deeply aroused, imagination loses power. If they so rouse it that only the true medicine will heal it, we shall heartily rejoice at such a course, indifferent whether it makes Presbyterians or not.

ARTICLE V.

THE FUTURE OF THE FREEDMEN.

Less than three years ago, four millions of slaves were suddenly emancipated in these Southern States. Less than eight years ago, nearly every individual of this vast multitude, then born, was in a condition of positive comfort and of consequent contentment. In all the elements of material prosperity; in the possession of means adequate to every physical want; in the lightness of their daily tasks; in health of body, and in tranquillity of mind, their condition was far superior to that of any other peasantry on the face of the earth. Their labor,—that of agriculturists,—is proverbially the most healthful and pleasant among the various forms of toil in which, by the decree of God, man earns his daily bread. They were slaves, yet virtually freer than most of the laborers of the world. The restraints that were upon and around them were only those, which, it was supposed, the safety of the state rendered necessary. If sometimes separated against his will from his family, it was in general either for crime or else through overwhelming misfortune compelling the master to part with his slave; although it cannot be denied that bad men would exercise their power as masters in an inhuman manner and sometimes separated slaves for gain; always, however, frowned upon by good men for such conduct. Sometimes also, the supposed necessity for more land led to a removal to the west; in which case a husband or wife frequently elected (the choice being given) to go with his or her “white folks” rather than be left behind. In either of these cases of separation (voluntary or involuntary) from his family, no greater evil was incident to the negro than to white men in every country and condition of society. Aside from the instincts of a common humanity, which usually secure kind treatment to a dependent class, it was always to the interest of the owner to provide for the health and comfort of his slaves. In no other part of the

world was the natural antagonism between capital and labor less apparent than in the wide domain where the workman was the property of the capitalist. No strikes,* no trades-unions, no combinations to resist the demands of the employer, no riots were dreamed of, or possible; yet it is notorious that these enslaved workmen regarded the status of the *poorer* class of the dominant race as inferior to their own in every respect. So much for their physical condition.

This large population, separated from the white races of the earth by the decree and providence of God, and separated specially from the white population of the South by the natural operation of the laws that regulated the relations betwixt master and slave, was yet very closely and intimately associated with the people of the superior race. It is safe to assert that throughout the greater part of the wide territory they inhabit, if a professedly Christian household could be found where the religious instruction of this dependent people was not attempted with more or less zeal and fidelity, and with greater or less success; or where, at least, the attempts of others to teach Christianity to their slaves were not thankfully acknowledged; that household was a marked and dishonored exception to the general rule. The religious status of these children of heathen progenitors, was, and is, an absorbing source of anxiety to multitudes of God-fearing and highly cultivated white men, who never regarded slavery as an evil or a curse. And so prevalent was the conviction that God held the better instructed masters responsible for the religious training of their dependent and untutored slaves,

*There was recently a *strike* amongst the workmen on the wharves in Charleston. Their wages had been two dollars per day, and they struck for *three*, perhaps influenced in part by knowing that black men, not their own superiors generally, were receiving eleven dollars for a day's work in the reconstruction convention then assembled. What is the result? The stevedores (some of them *colored*) imported white men from New York to load vessels at the old price. The young white men of Charleston, several hundred in number, also offered their services. Thus the labor slips away from the black man, and what his white brother thus secures, he will hardly ever again surrender. Alas, poor negro! it is an unequal contest into which you were forced when they made you antagonist to the white race!

that even ungodly owners could not resist its influence. The laws that affirmed the right of ownership, also secured to the bondsman the rest of the Sabbath, and consequently the opportunity for instruction in the great truths of the gospel. So, the second point is reached, to wit: that no peasantry on the face of the earth, excepting perhaps in the single kingdom of Scotland, was so thoroughly Christianized as the slaves of the South prior to the termination of the war.

The present condition of this population physical and moral throughout the entire South, it were indeed a difficult undertaking to portray in full. Perhaps it may not be safe to reason from their circumstances in one section of the country to those in another, or from any one portion to the whole mass. Probably no individual is competent to speak of the general condition, and each can tell only of what he has himself seen or heard from others on good testimony. There are no statistics carefully made out from which to reason. In a certain sense it may be said that the *present* status of the freedmen is as uncertain to us as their *future*. Some few points, however, it may not be presumptuous to set before the reader as open to no doubt.

Examining, first, into the material circumstances of the freedmen—it is undeniable that generally the sick negro now finds it very hard to get medicine and medical attendance, while from want and exposure he stands more in need of both than ever. These advantages he never lacked while a slave; but, now, robbed of his natural protectors and providers, and a wanderer to a very great extent amongst strangers, themselves greatly impoverished, he cannot reasonably expect to find either. Of course no one would suppose it possible that the medical profession (proverbially charitable the world over) who have suffered overwhelming losses in common with all their fellow-citizens in the South, could be able to furnish medicine and attendance gratuitously (which nevertheless many of them are constantly attempting) to *all* the poor, sick, and dying negroes of whom the country is full. Meanwhile, gentlemen of the medical profession in Virginia, and also in South Carolina, have been understood to express their conviction that there are causes of disease at work

amongst this population, such as have been and are destroying the native Sandwich Islanders, which, unless they can be checked and controlled, must inevitably bring about the annihilation of the race.

Again, it cannot be doubted that negro children perish now by hundreds, and that in various ways; while formerly they were always carefully watched over, provided for, and in every way fostered by masters of all sorts. In fact, negro children are not born in such numbers as formerly. Upon a recent visit to Charleston, an interested and impartial observer discovered but two negro infants in places and circumstances where he would have expected previously to meet with at least fifty. An intelligent and respectable lady has declared that dead negro children have been eaten by buzzards in the fields around Beaufort, the headquarters of freedom to the negro. The same competent witness has described the squalid misery of multitudes of this unhappy people living on fish only, there, where always and very naturally has been supposed to be, the paradise of the freedman.

In the next place, it may be mentioned that insanity (formerly not often met with amongst the light-hearted and cheerful slaves) is becoming of frequent occurrence amongst the freedmen. They begin to taste care and anxiety. A respectable gentleman met on one day's ride in Williamsburg District, South Carolina, four cases of derangement in colored people. The intelligent and experienced superintendent of one of the largest and best managed Lunatic Asylums in the South, (which has received into its kindly care more than forty of these unfortunate ones) corroborates the truth of the assertion made above. To use his own language, "they are wandering all over the country."

Again, in a great variety of ways, the freedman now experiences the hardships of poverty, from which he was protected in slavery. Whilst in many cases the thrifty and intelligent class may find their physical condition improved by emancipation, and are better clad and more comfortable every way, the mass of them are manifestly poorer, worse clad, worse fed, and, in all their material circumstances, sufferers by the change. This, no man acquainted with the facts can deny. Multitudes of them

are now thrown upon public charity. Of this never did the slave stand in need, as he always *owned* some master to find him all the necessaries of life. *

Coming, in the next place, to the examination of the present moral condition of the freedmen, two features of it have very great significance. There appears to be a very common inclination amongst them to reject those religious teachings to which they have been hitherto accustomed, and by which, it is hoped, many thousands of them were guided to glory. Partly, this may be accounted for by saying it is *natural*, and always was the disposition of many of them; also, that it is *especially natural* in their new circumstances. Partly, it may be accounted for as the result of earnest and zealous efforts by many "false brethren [not] unawares brought in, who have come in privily," and also publicly, to sow the seeds of discord between these races, and persuade the negro that his late master is his natural and inveterate enemy. What is the consequence? In many cases the so-called ministers of the gospel, (both white and black) who have come from the North to preach to the freedmen, are simply *political emissaries*, figuring more prominently than any other class in all the Reconstruction Conventions, loyal leagues, and other political gatherings. It would be very strange if these men were, indeed, doing the same kind of work with him who said, "I determined

* One illustration may suffice of the novel experiences to which the *quondam* slave has been subjected by emancipation. A gentleman about to move with his family to Tennessee, set out from his home in South Carolina to go first a short distance upon a railroad accompanied by an elderly woman hired by him as a child's nurse, who was going to the same neighborhood with her employer, in order to take leave of her daughter there. Both descended from the cars at the same point. The gentleman was met by a friend's buggy, with horse and driver to convey him to his precise destination. The old freedwoman's daughter had no buggy and no wagon to send for her mother, and the decrepid ex-slave, (a sufferer from varicose veins) had to perform a journey of eighteen miles and back on foot. In former days, when going on such a visit, her master's horse or mule would have been put at her disposal, because no decent master would have suffered an elderly and delicate female slave (a house servant at that) to walk so far on such an errand. But now, what was she but a *hireling*?—fallen from the close relation she once occupied towards the white race.

to know nothing amongst you save Jesus Christ and him crucified." Of course, it is not the gospel of salvation to perishing sinners they preach, but their own political rhapsodies. In those cases where these Northern emissaries do not make politics their mission, still, *frequently*, they are bent on sowing division between the blacks and the whites. In fact, it is to be observed of the missionaries of the Presbyterian Church of the North, for example, that they seem to feel themselves called to go, not to the destitute and hitherto more neglected portions of this people, but precisely to those sections and towns, and indeed congregations, where always the most attention had been given to the religious instruction of the slaves; and to go thither apparently for the set purpose of *dividing*. Take, for example, Zion church, Charleston; or take the Presbyterian churches of Sumter District, S. C. But recently we read the report of the Rev. M. R. Miller, of his own doings in the latter region. "This (quoth he) has been one of the hard districts in this State, yet we have made a fair beginning to give this wilderness the richness and beauty of the rose." What Mr. Miller means by a *hard* district we are at some loss to understand, but we know well that Sumter was always distinguished for its zeal in giving the gospel to the negroes. "We have a church (Mr. M. continues) organised within a year, of more than one hundred and fifty communicants." Whence did he get them? With the aid of the notorious Mr. Gibbs, formerly the military occupant of the Zion church pulpit, (at this present writing said to be in the Florida Reconstruction Convention,) he robbed Salem (Black River) Presbyterian Church, of them all!

But there is a second class of religious teachers which has become very plentiful amongst the freedmen, viz., men of their own condition with no claims whatever to education, setting themselves up for teachers of religion; in many instances of bad personal character, licentious and dishonest, and ready to make use of their ghostly power for selfish and base ends. As might be expected, these men, some of whom are sincere though ignorant, mix up in their preaching, along with the doctrines of the gospel, the most absurdly ridiculous fancies and superstitions.

It is to the religious meetings held under such auspices that, as is well known, these misguided people go *in pairs*, each with his partner selected beforehand, and there engage in fanatical dances, like some of the enthusiasts of the times of Reformation. It was at such a meeting that, the lights being put out, the preacher gave the signal, "Come, le' we [let us] go hunt for find Jesus," and then he and all the brethren and sisters on their knees engaged in a general scramble until ere long the exultant shout of the preacher and his fellows began to be heard, "Oh! I find um! I got um!" Still further: it is amongst assemblies held by such men, that the old *Fetich* worship of their fatherland begins in various places to be revived amongst the unfortunate freedmen torn away from those influences which, banishing these horrid rites from amongst them, had substituted the rational and pure worship of the true and living God. For example, in portions of South Carolina the negroes are known to be boiling the lizard for purposes of witchcraft; while in North Carolina two freedwomen have been arrested and imprisoned for offering the sacrifice of a living negro child.

The significance of all this is, that to ruin this race religiously, is to ruin them every way. Formerly, Southern Christians were highly commended by their Northern brethren (especially Presbyterians) for faithful endeavors to preach Christ to the slaves. Who can now deny that it is a bad omen for the future of the freedmen that they should to so great an extent turn away from their former teachers and the blessed message of grace which they still bear. Unspeakably sad indeed is this feature of the present moral and religious condition of these unhappy people. Rejecting competent and faithful teachers, who still, as of old, love the negro, and have long manifested their earnest desire for his welfare both in this world and in the next, and blindly following after every kind of substitute, what a future would seem to be before the freedman, of delusion, fanaticism, and destruction! The Southern Christian, so long his faithful and patient teacher, must still be forbearing and affectionate, if, by God's help and blessing, he may win back these wanderers, from their ignorant and fanatical leaders, to the teachings of saving truth.

Another very significant feature of the moral condition of the freedmen has reference to their youth of both sexes. The present generation were trained under a dispensation, more or less faithful and complete, of the gospel of the grace of God. The generation now growing up, for the most part, have no man to care for their souls. All the schools set up by the government and by private individuals must come far short of reaching the great body of their youth. And where they do reach them, it is for the most part only secular knowledge which they furnish, and that (although good in itself, and every way better than ignorance) cannot of its own power, purify the heart or life. It is not possible to deny, what indeed it was in the circumstances perfectly natural to expect, that, to a dreadful extent, the black boys now growing up are addicted to the most horrible obscenity and blasphemy. How could it be otherwise? There is no *master* now to restrain them, and their parents, unfortunately, are incapable of it. The government cannot supply by schools the restraining, correcting, elevating influences, which the system recently abolished was able to carry, and did carry more or less perfectly into every corner of the whole land. The white man, though in very many cases himself not a pious Christian, was yet, nevertheless, steadily, though indirectly and unconsciously, nay, even involuntarily, at work lifting up the black race from moral degradation. What is the inevitable result? The rising generation of negroes as they are growing up, to a great extent, without any kind of instruction either of books, or of a trade, or of agricultural labor; and as they are growing up (unlike their fathers) without any sympathetic relations to the white race, so they are also growing up, to a great extent, in unrestrained vice; to be a curse to the whites, to their parents, to themselves, and to one another alike.

Such are some features of the present condition of the freedmen. What is the promise of their future?

The grand doctrine of the unity of the human race necessarily underlies the whole scheme of redemption. It would be incumbent upon Christians to uphold and defend it, even if God had not expressly revealed it in his word. But independently of

the express words of Scripture, and of inevitable deductions from its clearest doctrinal teachings, the unanimous testimony of all sciences that touch the subject tends to the same conclusion. The revelations of Anatomy, Physiology, Philology, and Ethnology, with wonderful accuracy, confirm the higher revelation; and one of the most curious of the many tricks of the devil, is his employment of shallow professors of these very sciences, to disprove the doctrine. There are thousands of men all over this land, and in every part of it, of more than average intelligence and culture, who to this day regard the pitiful work of Nott and Gliddon, ("Types of Mankind,") as conclusive upon this subject. Yet the review of Dr. Cabell, of Virginia, published ten years ago, effectually demolished this infidel work, and scattered the flimsy materials of which it was composed into fragments. The devil is neither subdued nor disheartened, however, but boldly inspires fresh emissaries to write, print, and sow broadcast, similar theories, throughout Southern homes in the present day, well knowing that the last refuge and hope of this ignorant and oppressed people is in the humanity of their former masters; because the recognition of the *brotherhood* of the race, and the negro's share in the benefits of redemption was, of course, the broad foundation upon which the great work of evangelizing this inferior race proceeded.

Concerning the inherent wickedness of these assaults as directed, first, against the truth of God, and secondly, against the very existence of these defenceless people, it is very difficult to speak with moderation. If the reader will consider that jealousy for the honor of the Lord God of hosts is entirely compatible with unfeigned interest in and compassion for this unhappy people, nay, absolutely requires this interest and compassion on our part, because they are his creatures and his children; he may appreciate this difficulty. On the one hand, the negro is assailed by writers, calling themselves friends of the South, who affect to write in the interest and behalf of the white population now groaning under intolerable burdens. With a slender and deceitful show of learning they even venture to discuss the question in its ethnical aspect, and the result of their labors is to degrade

the negro to the condition of the brutes that perish, and thus rob him of the sympathy of the only people that ever cared for his soul! On the other hand, he is assailed by emissaries of a fanatical faction, composed for the most part of men who hate the negro only less than they hate his former master. The avowed purpose of this faction is to use the freedmen as instruments to work their own political aggrandizement. And as the future of the black population cannot be considered without some reference to the political side of the question, it is necessary to give this part of the subject a brief examination.

As in the nature of the case, it is simply impossible that the whites of the South can ever be dragooned or cajoled into affinity with the authors of their ruin, the only hope of Radical disorganisers must be in the suffrages of the blacks. Two things are indispensable to the success of the scheme. First, the freedmen must be taught that his late master is his most inveterate enemy. Secondly, he must be fully invested with the rights and privileges of citizenship.

In a discussion like this—one in which the destinies of a mighty empire are involved, it is scarcely possible for any man with a human soul to be swayed by such paltry considerations as the success of merely partisan measures. Neither is it possible for such a man to let his abhorrence of the atrocious principles of a party degenerate into personal hatred of individuals. In the midst of the perils that now environ this Republic, he is a shallow thinker who can be absorbed in the contemptible squabbles of politicians, when the whole heavens are shrouded in portentous clouds, and the broad land trembling in the throes of an earthquake which threatens to engulf a nationality. In what may be here said, therefore, about individuals, no touch of personal or vindictive feeling can find a place.

Looking, first, at the seat of authority and power, under whose shadow the schemes above suggested have been devised, what are the distinguishing characteristics of the acknowledged leader of the dominant party? In so far as a man may be judged by his public deliverances, there is no room for doubt as to the proclivities of the Pennsylvania representative. Let it be remem-

bered that the questions which affect the political status of the negro have been the *only* questions discussed in any political canvass since the end of the war. Consequently, the men in power are representative men, and the theories they openly advocate are the theories of their constituents! Advancing one step higher—the leader of opinion and legislation in the Senate—the representative of a populous State—has presented to the world a clear and unmistakable record. What the world's judgment upon this record will be half a century hence, it is not difficult to predict. Advancing still another step, it is fair to take such individuals as Hunnicutt and Brownlow as representatives of the missionary agents of the religious segment of the faction, and thus the climax is reached. If the political future of the freedmen can be shaped by these legislators, and the religious future of the freedmen determined by these teachers, there is no conflict of opinion to hinder their full success; for the politicians and the preachers are at agreement.

Here then is the picture: The leader of the Senate, the leader of the House of Representatives, (both absorbed in the good work of enfranchising the blacks of the South, bending all their energies to the accomplishment of this solitary purpose,) the governor of a Southern State, and the most prominent of the politico-religious emissaries in Virginia, (and the two last mentioned *quasi*-preachers of the gospel of Christ!) all of these busy men, and following their lead a horde of their agents, political and religious, all over the South, are diligently laboring to the same end; and under God, the future of the freedmen depends upon their success or failure. So far as they may be able to affect the condition of the white men in the South, it is certain that whatever can be accomplished by acuteness, diligence, and zeal, urged on by a malignity that has no parallel in human history, will be done. But this is no part of the matter now under examination, except as it incidentally affects the condition of the negro.

For the sake of the argument, let it be supposed that the object of the dominant faction in elevating the negro to the dignity of citizenship, is ultimately to benefit and strengthen the State. It would be a rash and dangerous experiment under the

most favorable circumstances. If the white population of the South unanimously and cordially coöperated in such a movement, there would still be insurmountable obstacles in the way. But this is so far from the fact, that the most prominent feature in the Radical programme, is the fostering of a terrible antagonism between the two races, and the elevation of the one is made coincident with and dependent upon the degradation of the other. Humanly speaking, nothing can be more certain than that a persistence in these efforts will result disastrously, and the proximate effects are already apparent. To some of them we have already referred in the earlier pages of this article. Now, numerous and mighty and skilful as may be the agents in this enterprise, and however untiring and zealous the efforts put forth by them, the elevation of the black people to a positive political and social equality with the whites, is simply an impossibility. Vain must be every effort to resist the decrees of God; and if any fact is demonstrable from the known annals of mankind, it is the fact that God has so constituted the two races as to make their equality *forever* impossible. Indeed, it is the recognition of this very truth that has given birth to those monstrous falsehoods touching the unity of the human family, to which attention has already been directed. It is as certainly true that God has brought about the distinctive diversity of races, as that he has made of one blood all the races that dwell on the earth.

It would be easy to show upon universally admitted authority, the separation of these various and distinct races into subdivisions even more numerous than the five great families that people the earth. But the present purpose is entirely served in noticing the essential difference between the two—the Caucasian and the African. These are confessedly the most distinct and distant, the one from the other, in all the natural attributes of humanity. Culture, climatic, influences, and all the varied causes of change and diversity, which form the staple of ethnological studies, do not explain the essential difference between these two families. It is only the sovereign providence of God that can solve the problem. The known effect of the gospel of Christ in changing the

character of whole nations does not reach the point. The gospel transforms the sinner into the saint; but the highest saint is only a sinner sanctified. The inculcation of human knowledge transforms the boor into the scholar; but the native attributes of the boor cling to him in spite of his learning. They cannot be educated away. It is not possible to take an infant from the banks of the Niger, and educate him up to the intellectual status of Newton, because God hath made them to differ.

So, if it were possible for the cultivated and Christianized races of the world to unite and devote all their energies to the elevation of the African race, giving each individual of this multitudinous family a separate and competent preceptor, the result of their labors would not be an intellectual equality, after long years of incessant application. In the few cases in which the negro has made any remarkable attainment in the ordinary fields of human research, the comparison is always instituted between him and the rest of his race, and never between him and the philosophers whose names are a portion of the world's history. Certainly it is not reasonable to expect the *savans* of the Freedman's Bureau to transform the millions that are under their charge into a condition approximating mental or moral equality with the white people around them. Of the one species, man, the present argument is confined to the two races—African and Caucasian; and as these are capable of subdivision into classes, it happens that the best specimens of both these races are to be found in the classes now inhabiting the United States.

It is possible that the great Anglo-Saxon family is the dominant race of the world. There are other tribes or classes of the Caucasian races, of superior physical development; but there is no race on the earth possessing the trait of intense individuality, by which this people is distinguished. In America, where more than anywhere else, the bloods of the Celt, the Saxon, the Gaul, and the Teuton, have been so intermingled, it would appear that a distinct nationality has been produced, possessing qualities of energy, endurance, self-reliance, acuteness, and receptivity—all elements of national greatness—to a degree far in advance of any other. Leaving out of view what are called the acci-

dental helps and hindrances to human progress—that is, in more appropriate words, the providences of God—the promise of this people's future is one of transcendent splendor.

On the other hand, the negroes in America who have here had the very best opportunity for mental, moral, and physical culture that has ever been afforded their race, have not, except in some few instances, materially improved their status. Speaking of the negro as a class, they are notoriously wanting in all those elements of success above enumerated. They are naturally indolent, unstable, dependent, dull, and without the capacity to receive instruction in any high degree. No part of this argument must be misconstrued into a denial of the negro's capacity to receive *religious* instruction. The wonderful grace and wisdom of God are manifested in the revelation of a gospel whose provisions include all the classes of mankind. His grace and wisdom are also manifest in the providence that placed the negro in a condition to receive this gospel and to be christianized by it. In Hayti and Jamaica, he does not appear to have made equal attainments, though he has been long free from the "dismal curse of slavery" in those localities. In the Northern States of the Union which have been happily free from the same "blighting curse" for long years, his religious character is no better than at the South.

As this is a land of schools, the black people in the Northern States have made some slight progress in the rudiments of learning. But how meagre is the result in comparison with the opportunity!

This grave discussion of the relative capacities of the two races has seemed necessary to introduce the question indicated by the title of the present article. If a small part of the foregoing is true, there is nothing short of the miraculous interposition of God that can make the social and political equality of the races possible. While the vast majority of the blacks were in a state of bondage, the question was susceptible of more than one solution. But now that these millions—suddenly freed, suddenly invested with new and extraordinary privileges, and suddenly inspired with vague apprehensions of their own importance, and with indef-

inite expectations of ease and affluence to be conferred upon them by governmental authority—are thrust upon the hearts and consciences of a Christian nation, the question assumes an aspect both perplexing and threatening. What future can this people carve out for themselves, or what future can be assigned them by those who occupy a higher place in the scale of humanity? It is not possible that they should remain in their present condition, a condition that is tolerated by both races only because it is understood to be a transition state. It is still less possible that they should attain a perfect assimilation with any portion of the white citizens of this country, where a subdivision into classes is jealously repudiated by those of them who occupy the third and lowest round of the social ladder. It is most of all impossible to replace them in their late condition of slavery, as their former owners would as earnestly resist such a step as the ex-slaves themselves could do.

There are three possible answers to this question.

I. The partial or total extermination of the black race.

1. No writer could gain access to these pages who would regard this catastrophe otherwise than with unmingled horror. No man possessed of human sympathies can contemplate the picture presented in the present condition of the freedmen without commiseration, or attempt to forecast their dark and portentous future without dismay. And of all the ways of exodus from the complications that environ the subject, none is so appalling as that presented in the possible blotting out of existence of a population more numerous than some of the nationalities of Europe. Nevertheless, the extermination of the negro is coolly suggested, and the mode of operation calmly discussed by thousands of white men, as a solution of the problem, meeting the exigencies of the case more squarely than any other feasible plan. The readers of this journal are not unacquainted (see *S. P. R.* for Nov., 1867, pp. 579–583) with a recent publication by the notorious author of “*The Impending Crisis*,” in which the destruction of the negro is urged, on the ground that they are “*evidently foredoomed to destruction*” and “*fit only to be exterminated*” like the Indians. It is the logical culmination of ab-

olitionism, for abolitionism is infidel, and hates both black and white, both man and God. It is the crowning work of a man, who has done as much perhaps as any other to deluge the land with the blood spilt in the late war.

2. The tendency to this violent termination of existing complications is far more urgent and painful than appears on the surface. Among the true citizens of the South there are not two parties in conflict. The struggle is between Southern men and the imported agents of a Northern faction. But in the Northern States the party in power and the opposition are at agreement on many points. For example: the propriety and justice of the emancipation acts; the inherent evil of slavery; the necessity for, and justice of, a long and bloody war for the abolishment of the system. On one side these propositions are asserted with emphasis; on the other, they are either quietly acquiesced in, or opposed with extremely faint denial. The contest is not for or against the undying abstract principles which underlie the question propounded in this concrete form, but rather for power and place, for the *eclat* and emoluments of official station and for the triumphs of personal ambition. The old cry of oppression is not entirely given up, it is true, but it is regarded as a burlesque on both sides; while the main fact, namely, that the negro is an incumbrance and a hindrance, is tacitly admitted by both. As for any real personal tenderness of feeling towards the unhappy freedmen, it would be both vain and unreasonable to seek for it in that latitude. The slave—may God pity him! has no friend except his former master, who has been legislated into a condition in which he is utterly powerless to aid the servant born in his house, or even to retard his doom. In the meantime, these two powerful parties are directly operating for his extermination; one of them, by industriously creating and fostering a ferocious antagonism between the races, making incendiary appeals to the basest passions of the ignorant negro, (who is rapidly relapsing into savage barbarism,) and preparing the way for the repetition of the horrors of the Sepoy mutiny; the other, by familiarizing the public mind with the idea that the negro is doomed; that the war of races is inevitable, and that the only

permanent cure for the disease that is destroying the body politic is the destruction—the excision—of the cancer that is preying upon its vitals, to wit, the negro! A little longer continuance of the present mode of treatment may make this opinion frightfully true. A correspondent of the *New York Journal of Commerce*, in commenting recently upon an opposition editorial in that paper, uses the following language: “The vital cause and motive of negro suffrage, its principal justification in the eyes of most people is this: that having emancipated a whole race, severing the bond of interest which formerly bound their masters and them, and in so doing having naturally and inevitably aroused the hatred of the former towards them, we cannot in common justice, leave them in the hands of their late owners without some protection.” There is no reply to a fabrication so base and baseless as this. Yet it is the common opinion of the party in power, and of the most conscientious of its members. How long a time will it require to convince the credulous negro that this false charge is true, and that his salvation depends upon the destruction of the white race? And if the conflict thus induced be once inaugurated, the extermination of the semi-savage people is absolutely certain.

3. But supposing that no such crisis is impending, there are other causes in operation that threaten the speedy destruction of the freedmen. In all the localities that have been visited by pestilential diseases, the relative mortality among the black people has always been disproportionately large. There seems to be less recuperative power, less ability to resist the encroachments of disease in the children of this race, than is found in any other that is even partially civilised. And during the winter just past, the ratio of deaths among them is greater than the extreme rate in life assurance tables compiled from the records of the most pestilential localities inhabited by civilised men. The history of nomadic tribes has always been a terribly brief story, from the legends of the wanderers in the arid deserts of the tropics to those of the dwellers in the frozen zone. But all of these records lack the bad elements that characterise the recent history of the freedmen. They are, to a great extent, wanderers without any

settled purpose, broken up into small bands of Ishmaelites, whose very existence is fast growing into a national curse. The cost of all the eleemosynary institutions of Great Britain, is very far less than the national expenditure for the sustentation of the freedmen in these Southern States; yet multitudes of them perished from actual poverty and exposure during the past winter. Decimated by disease, decimated by poverty and starvation, rapidly drifting into predatory habits of life—their hand against every man, and every man's hand against them—all that is needed to secure the destruction of the poor Africans, is to let them alone!

4. The white tax payers in the whole land, especially at the North, are growing extremely restive under their intolerable burdens. While the war was in progress, men paid cheerfully a portion of their large gains; but during the past year this rapidly accumulated money has been rapidly melting away. The reverses in commercial circles in 1867, were terribly severe; and while the demands of the tax-collector were none the less urgent, the ability of the payers was very seriously diminished. So, the outcry against the enormous expenditures for the support of the freedmen, has increased in volume, until to-day it is no longer a *party* cry. The most ultra of radical organs begin to demand the ballot for the negro as a substitute for bread! While they have not had the effrontery to state the proposition in plain terms, the drift of their reasoning is precisely to this purport. The following quotation is comparatively moderate in its tone: "The ballot is designed to afford protection to the negro cheaply and efficiently, and in time will supersede the Freedman's Bureau, military governments, and all other temporary and expensive schemes, which, without it, would have to be continued in force indefinitely. * * * People have no confidence that the white race at the South will treat the negro any more fairly than compelled to, and they deem some new measure necessary to his protection." There is no need to call attention to the animus of this sentence, as applied to the white race, but the evident restiveness of the Northern philanthropists under the Bureau outlays is the most suggestive point. The comment of the *Journal of Commerce* upon the above quotation is: "The tender mercies of Northern men are cruelty to the emancipated race."

The Bureau is growing in disfavor, and its days are numbered. It has done enormous evil in the land by rendering a class whose proclivities are to idleness and vagrancy, more idle and vagrant. In a dozen populous States, where a poor-house was formerly unknown, it has created a race of paupers, whose needs are frightfully urgent. And just as this class is absolutely perishing for aid, its aid will probably be withdrawn, and then comes chaos. The planters, impoverished by the results of last year's operations, have been this year unable to employ all the willing laborers; whilst, unfortunately, thousands of them, inflated with false hopes of government support, or incapable, like all barbarian and semi-barbarian people, of patient labor voluntarily undergone, are unwilling to be employed. An idle vagabond,* with the undefined impression upon his mind, that the property of his late master is somehow to pass into his possession, the negro will take by stealth or violence that which he cannot earn, and so the war of races will begin. At the end of the horrors that would accompany such a strife, the extermination of the negro is the most certain fact to predict.

II. Another possible solution of the problem is in the deportation of the black population. If it is impossible that the two races should dwell peaceably together on terms of equality, no matter from what cause or causes, may it not be possible to effect a separation of the incongruous elements? The colonization of the blacks on their native soil, has long been a favorite scheme with some few philanthropists of both sections. The measure commends itself to minds at either extreme of the controversy. The cure for the evil in question that promises to be most effectual, is the restoration of the ex-slave to his own continent, to win from its luxuriant fields an easy subsistence. It is true, that these fields have to be wrested from the hordes of his

*It was a very general thing last year for the freedmen's wives not to be included in the contracts for plantation labor; in imitation of their white sisters, they were to remain at home, keep the house, mend the clothes, prepare the food, take care of the children, etc. This plan is not now so general, and has given place to another borrowed from the Indians instead of the whites. It is for the wife to go to the field and labor, while the husband, with fishing-rod or gun, betakes himself to the swamp.

heathen kindred, or from the usurped dominion of the brute creation. But the American negro, if a small part of that which is claimed for him be his true possession, should be more than equal to the task. If he is fit to take part in the government of the American Republic, he is surely fit to establish a government for himself in Africa. The degree of civilisation to which he has attained here, is the surest guarantee of his success there. In the virgin soil of the fertile valleys which recent explorations have opened to the world, the yield secured to the agriculturist would far exceed the product from any lands in these States. The climate, so destructive to Caucasian life, is the native climate of the negro. These tropical lands, where the white man perishes, would be to the negro the very vale of paradise. On the other hand, the Southern citizen who complains least of the burden, is more encumbered by the freedmen than anybody else. He has so long been accustomed to recognise the claim of the blacks to his protection and support, that he still manifests his readiness to feed and clothe them, in the midst of his own poverty. Therefore the deportation of this dependent and shiftless population would be an inestimable boon to him. And when considered in comparison with the atrocious policy of extermination, which is an actual, clearly-defined scheme presented to the Southern people, any plan of colonization would undoubtedly meet their unanimous approval. But there are difficulties to be considered.

1. The removal of this bone of contention would be the immediate destruction of the party in power, supposing it could be effected by legal enactments. Moreover, such a step would be entirely subversive of all the theories of all the abolitionists of the world. It would be a tacit admission of the fact that will be the salient point in the history of these days, to be written half a century hence; to wit, that the white men of the South are being ground under the heel of the most remorseless despotism that has ever cursed the earth, for the sake of an abstraction which is contradicted by all the experience and all the science of mankind. The deportation of the negro is a denial of his fitness for association on equal terms with the white citizen. It

is therefore vain to expect the accomplishment of a wholesale colonization by legislative authority.

2. It is equally vain to expect the freedmen to expatriate themselves. The voluntary emigrants to Liberia, especially after the novelty of that enterprise had worn off, were always very few in number. And it is probable that no benevolent associations have accomplished so little in proportion to the efforts made, as the various colonization societies of America. While the good they have done should not be underrated, it will not be denied that their chief difficulty has ever been to overcome the repugnance of the negro to avail himself of their aid. In many cases, especially in Maryland and Virginia, families of slaves were manumitted, and express provision made for their deportation; but there has always existed among the free blacks who should have been the first to join in the emigration scheme, (which undoubtedly had for its object the establishment of an enlightened negro nationality,) an invincible repugnance to it. Since the general emancipation of the Southern slaves, the blessings of freedom here have almost universally satisfied them; and comparatively very few have voluntarily taken steps leading to emigration. It is not credible that they have been deterred by what is called "love of country," as no such sentiment could be predicated of them while in bondage, and they have not had time to imbibe the sentiment from their most industrious teachers, if these had any to communicate. But the fact is as stated, and a formal proposition to emigrate to Africa, if it were made to them as a class, would doubtless be instantly rejected with scorn and indignation.

3. Another objection to universal colonization is that founded upon the value of the black laborer in Southern fields. It is sometimes asserted that he can be easily substituted by immigrants of white blood; but this assertion lacks proof. Supposing it possible to overcome the prejudices of the men who control the destinies of both races, and to manage the restoration of the negro to the subordinate position for which God designed him, without reviving the dead institution of slavery; and supposing his rights were secured to him by judicious laws; and finally, supposing his

mind could be disabused of the harmful impression that he is somehow the legal owner of the broad lands he formerly cultivated, it is extremely probable that he would cheerfully occupy his proper place, and prove himself the most valuable among the numberless workmen of the world.

III. The truest and best solution of the problem is thus suggested. It is to put into the hands of the men most competent by experience, most fitted by years of kindly intercourse with these simple people, the control of their future. Under God, the last hope of the freedmen is in the restoration of the Southern States to their rightful political status.

1. To say that the negroes, viewing them as a whole, are this day fugitives and vagabonds throughout the length and breadth of this Southern land, is to state the case in its true aspect. Many causes have operated against them since their manumission, but if they had not as a class been inherently shiftless and indolent, their condition would have been far better. They have been demoralized by the lessons they received from Northern teachers; and they have been damaged by indulgence in their own unrestrained and vicious habits. It is no easy task to bring them back into a condition in which they will be producers instead of profitless consumers; and the initial step, *sine qua non*, is the reinstatement of State authority. If the present ill-defined forms of authority were even efficient, there is a constantly recurring antagonism between or among them, and an ever-present apprehension that their powers are unsettled and transient. In more than one locality, the negroes themselves have not hesitated to resist the representatives of Federal power, and scout their authority. But a restoration of the ordinary forms of civil law would infallibly work the cure. Naturalists tell of the viscous flow of the glaciers of the far Northern coasts, as the most remarkable of the phenomena they describe. These vast seas of ice, apparently as solid and immovable as the rocky bed upon which they rest, are actually flowing towards the ocean with unremitted and resistless force and power. If, in their course, they encounter the huge boulders of that sterile region, these are taken up into the cold embrace of the advancing ice-

flood, and borne onward toward the sea. And at last the same glacier appears, issuing from the deep fiord, the majestic iceberg crowned with spire and minaret, and bearing upon its broad bosom the various *impedimenta* that vainly opposed its progress. So is the course of civil law. By slow and imperceptible advances, but with majestic force and certainty, it tends to the establishment of justice, and the peace and prosperity of its subjects. No more dire calamity can befall a people than the substitution of a different authority, like that of military law. One is the expression of the power of reason and rectitude; the other, the manifestation of mere brute force.

2. A new code is undoubtedly necessary to meet the exigencies of the new state of society. The law that was just and proper as applied to a slave population, would be manifestly improper as applied to the same population freed. It is not likely that any reader of these pages will need to be assured that a just and equitable code would be framed, if the citizens of these commonwealths were allowed to make it. The eyes of the civilised world would be upon them, and their legislation upon this subject would be worthy of their record. For the better part of a century, these men and their fathers controlled the legislation of a magnificent empire, and it is reasonable to suppose them capable of settling a question of strictly local application. To accuse them of inhumanity towards the black people; to suspect them of harsh or resentful feelings towards their former servants; to doubt that their enactments would be judicious, temperate, and beneficent, is to betray total ignorance of their character and antecedents, and to misapprehend entirely the nature of the task before them. The security of the peace and safety of the entire community would necessarily be their primary object. And the security of the highest possible prosperity of the freed people is necessarily involved in the larger proposition.

3. It is even possible to secure this sorely needed and conservative legislation, without restoring the ten States to their just and constitutional position. The territories, immediately under the control of the Federal authority, are still allowed to shape their own local laws. If the rulers, who cannot evade the terri-

ble responsibility that rests upon them touching the welfare of the millions of paupers they have made, could be induced to regard the subject from any other than a partisan stand-point, they would see the propriety of the measure here suggested. It is true that the success or failure of all the efforts of Southern law-makers, would not alter the original fact, for which the Southern people are in no wise responsible. But under tolerably favorable circumstances, and with tolerably fair treatment, this plan would be successful. There is absolutely *no* law now in force that makes special provision for the freedmen, excepting Bureau laws and military orders; one set, resting upon doubtful authority, and frequently inoperative; the other, *ex post facto*, in the nature of the case, frequently oppressive, and always liable to sudden repeal.

These brief suggestions—and they do not profess to be anything more than suggestions—are well worthy the consideration of all men who have the good of the country at heart. The subject is environed with peculiar difficulties, and is involved in peculiar complications, but the case is not hopeless. In the great contest for political place, for the emoluments of office, new men ever and anon struggle to the surface, and it is not unlikely that a leader may appear, who shall be chosen of God to extricate the country from the toils that are now around it, and preserve it for a career of unexampled grandeur.

The argument of Hugh Miller applies with wonderful accuracy to one or more of the points suggested in the foregoing pages. He says: "All these varieties of the species, in which we find humanity 'fallen,' according to the poet, 'into disgrace,' are varieties that have lapsed from the original Caucasian type. They are all descendants of man as God created him; but they do not exemplify man as God created him. They do not represent, except in hideous caricature, the glorious creature moulded of old by the hand of the Divine Maker. They are fallen,—degraded; many of them, as races, hopelessly lost. For all experience serves to show that when a tribe of men falls beneath a certain level, it cannot come into competition with civilised man, pressing outwards from his old centres to possess the earth, with-

out becoming extinct before him. Sunk beneath a certain level, as in the forests of America, in Van Dieman's Land, in New South Wales, and among the Bushmen of the Cape, the experience of more than a hundred years demonstrates that its destiny is extinction, not restoration."*

Nothing can be urged against the facts here stated, or against the deductions from them. The question to be determined is, whether or not the freedmen come under this category, or even if they are drifting towards that fatal level. If the latter is the case, then it becomes every good man to oppose the course of the tide which is sweeping them to destruction. A whole race cannot perish in the very midst of us without entailing a lasting curse upon the American name. The ghosts of these murdered millions will haunt the land, calling for vengeance upon the children of the degenerate people who perpetrated or permitted the wickedness. Because there is a possible remedy, and only one.

While it is undoubtedly true that the African race cannot come into "competition" with a superior class, and survive the ordeal, it is also true that this race may be placed in subordination to, and under the tutelage of, the rightful citizens of America, and so escape the antagonism that threatens their extermination. In this condition of a regulated and protected subordination, they may attain their highest possible development. In any other conceivable condition, they are verily doomed. Every Christian recoils with abhorrence from the mere idea of extermination, and no higher duty can challenge the earnest attention of the American people than the duty of saving this decaying race, if peradventure, God has purposes of mercy towards them.

First, then, nothing can be done while the patent fact of the essential inferiority of the black race is denied, or even ignored. The acknowledgment of their equality, is the establishment of the fatal competition. All that is proposed for their aid, proceeds upon the assumption of their nonage, their dependence, their subordination.

Secondly, the variable forms of law, so far as they affect the

* Testimony of the Rocks.

status of the freedmen, must give place to some stable legislation, and the negroes must learn (all of them) that rulers are a terror to evil-doers.

Finally, no better model can be found than the "poor laws" of Massachusetts. The shiftless wanderer in that highly favored commonwealth has a short experience of freedom. If a man travels from one town to another without money and without occupation, he is provided for by the State. He is furnished with a dwelling place, more or less permanent according to his own abilities or proclivities, *in the workhouse*, where his pauperism is not totally profitless. His labor is hired out without consulting his preferences, and the temptations to assume vagabondage are not very numerous or brilliant in New England. Unfortunately for the idle and thriftless in that latitude, they have no institution corresponding with the Freedmen's Bureau; no machine invented to distribute premiums to idleness and unthrift. If the municipal authorities in the towns of the South were invested with powers similar to those of Massachusetts selectmen—if the numerous Hunnicutts were substituted by respectable policemen, the disorderly element in Southern population would speedily disappear.

The details of the arrangement are very simple, and would be suggested by circumstances as they were presented. The object of poor laws is to ameliorate the condition of the destitute, and to regulate the conduct of a class that is incapable of self-government. Under the abolished *regime*, the old and helpless were secured against the assaults of poverty. They were housed, clothed, and fed. In the vast majority of cases, the aged servants were the objects of the special and unremitting care of their owners' families. No public charities can as effectually prevent destitution among the old negroes; but there must needs be special legislation in their behalf.

Hitherto is the end of the matter. Five hundred thousand able-bodied men of a distinct race, without any positive concert of action or purpose, are steadily advancing towards the termination of their history. They are daily becoming more and more improvident, more restive under restraint, and more truculent.

Docile and manageable as this people has ever been under the wise and beneficent government of the white race, it is still certain that there is a latent ferocity in the African character, which generations of civilisation cannot destroy. It is now being awakened, cultivated, and encouraged. Woe to the land, when the reaping-time comes! The heart recoils with a shudder, from the contemplation of the appalling possibility. But at the end of this horrible harvest, the very foot-prints of the black race will have been effaced from the surface of this continent.

The Lord God omnipotent reigneth. He maketh the wrath of man to praise him, and the remainder of wrath doth he restrain. In this solitary, sublime truth is the hope of the country, and the security for its future. And it is enough.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

Ecce Ecclesia: An Essay, Showing the Essential Identity of the Church in All Ages. New York: Blelock & Co. 1868. Pp. 576, 12 mo.

The *getting-up* of this volume is not in first-rate style—the paper and the binding being both inferior. These defects are fully made up, however, by the simple, clear, forcible style, strong common sense, and competent learning of the writer. The author purposes a strict *incognito*, dropping no hint whereby the reader may discover who or what he is. We feel persuaded, however, that he is not a Baptist, and we are strongly inclined to the opinion that he is not a Presbyterian. There is no sign of Episcopacy, much less Popery, about him. He seems very familiar with Methodist bishops, and other of their authors, and we are led to the conclusion that he is a Methodist, and a Southern man at that. But we have detected no Arminian tendencies in his book, although Chapter XL. contains some expressions which might possibly be understood to squint that way. We hail the writer, whoever he may be, as a Christian brother, the doctrine of whose book and his whole manner of presenting and urging it, draws us strongly to him. What is more, we hail him as an efficient ally in establishing the *jus divinum* of that system of Church Government which we believe to be revealed in the Scriptures.

The doctrine of this writer is, that the Church in all ages has

been one and the same. He admits that this is the common doctrine of Protestant divines, yet he shews by many references and quotations how they overlook and deny it continually. Neander, Adam Clarke, Coleman, Barnes, Henry, Bloomfield, Conybeare and Howson, Thomas Scott, Macknight, Nevin, Dick, George Smith, Watson, Doddridge, Burkitt, Dwight, Kitto, Fairbairn, Olshausen, Paley, Schaff, Gieseler, Buck, Benson, Keith, Horne, Bishop Wightman, and some others, are brought in to illustrate how often the Jewish Church and the Christian Church, the Jewish religion and the Christian religion, are spoken of as different and opposite things. But he maintains (and does it clearly, forcibly, and successfully,) that Christ and his apostles set up no new Church, and introduced no new religion; that there never has been and never could be any but one true religion from the beginning, and that is Christianity; that all the patriarchs and prophets and Old Testament saints were believers in Christ, that is, *Christians*; that the Jews not in small but great numbers, embraced Jesus when he came, as the true Messiah; that the rejecting Jews became apostates from their national religion, and do not now hold to true and proper Judaism; also that as the true Church of God has existed from the very fall, when the first promise of redemption was given, so there has always been a competent knowledge of God accessible to men; and both before the flood and after the flood, both in the patriarchal and Mosaic times, and all along down to the full noontide of New Testament revelation, God has been manifesting himself in his Son clearly and savingly to men.

We do not accept every statement made by this author, but we acknowledge ourselves his debtors for instruction upon the point he presses so earnestly, and him as our co-adjutor in the controversy with Baptists on the one hand, and Papists on the other, and with certain Presbyterians in the middle.

This work has been severely criticised and summarily condemned, but we have reason to suspect the critics of judging without careful reading and considering. For example, it has been characterised, in two or three very different quarters, as belonging to the "Ecce series," and that series a "descending" one

as to originality and force. But this work has nothing whatever to connect it with the three works alluded to, except the word *Ecce* in the title. Those three books do form a series, for they relate to one and the same subject, and they controvert one another. This book relates to a different question altogether, and makes no reference to either of those three. But critics are like other men, and following sound more than sense, they have, merely on account of the use of this sensational title, imagined here a connexion which does not exist.

Again, it has been said the subject is too limited to warrant the use of so wide a name as *Ecce Ecclesia*. Now surely the topic is wide enough—the identity of the Church *in all ages*; and surely the argument is wide enough, for the author draws his proof from all quarters.

Another fault found is, that the book is “full of unauthorised assumptions, with but little attempt at proof.” On the contrary, it appears to us, that the author aims at establishing but one point, and that in doing this he accumulates proof upon proof, almost without end.

Again, it is complained that the book casts “no additional light” upon what is universally admitted amongst Protestants. But, it appears to us, that though the doctrine of this book is indeed the “common faith of Protestants,” yet many of them have taken a strange way of manifesting that such is their faith, for the author quotes abundantly their use of expressions to the contrary. The service done by the author for what is doubtless the “common faith of Protestants,” is, that he sets it forth in a clear and convincing manner through eighty-eight chapters, none of them long, but none of them irrelevant to the point in hand.

Once more, the book is said to contain “near six hundred pages of dreary twaddle.” This clinches our charge, and proves that these critics have not carefully read, and do not know the book condemned. We cannot conceive how any Christian minister should fail to be interested in the subject of this treatise; but that any one feeling such an interest, and examining candidly and carefully this volume, should pronounce it “dreary twaddle,” is simply impossible.

VOL. XIX. NO. 2—10.

The Book of Praise: From the best English Hymn-Writers. Selected and arranged by ROUNDELL PALMER. Cambridge, Sever & Francis. 1864.

This exquisitely printed book is a striking instance of that feature in the abler English minds of which Mr. Gladstone and Lord Derby have given us even more remarkable examples in secular literature: studies profitably pursued as recreation, amid stern and apparently absorbing toils. Sir Edward Roundell Palmer is Attorney General of England; and has yet pursued his search for hymns, with a friend's help, through the works of sixty-four deceased authors, named in the preface (p. x.), besides the many living authors not catalogued there, but duly credited elsewhere.

It is difficult to say what the principle of selection has been, and the author does not tell us. The title page names "the best *English* hymn-writers;" but Ralph Erskine (ccclxx.) is no Englishman.* Nor has he regarded only hymns of praise; nor exclusively hymns to be sung; nor rare hymns; nor hymns peculiar to any one type of doctrine. And the most reasonable remaining supposition would seem to be that these were the compiler's own favorites. And this, after all, is really the pleasantest view; because we are thereby brought into acquaintance with the man himself, and come to enjoy a fresh Christian sympathy with one whose choice is so pure and so spiritual.

The work is thus not "a standard collection," in any sense of that much used phrase. It is the culling and delight of a refined taste, a cultivated mind, and a pious heart; and to be prized accordingly.

One is astonished to find the practice of altering hymns so universal, even among hymn-writers—and those the very writers who complain of such liberties, when taken with them:

"The Wesleys altered the compositions of George Herbert,

* Neither is "O mother dear, Jerusalem,"—here disguised by substituting "Jerusalem, my happy home" for its first line—an English hymn, but Scotch, and of the true old Covenant ring.

Sandys, Austin, and Watts. Toplady, Madan, and others, altered some of Charles Wesley's hymns, much to his brother John's discontent, as he testifies in the preface to his *Hymn-Book for Methodists*. Toplady's own hymns, even the "Rock of Ages," have not escaped similar treatment. James Montgomery complains much, in the preface to the edition of his collected hymns published in 1853, of his share in this peculiar cross of hymn-writers, as he calls it. But he had himself, about thirty years before, altered the works of other men, in his *Christian Psalmist*. Bishop Heber, scholar as he was, and editor of Jeremy Taylor's works, silently altered Taylor's Advent Hymn in his own hymn-book." Preface, p. viii.

We miss some, at least in extracts, of the sweetest and best of sacred lyrics. Not a word of Milton's Ode upon the Nativity. Walter Scott's noble hymn borrowed from the Dies Iræ—"That day of wrath"—is omitted; and we have but three stanzas of Montgomery's "Grave," and but one of Milman's best hymns, though that is exquisite: "Brother, thou art gone before us."

As we have already intimated, there is no room for such remarks by way of *censure*; any more than there would be if we walked in Sir Roundell's library and found that certain favorite books of ours had no place on his shelves.

The thought of grouping his selections upon the clauses of the Lord's Prayer and of the Catholic Creeds is a graceful idea, but necessitates some odd and far-fetched combinations; *e. g.*, several of the richest hymns of heaven appear under the heading, "I believe one Catholic and Apostolic Church."

Still, it is a choice book. There is a charm in rambling on from hymns just out of the mint, to the reverend songs of two hundred and fifty years ago. It kindles into holy exultation the sense of the unity of the invisible Church, as we find the thousand voices of God's worshippers, diverse in doctrine, rank, period, sect, pouring forth such perfect accord of hope, and pious fear, and praise. It lifts the thoughts to that world of peace, of which every Sabbath is a reminder; and therefore we conclude with one sweet Sabbath strain of George Herbert's. (P. 328.)

O Day most calm, most bright!
The fruit of this, the next world's bud;
The indorsement of supreme delight,

Writ by a friend, and with His blood;
 The couch of time; care's balm and bay;
 The week were dark, but for thy light;
 Thy torch doth show the way.

Sundays the pillars are
 On which Heaven's palace arched lies
 * * * * *

They are the fruitful beds and borders
 Of God's rich garden; that is bare,
 Which parts their ranks and orders.

The Sundays of man's life,
 Threaded together on Time's string,
 Make bracelets to adorn the wife
 Of the eternal, glorious King;
 On Sunday, Heaven's gate stands ope;
 Blessings are plentiful and rife,
More plentiful than hope.

What a volume compressed into that last line! We know very well these lines are familiar; but they cannot be worn threadbare.

The Christian Ministry. With an Inquiry into the Causes of its Inefficiency. By the late Rev. CHARLES BRIDGES, A. M., Author of "An Exposition of Psalm 119th;" "The Exposition of Proverbs," etc. Carter & Brothers. New York. 1868.

The publishers have done good service to the cause of Christ in bringing out a new edition of this invaluable work. The sixth, and apparently last, English edition was published in 1844. The Carters have wisely placed it among their first publications for the new year. It is the production of a zealous and faithful minister of the Church of England, and exhibits the same earnest piety, extensiveness and accuracy of reading, and maturity and finish of thought and composition, which characterise his work on Proverbs. No minister can prayerfully read this book without its forming an era in his life:

The author's conception of the Ministry is illustrated in the following closing paragraph of a chapter: "But let every view

of the ministry realise it as an *absorbing work*; as a high and holy vocation; involving results which eternity alone can disclose, and therefore demanding the entire consecration of health, time, energy, and life itself, to the accomplishment of its vast designs. If the soul be really engrossed with the mighty project of 'saving souls from death,' and instrumentally fixing them in the Redeemer's crown—how will every other object fade as a mere transient emotion! The one self-annihilating desire will be, that whether our course be long or short, in joy or sorrow, in honor or dishonor, 'we may so labor that we may be accepted' of our gracious Master."

The work is divided into six parts. The first contains "a General View of the Christian Ministry." In this part the author treats of the divine origin and institution of the Christian Ministry, its dignity, its uses and the necessity for it, its trials and difficulties, its comforts and encouragements, the qualifications for it, and preparation for its duties. Under the last head, he treats of habits of general study, of special study of the Scriptures, of special prayer, and also of employment in the cure of souls.

In part second, we have "the General Causes of the Want of Success in the Christian Ministry." In this part the following topics are well discussed, viz.: The Scriptural Warrant and Character of Ministerial Success, together with the symptoms of want of success—The Withholding of Divine Influence; The Enmity of the Natural Heart; the Power of Satan; Local Hindrances; The Want of a Divine Call.

In the third part, the author discusses "The Causes of Ministerial Inefficiency connected with our Personal Character." This part should be read with prayer and fasting. The headings of the chapters are: Want of Entire Devotedness of Heart to the Christian Ministry; Conformity to the World; The Fear of Man; The Want of Christian Self-Denial; The Spirit of Covetousness; Neglect of Retirement; The Influence of Spiritual Pride; Absence or Defect of Personal Religion; The Defect of Family Religion, and the Want of Connexion of the Minister's Family with his Work; Want of Faith.

Parts fourth and fifth are devoted to the two great departments of ministerial work: "Pulpit Work and Pastoral Work."

What an awful calamity, by the way, is now upon the Church in our section of country, by the blotting out of pastoral work in great measure, through the exacting physical necessities of the times!

Part sixth is devoted to "Recollections of the Ministry," and is followed by a fervent evangelical address originally delivered before a company of three hundred and fifty clergymen.

The entire work is exceedingly copious, and apposite in its quotations and illustrations from a wide range of Christian literature. The occasional tinge of merely local and Episcopal sentiment found in the book, does not mar its excellence to any appreciable extent. Catholic, full of holy fervor and of weighty words, it deserves a place among the golden books of the minister's library. We have no means of ascertaining the extent to which former editions of it were purchased in this country, but we heartily wish that every minister in the land possessed a copy.

Ecce Deus-Homo; or, The Work and Kingdom of the Christ of Scripture. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1868. Pp. 207, 12 mo.

In point of typographical beauty and excellence, this volume is fully equal to either the *Ecce Homo* or the *Ecce Deus*, and this we consider no small praise to the Philadelphia publisher.

In point of ability on the part of the author, the work bears no comparison whatever with the second named of those two works, nor is it even equal to the first. This, however, is not much dispraise of the writer, for both those volumes exhibited great talent, and the second especially was, in our judgment, a book instinct with life and power. The author of *Ecce Deus* is a poet and a man of genius.

But in point of sound scriptural doctrine, this last work is far superior to both the volumes named. The chapter on the *Structure of Christ's Kingdom*, is especially to our liking, for it presents the doctrine of the Church as held forth in God's word,

with great clearness, justness, force, and truth. Of the chapter on the *Spirituality of the Kingdom*, we shall only say, that it presents the view at present urged with so much zeal by our friend and brother, STUART ROBINSON, and others. Indeed, the volume bears, in various parts of it, the impress of his mind, and we are sure the author of it, whoever he may be, holds him in very high honor.

We should be glad to have this book widely read and diffused throughout the whole land, as being in nearly all its teachings, as we suppose, the very truth of God. It is not, however, we feel bound to say in candor, such an answer to *Ecce Homo* and *Ecce Deus* as we had hoped to find in it.

Memories of Olivet. By J. R. MACDUFF, D. D., Author of "Morning and Night Watches," "The Shepherd and his Flock," "Sunset on the Hebrew Mountains," etc., etc. New York: Carter & Brothers, 530 Broadway. 1868.

One is tempted, at first thought, to accuse Dr. Macduff of an unpardonable fluency. The "et cetera" on the title page have rather an ominous appearance, in any case, and would betoken a grievous wrong done to the Church, where the author could have ripened richer thought for utterance, or have delivered himself in wiser words, by pause and study.

A mind must either have reached its actual completeness, and be capable of doing its best without special effort, or it must have chosen the rôle of reminder rather than of teacher, and be content to "declare the thing plentifully as it is," to write *currente calamo* without blame. Into this latter class falls Dr. Macduff.

He is familiar with the best topographers and the best commentators, and adds the point and life of personal acquaintance with the sacred places to the valuable matter compiled from them; and thus he is an ever-welcome visitor to those who are glad to get vivid impressions of the scenes of gospel history. Of this we will give some pleasant instances presently. It only remains to be said that the other parts of the book have the

charm of association, rather than of originality or depth. They call into action the best, the most necessary, and the most frequent thoughts and feelings, of the believer's heart. And though this does not involve the exercise of a high order of mental power, it does require a sound, warm, frank, clear heart, which is no small gift.

The introductory chapter contains a great deal of interesting matter; many of its sketches are material accessions to our knowledge;—as, for instance, this of the view from Olivet:

“The striking feature here is that of *contrast*—a contrast which, as we have just said, must have been greater and stronger still, when the city hard by, now comparatively solitary, was then ‘full of people.’ In the palmy days of Jerusalem, it must have seemed like a vast border watch-tower, separating death from life. Not more striking the transition between the green strip of the Nile in Egypt, and the barren contiguous desert; not more striking the contrast between the tropical verdure on the banks of the Barrada at Damascus, with the arid desolation of the hills of bare red earth, at whose base rushes its life-giving stream; than that between the view on the one side of Olivet,—the hallowed and gorgeous magnificence of Jerusalem, ‘beautiful for situation,’ (the western slope of the Jebel Tûr keeping vigil, like a wakeful Levite, over its sacred edifices,) with that on the other,—a wild sea of sandhills and limestone rocks, tossed and tumbled, as with Titan hands, in endless, fantastic, savage confusion, till they sink in the deep depression of the Jordan valley—the Dead Sea gleaming like dulled quicksilver in the far distance, backed by the wall of the Moab Mountains.” Pp. 5, 6.

“I am now seated on a stone embossed with lichen, and the ground strewn around with crimson anemones. The almond-tree is blossoming, and the fig-tree just putting forth its tender leaves.” P. 17.

“A specially rich cluster of them [*i. e.* the crimson anemones] were at the undoubted spot where He saw the city and wept over it.—*Home Letter*. I may here add, nothing can exceed the beauty and diversity of the spring flowers in Palestine; and more especially the glow imparted to hill and valley in the morning or evening sunlight from patches of this same anemone. I never can forget one evening in particular, riding along the tropical plain of Jericho, the flush of crimson glory on one of the mountain-sides near the Dead Sea. The floral brilliancy of March and April is one great reason for the selection of these months for the tour of the Holy Land, when ‘the winter is past,

the rain (the latter rain) is over and gone; and the flowers appear on the earth.'" P. 19, note.

We add a similar extract from a later page:

"The hand of man is indeed now upon Him; the gleam of the lantern—the midnight torch, and the flash of the traitors' swords, beheld from the scene of the agony coming down the opposite ravine, all tell of dastardly purposes of betrayal, torture, and death."* P. 327.

And the second section throughout—the "Royal Flight across the Mount"—is of deep interest, due to similar passages.

An Apology for African Methodism. By BENJ. T. TANNER, Baltimore. 1867. Pp. 468, 12mo.

We have read this book with very great interest, partly because it is the production of a colored man; partly for the information it furnishes upon an interesting subject; and partly because of the style and manner of the writing. The author was a student of the Theological Seminary at Allegheny, and has been or is pastor of a congregation of African Methodists in Baltimore. This book manifests a high degree of that kind of talent which belongs often to the negro race,—a lively imagination, and an eloquent use of words. Mr. Tanner possesses a great deal of graphic power. We should like to quote some of his racy and sparkling descriptions, which do him credit as a writer, and give life and interest to his book. He is filled with a commendable zeal for his own people's progress and elevation, and breathes a spirit of independence, courage, and hope. With him, it is a matter of honest and earnest pride that he belongs to "a church of men who support from their own substance, however scanty, the ministrations of the word which they receive; men who spurn to have their churches built for them, and their pastors supported from the coffers of some charitable organisation; men who prefer to live by the sweat of their own

* "From the present traditional locality of Gethsemane, the entire length of the eastern wall of the city with its gates is visible, so that the eye of Jesus could clearly discern, through the olive thicket, the approach of the band, as they emerged from these, and hurried down the steep slope." P. 327.

brow and be free;" p. 16; and he shows that his is "the only colored church in this country" which occupies this independent position. P. 333.

The African Methodist Episcopal Church was organised in 1816, at Philadelphia, by sixteen men, of whom, Mr. Tanner tells us, not one quarter were able to read or write intelligently. Richard Allen, a native of Philadelphia, was their leader and first bishop, a man of good common-sense and earnest Christian spirit. It is now about half a century old, with one hundred thousand church members; nearly two hundred "pastors;" not far from three hundred church buildings, many of them brick and valued at \$825,000; a college called "Wilberforce University," with fifty students, and four professors, one of Christian Theology, Moral Science, and Church Government, one of Greek and Mathematics, a third of the Natural Sciences, and a fourth of English, Latin, and French Literature. A publishing house and a weekly religious newspaper also belong to this body. Moreover, the British Methodist Episcopal Church is "a child of this Connexion, with a bishop, a numerous band of itinerant preachers, well built brick churches in all the Provincial cities and many of the towns, a score hundred of members and a well edited monthly organ."

Thus, beginning its existence in Philadelphia, this African Methodist organisation spread feebly into New York; more feebly still into New England; with considerable vigor into Canada; and with still more into the States of the North-west, and into Maryland and the other border States, up to the time of emancipation. Upon the occurrence of that event, it spread rapidly over the whole South, sweeping the "Methodist Episcopal Church South" quite clear of its colored membership, and adding immediately, (if we understand Mr. Tanner's book,) at least 75,000 to its roll of members. Of course there is nothing very strange or wonderful in this, when the circumstances of the case are considered.

There is one fact concerning the Church of Mr. Tanner, which we have learned from sources outside of his volume. The *New York Evangelist* quotes its New England exchanges as stating

that this Church and the Unitarians have formed an alliance; the African Church agreeing to disseminate the tracts and other publications of their Unitarian friends, this favor to be repaid by assistance in money and professors for the theological schools of the African Methodists. If this be so, the author must give up glorying in the self-supporting attitude of his Church. And we must also refuse to bid that Church God-speed, in its work of *infidelizing* the unhappy freedmen of the South.

A considerable portion of this volume is made up of sketches of the character of the bishops and chief men of the connexion, and specimens of the composition of the preachers and members. Some of these specimens exhibit, of course, very slender talents or information, but others are touching, poetical, and eloquent. As for the sketches, they are usually *in the superlative*, and the characters drawn are all nearly perfect. Taking the book as a whole, we must not severely judge any of its peculiarities, nor criticise sharply any of its defects. But we cannot help remarking that there is more in the volume about education than religion; about freedom than salvation; about physiology and progress than the gospel; about the talents of the different leaders, and the glory, zeal, self-reliance, and "manly movement" of the African Episcopal Church, than the kingdom of Christ. In fact, it appears to us, that Congress and the Capitol, General Howard and President Lincoln, figure more prominently in the history of this Church than the Lord Jesus himself.

The author's references to the institution of slavery, are, of course, very unfavorable, but this does not in the least affect our kindly feelings towards him and his brethren. It would be very strange if he were to have any other ideas on that subject. We can even read the few expressions which seem to evince, on the part of some who figure in this volume, some feelings of hostility towards the Southern white people, without any indignation being excited in our breasts, because these expressions are very few, and because we know how to pardon something to the sentiment of race, and to the natural, unavoidable, and insuperable prejudices of Mr. Tanner, and some of his associates, as free negroes from the North. It is, however, we would suppose, a matter

of great moment in every point of view, that the African Methodist Church, and all her leading men, take pains to avoid exciting the prejudices of the white race at the South by any such indications of hostility.

But no degree of the prejudice we have alluded to, can excuse some things contained in this volume; for example, this sentence in a piece of composition by one whom the author ranks "among the first of African preachers:" "The prayers of Stonewall Jackson were as refreshing to Beelzebub, as a draught of ice-water would be to the importunate and unfortunate Dives;" (pp. 409, 410;) or these sentences from one who is said to be "known to three continents": "First Christ, and next the negro, bore the cross of calvary. And no picture of salvation is complete except a halo of light ascending a hill, followed by a comely, sturdy negro bearing upon his brawny shoulder the Cross of Redemption and Salvation." "Christ and the negro! How wonderful! The inscrutable providence of God willed it thus. The plan of salvation not completed without the negro's aid." Pp. 385, 386.

To us, the two most interesting chapters of Mr. Tanner's book are those on ignorance and fanaticism. In the former, he defends his Church from the charge of being hostile to education by appealing to history to shew that it is no new thing for Christians to oppose "education when mixed up with errors and wickedness;" also, that as educated men of old often proved by their bad conduct a beacon to warn other Christians away from human learning, so it should cause no wonder if the same thing has happened amongst the colored people in this age and country. Then he concludes with this threefold statement, which we have had to abridge:

1. Though it is true that many of these people fail to appreciate education as they ought, the fact must be patiently "borne with, and not derided, but worked upon."

2. The heart ought not to pay tribute to the head. If education means a dead Christianity, which builds no churches and bestows no charities, and makes us willing to become perpetual paupers, living by the sweat of other men's brows, then away with it!

If an earnest Christianity is only for the simple, then let us continue such.

3. That the works and progress of the African Methodist Church prove it to be no lover of ignorance.

The chapter on fanaticism contains an ingenious and eloquent defence of the author's Church from this charge. It is as good a defence, we suppose, as could be made. The points are, that God requires a zealous service, and that in every dispensation of the Church, warm and lively zeal has been preferred to cold, dignified, heartless homage. And who shall draw the line between fervor and fanaticism? Only God is able to do it. The bane of this age of the Church is that ministers are elocutionists, not preachers of the gospel. "The rudeness of the Methodist preacher is the pointed presentation of the truth; it is the natural rudeness of the unhewn Cross." As to the emotional demonstrations in prayer meetings and class meetings, he says, the mass of the people being without education, yet having strong and warm affections, how can they express in words their enrapturing thoughts of God reconciled and sins forgiven? The language of signs and motions among Africans, however, is fast passing away, for the people are learning a better way. "With patience we await the time, not willing to doom to silence the generation that uses signs and motions—not willing to say with our revilers 'It is all wrong.' We say to these fathers and mothers, beloved, express all you possibly can with the tongue, but if the burden of your joy be too great, then speak with the streaming eye and the clapping hand, for he is most eloquent who expresses most fully the soul's great thoughts." P. 111.

The question of interest regarding popular excitements in religion is: What is the influence which produces them? So long as it is the truth of the gospel, the highest excitement is legitimate. But the excitement is a spurious and dangerous one, when not the truth, but mere animal sympathy or false doctrine has caused it.

Now, we think Mr. Tanner takes for granted too readily, that the religious excitements to which his people are so liable, are the pure offspring of the truth of God. And we are much mistaken

if the "signs and motions" employed where words fail amongst these ignorant people are merely "the streaming eye and the clapping hand." Alas! we have no belief at all that it is the sense of "a reconciled God and sins forgiven" which runs riot so often in the religious meetings of the freedmen. The apostle says those who have the care of men's souls should be "apt to teach," and our Lord declares that if the blind lead the blind both will fall into the ditch. What right has the African Methodist Episcopal, or any other Church, to set ignorance up to teach ignorance? And if they do so, what security is there that it will teach the truth? We personally know two of the ministers of this Church. One of them, as we have been credibly informed, has been selling tickets of membership for from ten to fifty cents per head, and gathering into the communion of his church all sorts of characters, who were ready to pay him this price. The other is as stupidly ignorant and as inexperienced in religious matters, as ninety-nine out of every hundred negroes of our acquaintance. When we asked him how he dared assume the care of men's souls, and how so ignorant a man had been made a minister, he answered: "I told them I didn't have education enough, but they said I had more now than most of themselves." Saying nothing whatever about the moral character of these two men, we protest that it is a fearful thing to commit "the ministry of reconciliation" to novices and babes like these. What avails the claim of many thousands of members added to their Church, when such men regulate the business? And what avails the pretence such make of a call from God to preach the word? Does God ever call whom he has not qualified? Is there not the greatest danger when an open door is set before "the prating fool," whether his skin be white or black, that he will enter? And would not the author's ingenious apology for the wild excitements gotten up in their churches, apply just as fairly to the case of the Anabaptists of the sixteenth century, or any of the fanatical religionists of the past?

It is very important that we comprehend the dangers threatening both the negroes and ourselves, but them especially, from a complete ecclesiastical independence on their part. Left to them-

selves by the white race, ignorance and fanaticism, it would seem, are very likely to carry the negroes far away out upon a wild ocean of religious errors, all the various dreadful consequences of which no language can portray. We can best express our sense of these dangers by quoting a few sentences from Isaac Taylor's celebrated work on Fanaticism.

"Manifest as it is that the human mind has a leaning towards gloomy and cruel excesses in matters of religion, whence can we derive a firm persuasion that this tendency shall in all future ages be held as much in check as it now is? Not surely from broad and comprehensive calculations, such as a sound philosophy authenticates. The supposition that human nature has forever discarded certain powerful emotions which a while ago raged within its circle, must be deemed frivolous and absurd." P. 16.

"Human nature, let us be assured, is a more profound and boisterous element than we are apt to imagine, when it has happened to us for a length of time to stand upon the brink of the abyss in a summer season, idly gazing upon the rippled surface, gay in froth and sunbeams. What shall be the movements of the deep, and what the thunder of its rage, at nightfall and when the winds are up!" P. 16.

"The security which some may presume upon, against the reappearance of religious excesses, if founded on the present diffusion of intellectual and biblical light, is likely to prove fallacious in two capital respects. In the first place, the inference is faulty, because this spread of knowledge, (in both kinds) though indeed wide and remarkable,—or remarkable *by comparison*,—is still in fact very limited, and its range bears an inconsiderable proportion to the broad surface of society, even in the most enlightened communities. If a certain number has reached that degree of intelligence which may be reckoned to exclude altogether the probability of violent movements, the dense masses of society on all sides, have hitherto scarcely been blessed by a ray of genuine illumination; moreover, there is in our own community, and in every country of Europe, a numerous middle class, whose progress in knowledge is of that sort which, while it fails to insure moderation or control of the passions, renders the mind only so much the more susceptible of imaginative excitement. * * * *
In now looking upon the populace of the civilised world, such as the revolutionary excitements of the last fifty years have made it, one might fancy to see a creature of gigantic proportions just rousing itself after a long trance, and preparing to move and act among the living. But what shall be its deeds,

and what its temper? The most opposite expectations might be made to appear reasonable. Everything favorable may be hoped for; whatever is appalling may be feared. At least, we may affirm, that the belief entertained by some that great agitations may not again produce great excesses; or that egregious delusions may not once more, even on the illuminated field of European affairs, draw after them, as in other ages, myriads of votaries, rests upon no solid grounds of experience or philosophy, and will be adopted only by those who judge of human nature from partial or transient aspects, or who think that the frivolous incidents of yesterday and to-day afford a sufficient example of all time." Pp. 17-19.

If we had space we would like to quote also what Isaac Taylor says of the consequences "in sanguine and imaginative temperaments" of "sudden overthrow of restraining principles," and of "the rush of the passions" being "on such occasions impetuous just in proportion to the force that may have been overthrown." We should like also to refer to his definition of fanaticism as "a fictitious fervor in religion rendered turbulent, morose, or rancorous," or, as "enthusiasm inflamed by hatred." The "fictitious fervor in religion" it has always been an easy thing to rouse amongst the poor negroes, and certainly there has been no lack of efforts to stir up their "hatred" to their former masters. We pray God that these efforts may never prevail. A bad day indeed must that be for both races which shall witness their success on any grand scale. But not that day, nor all the days of coming time, shall be able to measure the full consequences which must flow from the Christian white man's surrender of this dependent race to the guidance of religious ignorance and folly.

SOUTHERN
PRESBYTERIAN DEPOSITORY,
COLUMBIA, S. C.

ESTABLISHED, JULY, 1865.

THIS DEPOSITORY was established with the design of furnishing a point from which persons residing in this and the adjacent States could readily procure

SUNDAY-SCHOOL
AND OTHER
RELIGIOUS BOOKS.

All the *BOOKS, TRACTS, ETC.*, published or recommended by the EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF PUBLICATION at Richmond, Va., are kept on hand and sold at the *retail price* of the Publishers.

In addition to these, a general assortment of

THEOLOGICAL AND RELIGIOUS WORKS,

And also of

SCHOOL BOOKS, STATIONERY, ETC.,

Will be kept for sale at very reasonable rates.

Large additions have recently been made to the Stock on hand.

When the amount of an order is \$20.00 or upwards, the package will be sent to any Express Office in South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, or North Carolina, *free of cost* to the purchaser. And a proportionate reduction will be made on packages sent to more distant States.

A liberal deduction will be made to ministers, and to teachers and others who buy to sell again.

Orders should be always accompanied with the money.

Address,

SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN DEPOSITORY,
Columbia, S. C.

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW

Is published Quarterly, in January, April, July, and October.

TERMS.—Three Dollars per Volume, payable in advance. Single numbers, One Dollar.

✎ All Communications should be addressed to the Rev. JAMES WOODROW, Columbia, S. C. No subscription discontinued until a special order is given, and all arrearages are paid, or after the first number of a volume is published.

✎ A few complete sets of the back volumes can be had at Three Dollars per volume. Single back volumes, when they can be furnished without breaking a set, Two Dollars per volume.

✎ 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, One Dollar for each new subscriber.

✎ 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 Editors of the SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW think it is due to themselves and to their subscribers to announce that they do not endorse in every particular what is uttered in their pages. Each author is responsible for the views he expresses. This is a matter of convenience where there are minor differences between editors themselves, or between them and their brethren. Free discussion, too, is important to the interests of truth, if kept within just limits. These limits must be strictly observed. Editors would be worthy of censure, should they allow opinions to be expressed, subversive of any doctrine of the gospel; nor would it be becoming to allow their own views, or those of their contributors, to be rudely attacked in their own pages.

Their desire is, to make the REVIEW worthy of the Presbyterian Church in the United States—the representative of its views and its literature, the means of disseminating sound doctrine, and a stimulus to the genius and talent of our ministers and people.

THE SOUTHERN
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW,

CONDUCTED BY

AN ASSOCIATION OF MINISTERS

IN

COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA.

Vol. XIX.

JULY, MDCCCLXVIII.

No. 2.

COLUMBIA, S. C.

PRINTED AT THE OFFICE OF THE REVIEW.

1868.

CONTENTS.

ARTICLE.	PAGES.
I. Hodge on the Atonement. By the Rev. A. A. PORTER, D. D., Spartanburg C. H., S. C.,	313
II. The Technical Development of Attic Tragedy. By Prof. A. SACHTLEBEN, University of South Carolina,	357
III. Canonicity and Inspiration of the Sacred Scriptures. By the Rev. B. GILDERSLEEVE, Tazewell C. H., Va.	370
IV. Powers of the General Assembly. By the Rev. I. J. LONG, Batesville, Arkansas,	395
V. The Reviewer Reviewed; or, Dr. Ross on Right and Wrong,	404
VI. The General Assembly of 1868,	430
VII. Critical Notices,	449
1. Lindsay's Lectures on the Epistle to the Hebrews. 2. Spiritual Progress. 3. Lord's Old Roman World. 4. Stephens's Constitutional View of the Late War. 5. Alfriend's Life of Jefferson Davis.	

THE SOUTHERN
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XIX.—NO. 3.

JULY, MDCCCLXVIII.

ARTICLE I.

The Atonement. By the Rev. ARCHIBALD ALEXANDER HODGE, D. D., Professor of Didactic, Historical, and Polemical Theology, in the Western Theological Seminary at Allegheny, Pa. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. 440 pp., 12mo.

"We preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumblingblock, and unto the Greeks foolishness; but unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God."

"For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness; but unto us which are saved it is the power of God."

What is the gospel but the doctrine of Christ crucified, the doctrine of the cross? This is its central truth, on which all others depend, around which they revolve, without which they are vanity and confusion. This doctrine founded the Church. The Church has always believed it, and preached it, and lived by it, and drawn from it the inspiration of all its hopes, the strength of all its energies, and the secret of its triumphs. Without it Christianity and the Church are a folly and a lie.

But precisely against this doctrine—and that of course—human reason and pride and depravity, with deadliest hostility, have ever waged an implacable warfare. It has scandalised the Jew,

VOL. XIX. NO. 3—1.

and awakened the contempt of the Greek. The infidel outside of the Church has scouted it. Heretics within her bosom have labored to corrupt it. And no wonder. For it is a doctrine to be discerned only by the illumination of the Spirit of God, and faith in it is possible only to a soul that has been brought into the depths of humility and self-abasement and self-despair on account of sin, and is ready to believe and trust as God shall teach. Otherwise it encounters in diametrical antagonism the uttermost strength of human pride, human corruption, and human reason in its present estate.

Now, as evermore, this precious life-doctrine of the Church is assailed with all the power which the literature, learning, and philosophy of the world can minister. But let not the humble believer, who regards it as the very hope of his soul for immortality, be terrified. Let not his heart shrink and shiver as if, this truth about to perish, nought will remain for him but chaos and despair. It is believed to-day with a more sure and intelligent faith, and loved with more intense and entire devotion, and by a greater multitude of disciples, than ever before. It still lives and it will live forever. It has survived for eighteen hundred years the combined efforts of earth and hell to destroy it. It has survived far greater perils from the folly, ignorance, and unfaithfulness of its professed friends. It can never die, for it is truth. As it is the truth of God, it has the life of God.

All who profess to accept the New Testament as true, in any sense, as inspired or uninspired, are of course compelled to believe also, in some sense or other, what it every where teaches as to the condition and character of men as sinners, and that Jesus Christ our Lord came into the world to *save* them from sin and its consequences. But here the question arises, *how* does he save them? What was that work by which their salvation is accomplished? By his sufferings and death preëminently, the Scriptures abundantly testify. But *what* did he suffer? *What* death did he die? *What* was that mysterious transaction on Calvary, where the Son of God expired in tears and blood and anguish of soul? *What* were the nature, meaning, design, and effect of it? *What* its bearings and relations?

The answer to these inquiries is intimately and necessarily connected with other questions having reference to the character and position of men under the moral government of God. What is our condition in that respect? What was *necessary* to be done in order to our salvation? *That*, whatever it was, our Saviour did. It is granted that we are subjects of the divine government; that we are under law to God. It is granted further that we have transgressed that law, that we are sinners, and consequently under obligation to suffer the penalty, which is a part of that law, for a law without a penalty is an absurdity. Our position under the law of God, then, is that of sinners, guilty, condemned, bound to suffer the punishment attached by it to our transgressions. Prominently, therefore, *one* thing necessary to be done for our salvation is to secure for us the remission of that penalty. We must be punished, or we must be *pardoned*.

But this pardon, this necessary, indispensable pardon—how, in what way, on what terms, can it be granted to sinners by the just and holy Majesty of heaven? Not by an absolute, arbitrary, unconditional act of the divine sovereignty. Never in that way, answer the universal common-sense and instincts of mankind. The stupidest heathen seeks it by sacrifice and penance. The lowest Socinian makes the repentance of the sinner a condition of it. Even the small class of orthodox theologians who hold that the mere will and pleasure of God is the only foundation of moral distinctions, the fountain of law and justice, the sole ground and origin of all the dispensations of his moral government, yet hold that as he *has* willed as he has, unconditional pardon is impossible.

On what condition, then, can this pardon of sin be granted and the sinner saved? The current opinions, among professed believers of the gospel, on this point, may be generalised in three classes, each including among its adherents men of various shades and differences of doctrine, but whose sentiments on this point are clearly reducible to one or the other of the following heads:

1. There are those who hold that the only necessary condition of pardon and salvation is the *repentance* of the sinner—that is,

that he shall cease to sin and return to the path of holiness and obedience. 2. A second class, while assenting to and affirming the necessity of repentance on the part of the sinner, add to it this other condition, that his pardon must be granted in such a way and on such a plan that no evil shall ensue to the authority of the divine government, the potency of the divine law, and thereby to the well-being of the universe. For, it is argued, if sin is pardoned unconditionally, by the sovereign prerogative of God, the bonds of the law will be thereby relaxed as to all moral creatures, its compelling power weakened, the motive to obedience diminished, and the authority of the divine government impugned and dishonored. If the sinner is saved, therefore, it must be in some way which will provide a sufficient guarantee and security against these direful results. 3. A third view of the subject, while it includes the two former, and asserts the necessity both of the repentance of the sinner and of adequate security against the dangerous consequences of unconditional pardon to the moral government of God, affirms that sin cannot be pardoned *without an atonement*, that is, an adequate satisfaction to divine law and justice of all their claims against the sinner. And the necessity of such an atonement is affirmed in two respects: first, independently, resulting from the very nature of the case; and secondly, as the necessary means by which the two former conditions are to be secured and provided for.

Corresponding with these three views as to the necessary conditions of the sinner's salvation, there are three principal opinions as to the nature of the work of Christ by which he has undertaken to effect it—three answers to the question *how* he saves; what did he do and suffer for us, what was his death, and what the meaning of that dread tragedy of the cross? And in enumerating them, our readers must forgive it if we are compelled to employ the language of Ashdod, to use words foreign and strange to the Israel of God.

1. First in order is that which is designated as the "Moral Influence Theory." It regards the work of Christ as intended solely to produce a moral impression on the soul of the sinner, and thereby, by the force of "moral suasion," to

lead him to repentance, the only necessary condition of salvation. The sufferings and death of our Lord had no reference whatever to the divine law, justice, or government, or to the penalty of sin. Their effects terminate only on the moral nature of the sinner, and somehow exert an influence to convert him. *Somehow!* But *how?* Here, in attempting to understand this theory, we get into a fog. All is vague, dim, and misty. Or to change the metaphor, we find ourselves in the realm of shadows. Faint rhetorical figures in multitudes pass before our vision, but when we attempt to grasp them we seize emptiness and nothing. One advocate of this theory, in endeavoring to interpret the nature and meaning of Christ's sufferings and death, compares them to the bursting anguish of a loving parent over the sin and folly of a wayward and erring child, at sight of which the heart of the child is melted and overcome, and he repents. That is, they were an expression and exhibition of the mingled love and sorrow of God for the sinner and on account of his sin, designed to touch, to win, to subdue, to persuade the sinner to repent and sin no more. And this is all of it. The cross was just an appeal to our hearts, through the love, gentleness, meekness, tenderness, patience, tears, sufferings, and death of Christ, and nothing more. But when we inquire *how* the sufferings and death of our Lord express and exhibit divine love and sorrow for the sinner; what was there in them to give them this virtue and efficacy; what in their interior nature to constitute them a demonstration of these divine emotions; we are again, so far as this theory is concerned, clutching at the air. No answer to that question has yet been given presenting anything tangible and real. At the last analysis, all this theory yields to the chemistry of logic, is, that the cross was a tragic scene, a kind of stage play, to show us by way of a picture, the anguish of God's loving heart over our sins, and so to move and melt us to sorrow and repentance and to persuade us to cease from sin. This theory is the one adopted generally by Socinians, Unitarians, *et id genus omne*.

2. The second view on this subject is the one known as the "Governmental Theory." This, while including the idea of the

former, regards the sufferings and death of Christ as chiefly and essentially designed to produce an impression on the minds of God's intelligent creatures throughout his moral government generally. This impression, or influence, is intended to provide the second necessary condition of the pardon of sin, which we have previously mentioned—an adequate security and safeguard, namely, against the possible evil consequences if sin is not punished and the transgressor escapes with impunity. As to what this impression is, it is variously described as of the evil of sin, of God's hatred and abhorrence of it, of what it deserves, of the certainty and terribleness of its punishment, of the majesty, holiness, and terror of the divine law and government, and of the awful doom of the impenitent, unpardoned transgressor. Here we are again among shadows, pictures, and figures. God means to forgive and save the sinner, but lest thereby others should be encouraged to sin in hope of like impunity, lest the authority of his government and the bonds of his law should be weakened and thereby the happiness of his creatures be impaired, the awful drama of the cross is devised and enacted. It is an exhibition, a representation. Its efficacy and effect are to show the universe what God thinks of sin, what it deserves, and what it must receive if not repented of and forgiven; and this is all. Christ did not really make an atonement for sin. By his sufferings and death he only made such an impression on the subjects of God's moral government, in the respects before mentioned, that it would be *safe* for him to forgive sin. His mission in the world and his work here was merely a governmental expedient, a device of administration, to guard against the possible evil consequences of the sinner's forgiveness and salvation.

But when we raise the question again here, *how* do the sufferings of Christ produce this needful impression; what was there in them, that is, in their nature, to have this effect on the moral universe; we set out again on a fruitless search. The governmental theory has no intelligible answer to give. It denies that Christ suffered the penalty of sin in the sinner's place; it denies that in any proper sense he atoned for sin; it denies that he satisfied the claims of the divine government against sinners; it denies that

law and justice were executed in regard to our sins. It only affirms that he showed by his agony and death that it is not safe to sin. Do you ask *how*? You might as well ask how a lofty column can stand erect with no resting-place and support for its base.

This theory is inwrapped with a distinct and peculiar system of ethics. It is a moral philosophy moulding and forming a theology. Its fundamental principles may be briefly stated as follows: 1. The highest good, the supreme final end of all things, is *happiness*. 2. Hence all virtue, all moral excellence, consists essentially in *benevolence*, a desire to promote the happiness of others. All forms of virtue, every species of moral goodness, may be resolved into that. Truth, honesty, humility, temperance, purity, justice, love, for example, are only specific forms of the genus benevolence. 3. Hence the supreme, ultimate end of all God's dispensations towards his creatures, is, of course, their happiness. 4. Hence the *end* of the law, both in its precept and its penalty, its origin, reason, and necessity, are to be found in the happiness of its subjects. 5. Hence it follows that if any expedient or device can be found by which that end can be secured as well, the law may be set aside, abrogated, annulled, in any particular case. 6. But as the forgiveness and salvation of a sinner necessarily imply that in reference to him the law is nullified and abrogated, and as the unimpaired authority and constraining force of the law are necessary to the happiness of the moral universe, his salvation is impossible unless some such expedient can be contrived. 7. Such an expedient has been found and employed in the work of Christ, by which, while the law is not executed and the claims of the divine government against the sinner are not exacted, the same effects are produced on the minds of the moral universe as if the penalty had been inflicted on him to the full extent—the same moral impression as to the ill desert of sin, the holiness and authority of the law, the rights and majesty of the divine government, and the danger of transgression. So far we can follow this theory and think we understand it. And so far it seems to be plausible and consistent, though fundamentally erroneous. But when we

desire to know how the sufferings of our Lord produce these effects, what did he do and endure to make this impression on the moral universe, this theory gives no satisfactory or even intelligible answer. Like the preceding, it converts the cross into a mere scenic exhibition, where there is representation, but no reality.

This "governmental theory" was suggested by the celebrated Grotius in the seventeenth century, but it was left for certain New England theologians to develop and clearly state it. It is a part of what is known among us as the New School Theology.

3. The third view of this subject is the one which has been and is held almost universally in the Christian world, and is the good old "gospel of the grace of God." While including the main ideas of the two preceding theories, as to the sufferings of our Lord, it regards them as a real and proper expiation of sin, satisfying the claims of the divine holiness, justice, law, and government against sinners, and providing this necessary condition of their salvation, namely, a true and adequate *atonement* for their sins. It regards the work of Christ as not only designed to produce a certain effect on the heart of the sinner, and to prevent the possibly injurious results of his salvation to the welfare of the universe, but as having reference also to God himself, to his divine attributes, and to his character and position as the sovereign ruler of his creatures. The "moral influence" theory finds the sole impediment in the way of the sinner's pardon and salvation in the subjective state of his own soul, as alienated from God and morally corrupt, and it makes the work of Christ to be but a demonstration of God's great love to the sinner, which by its mere moral power shall melt and charm and convert him, and then forgiveness and salvation follow as a matter of course. The "governmental" theory finds another difficulty in the possible harm to the happiness of other moral beings which might follow if sin in any case goes unpunished, and it adds to the former doctrine that the sufferings of Christ were a demonstration to the universe that sin will certainly be punished, and none must presume from the impunity of the saved from

among human transgressors that any can sin with the hope of safety.

The orthodox doctrine finds another difficulty, the first and the greatest, in God himself—in his *holiness*. The holiness of God is the infinite moral purity and perfection of his nature. It is the sum total of his moral excellence in himself, in his own divine and eternal being. It is that moral perfection especially as it is related to moral evil, to sin. It is that principle of his nature whereby he loves right and hates wrong, his everlasting and unspeakable joy in the one, his intolerable aversion and eternal-enmity towards the other. It is the fashion of modern sentimentalism to strive to eliminate this element from the character of God. But the Bible is full of it. And while we accept its statements as truth, we must admit that there is something in God which is truly and properly described in the language of men as hatred, abhorrence, wrath, toward all sin. And ere it can be forgiven, this holiness of God must be appeased and propitiated.

Then there is the *justice* of God, which demands that sin shall be dealt with *as it deserves*. Intrinsically, in its own nature, it merits punishment. Apart from its injurious consequences, from all the harm it may inflict on the happiness of the transgressor and his fellow creatures, it deserves to be punished. If there are no other reasons for its punishment, a sufficient and necessary reason is found in itself, in its own intrinsic, inseparable, essential demerit. It must be punished because its punishment is *just* and God is just. Justice is not benevolence, no more than bitter is sweet. No analysis of thought can resolve the one into the other. No sophistry can confound our moral perception that they are distinct and different. Justice stands on a level with all the other attributes of the divine nature, as distinct, necessary, and eternal as any one of them. It is an ultimate, unresolvable principle. Its reason and necessity are found in itself. It is its own end, and ere sin can be forgiven, justice must be done. Justice must be fulfilled and satisfied.

Then, again, there is *the divine law*. This is but the embodied and expressed principles of the divine holiness, justice, and benevolence. It contains in a revelation from God to his crea-

tures what they require. Further, as thus made known, it is a declaration not only of his will in the precept, but of his *purpose* in the penalty. It is an express, deliberate, solemn utterance of God, as to what he will do if the creature sin. Its execution involves, therefore, the *veracity* of the Most High. The truth of God is at stake. The law, therefore, evidently possesses the sacredness, the inviolability, the necessity, and the immutability of the divine holiness, justice, goodness, and truth. It can no more be set aside and abrogated than these everlasting principles of God's very being and nature can be annulled and abjured. The very glory of Jehovah is in it, and the law must stand, or that glory shall perish with it. "Wherefore," says the apostle, "the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good." How then can it be set aside, repealed, or so much as relaxed, but at the sacrifice of holiness, justice, and goodness? Ere sin can be pardoned, therefore, and the sinner saved, *the law* of God must be fulfilled, its claims must be satisfied. The law must be sustained, honored, and glorified.

Now, according to the orthodox doctrine, our Lord Jesus Christ met and fulfilled all these conditions of salvation. He took our place in and under the divine law. He assumed our liabilities as sinners under that law and fulfilled them, answering all its claims against us. He obeyed its precept and he endured its penalty in our stead, in our name, and on our behalf. And as that law expresses and contains the demands of divine holiness and justice against us, in fulfilling it he satisfied them. As our representative and substitute, he did and suffered all the law required of us as sinners. Thereby he expiated and atoned for our sins. That expiation appeased and propitiated the divine holiness and justice. Propitiation secured reconciliation with God. Reconciliation is salvation. This was the meaning of the cross. This was the wondrous transaction enacted there. The pale sufferer who in a mysterious passion expired on that accursed tree was burdened with the responsibilities of the sinner to the law of a just and holy God, and then and there he fulfilled and discharged them. He did and suffered precisely what the law required sinners to do and suffer, in their place, in their name,

and for their benefit. The holiness and justice of a sin-hating and sin-avenging God in that awful hour dealt with him in their stead; and when the deed was done, salvation for them was possible, was secured.

Intimately and logically connected with the orthodox doctrine on this subject, and necessary to be known in order to a clear apprehension of it, are the great scriptural doctrines of the Trinity, the union of the divine and human natures in the one person of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the mystical union between him and all who are redeemed and saved by him. The subsistence of distinct persons in the Godhead rendered it possible that the Father should execute justice and law upon the God-man as the substitute of his people, and that the Son, assuming our legal liabilities, should answer to the Father for them.

It is further manifest that the Redeemer of men, in order to be competent to fulfil these conditions of salvation, must be one who was not originally and personally responsible to the law on his own behalf. Otherwise, as it would claim his all for himself, he could render it nothing for any other. He must also have an independent and sovereign right over his own life and powers, to dispose of them as he will. But these are the prerogatives of God. The Saviour of men therefore must be a divine person. This is necessary, moreover, by the infinite dignity of his person, to attach transcendent dignity and merit to what he shall do and suffer, commensurate with the infinite majesty of the divine holiness and justice whose dishonored claims were to be fulfilled and satisfied.

And yet it was equally necessary for this Redeemer to be man. It was the human race who were guilty, condemned, and lost. It was against them that infinitely holy and just law entered its demands and proclaimed its terrors. And out of the bosom of humanity, from among men themselves, by one of the same race, that law must be answered and satisfied.

Hence the second person of the adorable Trinity united our nature with himself in a personal union. Thus constituted and qualified, he undertakes the mighty task. He bends his Godhead to the great achievement, and in the form of a man triumphantly

fulfils it. He had power to lay down his life, and power to take it again. He was able to endure the penalty of sin, to endure it all, to endure it all at once, and enduring it, to triumph over it; to exhaust it, and to live again; to die, and again to rise in the power of an endless life. The law exacted of him its last item, and he paid it. Sin's entire curse fell upon him, and he bore it. Justice launched at him all its thunderbolts, and he quailed not at their shocks. It let loose upon him the terrors of a sin-avenging God, and he answered, "I delight to do thy will!" He stood between a guilty world and a wrathful heaven, intercepted the descending vengeance, and let it expend all its fury upon himself. And when the darkness and terror cleared away, he appeared living and victorious, showing his wounds and pleading for the souls he had saved.

The work of our Lord, according to this orthodox doctrine, while thus answering the liabilities of sinners to divine law and justice, further, and in a way intelligible and most satisfactory, provides for the two other conditions of salvation insisted on by the preceding theories. For, first, it presents to the moral universe a demonstration of the evil of sin and of God's inflexible purpose to punish it, the most impressive and convincing possible, inasmuch as it was the actual execution of law and justice as the indispensable condition of our salvation. And secondly, as it was from beginning to end the work of divine grace and mercy, it was a most amazing exhibition of the love of God, of a love which underwent the most stupendous self-sacrifice, and paid an infinitely precious price for the redemption of sinners—a love therefore which is transcendently adapted to meet and subdue and convert the hearts of men.

The opponents of this doctrine of the cross, in their turn, raise the question of "*how?*" which we have so often put against their theories. They ask, if justice is so sacred a thing, how was it consistent with justice to punish the innocent for the guilty? Jesus Christ our Lord was innocent; how then could it be right for him to be made to suffer for our sins? Moreover, how, in what way, on what principle, can the sufferings of one person satisfy the demands of law and justice for the sins of

another? How can any one bear the punishment due to a different person, consistently with the principles of law and right? The answer to these inquiries and objections is one, and it is found in a truth and fact abundantly taught in the Holy Scriptures. But it should be remarked that any difficulty felt in the idea that it is unjust for the innocent to be made to suffer for the guilty is involved in the moral influence and governmental theories just as truly and fully as in the orthodox view. They teach that Christ was innocent, and yet that his sufferings were caused by our sins. What may have been the relation and connexion between our sins and his sufferings, does not alter the case. There is no more injustice in the orthodox view of this point than in theirs, but less, as it would be easy to show.

The satisfactory solution of these difficulties, however, is furnished by a doctrine often expressly affirmed in the Scriptures, and every where assumed and implied, where they speak of the salvation of sinners through Christ; the doctrine, namely, of the *union* between him and those who are saved by him—that which theologians call the “mystical union” between him and them, inasmuch as while the truth and fact of it are clearly and fully revealed to our faith, and its nature and consequences in part set forth, the essential basis and nature of it are not explained. This union is such, however, that there results from it a community of relations and responsibilities under the divine law and government between Christ and those whom he saves. It lays a foundation in law and right for him to be punished for our sins, and for us to enjoy the benefits and consequences of all he did and suffered for us. By virtue of it, he and they are vitally, spiritually, morally, and legally ONE—one in law and in justice. Their liabilities attached to him. His work and sufferings are imputed to them. The satisfaction he rendered for sin, they rendered in him. The righteousness he wrought out, they wrought out in him. It is theirs in the eye of the law. What he did, they are regarded as having done themselves. In him they obeyed the law. In him they fulfilled all righteousness. In him they paid the penalty of sin. In him they died. In him they live. His death for sin was

theirs. His life is theirs also. In short, it is by virtue of this union that the Scriptures explain, so far as they explain at all, the whole mystery of our salvation, from its beginning in the counsels of eternity to its finished consummation in the unspeakable glory of a future heaven. It is admitted to be mysterious. It transcends human reason. But it is unquestionably revealed in the word as a truth and a fact. Moreover analogies and illustrations of it abound as facts in the dealings of God with the children of men. In the peculiar constitution and administration of the divine government over the human race, the principle appears to be incorporated and often proceeded on—the principle, namely, of the responsibility of one for another, frequently for many, and the correlative participation of the many in the guilt or the righteousness of the one. Adam sinned, and as a matter of fact the penalty of that sin has been executed upon him and all of his descendants. The divine covenants with Noah, Abraham, and David, were with them and their posterity. Paul testifies of the Jews that “they are beloved for the fathers’ sakes.” The “exceeding great and precious promises” are not only to the people of God but “to their seed after them.” He expressly declares that he will visit the iniquities of fathers upon their children. All Israel was punished for the sin of Achan and again for a sin of David. And evermore, in the actual history of men, it is a fact that the penal consequences of many sins, and the benefits of many works of righteousness, pass over upon those who stand some way related to and connected with the doers of them. And so is there a foundation and necessity laid for this arrangement in the nature and constitution of the human race, that it is, in many forms, incorporated in the laws and governments which they themselves establish. They are pervaded by it from beginning to end. Take out of them the idea of agency, representation, substitution, suretyship, of one acting for others, and they are nothing. In international law it is the same. One government and nation holds another responsible for the acts of its rulers, and even of its private citizens. In short, the general principle that there may exist such a relation and connexion between one person and others that there shall

result a community of responsibilities between them, is interwoven with the whole web of human affairs. And what shall we say, if God, by whom it was so inwrought with the constitution and administration of law, both human and divine, extend and carry it out in the matter of our salvation? Shall a principle which every where else prevails be here abandoned? The method of the divine government in regard to man must be one. Its general and fundamental principles must be the same every where and always. And "as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous." In the work of our salvation there is a union, relation, connexion, call it as we please, between Christ and us, "of such a nature as to involve an identity of legal relations and reciprocal obligations and rights." Though personally innocent, holy, and undefiled, yet by virtue of that union our sins were laid to his charge and he bore their penalty; while law and justice recognised what he did and suffered, as done and suffered by us, and therefore an adequate satisfaction to all their claims against us.

According to the orthodox view of this great subject, therefore, this was the work of Christ. As our substitute and representative, he made a true, a real, and a proper atonement and satisfaction to the holiness, justice, and truth of God for all their demands against us as sinners, and he did this by enduring in our place, under the law, the penalty of our sins.

But a clear and complete apprehension of this doctrine cannot be had if we do not consider it distinctly in another view. The work of Christ may be regarded in a passive or an active aspect, as suffering or as obedience. We do not divide it into two separate parts, one of which is made up of his obedience to the precepts of the law and the other of his suffering of its penalty. It is true that he fulfilled essentially its precept as well as endured its penalty. But his whole undivided work may be viewed in one respect, as it was voluntary in the highest and most absolute sense, as obedience; and in another respect it may be viewed as suffering. In obeying he suffered, and in suffering he obeyed. Corresponding with this twofold relation of that transcendently glorious and divinely perfect work, there attaches to it a twofold

efficacy and value. Regarded as suffering, it atones for sin, it satisfies the penal requirements of the law, it propitiates the divine holiness and justice. Regarded as obedience, it is righteousness, it fulfils the preceptive demands of the law, it merits the rewards of eternal life, it justifies. As an atonement merely, it could obtain only pardon for the sinner, the remission of the penalty due his sins. In that view, it could only absolve him from obligation to punishment. But that is not all the sinner needs. That would leave him midway between hell and heaven, to work out for himself a title to everlasting life and a claim to the rewards of righteousness, which of course he could never achieve. But the work of our Lord had not this abortive result. It was not mere atonement and satisfaction for sin. It was an infinitely perfect and meritorious righteousness. It not only pardons, it justifies. It does not merely remove the difficulties in the way of salvation, it saves. It redeems from hell and it secures heaven. It provides both a full acquittal for the sinner from the indictment of the law, and a title perfect and complete to the reward conditioned on stainless obedience. And it has always been the doctrine and faith of Christians that the life and death of our divine Saviour not only atoned for their sins, but merited, procured, and purchased every grace and blessing, from the greatest to the least, necessary to their complete, final salvation and glorification in eternal blessedness. Repentance, faith, holiness, knowledge, all the gracious work of the Spirit in the soul, the beginning, progress, and consummation of all actual experience and enjoyment of salvation, are the fruits of his blessed work, the reward of his obedience and sufferings. This is the gospel of the grace of God. This is the doctrine of Christ crucified, so unspeakably precious in the faith of the Christian—which oftentimes so fills his heart with love and joy and gratitude that he wants an eternity in which to praise and to thank him who loved us and gave himself for us. In the plain phraseology of the olden times, he is not half a Saviour. He is a whole Saviour, complete and perfect, the author and finisher of salvation, in whom and from whom by whose finished and completed work, the redeemed have all things. "Ye are complete in him."

In the preceding pages, we have endeavored, avoiding as far as possible the use of technical and abstruse terms, to present a general view of the subject discussed in the work of Dr. A. A. Hodge, named at the head of this article. Our readers will be able to gather from them an idea of the field of debate over which his discussions lead. His book is divided into two parts: 1. The nature of the atonement; and 2. Its design or intended application. The former occupies the body of the volume, 346 pages out of 429; and as the author states, the subject of it "is the real interest for the sake of which this book is written." Intimately connected with the discussion of the *nature* of the atonement, and indeed inseparable from it, the *necessity* of it has to be considered. The first chapter is introductory, presenting the importance of the doctrine to be discussed, the general agreement of the Church in all ages in regard to it, the danger of rationalism, and certain preliminary points necessary to be kept in view, viz.: that all dangerous error contains some element of truth, which is afterwards illustrated in the case of the moral influence and governmental theories of the atonement; that systems and definite statements of religious truth are a necessity; and that the questions in regard to the work of Christ are to be answered only by the authority of the Holy Scriptures and by a full and fair induction from all they teach on the subject.

The second chapter is occupied with a statement of the orthodox doctrine respecting the work of Christ, as to its motive, its nature, and its effects, in connexion with those conditions which made that work necessary to the salvation of sinners, while the Philistine theories, with Ashdod names, are also stated.

The third chapter contains a definition of the terms employed in the discussion of this subject, and a statement of the principal points involved in the doctrine of the Church.

In the fourth chapter, the author enters upon the direct arguments by which that doctrine is established, and shows that the essential and immutable perfections of the divine nature make the punishment of sin necessary and inevitable. The discussion here carries us into the deep things of God. The questions involved are, what is the ultimate motive of his actions? are holi-

ness and justice essential and necessary principles of his very nature? why does he hate and punish sin? what is the nature of virtue? The "governmental" notion, that all virtue in God and man must be resolved into benevolence, is considered and refuted.

The second argument, contained in the fifth chapter, is derived from the immutability of the divine law. That law is absolutely immutable, because the essential principles of righteousness which it embodies have their ground not in the mere will of God, but in his eternal and unchangeable nature. The penalty is an essential element of the law, and therefore cannot be set aside. The Scriptures clearly teach that Christ came not to annul or relax the law, but to fulfil it. But if the penalty is a necessary part of the law, if the whole law is immutable, if in fact Christ came to fulfil the law, then it follows that he suffered the penalty of the law in order to save us.

But if the law is immutable, as shown in the fifth chapter, how can the legal relations of one person be assumed by another, and the legal liabilities of the principal be discharged by his substitute? Light is thrown on this question, in the sixth chapter, by the distinction, noted by Turretin, of the threefold relation of men to the law, viz., the *natural*, *federal*, and *penal* relations. It is shown that with regard to the first there can be no substitution or representation; but that this is possible in regard to the other two in the case of man. This brings up the relations of Adam to the human race, the federal and representative nature of which is presupposed by the federal headship of Christ.

Hence the seventh chapter is occupied with a discussion of the legal relations of Adam to his posterity, and a defence of the orthodox doctrine on that subject.

The third general argument, contained in the eighth chapter, is "derived from the fact that the Scriptures constantly represent Christ as dying, and thus effecting the salvation of his people, as a *sacrifice*." Here it is shown that the primitive sacrifices were of divine origin, and expiatory and propitiatory; that the Jewish sacrifices were also expiatory in their nature; and that the sacrifices of the law were *typical* of the sacrifice of

Christ, from which it follows of necessity that his death was vicarious and expiatory.

The next chapter presents a fourth argument in the fact that the Scriptures teach that Christ saves his people by acting as their *High Priest*. It is proved that the work of the priest primarily had reference to God and terminated on him, being propitiatory—that he acted as the representative of those whose priest he was, and secured for them the actual remission of their sins. When he offered a sacrifice for any, the design and effect of it was not to produce a moral impression on them or on others, but to procure the pardon of their sin—its remission, not its remissibility. And it is further shown that Christ was really and truly, not figuratively, a High Priest for his people, and therefore offered a propitiatory sacrifice for them, atoning for their sins, and securing pardon and salvation.

In the tenth chapter, a fifth argument is founded on that large class of scriptures which teach that Christ's sufferings were *vicarious*—that is, that he suffered, not merely for our advantage, but in our room and stead, in the strict sense of the word as our substitute. He took our place in law, and therefore necessarily assumed our legal responsibilities, which were obedience as a condition of life, and suffering as a penal consequence of sin. The adherents of the erroneous theories admit in words that Christ's sufferings were "vicarious." Dr. Bushnell, one of the arch-advocates of the "Moral Influence" theory, has published a book with the title "Vicarious Sacrifice," to teach that error. But they use the word in a perverted and fallacious sense.

A sixth argument is contained in the next chapter, derived from the fact that the Scriptures teach that *our sins were laid on Christ*. In this connexion the scriptural doctrine of the imputation of sin is explained, defended, and proved. This is followed in the next chapter by a seventh argument found in the numerous passages of the Holy Scriptures which describe the effects of the work of Christ. These are of three classes: as they have respect to God, these effects are termed *propitiation* and *reconciliation*; as they regard sin, *expiation*; and as they relate to the sinner himself, *redemption*. The natural import of this language:

necessarily teaches the orthodox doctrine, and cannot be harmonized with the other theories. The work of Christ is presented in Scripture in various forms of conception, and in its multifold relations; all of which were designed to limit and supplement each other, are all accordant and consistent with each other and with the Church doctrine, (in fact constitute and express it,) but with no other view.

In the following chapter, the true nature of the atonement is proved by an eighth argument—the Scripture doctrine of the *union* which subsists between Christ and his people. This doctrine, as revealed in the word of God, is set forth, and it is shown that it involves as a necessary consequence his suffering for our sins, and our being invested with the results of his righteousness, and that this doctrine cannot possibly be consistent with the two erroneous views of the work of Christ.

The fourteenth chapter presents a ninth argument in the teachings of the Scriptures as to the nature of *justification* and the grounds on which it proceeds. In this argument the true doctrine on this subject is defined and established, and shown to involve necessarily the orthodox doctrine of Christ's redeeming work.

Then follows in the next chapter, as a tenth argument, an exposition of the nature and office of *faith* according to the Scriptures.

In the succeeding chapter, an additional argument is drawn from those statements of Scripture which directly establish the fact that the atonement of Christ, in order to the pardon of sin, was *absolutely necessary*. For if that necessity was absolute, it must have its ground in the nature of God, and not in the exigencies of government or the subjective condition of the sinner, as the erroneous theories teach.

The seventeenth chapter presents the doctrine of the Scriptures as to *the perfection* of the atoning work of Christ, and that in two respects, that it truly and fully, by reason of its own intrinsic value, satisfied divine law and justice, and that by virtue of its own intrinsic merit and efficacy it secures the salvation of those for whom it was made, and does not merely render their

salvation possible, leaving the actual result to depend on other conditions. The advocates of the moral influence and governmental theories, and of a general indefinite atonement, necessarily hold that the atoning work of our Lord does not of its own force and effect actually save any one, but only removes legal difficulties so as to make salvation possible. It is shown however that the work of Christ secures salvation as a whole, the means as well as the end, all the conditions as well as the result.

In the following chapter, it is proved distinctly that the satisfaction rendered by Christ embraced his *active* as well as his *passive* obedience. With this the author closes his positive arguments in regard to the nature of the atonement, in the progress of which, however, he has constant occasion to answer objections to the orthodox doctrine, and to present proof of the errors of the opposing theories. In the nineteenth chapter, he proves the doctrine he advocates to have been the faith of the Christian Church through all ages; in the twentieth, he states and answers more distinctly and formally the principal objections to that doctrine; and in the twenty-first, he carries the war into Africa, and directly attacks the moral influence and governmental theories, proving their errors by multiplied and accumulated arguments. With this ends the first part of the volume.

The second part discusses the *design*, or intended application of the atonement, or, as it has been often expressed, its *extent*, the persons for whom it was made. In this part, the first chapter is introductory, and considers the question as involved in the controversy with Arminians and with Calvinistic advocates of an indefinite, universal atonement.

The second chapter presents an accurate statement of the true doctrine on this point, first negatively and then positively. The third chapter examines the relation which the nature of the atonement sustains to its design. In the fourth, we have a historical review of the opinion of Calvinists as to the design of the work of Christ. The fifth shows the true position of Calvin himself on this question, answers the inquiry, "what is the standard of Calvinism?" and proves that it admits only the doctrine of a

definite, personal atonement, and that the Westminster Confession and Catechism teach the same.

In the sixth chapter, the orthodox view, that the design of the atonement was the salvation of the elect personally and definitely, is established by eight arguments; and in the seventh and last, three principal objections to this doctrine are stated and answered.

It will be seen from this summary of the contents of the volume before us, that its discussions lead the reader over the richest and widest fields of religious thought and study. Its broad sweep swings us round well nigh the whole circumference of theology. This is inevitable in a complete and thorough examination of the subject. The question of the atonement connects with itself every other question as to the religion of the Bible. When we ask, "*What did our Lord Jesus Christ do and suffer for our salvation?*" we ask everything. If the orthodox answer to that question is correct, then religion, both doctrinally and experimentally, is one thing. If either of the opposing theories is true, then it is another and altogether a different thing. It was therefore with most sufficient reason that Dr. Hodge devoted so many of his pages to a discussion of the nature of the atonement, and has interwoven his argument with so many of the principal doctrines of the Holy Scriptures. And so abundantly, clearly, and conclusively is the received faith of the Church on this subject taught in the written word, and that both expressly and directly, and in other doctrines which necessarily involve and imply it, that the question whether we shall accept that faith or reject it, is virtually equivalent to the question whether we shall or shall not submit our faith to the plain, grammatical sense of that word. It is just the old and ever recurring debate between those who hold that we should come to the Scriptures as humble inquirers and disciples, to learn, to be taught, to hear and to believe what God shall say, and to believe it because he says it; and those who open the Bible only to compel it, by the torture of a subtle or a violent exegesis, to teach the dogmas of their own self-derived reason and philosophy. This is one of the considerations which attach an importance so vital and immense to

the question as to the nature of the atonement. Shall our faith rest on the authority of God speaking in his word, or shall it stand in the strength of our own reason and understanding? The adherents of the moral influence and governmental theories do not derive their views in the first instance from the Scriptures, but from their own wisdom and philosophy, and then endeavor to find their doctrines in the word, or rather to force them into it. The former is the view adopted generally by Pelagians, Socinians, and Rationalists. It implies at least one step in infidelity. The advocates of the latter, as Dr. Hodge shows, "do not pretend that they generate it out of Scripture; the most they claim is, that having developed it as a product of speculation, they are able to show that it *harmonizes* with all the facts of Scripture." This is at least one step towards infidelity. It is just a parallel to the case of the "abolitionist," who proves by his own ideas of justice and of the natural rights of man the wrong of slavery, and then goes to work to force the Bible to the support of his own preconceived opinion.

Dr. Hodge refers to the fact that there is little to be found in the writings of the early fathers of the Church, which have come down to us, in the way of a dogmatic and clearly defined statement of their faith as to the atoning work of Christ. Is not the explanation of this to be found in the facts that the true doctrine was so manifestly taught in the Scriptures, and so unquestionably constituted the very essence of the gospel, and was so fully and undeniably delivered by a tradition yet fresh and worthy of reliance, and was so universally believed, that no early heretic had the folly or the rashness to assail it? It was unquestionable and unquestioned. Dogmatic, defined, and developed formulas of doctrine are of course the result of controversy and opposition. It was only when errorists had gathered courage from their attacks on other doctrines, and from the confusions and divisions of more modern times, that they ventured to essay the corruption of the very doctrine of the cross itself, and to deny that "Christ died for our sins, according to the Scriptures." It was reserved for the more daring unbelief and presumptuous speculations of latter days, clothed in the form of Christianity itself, to question

a truth which is so clearly the sum and substance of revelation. And just so far as men depart from the received doctrine of the Church on this subject, it will be generally found that theoretically or practically they so far reject the word of God as an authoritative standard of belief. It is just the old contest between faith and reason, the question whether we shall appeal to the testimony of God speaking in the Scriptures, or excogitate our creed from the resources of our own reason and understanding—not indeed right reason, but man's reasoning powers, as they are now crippled, blinded, and perverted.

This question of the nature of the redeeming work of Christ assumes a supreme and essential importance also in that it involves the moral nature and character of God himself. The discussion of it penetrates to the original and ultimate principles of his very being, and turns upon the question of *what he is*. The schoolmen of the middle ages followed the argument up to that last point. The great theologians of the seventeenth century, orthodox and heretical, fought the battle on that ground, and there it must be decided. If holiness, justice, and truth, are absolute, original attributes of the Godhead, not resolvable into benevolence, or not the effects and creations of his mere will, then of necessity the orthodox doctrine is true. And on our doctrine of God, *all other* doctrines depend. As is the fountain, such must be the stream. An error there will taint and corrupt all other parts of our faith. Every drop of it will contain poison. All theology, all religious belief, is logically but the unfolding and development of our idea of God. And as all subjective, experimental, and practical religion, is but a condition of our moral nature correspondent and in harmony with our ideas of God, it will be one thing if we believe the orthodox doctrine, and a different thing if we reject it. Our faith on this point will modify and characterise the very feelings and affections of the soul in the most vital respects, as in regard to sin, to holiness, to Jesus our Lord, to God himself. This, the relation of the atonement to the divine attributes, as Dr. Hodge remarks, is "the centre of the question in debate between ourselves and the advocates of the governmental and of the moral theory of the atone-

ment. Both parties estimate it as a moral question of the utmost importance and incapable of compromise." And referring to the fearful terms in which some prominent advocates of those two theories have spoken of the orthodox doctrine in regard to the divine nature, he adds, "What these men blaspheme, the inspired Scriptures and the Christian Church revere and vindicate as an essential element of that holiness which is the crowning glory of our God." Let none therefore ignorantly suppose that this question is a mere abstraction, a curious speculation and nothing more. It enters into the most vital and fundamental matters of our faith, and involves the very essence of living and experimental piety.

What, indeed, is this question but that of a sinner's hope for eternal life? If the received doctrine of the Church is true, that hope as to its ground, its foundation, its reason, its origin, is one thing; if not, it is in these respects something different. The hope of glory which has always comforted and often thrilled and ravished the hearts of the children of God, springs from and is founded on the truth that Christ did, in the orthodox sense, die for our sins, bearing them in his own body on the tree. If we can trust to the united testimony of the faithful in all ages, it is the apprehension of this truth, under the convicting power of the Spirit of God, which brings peace to the soul and inspires the hope of salvation. Under that power, understanding, heart, and conscience, are enlightened and quickened, and the sinner comes so to see and to feel the vileness and guilt of sin, his own ill-desert, and the infinite purity and majesty of the divine holiness and justice, that nothing can lay to rest the terrors of conscience, satisfy the demands of his own moral nature, and save him from despair, but an adequate atonement for sin satisfying what he sees and knows to be the demands of eternal immutable justice. There is a voice in his own soul which requires that sin must be expiated, and which must be appeased. And it is not until the Son of God is revealed to him, as the propitiation for sin, whose blood cleanseth from all unrighteousness, that his own convictions are satisfied, his heart is "sprinkled from an evil conscience," his "conscience purged from dead works to serve the living God," and hope awakens within his despairing breast.

The highest importance belongs to this subject in yet another respect. As we have seen, it involves fundamental principles as to moral distinctions and obligations—in the language of the schools, as to the nature and obligation of virtue. The orthodox view teaches that moral principles are absolute, essential, immutable, having their ground and origin in the very nature of God—that he can no more cease to be holy, just, and good, than he can cease to be at all; that he commands all that is right, not because it is benevolent, or for any other reason, but just because it is right, and punishes sin, not because its punishment is necessary to the welfare of the universe, but because it is *right* to punish it, because sin by reason of its own intrinsic evil nature *deserves* to be punished; that he is just in his dealings with his creatures, not in order to promote their happiness, but because he is just in his own eternal nature and cannot act otherwise; that the reason of justice and of every moral principle is in itself, as it eternally constitutes a part of the very glory of God. Plant a conviction of this absolute, immutable, and inviolably sacred character of moral principles in human hearts, and what will be the sure result? We have the answer in the historical fact that where the orthodox views on this subject have been held, they have ever been attended and followed by a morality purer and loftier in its tone and standard than has been elsewhere common in the world. A popular reproach has universally been cast upon “high Calvinism” on account of what men are pleased to call its austere, rigid, inflexible, and (as meaning all that and something worse,) its *puritanical* code of morals, which will not yield so much as one hair-breadth of the sacred claims of right and principle to any pleadings of expediency, of interest, of passion, or if you please, of benevolence; for it holds that the highest right is itself the highest benevolence, and that benevolence is benevolence only so far as it is right. The other and opposing theories deprive moral distinctions of their sacredness and power. They teach either that they may be set aside, annulled, and abrogated, or resolved into a thin and airy phantom, called benevolence or the love of happiness. Right is not something sacred, fixed, unchangeable. It is a thing of times

and circumstances. In short, it is expediency—it is *policy*—the poorest, paltriest, most pitiful thing that fell from heaven. This matter affects not only the moral character of men personally, but also legislation and government. The idea that sin is to be punished, not because it intrinsically deserves it and justice demands it, but only for the good of the transgressor and the public, will pass over and has passed over from the theologian to the law-maker and the magistrate, the criminal code of nations is modified to suit it, government is administered according to it, and the execution of *justice* ceases to exist except in name. There is no such thing. It should be called the promotion of the public happiness. The politic and the expedient have usurped the place of the just and righteous. To what other causes than these can we ascribe the general corruption of morals, the prevalence of crime, the relaxation of law, the abolition of capital punishment, the utter confusion of moral principles, which are spreading so rapidly in those very communities where the fundamental ideas of those heresies of which we speak have received the most favor? Men cannot unsettle the foundations of the social fabric and expect the superstructure to stand strong. This argument then, is no mere battle of words, not just a contest of skill with the weapons of logic and learning, the only result of which is to decide who is the ablest disputant and to settle some abstruse point in some abstract creed. Under cover of this war of the theologians, mighty *moral forces* strive for mastery over the souls of men, one to purify, exalt, and bless the world, the other to dissolve the very bands of society, to let loose the powers of evil, to corrupt and to destroy.

The importance of the second main question considered by our author, viz., as to the persons for whose benefit the atonement was made, whether for all men, indiscriminately and indefinitely, or for the elect, personally and definitely, he correctly states, grows out of its relations to the question as to the nature of the atonement chiefly. It is perfectly obvious that according to the moral influence and governmental theories, the death of Christ had not and could not have any special reference to any

one individual of the human race more than to another. And according to the orthodox doctrine, the work of our Lord, considered in itself, separately and abstractly from his design and purpose in undertaking it, may be related indifferently to one man as much as to any other. But according to that doctrine, the very nature of that work involves and implies a personal reference, a purpose and design as to the individuals for whose benefit it was wrought. Take, for example, the general principle on which our salvation was effected by the Redeemer, the principle of *substitution*. To act and to die in our place, as our substitute, to assume our liabilities to divine law and justice, to suffer vicarious punishment, necessarily implies a definite and personal recognition of those for whom the substitute acts and whose obligations he discharges. Any other idea is absurd and impossible. The very conception of substitution involves a purpose and design as to the persons for whom it is made.

The same conclusion is inevitable from the orthodox view of the work of Christ as a real and proper satisfaction to the demands of law and justice against sinners. For the law can have no further claims against those with regard to whom all its requirements have been fully satisfied. Hence, it follows that Christ did not make such a satisfaction for all men indiscriminately; or if he did, that all will be saved. To say that he made a true and real satisfaction for the sins of any one, and yet that the same person is by the same law condemned and punished, is a contradiction. When it is said that Christ made a real and proper atonement for sin, the simple meaning is that he *really atoned* for it; which manifestly he did not do if that sin is punished in the person of the sinner. If we hold to the orthodox view of the nature of that atonement, therefore, we must of necessity admit its definite and personal design as to the elect, or we must adopt the folly of universal salvation. There is no alternative.

As we have previously stated, the orthodox view of the nature of Christ's redeeming work ascribes to it the whole process and result of our salvation; the means, the beginning, the progress, and the consummation of it, are all the fruit and effect of that

work. The gift of the Spirit, regeneration, faith, repentance, pardon, justification, sanctification, and the future glory, are all the purchase of his death. And a vital point in this inquiry is, what did our Lord *effect* by his death for those for whom he died? Every form of the universal atonement theory necessarily teaches that it only removes the legal difficulties out of the way of the salvation of men, making salvation possible, but not actually saving any, leaving the result in any individual case dependent on other conditions. The logically absurd Calvinistic Universalist conditions it on election. Evangelical Arminians, whose theory is only incidentally noticed in the work before us, while holding the true doctrine of the nature of the atonement as expiatory and propitiatory, and ascribing to it as the meritorious and efficient cause, all our salvation, yet conditions the actual result in the case of each individual on the act of his own self-determined will, which, in their view, is in its own nature uncontrolled and uncontrollable by any influence, human or divine. After all that Christ has done, and all the means of salvation and the grace and power of God can accomplish, the actual saving efficacy of it all is arrested by the insuperable barrier of the sinner's will, until that, self-determined, consents and concurs: thereupon, the conditional cause coöperating, the cause meritorious and efficient carries on the work.

The orthodox doctrine, however, teaches that the atonement, by virtue of its own force and efficacy, fulfils and carries out to the end the whole work of salvation, securing all the means and conditions necessary to the great result. It not only makes salvation possible, it saves. It purchased repentance, faith, and obedience, for all those for whom it was made. "The Scriptures over and over again declare that Christ died with the design and effect of procuring for those for whom he died the subjective grace of sanctification, including faith, as well as the objective grace of forgiveness conditioned on faith." They ascribe all our salvation, in every part and particular, and the whole glory of it, to that work of Christ alone. There are here two questions, first, what does the atonement effect; secondly, for whom was it made? We must limit the first or the second, or else hold to

the actual salvation of all men. How can a Christian put his limitation on the first, and rob the Son of God of at least a part of his glory as a Saviour? Dr. Hodge remarks well, "it is not we who teach a limited atonement, but our opponents;"—an atonement limited, incomplete, imperfect, in its saving efficacy; an atonement which limits the honor of our divine Redeemer, and would teach us to sing, "unto him that loved us and washed us from our sins in his own blood," and to ourselves, or to somebody or something else, be glory!

In this respect, therefore, as it necessarily affects our view of the nature of the atonement *in regard to its effects*, the question as to its design becomes one of the highest importance, both theoretically and practically.

It has not been our object to put our readers in possession of our author's arguments on the various points which he discusses: to do that, it would be necessary to transfer substantially the entire volume to this article. His arguments are in his own pages so condensed that they cannot well be reduced to greater simplicity and brevity and remain intelligible to the general reader. Nor have we aimed in our own way to construct a complete argument on any of the questions connected with this subject. We have endeavored rather to give an idea of the scope and contents of the work before us, of the subject matter of which it treats, of the method in which that is handled, and the relations and bearings of the great themes which are discussed. Our object is gained if our readers gather from what we have said, an understanding of the subject of the book, and of its supreme importance, and conceive a more earnest desire to acquaint themselves with it.

There are several incidental points of interest and importance, which come up for notice in the progress of Dr. Hodge's discussions, to which we desire to call attention before we conclude.

One of these has reference to the relation of the atonement to the doctrine of election, which is one particular involved in the general question of what has been called "the order of the divine decrees." An unfair attempt has sometimes been made to excite odium against any statement on this point by an effort to con-

nect it with the unpopular discussions of what is known as the supralapsarian and sublapsarian theories. But every competent theologian knows it has nothing to do with that. It has been still further attempted to prejudice the doctrine of the Reformed theology on this subject by accusing it of an endeavor to pry into the secrets of the hidden things of God, and to assert a sequence of thought in the divine mind itself. But every competent theologian knows that the statements of the Reformed theologians on this subject refer solely to the sequence of thought in our own minds, to the order and arrangement of our own conceptions of the divine dispensations, which the laws of human thought necessarily and inevitably compel us to form. It is impossible for us to think at all on this subject without defining to ourselves some relation or other between the divine election of some to salvation and the redeeming work of Christ.

What is that relation? We will quote the statements of Dr. Hodge on this point, which no man who has any regard to his reputation for a knowledge of the subject should venture to deny:

“Was it the design of the redemptive work of Christ that it carry into effect the purpose of election, or was it the design of God’s sovereign election that it should carry into effect, in part, the general purpose of redemption? The theology of the Reformed Churches was broadly characterised by its subordination of redemption to election. Their habitual mode of representation, is, that God, having of his mere good pleasure elected some men to everlasting life and to all the means thereof, sent his Son to effect that purpose by his obedience unto death. All the advocates of indefinite redemption, on the other hand, must agree in maintaining that God provided the atonement for the good of all men indiscriminately, and that election comes in subordinately to redemption, either conditioned on foreseen faith (so the Arminians), or as a sovereign purpose on the part of God to make certain the success of the general purpose of redemption, at least in the case of the persons elected, (so the Calvinistic Universalists).” Pp. 361, 362.

“Calvinists” “believe that an absolute sovereign, in that eternity which is without beginning, end, or succession, foreordains whatsoever comes to pass. They acknowledge that if the decrees of God are eternal, they must be one, single, changeless,

all comprehending intention. They profess to believe that as of his mere good pleasure God has chosen out of the great mass of men, equally guilty, some men to eternal salvation, 'so hath he fore-ordained all the means thereunto. Wherefore, they who are elected, being fallen in Adam, are redeemed in Christ,' etc. (Westminster Conf., chap. iii., sec. 6.) Redemption must be in order to accomplish the purpose of predestination, because, as a matter of fact, it does precisely accomplish that purpose. On the contrary, a sovereign election of some *cannot* be in order to accomplish the purpose of the general redemption of all, because, as a matter of fact, it does *not* accomplish it. If, then, redemption be in order to accomplish the purpose of the sovereign election of some, then it is certain that Christ died in order to secure the salvation of the elect, and not in order to make the salvation of all men possible. St. Augustine and all consistent Augustinians, Calvin and all the Reformed Churches, held that REDEMPTION IS IN ORDER TO ACCOMPLISH THE PURPOSE OF ELECTION." P. 370.

In regard to the views of the great Calvin himself the following cannot be questioned:

"The entire analogy and spirit of Calvin's system was, as a whole, broadly characterised by the subjection of redemption to election, as a means to an end."

And after quoting the testimony of "the able, learned, and impartial F. Christian Baur," to the effect that Zwingle and Calvin held the satisfaction of Christ to be only the carrying out of the purpose of redemption, Dr. Hodge adds, "that this is true, so far as it represents Calvin subordinating the purpose of redemption to the purpose of election, every student of his *Institutes* and of his *Consensus Genevensis* knows; and that this conclusively settles the present debate, every competent theologian will confess." (That is, the debate as to Calvin's opinion on the extent of the atonement.) P. 389.

As to the doctrine of the Westminster Confession on this point, whatever may be said as to its teaching or its silence on the supralapsarian and sublapsarian controversy, no unprejudiced mind can deny that it plainly decides that the work of redemption was in order to accomplish the purpose of election, and not that election was in order to carry out the work of redemption—which is the question. Redemption, atonement, is the means by

which election is carried out, and not *vice versa*. Chap. iii., Sec. 6: "As God hath appointed the elect unto glory, so hath he, by the eternal and most free purpose of his will, foreordained *all the means thereunto*. Wherefore, they who are elected, being fallen in Adam, are redeemed by Christ, are effectually called unto faith in Christ by his Spirit working in due season, are justified, adopted, sanctified, and kept by his power through faith unto salvation. Neither are any other redeemed by Christ, effectually called, justified, adopted, sanctified, and saved, but the elect only." This deliverance of that venerable testimony, taken in connexion with the fact that the relation of redemption to election was one of the controversies of the times, in consequence of the innovations of Cameron and Amyrald on the faith of the Reformed Churches, cannot be mistaken by an honest and candid reader.

A cautionary remark of Turretin, in regard to speculations concerning the order of the divine decrees, is sometimes quoted to discredit all such distinctions. But in fairness it ought to be stated that he says the opposition of its adversaries to the truth has made such distinctions "necessary," that he discusses them at length, and that he decides in favor of that view which he affirms is the "common" opinion of the Reformed Churches, which subordinates the work of redemption to the decree of election, as the means to the end. Indeed, this matter of the relation of the work of Christ to election is just one of those logical analyses in which the question is reduced to its simplest, ultimate terms, and which serve as the formulæ of mathematics, as a test of truth. If a doctrinal statement on the subject involved cannot be reduced to this form, it contains an error.

The reader will not fail to observe, in the language quoted from the Westminster Confession, the distinction clearly, unequivocally, and unquestionably noted between "redemption" and the application of it to the elect, which some have confounded. By redemption, the Confession and the Reformed theologians generally, denoted the work of Christ in order to procure salvation for the elect, and they carefully and clearly distinguish between that and the actual application and execution

of its results. In the old theology "redemption" meant what "atonement" means in modern phraseology, and we must not be misled by a play upon words.

In connexion with this, it is worthy of notice that the adherents of the moral influence and governmental theories use freely many of the terms employed in the statement of the orthodox doctrine, but in a loose and deceptive sense, with a meaning very different from that which they are intended to convey when applied to the truth. They use the word "atonement" for example, but they mean by it simply the reconciliation of sinners to God, the change of their hearts from a state of enmity to him to one of friendship, and not at all the reconciliation of God to sinners. The advocates of the governmental theory will say that Christ "satisfied justice" in regard to our sins; but when they explain their meaning, it refers to what they call "public justice," and the phrase in their dialect only signifies that by his death he prevented the injury which otherwise would have befallen the public interests of the divine government in consequence of the salvation of sinners. They contend with implacable hostility against the doctrine that he satisfied the demands of justice against the sinners who are saved themselves. And as Turretin states, the Socinians admitted that Christ made a "satisfaction" improperly so called, and the adversaries of the truth generally, a satisfaction in a metaphorical sense, that they might impose on the simple. As to the words "substitution" and "vicarious," Dr. Hodge says, correctly, "these terms are admitted in a loose sense even by Socinians, and are paraded by Young, Maurice, and Jowett, and very much in the same loose indifferent sense by Barnes and the advocates of the governmental theory generally." It has been stated that Dr. Archibald Alexander was accustomed to say, that he who admitted the atonement to be *vicarious* was substantially sound on that point. If he did, he must have meant vicarious in *his*, the orthodox sense of that word; and to suppose that he could have made such a statement without reference to that meaning would be to make that great and good man utter nonsense of which he was not capable.

Another of the incidental questions to which we referred, is whether Christ suffered the *same identical penalty* due, according to the law, to those for whom he died, or something else which was accepted in place of it, and as equivalent to it. Dr. Hodge does not fully and distinctly discuss this point, and his statements in regard to it do not seem at first sight to be altogether consistent. Thus he says "the penalty, when once incurred, can be preserved inviolate only by being executed." P. 26. Speaking of the satisfaction which Christ rendered for our sins, he says :

"Being the actual execution in strict rigor of justice of the unrelaxed penalty of the law." P. 31. "If the penalty is an essential part of the law; if the whole law is immutable; if Christ came to fulfil the law and not to relax its demands; then it follows, without doubt, that he suffered the penalty of the law as our substitute." P. 67. "It is self-evident that nothing can possibly so exactly take the place of the penalty and effect the precise end for which the penalty was designed, as the penalty itself." "Nothing else possible can so effectively demonstrate the inflexibility of the law as its literal fulfilment in precept and penalty." P. 331. "Christ satisfied the retributive justice of God by bearing the very penalty of the law." P. 343.

But while our author frequently uses this language, which seems to imply that Christ suffered the very thing which the law had denounced as the penalty of sin, he appears in other places to say that our Lord endured not *that*, but something else, and that his sufferings were penal in their nature, and may be called the penalty of our sins, inasmuch as he sustained our relations to the law, and what he suffered, whatever it was, had a legal relation to our sins, and was inflicted as punishment. Thus on p. 30 :

"But he did suffer the very penalty of the law. That is, sin was punished in him in strict rigor of justice. His sufferings were no substitute for a penalty, but those very penal evils which rigorous justice demanded of his exalted person when he stood in our place, as a full equivalent of all that was demanded of us. The substitution of a divine for a human victim necessarily involved a change in the *quality*, though none whatever in the legal relations, of the sufferings." "We say that Christ suffered

the very penalty of the law, not because he suffered in the least the same kind, much less the same degree of suffering as was penally due those for whom he acted, because that is not at all necessary to the idea of penalty. But we say that he suffered the very penalty of the law, because he suffered in our stead; our sins were punished in strict rigor of justice in him; the penal demands of the law upon his people were extinguished, because his sufferings sustained precisely the same legal relations that our sufferings in person would have done; and because he suffered precisely that kind, degree, and duration of suffering that absolute justice demanded of his divine person, when found federally responsible for the guilt of all the sins of the elect. We believe that while the sufferer is substituted, the penalty as penalty, though never as suffering, is identical." P. 38. "The execution of precisely the same sufferings, if it had been possible, in the person of the God-man, that would have been the proper penalty of the law if executed in the person of the transgressors themselves, would have been an outrageous injustice." "What Christ suffered is by no means the same with what his people would have suffered, when considered as suffering, but is precisely the very same when considered as penalty." P. 66.

These statements may perhaps be harmonized by what we find on the one hundred and sixty-eighth page. He first remarks, respecting the view of Barnes, that he maintains "that Christ suffered and died as the true substitute of his people. And yet he affirms that Christ did not suffer the true penalty of the law; that is, he did *not* suffer what they would have done; that is, that he was their substitute, while he lacked that which is essential to the idea of a substitute;"—which seems to mean that Dr. Hodge understands that for Christ to suffer the true penalty of the law, (which he constantly affirms,) was to suffer what his people would have suffered, and that this is essential to the idea of substitution. Then he goes on to say:

"It is true as I showed above, that the person upon whom the penalty is to be inflicted being changed—one divine Person being substituted for many human persons,—the law itself, on principles of essential justice, spontaneously adjusts the quality of the sufferings constituting the penalty to the quality of the victim. Sinners being the victims, the penalty includes remorse and eternal death. Christ being the substituted victim, remorse and eternal death, *ipso facto*, cease to be the penalty, and he stand-

ing in our place, suffers precisely the very penalty of the law in our stead ; that is, all that the law in rigor of justice demands on the account of our sins, when that account is settled in his person. *In every substitution there must be a constant as well as a variable quantity.* A substitute is not a different man in a different place, but a different man in the same place."

The sentence which we have put in italics seems to contain the key to the difficulty. That difficulty, as it might appear to be involved in the orthodox view of the sufferings of Christ, is this: If we say that he endured the very penalty of the law, suffering precisely what we would have suffered but for his substitution in our place, it might seem to imply that he must suffer remorse, despair, the depravation of his moral nature, and *eternal* punishment—which is abhorrent and intolerable to be thought of for a moment and impossible. The great masters of the seventeenth century, who contended with the adversaries of the truth over every point of the old theology, met this difficulty in this way. We must distinguish, they said, between the *essence* of the penalty and its *accidents*, between that which is of its substance and that which is incidental. The former is invariable, universal, immutable in the case of every sinner punished by the law, the proper and necessary suffering in every instance. The latter may vary in every case, depending on the nature and circumstances of the person who suffers. The former, the essence of the penalty, is expressed in the Scriptures by "the curse" of the law, "the wrath of God," "death"—the exact and fearful meaning of which can be fully understood only by those who have suffered it. The latter, the accidents and adjuncts of the sinner's sufferings, are not necessary and essential elements of the penalty, but result from his nature and character—from his weakness and corruption. To this latter category belong remorse, despair, etc. They are not of the essence of the penalty, but incidental to the circumstances of the person who suffers it. No two victims of any law, human or divine, though they may suffer the same punishment substantially, experience precisely and in all respects the same sufferings. And so our Lord, while he did suffer, really and properly, the very

same penalty which was threatened against his people, as to its essence, did not suffer in all respects what they would have suffered, nor that which would have been merely incidental in their punishment personally; nor was it necessary or possible that he should. He endured the curse of the law, he bore the wrath of God, he suffered *death*. But he did not feel remorse, for that attends the consciousness of personal guilt. His moral nature was preserved immaculately pure and holy, by reason of its personal union with the second Person of the Godhead. A sinful human being under the penalty of the law dies forever, for he has no strength to bear it, or to recover himself from it. But it was not possible for Christ to be held by the bonds of death. He was able to receive the stroke of divine justice and not to perish by it—to die and to live again.

In the language of Dr. Hodge, there is in the penalty “a constant and a variable quantity.” The divine substitute for human sinners endured the former; in his case the latter assumed the character which necessarily resulted from the nature of him who suffered, as it does in every other case. Our Lord fulfilled the law as to its *precept*, as well as to its penalty, as our substitute. But it was not necessary to this that he should render in all respects precisely the same acts of obedience which the law requires of us. There is as to the precept that which is of its essence, its constant quantity—perfect love to God; and there is that which belongs to its incidents and adjuncts, its variable quantity, changing with the nature and circumstances of the individual. Christ fulfilled the former exactly and perfectly—the latter just in that respect which his person and circumstances required.

The advocates of the governmental theory, as represented by Mr. Barnes, hold not only that Christ was substituted in the place of his people, but that he suffered, not the penalty of the law in any sense, but something else wholly and essentially different substituted in the place of that. This is unquestionably opposed to the view of the teachers of the old theology. By some who do not appear to have clearly apprehended their views, they are said to have taught that in the atonement not only was

one *person* substituted for another, but one *penalty* for another—that the satisfaction rendered by Christ for our sins was not the payment of the exact debt due to the law, but of *something else*, which was accepted as a moral equivalent and sufficient by God. Even Turretin is supposed by some to teach this view. What Turretin does teach, in agreement with all the recognised old authorities of the Reformed theology, is, that the satisfaction rendered by Christ was not the *exact* debt demanded for our sins by the law, *in one respect*, namely, that *that* was our own *personal* punishment. But he affirms that Christ suffered not only generically, but specifically the very same penalty due to us. This may be seen by referring to the original of a passage quoted, but not fully translated, on the thirty-fifth and thirty-sixth pages of Dr. Hodge's work. Christ was substituted for his people. His suffering was substituted for their suffering. But there was no substitution of one penalty for another penalty, or of something else for the very penalty of the law. Indeed, Turretin, over and over again, argues that Christ did suffer *essentially* the very identical thing which his people would have suffered, meeting all the old objections against this view, and insisting on the distinction we have referred to between the essence of the penalty and its accidents. He even goes so far as to affirm, and to defend the language, that Christ *dolores infernales sustinuit—gehennalem poenam tulit*. The reader will find these points fully discussed in his elaborate Disputations concerning the Satisfaction of Christ, a distinct work from his Theology, and unfortunately even less read by modern students than the latter, but containing almost every thing new and old on the subject of the atonement.

It would be presumption in us to attach any eulogistic phrase to the mention of the name of John Owen, either as to the respect due to his own opinion, or as to his competency as a witness to the opinion of others. But we may quote his authority in both particulars. He had a controversy with Richard Baxter on this very subject. After stating the question as to “that kind of punishment which Christ underwent in making satisfaction for sin,” namely: “Whether it were the same that was

threatened to the transgressors themselves, or whether something else which God accepted in lieu thereof, relaxing the law, not only as to the person suffering, but also as to the penalty to be undergone?" he says: "The first of these, and that with the concurrent suffrage of far the greatest number of Protestant divines, I assert." "I affirm that he paid *idem*, the *same thing* that was in the obligation, and not *tantundem*, *something equivalent* thereunto in another kind." And in the Exercitations introductory to his Commentary on the Hebrews, he has a special dissertation to prove this view, in which he recognises the distinction noted by Turretin, a substitution of the *person* suffering, but not of the *punishment* suffered.

It seems a great transition—*longo intervallo*—to pass from the names of Turretin and Owen to that of Principal Hill. But it is yet more remarkable that any one should regard him as a standard of the Reformed theology. Whatever value his lectures in divinity may possess, it is certainly not that. He says "the sufferings of Christ for sin have received the name of a satisfaction to the justice of God because they were not the penalty that had been incurred, but were something accepted by the Lawgiver instead of it." "It is plain they were not that very punishment which the sins deserved." It is sufficient to state the fact, that Hill endorses the work of Grotius on this subject,—the father of the governmental theory,—and represents the atonement as demanded not so much by the justice of God as by the good of the universe, as a matter of expediency rather than of necessity.

A question of some interest is, What were the views of Calvin as to the extent of the atonement? This is particularly considered by Dr. Hodge. He says:

"Many in our day who hold very imperfect views as to the nature of the atonement and as to the design of God in it, fall back upon some of the vague statements as to the latter point which they are able to glean out of Calvin's voluminous works, and under cover of his great name claim that their various specialties come legitimately under the category of genuine Calvinism." "It has been a very old, and is still a very common trick of errorists, to seek to cover themselves with the authority of

the general and unscientific statements of eminent theologians, written before any particular doctrine in question has been consciously considered and clearly discriminated and defined by the responsible representatives and organs of the Church."

After illustrating this remark by the instances of Arians, Socinians, Pelagians, Papists, and Arminians, Dr. Hodge proceeds:

"In like manner the advocates of self-styled 'improvements in theology,' on occasion, find it to their interest to quote the general and indefinite language of Reformers who wrote without ever consciously entertaining the precise points in question." "Let the fact be well noted, therefore, that Calvin does not appear to have given the question we are at present discussing a deliberate consideration, and has certainly not left behind him a clear and consistent statement of his views." Pp. 387, 388.

The author then, in a passage which we have already quoted, refers to the fact that Calvin's system was distinctly characterised by the subordination of redemption to election, and remarks that every competent theologian will confess that this conclusively settles the question as to Calvin's views in regard to the design of the atonement. We should think any one entitled to the name of a theologian in the humblest degree would acknowledge it.

"It is true, that at times Calvin uses general terms with respect to the design of Christ's death in a more unguarded manner than would now be done by one of his consistent disciples. But at other times he explicitly denies that he believes in an indiscriminate atonement in the sense of Barnes and the great majority of the modern advocates of general redemption. And let it be remembered that one deliberate statement *limiting* the design of Christ's death is sufficient to define the sense of any finite number of vague and indefinite expressions, such as that referred to in his comment on Rom. v. 18. Thus in his comment on 1 John ii. 2, he declared his adhesion to the scholastic formula that 'Christ died sufficiently for all, but efficiently only for the elect,' which is very different from the opinion of those who hold that Christ died for the purpose of removing legal obstacles out of the way of all men indifferently. And at the same time he denies utterly that the apostle in saying that Christ is the 'propitiation for the sins of the whole world' (*totius mundi*) could have meant to include the reprobate. 'Such a monstrous thing deserves no refutation. The design of John was no other than to make this benefit common to the whole Church. Then

under the word *all* or *whole* he does not include the reprobate, but designates those who should believe, as well as those who were then scattered through various parts of the world.'” “In his treatise in reply to a Lutheran defender of the corporeal presence of Christ in the Eucharist, this passage occurs: ‘I would desire to know how the impious, for whom he was not crucified, could eat the flesh of Christ, and how they can drink his blood for the expiation of whose sins it was not shed?’” Pp. 390, 391.

“In all ages many of the most rigid predestinarians have said in the words of Calvin himself, ‘*Passus est Christus pro peccatis totius mundi,*’ while it has been only very superficial critics who have inferred therefrom, that these men intended to decide against the doctrine of the Reformed Churches, which is, that Christ designed in his death to secure the salvation of his elect, and of none others.” P. 372.

The old formula of the Schoolmen, to which Dr. Hodge refers in one of the foregoing extracts, namely, that “Christ died sufficiently for all, efficiently for the elect,” has often been quoted by those who sought in some way to evade the defined and exact statements of the Reformed doctrine on this subject. In reference to it our author says:

“This form of expression was adopted by Calvin and by the early Reformed theologians previous to the thorough sifting of this subject occasioned by the speculations of the French theologians, Cameron, Amyraldus, Testardus, etc. This scholastic expression is inaccurate and inadequate rather than false.” P. 361. “This we regard as a statement inaccurate in terms, and more likely to confuse than to clear the question, yet as very near the truth.” P. 374.

The truth is, the first part of this formula is equivocal, susceptible of two if not more interpretations, under cover of which an error can easily lie concealed. It may be understood either that the death of Christ, in itself, in its intrinsic worth, was of sufficient value to save all. Or it may mean that Christ designed by his death to make a sufficient atonement for all; that is, designed it for all. And then the word “sufficient” also may be variously interpreted. So that before “the thorough sifting of this whole subject,” thoroughly orthodox men may easily have adopted that expression. But such will hardly do it now.

We intended to present the conclusive evidence that the Westminster Confession teaches the definite and personal design of the atonement, as it is exhibited in Dr. Hodge's volume. But we have already drawn out this article to such an unconscionable length that we must forbear.

It is fit that in conclusion we should express our judgment of the manner in which Dr. Hodge has discharged the task he has undertaken. And we are happy in being able to do so in terms of almost unqualified approbation. As to the style of his book, as a literary composition, it is without much grace or elegance of diction, which, indeed, it is evident the author has not aimed at. On the contrary, it is exceedingly plain, simple, and naked, often careless, and sometimes awkward. But it is nervous and remarkably perspicuous. Even when treating of the most abstruse topics, it seems impossible to mistake his meaning. And yet in the whole volume there is scarcely a superfluous sentence, and but few unnecessary words. Both the arguments and language exhibit a remarkable power of condensation. It is surprising how much the author has got into the compass of a volume no larger than the one before us. This has been attained by a happy art of simplifying every subject, of penetrating to the core of every question, of seizing the exact points on which every discussion turns, and of stating in clear and precise terms the thing to be proved.

As a discussion of the subject of the atonement, this volume is well nigh exhaustive. There is, so far as we are informed, scarcely one view of any one point of interest at the present day which it does not consider; and not many of the arguments for or against the orthodox doctrine or any value are left without notice. The arguments are perhaps not always put in the strongest light of which they are capable, but they are never made more of than they deserve. Indeed, while the author is always earnest, he is also moderate, just, and respectful to his opponents, and courteous in his terms. Sometimes an irrepressible warmth will show itself when the inevitable course of the logic unveils some hideous thing in the doctrine of his adversary. But those whose errors he assails will have no real ground for

complaint of their treatment at his hands, unless they find it in the exposure of their errors, the destructive analysis of their sophistries, and the cogency of his reasonings in favor of the truth.

While we would not endorse, without qualification at least, every statement and argument of the author, we can warmly commend his work as a most able and valuable contribution to the defence of the precious old faith of the Church, and deserving the hearty gratitude of every friend of our Old School theology. Besides the merits of the work as a treatise on the subject of the atonement, the chapters on the intimately related questions of the federal headship of Adam, of the nature and grounds of justification, of the nature and office of faith, and of the relations of Christ's active obedience to the work of redemption, are of great value. The least successful parts of it, as it seems to us, are where the author attempts to show the relations of the atonement, on the orthodox view of it, to the non-elect. Here he appears to labor. But perhaps this is inevitable. Perhaps we attempt to do more than needs to be done, when we try to prove that the atonement has done any thing at all for them. Perhaps the parable of the tares and the wheat explains this matter as our Lord would have us understand it. We confess that we cannot reconcile with one another the statements of Dr. Hodge, on pages 371, 414, 416, 417, as to the effect of the atonement in removing the legal obstacles out of the way of the salvation of all men, and making it objectively possible. We confess that we cannot see how the benefits said to accrue by the atonement to those who are finally lost are really benefits at all, since they only add to their guilt and ultimate misery.

On pages 255, 256, 257, there seems to be some confusion of statement in regard to the Arminian theory of the atonement, accidental no doubt. On page 393, there is an important verbal error of "different" for "definite;" and on page 403, twice of "redemption" for "repentance," which we note for the benefit of readers.

Dr. Hodge's pages, bristling all over as they are with the sharp points of dialectical subtlety, are relieved occasionally

by a gleam of pleasantry; but it is the grim humor of a logician, the sport of giving an adversary a nimble-witted toss on the horns of a dilemma, or the dry joke of a neat *reductio ad absurdum*. With one specimen we close our article, begging him to accept our heartfelt thanks for the instruction and pleasure derived from his volume.

Remarking on the fact that the advocates of the governmental theory when opposing the Socinians fall back on the fundamental principles of the orthodox doctrines, and when opposing the latter fall back upon Socinian ground, he says:

“They thus ceaselessly oscillate between the two—orthodox in all they affirm, and Socinian in all they deny. Their champions put one in mind of a landless laird straddling the line fence between two farms. He is always found standing upon that leg which is the *other* side of the fence.”

ARTICLE II.

THE TECHNICAL DEVELOPMENT OF ATTIC TRAGEDY.

In the poetry of the classic period of ancient Greece, we observe a singular phenomenon, which the literature of no other more modern nation presents, at least, in any similar degree, namely, that its principal branches were cultivated to the total exclusion of the others, by each of the distinct races which constituted the Hellenic nation. Thus epic poetry was the sole offspring of the Ionian muse; the religious ode and hymnus was entirely of Dorian origin; erotic poetry, or the ode in the narrower sense of the word, we find exclusively in the hands of the Æolians; whilst the drama originated with, and rose to perfection among the inhabitants of Attika, or rather of Athens, the great centre of Attic life. This remarkable fact was, nevertheless, undoubtedly one of the chief causes of the surpassing excellence of all that remains to us of Greek literature previous to the

Peloponnesian war; since it permitted the full development of each poetic manifestation, unshackled and undisturbed by any element foreign to its peculiar nature; and it was, besides, but the legitimate effect of the influence, which the difference of climate and soil, remarkably large for the small compass of Grecian territory, as well as the various modes and pursuits of life arising from it, exercised not only on the political condition, but also on the moral character of its susceptible inhabitants.

The Ionians inhabited chiefly the western coast of Asia Minor, where a bountiful nature supplied them, without much exertion of their own, with all the necessaries, and most of the luxuries of life. Their prosperous commerce extended at an early period to Egypt, Pontus, the Adriatic, and many of the western parts of Europe, and furnished them both with the opportunity of becoming acquainted with, and the means of acquiring whatever tended to adorn and refine life. The semi-barbarous nations who surrounded their colonies, the Lydians and Carians, were too unwarlike seriously to disturb them in the quiet possession of their territories, and thus they were enabled, in almost perpetual peace, to foster those free institutions under which their commerce prospered, and to devote their lives to the enjoyment of all that nature and their own enterprise had bestowed on them. Thus they became the happy, sensual yet elegant, indolent yet vigorous nation, that seemed constitutionally inclined to indulge in that calm, unreflecting contemplation of nature, that serene belief in a glorious world of gods and heroes, happy and high-souled like themselves, which the rhapsodies of the Homeric epos depict, while they naturally shrank from the subjective speculation which is the legitimate province of the lyric poet.

Different from, nay, the very counterpart of the joyous Ionian, was the Dorian. On his native mountains no warm Asiatic sun shed his dazzling beams; no luxuriant plains, no broad placid streams, teeming with life and plenty, met his eyes; in the wild and rugged regions, which were his home, he was compelled, by hard, unceasing labor to wring from the stony soil the scanty subsistence which he needed for his support. What time he could snatch from his agricultural employments, he devoted to

the chase or to warfare with the petty mountain tribes that infested his borders, and with whom alone he came into contact. This hard life, and the gloom of the scenery around him, rendered him frugal, stern, brave, exclusive, a man of few words, but energetic deeds; and this character the Dorian retained after he issued under the guidance of the Heraklidæ from his native Doris to the conquest of the Peloponnesus. Only in Corinth, which by its position soon became the centre of Greek commerce, the original sternness of his character was mellowed and mollified, while the aristocratic institutions, the jealous exclusion of every foreign element, in the rest of the Peloponnesian states, preserved the original Dorian character, until all Greek nationality was lost under the levelling influences of the Macedonian sway. The religion of the Dorian reflected his simple, lofty, aristocratic character: its true element was deep enthusiastic feeling, its chief characteristic, as Plutarch in *Alkibiades* says, prayer. Hereditary families of priests raised the worship of Apollon, the chief national deity, to almost monotheistic purity, and as the religious training of the young was exclusively their prerogative, they did not fail to inspire, to cultivate, and to preserve that deep, mystic, and often fanatical faith, to which the Dorian temperament naturally inclined, and which sought and found utterance in the solemn religious ode and hymnus, composed for the worship of the temple, which constituted the great bulk of their literary activity. The only exception from the purely religious tendency of Dorian poetry we meet with in the works of *Stesichorus*, who composed with great success panegyric choral songs in praise of the heroic ancestry of his race. But even these choral odes, which were sung at the public tables, and political festivals of the nation, breathed so deep and fervid a spirit of patriotic devotion, as to stand in closest relation to the religious hymnus, and can, at best, but serve as a connecting link between it and the erotic ode of the Æolians, which comes next under our consideration.

The scattered families of the last-mentioned race, among which the Bœotians, E læans, and Lesbians were the most prominent, stood undoubtedly lowest in the scale of Greek nationality.

They were superficial, of no decided moral character, their public spirit was blunted, perhaps in some measure by the heavy atmosphere which they breathed, and their energies were almost exclusively directed to the pursuit of sensual pleasures, for indulgence in which the richness of the soil and the great vigor of their bodily frames gave them ample scope. Even the superior climate of Lesbos could not raise its inhabitants to the manly enterprise and refined serenity of the Ionians, but seemed only to invite them to voluptuous enjoyment and careless ease. Their political condition had likewise a powerful tendency to depress their character; a few oligarchical families succeeded each other in despotic sway, and jealously suppressed every germ of political energy that sprang up in the better minds of the nation. Under such circumstances, it is not surprising that the literary productions of the race reflect the same sensual, frivolous love of pleasure, which characterised them, and which rose only occasionally to a purer and more refined sentiment in the songs of *Sappho*, or strayed off into fierce invective against the usurping despots in the odes of the noble, ardent, and patriotic *Alkæus*. As however the Æolians had the most exquisite taste for music, and the enthusiastic worship of Bacchus and kindred deities furnished them with ample occasion for its exercise, they, and chiefly the Lesbians, have, especially by the invention of their complicated metrical systems, not a little contributed to the development of the Greek language.

These then appear to be the results of Hellenic culture in the three distinct races which constituted the Greek nation, and it becomes us now to consider briefly the peculiar fitness of the inhabitants of Attika, who, though Ionians by descent, yet soon exhibited a decided difference of character from the rest of their countrymen for the development of the drama.

The Athenian combined in his character not only all the excellences of the Ionian and Dorian, the liveliness of the former, and the firmness and energy of the latter, but nature had endowed him in addition with a remarkable power of reflection and combination, which placed him intellectually above the rest of his countrymen, and enabled him to compare and bring into mu-

tual relation the phenomena of outward life with the inner nature of man ; to investigate the causes and purposes of his existence, and to define his position and responsibilities as a moral and social being. If we add to this quality other characteristics of the Athenian, by which he was no less distinguished : his quick decision and restless activity, which caused him to abhor idleness and sloth so much as to make it a crime against the state punishable by law ; his wonderful power of eloquence, full of burning passion, yet restrained by the nicest perception of propriety ; his never-tiring love for conversation on all subjects and in all places, which he carried to such an excess as to bring upon himself the reproach of loquacity ; his fondness for brilliant sallies of wit, pungent sarcasms and nicknames, odd, but with a world of meaning in them, bestowed on every man of distinction irrespective of moral excellence or turpitude, and for the invention of which, as Athenæus (xiv. 614, D.) relates, a society of sixty members was formed ; if, we say, we consider this combination of qualities in the Athenian character, we cannot doubt that he was preëminently gifted and designed by nature to develop the last and highest branch of poetry, the drama. How this was done, how, within little more than half a century, it rose from the rudest beginnings to that perfection which it attained shortly after the Persian war, we proceed now to consider.

Although the invention of tragedy was essentially the work of the Athenians, yet it received its first impulses from abroad. Its original germ rested in the dithyrambos, which, after it had been carried from the Æolian islands to the Isthmus of Corinth, and the northern parts of the Peloponnesus, made, together with the Bacchic rites, at last, its way to Athens, and soon became an integral part of the ceremonies of the Lenæan and Dionysian festivals. The god Dionysus was the type of a nature, which, in continual conflict with hostile elements and seasons, seems sometimes to be crushed by their power and to sink down into death, but ever again renews her strength, and bursts forth with fresh vigor and beauty ; and as his fate was a truthful image of the never-ending conflicts, the sufferings and victories, the joys and griefs of human life, it was but natural that the feelings of his

worshippers especially should have been excited to the utmost, and that their sympathies should have been habitually so deeply engaged, as if they themselves had been directly affected. Hence the impassioned character of the dithyrambos which from its earliest stages was not only of a deeply enthusiastic nature, but also bore in itself many dramatic elements, which developed themselves in the course of time, until finally the dithyrambic chorus, extending its legitimate sphere from the myths of Bacchus to that of other deities and the heroic world, ended in tragedy.

The first important step towards this dramatic development of the dithyrambos was taken by *Arion*, who about the fortieth Olympiad (B. C., 620,) chiefly in Corinth, where he enjoyed the favor and friendship of the tyrant Pittakus, arrayed the choral song of the Bacchic service systematically into an antistrophic poem, to be performed alternately by fifty members who composed the chorus. The subject of these poems he drew from the mythus of Bacchus, accompanied their performance with instrumental music, and if not invented—for there are signs, that it existed before—at least settled the custom of introducing the chorus in the dress of Satyrs. This arrangement the ancients called *τραγικὸς τρόπος* and may perhaps be best expressed by the term lyric or *Dorian* tragedy; for as a further development of the service conflicted with the religious feelings and principles of the Dorians, it remained the first and last step which that race ever took in this direction. About the time of Arion we hear also of one *Epimenides* of Sikyon, who, however, is only of interest, because, if we may believe the story of Herodotus, (V. 67,) he, by attempting to celebrate in a tragical chorus the fate of Adrastus, was the first who transferred it to a subject beyond the mythological cycle of Bacchus.

We come now on Attic ground, and here we meet with *Thespis* the Icarian, whom Peisistratus, about the year B. C., 535, had drawn to Athens on account of his great musical talents. He gave to the leader of the dithyrambic chorus a second office, that of actor, who at proper intervals recited stories from the old epos, which, however, had no further connexion with the lyric part. He also placed this leader, called *Coryphæus*, on an

elevated place near the *thymele* or altar in the theatre, after such a building had been erected for the habitual performance of the choral songs. Of a dialogue there was no trace as yet, neither, as has been said already, was the epic in any close connexion with the lyric part of the performance, although a selection may have been made, and the illusion was probably heightened by a mask, characteristic dress, and mimic execution. Whilst *Chærilus* the Athenian, occupied himself chiefly with writing satyr-dramas, (which fact is however a remarkable proof that tragedy began already to abandon the original object of Bacchic worship,) *Phrynichus*, the son of *Polyphradmon*, distinguished himself as a successor of *Thespis* by the important improvements which he introduced, both in the composition and the representation of the drama. He chose the subjects of his works with care, executed them according to a certain plan, invented the trochaic trimeter for the dialogue, introduced the first actor, who carried on the dialogue with the *Coryphæus*, and brought also female characters, of course performed by male actors,—for the Greeks never permitted women to act,—on the stage. In his works, however, the lyric part continued still to predominate; his taste directed him chiefly to cultivate the orchestric and music of the performance; for *Athenæus* remarks that he was a good dancing-master, who gave instruction in that art to many other Athenians besides the chorus. His most celebrated piece, which he performed under the patronage of *Themistokles*, and by which he gained the prize, was entitled the *Phœnissæ*. In this drama, *Phrynichus* extolled the achievements of his countrymen over the Persians, and in order to bring more action into the chorus, he divided it so that one-half represented the Phœnician or Sidonian women, who, after receiving the news of the battle of Salamis, bewailed the death of their slain husbands, while the other half performed the part of the ancient counsellors of the King of Persia, and deliberated in his absence on the safety of his endangered realm. Another of his tragedies was taken from contemporary history, and entitled *Μίλητον ἀλωσις* (the capture of Miletus.) Herodotus (VI. 21,) relates that the beauty of the play moved the assembled people

to tears, but that after his performance they fined him a thousand drachmæ for having exhibited their domestic misfortunes, and ordered him never to bring it on the stage again.

After such comparatively small beginnings, the genius of *Æschylus* at once raised the tragic art to that height, which since his age no nation has ever attained again, except, perhaps, the English, in and through Shakspeare. *Æschylus*, however, like Shakspeare, did not achieve this wonderful success through his genius alone; to the times in which he lived, a large share of his glory was due. Without the powerful impulses which his native country had received by the stirring events that had recently occurred, without the elevating influences of Attic society, which had then reached its healthiest tone, even his genius could not have obtained such great results. The terrible struggle against the Persian invader, to the heroic deeds of which *Aeschylus* had contributed by personal valor when in the full bloom of manhood, had revived in the Hellenes a strong feeling of nationality, whilst their almost miraculous escape from destruction had turned their minds to serious investigation of the relations of the deity to human existence, had filled their hearts with gratitude towards their divine deliverers, and had elevated their moral character. As the Athenians had been the chief contributors towards the favorable issue of the war, and were raised by it to the hegemony of the whole of Greece, their city of course became the centre of this national regeneration, and felt its effects most powerfully. Under such hallowed influences, glowing with patriotic enthusiasm and a fervent religious faith, *Æschylus* composed his works, and gave to them that patriotic, moral, and religious character which the preceding poets had failed to impress on theirs, at least in any similar degree, because they had written them under less favorable circumstances, or at least were too old to become so thoroughly imbued with the spirit of the times as to reflect it with equal power in their latest works. But as the more elevated tone of tragedy required also enlarged means for its performance, *Æschylus* improved the stage by the introduction of beautiful scenes, executed by the skilful painter *Agatharchus*; he invented various machines for the raising of

ghosts from below, or for suspending actors in the air when they represented gods; he also adapted the costume of the actors to the more elevated characters which they performed, by giving them painted masks, long flowing robes of bright colors, with showy embroideries, and the cothurnus by means of which their figures were raised to a superhuman height. These splendid decorations the poet was enabled to introduce by the ambitious liberality of rich and influential citizens, under whose patronage the plays were brought out, after tragedy had ceased, as a purely religious ceremony, to be under the sole supervision of the state. These *choregi*, as they were called, bore the whole expense of the performance, with the exception of the salary of the actors, who were paid by the state and distributed by lot among the contending poets. They, the choregi, furnished not only the means for the decoration of the stage, but also had to support the chorus, always composed of Athenian citizens, during the time of rehearsal, which, of course, usually extended over several weeks. They had besides to pay the *χωροδιδάσκαλος* or chorus teacher, with his assistant, the *ὑποδιδάσκαλος* to whom the instruction of the chorus was intrusted. After the performance of the plays, the choregus was also expected to show his gratitude to the chorus by a sumptuous entertainment; and if the tragedies performed under his patronage had gained the prize, he dedicated a tripod in honor of the victory.

Such outward improvements were, however, of small importance compared with the development of the internal economy of tragedy, which the genius of Æschylus devised and established. He did this first by confining the subjects for tragic composition entirely to the Trojan cycle of mythology and the princely houses, heroes, and demigods connected with that cycle. The Homeric epos thus became the fountain from which he drew his inspiration; the powerful and plastic forms that move in its pages, revealed to him also the tone and pathos of the true dramatic character, and offered themselves as the fittest organs for the development of the lofty ideas, and the solutions of the high moral problems which moved the minds of the age. But the higher elements which were thus infused into the drama and

raised it to the place of a moral and social teacher of the people, required a decided and final separation of the offices of chorus and actor, of the objective representation of the past, and the subjective reflexion of the present. Hence he created a second actor, by whom a regular dialogue and an uninterrupted action on and behind the stage, with the assistance of messengers and mutes, became possible. One of the most natural consequences of this introduction of a second actor was the comparative restriction of the choral parts of the drama. Henceforth they no longer spread throughout the play in planless profusion, but began to be adapted to the dramatic part and were only then admitted, when a decisive moment of the action made a pause for reflection desirable, and as these reflections depended in their nature altogether on the action which called them forth, the poet was led to a systematic selection of different metres, the rhythm of which expressed the various emotions required. Thus, for instance, the dochmian metre, on account of its great variety, was chosen to depict every kind of violent excitement; the anapaest, the metre of the battle-songs of the Greeks, became the organ of the feelings of hope and joy; the trochaic and choriambic systems were used for calm and grave reflection; whilst the iambic trimeter or senarius took the place of the trochaic trimeter for the dialogue, because, on account of the quickness and energy of its motion, it proved most adapted for conversation.

But nothing exhibits the comprehensiveness and boldness of Æschylus more decidedly than his invention of the trilogy. It had, at an early period of the tragic art, become a general custom among the poets to enter each dramatic contest with three plays, which, however, stood in no immediate connexion with each other. This usage Æschylus adopted and perfected in accordance with his peculiar talents and the spirit of the times. The mythological subjects which he drew from the Homeric cycle were frequently of so complicated a nature that Æschylus found it impracticable to present them in all their bearings in one single play; he conceived, therefore, the idea of enlarging the sphere of dramatic action by combining the three hitherto un-

connected tragedies, as far as subject and plan was concerned, into one whole, and by this means he enabled himself to exhibit before his audiences a succession of mythical action, and the complicated fates of whole families and races. But as the violent emotions, which the heightened pathos of such a threefold performance must necessarily produce in the beholders, needed some relief before they again entered into the realities of life, he added to it a kind of comic conclusion, the satyric drama, the subject of which stood at least in connexion with that of the preceding tragedies. These were the *trilogies*, or rather the *tetralogies* of Æschylus; but what their internal connexion was we could hardly now fully comprehend, had not one of them, the *Oresteia*, fortunately been preserved to us entire, with the exception of the satyric drama, of which we know at least the name—*Proteus*.

In such a succession of tragedies, which must have required the space of several hours for their performance, a division of the chorus, the first sign of which we have seen in the Phœnissæ of Phrynichus, became necessary, as it was impossible that the physical strength, the memory, and dramatic skill of the same choreutæ should have sufficed to bear them through the performance of the three plays. Æschylus, therefore, divided the fifty members of the chorus into four sets of twelve, and sometimes, when no satyric drama was performed, into three sets of fifteen, each of which acted in one of the four or three plays, as the case might be. Thus Æschylus had in all essential points completed the external development of tragic art; the few modifications which it subsequently received were only the necessary consequence of the different direction which its tendency took under *Sophokles*. For while Æschylus had, as we have before seen, made the complicated fates of the families of the mythological cycle the medium for a discussion and solution of the great national problems of his day, and had for this purpose enlarged the extent of his dramatic plans by the invention of the trilogy, Sophokles, following the tendencies of *his* time, conceived the idea of creating for the drama a still higher, a more humane sphere, than it had so far occupied, by making it the reflecting mirror of the emo-

tions, the passions, and the conflicts of the human heart. This was indeed a nobler, but also a narrower sphere; and whilst it permitted the dramatic action to be concentrated into a more limited space, so as to render the trilogical system of Æschylus unnecessary and even embarrassing to its quicker progress, it required a far more minute development of character; and further, as it became less the object of the poet to represent the impressions which the events made on the reflecting beholder, than to elicit the emotions that took place in the heart of the actor, it effected an important reduction of the lyric element. Sophokles therefore abolished again that connexion between the three tragedies performed on the same day, which Æschylus had introduced in the trilogy; and with a view to acquire enlarged means for the development of the various shades of human character, he created the third actor. To understand, however, how, with the help of the limited number of three actors, the many complicated situations of the psychological dramas of Sophokles could be brought before the audience, it must not only be borne in mind that each actor performed different parts in the same play, but also that this distribution was so arranged as to limit each actor to a particular share in the development of the action. Thus while the poet intrusted to the first actor, the *protagonistes*, the chief character of the play, in which the leading *motive* of the drama, as it reflected itself in the fate and sufferings of one person, was developed, the second actor performed those parts, which, by exhibiting a smaller degree of strength and depth, served as a foil for the more pathetic character of the protagonist, while the *tritagonist* played especially those persons who caused the sufferings of the protagonist, and elicited interest and sympathy for him from the audience. Thus, for instance, in the *Œdipus Rex* of Sophokles, *Œdipus* himself was performed by the protagonist, *Jokaste* and the *Priest* by the deuteragonist, and *Tiresias* and *Kreon* by the tritagonist.

In the works of Sophokles the dramatic art of Attika had reached its highest excellence, both in regard to the nobleness of its subjects, the moral dignity of its characters, and the grace of its language, as also in the symmetrical beauty of its arrange-

ment. The technical changes, which his younger contemporary and rival *Euripides* introduced, exhibited already signs of that decay, which after his death advanced with rapid steps, until tragedy lost all its original vigor and greatness in the hands of the rhetoricians and sophists.

The most prominent characteristics which distinguished Euripides from his predecessors, were, in the first place, the influence which the philosophy of Anaxagoras had exercised on his religious belief. *Æschylus* traced and recognised in the ancient mythology an overruling influence of the deity, which appeared in his poems as a dark, mysterious, awful fate; *Sophokles* read in it, as in a magnifying mirror, all the mysterious recesses of the human heart; but Euripides could no longer harmonize his own convictions with the nature of the gods and their providential influence on human existence, as depicted in the pages of the epic cycle. Hence, as it once had become the custom to draw the dramatic subjects from these myths, he used them only as the organs for bringing about interesting situations in which the most violent passions conflicted with each other, and he did not raise his characters, as *Sophokles* had done, to the ideal standard of the mythological heroes, but represented them as he daily met them in actual life. In the language of *Sophokles* himself, as *Aristoteles* has preserved it, he drew men, not as they should be, but as they were. Euripides lived, besides, in times which had already deteriorated, both in regard to morals and the purity of the Athenian commonwealth. The conservative principles which had obtained at the time of *Æschylus* and *Sophokles*, began to give way to the rule of the rabble, and Euripides, though he led a very retired life, could not help taking an intense interest in the political struggles of his age. Hence he began to introduce politics into his dramas, and used his characters frequently to express in long harangues his political convictions. Such tendencies, however, could not but be highly injurious to the symmetrical development of the plots of his dramas; the action often became embarrassing to him; he therefore had recourse to the introduction of a prologue, by means of which he informed the audience through the medium of a god or one

of the *dramatis personæ* about the state of affairs at the commencement of the play. In like manner, the many conflicting passions which he depicted in his works, occasionally entangled the plot so much that he found it impossible to bring everything to the desired conclusion without the use of violent means: he therefore introduced the "*deus ex machina*," who suddenly appearing in a chariot from the clouds, settled every difficulty to the satisfaction of all concerned. Such loose construction of the plot had of course also a very injurious effect on the nature of the chorus; it remained no longer the faithful and impartial exponent of the thoughts which the dramatic action suggested, but sided often from the commencement with one or the other of the parties, (as in *Hippolytus*), or even uttered lyric songs which had little or no connexion with the play itself. This habitual neglect of the office of the chorus produced also a laxity in the construction of the metrical systems, of which Æschylus and Sophokles had been, for the opposite reasons, entirely free.

ARTICLE III.

CANONICITY AND INSPIRATION OF THE SACRED SCRIPTURES.

- I. *The Bible True, and Infidelity Wicked.* By WM. S. PLUMER, D. D., LL. D. American Tract Society.
- II. *The Schools of Doubt, and the School of Faith.* By COUNT DE GASPARIN, Translated by Robert S. Watson. Edinburgh: Thomas, Constable & Co.
- III. At the last General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Nashville, the Rev. Dr. B. M. Smith, of Union Theological Seminary, Va., offered the following resolution, which was unanimously adopted:

"The Assembly would earnestly impress on the minds of all having in charge the government and instruction of our Theological Seminaries, the vital importance of training our future ministers, not only to be able and faithful ministers of the word, but also to be fully imbued with an implicit faith in the plenary and literal inspired authority of the Sacred Scriptures."

In the discussion of this subject, the first and main question to be settled relates to the authority of the Bible, or upon what testimony, human or divine, it rests its claim to implicit belief. Assuming as we do, that the Bible, the whole Bible, and every part of the Bible, is the revealed word of God, we shall defer the direct proof of our position until we submit to a careful analysis a portion of the testimony which is usually regarded sufficient to establish it beyond a doubt. The triple foundation which an old divine, Gerhard, makes the basis of this authority, consists: 1. Of the inward testimony which the Holy Ghost gives to it in our souls. 2. Of the internal evidence of Scripture, or the immense superiority of the Bible to all human works. 3. Of the external evidence, or the attestation of contemporary or nearly contemporary writers to the authority of the sacred books.

Later authors have built, for the most part, upon the same foundation, varying more in terminology and arrangement than in matters of any essential importance. Hence we have, first, the *a priori* argument, or proof from necessity; secondly, the mystic argument, or proof from feeling; thirdly, the argument from miracles and prophecies and gifts of the Holy Ghost; fourthly, the argument from the acknowledged superiority of Scripture, and the correspondence and harmony between its varied parts; and lastly, the testimony of the Church, and of early Christian writers. Under the article "Christianity," in the British and New Edinburgh Encyclopædia, which is ascribed to Dr. Chalmers, we are told that "the external evidences of the authenticity and divine authority of the Scriptures have been divided into the *direct* and *collateral*. The direct evidences are such as arise from the nature, consistency, and probability of the facts, and from the simplicity, uniformity, competency, and fidelity of the testimonies by which they are supported. The collateral evidences are either the same occurrences supported by heathen testimony, or others which concur with and corroborate the history of Christianity. Its internal evidences are either from its exact conformity with the character of God, from its aptitude to the frame and constitution of man, or from those supernatural

convictions and assurances which are impressed on the mind by the immediate operation of the divine Spirit."

We do not mean to underrate the evidences of Christianity which are drawn from these and kindred sources. Indeed, many of its defenders are entitled to our admiration and gratitude for their skilful employment of the proofs thus indicated. And besides, they have done much good—confirmed the faith of many, and led many to renounce their infidel errors, and to receive with joyfulness the Scriptures as worthy of all acceptance.

But is any one of these proofs, or is a combination of them all, sufficient to silence all doubt as to the infallibility of the Canon, or as to "the plenary and literal inspired authority of the (entire) Sacred Scriptures." Take, for example, Gerhard's first foundation, viz., the proof of authority drawn from "the inward testimony which the Holy Ghost gives to it in our souls;" or what, in other words, Dr. Chalmers calls "those supernatural convictions and assurances which are impressed on the mind by the immediate operation of the divine Spirit"—and we venture to ask whether any one is conscious of having this inward testimony of the Holy Spirit to any thing more than a limited portion of the Sacred Scriptures? Is there any such testimony when he turns to the ceremonial law, or to the history of the extermination of the Canaanites, or to the presentation of Esther to Ahasuerus? Or can he discern the divine beauty and aptitude of the Scriptures in the imprecatory Psalms, or in every chapter of Chronicles or of Ezekiel? While there may be on the mind a general impression that all this is true, it seems not to afford a sufficient pledge that all the books of the Bible are canonical, and every text infallibly inspired. It meets not the objection that uncanonical books may have found their way into the Scriptures—that whole chapters and parts of chapters of very questionable authority, may have thus been interpolated; and that many of the texts fail to furnish from this inward testimony any proof that they were infallibly inspired.

This mystic proof, or proof from feeling, may be illustrated by an interview which the writer once had with a young Roman Catholic of irregular habits, but a rigid observer of all the cere-

monies and requirements of his Church. Knowing that he had recently been to the confessional, we asked him one day how he felt when his priest pronounced him absolved from all his sins? "I felt," said he, "like a new man—entirely freed, not only from the condemnation, but from the pollution of all my sins." And under the *opus operatum* principle of that communion, such an inward but deceptive attestation as this is common with its devotees, while they may be utter strangers to that "faith which purifies the heart." And so it is with the devotees of every form of error—they "*feel*." It is the inward testimony on which they depend; and no argument can convince them that such proof may be deceptive. They may not go the length of the mystic Platonists of Alexandria, or of Bridget, or of Catharine of Sienna. They may not have invented a reign of the Holy Ghost, in the place of the Father and of the Son, as did the Abbé Joachim, the prophet of the twelfth century; nor administered baptism, as did Baron Swedenborg, "into the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is Father, Son, and Holy Ghost," thus confounding the persons of the Trinity. All have not blended themselves with the Holy Ghost, like some old nuns and monks, or sat down to contemplate the divinity in themselves, like the quietists of Mount Athos. All have not laid claim to direct inspiration, like Fox, the founder of the Quakers. All have not pretended to prophecies and miracles, like Munzer and the prophets of Zwickau, or like the Mormons of our own day. All have not spoken the language of pure love, like the Fratricelli and Molinos, and Labadie, and Poiret, and Mademoiselle Bourignon. All have not come to the absolute disinterestedness and loss of themselves in God, as did Madame Guyon. All have not been carried away like Arndt, to the blotting out of Christ for us, in order to substitute Christ in us. But all have placed a reliance upon *feeling*, or shades of feeling, just as diversified as are their respective systems of belief. And yet while error has its feeling accompanying it, so has pure religion. We cannot have faith or love without feeling, but it must be feeling founded on the knowledge of Christ Jesus as he is revealed in the gospel to make it of any value as evidence even to ourselves.

From what has been said, it must, we think, be apparent that the inward testimony, or the testimony from feeling, (called the testimony of the Spirit,) furnishes no certain or solid foundation on which to rest the authority of the Bible as a canonical book divinely inspired in all its parts. If we turn now to the testimony of the Church, we shall find it also defective in the main element which is needed to establish its divine authority. From the preface to the Catechism of the Council of Trent, we learn that faith in Revelation is that "knowledge by which we yield our unhesitating assent to whatever the authority of our holy mother the Church teaches us to have been revealed by Almighty God." This, at the very best, is but human testimony, and human testimony, we are sorry to say, not the most trustworthy. Chillingworth, whose motto was, "The Bible, the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants!" well said in the same connexion, "I see plainly and with mine own eyes, that there are popes against popes, councils against councils, some fathers against others, the same fathers against themselves, a consent of fathers of one age against a consent of fathers of another age, the Church of one age against the Church of another age. Traditive interpretations of Scripture are pretended; but there are few or none to be found; no tradition but only of Scripture can derive itself from the fountain, but may be plainly proved either to have been brought in in such an age after Christ, or that in such an age it was not in." These are not random charges, but charges that can be substantiated on the clearest testimony. And shall we receive the Church as a witness to the canon and inspiration, when in other important matters her testimony is so discordant and contradictory?

Besides the general ground already indicated for regarding the testimony of the Church less trustworthy than the subject demands, we invite attention to other grounds more specific and bearing more directly upon the question before us—the question of authority. And

1. When the Church is asked for the evidence of her own assumed prerogatives, she at once appeals to the Scriptures as amply sustaining her claim. And then she gives her own testimony to

the Scriptures, vouching for their truth upon her assumed infallible authority. This sophistical mode of reasoning is what logicians call the *vicious circle*, and proves nothing. The claim of the Church is questionable—

2. Because she has never yet been able to decide where we are to look for the exercise of her infallible prerogative—whether to the Pope, to a general council, or to the Pope and council in concert. It has been claimed in turn for each, and it remains undecided still. And if she cannot tell where rests the seat of her infallibility, how can she bear infallible testimony to other matters of which she is a witness ?

3. We cannot regard the testimony of the Church as beyond a doubt, when we know that she has falsified the Bible by adding to the canon a dozen books (the Apocrypha) which have no right there; which neither the ancient nor modern Jews regard as canonical; which Josephus, though he speaks of them as having some title to credit, classes as of inferior authority to the sacred books, and which contain internal evidence that they were not written under the guidance of the Holy Ghost. For it contains apologies for the defects to be found in it: and to suppose that the Holy Spirit would thus apologize, is both impious and absurd. There may be a reason, however, why a “Holy Mother” has taught that the Apocrypha is a revelation from God; for it is easy to find there, what cannot be found in the truly canonical Scriptures, authority for offering prayers and oblations for the dead, for the merit of good works, for purgatory and for some other distinguishing peculiarities of the papal creed. Her testimony is questionable—

4. Because she has added to the true canon, or rather to the generally accredited canon, not only the Apocrypha which was scarcely less known in the time of our Saviour than the Old Testament Scriptures, but which was never directly quoted by him or his apostles; but she has added to the Bible a mass of tradition which she holds to be of equal, and practically, of superior authority to the Bible—traditions much more voluminous than the Bible—which, on her testimony, were handed down in their purity from Christ and his apostles, and which, when ex-

amined, are found to add to, modify, contradict, and materially change the teachings of the Sacred Scriptures. But how can her testimony be good for the Bible, when it is not good for her Apocrypha and for her traditions? But we do not receive her as a true witness—

5. Because she withholds from the people those “living oracles of God,” which were originally written for the people, and addressed to the people, and *all* of them declared to be “profitable” to the people, “for doctrine, for reproof, for correction and for instruction in righteousness.” If she is afraid to intrust the people with God’s oracles, we should be afraid to trust her as a witness to the truth of these oracles.

6. But the testimony of the Church is discrepant and therefore not entitled to the fullest credit. Admit that the Council of Carthage did, A. D., 397, publish a full catalogue of all the books of the Bible, was not the Council of Laodicea, which sat thirty years earlier, equally infallible? And did she not then publish a true and full catalogue from which the Book of Revelation was excluded? In what are called the “Apostolic Constitutions,” the Epistle of Clement was included in the Canon—were these Constitutions spurious? Has the Church ever condemned them? Are they not still of equal authority with any of her traditions? Why then did later Councils erase from the catalogue of sacred books the Epistle of Clement? Again, some of the Fathers to whom she appeals as witnesses to testify in other matters, put into the Canon the Gospel of the Egyptians, the Book of Enoch, and the Shepherd of Hermas, while others entitled to equal credit are found testifying in favor of legendary stories of the most childish character, of many Apocryphal books, and even of the Sybilline oracles? What right then have we to cut their testimony in two, and receive what we like as true, and reject that which appears to us fabulous, or not entitled to full credit?

On such grounds as these, we cannot but receive with hesitancy and doubt even the testimony of the Council of Carthage, though held at an age when there were such lights in the world as Chrysostom and Augustine; especially when we know that in

that day, there was also a great deal of darkness and superstition, and more especially when we know that there is much better evidence (presently to be adduced) to commend the Bible to our implicit belief. That the Bible as it now is, was received and admitted to be true by the Church at large many a long year before the Council of Carthage, is proved by the references to its varied books to be found in the writings of the early Christian apologists. And the Council of Carthage did no more than to proclaim a fact that had existed long previous to that day. The canon of the Old Testament was complete hundreds of years before the coming of our Saviour, and the canon of the New Testament was complete probably while the last of the apostles was still living. It seems to us to have been closed with the concluding verses of the Revelation, not only as it refers to that book, but to all the other parts of "the word of God and the testimony of Jesus."

We come now to notice the proof of the Scriptures from miracles and prophecies. It is the main ground taken by Dr. Plumer in the unpretending little volume, the title of which is placed at the head of this article. With a happy facility he has condensed, in a very small space, the essence of what occupies many a ponderous tome in our theological libraries. And what is more, he has divested the subject of all obscurity, making it plain, simple, easy to be comprehended, and convincing. We therefore take great pleasure in commending it to the readers of this REVIEW.

But has he, or have any of the writers on miracles and prophecies, made the testimony thus derived sufficiently strong, and so enlarged as to embrace—except by inference—either the entire canon, or the plenary inspiration of every text? In our day we have to deal with men who admit miracles and prophecies almost as fully as we could wish, but who contend that they apply as evidences only to a limited extent, and that they neither attest the divine origin of many portions of the Bible, nor "the plenary and literal inspired authority" of many of its parts. We were sorry to see the other day an extract purporting to be from the writings of Dick, whose defence of a verbal inspiration ranks

next in our estimation to that of Gausson, which attributes to him these words: "In all those passages of Scripture which were written by revelation, it is manifest that the words were inspired, and this is still more evident with respect to those passages which the writers themselves did not understand." The legitimate inference from the beginning of this extract is, that revelation only applies to a portion of the Scriptures, and not to the whole; to a larger or smaller portion, as may suit the judgment and critical acumen of the commentator; he being the sole umpire of deciding what in the Scriptures is revealed, and what is not revealed. The following extract from Gasparin presents this subject in the proper light:

"The watchword of the system of spurious inspiration, a watchword adopted by all its representatives: 'The word of God in Scripture.' According to this maxim, Scripture as a whole is not the word of God, and we must make a distinction between the Bible and revelation. I am only astonished to see Christians using such language in their writings, and then ascending the pulpit to read the Bible to the people, as if it were the word of God. Whatever be the book of Scriptures they open, if it be even a historical book, they let the people believe it is God himself who speaks in each verse. Their very first duty, in my opinion, would be to separate the part which is human from that which is divine, the fallible from the infallible, and thus to say to their brethren, 'Here is the word of God which was in the Bible, and which I have extracted. Let us lay hold on that which comes to us from God, not on that which comes from men.'" Pp. 149, 150.

All this applies to the use which many make of miracles and prophecies, not as evidences of the whole Bible, but only of those parts of the Bible which they suppose God has revealed. But if asked, Are they useless as evidences? we answer, emphatically, No. They have their use, and a very important one, in placing the entire sacred record beyond a doubt. When Nicodemus said to the Saviour, (John iii. 2,) "Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God; for no man can do these works that thou doest, except God be with him," he states the principle upon which the use of miracles as evidences apply, as attestations to the personal character and relations of the witness—he came

from God; his works prove it. The witness therefore which he bears must be true. The same principle was stated by Peter on the day of Pentecost, when he said, (Acts ii. 22,) "Ye men of Israel hear these words: Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you by miracles and wonders and signs, which God did by him, as ye yourselves also know." These testimonies from miracles were, therefore, to Jesus of Nazareth as both "Lord and Christ,"—the true witness, whose word is sufficient to establish beyond a doubt the truth of his own revelation. But has he done it? We shall see.

When the Lord Jesus quotes the Scriptures of the Old Testament, his testimony evidently applies not merely to the particular books where such quotations are to be found, but to the whole collection of which these books formed a part. There can be no dispute that collections were then universally received under a particular name, and are so received by the Jews even to the present day. Nor does he appeal to this collection as a whole, but he refers to the particular sections into which the books of the Old Testament were divided, under the well known names of "the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms." (Luke xxiv. 44.) For as every one knows, that whole section of Scripture which forms the *Cetubim*, *Hagiographa*, or *Holy Writings*, was sometimes included in the "Prophets," and sometimes classed by itself. In the latter case, it was called the "Psalms," because that was the book with which it began. (See *Prideaux's Connexion*, Vol. II., p. 61.) There can then be no doubt of the meaning of the words continually repeated by our Lord "That which is written;" "The Scriptures;" "The Law;" "The Law and the Prophets;" "The Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms." In every case, the reference is to the books enumerated by Josephus and unanimously received by the Jews as divine.

If we now turn to the particular references in the New Testament—(we need not quote the chapter and verse)—we shall there find such as these: "Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures;" "On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets;" "All this was done that the Scriptures of the prophets

might be fulfilled ;” “O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken ;” and “beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself ;” “All things must be fulfilled which were written in the Law of Moses, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms concerning me ;” “Then opened he their understanding that they might understand the Scriptures, and said unto them, Thus it is written and thus it behoved Christ to suffer ;” “The law and the prophets were until John ;” “It is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than for one tittle of the law to fail ;” “They have Moses and the prophets, let them hear them ;” “How then shall the Scripture be fulfilled that thus it must be :” “Search the Scriptures ; for in them ye think ye have eternal life ; and they are they which testify of me ;” “Think not that I am come to destroy the law. I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil.”

With such references as these before us, (and if there was any necessity they could be greatly multiplied,) can we doubt for a moment, that the Lord Jesus bore his testimony to the entire canon of the Old Testament—to all the books of which it is composed, no matter by whom written, or by whom compiled ; whether, as tradition will have it, by Ezra and the Great Synagogue, or by some private individual inspired of God for this very work ; to the entire canon as it then stood, and as it now stands ; maugre the defects and the interpolations in it, which biblical critics have labored hard to discover, just as the old Samaritans did, who rejected all of the Old Testament but the Pentateuch ? Let it also be remembered that the Saviour refers to it as to a code from the great Lawgiver, which could not be broken ; referred to it not merely in its detached parts, but as a whole ; and referred to nothing else as the word of God. Nor is there in all that the Saviour has said of the Scriptures, the remotest allusion to any defect or any error, verbal or otherwise, in the entire collection. To the canon, thus far, we have then all the assurance that can be given by the testimony of God's own Son, that it is perfect and complete ; that there is in it nothing redundant, nothing interpolated, nothing defective ; but that

it contains just what God designed it to contain, and nothing else.

It may not be improper here to remark that the passages already quoted to show the perfection of the canon very clearly imply the plenary inspiration of its contents, since they take for granted the infallible authority of the text. "The plenary and literal inspired authority," in the resolution of Dr. Smith, is the great stumbling-block in the way of many modern expositors of the word, and they contemptuously cast it aside. They are afraid of too much "literality." But our Saviour seems not to have had any such fears. He always appeals to the text, in its ordinary and literal import. Nor does he differ in this respect from his own countrymen, the Jews, who were rigid literalists. Indeed, the written word, and just as it was written, was the authority to which he constantly appealed. It was in his hands "the fire and the hammer" which he invariably employed, not only for their instruction, but for the exposure of their hypocrisy, and their hatred, and their envy, and their avarice, and all their other violations of the divine code. And this authority was unanswerable. With the literal word, too, he utterly demolished the traditions of their oral law. For the scribes and Pharisees had their oral law and their traditions, just as their disciples, the Roman Catholics, now have, which they palmed upon the people as authoritative expositions of the text, or as supplying pretended omissions in it—making these addenda the practical rule of faith, and giving them a rank superior to the written word.

Having thus indicated, without making any thing like a full statement of the testimony of our Lord to the canon of the Old Testament Scriptures, and to their plenary and literal inspiration, showing that he referred always to the written word and to nothing else; thus establishing the whole as a literal transcript of the divine authority, let us now turn to the testimony of the apostles that we may see its perfect unison with that of their Lord. John, for example, in his details of the tragedy of the cross, is manifestly imbued with the same spirit of literality which is apparent in all the references of his Master, closing almost

every incident by adding—"that the scripture might be fulfilled." They cast lots for his coat "that the scriptures might be fulfilled." "Jesus knowing that all things were now accomplished, that the scripture might be fulfilled, saith, I thirst." They pierced the side of our Lord, but brake not his legs, as of the two thieves, "that the scripture should be fulfilled, A bone of him shall not be broken." Then adds the apostle, "Again another scripture saith, They shall look on him whom they pierced."

Peter also appeals to the Scriptures, and to the fulfilment of the Scriptures, (see Acts ii.) in that wonderful manifestation of the Spirit which was witnessed on the day of Pentecost, and shows clearly that David referred to Christ when he said, "Thou wilt not leave my soul in *Hades*, neither suffer thine Holy One to see corruption."

As the Lord Jesus had drawn an argument from one of the historical books of the Old Testament, in proof that the doctrine of the resurrection was there taught by a single word, where it is written: "I *am* the God of Abraham," etc., and added, "he is not the God of the dead, but of the living," so Paul founds an entire doctrine on one word, nay, on less than a word, on the singular being used in the Scripture instead of the plural: "He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed." In the same epistle (Galatians.) he goes even the length of personifying Scripture, attributing to it an office which belongs distinctively to God and God alone. "The Scripture," he says, "foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed." And, again, a little further on: "But the Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe."

When so much is made to rest upon a word, a jot, or tittle of Scripture, is it to be presumed that the original inspiration included only the thought, and not also the language, the form, the mode, the arrangement, nay, anything else which is necessary to constitute it literally a divine revelation? The proper answer to this question is fully implied in our references to the testimony of Christ and his apostles. For they were literalists.

Nor did Neander learn from "the Life of Christ," which he has written from a semi-neological stand-point, to speak so slightly as he has done of verbal inspiration, saying, "The old mechanical theory of inspiration has now been generally abandoned."

Any one who concedes the competency of Christ and of his apostles to bear testimony in a matter so important, can scarcely fail to discover ample proof, in the way we have already indicated, that the canon of the Old Testament is complete, and that its inspiration is plenary and perfect. In the sequel we shall notice some of the objections to what is sneeringly called the "old mechanical theory," and hope to furnish a more thorough vindication of our position. Meanwhile let us advert to the testimony on which the canon and inspiration of the New Testament can be firmly established.

For this proof we need not go to the Council of Carthage, nor to any other council of the Church, either in its comparative purity or in its palpable apostasy. The same testimony which has been given to the Old Testament, has been given to the New, with only this difference: The Lord Jesus Christ in person bore testimony to the Old Testament; but to the New he bears the very same testimony by his divine representative, the Holy Spirit. If upon some of the promises of Christ of more than questionable application, the Church of Rome founds its claim of authority, with nothing either external or internal to support it, how much, how infinitely higher is that claim when it has been attested by miracles and gifts of the Holy Ghost? Such attestations, we maintain, have been given to all the books of the New Testament, and they bear on their face the stamp of divinity—the seal of God. The canonicity of many of the books of the New Testament seems never to have been questioned; while others were not so readily received as canonical. There were theorists and critics then as there are theorists and critics now, who seemed to imagine that a book must be written by an apostle in order to give it validity. And accordingly there was an early tradition without a shadow of evidence to support it, that the Gospel of Mark, who was not an apostle, was written under

the superintendence of Peter, and that the Gospel of Luke and the Acts of the Apostles, which were in the same category, were written under the superintendence of Paul. But it is nowhere said that the gifts of the Holy Spirit were restricted to the apostles, and that they and they only were endowed with adequate gifts to write a canonical book. All that has been revealed on the subject is that "holy men wrote as they were moved by the Holy Ghost;" and that "all Scripture is given by inspiration of God."

But to this general evidence we may add that which is more specific. If asked, for example, why the Gospel of Luke, who was not an apostle, was received as canonical, while the many treatises to which he refers in his opening chapter have been suffered to perish, we answer, that perhaps he himself has given us the reason (Chap. i. 3,) where he claims as in our translation to have had "perfect understanding of all things *from the very first*." The Greek text is *ἀνωθεν*—*from above*. If this be so, and we have no wish to strain a point about which doubts may be entertained, there is here a claim for the inspiration of his work which entitles it to more than ordinary weight.

Then, again, there is another internal testimony given after most of the books of the New Testament were written. See 2 Peter iii. 15, 16: "And account that the long-suffering of our Lord is salvation; even as our beloved brother Paul also according to the wisdom given unto him hath written unto you; as also in all his epistles speaking in them of these things; in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other scriptures, unto their own destruction." Examine this testimony, and it will be found that all Paul's epistles are here classed as Scripture. But nothing in that day was thus called but a canonical book. The Apocrypha was not; the Jewish Targums were not; nor were the Epistles of Barnabas, or Clement, or the Shepherd of Hermas. "Wrest as they do the *other* Scriptures." What *other*? We answer, the entire Old Testament, and all the New, with perhaps the exception of the Apocalypse and the Gospel of John, to which may possibly be added one or two of the minor epistles.

But the Lord Jesus, it may be said, has never given the same attestation to the canonicity of the books of the New Testament that he has given to those of the Old. In reply, we may ask, What more have we the right to expect than that which he has actually given? What more is needed as the foundation for implicit faith in the entire canon? Has he not all power in heaven and on earth? all wisdom? all truthfulness? Has his promise ever failed? Did he not in accordance with his promise bestow the gifts of the Holy Ghost, not only upon his apostles, but upon others—the gift of inspiration included? And as under his dictation, the last survivor of the apostles was taught *what to write*, and closed his message by solemnly adding: “For I testify unto every man that hearth the words of the prophecy of this book, if any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book; and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book”—what further testimony do we need? And if that is not enough, let us remember that in his mediatorial reign “he is head *over all things* to the Church.” *Over all things*,—revelation, the canon, the rule of faith, inspiration,—every thing which pertains to the Church or contributes to its edification. And as head over all things, he has, in his providence, admitted into the canon that which is “profitable,” but has set aside and even blotted out from the remembrance of man many a work that once aspired to that high honor. If it were the height of impiety to add any thing to or to take any thing from, the book of Revelation, of a like impiety are they guilty who would add any thing to, or take any thing from the canon—the book of life—God’s own word which shall never return to him void. We must, then, either give entire credence to the canon—receive it with implicit faith, or we must deny him the Headship of the Church.

Will it be said that all this is but inferential proof, and not sufficient to command our implicit faith? But let it be remembered that inferential proof is often stronger than that which is

direct and positive. And so we esteem it on the question before us. The promise of the Saviour,—and he cannot lie,—assured his people that he would not leave them comfortless, that he would afford them a sure guide who would be with them forever; that he would himself teach them what to believe and what to do; and he forewarned them of apostasies from the primitive faith; and as these apostasies have manifestly arisen, where else are we to look but to some monument which he has erected, to some chart in which he has mapped the way of life, for our direction amid the perils to which we are exposed; and such a monument, such a chart, we have only in the Sacred Scriptures. Here then is the proof, not only from the promises of Christ, but from necessity and our own consciousness. We need it, and he himself has supplied the need. Chillingworth thus speaks of the Bible, and what he says receives a loud amen from the heart of every true believer: “I, for my part, after a long, and as I believe and hope, impartial search of the true way to eternal happiness, do profess plainly that I cannot find any rest for the sole of my feet, but upon this rock only. Propose me anything out of this book and require whether I believe or no; and seem it never so incomprehensible to human reason, I will subscribe it with my hand and heart, as knowing *no demonstration can be stronger than this*: GOD HAS SAID SO, THEREFORE IT IS TRUE.” This, and this only, is the profession of an *implicit faith* in the Sacred Scriptures.

We have already intimated that the testimony which establishes the canon of the Scriptures proves also the inspiration of the text. As to inspiration, it was among the schoolmen and not among the apostles that subtle questions arose as to whether the Holy Ghost merely kept the writers from error, or whether he suggested first of all the resolution of writing, then the choice of a subject, then the selection of words, then the arrangement of materials, and finally the disposition of the words. It is the spurious inspiration of our modern teachers, and not the plenary inspiration of our Lord which has taught men to fancy that the inspiration is intense when doctrines are in question, and that it becomes insensible when the matter is one of facts and of history;

it being thought that in this way, the sacred writers may be supposed to retain, to some extent, their individuality, which otherwise, it is conceived, they must have wholly lost; whereas our Lord acknowledges no such interruptions and intermissions in inspiration, and declares every part of the Sacred Books equally infallible.

Let it be borne in mind that the authority of the Bible rests on two facts which are often too much confounded, but which it is of special importance to distinguish: the divine guarantee for the canon, and the divine guarantee for inspiration. For if the canon be uncertain, if the collection of sacred books be subjected to our judgment, which is necessarily variable, the absolute authority of the Bible disappears. It disappears, because every one has the right to modify its contents; and especially it disappears, because a deadly uncertainty hovers over the whole of it and begets universal distrust. Faith in Scripture henceforth becomes impossible for plain men who know that a multitude of critical questions are raised with which they cannot directly grapple, and in spite of all their efforts, they end by feeling that the whole foundation of their belief is shaken. This is the reason why we have given so much space in this article to the testimony for the canon.

On the other hand, if inspiration be incomplete or discontinuous, the absolute authority of the Bible disappears in like manner. Who shall say how far the errors, the interruptions, extend? Who shall hinder suspicion from spreading, and prevent the most generally received portions of the Bible from being attacked in their turn? In books where the true and the false, the human and divine, are mingled in different proportions, we may readily set some portion apart, and fancy that we accept of that as God's word; but even then we make only a partial concession. The question may arise in the mind, May we not have been mistaken in our selection? The divinity of this portion may be of our own making. What is true elsewhere holds especially true here—that we never can thoroughly adore a God of our own making. So we never can have the same reverence for a partial, that we have for a plenary inspiration. We must be-

lieve that God speaks in the whole Bible, or it loses its authority. How he speaks we do not know, nor do we care to know. How holy men wrote as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, God has never told us. It is enough for our faith that he claims the whole as his word; and far be it from us to question or dispute his claim. He has employed human agency in the declaration of his will, and while the individuality of the writer is clearly seen in every page, the *theopneustia* or inspiration is complete. And if this is a mystery too deep for our comprehension, it is no contradiction; yet it may and does serve as a test of our faith in God, just as it was a test of the faith of Nicodemus, when the Lord Jesus said, "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh nor whither it goeth; so is every one that is born of the Spirit."

It is sometimes objected that inspiration was not needed, or, at least, it was not needed in the same degree or with the same intensity for history as for doctrine; for matters of which the writers had personal knowledge as for the revelation of mysteries which they could not otherwise know; for the expression of their personal affections, desires, and wants, as for those matters which respect our relations to God and the duties thence arising. But in reply, we may say that plenary inspiration respects every part of Scripture alike, and we are not authorised to speak or think of it as being greater or less in degree or intensity in one part than in another. It is all of God—*theopneustia*. It is all too of man. For "holy men wrote" it—every part of it—"as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." God spake to them as men, employed them as men, made them the instruments of declaring his will; and though men of like passions and infirmities and conditions and circumstances as other men, he made known to them what he was pleased to reveal. All this is natural and in perfect accordance with his other works. Instead, therefore, of its invalidating, it serves to corroborate the proof already indicated, that the Bible, the whole Bible, is of divine authority. For in speaking to men, as men, and using the common language of men, now the Hebrew, now the

Chaldee, and now the Greek, and now even the Septuagint version of the Old Testament, he has given the clearest evidence that he designed it to be received and understood in the obvious and literal import of these different tongues.

But if the Bible is inspired, it is of course infallible—infallible in all its parts. But no one will understand us as claiming this infallibility to the same extent for all the translations of the Bible; no, not even for the Latin Vulgate which has received the infallible(?) imprimatur of Rome; nor for the Douay version, especially where countenance is given to image worship, by so translating Hebrews xi. 21, as to make Jacob worship the top of his staff; nor yet for the common English version—and perhaps there is no better in any language. Still all the versions which we have been able to consult, contain, in all matters of primary importance, the true sense and import of the originals. In most cases they are as literally faithful as we have reason to expect from fallible men. Nor do we claim the same infallibility for the manuscript copies of the Bible, or for the printed copies, as for the original. The “various readings” indicate errors which all candid men are ready to concede. When Brian Walton published his Polyglot, in which were noticed the various readings in the MSS. then discovered, it occasioned at first great alarm for the integrity of the text, and the distinguished John Owen wrote an elaborate essay in its defence. But when upon a more minute examination it was found that these various readings, numerous as they were, made no material change in any precept, doctrine, narrative, or fact, the alarm at once subsided, and the Scriptures still retained the full confidence of the Church as ever. In like manner, scientific objections have been urged against the infallible inspiration of the Scriptures, from history, geography, astronomy, geology, ethnology, and the like; and these for a while seemed unanswerable. But a more thorough acquaintance with these subjects has in so many instances confirmed the truth of revelation, as to establish it, if possible, upon a still firmer foundation than ever.

But as we have put the work of Gasparin at the head of this article, the reader has a right to expect that we should notice it

more at large. It is, however, no easy task so to sketch even the outlines of an original work such as this, and do it anything like adequate justice. Suffice it to say, that he has followed Gausson, without imitating him, in defending the canon and the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures. His battle-ground is Geneva, and in the first part of his work, he shows conclusively that the School of Romanism is essentially a school of doubt. In the second part, he takes up Rationalism as a natural offshoot or reaction from Romanism, and shows by its varied teachings, whether in the vulgar, the mystic, or the present new form, that it is a school of doubt. He then turns to the school of faith, finding there, as Chillingworth did, solid ground upon which to rest his hope of life—the testimony of God to the canon as it is, and the testimony of God to plenary inspiration in the fullest sense of the term. In the discussion of his subject, he shows a familiar acquaintance with the writings of Newman, and Wiseman, and Reuss, and Strauss, and Hegel, and Neander, and Tholuck, and of many others less known, as Scherer, and Cellerior, and Secretan, and Martin, and Huetius, and Royer Collard, and many more whom he quotes to elucidate his positions. But it will give the general reader a better conception of his manner, as well as throw light upon the subject, to quote a part of what he says of Neander :

“If Christians think they may decry a providentially formed canon, and an inspiration absolutely plenary, they ought to know what awaits them. They will not sink so far as the theories of M. Scherer, of this I am sure; but are they sure they will not fall into the theories of Neander? Are not Neander’s praises in every mouth? Are not Neander’s works in the hands of all? * * * Neander expresses himself very freely on the canon. He makes it up after his own taste; but we are now so much accustomed to such excesses of biblical critics, that I need not dwell upon them. I would only observe that in his list of rejected books, Neander places the first Gospel, ‘which merely has for its basis some collection of the discourses of Christ made by Matthew in the Hebrew language.’ As to the Gospels of Mark and Luke, I really do not know if I ought to consider them as admitted by Neander, who sees in them ‘nothing but a collection of scattered traditions.’ But this point belongs rather to the canon than to inspiration, and it is of inspiration in Nean-

der's sense of the word that I wish to speak. Let us seek for it then in 'the Life of Christ,' which now in the original or by translations is within the reach of every one. Neander first establishes 'the progress' which the theology of our day has made: 'The old mechanical theory of inspiration has now been generally abandoned.' Thanks to this progress, that theology which examines the sacred writings has henceforth as its object 'to establish the real value of the facts related to us by separating them from the subjective form which tradition has given them, and to fill up, as far as possible, the inevitable gaps which are always found in fragmentary writings.' So soon as we have to do only with traditions, and with traditions too, clothed in a subjective form, which require the help of German learning before they present even a part of the evangelical reality, we need not wonder at the errors of the New Testament. Was Luke mistaken as to the taxing? What can be more simple? 'What right have we to demand from him so exact a knowledge of things in which he had no interest? Such mistakes as to time are to be found in all writers?' In all writers these are to be found, and therefore in the evangelist, who has done like others, gathering together their recollections—picking up the best accredited reports, and making out of them a history as exact as possible. It is thus that in regard to the shepherds and the song of the angels, Neander tells us the history was probably made up in the following fashion: 'One of the shepherds was met with who had seen the heavenly vision, and who retained a powerful remembrance of it.' This man was interrogated. He told the story as well as he could, but we cannot guarantee 'his having related the very words which he had heard.' There seems to be very little regard to certainty here; moreover, some details are treated as of no consequence. 'Whether it was from the advice of Herod or from other motives the Magi directed their course to Bethlehem, is a matter of little moment.'" Pp. 182–187.

After citing other examples of the same cast from the pen of Neander, Gasparin says: "Such are the securities which the favorite rationalism of the present day offers us for the integrity of Scripture."

In regard to the Assembly's resolution, which comes in direct conflict with the schools of doubt, it may be proper to remark that our theological institutions need to be peculiarly watchful, inasmuch as constant references are there made to the deep learning and profound research of theologians who go even further

than Neander in calling in question the entire truth and authority of what God has revealed. And in biblical criticism, as now conducted, it is exceedingly difficult to separate the precious from the vile. In criticisms perfectly legitimate, there is ample scope for the student, a much broader field than he can fully explore, while he retains the full assurance that "the Bible is true," and not a word of it can be broken. When we bring before the people the word of God, they are accustomed to regard it as speaking with authority; and unless it is wrested from its true meaning by the sleight of men, they receive with implicit faith all its utterances, whether "for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, or for instruction in righteousness." But give them to understand—and they will readily learn it—that there are errors in the Bible, mistakes, interpolations, and that only some portions of it are inspired, and you will shake their faith in the entire fabric, and universal scepticism will be the result.

We refer again to the fact that the Lord Jesus and his apostles always appealed to the Scriptures, to show the effect of such appeals. This was the authority which the adversaries of the cross could neither gainsay, nor resist. It was that which effectually silenced every objection, which the captious unbeliever urged against the teaching of the Saviour. And with the same all-potent weapon, which was the sword of the Spirit, the wonderful conquests of the apostles were achieved. It was the word, and only the word, which was made effectual by the eternal Spirit to the pulling down of the strongholds. But there was a gradual departure from this authority in the subsequent ages of the Church. The Apocrypha was quoted, the fathers, the acts of councils, the legends of the saints, traditionary tales, heathen philosophers, the schoolmen; till at last very little of the Scriptures, almost none, made up the warp and the woof of what was styled Christianity. But what was the effect? Was there light? Was there life? Was vital Christianity the prevailing spirit of the Church? Or was it not in the outward form alone, distorted and disfigured by additions of human device, that it was exhibited to the view of angels and men? Mark its progress

through the dark ages, and see the results of an almost total abandonment of the Scriptures.

If we now turn to the Reformation of the sixteenth century, we shall there see as its chief characteristic a return to the authority of the Bible. The return was gradual. It was hard, for example, for Luther at the beginning to throw off the incubus of custom, of usage, and of human authority in matters of faith and practice. And on some points, perhaps, neither he nor any of the Reformers were completely successful in reëstablishing the Church upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone. But the Reformers, all of them, acknowledged the authority of the Bible—its supreme, unquestioned, absolute authority. And to this only standard they applied the whole *credenda* and *agenda*—things to be believed and to be done; and though widely different as were their mental powers, their education, and their training, their symbolical books furnish ample proof of a unity more remarkable than had ever before been witnessed since the days of the apostles. Still, as they were men, they were liable to err. And hence we do not claim for them or for their symbolic books any authority over our faith. Indeed, we hold our own “Confession” in entire subordination to the word of God.

It is a great mistake when men impute to the Bible the existing diversities in the confessions of faith and modes of worship among professed Protestants. For these diversities have chiefly arisen from a partial or total abandonment of their great principle. There was no diversity of any material importance among the early Reformers—none except those which papal usage had so deeply engraven upon the minds and habits of the people that they could not readily be thrown aside, and hence they were, in part, retained under the plea of expediency. But these diversities among those who recognise the authority of the Bible, great as they are, and lamentable as they are, are of trivial moment, compared with those which, under a profession of unity, disfigure the papal communion. Bossuet, to bring the Bible into disrepute, and to extol his own Church, has magnified “the variations of Protestantism.” But there is a Rowland

for an Oliver, by Bishop Hurd and other writers, but especially by Archinard, who has traced, step by step, the encroachments of Rome upon "the faith once delivered to the saints," showing a great gulf between the Gospel and the Fathers, and a second gulf between the Fathers and the Popery of Trent.

But they have a very questionable claim to the name of Protestant who deny the "the plenary and literal inspired authority of the Sacred Scriptures." They may be Protestants after a fashion, but not after the model of the Reformation. And when they once let go their firm hold on the absolute and unquestioned authority of the Bible, there is no telling how far they will drift from their only safe mooring. Rome tried it, and we have no reason to believe that her drifting is yet ended. For it is but a little more than ten years since a new article—the immaculate conception—has been added to her creed. And the beginning of all the heresies of this and of every age can be traced to the abandonment of this principle. Then comes the "wresting of the Scriptures;" and it is an easy task to wrest them when their divine authority is a questionable matter.

We need not quote from the Bible the many testimonies to the influence and power of the word. We may merely look at its effects upon ourselves and upon the world around us—upon all who receive it with docility and faith—to be convinced that it is in truth "the sword of the Spirit;" that God himself honors it by making it "the wisdom of God and the power of God unto salvation;" and that whatever else may perish, his word shall never return to him void.

ARTICLE IV.

POWERS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY.

In every well conducted discussion, it must be freely admitted that the abuse of any principle is no argument against its legitimate use. By carefully bearing in mind this axiom, universally admitted in theory at least, much controversy might be avoided. For instance, that theory of the jurisdiction of ecclesiastical courts proposed in the revised Form of Government, recently so amply discussed in the columns of our church papers, was opposed mainly on the ground that the theory which places original jurisdiction in extraordinary cases within the powers of the higher courts has been subjected to great abuse. The argument mainly directed against this principle, when reduced to its last analysis, seems to be simply this: General Assemblies, in some rare instances, have abused this power—have assumed to exercise original jurisdiction in instances where the circumstances of the case clearly did not justify them in resorting to the exercise of the power; therefore the Assembly does not and should not possess this power. Such an argument would play sad havoc with both civil and ecclesiastical government, if only pushed to its legitimate results. It will readily be admitted that civil rulers have sometimes abused the powers vested in them; then according to this modern ecclesiastical logic, they do not and should not possess these powers.

In the administration of both civil and ecclesiastical law, we occasionally meet with extraordinary cases, which, from their very nature, cannot be provided for by special enactment, and therefore must be decided upon by the application of general principles. The safeguard, therefore, of either political or ecclesiastical constitutions is not to be found or sought for in the fact that they embrace no principles which are liable to abuse, (which, from the nature of the case, is impossible;) but that safeguard must ultimately rest in the intelligence, the moral integrity, and fidelity of those who are professedly governed by them. In po-

litical constitutions, for example, of what avail are the most carefully framed stipulations, unless the moral tone of the masses be elevated to a standard high enough to secure the faithful fulfilment of those stipulations? This, indeed, is one of the great quicksands beneath the foundation of every free government. Nor is the case essentially different in this respect with regard to ecclesiastical constitutions. True, in many respects there is a great difference, but in this an essential agreement.

We have, indeed, a practical illustration at hand, in the fact that one of the main arguments against the Assembly in any instance being possessed of original jurisdiction, is drawn from the alleged abuse of this power as exercised by the St. Louis Assembly in the case of the Louisville Presbytery. This shows, say some, that we should have no change in our Form of Government on this subject. But under what written constitution did the aforesaid Assembly sit and act? Under our present Form of Government, of course. Now what has occurred, we have good reason for believing, may occur again under similar circumstances. Refusing to make a change cannot then be an infallible guarantee against the exercise or even the abuse of the power in certain cases, as shown by the example referred to. Suppose it be clearly shown that men have been put to death without good reason, under the law allowing capital punishment for murder, or even show that similar cases may occur again, we should yet be slow to admit the conclusion that all capital punishment should be abolished. Then, granting that there have been instances where the exercise of this power has not been justified by the circumstances, still this is far from proving that it ought to be wholly denied to the Assembly.

It must be admitted that in shunning one extreme upon subjects of this kind, there is a manifest tendency to drift towards the opposite, giving rise to the familiar maxim that "extremes beget extremes." There seems to be a tendency on the part of our Assembly to appear, as some think, a little over-scrupulous on the question of its own jurisdiction.

At a recent meeting of the General Assembly, this highest court of the Church resolved that it was constitutionally incompe-

tent to divide a Presbytery, even when overtured to do so under circumstances manifestly extraordinary. The facts of the case referred to are something like these: The Synod of Arkansas at the beginning of the late war consisted of four Presbyteries, viz., Arkansas, Ouachita, Indian, and Creek Nation, embracing constructively a territory of at least one hundred thousand square miles, including the entire State of Arkansas, (except a small portion of the northeastern border) and the Indian Territory. During the war, by deaths and removals, one of these Presbyteries, viz., Creek Nation, became extinct, leaving only three, the smallest number which can constitute a Synod. It therefore became absolutely necessary in order to obtain a quorum that some should be present from each Presbytery. It must be remembered too, that the journeys necessary to reach the places of meeting must be made on horseback, often alone, and over a very rough country. Again nearly all the members of the most remote Presbytery, (Indian,) are brethren now considerably advanced in life, and if possible should be relieved, amid all their burdens, which are neither few nor small, from the absolute necessity of taking such journeys. These circumstances have caused repeated failures to secure a quorum of Synod; and had it not been for the remarkable energy and promptness of the Indian missionaries, would have caused many more. Some of the members, after having left their homes and churches and travelled at their own expense on horseback from one hundred to three hundred miles to reach the place of meeting, have been compelled to return without accomplishing anything, merely for the want of a quorum. In order to remedy this difficulty, and at the same time a similar one with regard to Presbytery, the Presbytery of Arkansas at its last meeting unanimously adopted an overture to Synod to readjust the lines of the Presbyteries of Arkansas and Ouachita, so as to form three instead of two Presbyteries, as now in the State of Arkansas. But when the time for the meeting of Synod came, although an unusually large number of ministers and elders were in attendance, yet they were all from two Presbyteries, and therefore were debarred from transacting any Synodical business. In the mean time, the Oua-

chita Presbytery having adjourned to meet during the sessions of Synod, the overture was introduced and discussed in that body. All seemed anxious to effect the object, all were impressed with the absolute necessity of the case, yet inasmuch as it was the belief of some that nothing could be done by the Assembly on account of the insuperable barrier of jurisdiction, the overture was not officially adopted. All agreed that the Presbytery under the circumstances could not divide itself; no quorum of Synod could be secured; many believed that the General Assembly would refuse; and therefore nothing could be done in an official capacity to meet the difficulty. As a last resort, the commissioners, in their individual capacity, with the approbation of a large majority of their brethren, overtured the Assembly: and the result, as before stated, was a declaration from that body of its inability to perform the act.

What, then, is to be done? The probabilities of securing a quorum of Synod at the next proposed meeting are by no means as favorable as at the last, inasmuch as it meets nearly a hundred miles further from the most remote Presbytery. The difficulty of securing a full meeting of Presbytery during the spring when the streams are swollen, according to the present arrangement of Presbyterial lines, and the nature of the country, is absolutely insuperable. It is sometimes alleged as an objection to our form of church polity, that it is essentially unsuited to a comparatively new country, and is only adapted to an old country and a state of society where everything has assumed a settled order. Now, we must confess that adopting the principles of modern self-styled "strict constructionists" on the question of jurisdiction, the objection is difficult to answer. When we examine the subject here referred to in the light of history, we find that the General Assembly in our own country has at different times erected nearly twenty Presbyteries, without the intervention of a Synod, and it would certainly be difficult to shew wherein any injury to the best interests of the Church has resulted from the exercise of the power. But here we would no doubt be met with the assertion, that all these were extraordinary cases. In the usual acceptation of the term, we freely ad-

mit that they were; but at the same time contend that the case referred to above belongs to the same category—one perhaps in the history of the Church in our country *sui generis*.

The great danger of our Church at this time, as we conceive, does not arise from the mistakes into which, as we believe, the Northern Presbyterian Church has fallen, at the time of and since the separation, but from the danger of drifting to an opposite extreme. Our chief concern, therefore, should not be (as some seem to think) to avoid the errors which we believe they have committed; for of these we are in no special danger at the present time; but it mostly behoves us to guard carefully the tendency to extremes just the opposite. This is what we have most of all to fear. The tendency of the Northern Church for some years past has apparently been to drift towards some of the essential principles of Popery or spiritual despotism; the great danger of our Church on the contrary is the tendency to approach the essential principles of Independency and virtual Congregationalism, or in other words to verge towards the opposite extreme. We believe that good reasons could be assigned as to why this would reasonably be expected from the nature of the case. But this does not affect the truth of the statement; on the contrary, it only establishes it.

In some respects a singular phenomenon has been presented among the advocates of Presbyterian Church government in the United States for a few years past upon the question of the jurisdiction of the respective courts, the fountains of ecclesiastical power, and kindred topics. Men trained in the same schools, under the teachings of the same preceptors, seem to have adopted opinions upon this class of topics, influenced apparently more by the locality in which their lots are cast than by any other consideration. The question here arises, Can any adequate reason be given for this? Can any other cause be assigned, besides the prejudices and passions of the hour, to account for the fact that Presbyterians at St. Louis should come to conclusions upon the points before named, so different from those arrived at by Presbyterians at Macon, at Nashville, etc.? We are fully aware of the fact, so patent to the observation and conformable to the

experience of all, that passion and prejudice often wield a mighty influence over the opinions of even partially sanctified men. But apart from this influence of mere circumstances, if we mistake not, there is another solution of the problem.

For years past it has been a favorite analogy with many leading men of the Church in both sections to illustrate the relation between our church courts by that which subsisted between the States and the general government—comparing the Presbytery to the State, and the General Assembly to the central government. And it is not a little singular to notice how the idea has operated in forming opinions of church power, as to its nature and extent, in exact accordance with the views entertained with regard to the nature of the relation of the State to the central government, as a general rule: of course there are exceptions. Those who adopted what was known as the State-rights theory of our civil government, of course believed that the States were the fountains of power, and looked with jealousy upon the jurisdiction of the central government—holding that it could lawfully only exercise such powers as were expressly delegated to it by the States, according to the terms of a written constitution. As a general rule, these, as we believe to some extent under the influence of the analogy above referred to, have contended that the Presbyteries are the fountains of power, that the Assembly derives its powers by delegation from the Presbyteries where it inherently resides; and have looked with jealousy upon the exercise of power on the part of the Assembly. On the other hand, those who adopted what is known as the old Federal or consolidation theory of our civil government as it formerly existed, of course maintained that the central government was the great source of political power. These as a general rule have regarded the General Assembly as possessed of well nigh unlimited power in church matters, just as they regarded the general government as the great controlling power in civil affairs. This view regards, too, the Presbyteries as merely agents to carry out the injunctions of the Assembly. It will therefore remain a curious inquiry for some one in future to ascertain how far the influence of this analogy, employed primarily for purposes of illus-

tration, has ultimately contributed to the formation of different views on church polity in exact accordance with the views of the nature of civil government prevalent in different sections.

If the view presented above be correct, then the false analogy which induced the St. Louis Assembly, as it appears to us, so nearly to ignore the existence of Presbyteries, and to assume that it was the embodiment of arbitrary power, is really what it behoves us to specially guard against, with this exception, that with us it manifests itself in a form wholly different, owing to the prevalence of different views relative to political relations of States to the general government. The tendency of it in our Church will be to make the General Assembly virtually a mere convention of delegates or deputies to perform certain prescribed acts, with no authority to enforce anything, and whose deliverances will be practically treated as mere advice. Already, if we mistake not, the fruits are beginning to manifest themselves in that growing indifference practically shown towards the acts of the Assembly in many respects.

Another manifestation of the same error is to be found in the opinions prevalent with regard to the relation of the ruling elder to the people. The idea is rapidly gaining ground that the elder derives his authority from the people who elect him; that he is responsible to them for the exercise of it, and that they have the undisputed right to sit in judgment on his official acts. This idea has also originated in the supposed analogy between Presbyterian Church polity and the republican form of civil government. The opinion in modern times throughout our own country has extensively prevailed that a representative of the people, in political bodies, goes there merely to carry out a system of instructions previously given by those who send him. This is to be a mere deputy or delegate, at most, and not a representative. The idea thus originated, under the influence of the analogy before noticed, has been transferred to the relation which the ruling elder bears to those whom he is said to represent. But it is evident there must be an essential difference between political and ecclesiastical assemblies, so far as our Church is concerned. They differ in their very nature and design, the former fre-

quently being legislative bodies, the latter never, so long as they are confined to their proper sphere. We do not even call our church assemblies legislatures, but courts. If any analogy between the two be allowable, it should be confined to the judicial department of civil government alone, and that only while maintained in its efficiency and purity. The true doctrine we believe to be, that the General Assembly within its sphere derives its power and authority not by means of any delegation from Presbyteries, but from the same source that the Presbyteries themselves do, and is responsible in the same way directly to the Lord Jesus Christ as King and Head of the Church. Otherwise we cannot see how the claim to divine authority for its existence is to be made out; and if not, then it should have no place in our church polity at all. The source of power must rest some where. To say that the General Assembly is the agent of the Presbyteries and responsible to them, and then in turn maintain that the Presbyteries are responsible to the Assembly, is only reasoning in a circle, and brings us back to the same point from which we started. The true source of all church power is, we maintain, the Lord Jesus as King of Zion, and it is delegated by him to his Church; and it would be difficult to find the grant wherein he has made any particular court of the Church the fountain of power. In like manner we maintain that the ruling elder does not sit in our Presbyteries, Synods, etc., as a representative, in the modern political sense of the term, deriving his official authority from the people, and responsible to them for the exercise of his power; but he sits there in a judicial capacity, deriving his authority from the King and Head of the Church, and responsible to the same source whence he derives his power, for its exercise.

The idea has become prevalent that our forefathers were pious well-meaning men, but they did not attain to any proper understanding and appreciation of the principles of a pure Presbyterianism, so far as the jurisdiction of church courts, the fountains of ecclesiastical power, etc., are concerned. These have been discovered in comparatively modern times. It is with arguments or rather assertions of this kind we are met, when refer-

ence is made to the higher courts exercising original jurisdiction with regard to matters now held to be exclusively confined to the lower. For example, the Synod of New York and Philadelphia, before, during, and after the schism of those bodies in 1741, habitually examined and licensed probationers, ordained ministers, instituted and dissolved pastoral relations, etc., with many other similar matters now assigned to Presbyteries, and even sessions. And yet if any should venture to suggest that the Synod or Assembly was competent to discharge such duties now without the intervention of the lower courts, how many would contend that such an admission would be virtually overthrowing the cause of Presbyterianism.

Once more, with regard to the theory of the General Assembly deriving its powers by delegation from the Presbyteries, let us look at it in the light of history. Scotland is often styled the cradle of Presbyterianism, subsequent to the Reformation. The Presbyterian Church in America may be said to have derived its existence, humanly speaking, from the Church of Scotland. Now if we are not greatly mistaken, in the parent Church from which we trace our immediate descent, the General Assembly was the first ecclesiastical court, and Presbyteries were created by the act of the Assembly. Then, according to the theory referred to, whence, we ask, did the General Assembly of Scotland derive its power? Under what authority did it originally act? Not certainly under any authority or powers delegated to it by Presbyteries, for they had no existence as such, until created by the act of the Assembly itself, and the effect cannot exist prior to the cause. Unless, therefore, we take the ground that Presbyterianism is one thing in Scotland and something essentially different in America, we are led to the same conclusion, that the General Assembly is not simply the agent or the creature of the Presbyteries, but in its own sphere a court of the Church deriving its powers from the Lord Jesus Christ as King and Head of the Church.

ARTICLE V.

THE REVIEWER REVIEWED; OR, DR. ROSS ON
RIGHT AND WRONG, IN REVIEW OF MR. BARNES
ON FAITH IN GOD'S WORD.

In the year 1859, there was published by Mr. Barnes of Philadelphia, a work entitled *Inquiries and Suggestions in Regard to the Foundation of Faith in the Word of God*. It sets forth, in chapter first, nine "maxims or settled principles as bearing on a revelation from God," such as, that there is such a thing as truth; that there is that in man which responds to truth; that there is an essential and eternal distinction between right and wrong; that a revelation from God will not contradict any truth, however that truth is made known; that a pretended revelation, which should contradict established-truth, could not be received by mankind; and that a revelation will not, in its teachings, violate any of the constitutional principles of our nature. In chapter second, there is a discussion of reason, of the moral sense, and of science, as so many elements in judging of a revelation. The third chapter considers the appeal made by the Bible to reason and to conscience, and also the Bible in its relations to science. In the fourth and last chapter, the question is met: What is the foundation of faith in God's word? And the conclusion reached is thus expressed in the final paragraph, which we quote in full: "The sum of all, the result of all our inquiries, is this: The foundation of faith in God and in his word is, that GOD IS INFINITELY WISE, JUST, AND GOOD; not that he is an arbitrary Being, making evil good and good evil at his pleasure; not as having the right to reverse these things, if he should choose; not as having the power of making that right which is now wrong, or that wrong which is now right—that true which is now false, or that false which is now true—that crooked which is now straight, or that straight which is now crooked—that benevolent which is now malignant, and that malignant which is now benevolent; but the foundation

of confidence in God and his word is in the fact that there is an eternal distinction between right and wrong; that there are things that are right in themselves and things that are wrong in themselves; and that the character of God IS SO PERFECT THAT ALL THAT HE SAYS AND DOES, IS, AND WILL EVER BE, IN ACCORDANCE WITH WHAT IS ETERNALLY TRUE, AND RIGHT, AND BEST."

We confess that we have read this book of Mr. Barnes' with very great satisfaction. Some few statements and some expressions we would criticise; but, taking the book as a whole, it appears to us sound and good, as well as able and convincing. And we are decided and clear in the opinion that not half a score of our whole ministry and eldership would much object to the book, considered all in all; and that the last thing it would occur to them to charge against the work is *atheism*.

We are no champions of Mr. Barnes against the assaults of any one. He is nothing to us, more than any other New School Presbyterian minister of the whole body whose separation from our Church, thirty-odd years ago, filled us with devout thankfulness to God for so great a deliverance from the swelling tide of error. We know very well that Mr. Barnes has ever been a leader amongst his own brethren, and had, perhaps, as much to do as any man amongst them with the development of that new theology which led to the division in 1838. We do not forget how extremely offensive to the sound men of that day was his celebrated sermon on "The Way of Salvation." His "Commentary on the Romans" we remember as inculcating the most dangerous views upon the main points of our Calvinistic system. And we are therefore altogether unprepared to endorse any book put forth by him now, without careful examination. In particular, we express no opinion favorable to the lectures before the Union Theological Seminary of New York city, recently condemned by the Rev. Dr. Van Dyke of Brooklyn, which we have not had the opportunity to see. Nor are we disposed to defend the positions he has been understood by us to have taken years ago on the subject of slavery. But whereas the volume now under consideration bears upon slavery, we are free to say that, in our judgment, Mr. Barnes, *in this book*, says nothing

against slavery that is objectionable, *if slavery be understood (which, of course, it ought not to be) as he understands that word*; and whereas this book bears also upon the points concerning which Dr. Van Dyke criticises Mr. Barnes in his fourth letter to the Philadelphia *Presbyterian*, we feel free to say that, in our judgment, the positions of Mr. Barnes *in this volume* are such as no reasonable Presbyterian would censure, but must approve.

To be more explicit: The ninth maxim of Mr. Barnes is, that "*a revelation will not in its teachings violate the constitutional principles of our nature.*" He then states why he uses the word *constitutional*: "It refers to man as he came from God; to the nature with which he was originally endowed. It is designed to distinguish this from another sense in which the word 'nature' is sometimes employed now as referring to man, not as he *was*, but as he *is*. Using the term 'nature' in the largest sense, man has two natures—that in which he was made by his Creator, and that which refers to what he has become by his own act; that which belonged to him as a holy being, and that which belongs to him as a sinner." He proceeds to describe man in this "lapsed state," and with this "fallen nature;" and then he insists that "underlying all that is depraved and impure," there are still some indications of the original constitution of man. "There are accurate deductions of reason;" "just convictions of conscience;" "a moral sense, which approves of what is right, and disapproves what is wrong." "There is *something* in man which is the basis of appeals on the subject of morals." It is the original constitution of our minds to which he then declares that he insists no revelation from God can do violence. "It will be such as the conscience, under the highest teachings and in the most perfect state, will approve; it will be such as will commend itself to the moral sense of mankind, when that moral sense is developed in the best and most perfect forms. It will contain nothing which will be contradictory to either of these things. And if a pretended revelation *did* contain that which was a contradiction of these things, it could not be embraced by mankind." Page 34.

Now, we cannot see anything very bad in all this; on the contrary, it appears to us to be good and sound doctrine.

As to the subject of slavery, this book says: "Just in proportion as a professed revelation should be found to contain sentiments, or authorise acts, or lend its countenance to institutions, customs, or laws that violate the moral sense of mankind; that are contrary to the spirit of humanity; that impede the progress of society; that cramp and fetter the human powers; that are contrary to the best arrangements in the family relation, or that tend to debase and degrade mankind—just in that proportion will infidels be made to such a pretended revelation; for mankind will not receive a system as from heaven which violates the established principles of our nature. And hence it follows that all the defenders of a revelation, in proportion as they endeavor to show that it sanctions and sustains such institutions and customs, become the promoters of infidelity in the world, and are, to the extent of their influence and the success of their arguments, responsible for the infidelity that may prevail. A pretended revelation that, by its fair teaching, sustained oppression and wrong; that was the advocate of ignorance and barbarity; that fostered a spirit of revenge; that encouraged licentiousness; that advocated irresponsible power, or that placed slavery on the same basis as the relation of parent and child, husband and wife, guardian and ward—would so impinge on the great principles of our nature, and be so at war with the best interests of society, that the world could not ultimately receive it, and all who should endeavor to show that such a revelation *did* sustain and countenance such doctrines, would of necessity become the practical diffusers of infidelity in the world." Pp. 49, 50.

And in another place he says: "Nothing could convince the world at large that theft and piracy are right; nothing can convince the world at large that slavery is right; and if in a book of pretended revelation these things were sanctioned as right or enjoined as just, the book would ultimately be rejected by mankind." P. 170.

Now, what is to be censured in these utterances of Mr. Barnes' about slavery—what makes it somewhat difficult for us, as Southern Presbyterians and quondam slaveholders, to read with patience these utterances—is simply that they proceed upon a

false view of the facts about slavery. It is not the principles (for the most part just and true) here laid down by this writer to which we can object, but to his application of them to the system recently in existence amongst us, and defended by us then and now. The facts were not as this writer had been led to believe. Slavery was a good institution. It was not an oppressive, degrading, debasing institution, but quite the contrary. In about two centuries, it elevated barbarians and savages, four or five millions in number, into a partially civilised and Christian people. It was a kindly relation on both sides—especially was it good for the negro, as it protected him from that antagonism to the white race, and that consequent blight, decay, and ruin, which, it is to be feared, false friends and mistaken friends have recently conspired to precipitate upon him.

We said Mr. Barnes's principles respecting slavery were, for the most part, just and true. We except always his principles of Bible interpretation on this subject—according to which he was led to deny what is so patent on the very face of the record. He talks of the defenders of slavery as "promoters of infidelity." Let him look to it that this dreadful fault be not found lying at his own door; for what Christian can promote infidelity, if *he* does it not who wrests *the Bible forcibly and violently* to suit his own preconceived opinions?

We consider Mr. Barnes's book open to criticism in that he sometimes allows himself to put the distinction of right and wrong "*in the nature of things* or apart from the mere will of God." (See p. 67.) Dr. Paley defines "the nature of things" as meaning "the actual constitution of the world," and we suppose no one will object to the definition. But an actual constitution implies an actual constitutor. And so Mr. Barnes may, perhaps, legitimately defend his expression from the charge that it is atheistic. And yet it sounds like erecting a power separate from God and greater than God, when he sometimes allows himself to say that right and wrong are "*in the nature of things* or apart from the mere will of God." And inasmuch as no actual constitution of the world was or could be set up, apart from the will of God, and because we must conceive of the distinction of

right and wrong as antedating any actual constitution or nature of things, it is certainly a serious error to found this great and eternal moral distinction on any actual constitution whatever apart from God's will. And yet we think it is impossible for any one who considers fairly the whole scope and bearing of Mr. Barnes's book, to hold him responsible for the atheistic conclusion which might be forced out of the expression, if it were invariably and of set purpose so employed in this volume.

We have still another criticism. The whole discussion manifestly relates to *speculative* belief, and yet the title is "Inquiries and Suggestions in Regard to the Foundation of *Faith in the Word of God*." Mr. Barnes should perhaps have distinguished, even on his title page, betwixt true faith and that which is merely speculative." He should, at least, have made it indisputably plain, in the whole conduct of his argument, that he knows it is not reasoning nor proof which ever did or can of itself lead any man truly to believe. He should have manifested in every chapter, if not on every page, what appears no where, if we mistake not, throughout the volume, that not any nor all of his "maxims or settled principles which bear on a revelation," not reason, not the moral sense, not science as confirming the truth of the Scriptures, ever begot true faith in any human soul. All such appeals as these can produce only a cold, dead, inoperative assent to the claims of Christianity; whilst, on the other hand, thousands and millions of sinners have believed unto salvation without ever hearing a word about these "maxims," or having the advantage of any of these appeals. And yet very far are we from maintaining that Mr. Barnes's argument is a vain and unprofitable one. Very far are we from holding that the speculative faith he seeks to confirm by it is a useless thing. On the contrary, we hold that it may be, and often is, (as it has been said justly that even Gnosticism was in the first ages,) "a bridge to faith" for many souls, though deceiving more. Incomparably better as a condition for the general mind is even the merest speculative acceptance of the gospel than a state of blank and naked infidelity. Give us utter indifference and worldliness—which is, of course, practical infidelity—or give us superstition

in its most popish or in its most heathenish form, rather than icy scepticism, freezing the soul to death. There is hope that the slumbers of the worldling may be broken, and the strong religiousness of the superstitious be directed out of the wrong and into the right channel by the grace of God; but it is an almost hopeless condition for the human mind, when closing its eyes against evidence, it has deliberately rejected the Scriptures and profanely hardened itself into a denial of God and immortality.

The book which we have now for the most part earnestly commended, Dr. Ross, reviewing, condemns in the strongest terms—it is actually *atheistic*. Our opinion is, that his own errors are far more serious and important than any contained in Mr. Barnes's work. There are two points which come up in the course of this discussion. The first relates to the true foundation of the distinction between right and wrong; the second, to the part which reason may legitimately act in judging of the evidences of Christianity. The reviewer holds that right and wrong are made such by the absolute will of God. The writer whom he reviews holds that this is an essential and eternal distinction. So much for the first point. As to the second, the writer reviewed maintains that as there is such a thing as truth and right, essentially and eternally distinct from error and from wrong, so there is that in man's original nature which responds to truth; and there being in man some remains of his primeval constitution, his reason will respond to the truth of God revealed, and will recognise truth as from its own author and creator. Accordingly, he allows the appeal to reason as being in its proper sphere a legitimate judge of any professed revelation. The reviewer, on the other hand, if we understand him, disparages all such appeals to human reason; has no use for speculative belief, nor for moral philosophy; regards Satan as its first and latest teacher; and indiscriminately classes the wise men of Athens, the Gnostics, the early fathers, the scholastic divines, and all the teachers of philosophy since the Reformation, and also "all schools, all universities, all colleges, all lyceums, all books and tracts," as doing Satan's work. (Article II., pp. 215–24.) On both these points of dispute, we give our decided preference

to Mr. Barnes's views over those of his assailant. It is our solemn conviction that the *Southern Presbyterian Review*, during the whole course of its existence, from the beginning to the present time, has never admitted to its pages any such grievous errors against sound theology and morals as these two articles contain.

I. It may assist our readers to get a distinct view of what Dr. R. holds about right and wrong, if we cull from different portions of these articles his statements of the case, without the accompanying arguments, so as to present the matter briefly and in connected form. We shall give the Doctor's own Italics and capitals:

"God is the creator of all truth," Article I., p. 340. "Man, being the image of God, is the *maker of his ideas*," p. 341. "Man, like his Creator, spontaneously generates ideas, and makes them his in the same self-pleasure of his will," p. 346. "God makes one and one to be two," p. 341. "An axiom is divinely originated thought," p. 342. "And when He placed man under law in the relation then constituted between himself and his creatures, with his covenant of life and death, RIGHT and WRONG were then *first MADE to be* in the PLEASURE of his WILL; the thing commanded was right, because he willed it to be right; the thing commanded not to be was wrong, solely because he willed it to be wrong," p. 343. "Those ten relations," [referred to in the ten commandments,] "with their good and evil, were such in his mere pleasure," p. 343. "Heaven is of his pleasure; Hell is the infinite wisdom of his will," p. 344. "God's *nature* is, so to speak, without form and void until it is *will*," p. 345. "*God has freely and eternally CONCEIVED certain ideas, which HE MAKES TO BE TRUTH*," Art. II., p. 185. "God could (as to his mere power) have made the mind of man think infinitely differently from what it does, and to *hold any of its conceptions to be truth*," p. 188. "The Supreme Being has MADE himself to be just, and holy, and true, and good," p. 198. "He, by his will, determines from the beginning his mode of existence as THE FATHER, THE SON, AND THE HOLY GHOST;" "God made himself to exist in a Trinity by act of his will," p. 204. "God even constitutes, by his voluntary act, the relations of the persons of the Godhead," p. 205.

Now, in the first place, the reader will notice in what strong terms God is here declared absolutely to make all the difference

there is between truth and error, right and wrong, good and evil. God *creates* all truth and all right. Man also *makes* truth, but God's making overrules man's; for God can and does *cause* man to think "and so make truth" in an infinitely different way from what he might and does think "and so make truth." But if man, the creator of truth, can be made to think infinitely different and opposite thoughts, much more must God, the absolute and free Creator of all distinctions, be able thus to think and so make opposite truths! "We must reason thus," says Dr. Ross, "because our notion of God is derived from his image in man." Art. II., p. 195. "If we try to conceive what God is at all, we must take the idea of what man is, and fill out the conception with attributes of infinite and eternal perfection. There is absolutely no other way to think of God, even by possibility, as a personal being." P. 203. We *must* therefore conceive that God might have thought error to be good and right, and truth evil and wrong; and that he might have made himself the opposite of the just, holy, true, and good God that he is! And so we must conceive that he might now cease to think and to be as he has thought and has been from all eternity, and become infinitely opposite to what he is and always has been! And we must, in like manner, conceive that he might, by a free voluntary act, put an end to the relation of the persons in the Godhead which he freely and voluntarily constituted; nay, cause himself no longer to exist in a trinity of persons at all!

The reader's mind must be constituted very differently from our own, if he can attentively consider all this and not be filled with horror. Should we be going any further, if in opposition to the plain teachings of Scripture, we should blasphemously declare that the God of truth can lie and the self-existent Jehovah cease to be?

It is not necessary to say much about the metaphysics involved in these statements concerning God's *creating* and man's *creating* truth. Truth which is created must *be*, and it is impossible to conceive of both God and man's creating and so causing truth to be; since, as the author confesses, the truths created by

man oftentimes do not agree with those created by God. Truth is one harmonious whole, and every truth must always consist with every other truth. Our author seems to be conscious of the difficulty into which his metaphysics have brought him; for in the earlier pages of Article II., we find him laboring to explain away this creating power of man. It is not seldom, indeed, that Dr. Ross's genius for speculation leads him astray. How can any person, not thus endowed equally with himself, digest such statements as this: "*God has freely and eternally conceived certain ideas, which he makes to be truth.*" Article II., p. 185. This is all vain speculation. The Scripture does not tell us that God first conceives his ideas and then makes them to be truth; and untaught by Scripture, what can any man know on such a subject? or what right has he thus to lay the mind of God on the Procrustean bed of his earth-born metaphysics? On page 343 of the first article occurs a similar speculation, which, it appears to us, is altogether unwarranted, where it is boldly asserted, and here also in capital letters, that before the creation of man and his coming under law, right and wrong existed not. Were there, then, no moral ideas amongst all the sons of God before Adam? And does this glorious moral distinction (which the Scriptures tell us, Exodus xv. 11, constitutes the very glory of Jehovah himself) depend on the existence of any creature, however exalted? When the Scriptures declare that God is glorious in holiness, that his holiness is his glory, who amongst human teachers is at liberty to assert that in the ineffable communion of the eternal Trinity there was no such idea known or felt as the idea of the right, the good, and the true? But it is not only in these few cases that our author seems to give the reins to his own speculative tendencies. This disposition in no ordinary measure is evinced all through these two articles. His readers generally, we doubt not, would be glad if he had only remembered his own strong denunciations against all philosophizing *as Satan's service*, when tempted himself to indulge in this kind of employment for his faculties. Surely there are not many of the philosophers who have been bolder or wilder. Few, indeed, have more adventurously spread the wings of their fancy

over the regions of thought not illuminated at all by the word of God.

The careful reader of Dr. Ross will observe, in the next place, that he sets out (Art. II., p. 186) with three hypotheses as possible, respecting the ground of moral distinctions: 1. His own—that that ground is *the will of God absolute and arbitrary*. 2. That that ground is *the nature of things*, which he pronounces to be “plain atheism.” 3. That that ground is *the nature of God* antecedent to his will, which he pronounces to be *modified atheism*; since, says he, it represents God as obeying an eternal law in his own nature. The reader will also observe, that in immediate connexion with the first hypothesis, it is asserted that “*truth*, as a thing believed, is wholly *mental conception*, idea in God and in man.” The author holds that “*truth*, as revealed to us from God, is * * * not fixed; but it is made by God to be contingent upon changing circumstances, which are always *his will*.” P. 187. Of course, this is quite consistent with its being only “a mental conception, an idea.” But how does it consist with truth’s being a created and of course existing thing? Nay, how does it consist with any stability whatever of the truth? Not only God’s own nature is thus made to be changeable, (while Scripture asserts that God changes not,) but also the very being of God is robbed of all certain permanence, as is also the threefold personal distinction in the Godhead. All these things are made to be not “fixed truths,” but mere “mental conceptions, mere ideas,” which may be unmade as freely and voluntarily as they were made. It appears to us that even the charge of atheism may be now retorted upon our author, for he ungodds the universe when he thus makes God’s nature and being both mere abstractions.

But beginning with three possible hypotheses, the author shortly dismisses the third one as not possible at all, and his conclusion is: “Right and wrong must be either in the nature of things distinct from the will of the Deity, or in that will supremely. There can be no third suggestion.” P. 200. And yet further on we read not only that the third suggestion is possible, but that it is even more dangerous than the second. For,

on page 230, three modes of stating atheism are given, and this one that God carries out in action what he thus perceives in his nature is said to be one of them, and to be "the most subtle and mischievous form of atheism; because, while it pretends to affirm belief in a PERSONAL JEHOVAH, it teaches the same unwilling law of things to be the eternal fact." We submit that there is a want of coherence in these several statements, which may well weaken the reader's confidence in the careful exactness of the author's thinking and utterance. We submit, also, that inasmuch as it is the commonly received doctrine amongst orthodox Christians that the distinction of right and wrong is grounded in God's own eternal and unchanging holy nature, there is some degree of arrogant presumption in the charge that this view is "the most subtle and dangerous form of atheism." Surely this writer does not really mean to say of his orthodox Christian brethren that they all "*pretend* to believe in a personal Jehovah," but are yet subtle 'atheists, and so hypocrites of the worst sort. The difficulty must be only in his way of conceiving and expressing his ideas.

We will not consent, therefore, to Dr. Ross's summary dismissal, on page 200, of the third hypothesis; but correcting and improving his statement of it, we shall insist upon that as the true theory of the case. God's command is not the *ground* of the moral difference of the actions of his responsible creatures, although it is indeed the *measure* of their obligation and the *rule* of their conduct. We must go back of that command to find that ground. It is not the command which makes the thing commanded to be right, but because it is right it is commanded by God. Whither, then, do we go back of God's command to find the foundation of this rightness of the thing commanded? Shall we go, as Dr. Ross says we needs must go, to the nature of things? No; for we cannot for a moment consent to put anything above God's will which is outside of himself. But we go to his own holy nature. He *is* necessarily, and he is *necessarily* holy. He cannot but *be*, and he cannot but *be* holy. His will is determined by his nature, and his nature is necessarily holy. And whatever is not conformed to this eternal and neces-

sary holiness of God, that is evil. Here is the true foundation of the distinction of right and wrong.

Dr. Ross, throughout this discussion, appropriates to himself the character and attitude of a disciple of the word, in opposition to what he regards as the rationalistic tendencies of Mr. Barnes; and yet it is a favorite idea with him, that "our notion of God is derived from his image in man." P. 195. For man was and is, "however now without divine life, the image of his Maker, as a spiritual being." P. 203. We do not deny the reasonableness of arguing, within moderate limits and in unmeasured terms, from man to God; but certainly Dr. Ross is as much a rationalist in employing this method of argumentation as Mr. Barnes can possibly be considered when he says that reason is in its sphere a legitimate judge of revelation. Mark how he insists that as to the nature of God in distinction from his will, "the inspired writers never speak of it at all. The word, in fact, occurs but once in the New Testament and not in a single instance in the Old." P. 203. But we make bold to assert, on the contrary, that it is from the Bible alone that we justly obtain all authoritative information respecting the nature of God. With reference, indeed, to the passage in 2 Peter i. 4, where he admits that the term "divine nature" occurs, Dr. R. draws the distinction of its referring to God's character and not to his essential nature—surely a needless and impertinent distinction here; for that nature of God in which moral distinctions are to be founded, must, of course, be his moral nature or character. He goes on to speak of "God's absolute silence as to his nature lying back of his will," from which God "gives us to understand that we shall believe there is nothing lying back of that will." P. 205. But we insist that God is very far from being silent about his own moral character or nature; for whatever may be the case about the *term* in the Scriptures, they certainly are full of the *thing*. They tell us God is light, and love, and a consuming fire to the Christless sinner. They tell us he is merciful and gracious, long-suffering and abundant in goodness and truth, and that he is of purer eyes than to behold evil, and cannot look on iniquity. They record every possible mani-

festation of his holiness in his works of providence towards men and angels. Indeed, that God is of inflexible justice and immaculate holiness is one great and constant theme of all the sacred writers.

But to come still closer to the point in dispute. The Scriptures found the very commandments of God upon his nature. God says to Israel: "Be ye holy, for I am holy,"—not because such is my will. He says: "Thou shalt not bow down to graven images; for I, the Lord thy God, am a jealous God,"—not because such is my will.

Thus, so far from God's being silent respecting his own nature, as though that were nothing and his will everything, we notice, in this and many other similar passages, how he often seems to take pains to set his nature forth to us by ascriptions to himself of the most powerful and terrible human passions—such as hatred and jealousy, wrath and revenge—and so makes plain to us, by terms which we can feel and understand, how opposed his nature is to everything that is evil.

There is a double error into which Dr. Ross has fallen in this whole discussion of the nature of God. On the one hand, he confounds the nature of God with the nature of things; and, on the other hand, separates too broadly between God's nature and his will. What he should join he divides, and what he should divide he joins together. As to the nature and will of God, they must not be set apart. His holy will is but his holy nature in action. God's will is holy; he commands what is good and forbids what is evil, because his nature is holy. But Dr. Ross places the foundation of moral distinctions in the mere will of God, and denies that it is found in that nature from whence his holy will must proceed. Nay, he declares that God's nature is without form and void until it is will. Art. I., page 345. And in Art. II., p. 203, he represents it as for "philosophers (wise above what is written)" to talk of the nature of God as "a something to be considered distinct from his will;" while "the inspired writers never speak" of the divine nature at all. So widely does he set apart what must not be disjoined. It appears to be his feeling that it dishonors the will of God to say that it

is based on his unchangeable eternal holy nature. But what more glorious foundation for the will even of Jehovah than his own nature—that holy nature which is as necessary to him as his being? If it is not dishonorable to the will of God to be dependent upon his necessary being, no more is it dishonorable to his will to be dependent on his necessary holiness.

On the other hand, Dr. Ross confounds together, in one aspect of them, the nature of God and the nature of things; for he can see no difference between them, considered as a foundation for right and wrong. In Art. II., p. 186, he declares that, so considered, the one is only plain and the other modified atheism. And in Art. I, p. 341, he even more strongly represents these views as “equally atheism.” Again, in Art. II., p. 230, he declares the view which founds the distinction of right and wrong in the nature of God to be the most subtle and mischievous form of atheism. When did Christian theologian ever utter anything at once so unsound and so extravagant?

Dr. Ross is a pupil of Paley. His notion of the arbitrary will of God as the source of all moral distinctions is derived from that most unsafe teacher of ethics. We shall satisfy the reader of the correctness of this allegation, and also adduce very high authority in condemnation of these false views, by appending in a note some paragraphs from the pen of Dr. Thornwell, originally published in this *Review*, Vol. VII., pp. 8–10.*

* “Is an action, then, right, simply because God commands it, and that upon pain of eternal death? Is it the *command* which makes it to be right, or is its being right the cause of the command? According to Dr. Paley, it is right *because* commanded. According to the common sense of mankind, it is commanded because it is right. If it is the will of God which creates the distinction between right and wrong, the difficulty which Dr. Paley felt, and which he has endeavored to obviate, would manifestly embarrass all our judgments in regard to the moral character of the divine administrations. ‘It *would* be an identical proposition to say of God that he acts right,’—a contradiction in terms to say that he could, by any possibility, *act wrong*. We cannot escape the conviction—it is forced upon us by the constitution of our nature—that there is a rectitude in actions, antecedently to any determinations of will, and that this rectitude is the formal cause of their authoritative injunction upon the part of God. To this

II. The second point of the discussion we are reviewing is the part which reason may legitimately act in judging of the evidences of Christianity. Some such part is on the one hand allowed, but on the other hand denied to her. The explanation of the difference we suppose to be that the parties are looking at different things. We have criticised Mr. Barnes for not making it perfectly plain, even on his title page, that his subject is not true saving faith—the work only of the Holy Spirit in the heart of man, but mere speculative belief—the offspring of the human understanding. Dr. Ross choosing to regard his antagonist as discussing the subject of saving faith, very unnecessarily occupies a large part of both his articles in showing the inefficacy

eternal standard we appeal when we vindicate the ways of God to man. We do not mean, as Dr. Paley suggests, when we pronounce the dispensations of Providence to be right, that they are merely consistent with themselves,—for that is the substance of his explanation,—but that they are consistent with a law which we feel to be co-extensive with intelligent existence. Right and wrong are not the creatures of arbitrary choice. They are not made by the *will*, but spring essentially from the *nature* of God. He is holy, and therefore his volitions are just and good.

“According to Dr. Paley, a different arrangement of the adaptations of the universe would have changed the applications of all moral phraseology, and made that to be right which is now wrong, and that to be wrong which is now right. There is no other difference in the properties expressed by these words than the relation in which they stand to our own happiness. For aught that appears, God *might* command falsehood, perjury, murder, and impiety; and then *they* would be entitled to all the commendations of the opposite virtues. Actions and dispositions are nothing in themselves; they are absolutely without any moral character, without any moral difference, until some expression of the divine will is interposed. It is not till God enjoins it, and it becomes connected with everlasting happiness or misery, that an action or disposition acquires moral significance. Such sentiments contradict the intuitive convictions of the race; and he grievously errs who imagines that he is exalting the will of the Supreme Being, or reflecting a higher glory upon the character of God, by representing all moral distinctions as the accidental creatures of arbitrary choice. If no other account can be given of the excellence and dignity of virtue than that God *happened* to choose it, and to take it under his patronage and favor, we may call vice *unfortunate*, but we can never condemn it as *base*.

„We must, consequently, go beyond the divine command for the true

of human reason to produce this faith. But, in the course of this exposition, he allows himself to utter many extravagant things in disparagement of reason and philosophy.

Christianity finds herself in the midst of an unbelieving world. May she not legitimately take any notice of speculative unbelievers? Is she only to deal with those who already possess true saving faith, thus cutting off from all possible access to salvation, along with the perverse and profane opponent of the truth, every honest doubter groping his way to the light? Not so taught that great thinker, from whom we have already been quoting. "As a system," says he, "*claiming to be divine*, it invites the fullest discussion. As a system *proved to be divine*,

foundation of the moral differences of things; but, as we cannot ascend beyond the Deity himself, we must stop at the perfections of the Divine character. It is because God is *what* he is, that he chooses virtue and condemns vice; and it is because he is what he is *necessarily*, that the distinctions between right and wrong are eternal and immutable. His will is determined by his nature, and his nature is as necessary as his being. His will, consequently, has a law in the essential holiness of his character; and that essential holiness is the ultimate ground, the *fons et origo*, of all moral distinctions.

"But while it is denied that the will of God *creates* the differences betwixt right and wrong, it is not maintained that his will does not adequately express the rule of duty. If Dr. Paley had asserted nothing more than that the divine command was a perfect *measure* of human obligation, no exception could have been taken to his statement. But he obviously meant much more than this; he meant to affirm, in the most unequivocal manner, that the sole distinction betwixt virtue and vice was the arbitrary product of will. It is true, that he subsequently insists upon their respective tendencies, but these cannot be regarded as the ultimate reasons of the divine volitions. All beings are from God, and all the adaptations and adjustments which obtain among them, by virtue of which some are useful and others hurtful, are as much the offspring of his will as their individual existence. Utility finds its standard in his determinations. It is because he has chosen to invest things with such and such properties, and to fix them in such relation to each other, that any place is found for a difference of tendencies. A different order and a different constitution would have completely reversed the present economy. Will, therefore, as mere arbitrary, absolute choice, is the sole cause why things are as they are—why some things are useful and others hurtful—some right and others wrong."

it demands implicit submission. It both admits 'and rejects disputation with difference.'"*

It appears to us that Dr. Ross has laid himself open to the rebuke which, in immediate connexion with the passage just quoted, the same great teacher administers to those divines whose "language has not always been sufficiently guarded" on this subject, and whose "intemperate reprobation of the spirit of perverse speculation * * * has given some pretext to the calumny that faith is inconsistent with reason, and that Christianity repudiates an appeal to argument." "Religion," it is well said by Dr. Thornwell, "from the necessity of the case, is addressed to reason; its duties are represented as a reasonable service, its inspired teachers * * * were accustomed to resort to argument to produce conviction. It is reason which distinguishes man from the brute. Without it, we should be as * * incapable of appreciating a message from God as the 'beasts which perish.'" "To prohibit *rational* is to prohibit *moral* action."

Now, we think it cannot be denied that man's original nature, in the relics of it which still exist, does certify the divinity of the Christian revelation, and that a pretended revelation must be such as it will certify, or it must lack one main element of credibility. But, on the other hand, it is equally certain that the heart of man hates the truth, is blind to the truth, and is no competent judge of what God does reveal. For the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit. Surely there is no difficulty in reconciling these two statements. The heart of man is blind, yet it sees; it sees, yet is blind. "See ye indeed, but perceive not." Man's nature is ruined and fallen, yet it does homage to the word. Blind, it yet sees enough to condemn it. And it does condemn itself; and it does certify the truth; and that certificate is both needful and valuable.

Dr. Thornwell points out, (*ibid.*, p. 3,) quoting Locke and Witsius to support him, how the term reason is used in two senses. According to the one it is "the faculty which judges

*See article on the Office of Reason in regard to Revelation. *Southern Presbyterian Review*, Vol. I., p. 2.

of truth and falsehood, right and wrong." Taken in this sense, reason "is necessarily presupposed in the very idea of revelation;" it is the rational creature to whom God thus addresses himself. And there is therefore no room to question whether reason, in this sense of the term, has an office in regard to revelation. The other sense of the term reason makes it "a compendious expression for the principles and maxims, the opinions, conclusions, or prejudices, which, with or without foundation, men acknowledge to be true." And to reason in this sense, "it is not only possible, but likely," that a system preëminently displaying the wisdom and power of God shall appear to be foolishness. It is thus that reason, or what men regard as reason, is "plainly at war with revelation," and any Christian teacher, of course, must err, who would propose to submit the claims of revelation to human reason in this sense of the term. Thus we are brought again to the point already reached, that man is a fallen creature, whose faculties have been perverted and become subject to error, and in whom reason is no longer right reason.

We quote again from Dr. Thornwell: "In regard to doctrines which are *known* to be a révelation from God, there can be no question as to the precise office of reason. The understanding is simply to believe. * * * * When God speaks, faith is the highest exercise of reason. In his testimony, we have all the elements of truth, and his veracity is the ultimate ground of certainty in every species of evidence. The resistless laws of belief which he has impressed upon the constitution of our minds, which lie at the foundation of all human knowledge, * * * derive all their authority from his own unchanging truth. Let it, for a moment, be supposed that God is willing to deceive us, and who could rely with confidence upon the information of his faculties? Who would trust his senses, if the instinct by which he is impelled to do so might, after all, be a false light, to seduce him into error? That instinct is the testimony of God; and what we call reasoning is nothing but the successive steps by which we arrive at the same testimony in the original structure of our minds. Hence belief, even in cases of the strictest demonstration, must, in the last analysis, be traced

to the veracity of God. Reasoning is only a method of ascertaining what God teaches; the true ground of belief is the fact that God *does* teach the proposition in question. * * * All real evidence, whether intuitive, demonstrative, or probable, is only the light with which he irradiates the mind, and we follow it with confidence, because the Strength of Israel is not a man that he should lie, or the son of man that he should repent." *Ibid.*, p. 5. These statements, which must commend themselves to every considerate Christian, imply that God has a nature unchangingly true and holy, which nature is the sole ground of our confidence in him in all truth. If we should allow Dr. Ross to bury out of sight this great revealed doctrine of God's necessary truthfulness, there would be an end to all reasoning, as well as to all religion.

But, says Dr. Thornwell, "the true question is," what is "the office of reason in those cases in which the reality of the revelation remains yet to be proved?" And he shows, in reply, how a sense of the danger there undoubtedly is in according to human reason the prerogative of judging revelation that it may reject its doctrines, has led certain distinguished writers of the present day to insist, with more zeal than discretion, that only the external evidences of Christianity may, in the first instance, be examined, and that until satisfied of the credentials of the messengers of revelation, reason may not presume to judge the character of the message which they bring. But, contrary to these eminent writers, says Dr. Thornwell, the apostles always remand us "to the *doctrine* as the decisive test of spurious and true revelation." "If there come any unto you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not." "But though we or an angel from heaven preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed." "The *doctrine*, and the doctrine alone, is made the turning point of the argument. The directions of the apostles were founded upon the obvious principle that one truth cannot contradict another; and therefore whatever contradicted the Scriptures, which were known to be truth, carried upon its face the impression of falsehood." "The proposition is universal that whatever is repugnant to a known

truth, no matter what may be the method by which that truth is ascertained to us—whether by the oracles of God, intuition, demonstration, or experience—cannot be divine, and the application of this principle presupposes the right, which Bishop Wilson denies, to examine the nature of the doctrines, discoveries, or precepts which profess to be from heaven. Even the Papists who, of all men, are most concerned to establish the coëxistence of repugnant truths, admit, with the exception of a few schoolmen who have taught the consistency of the same things being theologically true and philosophically false, or philosophically true and theologically false, that to effect contradictions is not an element of the power of God. But if the right to interrogate the record be denied, admissions of this sort are nothing worth.” *Ibid.*, p. 11.

In direct opposition to all this, Dr. Ross denies to human reason “a right to interrogate the record,” just as he ascribes to God the power “to effect contradictions,” whilst, at the same time, he insists that a revelation from God may contain that which is repugnant to known truth!

We shall make no apology for extracting some longer paragraphs from the article referred to before, by Dr. Thornwell, inasmuch as they will present to the reader, with masterly power, in opposition to Dr. Ross’s theory, a just and true statement of the relation of reason to revelation. “Revelation may be contemplated as imparting to us truths which eye hath not seen nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man to conceive—which ‘descend to us immediately from heaven, and communicate with no principle, no matter, no conclusion here below’—or as proclaiming upon divine authority what we were capable of discovering without the aid of inspiration. In other words, revelation may be regarded, according to its subjects, as either supernatural or natural.” *Ibid.*, p. 12. “The distinction betwixt the supernatural and the natural we conceive to be important, not merely as it serves to give clearer views in reference to the office of reason, but as it equally serves to remove some popular objections sedulously inculcated by Papists to the universal reading of the Scriptures. The obscurity which is alleged to render

them unfit for indiscriminate perusal will be found, on examination, to lie for the most part within the province of the natural; it is of the earth, earthy. Allusions to the events, manners, customs, and institutions of an age long since past—to places of which no trace can be found—to scenery which is not familiar to us, and to modes of thought into which we find it difficult to enter—all of which were simple and natural to the countrymen and contemporaries of the sacred writers—are the sources of no little perplexity and labor to their modern readers. But these things affect the costume, but not the substance, of revelation—the body, but not the soul. Its life must be sought in its supernatural discoveries. This is its own field; and whatever obscurity attaches to them presses as heavily upon the learned as the unlearned—the clergy as the laity. All stand upon the same level. All are equally dependent upon God for his divine illumination; none can claim to be a master—none should submit as a slave. The august mysteries of Christianity are revealed to the meek, however untutored in this world's wisdom—and concealed from the wise, however skilled in philosophy and science. Here *God* is the teacher and man the disciple; and every one in this school must become a fool, in order that he may be wise. The Bible incidentally treats of history, geography, and ancient manners; but these are not the things which give it its value. Christ crucified—its great subject—it is the knowledge of him that saves the soul; and that knowledge is more accessible to the poor and ignorant than to the arrogant disputers of this world.

“But—to resume the immediate subject of discussion—the office of reason in the supernatural department of revelation may be positive, but can never be negative; in the natural it is negative, but only to a very limited extent, if at all, positive. We use the terms positive and negative to indicate the nature of the conclusion, and not the arguments by which it is reached—that being positive by which the reality of the revelation is affirmed, and that negative by which it is denied. When we say, therefore, that reason has no negative jurisdiction in regard to the supernatural, we mean that it is incompetent to infer the spu-

riousness of a pretended revelation, from the nature of its mysteries; that it cannot construct an internal argument from discoveries and doctrines which transcend the limits of natural attainment to convict of falsehood what professes to be divine. The positive jurisdiction which, in this department, we have conceded to reason, refers to the perception of those impressions of his character which it is to be expected God would enstamp upon his word—those traces of power, wisdom, goodness, and glory, which proclaim a divine original, as truly as the works of nature or the dispensations of Providence. Every true revelation must authenticate itself; and the only faculty through which its reflection of the divine image can be manifested to us, is reason. Unenlightened by grace, it is confessedly incompetent to discover God in his word, and consequently never can exercise any positive jurisdiction until it becomes the habitation of the Spirit. It is to the called, and the called alone, that Christ crucified is the power of God and the wisdom of God. The negative power, which we have accorded to reason in the department of the natural, implies that it is competent to say, to a certain extent, what a revelation ought not to be, though it is not competent to say what it ought to be. It is able here to convict a pretended revelation of imposture, by showing that it contains contradictions, palpable falsehoods, or gross absurdities; though it cannot infer that a system is truly divine, because it is free from objections which would be fatal to its credit. The sum of our doctrine, then, is, that in the supernatural, reason may prove, but cannot refute, the claims of a pretended revelation; in the natural, it may refute, but cannot establish." *Ibid.*, pp. 13-15. "The doctrine which we have endeavored to illustrate, that reason possesses no negative jurisdiction in regard to the mysteries or supernatural facts of revelation, because it possesses no previous knowledge which they can contradict, subverts the basis of the whole system of philosophical infidelity. The corner-stone of the fabric is the competency of man to determine beforehand what a revelation should contain. That, from the very nature of the case, it deals with the unknown, and contemplates us in the attitude of learners and not of

teachers, of servants and interpreters, and not lords and masters, is a proposition, simple and obvious as it is, which the disciples of Herbert, Bolingbroke, and Hume, have entirely overlooked. The legitimate conclusion from their principles is either that man possesses, in his natural faculties and resources, the means of omniscience, or that whatever God knows beyond the reach of reason must forever remain an impenetrable secret with himself." *Ibid.*, p. 17.

Dr. Ross treats the venerable name of Bishop Butler with disrespect. (See Art. II., p. 220.) This shall not deter us from confirming what has just now been said, by quoting a few words from his immortal pen, as we find them referred to in Dr. Thornwell's article. The great Bishop says that reason "is indeed the only faculty we have wherewith to judge concerning anything, even revelation itself;" and he says, also, that a "supposed revelation" can be proved false from internal characters. "For it may contain clear immoralities or contradictions, and either of these would prove it false." Analogy, Part II., Ch. 3.

We shall still further confirm what has been said in opposition to Dr. Ross, by a few words from the eminent John Owen:

"So, if any pretend unto *revelations by faith*, which are contradictory unto the first principles of natural light, or reason in its proper exercise about its proper objects, it is a delusion. On this ground, the Roman doctrine of transubstantiation is justly rejected; for it proposeth that as a revelation by faith which is expressly contradictory unto our sense and reason in their proper exercise about their proper objects. And a supposition of the possibility of any such thing would make the ways whereby God reveals and makes known himself to cross and interfere one with another; which would leave us no certainty in anything, divine or human."*

"What reason do they intend? If reason absolutely, the reason of things—we grant that nothing contrary unto it is to be admitted. But reason as it is in this or that man, particularly in themselves, we know to be weak, maimed, and imperfect. * * * * Reason in the abstract, or the just measure of the answering of one thing unto another, is of great moment. But reason, that is, what is pretended to be so, or appears to be

*See Owen's Reason of Faith. Works, Vol. III., p. 328.

so unto this or that man especially, and about things of divine revelation, is of very small importance; of none at all where it riseth up against the express testimonies of Scripture, and these multiplied to their mutual confirmation and explanation."*

In reviewing this discussion, we have confined our attention to the two points upon which it turns. Before we close, however, we must offer a few words upon some of the more important theological bearings of Dr. Ross's theory. It is, in the first place, utterly inconsistent with the holiness of God, which is his glory. According to Dr. Ross, it is by mere arbitrary choice that God prefers holiness to sin. There is no essential eternal distinction between them. There was no reason in his own nature why he should prefer the one to the other. This plainly is tantamount to saying that he has no holy nature.

Again, in like manner, this theory is utterly opposed to the essential and eternal justice of God. It does not agree with his ineffable hatred against sin. Disguise it as the author may, his theory makes God indifferent to moral distinctions. They are what they are by an arbitrary act of his creating will, for no reason whatever based in his own nature. In the most absolute freedom of his own will, he creates them one way, but might have created them the very opposite way. Nothing in the nature of these distinctions themselves, nor even in his own nature, stood in the way of his reversing right and wrong, truth and falsehood, good and evil. To say that he could not have reversed these distinctions; that he was not free to make evil good and good evil, is to say that there is an essential and eternal difference betwixt them, grounded in his own nature.

The law of God, moreover, is sacrificed by Dr. Ross's theory. It is stripped of its honor, if you make it the product of mere arbitrary will. Say that there is not in God's nature any necessary and eternal foundation for the discriminations which this law makes between good and evil, and you despoil it of the reverence which is its due.

Still further, this theory destroys the idea of any intrinsic

*See Owen's *Doctrine of the Trinity Vindicated*. Works, Vol. X., p 510.

necessary evil in sin. Between sin and holiness, the human mind cannot help acknowledging a distinction not arbitrary, but eternal and necessary. Dr. Ross would obliterate this inherent, native sense of sin in the human soul.

Finally, this theory annihilates the necessity of the atonement. That necessity is based in the eternal fact that God's vindicatory justice is an essential attribute of his nature, that he venerates his own law, and that his nature is inflexibly holy. If God's preference for holiness to sin is arbitrary, he might easily forgive sin. If there be no essential and eternal distinction between sin and holiness, it is impossible for us to believe that the Judge of all the earth would demand atonement for it at so great a cost as the honor and life of his only begotten Son.

These are very grave consequences to be imputed to any Christian minister's doctrine. The errors they involve are fundamental. We do not charge that Dr. Ross accepts any one of them. But it is our strong conviction that they flow logically from his principles, and we doubt not that nine-tenths of our readers will agree with us.

Did our limits allow, we should feel bound to comment severely upon the lax views of morality, akin to these fundamental theological errors, which the author sets forth in his exposition of some of the commandments of the Decalogue. But enough has been said by us to constitute a solemn and earnest protest against these false and dangerous opinions: and this being accomplished, we lay down our pen.

ARTICLE VI.

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF 1868.

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States met, according to appointment, in the Franklin Street Presbyterian Church, Baltimore, on Thursday, May 21st, 1868, and was opened with a sermon by the Moderator of the last Assembly, Rev. Dr. T. V. Moore, on Ephesians iv. 15, 16. The sermon was an able exposition of the teaching of Scripture touching the corporate life of the Church. We hail with satisfaction every indication of a reviving interest in the doctrine of the Church as an essential element of the gospel. It cannot be denied that the reaction against the extreme views of Rome, and especially in this country, has been too violent. The great Protestant symbols of the sixteenth century, both the Lutheran and the Reformed, as well as the great theologians of the seventeenth, contain views of the nature and importance of the doctrine of the Church with which "American Christianity" has, for the most part, little sympathy. However we may attempt to account for this fact—whether by the influence of the practical no-churchism of Independency, or by the influence of political democracy—the fact itself cannot be denied. The lamentable defection of so large a part of the American Church upon so vital a truth as that of the independence and autonomy of the Church, the superserviceable zeal of multitudes of Christians in elevating the flag of the nation above the banner of the cross, and the virtual annihilation of the Church as the appointed witness-bearer for the truth by the attempt to make the State *also* a witness-bearer for the same truths, constitute together melancholy evidence of the fact. If the afflictions of our Southern Church should have the effect of compelling her to recognise these great truths, then Samson's proverb will receive a new exemplification. "Out of the eater comes forth meat, and out of the strong comes forth sweetness."

It is difficult to exaggerate the importance of the Church, if

we are careful to avoid two leading errors. One error is that of substituting, either in theory or practice, the visible body in the place of the invisible Head, the Church in the place of Christ, in the great concern of the sinner's salvation. The other error is that of extending the sphere of the immediate functions of the Church, so as to make it operate *directly* upon the whole sphere of human activity, and thus convert it into a sort of *τὸ πᾶν*, embracing and absorbing all human relations and duties. To this last error there seems to be some leaning in the able discourse of Dr. Moore. It is one thing to assert that the truth for which the Church is the divinely ordained witness-bearer is destined to leaven all society, and that it reveals the principles and spirit according to which every human duty ought to be performed; and quite another thing to assert that the Church, as such, is to assume the direction and control of society in all its interests and relations. To affirm the latter is practically to ignore those other institutions of God, the family and the State, which have their own distinct functions to discharge in the mysterious economy of society. Such an extension of the sphere of the Church must have the effect of secularizing it, and so of destroying, or at least of obscuring, its distinct and substantive existence. Thus the theocratic ambition of the Church of Rome has resulted in the formation of a community which is not so much a church as a secular empire whose authority is supported and enforced by sanctions spiritual and eternal. Thus, also, the theocracy of New England has ended in ecclesiastical organisations, which are, to a very great extent, little more than the mere engines of political parties, following in the wake rather than marching in the advance of party leaders, and exhibiting, according to the celebrated saying of Edmund Burke, more than their share of partisan passion, and less than their share of political craft.

For these reasons, we were gratified that the action of the Assembly was so decided against the notion of the direction and control by the Church of secular education. We were still more gratified by the decided action of the Presbyteries upon the overture in reference to the same subject submitted to them by

the Assembly of 1867. No reason can be given for the control of secular education in schools by the Church, which would not be valid, though in a lower degree, perhaps, for the control of all kinds of education in the workshop, the counting-room, and the field, by the same authority. We sympathise deeply with those passages of Dr. Moore's sermon in which he depicts, with great force, the danger of allowing our children to be educated by other denominations; and we could cordially unite with him in denouncing the wickedness and folly of Presbyterian parents, who send the children whom they have solemnly dedicated to God, and whom they have vowed to bring up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, to schools in which they know, or might know, that attempts will be systematically made to fill the minds of these children with admiration for a false faith. But what is the remedy? Is it in establishing Presbyterial, Synodical, and Assembly's schools? Has not the experiment been tried? Have not Presbyterians given fresh color to the charge of being "God's silly people," by patronising (as the phrase goes) schools of other denominations? Are they not anxious, above all other denominations, to avoid the accusation of bigotry? But it may be said that if church schools were established, the members of the Church might be compelled to send their children to them. We answer, why not compel them *now* to keep their children away from Papal schools? The answer to this question, we apprehend, will be found to be a sufficient exposure of the weakness of that remedy. If it be that it would not be wise to exercise discipline in this last case, or that it would not be just to exercise it, then, for the same reason, it would be neither just nor wise to exercise it in the first.

The fundamental trouble here, as in almost every other failure or corruption in our Church, is, we apprehend, *in the want of light*. Let the pastors of our congregations be deeply convinced that Popery is the master-engine of Satan for the destruction of souls; that it is *the* great antagonist of the gospel of salvation; that its policy remains unchanged in the use of every kind of fraud and deception which may be deemed necessary for the extension and consolidation of its power; that it is an adept in

all the arts described in Psalm x. 8-10, and Rev. xiii. ; and, consequently, that any lamb of their flocks that is drawn into that net will, in all probability, wander away from Christ forever. Let them utter these deep convictions to their people with the fervor and earnestness with which Papal priests are wont to utter their warnings against Protestant schools ; and our opinion is that we should soon have less reason to lament the apostasy of our Presbyterian youth. Our people, there is reason to fear, are too little instructed in the *distinctive* features of their Church—its history and order. The *esprit de corps* is too low among them—lower, we verily believe, than in any other of the great historical churches of the Reformation ; lower than in some of the unhistorical churches. Otherwise, they would have their own schools—schools under a strictly denominational *influence*, though not under organic denominational control. There have been many such schools of the higher grades in this country ; and the service they have rendered to the Church has not only been very great, but greater, beyond all doubt, than it could have been if they had been *governed* by Presbyteries, Synods, or Assemblies. We may mention Nassau Hall and Hampden Sidney as well-known examples. It is true that the theological seminaries in the immediate vicinity of these schools have contributed not a little to their usefulness ; but this help has been given mainly in the way of stimulus to the *esprit de corps* of the Presbyterian population. On the other hand, there have been colleges, which, originally of this class, have tried the experiment of regular ecclesiastical control, and have been glad to revert to their ancient status. LaFayette College, in Pennsylvania, if our memory serves us, was one of these. Our conclusion, then, is, that if our people ever become enlightened on the subject of the superior “apostolicity and catholicity” of their Church, they will maintain schools of their own, without the organic action of the courts of the Church.

THE SYNOD OF KENTUCKY.

The Rev. Mr. Breck, as commissioner, tendered the salutations of the Synod to the General Assembly, and stated the reasons why

that body was not quite ready for organic union with the Assembly: that while the Synod was thoroughly with us in our testimony for the truth, especially touching the spiritual independence of the Church, and desired to be identified with us, there were considerations growing out of the state of matters within its bounds, which, in its view, compelled it to delay taking any further steps at present for a closer union. On the part of the Synod, he then tendered to the Assembly a cordial invitation to hold its next meeting in Louisville. The Assembly declined this invitation, while acknowledging the kindness and courtesy which prompted it. Some of the brethren doubted whether it was constitutional to meet outside of our proper bounds; some thought that our Church had done all that Christian charity required to assure the Kentucky brethren of our willingness to unite with them, and that to appoint the meeting of the next Assembly within the bounds of their Synod might embarrass both; the majority were probably determined in their vote by the consideration that more than one of our own congregations desired to have the Assembly next year, and that whatever of good might be expected to attend such a convocation was a good to which a part of our own body had the first claim.

The pervading feeling of our people in reference to the Kentucky brethren is one of gratitude for their timely and generous aid to our suffering ministers and congregations, and of hearty sympathy with them in their struggles in behalf of the freedom of the church. We are perfectly content to leave the question of organic union with us where it properly belongs—with themselves. We shall rejoice and be thankful to the Master who is our common trust and joy, if it shall please him, by his Spirit and providence, to bring us together in one body.

REPORT ON SUSTENTATION.

The report of the Committee was, upon the whole, encouraging. Every application for aid had been promptly and fully met. The ability of the Committee to do this was, however, due, in a good degree, to the liberality of individual Christians and of Presbyterian congregations beyond our bounds. Grate-

ful mention is made of the congregations in the Synod of Kentucky and in Baltimore. A much larger proportion of our own congregations has been contributing to this cause; but there are still many which have contributed nothing. The compulsory occupation of many of our ministers in secular pursuits is an evil greatly to be deplored, and the Assembly enjoins it upon the Presbyteries concerned "to ascertain and fix the minimum amount required for the support of a laboring minister, and to use diligent efforts to provide the same. The Committee of Sustentation is directed to cooperate herein to the extent of their ability, provided the sum so designated shall not exceed \$600." In lieu of the appropriation of five per cent. of the Sustentation Fund made in aid of disabled ministers and of the widows and orphans of ministers deceased, the Assembly ordered a special collection to be made in all the congregations for this class of sufferers.

This plan of sustentation seems to be the only plan by which many of our churches can be saved from utter extinction. Whatever objection may be felt or urged against it by brethren jealous of any apparent tendency to the undue centralization of power, ought to give way to the necessities of the case, unless it can be shown that the plan itself violates the constitution of the Church. Vigilance is, indeed, the price of liberty, and therefore let the Committee be watched. But, on the other hand, let them be heartily sustained in all their lawful efforts to maintain the ordinances of the Church and the stated preaching of "the glorious gospel of the blessed God." A famine of the *word* would be a sorer famine than any that has yet afflicted our suffering land; and we do not doubt that, in all their poverty, our people are able to avert such a calamity, if they have the *will* to do it. The question is not at all whether they can do it "without feeling it;" but whether they can do it at the expense of self-denial—of that kind of self-denial which was made by them, and made cheerfully, for defence during the late war. It is very bad economy to rob God. The third chapter of Malachi shows the result of this kind of economy among the Jews. And it is worthy of inquiry how far the continued poverty of our people

may be owing to their failure to honor God with what substance is left to them. We must acknowledge that all material as well as all spiritual prosperity is from him, or we must turn atheists. How, then, can we expect to have material prosperity, or, having it, to find it a blessing to ourselves or to our children, if we are reluctant to use it for the maintenance of that word which he has magnified above all his name?

One word more as to the relations of the Presbyteries to this sustentation scheme. As has been already hinted, we admire any reasonable jealousy, on their part, of invasion of their constitutional rights, and we have no fault to find with the "four Presbyteries" mentioned in the report as declining to coöperate with the central Committee. But there is a very solemn duty imposed upon the remaining forty-four which do coöperate. The Committee must depend almost wholly upon them; must be guided by their judgment in making appropriations. It is the clear duty, therefore, of these bodies to remember that the fund belongs to the whole Church; and painful as it may be to refuse to recommend a minister or a congregation for aid, yet resolutely to refuse such a recommendation, unless they are convinced that the good of the cause, as well as the comfort of the minister, requires it. This is no time to stand upon personal feeling. If a man is able to work and does work, let him be paid; if he is able to work and does not work, let him find bread for himself; if he is willing to work and is not able, let him be provided for out of the special fund for "disabled ministers," especially if he has been a faithful worker in time past. Let the congregations understand that they cannot have as much preaching for *nothing* as for *something*, and that they must make up their minds to deny themselves and raise more money, or to have the ordinances of the Church administered more rarely.

REPORT ON FOREIGN MISSIONS.

The most gratifying item in this report was the statement that "eight young men, of good report in respect of character and attainments, had devoted themselves to the foreign missionary work, and had offered themselves to the Committee." This is

good news indeed. No better token, aside from a general outpouring of the Holy Ghost, could be afforded to our Church, of the favor and care of her divine Lord. Extension is the very condition of existence to the Church. Let her cease to expand, and she begins to decline. "There is that scattereth and yet increaseth; there is that withholdeth more than is meet, and it tendeth to poverty." No Church can flourish which neglects the great commission, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature." Even the Church of Rome, poor as the gospel is which it has to preach, has felt the invigorating effect of missionary zeal. The Protestant Churches of the continent of Europe have felt the depressing effect of the want of such zeal, when they have been prevented, either by unbelief or by the want of maritime commerce, from preaching the gospel to the heathen. And who can estimate the wholesome influence of the foreign missionary work in checking, if not in arresting, the tendencies to fatal heresy in the churches of England and of the United States? We cannot be persuaded that any body of Christian people is Christian only in name, which can read with delight the *Missionary Herald*, and continues to sustain with liberality the missions whose labors and trials it is the purpose of that journal to record. In any communion, the men who go to the heathen are usually the best men. We do not except even the Church of Rome. The Jesuits who went to China, Japan, America, were, as a class, purer men than the members of the fraternity who remained in the courts, camps, and schools of Europe. The like may be said, with less hesitation, of the other orders of the Church of Rome. It must be very difficult, we think, for a missionary among the Feejees to be led astray by the vagaries of a dreaming theological professor in Andover or Tübingen, even if he should ever read them. It would be hard to make him a Pelagian there, or to persuade him that any power less than that of a divine Saviour or a divine Spirit, could lift the poor wretches among whom he labors out of their pit of sin and shame. The *sham* gospels could afford him little support or comfort in his sore perils and privations. Indeed, he would feel, could not help feeling, that if these gospels were

true, it must be the merest Quixotry to encounter those perils and privations at all. Missionaries, therefore, are more apt to stick to the gospel of the Son of God than their brethren who are living in ease at home; and their reports and correspondence can scarcely fail to exert a salutary influence upon the church which sustains them.

But now we have to meet the difficulty of our poverty again. Can we sustain so many laborers? In answer to this question, we protest, in the first place, against this continual ringing of the changes upon our poverty. The Southern Church is not poorer than the Church at Jerusalem in the year 34 of our era, which was also the Church of a conquered people, and looked upon the face of the tax-gatherer with no more satisfaction than we do now. And yet this Church filled the Roman Empire with the savor of Christ's name. It is no poorer than the Moravian Church, and is a larger communion; and yet the Moravian missionaries, if our memory serves us, have made converts more than equal in number to the members of the Church which sent them out and sustained them. But how much money will be needed? Assuming the statistics of membership to be substantially correct, it will not require as much as fifty cents per member for one year. Is there one member who cannot lay aside one cent a week for this cause? Certain it is, that multitudes of our people throw away more than this every week. But it is said it must be borne in mind that this is only *one* of the schemes of the Church, and that the sustentation of our ministry at home is the most important. If the Church at home becomes extinct, who will support the foreign missionaries? Very true. But what if the refusal to answer the call of Providence in reference to the foreign field be the very method to extinguish the home Church? We confess we have no patience with this habit of placing the foreign and domestic fields in antagonism to each other, as if their interests were conflicting. And this for two reasons. The first is, that our commission makes no such distinction. "The *field* is the world." The earliest missionary record—the Acts of the Apostles—makes none. The second is, that this antagonism is usually in the mouths of those who do

little or nothing for either. It is generally, we are constrained to believe, an insincere plea made by those who desire to escape the reproaches of conscience for reluctance to do anything.

But there are good brethren, who sincerely think that in the present paucity of ministers, these young men ought to stay at home. If they are men of more than ordinary promise, so much stronger is the obligation to give to their own country, in the agony of revolution, the benefit of their labors and counsels. We answer, that Christ makes no mistakes. And it is at least as probable that these young brethren, who have been seeking direction from God in reference to their duty for months past, have made no mistake, as it is that those who have not made it a matter of special prayer have made none. Again, many valuable men have gone into voluntary exile to escape the troubles of their native land, and have not been blamed for it. Shall none go to proclaim the unsearchable riches of Christ? Will not Christ make up the loss to us? Even now there are a hundred sons of the Church standing at our doors and asking to be aided in preparing for the ministry of the gospel. Let us shake off this apathy of despair which is creeping over us and hindering us from expecting any good, and of course from attempting to do any good. Christ is not dead or asleep. The Church is safe. Let us be concerned that we do not personally, by our unbelief and inactivity, lose our reward. "Let no man take thy crown!"

REPORT ON PUBLICATION.

There is little demanding special notice in the condition of this work of the Church. The Secretary and his associates appear to have been earnest and diligent in the discharge of their duties, and to have accomplished as much as could be reasonably expected, with the limited means at their disposal. The debt of the Committee has been reduced about \$8,000, and the result of its business for the last two years has been a gain of nearly \$2,000 upon the amount invested. The completion of the endowment of \$50,000, as an adequate working capital, is a prime necessity for the efficiency of the Committee's work on a larger scale. The proposed removal to Baltimore has been

abandoned or postponed, in consequence of the facilities offered at Richmond for the publication of books and the transportation of stocks.

In answer to some inquiries contained in an overture from the Presbytery of Winchester, the Assembly expressed its conviction, as the result of a full investigation made by its Standing Committee, that the expenditures of the Publication Committee have been graduated by a careful regard to justice and economy, and are, considering the contingencies and embarrassments incident to a new enterprise, below rather than above the amount to have been anticipated.

REPORT ON EDUCATION.

This report furnishes ground for encouragement. There has been a gratifying increase both in the number of candidates and in the means for their support. The aggregate of contributions, however, is still inadequate to the necessities of the case. Many young men, who have consecrated themselves to the work of the ministry, are prevented from prosecuting their studies by the want of means. Upon this department of the Church's work, our readers well indulge us in a remark or two.

In the first place, it is evident that this scheme does not enlist the same sympathy that is accorded to the other three. In the second place, it is equally evident, we think, that this want of sympathy, so far as it exists, is not due to an under-valuation of the importance of the Christian ministry. The Church is as thoroughly convinced that the ministry is essential to its life as it is that any ordinance is essential; while it must be confessed that Christ's people are very far from appreciating his wisdom and love in the institution of a living ministry as they ought. What, then, is the difficulty? We answer, that, in our judgment, it is to be sought in the apparently *elemosynary* character of this scheme. In the other schemes, money is given for labor performed. In this, the money *seems* to be given without any return of actual service to the Church. The fact that the Church is training laborers is overlooked; and the fact that some of these candidates for the ministry abuse the benefactions

they receive is too carefully remembered. That all public funds for the relief of indigence are liable to great abuses, is known to all who know anything about them. That anything which impairs the disposition and purpose of any human being, and especially of a young man, to work and struggle for an honest and reputable livelihood, is, *pro tanto*, an evil, is equally acknowledged by every right-minded man. It is further manifest that this disposition to struggle for self-support, on the part of an indigent candidate for the ministry, furnishes a test of his single-mindedness and sincerity in seeking the office, corresponding with the test which is afforded by a candidate of abundant means, in his renouncing the prospects which the possession of such means opens to him. We might add these additional considerations: That the battle which the straitened candidate wages manfully with difficulties of this sort is itself an education of vast importance for such a work as the ministry of the gospel; that a candidate who receives aid from an abstraction like a church or a committee may not feel the weight of the obligation to do his best so sensibly as one who receives aid from an individual friend or Christian brother; that the temptation to take advantage of a public fund, in order to obtain a liberal education and the honorable social position of a Christian minister, is no small one; that the want of diligence and conscientiousness in study, betrayed by so many candidates in the academical stages of their education, is often scandalous.

Considerations such as these must be acknowledged to have, if no real force, at least great plausibility; and the thinking members of our Church are not to be too severely condemned, if, for such reasons, they are not forward to contribute to a public fund for this purpose. Yet even these brethren must concede that the times are peculiar, and that, in the universal prostration of our people, the Church must either be deprived of an educated and competent ministry, or aid must be given to her struggling youth. The scandal brought upon this scheme of the Assembly, and the like schemes in other churches, might, in a good degree, be removed or prevented by a more watchful oversight of candidates by Presbyteries and Sessions.

So much for the four great schemes of the Assembly. The reports made last May call for thanksgiving on our part, and ought to inspire both hope and courage for the future. Our Church is *not* a forsaken Church. If we have not all we desire, we have enough to satisfy us that our Lord Christ is with us, and that he is ready to guide, strengthen, and bless us in our attempts to magnify his name. The discussion of these annual reports ought to be full and unrestrained, and the brethren to whom the administration is intrusted ought to be willing, as we have no reason to doubt they are, to have all their plans freely canvassed, and to consider any suggestions from any quarter which may be made in a proper spirit. Discussion is the shaking of the torch, that it may shine.

REPORT ON SYSTEMATIC BENEFICENCE.

“The revenue is the State,” is a saying which has become famous. There is a sense in which one might almost be endured in saying, “The revenue is the Church.” Nothing can be more certain than that our Lord does not need a revenue for the administration of his kingdom; and it is just as certain that he has determined not to do without it. He does not need the contributions of his people; but they need them, and therefore he has, in mercy to their souls, ordained that they shall have fellowship with him and with one another through contributions of their substance. The first formal and solemn act of worship recorded in the Bible was one which required the surrender of property on the part of the worshipper. “Abel brought of the firstlings of his flock and of the fat thereof.” Cain was a tiller of the ground, and, reprobate as he was, brought of its fruit as an offering to the Lord. He was rebel enough to appear before his Maker without a bleeding sacrifice, and thus became the father of Socinians and Deists; but even he was not so presumptuous as to appear before his Maker “empty.” He brought something upon which his care and toil had been expended, and with which his life had, as it were, become incorporated, and thus adapted to be a symbol of the surrender of himself to God. If we inquire for the reasons why, under the Mosaic Law,

certain animals only were allowed to be offered in sacrifice, we cannot fail to see that one reason was the fact of property in these animals. The blood of a stag, we should have thought, was as appropriate a symbol of the life as the blood of a goat; and we can easily imagine other reasons why the offering of a stag would have been more appropriate than that of a goat. But the goat was property, and the stag was not. So also in the vegetable offerings. It was not the spontaneous growth of the field and forest, but the vegetables, which demanded for their production the toil and care of men—the fine flour, the oil, and the wine—which God demanded. It was the hearty surrender of the person of the worshipper that God desired; and such a surrender could scarcely be expressed by the offer of that which cost the worshipper nothing. This principle is one of the most striking features of the Levitical *cultus*, and belongs to its very essence. The Jews rebelled against it from time to time; thought it was a nonsensical expenditure; preferred to lavish their money upon Moloch, upon Baal, upon their lusts in any form, rather than upon the service of Jehovah. In the time of Malachi, already referred to, they were so besotted as to ask wherein they had robbed God, (and so brought upon themselves, by a righteous *lex talionis*, the curse of famine,) when they knew all the while that they had failed in the matter of tithes and offerings. But God did not repeal the law then—nor has he repealed it since; and prophecy assures us that it will never be repealed while the Church remains in its militant condition. His people must worship him with that which costs them something. The free-will offerings of their substance constitute the revenues of that kingdom whose conquests are to be achieved by the power of truth and love.

It was for the purpose of keeping these great truths before the mind and conscience of the Church, that this Standing Committee on Systematic Benevolence was appointed by our highest court, and that regular reports from the Presbyteries were required upon the same subject. And now, after many years of constant testimony, the Committee of the last Assembly inform us that only eighteen of the Presbyteries made any report to

that body. This is, indeed, an improvement; since, in 1866, there was a report from only one or two, if we remember correctly; but why do not all the Presbyteries obey the injunction of the Assembly? Again, according to the summary of these reports given us by the Committee, it appears that very few of the congregations have contributed to all the schemes, and very many have taken up no collection at all! Passing strange, in a Church which has been careful to put the doctrine and duty of giving into its Confession of Faith, its Form of Government, and its Directory for Worship! Whose fault is it? The fault of the teachers mainly, again we are constrained to answer. Let our ministers be convinced of the doctrine; let them feel that there is great blessedness in holding fellowship with Christ and with his saints in this ordinance; let them feel that they are conferring a high benefit upon the people in persuading them to be cheerful givers; let them preach the doctrine with these strong convictions and feelings, and give the people the opportunity of contributing—and the Church will not only have money enough for her present needs, but will be able to enlarge the sphere of her operations. Whatever we do to any purpose must be done in *faith*; but faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God. How can they hear without a preacher?

We must get rid of the antagonism of “temporalities” and “spiritualities.” There is no antagonism between money and the love of Christ; the antagonism is between the *love* of money and the love of Christ. It is no infallible mark of an eminently spiritual man that he is careless about his pecuniary obligations. Why should the like carelessness be considered a mark of eminent spirituality in a congregation? It is the law of our condition in this world that we shall have “temporalities” to manage; and this law applies to the Church as well as to the individual believer. In both cases alike, these “temporalities,” according as they are managed wisely or unwisely, may be a serious hindrance, or an excellent spiritual discipline and help in accomplishing the great end of our being—the glorifying of God by a life of faith and obedience. We need not dwell longer on this view of the subject, as it has been presented with great clearness

and force in the last January number of this *Review*, in the article on "Congregational Temporalities." We earnestly commend this article to our brethren who have not read it.

The Assembly, upon the recommendation of the Committee, appointed a Committee to prepare a "Directory for the Oblation," to be inserted in the "Directory for Worship." The reasons for such a directory are very obvious. The offering of gifts by the congregation is already recognised in the "Directory," and in other parts of our standards, as an act of worship; but sufficient prominence has not been given to it. And in many of our congregations there is nothing in the mode in which the offerings are collected to impress upon the people the fact that they are making their offerings to God. On the contrary, the thing is very often done with as little regard to reverence and decorum as if the assembly were a secular meeting. Some congregations take no trouble to provide suitable vessels in which to receive the offerings; and even where the good taste of some of the members has provided such vessels, the deacons prefer to use their hats. It will not do to charge the brethren who advocate more decorum in this part of public worship, with aping the Episcopalians. We ought to imitate what is worthy of imitation.

SABBATH-SCHOOLS.

This subject occupied a larger share of the time of the Assembly than we have ever known it to occupy before. And it is a subject whose importance can scarcely be exaggerated. Tens of thousands of children, who are to be the men and women of the next generation, are receiving impressions in these schools every Sabbath, which will affect their characters for good or evil *forever*; and no man can doubt that many of these impressions, in some of these schools, are evil. The Church cannot discharge its duty to its own children without taking these schools under its direction and control. Whether the Assembly is the court which ought to assume this control, as a matter of original jurisdiction, admits of serious doubt; and we doubt the propriety, therefore, of the appointment of a Standing Committee of the Assembly upon this subject. It seems to us to belong more

properly to the Session than to the Assembly. There is no force in the argument which was used in favor of the appointment of that Committee, derived from the fact that a report is required of the number of children in Sabbath-schools. A report is required also of the number of communicants, and of other matters over which no direct control has ever been claimed for the Assembly. But about the duty and necessity of control by the Church through its courts, in some form, we have no shadow of doubt.

It has become an evil of such magnitude as to excite alarm, that the divinely ordained officers of God's house are abdicating their authority, and resigning it into the hands not only of private members, but even of professed worldlings. The trustees, for example, in some congregations, usurp the functions of both elders and deacons. They not only exercise a potent influence in the calling of a pastor—the most important act ever performed by a congregation—but an influence still more potent in a matter inferior only to the choice of a pastor—the matter of congregational singing, or, as the phrase goes, of “church music.” It is amusing to observe the patience with which the people of God submit to be deprived of any share in the only part of public worship in which they are permitted to take an audible part—the songs of praise. And who is it that dares to rob them and God of this communion? A godless or foolish organist or chorister obtruded upon them by worldly trustees, who are thinking only of the revenue from pew-rents; or, not unfrequently, by gay, volatile, brainless young people, who are thinking only of pastime. Where was the Session when this outrage was perpetrated? Have not the elders been appointed of God to watch over the spiritual welfare of the flock? And what account can they render of their stewardship, if they allow the Church to be converted into a place of exhibition, instead of a place of communion with God in praise? It is the *πρεσβύτεροι*, and not the *νεώτεροι* or *νεώτεροι*, whom Christ hath appointed to bear rule in his house.

So, also, the Sabbath-school is too often abandoned to the control of officious people, who are eminently qualified neither by nature nor grace for the work. The kind of instruction, the

books, the teachers, everything connected with the school, ought to be under the authority of the Session, of the grave and reverend elders, who are under solemn vows to feed the lambs, and have been solemnly chosen by the people of God for that purpose among others. If they will not do their duty, and the Presbytery cannot make them do it, we do not see how the General Assembly can reach the case.

It is to be feared that there has been a great decline in faithful instruction in the family among our people. Our milk-and-water Sabbath-school literature is no adequate substitute for thorough drill in the word of God and in the catechism. It was a complaint, loud and bitter, in the Church before the separation of 1861, that the precious ordinance of infant baptism was falling into neglect; and if we may judge from the statistical reports from the congregations to the Assembly of the number of infants baptized, we have reason to fear that it is neglected now. If so, of course instruction is neglected; for it is not to be supposed that a Presbyterian should undervalue the priceless privilege of an acknowledged place in the visible Church for his child, and, at the same time, give its full weight to the obligation of training up that child for God.

This whole subject, of immense, unspeakable importance at all times, has become to the people of the South, if we may use the expression, *more vital* than ever. The tendency of oppression to degrade and corrupt its victims is dreadful; and the ruins of character all around us are far more melancholy to contemplate than the ruins of princely fortunes and of civil institutions. The land is overrun and deluged with agencies and influences pregnant with corruption and death. God pity the little ones, and save them from growing up in an atmosphere of infidelity, licentiousness, and apostate Christianity!

Some other subjects of great importance were discussed in the Assembly. One of these was the relation of the deacons to the trustees in a congregation; another was the relation of the deacons to the elders or session. It appeared that some of our congregations were in great trouble, from the want of clear definitions or precedents upon these subjects. An able Committee

was appointed to report to the next Assembly upon them; and this report we shall not attempt to forestall by any discussion of them now.

GENERAL REMARKS.

We cannot close this hasty review of the proceedings of the Assembly without a remark or two of a general nature. We believe that it was the unanimous opinion of brethren who had attended Assemblies before, that they had never attended a pleasanter meeting. There was no debate of the highest order. Indeed, there was so little difference of opinion and of sentiment, that the body was in imminent danger of being dull. But it was felt that this was a very small evil in comparison with those melancholy breaches of Christian charity which sometimes result from earnest and vehement debate. The business was conducted with despatch, and yet without haste; with the seriousness becoming a court of Jesus Christ, composed of the representatives of an afflicted and anxious people, and yet with the manly cheerfulness becoming the servants of a King whose "kingdom cannot be moved."

To those who have ever had the good fortune to enjoy the hospitality of Baltimoreans, any remark on that subject is unnecessary. To those who have not, no words could convey an adequate conception of it. It was a common remark of the members of the Assembly of 1848, if memory does not deceive us, that they were able to endure even the "Skinner case," (a famous judicial case with which that Assembly was grievously afflicted,) inasmuch as they were sitting in Baltimore. What must the enjoyment of that hospitality have been, with no Skinner case or any other case to embitter it? And now that the tears and benefactions of those noble friends have been poured out for our suffering people through years of agony and blood, who of us will not bless them and teach his children to bless them?

CRITICAL NOTICES.

Lectures on the Epistle to the Hebrews. By the late WILLIAM LINDSAY, D. D., Professor of Exegetical Theology in the United Presbyterian Church. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co. 1867. 2 vols., 8vo.: pp. 406, 346.

This commentary on the Hebrews is a valuable contribution to our theological literature. The substance of it was delivered in the form of exegetical lectures to the theological students under the author's instruction, and is an excellent specimen of this species of prelection. It is not a bare explanation of the words of the Epistle, but sets forth its thoughts and arguments clearly, and for the most part successfully, with a happy blending of the popular with the critical commentary. The writer shows his familiarity not only with the ancient, but with the modern and more philological expositors, and his work is an important addition to the aid furnished by Owen, McLean, Stuart, and others, to the understanding of this noble Epistle, in which is shown, more than in any other portion of the Christian Scriptures, the truth of the distich of St. Augustine—

“Novum Testamentum in vetere latet.
Vetus Testamentum in Novo patet.”

The work appears under the editorship of the Rev. George Brooks; a part only of the manuscript being prepared for the press by the author before his death. A closer attention to the commentary of Delitzsch, which has so greatly enriched the notes of Alford on this Epistle, would have added, perhaps, to the value of this. Dr. Lindsay succeeded the Rev. John Brown, D. D.—whose commentaries on the First Epistle of Peter, the Epistle to the Romans, and the Discourses of Christ, are so well known—as Professor of Exegetical Theology to the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland.

Spiritual Progress, or Instruction in the Divine Life of the Soul:

Intended for such as are desirous to count all things but loss that they may win Christ. Edited by James W. Metcalf. New York: Published by M. W. Dodd, No. 506 Broadway. 1867. 12 mo., pp. 348.

If it could be made a penal offence for any mystic to quote Fenelon or Madame Guyon, the Christian world would receive a double benefit: their wise and precious things would not be used to commend subtle error, but would be winnowed of it; and sounder writers would no longer be afraid to employ the eloquence, beauty, nice discriminations, and admirable uses of Scripture, with which they abound, for the delight and instruction of the Church.

Now, one reads them with an uneasy vigilance, an almost painfully interrogatory mind; as asking continually, Is this true, as it stands, or only plausible? Is this truth shaped right, or *cut* ingeniously, to make a close join with falsehood? Where does this cease to be earnestness, and become extravagance? Can I use this or that noble paragraph, without danger of giving some mind a twist, from which it may never recover?

Mysticism is not a religion; nor is it a product of Christianity, for which Christianity is responsible. It is an *alloy*. It is produced by the misapplication of certain powers of the mind to certain fundamental religious ideas. It is the highest thought of Brahminism. It was the grandest hope of Platonism. It exercised the ingenuity of Philo and the Platonizing Jews. It entered the Church as one of the most dangerous and persuasive elements of Gnosticism. It blended with the visions of the alchemists. And it was almost the whole religion of the German transcendentalists.

Looked at philosophically—*i. e.*, with reference to its cause and nature—it may be described as the opposite pole to a hard, over-doctrinal type of religion, and a natural offset from it. It is not a solution of doctrine in sentiment; rather a dissolution. Doctrine ceases to be of consequence, and feeling, of certain sorts, becomes everything.

The radical fallacy which underlies Christian mysticism is,

that individuality is sin. And if we confine this allegation to Christian mysticism, it is because the idea of sin is peculiar to the Christian religion and its dependent forms of thought.

Common sense and every healthful instinct agree that God has made *beings*, and not mere *forms*. He did not create vessels into which *his* life should be poured, but living creatures. The relation we sustain to *him* is not that of cups of river water to the river from which they are drawn. It is like that of mountain springs to the sun, that draws their streams from the unseen ocean, and guides them by the wind, and bestows them upon the earth, and irradiates them with his glory, as they return to the sea. The difference between God and man is not a difference of degree only, but a difference in kind.

Now, mysticism contradicts the plain truth. It deplores every trace of a living human will. It forbids pleasure in things that please, except on the ground of their being sent from God; and as this is equally true of things that hurt, it consistently endeavors to ignore any distinction between pleasure and pain. And it seeks, as the one only good thing, absorption into God.

This pantheistic delusion, ignoring or openly contemning the logical faculty on the one hand, and renouncing a wholesome human individuality on the other, has lost in them the two great safeguards of truth and duty, and slips down into various subtle and tenacious forms of infidelity. It is vitally connected with that vast "spiritualistic" heresy and imposture, into which, as into a gulf, so many thousands have thrown themselves, and in which they are floundering amid follies and vices they once despised.

But, supposing no worse error than itself to be born of mysticism, it is evident that in many, who suppose themselves to be successful in their efforts after this sort of exaltation, it must breed pride—that cloudy sort of Pharisaism which takes refuge in pious phrases and humble professions, and cheats itself chiefly, if not entirely; and, on the other hand, the more honest souls, who are ensnared into accepting the system, but fail to realise its delusive hopes, are cast down in an equally unfounded despair and self-condemnation on wrong grounds.

But perhaps, for the mass of readers, the most serious wrong done them is in the misuse and perversion of almost the whole circle of religious and biblical language. The whole wealth of the language has been taxed for expressions which would convey the glorious, arduous, unearthly conceptions of our religion. They are sanctified from within by the matter they convey, and clothed from without in reverence by the associations of thought, feeling, and history, in which they have been held. Into this rich treasury the mystical writers have intruded, and have misapplied these terms; not, perhaps, in their grammatical, but certainly in their established, signification. One who weighs what he reads becomes conscious of a tendency to mental vertigo, through the welter and fluid mislocation of words; while those who read without weighing, and are imaginatively disposed, walk in a charmed haze, a pious romanticism, which Paul certainly never calculated upon when he called us "children of the day."

The volume before us, which has given occasion to these remarks, contains little that is new to American readers, unless the "Spiritual Maxims" of Lacombe be new. We confess we have not read them all. As Rowland Hill long ago said, "It is not necessary to eat a whole joint to know that it is tainted." And the few extracts which follow will suffice to show that this is tainted, and not fit for Christians' food: (the Italics are ours)—

"1. To rob God of nothing, to refuse him nothing, *to require of him nothing*—this is great perfection. (Compare John xv. 16; xvi. 23, 24.)

"2. In the commencement of the spiritual life, our hardest task is to bear with our neighbors; in its progress, with ourselves; and in its end, with God."

"3. *He that regards self only with horror, is beginning to be the delight of God.*"

"12. The ray of the creature is derived from the sun of the divinity; it cannot, however, be separated from it; and if its dependence upon *its divine principle* is essential, its union is not less so."

"11. It is a rare gift to discover an indescribable something, *which is above grace and nature; which is not God, but which suffers no intermediate between God and us.* It is a pure and

unmixed emanation of a created being, who is immediately connected with the Uncreated Original, from whom he proceeds."

This is certainly enough of *that* joint.

The typography of the book is the very neatest, as Mr. Dodd's of late has uniformly been.

The Old Roman World: The Grandeur and Failure of its Civilisation. By JOHN LORD, LL.D. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1867. 605 pages, crown-octavo.

This book is entitled to the praise of complete success. The author set before him a great aim, and he has worthily and nobly accomplished it. It was no light task, especially after Gibbon and Merivale, to portray the glory and decadence of the Græco-Roman civilisation. Yet, in a single volume, Dr. Lord has done this with sufficient fulness and eminent ability. The opening sentence of the introduction has the bold, defiant ring of Tacitus and Macaulay: "I propose to describe the greatness and the misery of the old Roman world; nor is there anything in history more suggestive and instructive." No one who has heard the lectures of this brilliant *litterateur* needs the information that the purpose here expressed is executed in this volume in the most thorough and delightful manner. The book has all the value of succinct and compendious epitome, and symmetrical comprehension, and all the racy charm of telling story, graphic paraphrase, shrewd comment, brief word-painting, and fervid vehemence. The style has such a *vivida vis* about it, that the reader is led captive by it to the end. The interest excited, especially in the biographical and philosophical parts, is sometimes almost poignant. The work is comprised in fourteen chapters, which embrace the following topics: The Conquests of the Romans; The Material Grandeur and Glory of the Roman Empire; The Wonders of Ancient Rome; Art in the Roman Empire; The Roman Constitution; Roman Jurisprudence; Roman Literature; Grecian Philosophy; Scientific Knowledge among the Romans; Internal Condition of the Roman Empire; The Fall of the Empire; The Reasons why the Conservative Influences of Pagan Civilisation did not Arrest the Ruin of the

Roman World; Why Christianity did not Arrest the Ruin of the Roman Empire; The Legacy of the Early Church to Future Generations.

Each of these topics is handled with the breadth, ease, and vigor of the master in each of the departments that is touched upon. The driest chapter in the book—the one on the ancient remains, the temples, bridges, aqueducts, forums, basilikas, amphitheatres, etc., etc.—is by no means devoid of solid attractions, especially to persons who, like most of our Southern readers, do not know the road to Forsyth and Hilliard. The chapter on art recalls those rapt discourses on Michael Angelo, Dante, and the mediæval builders, to which some of us listened when we were boys. A single quotation will give a general view of the author's plan:

“Great writers have written ingenious treatises, like Burke, Alison, and Stewart. Beauty, according to Plato, is the contemplation of mind; Leibnitz maintained it consists in perfection; Blondel asserted it was harmonic proportions; Peter Leigh speaks of it as the music of the eye. Yet everybody understands what beauty is, and that it is derived from nature, agreeable to the purest models which nature presents. Such was the ideal of Phidias. Such it was to the minds of the Greeks, who united every advantage, physical and mental, for the perfection of art. Nor could art have been so wonderfully developed, had it not been for the influence which the great poets, orators, dramatists, historians, and philosophers exercised on the inspiration of the artists. Phidias, being asked how he conceived the idea of his Olympian Jupiter, answered by repeating a passage of Homer. We can scarcely conceive of the enthusiasm which the Greeks exhibited in the cultivation of art. Hence it has obtained an ascendancy over that of all other nations. Roman art was the continuation of the Grecian. The Romans appreciated and rewarded Grecian artists. They adopted their architecture, their sculpture, and their paintings; and though art never attained the estimation and dignity in Rome that it did in Greece, it still can boast of a great development. But inasmuch as all the great models were Grecian, and appropriated and copied by the Romans—inasmuch as the great wonders of the “Eternal City” were made by the Greeks—we cannot treat of Roman art in distinction from the Grecian. And as I wish to show simply the triumph of Pagan genius in the realm of art,

and most of the immortal creations of the great artists were transported to Rome and advanced Rome, it is within my province to go where they were originally found.

“*Tu, regere imperio populos, Romane, memento!
Hæ tibi erunt artes.*” P. 145.

There is one other passage that amply evinces the writer's eloquence and pathos:

“Art, when true and exalted, as it sometimes is and always should be, has its end in itself. Like virtue, it is its own reward. Michael Angelo worked, preoccupied and rapt, without the stimulus of even praise—even as Dante lived in the visions to which his imagination gave form and reality. Art is therefore self-sustained, unselfish, lofty. It is the soul going forth triumphant over external circumstances—jubilant and melodious even in poverty and neglect—rising above the evils of life in its absorbing cultivation of ideal loveliness. The fortunate accidents of earth are nothing to the true artist, striving to reach his ideal of excellence—no more than carpets and chairs are to a great woman pining for sympathy or love. And it is only when there is this soul-longing to reach the excellence it has conceived for itself alone, that great works have been produced. The sweetest strains of music sometimes come from women where no one listens to their melodies. Nor does a great artist seek or need commiseration, if ever so unfortunate in worldly circumstances. He may be sad and sorrowful, but only in the profound seriousness of superior knowledge, in that isolation to which all genius is doomed.” P. 143.

He passes under rapid review the greatness and beauty of Grecian art, the Egyptian obelisks and pyramids, the Babylonian structures, the Tyrian monuments, the early Doric monuments, the colossal statues of antiquity, the principles of ancient art, the lives of the sculptors and painters, their supremacy, etc., etc.

The chapters on Roman jurisprudence and the Roman Constitution are equally full and thorough-going. The chapter on Roman literature is superb. It is probably the finest compression of what is most worth knowing on this subject that is extant in the English language. The chapter is not unduly long, and yet no important name is omitted, and each name is exhibited with a degree of fulness and a fascinating warmth of

eulogy and nervous incident, commensurate with its deserts. Take, for instance, what he says about Æschylus:

“The great creator of the Greek drama was Æschylus, born at Eleusis, 525 B. C. It was not till the age of forty-one that he gained his prize. Sixteen years afterwards, defeated by Sophocles, he quitted Athens in the highest honor, and his pieces were frequently reproduced upon the stage. It was not so much his object to amuse an audience as to instruct and elevate it. He combined religious feeling with lofty moral sentiment. And he had unrivalled power over the realm of astonishment and terror. ‘At his summons,’ says Sir Walter Scott, ‘the mysterious and tremendous volume of destiny, in which is inscribed the doom of gods and men, seemed to display its leaves of iron before the appalled spectators; the more than mortal voices of Deities, Titans, and departed heroes, were heard in awful conference; heaven bowed, and its divinities descended; earth yawned and gave up the pale spectres of the dead, and yet more undefined and ghastly forms of those infernal deities who struck horror into the gods themselves.’ His imagination dwells in the loftiest regions of the old mythology of Greece; his tone is always pure and moral, though stern and harsh. He appeals to the most violent passions, and he is full of the boldest metaphors. In sublimity, he has never been surpassed. He was in poetry what Phidias and Michael Angelo were in art. The critics say that his sublimity of diction is sometimes carried to an extreme, so that his language often becomes inflated. His characters are sublime, like his sentiments: they were gods and heroes of colossal magnitude. His religious views were Homeric, and he sought to animate his countrymen to deeds of glory, as it became one of the generals who fought at Marathon to do. He was an unconscious genius, and worked like Homer, without a knowledge of artistical laws. He was proud and impatient, and his poetry was religious rather than moral. He wrote seventy plays, of which only seven are extant; but these are immortal, among the greatest creations of human genius, like the dramas of Shakespeare. He died in Sicily, in the sixty-ninth year of his age. The principal English translations of his plays are by Potter, Harford, and Medwin.” (The author refers in a foot note to Müller and Bode—histories of Greek literature.)

The final chapters are grand, though, from the nature of the subject, not so picturesque, and in them, as also in the masterly chapter on the Grecian philosophy, the writer discloses a trace

of the speculative faculty which is so marked in Grote. He rapidly chalks off a picture of Rome's fall. Here, of course, he chiefly follows Gibbon and his successors. But why did not Paganism have within itself resources enough to arrest the ruin? In reply, the author shows conclusively that there is nothing conservative in a mere human creation; and that by unaided reason civilisation can only rise to a certain fixed height, which, in the case of Rome, had been attained. He discusses *in extenso* the virtues of the primitive races, and the decline of their successive civilisations. The virtues of primitive life were inadequate and were transient. Christianity is the only conservative power. The Bible is the only elixir of the nations. Primitive life indeed favors virtue. But life cannot always be primitive; and with development and prosperity come luxury, vice, decay, ruin. We are first dazzled by the spectacle of military strength. But the legions became degenerate. Nothing could exceed the hopeless imbecility of the army under the emperors. The military emperors gazed with despair on the rally of barbaric forces. The elaborate and complicated constitution of the Romans was subverted at the Rubicon. The forms in which Cato and Cicero had rejoiced were afterwards a dead letter. There were abortive attempts by the good and able emperors. But Hadrian, the Antonines, Theodosius, struggled in vain. Roman jurisprudence survived the constitution, but in time became corrupt, and Cyprian, Chrysostom, Augustine, turn with disgust from the practice of the law. Art, literature, philosophy—everything—*failed*. This Dr. Lord exhibits in accurate particulars. He then cries:

“And what is the logical inference—the deduction which we are compelled to draw from this mournful history of the failure of all those grand trophies of the civilisation which man has made? Can it be other than this: that man cannot save himself; that nothing which comes from him, whether of genius or will, proves to be a conservative force from generation to generation; that it will be perverted, however true, or beautiful, or glorious, because ‘men love darkness rather than light?’ All that is truly conservative, all that grows brighter and brighter with the progress of ages, all that is indestructible and of permanent

VOL. XIX., NO. 3—10.

beauty, must come from a power higher than man, whether supernatural or not—must be a revelation to man from Heaven, assisted by divine grace. It must be divine truth in conjunction with divine love. It must be a light from him who made us, and which alone baffles the power of evil.”

We have no space in which even to abridge the author's satisfactory but mournful answer to the question, why Christianity did not arrest this work of wholesale ruin. The sum of it is, that the earliest Christianity was either too young or too late to save the empire. It was also mixed with much that was evil. It soon itself needed salvation. Besides, there was a providential necessity for the overthrow. The last chapter is of gold.

A Constitutional View of the Late War Between the States: Its Causes, Character, Conduct, and Results. Presented in a Series of Colloquies at Liberty Hall. By ALEXANDER H. STEPHENS. In Two Volumes. Vol. I. National Publishing Company, Philadelphia, Pa.; Cincinnati, Ohio; Atlanta, Ga.; Richmond, Va. Pp. 654, 8vo.

We are glad to see this dissertation on the principles of the federative republic founded by our forefathers. Mr. Stephens's first volume is confined to this part of his great subject, necessarily the basis of any rational interpretation of the philosophy of its causes, progression, and ultimate results. For this initial task, he is admirably qualified. We are rejoiced that he has undertaken the work and accomplished it so well. No more suitable champion of the logic of our lost cause could have been found. The cold caution of his intellect, the warmth and tenacity of his convictions when once formed, the curious antagonism between the sympathies of his imagination and the sympathies of his heart, his well-known almost neutral position at the great crisis of the causes and consequences of which he writes, were well calculated to assure all men, not utterly blinded by passion and prejudice, that all a clear head, ample knowledge, long study, and dispassionate reasoning, could do to attain truth in the discussion of these vital first principles of our Government, might be safely looked for in the promised work of Alexander Stephens. In view of the fact that, though a firm believer in

the right of secession, he was an equally firm disbeliever in its policy or necessity, and that he yielded to his strong sense of the paramount duty of allegiance to his State and to natural sympathy with the fate of his people, in spite of his convictions of the practical madness of the measure taken; in view of the fact that the cause in which he so reluctantly embarked has proved for the present a failure, and that certainly no worldly advantage is to be gained by defending its logical symmetry and historic invulnerability; in view of the fact that the book can be the campaign book of no national party now in vigorous life in this land of anarchy—the work before us is eminently suited to speak to the minds of such calm thinkers as sit aloof from the stormy hurtling of party strife and the base self-seeking of a period which all future ages of political purity—if we may look for any such—will abhor with unspeakable loathing. No sane mind perusing these pages of most serene disputation can resist the conclusion that the arrangement of facts and the arguments based upon them are the work of scrupulous honesty of intellect as well as heart. That such a work should exert very great influence at this time, or even get a sober and thoughtful reading from the corrupt and shallow minds tossed and driven through the present anarchy by the rage of party strife, we are not optimists enough to expect. That it will ever teach a generation whose notions of republicanism, vague at best from the beginning, have long since been swallowed by the voracious maw of democracy, is almost more than we dare hope. But it matters little whether the book does present good or not; it is always a good deed to put truth before the world; and truth is a seed which God takes care of, and in good time the harvest will be given from all that has been sown, in some shape or other.

The form of the work is that of a series of colloquies. It is decidedly the best mode of discussing a subject which is of historic origin, has many ramifications, and has been the field of much practical controversy. The Socratic system has indeed been used in all enlightened ages with great effect. It is, perhaps, best known to the present generation in that admirable model of dialectic art, Henry Rogers's *Eclipse of Faith*—more

attractive in form, though, indeed, not more acute and eloquent, than Pascal's *Provincial Letters*. Mr. Stephens has not, it is true, put very wise or subtle objections into the lips of his Northern interlocutors. But perhaps we may regard this blemish on his production as a work of art as inevitable, so very deficient in sense or truth have been the published apologies of the consolidation party for the faith that is, or ought to be, in them. Even their boasted Motley makes a sad bungle of it.

The topics treated of in these colloquies are few in number. They are discussed with too much thoroughness to permit discursive argumentation, or even illustration, on any very extended scale. The nature of the Government of the United States previous to its subjection to the despotism of a faction looking to the army for support; the inquiry into the claims of the federal as opposed to those of the consolidation theory; the logical and historical basis of the doctrine of secession; the circumstances warranting the use of that extreme measure on the part of the Southern States; and the relative temper of the opposing sections during the period of Union—constitute all the points to which this dissertation is devoted. Mr. Stephens has handled them well. We have examined the work carefully, and take pleasure in expressing our conviction that the discussion is exhaustive of all essential facts and arguments which can be advanced on these subjects, the statement is clear and impressive, and the work fully worthy of the able mind and earnest spirit of the statesman to whose present leisure we owe it. It is well that such scholarly works, wrought of carefully consecutive argument, fortified by the most accurate grouping of facts, and made clear to common apprehension by the easy and unconstrained directness of statement due to the colloquial form Mr. Stephens has wisely adopted, should be opposed in good time to Bancroft and the other Northern falsifiers of history.

We do not know what may be the spirit of the second volume—yet to be published, perhaps yet to be written—or how far we may be able to approve Mr. Stephens's deliverances upon the facts of our late great struggle for liberty. His strictures upon the policy of the Administration may possibly displease

many, who, like ourselves, are of opinion that, on the whole, Mr. Davis and his Cabinet showed wise and prudent statesmanship, which posterity will better appreciate than the present generation can. That noble army of devoted men, who won such glorious victories over hostile nature as well as over an enemy vastly superior numerically; that yet nobler army of devoted women, who, at home, endured worse than physical trials—he cannot fail to do justice to, so far as language of mortal man can portray a heroism the very doing of which exalts humanity beyond even the highest ideal the merely speculative mind of man can form. Whatever may be the merits or defects of the promised second volume, we cordially commend this first one. It deals only, as we have said, with the principles which impelled the Southern States to their grand historic movement in vindication of the vital doctrine lying at the root of all federative union—that is, right of withdrawal so soon as the union becomes oppressive. It deals only with these matters, and it handles them well.

We had intended giving one or two extracts; but on reflection we feel that it would be unfair to Mr. Stephens to break the continuity of his argument. Such books should be read as a whole, and not in broken fragments.

The Life of Jefferson Davis. By FRANK H. ALFRIEND, late Editor of the *Southern Literary Messenger*. Cincinnati and Chicago, Caxton Publishing House; Philadelphia, Richmond, Atlanta, and St. Louis, National Publishing Co. 1868. Pp. 645, 8vo.

Glorious as is the record of this book, it is a sad one for those to read who loved the cause which has so lately gone down in blood and tears. But we are glad to see it, even though it helps to keep alive the bitterness of buried hopes. It is due to the pure principles battled for in vain by a confederation now no more, that the history of that struggle should be kept ever fresh in the hearts of those whose fathers waged it, and that those principles should be again and again reasserted in the telling of their first fate. It is due to the noble heroes, who, with the

steadfastness of the highest manliness, and the faith and enthusiasm of the purest chivalry, fought and suffered for the fallen cause, that the memory of their deeds and their devotion should be kept alive. It is due to the high heart and princely nature of that great statesman who guided the destinies of the short-lived commonwealth whose fall has perhaps forever laid in ruins the dream of a pure republic, that the story of that brilliant half decade which crowned his noble career should be told in reverent words and with the appreciative glow of honest enthusiasm. This Mr. Alfriend has done; and, whatever may be the minor faults of the work, we thank him in the name of the dead past which this groaning present so deeply regrets, for the spirit in which he has done his work. It is no small good that he has done in presenting to the world so perfect a picture of that great spirit, Jefferson Davis—a man with nobleness of purpose, loftiness of principle, and earnestness of conviction almost out of place in a flippant and scoffing age, were it not that so many true Paladins were at his side when the great strife began. Alas! the best and the noblest of his compeers are under the soil, or, like him, driven into powerless silence. But such men do not live in vain. Moral forces, once exerted, are no more lost than are physical forces. Complex as may be the process of their dynamic energy, and subtle as may be each separate evolution, the ultimate product is sure to be a mighty fact, crowning some grand historical cycle. But the highest and grandest principles are ever the slowest in their development; and it should be enough for those who have been called to contend for great truths that they have had that honor, let the issue for that time be what it may. One of the worthiest lessons which such a life as this teaches, is the grandeur of sustaining truth for its own sake; for, though evil is so apt to triumph in this sin-stained world, devoted maintenance of right is its own reward, and to have such glorious memories in the past is worth ten times the woes we suffer in the present. Thanks to the unrelenting spirit of wrong, in its temporary triumphs it never fails to wreak its vengeance on those who have opposed it, and thus by persecution it is sure to hallow for human sympathies the cause it has

trampled under foot. Mr. Davis, in his own person, has been a signal instance of this invariably short-sighted policy of furious and implacable factions; and we rejoice for him and for the cause in which he labored and for which he suffered, that it has had so illustrious a representative in its ruin as well as in its proudest period. We quote, to show the writer's comprehension of Mr. Davis, his summary of the distinctive features of the late President's genius and character:

"The peculiar charm of Mr. Davis is the perfect poise of his faculties; an almost exact adjustment of qualities; of indomitable energy and winning grace; heroic courage and tender affection; strength of character and almost excessive compassion; of calculating judgment and knightly sentiment; acute penetration and analysis; comprehensive perception; laborious habits, and almost universal knowledge."

Best of all, we may add, he is a true Christian gentleman. Some day in the time to come, the world will justly appreciate him and the principles he and the people who loved him well strove to uphold; and the lost cause of 1865 will be won for another generation and in other forms.

The book is in the main well written; and there are two things we especially like in the author's tone. One of these is the temperate way in which he handles many well-disposed men who were honestly opposed to Mr. Davis and his policy, while he shows no weakly sentimental tenderness for those whose violent and acrimonious hostility to our chosen leader so materially damaged the cause for which we were contending. His hearty appreciation of the late President of our Confederacy suffers no diminution from such fairness and just discrimination. We also like the justice and honesty of his admission that our long-suffering people were not to be blamed for the depression of spirits under which they sunk towards the close of the struggle. It is cheap pluck, now that all is over, to revile the gallant and noble race, who had endured so much and so long, for their final despondency. In those sombre days when ruin pressed near and the air was thick with signs of the coming doom, there were few whose souls still moved calmly on in the light of hope; and, without fear of contradiction, we affirm that these few are now the

very last to utter one word of reproach to the heart-sick thousands whose faith went down in that hour of gloom. It is only the infamous disgraces to our race and country, who never had done their duty, or who actually betrayed the cause for which we struggled, whom we brand as base and despicable. We quote with pleasure the sad but gentle language of Mr. Alfriend in reference to this period of despondency:

“Only a hasty and ill-informed judgment could condemn the Southern people for the decay of its spirit in this last stage of the war. No people ever endured with more heroism the trials and privations incidental to their situation. Yet these sacrifices appeared to have been to no purpose; a cruel and inexorable fate seemed to pursue them, and to taunt them with the futility of exertion to escape its decree. Victories, which had amazed the world, and again and again stunned a powerful adversary, and which the South felt, under ordinary circumstances, should have secured the reward of independence, were recurred to only as making more bitter the chagrin of the present. Previous defeats—at the time seeming fatal—had been patiently encountered and bravely surmounted, so long as victory appeared to offer a reward which should compensate for the sacrifice necessary to obtain it. But now even the hope of victory had almost ceased to be a source of encouragement, since any probable success would only tend to a postponement of the inevitable catastrophe, which, perhaps, it would be better to invite than to defer.”

At the same time that we agree with the author most cordially in taking this gentle view of the desponding temper of our people when the worst came fairly before them, we must ever rejoice that our great leader, fully worthy in that dark hour of the proud name he had won, and in true accordance with his high nature, hoped on to the very last, and would not give up the cause he represented until every army in the field had surrendered. He who was the last to believe our cause lost was the fit person for its enemies to exalt in their blindness as its martyr. It is well, now that the soil covers so much of what was best and noblest in the South, that this heroic nature should be thrust forward by hate and love alike, as the truest representative of all we once revered and held worthy of pride and honor.

SOUTHERN
PRESBYTERIAN DEPOSITORY,
COLUMBIA, S. C.

ESTABLISHED, JULY, 1865.

THIS DEPOSITORY was established with the design of furnishing a point from which persons residing in this and the adjacent States could readily procure

SUNDAY-SCHOOL

AND OTHER

RELIGIOUS BOOKS.

All the *BOOKS, TRACTS, ETC.*, published or recommended by the EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF PUBLICATION at Richmond, Va. are kept on hand and sold at the *retail price* of the Publishers.

In addition to these, a general assortment of

THEOLOGICAL AND RELIGIOUS WORKS,

And also of

SCHOOL BOOKS, STATIONERY, ETC.,

Will be kept for sale at very reasonable rates.

Large additions have recently been made to the Stock on hand.

When the amount of an order is \$20.00 or upwards, the package will be sent to any Express Office in South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, or North Carolina, *free of cost* to the purchaser. And a proportionate reduction will be made on packages sent to more distant States.

A liberal deduction will be made to ministers, and to teachers and others who buy to sell again.

Orders should be always accompanied with the money.

Address,

SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN DEPOSITORY.
Columbia, S. C.

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW

Is published Quarterly, in January, April, July, and October.

TERMS.—Three Dollars per Volume, payable in advance. Single numbers, One Dollar.

✎ All Communications should be addressed to the Rev. JAMES WOODROW, Columbia, S. C. No subscription discontinued until a special order is given, and all arrearages are paid, or after the first number of a volume is published.

✎ A few complete sets of the back volumes can be had at Three Dollars per volume. Single back volumes, when they can be furnished without breaking a set, Two Dollars per volume.

✎ 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, one dollar for each new subscriber.

✎ Subscribers changing their Post Office are requested to give immediate notice of the same to the Publisher, or their REVIEW will be sent to their former office.

✎ The Editors of the SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW think it is due to themselves and to their subscribers to announce that they do not endorse in every particular what is uttered in their pages. Each author is responsible for the views he expresses. This is a matter of convenience where there are minor differences between editors themselves, or between them and their brethren. Free discussion, too, is important to the interests of truth, if kept within just limits. These limits must be strictly observed. Editors would be worthy of censure, should they allow opinions to be expressed, subversive of any doctrine of the gospel; nor would it be becoming to allow their own views, or those of their contributors, to be rudely attacked in their own pages.

Their desire is, to make the REVIEW worthy of the Presbyterian Church in the United States—the representative of its views and its literature, the means of disseminating sound doctrine, and a stimulus to the genius and talent of our ministers and people.

THE SOUTHERN
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW,

CONDUCTED BY

AN ASSOCIATION OF MINISTERS

IN

COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA.

Vol. XIX. OCTOBER, MDCCLXVIII.

No. 4.

COLUMBIA, S. C.
PRINTED AT THE OFFICE OF THE REVIEW.

1868.

CONTENTS.

ARTICLE	PAGE
I. The History of the Spiritual Kingdom. By the Rev. JAMES B. RAMSEY, D. D., Lynchburg, Va., -	465
II. The Attitude of the Ancient Mind with respect to Truth, - - - - -	502
III. The Scriptural and Divine Right for Using Mechanical as well as Vocal Instruments in the Worship of God. By the Rev. THOMAS SMYTH, D. D., Charleston, S. C., - - - - -	517
IV. The Great Commission. By the Rev. JOHN S. GRASTY, Shelbyville, Ky., - - - - -	556
V. Critical Notices, - - - - -	588
1. Smyth's Ecclesiastical Catechism. 2. Scott's Centurions of the Gospel. 3. Hart's In the School Room. 4. Keith's Lectures on Calvinistic Doctrines. 5. Bonar's Light and Truth. 6. Baird's History of the New School.	

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XIX.—NO. 4.

OCTOBER, MDCCCLXVIII.

ARTICLE I.

THE HISTORY OF THE SPIRITUAL KINGDOM.

In its opening pages, the Bible gives us the account of Paradise lost; and man forsaken of his God. It closes with a glowing view in the future of Paradise restored, and God again dwelling with man on the renovated earth. The whole period between is filled up with the history of the mediatorial kingdom. There was a time when this form of the divine administration did not exist, and the great and holy God took delight in immediate intercourse with man here on earth. There will come a time when he will again do so; but not until every vestige of sin's dominion is wiped out, and death itself, the last enemy, destroyed, and all things made new. This is the mighty work of the Mediator King, the God-man, Jesus Christ. This is the grand design of his kingdom. The mercy of God founded it for the redemption of our fallen race and the vindication of his own honor; the wisdom, power, and love of the Son are carrying it forward to the final consummation. Then again God shall dwell with man as at his creation; and the Lamb, his mediatorial

VOL. XIX., NO. 4—1.

kingdom being ended, shall dwell forever on the peaceful throne of his redeemed Church as their eternal Head and bond of union with the Godhead, and God shall be all in all.

Our design in this article is rapidly to sketch the history of this kingdom, as we gather it from these inspired records of it.

I. ORIGINAL KINGDOM.

This is God's world. He made it for his own glory. To this the headship of a holy intelligent agent, ruling in and over it, was essential. When, therefore, all the rest of this lower creation was completed, and he was about to create man, it was with the expressed purpose that man should be his vicegerent. "Let him have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth." In this royal position Adam was installed as soon as created. For him and his race, the earth was prepared and adapted. He was specially fitted to rule over it, so as to gather from all its changes, and processes, and creatures, a revenue of praise for its Creator. Without him, the world was all a dumb and worthless thing. This headship was the link that bound it to its Creator.

Perfect loyalty to his God was the one necessary condition on which this high honor was to be retained and this high function discharged. As he was God's constituted king and representative, obedience to God was of course absolutely essential to his own authority and dominion.

II. MEDIATORIAL REIGN, IN TYPE AND PREPARATION.

1. *The Kingdom Lost.*

But on the very first assault of the tempter, he disobeyed. At once he fell from his throne. The whole inferior creation rose up in rebellion against him. The earth and the air and the waters, the sun and the moon and the stars, and the whole animal world, cast off his authority. Instead of uniting in a universal ministry of life, they all began to scatter the seeds of disease and death. Since then it has been with painful toil and constant conflict that he has been able to hold the powers and

forces of the natural world in such a degree of subjection and control as is necessary to his own existence. According to his own fatal choice in listening to the voice of Satan, rather than to the command of God, he himself was given up to be Satan's slave and drudge, to his own sore punishment and the glory of God's justice.

But though the creation was no longer in peaceful subjection to him, since he had failed to use it for his Creator's glory, it was inseparable from him. The world and man, being made for each other, must go together. Hence, in the Bible, the whole world is represented as a kingdom whose interests and agencies are employed against God, and Satan as its king. He is called "the god of this world," "the prince of this world," "the prince of the power of the air," "the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience." And "the creation" is represented as "made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same;" and therefore under "the bondage of corruption," so that "the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now."

2. *Its restoration required by the honor of God.*

Not so, however, could the Creator be despoiled of his glory. He could not suffer one of his own creatures to deprive him of the tribute of praise from his own creation, to triumph over the works of his own hands, and usurp the throne he had established for and given to another. It was essential to the full vindication of the Creator's glory and rights that not only *He* should still reign here and put down Satan's power and all opposition, but that man should reign. God's plan was not to be frustrated by the devil. And the apparent and temporary triumph of the foe was only in order to a brighter display of the divine perfections in the government of this world, and the advancement of its king to a far higher and more wonderful dominion than that which he originally possessed. That God may be fully vindicated and Satan utterly baffled, man must recover his forfeited dominion and again reign on the earth. But the justice of God must be first satisfied, and his holiness be manifested in the plan of such a restoration. It could not, therefore, be realised until

man's rebellion should be fully punished, the terrible consequences of disobedience displayed to all the universe, the frightful malignity of sin thus fully discovered, and a stop put forever to its ravages in the whole creation of God.

3. Its restoration promised.

At first, therefore, this restoration of the lost dominion could be only promised. This was done. With the sentence that followed Adam's first transgression, was an accompanying promise of deliverance; and this promise of deliverance for man was appropriately given not to him directly, but involved in the sentence pronounced upon the serpent, and through him on the invisible tempter. That sentence was the utter destruction of his power, the complete overthrow of his usurped dominion over man, and that to be accomplished by man, by the seed of the woman. "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel."

In close connexion with this promise, explaining it and explained by it, God gave the institution of bloody sacrifices—thus teaching that this restoration of the kingdom and its blessings could only be through the blood of an atonement to be provided by God, such as would satisfy his justice and procure forgiveness.

But even the promise of God is of mighty efficacy. It checks the tide of ruin and the triumph of the tempter. It at once secures and brings down upon the earth and man a divine influence for salvation. Mark well the force of its language: "*I will put enmity between thee and the woman.*" It might seem as if the woman, by yielding to the tempter, had gone over entirely to the devil and carried her posterity with her, and united in a hearty alliance with him. And indeed so it must have been, had not God interfered, and by his grace arrested the progress of this Satanic usurpation. This he did, not only by making man bitterly to feel the sore miseries of his new alliance, but by the powerful operations of the Holy Spirit on the heart. This was the heavenly power let down by this promise from above upon the soul of man, to commence at once the work of his restora-

tion. It was here, on this field—the soul of man—that the kingdom was lost and that Satan triumphed, and here it must be regained. It was a spiritual defection that lost it; it is only by a spiritual restoration that it can be recovered. Here the great battle must be fought, and from hence Satan must be cast out, in order that his power as the god of this world may be destroyed.

The reestablishment, therefore, of the divine kingdom on the earth, the restoration of man to his lost dominion, must be essentially a spiritual work. It must consist in breaking up the alliance between man and Satan, in rescuing him from Satan's dominion and bringing back his soul to a hearty and holy allegiance to his God. The moment any man is thus brought back to God and becomes holy, Satan's power over him is gone; created things again become his ministering servants, and all things work together for his good. When, therefore, the race of man on earth shall become holy, the world must return to its original perfect submission to man, and man must reign as God's representative. The restoration then to man of his lost inheritance and dominion, which is the burden of the first promise and the sum of all promises, is involved in the restoration of holiness to man's heart—the restoration of man himself to the image of God.

4. The restoration commenced.

At once the struggle commenced between the grace of God in the heart of fallen man and the usurped dominion of Satan. Satan has never had undisputed possession. God has always put enmity between the woman's seed and the serpent, enough to testify that he had not utterly forsaken his world, nor entirely abandoned his creature, man, to the power of Satan.

On the one side has appeared the kingdom of Satan, of darkness, of all evil, manifesting itself in all the native tendencies of the soul, in the deep and fixed ungodliness that has ever pervaded all human pursuits, in the perversion of all the gifts of God to low, selfish, and wicked ends, and in the violence and strife and woe resulting. But there have also, on the other side, been manifested the interests of this promised kingdom of God,

in earnest resistance to the wickedness of the world, in faithful testimony to the truth and claims of God, in patient submission to his will and trust in his promises. In external appearance, this resistance to Satan's kingdom was very feeble, confined to very few, and those unsupported by the great powers of the world—despised, persecuted, and down-trodden. For it pleased God to leave the world very much to its own way, and to permit Satan to rule for its own just punishment, and to prove to man his own utter ruin and helplessness.

But in this very fewness and feebleness of those who adhered to the spiritual interests of the kingdom of God, appeared really the divine strength of this kingdom, and the evidence of the secret heavenly power that supported it. During the long antediluvian period—more than one-third of the whole time between the creation and Christ—this was especially manifest. That a mere handful of feeble men should thus stand up and contend for God and truth, unconquered and unconquerable, resisting the violence of power, the enticements of ease and pleasure and worldly wisdom, in the midst of and in defiance of a whole world of sinners all leagued against them, and they themselves originally of the same depraved nature, was a proof of the heavenly origin and mighty secret resources of that promised kingdom whose interests they supported, no less convincing than a similar resistance by large multitudes with great visible resources of power and wealth.

In Abel the martyr, and in Enoch the preacher, the spiritual influences and power of this kingdom of God struggling against the reign of Satan strikingly appeared. In the translation of the latter, the secret, invisible, and almighty power of that kingdom for salvation was gloriously displayed. But especially in Noah and his history did its external weakness and its secret invincible strength both appear—one man against the whole world. This led to the first and greatest outward judgment ever sent upon the kingdom of Satan.

5. The first utter external overthrow of Satan's kingdom.

Fiercely did the enmity rage; mightily did the foe prevail. The interests of the promised kingdom of God seemed about to

be overwhelmed, and with it all the true interests of man; for violence filled the earth. To mere human eyes, the triumph of Satan seemed to be complete. When it came to this—one godly man against a world in rebellion—it was time for God to work; and he did. At one stroke of his mighty hand, he swept away the proud antediluvian nations, and buried all their boasted civilisation, and arts, and wisdom, and power, that had filled the earth at once with the triumphs of genius and ungodliness, forever beneath the waters of the deluge. That one man, with his little family and the living creatures preserved with him in the ark—the sole representative of the spiritual kingdom of God—was left alone in the world. The visible power and kingdom of Satan was destroyed by a stroke in the very zenith of its triumphs.

Then the renovated earth is again given to man. But, it should be carefully observed, not to man as man, but to man as redeemed. The whole inspired narrative shows this. It was to Noah as the heir of the promised kingdom. Immediately after the bloody offerings with which he entered on his new and undisputed possessions, the whole earth, renewed and re-peopled by its inferior tribes of living creatures, is, by a covenant of which the bow in the cloud is made the symbol, secured to the delivered family as the representatives of the kingdom of God, and secured in answer to the accepted sacrifices that prefigured the great atonement.

But it very soon became manifest that man could not hold the earth for God; that even this representative family, so wonderfully delivered as being in the interests of the kingdom of God, were unfit to hold it. Satan had still a fearfully strong interest in them, as the testimony of God himself immediately after the flood declares: “The imagination of man’s heart is evil from his youth.” *No outward judgments, therefore, can cure it.* It is almost at once evident that the most awful terrors of God’s mightiest judgments had not restored to man the dominion he had lost; it had not crushed the serpent’s head, nor expelled him from the heart of man. In Noah’s own family, the evil breaks out—drawing down upon a portion of his seed the pro-

phetic curse; but accompanied with a promise of final triumph to another portion in covenant with Jehovah. "Blessed be the Lord God of Shem."

First Satanic combination of the world's power.

Rapidly the evil spreads, as if no curse had smitten it; and the kingdom of darkness again overshadows the earth. It boldly attempts to grasp all the power of the world, and concentrate it in one great universal monarchy. This was the daring attempt of the Babel builders, or rather of Satan through them, to baffle and overwhelm, by a great central despotism wielding all the power of the world, all the interests of the kingdom of God. Again, therefore, God interposes, confounds their language, distracts their counsels, and scatters the nations. The three families of Noah's sons are thus kept separate, and the fulfilment of God's purposes, which had been declared by Noah, in reference to his descendants, is secured, and the way prepared for a visible organisation to represent and defend the interests of his kingdom.

G. First outward organisation representing the kingdom of God.

Having thus, by the flood and the confusion of tongues, baffled the attempts of Satan to establish a visible universal kingdom in his interests, God now begins to lay the foundations of a separate, organised government, that shall stand forth before the world as a representative and defender of the interests of this promised kingdom. This work, however, is one that courses through many generations, from Abraham to Moses, and provides for a vast and varied display of the malignity of that dominion to which man had voluntarily yielded himself when he dropped from his hand the sceptre God had given him. It commences in the calling and separation of Abraham, and the covenant made with him; and it is carried on in the training of his descendants through four hundred and thirty years. This long period of preparation for the first visible organised representation of the kingdom of God restored on earth, indicates the vast magnitude and glory of that visible Church or kingdom of which it was the first definite form, and which, in the lapse of coming ages, was to be built upon its foundations. Then, in the establishment of this visible kingdom, comes another terrible over-

throw of the powers of the kingdom of darkness, in the destruction of Egypt, its mighty representative and the enemy and oppressor of God's chosen people. This was, too, not only another most glorious deliverance of his people, but it was a deliverance the same in principle as the final one promised, and strikingly foreshadowing it. It was a redemption from a cruel bondage to Satanic power, and resulted in the actual establishment of a visible kingdom and the possession of the promised inheritance.

Of this kingdom, Jehovah himself is the immediate King, dwelling in the midst of it by a visible symbol of his presence, enacting all its laws, and worshipped in ordinances strikingly impressive to the eye and of deep spiritual import. These ordinances were merely the embodiment in visible forms of those truths, principles, and forces by which the lost inheritance and dominion should be regained. And this visible kingdom was formed to preserve and protect these truths, and to prepare for the full establishment of the true kingdom and the coming and actual reign of the woman's promised seed. At the same time, its purely spiritual design and the spiritual nature of its blessings were most prominently and unmistakably set forth in the wonderful and the truly glorious distinction, that its only King was the unseen, though ever-present, Jehovah. He, in fulfilment of his promise, settled them in the land given to their forefathers, destroying the heathen to make room for them. He preserved and disciplined them there in their successive struggles with the organised powers of the world and the still more dangerous secret influences of the kingdom of Satan. Such a palpable, glorious manifestation as Israel had of the presence, power, and gracious protection of the omnipotent spiritual Jehovah, was enough, if any visible and earthly manifestation could have done it, to have begotten a most joyful confidence, and unswerving allegiance to him, and to have raised them far beyond the reach of either the fear or the allurements of the nations around them. Thus forcibly does Moses, in his last words—his mind all aglow with the view of Israel's high privileges—describe them: "The eternal God is thy refuge, and underneath are the everlasting

arms; and he shall thrust out the enemy from before thee; and shall say, Destroy them. Israel then shall dwell in safety alone....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!"

7. *It receives an earthly head at the request of the people.*

But, strange to say, this, their highest glory and distinction, they after a time positively and persistently rejected. In Israel's whole history, there is no more amazing fact than this; and never has there been any development of human depravity and Satan's power more striking, or that showed more fully the extreme difficulty of establishing among men a spiritual kingdom of God. In the time of Samuel, the people persisted in the desire to have a human king over them, that they might be like unto the nations around them. In this desire, and the reason which prompted it, there was, as God himself testifies, a deliberate rejection of him as their true king and all-sufficient protector and ruler. God directs Samuel, who was distressed at what he regarded as the highest treason, to grant their request, but under a most solemn protest against their wickedness, and warning of its consequences. This led to such an entire change in the administration of the affairs of this kingdom of God as greatly to obscure its spiritual nature, especially to their carnal minds. Henceforth it ceased to be the strangely peculiar and spiritual organisation it was before, and became just like the nations around in its external form. This very form, granted in his displeasure, became the very natural occasion of leading their worldly minds into fatal error in regard to the whole nature and design of the Messiah's promised kingdom, and so of causing their final rejection of their divine King when at length he came in the flesh, just as they rejected a purely spiritual King at this time; and so to their own exclusion from the kingdom of God. The solemn protest of God, that in seeking this form they had rejected him, ought to have been enough to have made them sure that this was not the form the kingdom was to assume when it should finally come in all its promised glory.

But while the granting of this request obscured to mere

carnal minds the true nature of the kingdom, and occasioned its rejection by such, God did not cease to be their king. Nor did he suffer this even to retard the development of the true spiritual kingdom. On the other hand, he caused it wonderfully to advance it. As the rejection of Jesus Christ by the Jews, when he came in the flesh, was the occasion of his actual enthronement, so the rejection of their spiritual King by Israel, in Samuel's time, was the occasion of bringing out its completest earthly type. But it was only a type, and they kept on taking it for the substance. They had thus a twofold type—a divine symbol and a human representative. These human kings were required to be merely his representatives—additions to and servants of, not substitutes for, the divine Shechinah. When they ruled as such and the people regarded them as such, as especially in the case of David, the king became a striking type of the greater King promised: and coupled with the promises made to David, that the Messiah should descend from him and inherit his throne, it might have greatly assisted the spiritual mind to a clearer conception of the promised King. Thenceforward such would see not a merely symbolic representative of their divine King, but a human representative—a man exercising the functions of the unseen King; and so might discern a still nearer approach to the fulfilment of the original promise to restore the dominion of the earth to man, that man should reign over the kingdom of God.

S. Political and earthly forces cannot advance it.

It is next made manifest, through a long course of ages, that this earthly kingdom is a very imperfect shadow even, of that promised dominion and that true spiritual kingdom which is to triumph over the usurped dominion of Satan. It must be an arm far mightier than David's, and a throne far more powerful than that of any earthly kingdom, and forces of a far different and more potent kind than the material forces which such kingdoms marshal to their aid, that shall restore to man the dominion of the earth and destroy the power of the devil. To teach this, and to prepare the way thus for that mightier King, was the design of the succeeding history of the chosen people.

To direct the hopes and sustain the faith of the Church during

this period, and perfectly identify that King when he appeared, there was given to David, the head of this line of kings, the promise that his throne should be established forever; and that of the fruit of his body God would set upon that throne one who should be feared as long as the sun and moon endure, throughout all generations; in whose days the righteous should flourish, and abundance of peace so long as the moon endureth. "Before him," it is said, "all kings shall fall down; all nations shall serve him . . . His name shall endure forever; his name shall be continued as long as the sun; and men shall be blessed in him; all nations shall call him blessed."

These promises rendered it certain that he by whom this kingdom of God should attain its full establishment would be of the family of David and the heir of his throne. But if any ancient Jew supposed that this glowing picture of the restored kingdom would be realised in the same outward and earthly form, and under a mere earthly head, the history of David's successors and his kingdom was well adapted to correct the vain hope. Almost immediately it began to wane; and with occasional temporary revivings, in which the controlling power of the spiritual element of good or of evil was made more and more prominent, it gradually sunk lower and lower, until it sunk entirely under the power of Babylon, then the chief representative of the kingdom of darkness and the power of the serpent. Still the eye of its heavenly King was watching over its spiritual interests. At this moment of deepest depression, when the visible kingdom had lost its very existence, the voice of prophecy rings out clearer and more definite than ever from the very halls of the heathen conqueror, proclaiming the final triumph of this kingdom of God over all the Satanic and worldly despotisms. The prophecies of Daniel shone with heavenly brightness and power upon the fainting hearts of God's true Israel during the long ages of storm and gloom that followed. Who can tell with what a thrill of joy and hope the believer then, when Satan seemed to have everything his own way, turned to and read and read again and fondly pondered these glorious utterances of the prophetic oracle? "In the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a

kingdom which shall never be destroyed; and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever." "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 him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him.....And 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, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him."

The all-watching providence of God, after a time, cuts down the branching might and honors of Babylon. He restores at the same time to his visible kingdom a deeply humbled and feeble existence; but the earthly power and glory he passes over to the Persian, who inherits the same enmity of the serpent. He, in turn, falls below the Grecian monster, which, after fiercely devouring the remnant of the visible kingdom, bequeaths, in passing away, this Satanic dominion to the last and fiercest of all these representatives of the devil's power, the nondescript monster of Rome. Like the fabled Hydra, this world's power in its monstrous forms, though its heads successively lie crushed and bleeding, is ever throwing out, by the inherent force of the Satanic spirit dwelling in it, others of still more hideous form, until the heavenly King, the promised seed, comes, and pierces the seat of its life, and takes to himself his dominion. During the course of these great worldly despotisms, and under their tyranny, the throne of David, and with it the visible kingdom of God, seemed to have passed away. The family of David was buried in utter obscurity: its true representatives at the last being found on the one side in an obscure maiden, and on the other in a poor carpenter to whom she was espoused, residing in the despised village of Nazareth.

9. The incarnation of its King.

But the promises of God stand firm. The deep depression of the family of David and the visible kingdom of God is only a

fuller proof that that kingdom is spiritual in its nature and foundations, and can never attain its promised distinction and supremacy by material forces and in a mere earthly form. The time had now come to unfold to the waiting gaze of God's true and down-trodden people, and to a deluded and groaning world, the wonderful way in which the seed of the woman was to bruise the serpent's head, and man regain his lost dominion over the world, and that dominion have for its Head the Son of David, and in him become everlasting. Jesus Christ is born of the virgin Mary, the true heir, according to the flesh, of David's throne—of the headship, that is, of the visible kingdom of God. In him God has become incarnate; and the perfect humanity of Jesus is the humanity of a divine person—the eternal Son of God. The Shechinah, the glorious symbol of the divine invisible King, is now realised in a divine person; and with this divine person the human Son of David is identified. The words of the angel that announced to Mary his miraculous conception and birth are: "He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest; and the Lord shall give unto him the throne of his father David; and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever and ever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end."

But he came unto his own, and his own received him not: He presented himself as a spiritual King: they demanded one invested with earthly glory. He came with Heaven's own power "to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives" of sin, "and recovery of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised." Their hearts were set upon an earthly liberty, and triumphs, and glory. While he came the true descendant of David and heir of his throne, he came also as the *real* Shechinah, whose glorious symbol dwelling on the mercy seat, they had in the days of Samuel rejected for a king, that they might be like the nations around them; and now, when he was made flesh and dwelt among them, and his glory shone forth as the glory of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth, they, for the very same reason, rejected him and crucified their King. They thus, however, only crowned him, and forfeited their own rights and privileges to his Mes-

sianic blessings. Just as under Samuel their rejection of their true spiritual King led to the fullest, most glorious, and impressive typical representation of the kingdom of God, with its Head at once divine and human, so now their rejection of him is by God's wonder-working providence made the means by which he himself is crowned, and the old visible external Israel itself rejected, and a visible form given to the representation of this kingdom more in accordance with its spiritual nature and universal extent.

Though his own received him not, yet many—a remnant according to the election of grace—*did* receive him. And “to as many as received him, to them gave he power to become sons of God, even to them that believe on his name.” These became the nucleus of a new visible kingdom, which, as the little stone hewn out of the mountain without hands, smote the mighty powers of the world, and has become even now a great mountain, and shall fill the earth.

It was, as we have already observed, the claims of God's violated law that gave the world over to the dominion of Satan as the executioner of his just displeasure. Satan held possession as the prince of this world, just because the violated law demanded that the sin of fallen and rebellious man should be punished. Christ Jesus, by his perfect obedience and death, rendered infinite in worth by his infinite perfections, met all these claims and cancelled them, and thus, by his atonement, secured the complete redemption of his people from Satan's power, and their restoration to the dominion of the earth in him as their Head. His obedience, sufferings, and triumphant resurrection, removed every obstacle interposed by the justice of God to their restoration to his favor. Their salvation, therefore, and restoration to the lost inheritance and dominion, is his right; and to vindicate and secure it, he ascends the throne of the kingdom of God, and formally commences his mediatorial reign.

III. THE KINGDOM FULLY ESTABLISHED.

10. *The coronation of its King.*

The ascension of our blessed Lord, and his session at the

right hand of the Father in our glorified nature, "angels and authorities and powers being made subject to him," is his actual personal inauguration as the King of this spiritual kingdom of God. The design of this enthronement is that he, as the seed of the woman, may employ all the power of the divine government to subdue and finally destroy, in that way which to his infinite wisdom might appear best, the entire kingdom of evil, and secure to the saints of God—his redeemed and purified people—the dominion of the earth and the fulfilment of the original purpose of God in the creation of man.

Now, therefore, the lineal descendant of David according to the flesh, the hereditary heir of his throne, is found at last in intimate and indissoluble union with the Son of God; the identical soul and body to which belongs the crown of David is found to be the soul and body of a divine person, of the eternal Son; and that person has actually carried this human nature of his up to the very throne of God. In it he there reigns as "Head over all things to the Church," and as the Head of that very spiritual, real kingdom of redeemed sinners of which David's visible kingdom was only a feeble shadow and for the time the outward representation. This being so, where but in this human nature and on this heavenly throne to which he has carried it, are we to look for the fulfilment of that promise made to David, that his seed should reign for ever and ever, and of the same promise made to Mary at the annunciation of his birth? Being a divine person, he could find no earthly throne a fitting seat; to the high dignity and perfections of this Son of David, no throne could be suitable but the throne of God itself.

His right to that throne, the grounds of that right, his actual investiture with supreme dominion, and its glorious results, are all set forth most strikingly in the sublime vision of John, recorded in the fifth chapter of Revelation. He alone of all beings in the universe is found able to open the seven-sealed book of God's purposes in regard to this kingdom; and when he takes the book from the hand of him who sits upon the throne, the crowned representatives of this priestly kingdom burst forth into the new song, "Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the

seals thereof; for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; and hast made us unto our God kings and priests; and we shall reign on the earth." Immediately all the hosts of angels unite in the loud acclaim, "Worthy the Lamb," and every creature in heaven, earth, and sea, join with them in ascribing equal and supreme honors and power to "him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever."

What a glorious advancement, then, have we here of the grand and gracious purposes of Jehovah! Is not the mediatorial kingdom fully established? Is not its spiritual and heavenly nature fully displayed? When over this kingdom of God a perfect man reigns, and that man united to a divine person, and seated on the very throne of God, and wielding there all the powers of God's universal government, what further advance in this direction can there be? What more perfect and complete fulfilment could there be of this promise made to David and the ancient Church? "His seed will I make to endure forever, and his throne as the days of heaven." "Once have I sworn by my holiness that I will not lie unto David. His seed shall endure forever, and his throne as the sun before me. It shall be established forever as the moon, and as a faithful witness in heaven."

In the ascension of our Lord Jesus Christ to the right hand of the Father, therefore, the promise of the restoration of the forfeited kingdom has already been gloriously and wonderfully fulfilled. The apostle, in the second chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, referring to the eighth Psalm, in which man's original and forfeited dominion is described, and its fullest realisation intimated as yet future, describes this as fulfilled already in Christ: "One in a certain place testified, saying, What is man, that thou art mindful of him, or the son of man, that thou visitest him? Thou madest him a little lower than the angels; thou crownedst him with glory and honor, and didst set him over the works of thy hands; 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. But now we see not yet all things put under him. But we see Jesus, who

was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor." Let the Church of God, then, take up the triumphal song of the Psalmist, "The Lord reigneth; let the earth rejoice; let the multitude of the isles be glad thereof." Jehovah Jesus reigns. A man has been raised to the throne. The very nature that Satan thought to have destroyed, and so to have forever crushed the kingdom which God had here established at the creation, has been taken up into fellowship with the Godhead—nay, into indissoluble union with the Son of God—and made the medium through which God rules over all this lower creation.

11. The present dispensation, the fully established Mediatorial Kingdom.

Accordingly, the present dispensation of the grace of God is constantly represented as the real, the spiritual kingdom of God, the mediatorial reign of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Even when in the flesh, Jesus spoke of himself as a king and of his kingdom: "My kingdom is not of this world; if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews; but now is my kingdom not from hence." And in answer to Pilate's question, "Art thou a king, then?" he answered, "Thou sayest that I am a king. To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness to the truth." And just before his ascension, he uses language, in commissioning the apostles, which implies the possession of the very highest kingly dominion: "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth."

Throughout the Gospels, the present dispensation of God's grace receives as its characteristic designation, "the kingdom of heaven," a phrase peculiar to Matthew, and "the kingdom of God," used by the other evangelists as its equivalent. The gospel is called repeatedly "the gospel," or glad tidings, "of the kingdom"—of the kingdom not as ages distant, but as come already, or just at hand. The parables that describe the present dispensation, describe it as the kingdom of God; as *the* kingdom—that which was promised to the fathers, predicted by the prophets, symbolized in the visions of Daniel, and the object of

the Church's cherished hope for ages. Of it Jesus said to a multitude assembled around him, after having warned them of the decisive and tremendous results that would attend the final consummation of it, speaking of its establishment, its beginnings: "Verily, I say unto you, that there be some of them that stand here, which shall not taste of death till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power."

It was the announcement of this fact—that he, their promised Messiah, had ascended his throne—which carried such terror to the hearts of those who heard Peter on the day of Pentecost. Explaining the 16th Psalm in its application to Christ, Peter declares that David, "being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne; he seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of Christ..... This Jesus," he adds, "hath God raised up, whereof we are witnesses. Therefore, being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear. For David hath not ascended into the heavens; but he saith himself, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thy foes thy footstool. Therefore, let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ." And on another occasion, before the Sanhedrim, he says: "Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour."

In the Epistles, also, we find the same idea recurring in various forms, and all the spiritual blessings of the present dispensation of grace attributed to this kingdom. "The kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost." He "hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son." "Receiving a kingdom which cannot be moved, let us have grace whereby we may serve God with reverence and godly fear," says Paul to the Hebrews, where the connexion fixes it to the present dispensation of a glorified Saviour, which he contrasts with the old dispensation of the visible kingdom established at Sinai.

Of this, then, there cannot remain a doubt: The King has ascended his throne. He is now reigning in glory. His kingdom is no longer a matter of promise, but a reality, a present existence. Its interests control every movement of providence, and its powers and influences find a glad welcome in millions of subject hearts. Its triumphs, however, are merely commenced; the glorious results will not be complete till these triumphs are consummated. But this is made sure by the fact that the King has entered on his glory, and taken to himself his great power, and reigns for this very purpose.

12. *The present mediatorial reign essentially militant.*

The very design of the present mediatorial reign is to subdue all opposition, and to fill the earth with the glory of God. This is in the very nature of a mediatorial reign. The necessity of it arises from a state of opposition and enmity or rebellion. Its single, grand, immediate design is to restore peace. This can only be brought about by the perfect triumph of the divine government. But, being restored, there is no longer any room for a mediatorial kingdom or work. It ceases by a limitation, inherent in its very nature. In its very nature, therefore, it is militant. "Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool. The Lord shall send the rod of thy strength out of Zion; rule thou in the midst of thine enemies." "Wherefore"—*i. e.*, because he had been obedient unto the cross—"God hath highly exalted him, and given him a name that is above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, and every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." "For he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet."

It is important here to mark the two distinct aspects of this kingdom, first, towards the redeemed, who are the recipients of its blessings and for whose sake it is constituted; and, secondly, towards the rest of the universe, all the resources of which it employs on the behalf of the former. We have this twofold aspect of it beautifully and briefly expressed by the apostle in Eph. i. 22, in the words: "Head over all things to the Church." But in both these aspects of it, it is as it exists here on earth,

during this dispensation, necessarily militant. Its willing subjects—those who gladly bow to the yoke of Jesus and delight in his blessed rule—are ever here contending with *foes within and without*. “The flesh lusteth against the spirit.” “We wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities and powers,” etc. The conflict rages within and without. And until every enemy, every vestige of the power of sin in the souls of all the redeemed is destroyed, and their bodies, too, delivered finally and forever from the power of death by the destruction of this “last enemy,” the work for which Jesus is represented as having ascended his throne and established his mediatorial kingdom will not have been accomplished. Till then it must continue, and continue in conflict.

We might have expected that when Christ had come, and ascended his heavenly throne, and been clothed with universal dominion, he would at once have put forth the powers of that throne, and reduced the rebellious world to submission, and put an end to the fierce and long conflict between the seed of the woman and of the serpent, by crushing utterly the serpent’s head. And so the Jewish Church expected. They confounded the consummation with the founding. And often, as presented in the stirring visions of prophecy, to sustain the sorely tried faith and fainting hopes of God’s people, and when the entire reign of the Messiah was viewed as a whole and in the distance of ages, the two would naturally merge together, and the conflict be scarcely visible in the glorious and completed results. But enough was even then given—as, for example, in the 2d and 45th and 110th Psalms—to show that the coronation and the triumph were not the same. He is there represented as exercising his kingly functions in subduing the rebellious nations who were uniting to cast off his authority, and as breaking them with a rod of iron; as riding forth in royal majesty, gradually subduing his enemies by truth and meekness and righteousness; as waiting on the throne yet in the exercise of its powers, until his enemies are made his footstool.

13. *Its past history confirms this, and shows that this militant state was to be protracted.*

But neither the ancient Jews nor the early Church could ever have imagined that almighty power and love would have delayed the consummation so long and permitted the conflict to rage still so fiercely, and Satan still to seem to be the god of this world to such an extent. But the omniscient eye of God saw that neither the malignity of sin nor the magnitude of redeeming mercy could be fully shown until the amazing spectacle was laid before the universe of bleeding love despised, and this kingdom of love rejected, and its very waters of life poisoned, though everywhere presenting Heaven's broad seal, and offering Heaven's richest blessings to a sin-smitten and suffering world. And the whole past history of this kingdom is now seen to be in fullest accord with the predictions of the ancient prophets and of Jesus and his apostles. The prophecies already referred to and others are perfectly consistent with a long militant period of the kingdom, and others as those of Daniel demand it. Those of Christ and his apostles clearly intimate it. Always directing us to his second coming as the consummation of this period, it is taught that the gospel must first be preached to all nations. "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature," and "lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." In the parable of the talents, it is only "after a long time" that "the Lord of those servants cometh." And the Church's faith is represented as sorely tried by the long delay. "Shall not God avenge his own elect, which cry day and night unto him, though he bear long with them?" And in Rev. vi. 10, we hear the symbolic cry of the souls under the altar during the ages of trial, "How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?" And the impression which the whole book of Revelation must make on every careful reader, however little he may understand of its symbols, is that the glorious consummation was not to come till after many a fierce and varied struggle.

And accordingly now, though eighteen hundred years have passed away since he ascended his throne, the world is yet far from being subdued. The Church is still a little and a feeble flock. The nations are still taking counsel together against the

Lord and against his anointed. And he is still breaking them with a rod of iron, and dashing them in pieces as a potter's vessel. Satan still reigns among the nations; sin still predominates; misery still fills the earth with cries and wails of woe; and death still devours his victims. But it is also true that the gospel of his grace, the rod of his power, is going forth, that thousands of souls submit to him as their King, and enjoy the blessings of his kingdom. It is true, that silently the streams of this salvation are flowing further and further over the earth; that its light is penetrating the hovel and the palace, and even into the darkest seats of Satan's power, gathering every where an elect and redeemed people to the praise of the glory of his grace. How the progress is to be hereafter, with what accelerated speed and by what accumulated and multiplied judgments and spiritual influences, is known only to the King himself, except what glimpses of the future he has in his word given us for our consolation. The result, however, is certain; for to accomplish it, the King has ascended the throne, is at the right hand of the Father, and all the resources of the divine government are employed to bring it about.

14. During this militant reign, his bodily presence not to be expected or desired.

While, therefore, his second coming to put an end to this conflict, and perfect the salvation of his people and the triumphs of his Church, is the grand object of the believer's hope and infinitely to be desired, we cannot think that his presence here on earth during this present militant state of his kingdom is to be either expected or desired. It was for this very design that he ascended to his Father's throne, and that angels and authorities and powers were made subject to him. "Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool." "Whom the heaven must receive until the times of restitution of all things." Shall we expect him to change his throne for one on earth, however glorious, before he has accomplished that design? or, except to put an end to all conflict, and take possession of the completed and unchanging results, his own redeemed and glorified people in their own renovated world?

Would it be any advancement in the actual power and influence of this King, or any enhancement of our conceptions of his greatness and his excellence as the object of our trust and the foundation of our hope, for him to leave that throne in the heavens, and to come down to earth and dwell in his human form, however glorified, here among men, and establish a visible throne at Jerusalem or any where else? Does it enlarge our ideas of the power of his arm, or the riches of his grace, to conceive it either necessary or desirable that he should, during the fierce conflict between his spiritual kingdom and the kingdom of darkness, during that period in which he is gathering his elect and gradually subduing his foes, visibly appear among men after he has ascended to glory?

How do you now, believer, conceive of your Lord? Is it not as seated on the throne, in the unapproachable depths of the divine glory, looking down upon all worlds and into all hearts, and from thence controlling all the agencies of the visible and invisible world? Thus conceiving of him, do you not feel him ever near you, his power surrounding you, his hand sweetly holding you, and powerfully and easily controlling all your enemies, and his ear always open to hear with equal facility *your* heart's faintest whisper, wherever you are on the earth's wide surface, and the like cry of every child of the kingdom at every moment over all the world?

Now, would it increase these conceptions of his presence and power, and your facilities of actual communion with him, to think of him as actually present in his human nature in some particular spot *on earth*, where he received the visible homage of the favored few around him? or as visiting place after place, and displaying his visible glory to our mortal eyes? What kind of a visible glory would that be which these mortal eyes could see and these mortal frames endure? Oh, how far, how inconceivably far, below that heavenly glory in which we are taught now to conceive of him—a glory which none but glorified beings can behold; and below that glory in which he will assuredly associate with his people on the renovated earth, when the whole conditions of earthly existence shall have been changed after the

resurrection. Then, indeed, we shall see him as he is; for then we shall be like him. Must the magnificence of heaven, the unsearchable splendors of that living radiance which surrounds the majesty above, as now ever present to the eye of faith, and in the conceptions of every suffering praying saint, be exchanged for such low forms of material glory as these poor eyes can see and these poor hands can handle? Who would not rather think of him as *the brightness of the Father's glory, on the right hand of the majesty on high*, and by faith behold him where dying Stephen saw him? What other possible view of him could, equally with this, assure and comfort the hearts of his suffering, struggling people now, or strike such terror into the hosts of hell?

15. *The second coming ends this militant kingdom.*

The glorious hope, however, still remains to animate our hearts, that "we shall see him as he is," and see him here on this very earth that was stained by his blood and consecrated by the conflicts of his suffering Church; but it is when "we shall be like him." The time is hastening on when "every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him, and all the kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him," but it is not to have new offers of his grace, or to feel some mightier redemptive power by his visible presence. He will not come to do the work committed to the Third Person of the blessed Trinity, the application of salvation to the soul, as if the almighty Spirit was unequal to the task. That work will then have been completed. It is to end the strife with sin, and close his mediatorial reign, and establish his everlasting kingdom. The universality of doom then awarded is thus explicitly declared by the apostle: he "shall judge the quick and dead at his appearing and his kingdom." That judgment is not the exercise of mere ruling power; that he is now and always exercising; it must be the final decision of the Judge fixing their eternal state. And what language can more forcibly express this complete universality of reward and punishment at his appearing, than this of Paul in 2 Thes. i. 6-10: "It is a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation to them that trouble you; and to you who are troubled, rest with us, when

the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ; who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power: when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe."

It destroys death. "For he must reign," says the apostle, "till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death." Now this reign, which must continue till death, the last enemy, is destroyed, we are expressly told, shall be given up to the Father, when this is done. "Then cometh the end,"—literally, the end is,—“when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power. For he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet.” But how is death destroyed? Only at and by the resurrection; as long as the body of a single saint remains in the grave, or liable to dissolution, death still reigns, the destruction pledged in redemption and to be accomplished by the Mediator is not complete. And this resurrection of the saints is at Christ's second coming, after which there can therefore be no more dying. The same context expresses all this very plainly. "For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection from the dead. For as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive. But every man in his own order; Christ the first-fruits; afterwards, they that are Christ's at his coming." This glorious triumph over the last enemy is still more fully described in the thrilling and jubilant language of verses 51-57 of this chapter. "We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye at the last trump; for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality. 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."

Here then most assuredly is death's destruction. The last enemy is put under the King's feet. It is at his second coming. It ends his mediatorial reign. And it is by the universal resurrection and change of the entire body of his redeemed.

These passages speak only of the resurrection of believers; and that for the simple and obvious reason that their resurrection alone can in any proper and scriptural sense be said to destroy death. The resurrection of the wicked instead of being a deliverance from death, is the consummation of death eternal to both body and soul. Accordingly the resurrection of the saints is always distinguished from that of the wicked. It could not be otherwise. It is different entirely in its nature, grounds, and results. This is a difference far more complete than any difference of time, and rendering it far more impossible to treat them together. It is only the resurrection of the righteous which is resurrection unto life—a resurrection that delivers entirely from death in its true and fullest sense, or indeed in any sense that is desirable; the resurrection of the wicked is a "resurrection of damnation," and is strictly a resurrection *unto* death in its fullest and completest sense. So that the phrase—"the resurrection from the dead,"—whether taken in the common sense of resurrection of the dead, or in that which many think it ought to have, "from among the dead," can apply only to believers; and beautifully and forcibly distinguishes their glorious resurrection from that of those whose bodies are called from their graves only to be given over to the death that never dies. By it is wiped away that last vestige of that curse of death that caused them for a time to be still apparently associated with the dead who remain forever under the power of death. Hence this phrase in its most intensive form as it occurs in Phil. iii. 11—a form not at all preserved in our translation—is grandly appropriate to express the object of the apostle's stirring emotion: "If by any means I might attain unto the resurrection out of, which is from among the dead." This distinction then of the two resurrections, furnishes no argument whatever for a difference of time. But it does what is infinitely more important. It brings out into bold relief the glorious destiny of God's redeemed, even as re-

gards their bodies, which, by virtue of their union with Christ who is their life, shall, when he appears, "be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able to subdue all things unto himself."

By this, the triumph of the Mediator is complete, so far as regards the persons of his redeemed. But this destruction of "the last enemy" implies of necessity the destruction of every other.

The end of sin and sinners on earth. It follows, therefore, that Christ's coming will destroy sin on the earth, as well as death. It must end the former in order to end the latter. Sin brought death; and while men are born in sin, death must still reign. Sin therefore must cease completely and absolutely from the earth, and all the incorrigibly wicked receive their final doom when Christ comes. This would seem to be very definitely stated in the first chapter of Second Thessalonians, already quoted, where it is expressly said of "them that know not God, and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ," that they "shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power, when he shall come to be glorified in his saints and admired in all them that believe." Manifestly, this language cannot with any fairness describe a doom any other than both universal and final. It teaches that when he comes this mixed state shall no longer be, and sin and sinners no longer pollute the earth. The tares are gathered and burned when the wheat is gathered into the garner. They were spared only for its sake. This "vengeance" is visited, *when he comes* "to be glorified in his saints." That same day of his coming is called by Peter, "the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men." How long that day will be, has not been told us; but whether long or short, it is the day in which Christ will *judge the quick and dead at his appearing*. We are told that the guilty inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah, of Tyre and Sidon, of Capernaum and Chorazin and Bethsaida,—that all "who know not God," that all the angels too that kept not their first estate, and that led man and strengthened him in his rebellion, shall be there and receive their final doom. To this the

“resurrection of damnation” is essential, this completes that doom. This judgment, according to Matt. xxv. 31–46, whatever may be said about its being a judgment of nations as such, is manifestly to every reader who regards only the proper sense of the language, a judgment in which the final awards of eternal punishment and eternal life are meted out according as the character of each one in every action is decided by the presence or the want of love to Christ. It is a day of ending, not of continuing the conflict, or of long protracted judgments or of trial; it is not an *era*, but an *epoch*, an act or series of acts by which an end is put to this dispensation of the kingdom offered and advancing, and the eternal dispensation of the perfectly restored kingdom of God introduced. Sin and sinners therefore are forever banished and doomed.

16. The final conflagration and renewal of the earth.

But still further. The second coming of our Lord brings with it another event that fully confirms these views,—the final destruction of the earth in its present form by fire, in like manner as it was once before destroyed by water; only so as to effect a more complete transformation of all its present processes, laws, and capacities. This is expressly taught by Peter, in answer to the question of the scoffers of the last days, who shall say, “Where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation.” “This they willingly are ignorant of,” he says, “that by the word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of the water and in the water; whereby the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished: but the heavens and the earth, which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men....The day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements 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 unto the coming of that 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, wherein dwelleth righteousness." This is evidently no annihilation, but a glorious renovation. By these final fires that shall seize on all things here below, every vestige of sin's dominion over the earth shall be not merely wiped out, but burned out. Every thing that was associated with sin and sinners shall disappear. Now the curse has seized on every thing. Death lurks in the air we breathe, the food we eat, in the sunshine and the darkness alike; in every process of life there are seeds of death. But then all shall be changed. The groans and sorrows of this lower creation shall then come to an end. "There shall be no more curse." "New heavens and a new earth," by which are meant not the starry heavens, but the heavens that belong to this earth, and the earth itself,—a common phrase frequently used to express the whole constitution of physical nature, including the atmosphere with all its properties and powers,—shall succeed. "New" they shall be in all their arrangements, laws, and processes. Those deep-hidden and mysterious principles of nature, of which the keenest researches of science catch now but passing glimpses, but glimpses which stimulate and fill with wonder, and those secret agents whose powers seem so amazing and so illimitable, as electricity and magnetism, but of whose nature we know nothing, shall then perhaps be with all their ethereal natures, brought out into full play, and become the known and visible and familiar powers of nature. A new world at least it shall be, perfectly adapted to the new bodies of the risen saints, and to the bright displays of the glory of the Son of man as he lives with and reigns over his redeemed.

How new it shall be, and how truly and literally we are to understand these things, the apostle Paul teaches us in his *Epistle to the Romans*, ch. viii. 19 v.: "The earnest expectation of the creature [*i. e.*, the creation] waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God. . . . Because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God. For we know that the whole creation

groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now." Such language expresses a complete change in the whole constitution of nature, so as to adapt it to be the fitting and glorious abode of the glorified saints. And this renovation of all things is stated again by Peter, Acts iii. 20, to be the glorious close of this dispensation of Christ's mediatorial reign in heaven: "He shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you; whom the heavens must receive until the times of the restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began."

17. The thousand years.

But where, then, in this history shall we place the thousand years mentioned in Revelation xx.? The highly symbolic character of that passage, and the various and widely different interpretations given to it by men who equally reverence the word of God, render it very improper to make it a key for the interpretation of other and perfectly plain passages. It must receive an interpretation in consistency with the plainer. It describes a symbolic binding for a thousand years of that same old dragon that in the twelfth chapter was seen in the symbolic heaven, and was then cast out into the symbolic earth, and there made war upon the saints, giving his power to the beast. As a consequence of this symbolic binding, there is a symbolic reigning with Christ of the spirits of the martyrs who had resisted the beast; which is called the first resurrection. The old dragon, called here Satan, is most certainly not the person of Satan, any more than the binding is a literal binding, or the pit a literal pit, or the heaven the literal heaven. As he is before described, he is a monster with seven crowned heads and ten horns. It can be nothing else but the world's power in its political aspect, as inspired by Satan, who has ever wielded it since the building of Babel. Before the coming of Christ, by reason of the Church's political or national form, this power obtained a standing even inside the Church—in the ecclesiastical sphere, the heavenly places, the regions set apart for the powers of the spiritual kingdom. When Christ ascended his throne, and founded his kingdom as a purely spiritual kingdom, this dragon of political power

lost its standing there, and was cast out of the ecclesiastical or heavenly sphere into the earth, where at first he made fierce assaults upon the Church by means of the violence of the nations, and finally gave his power to a beast just like him—the heathen power christianized, supported by another—the false prophet or delusive wisdom of the world, by which agencies he prevails over the visible Church. These two have been, already at the time spoken of in the twentieth chapter, cast into the burning lake, forever destroyed. The dragon himself is not yet cast there, but simply chained in the bottomless pit for a thousand years. Can this possibly mean anything else than that this Satan-inspired political power shall be so completely restrained that no national powers or influences shall any longer oppress and restrain the free development of the spiritual kingdom, and that therefore the spirits of the martyrs, of those who had opposed that power, shall then be the true symbol of the ruling influences and spirits and people of the earth? This will be indeed “life from the dead,” as Paul says of the effect of the conversion of the Jews; it will be a glorious resurrection of the witnessing agencies and spiritual power of the Church; a blessed pledge of that complete and final deliverance, when at the last, after a brief reviving of this same worldly power under the Satanic influence, from which there again the restraints have been removed, this Satanic power also shall itself be, not bound, but forever destroyed—cast, as the beast and false prophet had already been, into the lake of fire. Then also “*death*” itself and “*hell*” are cast into the same lake; in other words, then it is that death and the grave shall be brought to an end by the resurrection of the body. Then shall the saints reign forever. The former reign of a thousand years was but the pledge and preparation for this. That is the time and those the events, which, as we have already seen, characterise the second visible appearing of our Lord to destroy the last enemy, and to end his mediatorial reign, a large portion of which, according to this vision of the seer, is to be one in which the saints hold the ruling influences of the earth, and to enter upon his eternal and unchanging kingdom.

18. *The Time.*

The time of this end is declared to be kept a profound secret in the bosom of the Godhead. And in reference to the general question of time, the answer of Christ to his disciples just before his ascension should be fully satisfactory: "It is not for you to know the times or the seasons, which the Father hath put in his own power." There are certain times and periods, indeed, mentioned in the book of Revelation of a suffering and triumphant Church; but whatever else they may have been designed to teach, it is certain they were not intended to remove in any degree the obscurity that rests on the day and hour of Christ's second coming. That uncertainty is as much opposed to the presumption that it is very near as that it is far off. "Ye yourselves," says Paul to the Thessalonians, "know perfectly that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night." And the feverish excitement caused among these Thessalonians by the apprehension that it was just about to burst upon them, he allays in his Second Epistle by these words: "Now, we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him, that ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand." He then further teaches that first a great apostasy was to be developed, the principles of which were even then at work, but secretly, being restrained for a time by an unnamed power. How long this restraint was to continue, and how long a course this great apostasy was to run "with all power and signs and lying wonders," deceiving them that obey not the truth, he does not give an intimation; and honest and earnest students are even now divided as to the very nature of this apostasy, or as to whether this man of sin and son of perdition has even yet arisen. And we are persuaded that the more earnestly, humbly, and sincerely any one studies this passage, the more will he find it impossible to extort by any pressure of critical logic or acuteness any such definite answer as has been sought from it, such as shall decide whether this apostasy shall culminate in a single individual or only in an organised system, or whether it is to be located on one system, to the exclusion of others that have in different degrees

the same characteristics.* The very design of the apostle is so to present this great apostasy in its horrible and leading features, that while these would be readily detected and their progress traced, yet their existence in different degrees and forms of error would render it impossible for the Church ever to tell when it was even completely developed, much less when its end was to come. It answered perfectly, therefore, the great end of the apostle in introducing it here: to correct the feverish anxiety occasioned by an immediate apprehension of the end of all things, by interposing such a view of intervening dangers and conflicts of uncertain length as would stimulate to incessant watchfulness, and patient preparation for and earnest desire of the coming of the Lord, to end the fearful strife.

But, however protracted that end may be, it is in its relation to the individual believer virtually and for all practical purposes just as near as his death. Then the militant state of the kingdom ends with him; then he goes to be with Jesus, and with him in perfect bliss, to wait for the grand consummation of his hopes.

This has led to serious error in the manner in which our Lord's coming is viewed. Death is virtually made to take its place; and the state of the disembodied spirit after death is substituted for the perfected glory of the consummated kingdom at the resurrection. This is entirely reversing the scriptural view. The Bible rather seems to put Christ's second coming in the place of death. It holds up this event in such prominence, and invests it with such luminous glory, as completely to obliterate all perception of any period intervening. Instead of fixing the eye on *death*, which to nature must be always repugnant in itself, it fixes it on the triumph over death and all the stirring and glorious and definite events that accompany and follow the resurrection. It gives no countenance whatever to that common con-

*Neither can it be assumed or proved that the phrase, "the brightness of his coming," τῆ ἐπιφανείᾳ τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ, more literally, "the manifestation of his presence," is exclusively the last visible coming, the final act by which he closes the present administration; as most certainly the "coming" or presence of the man of sin in the next verse cannot be a single consummating act.

ception of the Church which substitutes to so great an extent an ideal heaven of mere human imagination and shadowy forms for the realities of the resurrection state, as the great object of the believer's hope. It tells us enough, indeed, of that intermediate state to remove all shrinking from the call to pass through it. Yet it gives us our whole knowledge of it in one single phrase, "with Jesus"—with him in a state of conscious bliss and triumph; with him waiting in triumphant joy for his coming. It represents the fight as fought, the victory won, but the *crowning* with eternal life as yet future, yet as the necessary result, for which we have only to wait until the rest of his redeemed are gathered.

IV. THE MEDIATORIAL REIGN ENDS IN THE PERFECTED AND ETERNAL KINGDOM.

19. This kingdom, or mediatorial reign, then delivered up.

When all this shall have been done, the great design for which Christ was constituted Mediator will have been accomplished. The serpent's head will be crushed, and all his seed consigned to their eternal prison, no more to deceive or disturb a holy universe, and will be an eternal monument of God's justice and of the malignity of sin. There will be an end of death. No more souls to be saved, no rebels to God to be brought back—in a word, no mediatorial work to be done. And as all his power over the other agents and influences of the universe was given for this purpose, when this is accomplished, he can have no further use for it. Having faithfully used the mighty trust, and fulfilled the task of redeeming to God a chosen people and forming them into one glorified and perfected body, with him as their living head, he presents back in triumph the Father's great commission, amid the rapturous shouts of angelic hosts and of the ransomed kingdom itself—more rapturous than those in which he is represented as receiving it from the Father. This is no lessening of his dignity and high honors; it is their grandest consummation. Having gloriously finished his work, he is crowned with the glory of eternal triumph. "And when," says the apostle, "all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also

himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all." The separation caused by sin between God and his redeemed shall have been entirely healed, and God shall again dwell with men, and hold intercourse with them as before sin entered.

But the Mediator must forever continue the brightest and most glorious of all the beings in the universe. Though his mediatorial *work* ceases, and his reign over the *universe for this purpose* is ended, his mediatorial *nature* and character and glory are eternal as his being. And he shall ever be worshipped as the mighty restorer of God's violated majesty and dominion on the earth. And the blessed *results* of his work shall be permanent as eternity.

20. *The eternal results—the kingdom of God on earth restored.*

Of these results, we have in the revelations of God some bright and glorious visions. We have already glanced at the opening scenes of that restored and perfected kingdom; the redeemed, arisen, glorified, and with the Lord; sin destroyed from the earth, and all further ravages of it among the creatures rendered forever impossible; and the earth itself renewed, and adapted as the eternal home of the glorified Church.

Then shall Paradise be regained. The whole earth itself shall be one vast sea—one bright blaze of glory. Then shall Christ dwell here on earth, and *reign* here on earth over his redeemed; and they shall reign with him and have universal dominion here. All creatures, all the powers and agencies of nature, shall do them homage. The fiat of Jehovah at man's creation shall then receive a grand accomplishment, and man a far more glorious inheritance than the paradise of his creation or the life he originally received. For having been redeemed by the blood of a Mediator, and new-created by his Holy Spirit, and being so united to him as to be partakers of his life, and dependent, as the branch on the vine, for the perpetuation of this life, on the living influences of his grace and power, how infinitely and inconceivably intimate, tender, and loving, will be their actual communion with him in glory. "For the Lamb which is in the midst of the throne shall feed them, and shall lead them unto

living fountains of waters; and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes." Then it shall be said: "Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God." Then the Triune God—the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost—in whatever inscrutable ways he now displays himself to unfallen beings without a Mediator, shall in all the manifested glory of his character again dwell among us.

It will indeed be Paradise restored. But what a Paradise! See how John represents it, or rather how, in the last visions of Patmos, it was represented to him as a glorious picture ever to dwell before the expectant vision of God's waiting Church. It appears no longer as the garden of delights first bestowed upon man in his innocence. During the long course of the intervening ages of this mediatorial reign of Jesus, there have been gathered into it all the glorious things of God's creation, not of earth only, but of heaven; so that it has become a vast city, filling the earth with its heavenly radiance; the new Jerusalem coming down from God out of heaven, the very description of whose splendors and riches and blessedness and security, with God and the Lamb in the midst of it and the light of it, now oppresses and overwhelms the imagination.

Such are the accomplished results of the mediatorial kingdom, when its present militant state ceases and the end shall come. They are, in a word, the eternal and perfected Church of God, with Christ Jesus their Head and eternal King reigning peacefully and gloriously in their midst here on the renovated earth. Then shall the song of the crowned elders be accomplished with which they greeted the Redeemer's coronation, "We shall reign on the earth."

"Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, 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. And he that sat upon the throne said, Behold, I make all things new. And he said unto me,

Write; for these words are true and faithful. And he said unto me, It is done. I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end. I will give unto him that is athirst of the fountain of the water of life freely. He that overcometh shall inherit all things; and I will be his God, and he shall be my son." "And there shall be no more curse." "And they shall reign forever and ever."

ARTICLE II.

THE ATTITUDE OF THE ANCIENT MIND WITH
RESPECT TO TRUTH.

Wagner—Verzeiht! es ist ein gross Ergützen.
Sich in den Geist der Zeiten zu versetzen,
Zu schauen, wie vor uns ein weiser Mann gedacht,
Und wie wir's dann zuletzt so herrlich weit gebracht.

Faust—O ja, bis an die Sterne weit. [*Goethe's Faust.*]

It is generally a habit of the present day to patronize the past; and if some are found to smile at the extravagant praises which are commonly expended on the nineteenth century, very few there are, nevertheless, in whose inmost minds these praises do not find an echo of approval. In all that we hear said of the achievements of modern civilisation, it is easy to observe a tone of complacency, which betrays the proud consciousness of those who feel themselves set far forward on the way of knowledge and wisdom; and it is as the mouth-piece of his generation that the Laureate of England sounds the lofty and sonorous words: "I, the heir of all the ages, in the foremost files of time."

Now, while a certain respect is due, to be sure, on all points, to a prevailing public opinion, yet a reasonable mind cannot accept this as final authority for the settlement of any question. It cannot, therefore, be without interest to inquire wherein consists that great intellectual and moral superiority of the present

day, from the heights of which so many self-satisfied glances are thrown back upon the great periods of antiquity.

Cicero has somewhere said, that he must be a wise man who will determine the wisdom of others. And accordingly we shall not now enter on this inquiry with any confident expectations of positive results. But whatever may be the final end of our search, if it be conducted in a fair spirit, it is certain that some good reasons will present themselves why we should blush at the quiet and unquestioning assumption with which we are familiar—an assumption which will not hesitate to employ the very forms of thought and language coined first in a great age of vigorous mental activity, to disclose the weakness and deficiency of that time; which will weigh the wisdom of Greece and Rome in the very balances of criticism which were first nicely adjusted by the subtle thinkers of the classic period of antiquity, and pronounce that wisdom wanting.

Whoever will set about comparing the modern with the ancient civilisation must soon feel sensibly the presence of that impassable barrier between *now* and *then* which has been well designated by these words of Hermann Grimm: "There is a wall of separation drawn between us and antiquity; transparent, indeed, it may be, as though built of the purest crystal; yet it is and remains insurmountable after all."*

Vain must be the effort of even the most powerful imagination to vivify again an age which is dead and gone. However extensive and accurate may be our knowledge of the institutions, the life and manners of the ancients, however familiar may be our acquaintance with the records of their thought and imagination, we cannot hope to work ourselves into a state of mind in which we may attain to an adequate appreciation of their habitual sensations. And it is equally impossible that we should so far divest ourselves of the influence of a very different set of associations and habits in life, in feeling, and in thought, as to enable us to enter into any genuine communion with their views of nature, science, duty, truth, and God. If we undertake, then, to inquire into these matters at all, it becomes us to re-

**Aufsatz ueber die Venus von Milo.*

member that we make our observations inevitably from our own point of view, and that all our conclusions are finally drawn in conformity to our own standards. Hence, therefore, before all we should separate, among these our standards of judgment, those which are accidental and changeable, the creatures of circumstance and education, from those which we must regard as necessary and absolute. Something like positive tests we may hope to find in certain fixed laws of thought and certain necessary tempers of the mind, taken together with the permanent and unalterable nature of truth; while we shall run the greatest risk of error in attempting to found a judgment on external conditions of life. Everything that is merely formal and superficial must be treated only as a sign, and even when thus used it can only be supposed to yield us a more or less uncertain and approximate evidence of the true state of the mind beneath. If we will understand, then, how the ancient mind stood related to the truth, we must try to observe in the records of the thought and life of that old time what views were then had of the great "open secret" of the world and man, what conceptions entertained of God, of duty, and of the hereafter. And for this purpose we need not follow the schools of philosophy in their divisions and dissensions on those topics, but only note the ideas with which, through the medium of these disputations or otherwise, the minds of educated men of that age were familiar.

And first with regard to God. Whatever may have been the prevailing forms of their superstitious fancies and practices, it is plain that the thinking minds of both Greece and Rome were, from even a very early period, conversant with the thoughts of a Divinity far removed from the gross forms in which it was present in all its multiplied aspects to the popular imagination. Empedocles (444 B. C.) already taught: "There is only one God, the greatest among men and gods, comparable to men neither in outward form nor in spirit."

Socrates, as was usual with him, does not give any precise utterance to his conceptions of the Divinity. His has been called the philosophy of ignorance. Yet how high was that ignorance, which refused to see the true nature of God in the

fictitious representations of the poets, and could not find it any where short of the great incomprehensible, which should be approached only by faith, reverence, and obedience! (See Xen. Mem., iv. 3.)

Plato, too, bitterly condemns the false and degrading treatment which the gods had received at the hands of the poets, beginning with Homer and Hesiod; and in the second book of the "Republic," concludes an extended discourse on the subject with these words: "One truth will therefore serve as a guide to both orators and poets: not of all things, but only of that which is good, is God the originator." That this God of Plato's conception was an individual being, is not distinctly said by him, but it would seem fair to infer so much from his employment of the designating words, τὸ αἰτὸν ἀγαθόν.

Passing on downwards, we find among almost all serious authors the strongest expressions of indignant reprobation of the popular abuses and perversions of the true idea of the divine nature, which had been commenced and spread by the poets. Lucretius, in anticipation of the triumph of Epicurean infidelity, rejoices in the emancipation of men's minds from such a religion. Cicero spurns the popular delusions, and soars far above them in his ideas of God. Pliny, (N. H., II., c. 7,) Seneca, and Plutarch, (de Is. et Os.,) abhor the vulgar and corrupt fables about the gods. "Were these to be understood literally," says Plutarch, "we should have to curse the mouth that uttered them." And Seneca (De Vit. Beat., c. 26) uses such language as this: "I bear with your vagaries as the great Jupiter bears with the follies of the poets; one of whom invests him with wings, another with horns, another of whom presents him as an adulterer and debauchee, another as cruel towards gods and unjust towards men, and another" as the perpetrator of the most disgusting and unnatural crimes; "by which representations nothing else is accomplished than that men would lose all shame in sinning, if they believed in such gods."

Should we proceed now to gather, from the opinions of the various sects of philosophy, the several ideas of God, which,

*See Tholuck, *Der sittliche Character des Heidenthums*, p. 10.

more or less differently grouped, were widely held and commonly discussed in antiquity, we should find the men of that time thinking and speaking of a God who is a person and individual, a spirit, infinite, eternal, all-wise, omnipresent, all-good, the creator of all things, the father of spirits, the author and revealer of truth, and the regulator not only of the universe at large,—the realm of nature in its grand and mighty unity,—but enveloping and determining, by his special providence, the particular affairs of individual men. We need not go outside of the philosophical writings of Cicero to find these ideas abundantly set forth, connected frequently with the names of their principal supporters and expounders. It is not to the purpose here to narrate the history of those ideas, nor to examine the arguments by which they were maintained or the conflicts to which they gave rise. It is enough now to show that they existed and were the property of the ancient mind. We shall have to content ourselves with a very few passages for evidence. Cicero, in the *Tusculan Disputations*, (I., c. 26, 27,) argues at once for the divine origin of the human soul and the supreme and separate essence of the divinity. The soul must come from God, because there is no other known source from which its powers could be derived. "Therefore I call the soul divine, which Euripides went so far as to call very God. Whatever that is which feels, and thinks, and knows, and lives, is celestial and divine, and for that reason must be eternal. Nor can God himself, who is discerned by us, be viewed in any other light than as an intelligence unbound and free, separated from every form of perishable matter—an intelligence which is the prime mover of all things."

In the three books *De Natura Deorum*, we have an extended and many-sided discussion of the divine essence, the eternity, the omnipotence of God, (not omitting his unfailing *justice*,) together with his minute and personal intervention, by his providence, in the affairs of men. And we should not neglect to notice that Cicero, in his conceptions of the Deity, does not identify him with that living spirit or soul of the universe, beyond which the Stoics, the earlier Stoics at least, do not seem to go. In his *Timæus de Universo*, this idea of Zeno's, that the

material universe is endowed with an animal and intelligent existence, is adopted by conjecture, but the author there sets the spiritual creator distinctly above that great work of his power.*

It would be interesting to examine particularly the ideas of God promulgated by all the great thinkers of antiquity, and to follow them in some such detail as that which is furnished us in the admirable compendium contained in chapters 10–15 of the first of Cicero's books *De Natura Deorum*. Here the Epicurean Velleius passes them all in review, and satirizes each in turn, in order to prepare the way for the opinions of his master, the philosopher of the Garden, the hero of Lucretius's verse, "who, unterrified by the thunderbolts of heaven, first dared the assault upon a system of beliefs beneath the dreadful weight of which his race was toiling in the blind helplessness of oppression."†

In this sketch, we have something of Plato, the nearest to the Christian, as St. Augustine thinks, (*Civ. Dei*, l. viii. c. 9,) and the notions of Zeno, which some may think equally near to the truth. But the limits of our space confine us, and we pass now at once to an advanced period of antiquity, to gather from the works of Seneca a view of the opinions then held concerning the Deity. The following are some of Seneca's words: "God is the first and universal cause;" "God escapes the sight of the eyes: he must be seen by thought alone;" "Every one must worship him in his own heart;" "God, the ruler and determining power of the universe;" "Nothing is hidden to God;" "We all lie open to him;" "Everything is present to his divinity;" "God himself, the founder and ruler of all things, is the author of Fate indeed, but yet regulates his own acts by its prescriptions; he ordered once for all; he always obeys;" "All things are the gods'; the whole world is their temple, the only one worthy of their infinite majesty;" "No one has ever stretched forth his hand to the gods;" "God is not the minister of meanness;" "It is best to follow God, the providential source of all events, without murmuring;" "So deal with thy fellow-man as though supposing that God seeth thee." "The human spirit, which is

*Compare also *De Nat. Deor.*, I., 14, 36.

†*Lucr.* I. 62–79.

upright, good, and great, what else is that to be called," says he, "than *God sojourning* in the human body?" Already Plato speaks of the spiritual contact between God and the soul, in calling God (Rep. vi.) the *medium between the thinking and the thought*.*

But what shall be said of such language as this, which is used by Seneca in a letter to his friend Lucilius? (Ep. 41.) "You are engaged in a most excellent and profitable undertaking, if, as you say in your letters, you continue to strive after a good (and pure) state of mind; which it is folly to seek elsewhere, whilst you can obtain it in yourself. We have no need to lift the hands to heaven, nor to ask the keeper of the temple to give us access to the ear of an image, as though our prayers should there be offered more successfully. *God is near thee, with thee, within thee*. This I say, Lucilius: *A holy spirit resides within us—a guard, a watcher (of what we do) of evil and of good. As he is treated by us, just so in turn he deals with us. No good man is without God. He inspires with great and noble purposes.*"

We have undertaken to compare the intellectual point of view which was occupied of old with the mere worldly wisdom of the present day, and would carefully avoid all scrutiny of the light which is shed upon the mind of the true believer by the Spirit of all truth; and yet, when we meet with such language as this, we are almost tempted in wonder to carry our comparison beyond the bounds prescribed by a just reverence, and to exclaim with the elder Seneca, in words which he used of the Titan assailing the battlements of Olympus, "*Quam prope a caelo stetit!*" How near was he to the kingdom of heaven! So much for the ancient ideas of God.

No less ardent, no less constant, was their study of man; and it would be easy to make out (as is well known) the most elaborate roll of their penetrating investigations into the constitution of the human soul, its origin and its nature, its powers, its connexions with the body, and its future destiny; the restraints, both natural and moral, which confine the soul in this world, and its relationship with God. Familiar then as now were the dis-

*See Aug. *De Civ. D.* l. viii., c. 7.

sertations of philosophers on the immortality of the soul, its immaterial essence, the nature and standards of moral obligation, the self-determining power of the will, predestination, and the final state of the liberated spirit. Touching this last—the final destiny of souls—there are many expressions used by ancient authors of a vague and uncertain character, which have led to a general belief that they had no clearly defined notions about the prospect of a different fate for the good and the bad beyond the grave. The following fragment of Cicero, however, speaks with sufficient distinctness on that point: “For those same philosophers have held, that not unto all does the same passage lie open into heaven. Their teaching is, that those who are contaminated by vice and wickedness are forced down into darkness and lie prostrate in mire; while the chaste, the pure, the upright, the undefiled, and those who are cultivated and adorned by the worthy and elevating pursuits of liberal knowledge, with a light and easy flight, soar away to the gods—that is, to a nature like their own.”*

All are familiar with the many arguments in use among philosophers from a very early time, both for and against the immortality of the soul. What was *believed* on this subject remains to be considered in another place. But we are reminded here of a remarkable passage of Plutarch, which deserves to be read. It occurs in his treatise, *Non posse suaviter vivere secundum Epicurum*, and is as follows: “We see, therefore, that those who reason in that way, by denying the soul’s immortality, destroy the sweetest and greatest hopes of simple men. But why now do we still believe that yonder no ill, but a glorious prospect, awaits the righteous and holy man? First to be considered is, that combatants do not receive the crown so long as the combat endures, but after they have fought out the fight and come off victorious. Inasmuch as now, in the same way, men believe that only after this life the badge of victory is conferred, they become possessed by a wonderful striving after virtue, in view of those hopes. Further, he who has a love for true existence has never yet on this earth been able to satisfy himself with the beholding

*Lactant. Instit. I., c. 19.

of the same, since here his spirit could have but dim perceptions, because looking through the body as through a fog or cloud. Such a man can only keep his soul well ordered and turned away from earthly things by making use of true wisdom as a preparation for death, looking upwards, the while, as a bird, to soar away from the body and into the great and splendid immensity. Yes, I hold death to be a so great and truly perfect good, that I believe that in it the soul will first truly live and be awake, while now it is to be likened to a dreamer.”*

The ancient theories of morals, and the broad range of thought throughout which fluctuated to and fro the conflicts of the rival schools, are too well known to call for more than a reminder here. A few selections from the precepts and dogmata of the Platonist or Stoic will suffice to suggest their theories and point to the application of the same: “That only is good which is right;” “The virtuous man wants nothing for a happy life;” “The folly of the fool is madness;” “In wisdom only is freedom, and the fool is a slave;” “That which is right must be sought for itself alone;” “Innocence is true happiness;” “Know that you cannot be rich and be happy;” “’Tis the most difficult of all things to conquer self;” “He is the good man who has reached that point that he not only does not wish to sin, but cannot;” “Every sin is an act; but every act is voluntary, whether it be right or wrong (creditable or base); every sin is therefore voluntary. Away with excuses; no one sins against his will.” “Ask nothing which you would refuse; refuse nothing which you would ask.”

Many seem to suppose that the idea of conscience was but obscurely present to the ancients. But we find Menander addressing such words as these to the common people: “All mortals have a god within the conscience.” † And Cicero: “Great is the power of conscience in both directions; so that those who have done no wrong fear not, and those who have sinned have visions of punishment ever before their eyes.” ‡ Seneca: “Evil deeds are scourged by the conscience.” || And so many Latin

*Quoted by Tholuck in his Essay, *Der sittliche Character des Heidenthums.*

†Meinecke, 654.

‡Pro Mil., 23.

||Ep. 97, s. f.

authors use the words "good" and "bad" conscience, for the instinctive moral sense, by which the good and bad in thought and action is unerringly tried. Quintilian reports as a common proverb, "Conscience is a thousand witnesses." *

Thus we have sought to gain an idea of the intellectual point of view of the ancient mind, by passing in review some of the images of truth which were reflected on its surface and lie now fixed for our inspection on the pages of classic literature. Short and partial as our sketch has been, we have not room to pursue this method further, and must turn now briefly to consider some of the other tests of the ancient capacity and affinity for truth.

There is a spirit of shallow curiosity which often gives a lively stimulus to the pursuit of knowledge—an excited constant craving after the pleasurable sensation which follows every new stir among the thoughts, every fresh arrangement of the mind about a different centre. There are meaner motives still, which often conduct the most determined search for truth. Knowledge is power, knowledge is glory, knowledge is wealth, are watchwords with a host of students. Individuals, races, generations, whose intellectual activities are awakened and directed by no higher moving and controlling influences than these, may accomplish much indeed that bears the name and honor of knowledge and civilisation; but it cannot be thought that they stand in any true and intimate communion with the truth. Truth will be honored for herself alone, and unveils her glorious proportions only to such as approach her with simplicity, humility, and love. A stench in her nostrils is the incense rising in her name from the altars which stand in the temples of literary Epicurism, wealth, ambition, fanaticism, and national glory. How, then, did the studious minds of old regard and approach the truth?

* And the *moral sense*, now so called, is clearly designated by the following words of Cicero and of Horace: "Recte facta omnia aequalia, omnia peccata paria (esse); quae cum magnifice primo dici viderentur, considerata minus probantur; *sensus enim cujusque et natura rerum atque ipsa veritas clamat quodammodo, non posse adduci ut inter eas res, quas Zeno exaequaret, nihil interesset.*" Cic. de Fin. IV. 19 extr.; and Horat. Sat. I. 3, 97: "*Sensus moresque repugnant.*"

Was it in vanity, frivolity, and worldly greed, or was it with uplifted eye and disinterested zeal?

If we will hear the ancient philosophers themselves, as they discourse on the proper attitude of an inquirer after truth, we shall find repeated evidence of their pure and lofty aspirations. Where can be found nobler and more striking words on this subject than those of Socrates,* when about to step forth at once from the shackles of his Athenian prison and the trammels of his earthly body into the full presence, as he thought, of the glorious and unclouded Majesty of Truth! "It is the body," says he, "which, with all its many forms of appetite and desire, obtrudes itself continually between us and the object of our researches, so that, by reason of it, we are not able to discern the truth. And while we live, we shall thus, as it seems, approach most nearly to knowledge, if we hold no intercourse nor communion at all with the body, except what absolute necessity requires; nor suffer ourselves to be polluted by it, but purify ourselves from it until God himself shall release us."

The pursuit of truth, even in the department of physical nature, was, according to the standing opinion of antiquity, † allowed to the good alone; so that *σώφρων* and *sapiens* were epithets of moral as well as intellectual preëminence. And Plato, with rapture of philosophic enthusiasm, cries even: *Hoc enim est philosophari, amare Deum.* ‡

In short, from innumerable expressions of this nature throughout the whole reign of philosophy among the Greeks and Romans, as well as from the lives and efforts of many of its most distinguished votaries, it is plain to see that one of the most notable marks of those ancient searchers after truth was a high and reverent estimate of its purity and grandeur. They were fired, too, with a burning zeal. In both these points, the great founder of the name "philosopher" is worthy to be cited. When Pythagoras had "compassed sea and land" in his pursuit of knowledge; when, with the priests on the Nile, he had unrolled the wisdom of ancient Egyptian lore; when he had explored in

* See Plat. Phaed., cc. 29, 30, 31. † Compare Aul. Gell. N. A. l. xvii. c. 19. ‡ As quoted by St. Augustine. *De Civ. Dei*, l. viii. c. 9.

Persia the mysteries of the Magi; when he had studied, amongst the people of Crete and Lacedæmon, the institutions of those venerable states; and when, by his great stores of various knowledge, he had drawn upon himself the wonder and admiration of all Greece—on being asked the question how he wished to be known, he answered, “Not as though he had yet attained;” that he was “not a wise man, but a lover of wisdom.”* Most brilliant examples of an ardor neglecting or sacrificing all else in pure and single devotion to learning, are seen in Socrates, Plato, Democritus, Anaxagoras, Cleanthes, M. Terentius Varro, Cato the younger, and a host of others.

Where are the students of this type now to be found? We rejoice to know that there are some, and to believe that there are many, among us of a similar devotion; but yet a great multitude of those who would be known, and who are known, as the devotees of science, are men of narrower mould and inferior aims. For in our boasted modern civilisation knowledge is made a trade; and there is no little evidence that it is the prevailing habit of this time and country to render it subservient to ends which are regarded as of higher value.

First when the intellectual greatness of antiquity was verging towards decay, did the deep thirst for knowledge degenerate into a morbid and trifling curiosity, the foppery of learned vanity. With the greater spread of knowledge, it seems to have flowed in shallower streams. The spirit of ancient philosophy retired before the power of a universal infidelity, which, advancing with the refinements of vice and luxury, conducted the wisdom, the virtue, the honor, the glory, the institutions, the civilisation of Greece and of Rome to ruin and to death. Infidelity was at all times the great bane and bar of ancient wisdom. The visions of truth which passed before the eyes of philosophers were glorious enough to rouse their love and stir their zeal to the highest point of a poetic enthusiasm; but whilst they cherished and adored these visions, they were never quite convinced of their reality. Without faith, their knowledge was but imagination; and hence they never secured a body of living truth which they

* Val. Max., l. viii., c. 7.

could boldly and confidently propagate among the people. They did not trust their wisdom with power to penetrate and to control the darkened understanding of the common folk. In the writings of those philosophers who abound the most in discourses about God and eternity, it is not without sad disappointment that we encounter expressions which reveal their own want of certain convictions. Thus Cicero, in his treatise *De Inventione*, (l. i., c. 2^o, *in fin.*,) places in the category of things *probable* the punishment of the wicked, and seems to call in doubt also the existence of the gods. And Seneca, whose thoughts are usually so full of immortality, has only to say of his lamented friend (Ep. 63, 16): "And *perhaps* he whom we think to have lost is only gone before us, *if* what the philosophers say is true, and there is some (future) place awaiting us." While in another letter to Lucilius, (Ep. 102, 2,) occur these striking words: "I was pleasing myself with reflecting upon the immortality of souls—nay, I actually believed in it. I had surrendered myself unresistingly to the ideas of the great men who hold out to us this most delightful prospect rather than demonstrate its reality; and flattering myself with the comfortable hope that I should soon leave this imperfect state of existence, and pass over into yonder immensity of time, and enter on the possession of an eternal existence, when suddenly, by the arrival of your letter, I awoke, and *my beautiful dream was gone.*"

Since, then, among philosophers such ideas were felt to be at bottom no more than dreams, than fond imaginations, we wonder less to find them, as we do, encouraging the maintenance, among the people, of the traditionary superstitions of their religion, which, false as it was, gave them something to reverence or something to fear. And herein, too, we see how the educated people, as they rose in their intelligence to discover the folly of their superstitious worship, found no positive fountain of truth in philosophy; but, ruled especially, as they were, by the all-prevailing sensuality of the day, could take nothing from it but its later growth of Epicurean nihilism, or a blank and hopeless scepticism. Such was about the state of things when the gospel was first proclaimed. What, now, if we ask ourselves whether after

nineteen centuries the truth is much more intimately known and loved? Are not real scepticism in thought and Epicureanism in life still the prevailing principles in our world outside the pale of the true Church of Christ? Are men who entertain in their minds the truths of the gospel, but do not really believe them, in any condition to plume themselves on their communion with the truth? If they are, let their fruits now speak. For we do not propose to pursue this question into its metaphysical channels, but turn rather to a practical and final test.

The evidence drawn from the morals and manners of a people is indirect, it is true, and obscure; since here we find, in combinations hard to separate, the offspring of the heart and mind, and the products of accident and convention. Yet a general judgment may be admitted. It is well known that the history of antiquity presents us with many forms of organised corruption—a corruption fostered by a false religion, and not only recognised, but maintained even, in some instances, by the authority of government;* and hence it is commonly assumed that the modern form of civilisation in Christian lands is entitled to a precedence which is beyond dispute. And yet, so soon as we undertake to examine the matter in detail, we shall scarcely fail to find a parallel in our own time for almost every form of sensuality and wickedness which ever prevailed in either Greece or Rome. Who can miss, in the higher ranks of modern society, the picture of an Alcibiades or an Aspasia? For a Catullus or an Ovid, are not a Byron and a Heine here? And then, if we look to the general mass of the people and consider well the accounts which we have of the debasing excesses, the low revelry, dishonor, and crime of the ancient world, he must be a bold man who can declare this record darker than the black rolls of iniquity which in our own newspapers are daily spread before our eyes. The virtues of the ancient Roman people must also not be forgotten. Their constancy, fidelity to engagements; their temperance, frugality, respect for age and for authority; the integrity of the men and the chastity of the women of the early Commonwealth, the high standard of personal honor in public

* Compare, among many passages, Val. Max. I. 10, 8.

men, and the gravity of their national council: these are all continually made the theme of admiring commemoration by the authors of late and degenerate times, who fail not to set forth many a brilliant example. The ancient Roman mother was held up in rebuke to the fashionable women of his time by Favorinus, the philosopher, and her picture was beautifully drawn by Tacitus for the same purpose. Those portraits will bear to be inspected now, in comparison with many of the products of modern civilisation. We are informed by the antiquarian Gellius, that it was more than five hundred years after the foundation of the city when the first case of divorce came before the Roman courts, since there were none up to that time, he adds, "in either Rome or Latium, who turned off from their marriage bonds." (N. A. iv. 3, 1.) The records of Sir Cresswell Cresswell's court have a very different show of figures and of facts. So, indeed, was the later stage of Roman society vastly changed in this respect. But we have the right to look at all the best fruits of ancient life, and to select, if not exclusively, yet partially, its best periods, when it is to be compared with that form of civilisation which is so constantly vaunted as the purest and the best. It is hardly necessary, however, to conduct this comparison into further detail. It must be confessed that, whatever changes have passed over the face of society, its heart remains morally the same. And if the modern world has more pleasing veils by which to keep better out of view the corruption which is gnawing at its vitals, the most painful evidence of its existence is not far to seek. And it is hardly by a superior purity of heart and life that the modern world can claim any great precedence over the ancient in respect of its affinity for the noble and the good—its communion with the truth. The oracles of God and the Church of Christ are the repositories and vehicles of the truth in this world. But outside of the certain and divine illumination which the great Source of all truth is graciously pleased by these channels to dispense, it must be very difficult to make out that the lapse of nineteen centuries has done much to purify the moral atmosphere of the world. And by the heart, the life, and the manners, we are now judging also of the mind.

In the times of ancient philosophy, a wise man^r said: "The truth is open to all; (but) her domain is not yet occupied; and much of it remains to be discovered by the men who are yet to come."* We are the men who were yet to come; and if we would imitate the modesty of him who looked from the imperfections of his own knowledge on towards the discoveries of the future, we should call back to him in the words of the wise man, who "gave his heart to know wisdom and to know madness and folly:" "Is there anything whereof it may be said, See this is new? it hath been already of old time, which was before us."

ARTICLE III.

THE SCRIPTURAL AND DIVINE RIGHT FOR USING
MECHANICAL AS WELL AS VOCAL INSTRUMENTS
IN THE WORSHIP OF GOD.

Part I.—GENERAL ARGUMENT FROM HISTORY, THE NATURE OF
DIVINE WORSHIP, CHRISTIAN LIBERTY, AND PRESUMP-
TIVE PROOF.

It would be well for those who "seek to expel from the house and worship of God all the lovers and devotees of Jubal, who was a descendant of that wicked one Cain," to consider that it is by no means improbable that the mystic words attributed to Jubal (see Gen. iv. 23,) *may be* a penitential song, to which he was led to adapt the pensive tones of the harp and the ORGAN, by the guiding providence of God's redeeming mercy; and that from the beginning, therefore, instrumental music, both mechanical and vocal, has been consecrated to God's worship in the aid of penitence and piety. (See Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, Art. Jubal.) Certain it is, that such instruments as the harp and organ have been always regarded as sacredly associated with God's worship and the praises of his redeemed people, *under*

* Seneca, Ep. 33, 11.

every economy of the Church militant, and that they constitute an essential part of the symbolic minstrelsy of heaven.

“ Music's the language of the blest above ;
 No voice but Music's can express
 The joys that happy souls possess,
 Nor in just raptures tell the wondrous powers of love.”

And hence, among the attractive representations of heaven, it is written : “ The Lord shall count, when he writeth up the people, that this man was born there (that is, in Zion). *As well the singers as the players on instruments shall be there.*” And thus the apostolic seer in his vision “ beheld, and lo, in the midst of the throne and of the four beasts, and in the midst of the elders, stood a Lamb as it had been slain....And when he had taken the book, the four beasts and four and twenty elders fell down before the Lamb, *having every one of them harps....And they sung a new song, saying,*” etc. “ And I saw as it were a sea of glass, and them that had gotten the victory over the beast, and over his image, stand on the sea of glass, *having the harps of God.* And they sing the song of Moses and the Lamb.” “ And I heard a voice from heaven, as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of the great thunder ; and I heard the voice of *harpers harping with their harps* ; and they sang as it were a new song....and no man could learn that song but the hundred and forty and four thousand which were redeemed from the earth.”

We find, therefore, that among the very first arts given by God to man—when he sent him forth to inhabit and cultivate the earth, and had imparted to him, by divine communication, language and all that knowledge of natural history, science, and art, which was necessary for a state of incipient civilisation, which was undoubtedly the primeval condition of the human family (see Whately's *Lessons on Worship*, ch. i., *Political Economy*, and elsewhere)—was not only the mechanical knowledge necessary for pastoral life, but also for its social and religious enjoyment. And hence among the few hints given us of this period, it was thought of sufficient importance to record (Gen. iv. 21) of Jubal—who was no more really wicked, though in a

different form, than his apostate parents, Adam and Eve—that “he was the father of all such as handle the harp and the organ.” In connexion with this, it is said, in verse 26, that “*then began men to call on the name of the 'Lord;*” which cannot mean that, for the first time, they then began to worship God, (of which we have previous record—see chapter iv.,) and must, therefore, imply some more perfect and developed form of worship; and this, the context leads us to believe, was the introduction of the harp and the organ as auxiliary helps in God’s worship.

The term here employed to designate the organ has, says Prof. Bush, “the import of loveliness and delight, and the word translated ‘call upon,’ in ch. iv. 26, includes the whole worship of God—prayer and praise,” and necessarily teaches that this worship was then revived, and more perfectly, publicly, and solemnly established. “In the Old Testament, the words, ‘call on the name of the Lord,’ always,” says Prof. Bush, “mean an act of solemn worship, and denote all the appropriate acts and exercises of the stated worship of God.” In general confirmation of this interpretation, it is to be observed, as is remarked by Kitto, that *the corruption of the race did not spread till near the time of the flood*, and that when it did become general it contaminated *not only the posterity of Cain*, but the posterity of all the others except Seth. Oriental traditions trace the origin of fire and all the arts, including musical instruments, to the ministration of angels, and the glory of God, as exhibited in the providential introduction of inventions, has given rise to able and most interesting treatises. Du Bartas, as well as Montgomery, has therefore celebrated the praise of God, whose goodness and wisdom were so richly manifested in the invention of musical instruments as first introduced by Jubal. Du Bartas says of Jubal:

“Thereon he harps, and glad and fain some instrument would find
That in accord all discords might renew.”

James Montgomery, in his “World Before the Flood,” also renders homage to Jubal:

“Jubal, the prince of song, (in youth unknown),
 Retired to commune with his harp alone,
 For still he nursed it like a secret thought,
 Long cherished and to late perfection wrought;
 And still with cunning hand and curious ear
 Enriched, ennobled, and enlarged its sphere,
 Till he had compassed in that magic round
 A soul of harmony, a heaven of sound.
 Thus music's empire in the soul began—
 The first born poet ruled the first born man.”

The word *huggab*, here translated *organ*, was derived from a word expressive of the sweetness of tones, and is again spoken of in Job xxi. 12, and probably in Dan. iii. 5, and in Ps. cl. 4, and Ps. lvii. 8. This was undoubtedly a wind instrument, composed of an indefinite number of pipes, from five to twenty-five, and is found in some ancient representations enclosed in a box-form, so as to give the original essential idea of the present perfected organ, which is called THE ORGAN just as the Bible is called THE BIBLE, to indicate that in comparison with all other organs or instruments of music, it is the most perfect, both as it is the most harmonious of all and the most ancient of all, and because it includes within itself the sounds of all other instruments.

“Music, the tender child of rudest times,
 The gentle native of all lands and climes,
 Who hymns alike man's cradle and his grave,
 Lulls the low cot, or peals along the nave.”

Let it be borne in mind that God has adapted man to music and music to man—

“There is in souls a sympathy with sounds,
 And as the mind is pitched, the ear is pleased;
 Some chord in unison with what we hear
 Is touched within us, and the heart replies.”

“Our joys below, music can improve, and antedate the bliss above; and breathing divine, enchanting ravishment, can take the prisoned soul and lap it in elysium.” Let it also be borne in mind that as music was thus, by the constitution of man's nature and by God's gracious purposes towards him, made most essentially

ministrant to his greatest happiness, so it is designed by Christ to sanctify this most sweet and powerful instrumentality to the services of redeemed humanity and of his Church militant here upon earth. In accomplishing our salvation, Christ, by his Spirit, works in, by, and through the constituent elements and aptitudes of our nature, so as to bring men into a "*willing captivity and obedience*," that we may find his yoke easy, his burden light, his ways pleasantness, his paths peace, and may feel the worship of God to be our delight. Christ would make his sanctuary "*the beauty of holiness, and the very gate of heaven*," by which the seraphic tones of its far off minstrelsy may reverberate in thrilling ecstasy through all the winding avenues of the soul; and it must therefore needs be that he will consecrate the tranquil spirit of sweet melodious sounds to exercise their mastery of soft control.

“My spirit hath gone up in yonder cloud
Of solemn and sweet sound—the many voices
Peal upon peal, and now
The choral voice alone.
At door of heav’n, my soul is all unsphered,
Soaring and soaring on the crystal car
Of airy sweetness borne,
And drinks ethereal air.”

Plutarch informs us that singing and music, among the ancient Greeks, were employed exclusively in the worship of the gods, and he laments their profanation in later times. This sacred use, however, appears never to have been entirely lost, since we read of some instances of it in the early centuries of the Christian era. Music, poetry, and song, are all daughters of the same divine family, whose birth has ever been traced up, by remote antiquity, to parental deities, and consecrated in vestal purity to their divine service.

We have in these facts a twofold evidence of the original divine authorisation of instrumental music as an auxiliary aid to the expression of acceptable religious worship: first, in the testimony of Scripture and tradition to its most primitive use; and, secondly, in its adaptation to the sympathetic, emotional, and

religious nature of man. Man thinks in words, and expresses his emotions in musical intonations, and perfects music by instrumental combinations. When this combination takes place, the result is not merely sensational delight, but moral sensibility and religious aspiration.

“While to each rising thought true wisdom tells
Of purer heights,—whate’er of good desire,
Of love, or thought serene the bosom swells,
By these on bodiless wings to heav’n aspire,
And gain, perchance, a gleam of that diviner fire.”

This trinal unity of poetry with vocal and instrumental music, is as old as the trinal creation, when the morning stars shouted together for joy over man’s new created home, and expressed the delight which the Son of God cherished towards the sons of men.

“There’s not a voice in Nature but is telling
(If we will hear that voice aright)
How much, when human hearts with love are swelling,
Christ’s blessed bosom hath delight
In our rejoicing lays ;
Whose love that never slumbers
Taught man his tuneful numbers.”

The praise of God with voice, and language, and instrumental concert, is therefore found entering as a natural or instituted element into every dispensation of the Church, and into every representation of its Christian and celestial economy ; and it constitutes, therefore, one evidence of the unity of God’s militant Church, in all its various marches through the wilderness of time, and of that Church triumphant in heaven.

“In life we differ, but we join in song ;
Angels and we, assisted by this art,
May praise together, though we dwell apart ;
While solemn airs improve *our* sacred fire,
And angels lean from listening heaven to hear.”

But we are met here by the great argument of our opponents in this controversy, that the worship of God is a positive institution of God, and that nothing can rightly enter into it but

what can show its distinct divine appointment. "If," it is said, "praise is a necessary and important part of our worship, and derives its efficacy from its appointment and our method of performance, surely it is no vain inquiry how or with what we shall praise God." (See *S. Pres. Rev.*, Oct., 1855, p. 227.) Such is the apparently triumphant question of the former reviewer, in his elaborate article condemnatory of the use of organs or any other instrumental music in the worship of God. Now, the argument here implied is unquestionably fallacious. The argument put into form is this: God is to be worshipped by praise; but God can be praised only in that way and manner which he appoints; and as singing is the only form of praise appointed or authorised by God, therefore singing alone—to the exclusion of all other instrumental music—is acceptable to God as praise or worship. "It is not," says the reviewer, "because praise is a pleasant thing—pleases the ear and stirs up the deep feelings of the soul—that we employ it in the worship of God. A much stronger reason than this *enjoins its use upon us.*" In proof of this, he adds two texts: "*Sing ye praises with the spirit and with the understanding also.*" "Let everything that hath breath *praise the Lord.*" Now, this argument is, I affirm, inconclusive, and the fallacy is in confounding *singing* with *praise* and *worship*. Singing, which is vocal instrumental music, is, *in itself considered, no more praise or worship of God* than the music of the harp, of the organ, or of the cornet; neither is singing *music*, but only *one kind of music, made by one kind of instrument*, which, in its perfectly cultivated and well-trained form, is as really artificial, external, and instrumental to that heart and spirit which alone constitute true praise and worship of God, as are the harp, the organ, the cornet, etc. *The voice educated by man's artistic science is no more sacred and divine than other instruments, since the whole science and art of music, by which the voice is developed, perfected, and artistically played upon, is no more sacred or holy when applied to the organ of the voice than when applied to that mechanical organ with which that voice is accompanied.*

This is evident from the authorities relied upon by the re-

viewer, in which the fallacy is made self-evident by the clear distinction which they draw between *music as a means or medium*, and *the devout affections of the heart*, which alone constitute *praise or worship of God*, who is a spirit, and can only be rightly worshipped in spirit and in truth. "The design of sacred music," says Andrew Fuller, "is to EXPRESS our devout affections towards God and *make melody in the heart to the Lord* The intent of *singing* is, by a *musical pronunciation* of affecting truth, to *render it still more affecting.*" "Singing," says Dr. Gill, "is speaking *melodiously, musically*, or with *the modulation of THE VOICE*, for there is no such thing as *mental singing* or singing in heart *without the voice.*" (See *S. Pres. Rev.*, Oct., 1855, p. 227.) Dr. Gill perceived the fallacy which the reviewer and Dr. Fuller employed, and averts it only by a bold dogmatic contradiction of the apostle, (as well as of manifold other scriptures,) who enjoins upon believers, as a Christian duty, *two things*—(see Eph. v. 18, 19)—1. The use of *every form of sacred song and MUSIC, both vocal and instrumental*, as we will show; and 2. "*Melody in the heart...to God and the Father in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ;*" or, as the same apostle emphatically states the distinction in Col. iii. 16, where he says: "Admonish one another by singing *PSALMS*," (that is, *divine songs, composed with and adapted to instrumental and choral music*;) and secondly "do this with grace in your hearts to the Lord,"—which heart melody there is not a *voice* in nature or in art that is not adapted to unite so as to swell the song of praise to God, and that, too, in spirit and in truth. Vocal and instrumental sounds are either profane, artistic, artificial, and sensuous, like those of one "who hath a pleasant voice and plays well upon an instrument;" or, accompanied with the "*melody of the heart*" and the "*singing of the understanding*," they are united and identified with that spirit of praise and prayer which springs from the heart alone.

No such thing as mental singing, or singing in the heart without the voice! There is just as much of it—neither more nor less—as there is of praying, thinking, reading, hearing, and worshipping without the voice; since, in all these, the aid of language and of sounds are alike necessary and alike instru-

mental in giving form, fluency, and expression to these spiritual exercises. It were a fell and fatal delusion to teach that there is no other praise than that which is in the tongue, for it would also teach that there is no other worship than that which is outward, articulate, and ceremonious; whereas PRAISE, like

“Prayer—is the soul’s sincere desire.

Unuttered or expressed:

The motion of a hidden fire

That trembles in the breast:

———the burden of a sigh,

The falling of a tear;

The upward glancing of an eye.

When none but God is near.”

The doctrine of these writers into which our anti-organ-and-instrumental-music friends are very apt insidiously to fall, is gross Pharisaic formalism and ritualism, teaching for doctrine the commandments of men, and substituting for the acceptable sacrifice of true worship “the calves of their lips.” The true worship of God, so far as it consists in prayer and praise, is the expression of devotional feelings to *God*, and the exhibition of his truth to *the world* in certain forms sanctioned by himself, so as to secure the *strengthening* of right principles in Christians, and the *extension* of them to others. Now, the tendency of man’s corrupt nature is, on the one hand, to discourage such worship by its coldness; or to substitute for it mere formal, ceremonial rites, which impress only the senses, the imagination, and the natural religious sensibilities, and never attain to the deep and hallowed joy of those who “draw nigh to God with a true heart, in full assurance of faith, having their hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience and their bodies washed with pure water.” That praise, therefore, which is acceptable to God, is the grateful melody of the heart, the understanding, and the affections. As good old Master Herbert says:

“My joy, my life, my crown!

My heart was moaning all the day,

Somewhat it fain would say,

And still it moaneth muttering up and down

With only this, ‘*My joy, my life, my crown!*’

“Yet slight not these few words ;

If truly said, they may take part
Among the best in art.

*The finest which a hymn or psalm affords,
Is when the soul unto the lines accords.*

“He who craves *all the mind,*

And all the soul, and strength, and time,
If the words only rhyme,

Justly complains that somewhat is behind
To make his verse, or write a hymn in kind.

“Whereas if th’ heart be moved,

Although the verse be somewhat scant,
God doth supply the want ;

And when the heart says, sighing to be approved,
‘*Oh, could I love!*’—and stops ; *God writeth, ‘Loved.’*”

Let it, therefore, be borne in mind, that from the very constitution of our nature, a melodious succession of single sounds, or a harmonious combination of simultaneous sounds, is fitted to excite pleasurable sensations in the mind, *apart altogether* from any meaning, significancy, or sentiment associated with them; and that all real music, whether in the form of melody or harmony or both combined, is neither in the human voice nor in the instrument, but in the soul, whence it swells out, linking itself with conceptions that are solemn or sublime, and pouring itself forth through the medium of the *articulate* sounds of the human voice, or in conjunction with the *inarticulate* sounds of instruments. Now, if these musical sounds happen to be associated with words of piety and sacredness, which have no real meaning except to regenerate spirits, they who find sensitive regalement in the mere excitation of melodious sounds, without any susceptibility to the real meaning of words which symbolize heavenward thoughts and emotions, are very apt to indulge the fond imagination that they are religious and devout, when, after all, their only delight is in musical harmony and carnal sounds. The piety of such, whether it is *awakened by the voice or other instrument*, is nothing more than the devotion of a voice, or an organ, or a lyre, or trumpet, or murmuring brook, or waterfall; it is the mere excitement of sensitive affections, stirred up by the

play of vibrated matter, and in its essential principles differs in no respect from that of "serpents and cockatrices" referred to in Scripture, whose envenomed rage could be allayed, and themselves rivetted in apparent ecstasy, by the sweet notes of the charmer. Music, whether of the voice or of other instrument or of both combined, is to be considered simply as an *instrumentality* through which the truth may be conveyed with greater potency to the mind, and the ardor of its affections awakened and expressed according to its existing state and condition. It stands, therefore, in the same relation to real spiritual worship that reading, preaching, and praying do—as a means of grace, through which the Holy Spirit, the source of all divine life, operates in helping our natural infirmities, teaching us how to pray, and filling our souls with melody of heart in the high praises of our God. The character of music, therefore, in any church or congregation, depends *comparatively little* upon the manner in which it is conducted,—whether by a single leader, or by a choir, or by the combination with the voice of the organ,—but upon the state of the heart as cold, uninterested, and languid, or as animated by lively affections of faith and love, and hope and joy, towards God as a present, living, and adorable Redeemer. Jonathan Edwards therefore tells us—what uniform experience has always confirmed—that the intensity of a revival of pure and undefiled religion in the soul is manifested most conspicuously by the outbursting tones in which the praises of Jehovah are celebrated. And after all, the great practical difficulty—and it is confessedly exceedingly great—in regard to the music of our churches, is, that instead of having our attention and efforts directed to God's Spirit for the stirring up of *languid affections*, and the inspiration of pure devotional desires in the hearts of all the worshippers, there is a tendency to remedy the evil and remove the intolerable icy chilliness of the too ordinary praises of the sanctuary, either by the removal or introduction of precentor, organ, or choir, which are merely instrumental and auxiliary. I know no theoretical or doctrinal objection against the judicious employment of a precentor, choir, or of the organ, *as auxiliaries to devotion*; but it is a fatal mistake to regard

these, or any one of them, not as auxiliaries, but as substitutes for the general devotion of the worshippers. To praise God by proxy is just as preposterous and profane provocation as to pray or hear by proxy.

There is a deplorable ignorance and inattention to this subject, both on the part of ministers, officers, and people. The praise of God is considered as a kind of adjunct or interlude, and not, as it really is, a most important and delightful part of the worship of the sanctuary. It is regarded by many as perfectly immaterial or voluntary on their part whether they take any part in this portion of worship; or it is thought that only those who can sing *well* are required by God to glorify him by a heartfelt offering of praise, and that listening would be as acceptable and serviceable as participation. This, however, is a sad and serious mistake; for as the heart is more deeply moved by *hearing* devotional language *sung* than by hearing the same language *read*, so the heart is more deeply moved when a person himself sings than when he simply listens to the singing of others. Instead of indulging admiration and gratifying taste, or on the other hand being displeased, the heart is enlisted in the exercise and the attention absorbed. This will be the case even when the individual is incapable of artistic performance, and simply commits his heart, with all its emotions, to the general wave of melody, and allows himself to be borne with it as it rises to the throne of the Heavenly Grace. Individual personal fellowship in the praise of God is not less essential as a *duty* than it is as a means of spiritual benefit; and when singing in a congregation is—as it undoubtedly ought to be, whether it is conducted with or without the aid of a choir and organ—hearty, intelligent, and fervent, the influence of devout sympathy is universally felt. Each person aids all the rest, and in turn is aided by all the rest; and thus the ends of social worship are most fully gained. It is therefore most important that every person in the congregation should sing, both for his own and the general good. This is the case in our German Protestant churches, and in others where the organ is employed, and is particularly needful in our Presbyterian churches, since this is the only portion of our worship in

which the people generally can take an active and audible part. And if there are, as we deem, objections to alternate readings and audible responses of the people, it is all the more important to provide for that individual vivacity and interest which may and ought to be obtained by a general, hearty, and intelligent congregational singing.

It must therefore be considered as a most serious and fatal mistake where the whole order, arrangement, and control of the musical expression of the praises of our congregations is left so entirely, as it is in many of our congregations, to the choir, or to the corporation, instead of the spiritual government of the church. The relation in which the praises of God stand to the responsible direction and supervision of the spiritual offices of the church is just as direct and essential as that of the prayers, the preaching, and the general order of the services of the house of God. Whether, therefore, the praise of God is to be conducted with or without the auxiliary help of a precentor, choir, and organ, or through the official lead of the minister or some one of the spiritual officers of the church or not, let it be regarded as fundamentally important that this most essential and delightful part of the service of God's sanctuary shall be so ordered as to secure the instruction, and adaptation to it, and participation in it, of all the children as well as adults of the congregation.

“The song of Zion is a tasteless thing,
Unless, when rising on a joyful wing,
Each soul can mix with the celestial bands,
And give the strain the compass it demands.”

Man is by nature carnal, worldly, formal, and ritualistic in his spirit and tastes, but it is nevertheless a primary obligation and necessity that man shall worship God; and the whole scheme of redemption, the economy of the gospel, and the ordinances of God's Church, and the means of grace, are adapted to man as *fallen*, as redeemed in Christ, and as redeemable personally by the sanctification of the Holy Ghost. The Scripture models of worship, including praise and prayer, are perfect expressions to

be adopted by imperfect, sinful men. They are adapted not to our weakness, and ignorance, and sinfulness, but to our duty and privilege; not as of ourselves, in disobedience and unbelief, we *would* pray and praise, but as we *ought*, and as, aided from on high, we *may*. The spiritual blessing may be restrained by our unbelief, self-glorying, and unthankfulness; but prayerless and praiseless hearts cannot hinder us from rising with all God's saints and angels, and with all God's works, in blessing and magnifying the Lord with all our souls in God's divinely instituted form of worship, in which he has provided a perfect method of piety, a true and living way of approach to him, an exact mould for the heart and character, and forms vital with the Spirit, which accompanies them, to prompt the reluctant, to enable the incapable, and to transform the vile.

The question, then, which arises in reference to the subject of the praise of God as part of this public form of worship is: Has God left to his Church any discretion as to the form and order of its exercises and the auxiliary aid with which its services are to be conducted? It must be admitted that God's worship is of positive institution, and that, in regard to all that is essential, that alone can be acceptable to God which was introduced or permitted or approved by him. This being so, it is equally apparent that what God has permitted and approved by his own inspired record of the example and use of believers under different dispensations of his Church, can only be altered by a repeal or restriction as positive and authoritative. And if, therefore, the use of instrumental music can be shown to have existed in religious services from the beginning, the impropriety of its continued use can only be established by a plain and positive enactment of Christ, the great Lawgiver of his Church, prohibiting its further use. *The necessity for proof is not on the part of those who plead for liberty in the use of such instrumental music, vocal and mechanical, but on the part of those who assert that it has been interdicted, according to the argument of the apostle, that what had existed under divine permission during a previous dispensation could not be annulled by a later. The silence of the New Testament, even were that certain, would not condemn*

the use of instrumental music, any more than it does the law of infant church membership, the observance of the Lord's day as a Sabbath, and similar matters.

It is also a plain and conclusive inference from the positive character of God's worship and service, that if no exercise of a wise Christian expediency is allowed, the same argument which condemns the use of instrumental music, and requires for its use a plain and positive command, will also exclude the use of any thing not formally prescribed, and will thus drive out of the courts of the sanctuary, as profaners thereof, precentors, choirs, tuning forks, music books, and the whole body of artistic tunes, and will extend the besom of its destruction to whatever is comfortable or ornate in the arrangement either of the pulpit or of the pews. Such an absolute rule as that which would require positive institution and authority from Christ for everything admitted into the Christian worship and order, is manifestly a tradition of the elders and a yoke which neither we nor our fathers are able to bear. It must be admitted that there are many things connected with Christian worship which are not objects of such positive divine appointment. This is admitted by Dr. Fuller himself. All, for instance, that relates to particular times, forms, order, and length of the services of worship, and the distribution of reading, singing, prayer, and the frequency of public and week-day assemblies, and the administration of sacraments and their particular order, and all that relates to Sabbath-schools, must be considered as left to the exercise of a wise Christian discretion and expediency. So much, at least, is the evident teaching of the Apostle Paul in 1 Cor. viii., and Rom. xiv., where it is positively declared that there *are* matters pertaining to the worship of God which are in their own nature indifferent—as, for instance, the observance of days and feasts, and the eating or abstaining from certain articles of food and drink; and in the general canon laid down by him, which is in substance that afterwards embodied in the maxim of Augustine: “In things essential, unity; in things not essential, liberty; in all things, charity.” (See v. 4 and 17–19.)

The question, therefore, of the lawfulness or unlawfulness of

the use of organs, or melodeons, or bass viols, or tuning forks, and all that pertains to modern tunes, to choirs, to music books, to practising and training, so as to lead the music of the congregation in accordance with artistic taste and propriety, etc., is one which we may well regard as referred to the determination of Christian expediency, guided by the general rule of Scripture—that all things should be done with decorum and to edification. And if, under this divinely inspired canon, given us by apostolic inspiration, the auxiliary aid of whatever will conduce to the greater solemnity and impressiveness of praise as a leading part of God's worship is allowable, then there are many reasons in favor of the organ. As an instrument, the organ, next to the human voice, is most adapted to enkindle and fan the flame of devotion and move the hearts of true worshippers while they contemplate the truths expressed in the words sung, and to afford them the easiest and most perfect vehicle for uttering their devout feelings. And is not the more ardent and intense expression of feeling, in connexion with the truth, the very purpose for which music in any form is introduced as an aid to true worshippers in making melody in their hearts unto the Lord?

“Hark! the organs blow
 Their swelling notes round the cathedral's dome,
 And grace the harmonious choir, celestial feast
 To pious cars, and medicine of the mind!
 The thrilling trebles and the manly bass
 Join in accordance meet, and with one voice
 All to the sacred subject suit their song;
 While in each breast sweet melancholy reigns,
 Angelically pensive, till the joy
 Improves and purifies.”

The organ, while it is the most perfect of all instruments, as comprehending within its compass all others, is essentially and necessarily a sacred instrument, and has always been associated with sacred music. It has therefore been well said to be “worthy of the saint who had listened to the minstrelsy of angels.” And that such is the natural effect of the organ, when properly played, upon every unprejudiced mind, we may testify by the opinion even of the fiercely Puritanic Milton :

“There let the pealing organ blow
 To the full-voiced choir below,
 In service high and anthems clear,
 As may with sweetness through mine ear
 Dissolve me into ecstasies,
 And bring all Heaven before mine eyes.”

This instrument was so employed, as we have found, in some one of its essential forms, from the very beginning of the world, and long anterior even to the Abrahamic economy of the Church; and the use of it and other instruments formed a component part of the worship of God in every subsequent dispensation. Inspired by them, the prophets and the holy psalmist spake, sang, and *played*, as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, and for our example and instruction; and composed their poetical effusions of divine truth and adapted them to the use, *not merely of the human voice*, but also as auxiliary aids to other musical instruments. And as these divine psalms and spiritual songs are best employed in God's praise when they most perfectly express the mind and spirit of the psalmist, *it follows that this can only be accomplished with the assistance of such instrumental music*. And if these compositions are models and prophecies of the new psalms and hymns and spiritual songs which are to be employed under the New Testament dispensation, (*as they themselves distinctly affirm*, Ps. cxlix. 1, etc.,) then they teach us that under this Christian economy other musical instruments, in addition to that of the human voice, would be employed for the more perfect praise of God in the sanctuary.

Now, since this use of instrumental music in the service of God, under all former dispensations of the Church, was either by positive divine appointment or by the divinely permitted exercise of the discretionary wisdom and tastes of men, in either case it was *moral* and proper. It was not ceremonial or political; it was not antediluvian, Noachic, Abrahamic, or Mosaic; and hence it was unaffected by any change of dispensation of the Church of God, *unless God has positively prohibited it*. In order, therefore, to prove that the Church, under its Christian dispensation, is restricted to the sole and alone use of the instru-

mental organ of the voice, and to hymns and spiritual songs adapted exclusively to the voice, *it must be shown that God has forbidden any further use of those ancient psalms, which are unalterably lyrical in their spirit and arrangement, and of those instruments by which alone that spirit can be expressed.*

“Psalms, *then*, are always tuned best.

When there is most exprest

The holy penman's heart ;

All music is but discord where

That wants or doth not bear

The first and chiefest part.

Voices without affection answerable.

When *best*, to God are *most abominable*.”

There is therefore no necessity on our part to produce any positive proof for the permitted use, under the Christian economy, of instrumental music in the worship of God. The burden of proof that its authorised use from the beginning hitherto is now condemned must be produced by those who make such affirmation, just as it is imperative upon our Baptist brethren, who declare that it is unchristian to receive children into the membership of the visible Church by the seal of the covenant, to produce the authority of Christ for repealing the hitherto unvariable and immutable law and practice of the Church of God.

This leads us to an observation which is very important and very confirmatory of the conclusion we have reached—that while the supreme and final end of all worship, including praise, is the glory of God, nevertheless it is blessedly true in reference to it, as it is to the whole work of redemption and providence, that God brings glory in the highest to himself by making them all conspire to the production of peace and good will and joy among men. Just as man was not made for the Sabbath, but the Sabbath for man, so it is delightfully true that man was not made for the gospel, nor for the ordinances of worship and praise of God's sanctuary, but that these were all made conformable to man's nature and conducive to man's emotional, social, and intellectual enjoyment, and (by means of this) to his salvation and spiritual edification. The whole economy of redemption—all the

privileges and blessings of the everlasting covenant, the oracles of God, the means of grace, the Sabbath, the sanctuary, the ministry of men, public, social, and family worship, prayer and thanksgiving, the singing of psalms and hymns, with such instrumental accordances as perfect science and taste (which are equally of God) require—are all gracious adaptations to the nature and condition of man, to the occasions of this needy life, and to the impulses, anxieties, and desires of sorrowful and suffering humanity; so that whether we are merry, we may sing psalms; or in prosperity, rejoice; or in adversity and affliction, find in the plaintive and comforting songs of Zion solace and support. The temple, with all its august services; the tabernacle, with all its shadowy ordinances; the “*calling upon God*” with formal rites and sacred music, of the holy patriarchs in the grey morning of the world; the timbrel music of Miriam and her choral assistants; the plaintive harpings in the wilderness and by the streams of Babel; the perfected musical arrangements of David and Hezekiah—were each and all adaptations to our weak and suffering and sinful manhood. Nor is it true that this adaptation is less provided for in Christianity; for it, too, has its rites and ceremonies, and its many component parts of worship and service. It is quite illogical to infer that because an exercise of the *spiritual* faculty is *essential to worship*, therefore there is *no other element* in worship than the spiritual faculty; nor is it less illogical to conclude that because the primitive Christians were driven to upper chambers, and to dens and caves and catacombs, and were constrained to worship God in chief part *in silence*, that therefore all that is ornate, or beautiful, or comfortable, or pleasing in the architecture, furniture, and ritual order of Christian churches is anti-Christian. The Philippian jailor heard his first sermon in a gloomy cell, and the first disciples had to live by a common fund; but is it therefore unchristian or unscriptural to worship now in well-built sanctuaries, and to administer the sacraments from silver plates and goblets or from marble fountains? The body and all its tastes and desire of comfortable posture and repose are inseparable elements of our nature, and must have certain external, convenient, and expressive forms.

And then, again, mind and body have reciprocal action upon each other, so that the health and comfort of the body must be cared for, and has been provided for, by him who knows what is in man, in all that is social, artistic, and symbolic in the form, order, and worship of his Church. And the sublime declaration of our Lord that God must be worshipped in spirit and in truth, (which no man is at liberty to interpolate, as many do, by inserting the word "*only*," so as to understand Christ as *forbidding all worship save that of the spirit*,) simply means that without the action of the conscience, will, and moral powers, there can be no worship at all, even in the use of those rites and forms which he himself has ordained.* In regard, therefore, to the use of instrumental music, vocal and mechanical, in the worship of God, the only question is whether it is in accordance with reason and the nature of man, with Scripture, and with the laws of our own Church—in other words, whether there is for it a divine right—in order to gratify, under proper Christian regulation, the intuitive and universal delight which it would naturally impart. This divine right or warrant we assert, and will in the remainder of this article illustrate.

Part II.—DIVINE RIGHT ESTABLISHED, AND OBJECTIONS MET.

We will now proceed to establish the divine right for the use of instrumental music in the worship of God, by an appeal to the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament.

And first, let us understand what is meant by saying of this or any other matter, that it is of divine right. According to the interpretation of the words—that is, of DIVINE RIGHT—the term right means either that which is *in itself considered justum*, just, right, proper; or *jussum*, that which is *commanded* or *enjoined* by divine warrant or scriptural authority. "That, therefore," to use the words of the celebrated treatise on "The Divine Right of Church Government," p. 7, "is of divine right which is divinely commanded by any law of God, or by that which is equivalent to any law of God." And first, such a law of God,

*See Goulburn's Sermons.

constituting a divine warrant, is found in the true light of nature—"that light and image of God in man being not totally abolished and utterly erased by the fall. There remain still some relics and fragments, some glimmerings and common principles of light, both touching piety towards God and equity to man." (See do., p. 9, and Ps. xix. 1, 2, etc., and Acts xiv. 17, xvii. 27, 28, and Rom. i. 19, 20.) This is farther proved by the fact that "the Spirit of God and of Christ is pleased often to argue from the light of nature in condemning sin and commending and urging duty, as in 1 Cor. v. 1, xi. 13-15. "That, therefore, which is in accordance with the light of nature is prescribed *jure divino*—that is, by a divine right—and that which is repugnant to it is condemned." Our whole argument thus far, by which the use of instrumental music in the praise of God is shown to be in accordance with the best feelings and most sacred and holy practice of men in all ages from the beginning, demonstrates the divine warrant and authority for its continued use.

The second ground upon which a divine right is established by the writers above quoted, is scripture examples, which are made obligatory by the will and appointment of Jesus Christ, by whose Spirit those examples were recorded in Scripture for the imitation of believers. These being more clear, distinct, and particular than what is proved to be in accordance with the light of nature and the general sentiment of mankind, are still more binding. Many of the most important doctrines and duties of our holy religion are based upon this divine right; as, for instance, the baptism of women; the baptism of individuals under peculiar circumstances, while not members of any particular congregation, as of the eunuch, Lydia, the jailor, etc.; the preaching of the gospel and celebration of the word and sacraments on the first day of the week as the Lord's Sabbath; the ordination of *ministers* by the laying on of hands—on them and on them only (see 1 Tim. iv. 14, 2 Tim. i. 6, Acts xiii. 3); the government of many congregations by one common Presbytery and by Synod.

Those examples in Scripture, therefore, which the Spirit of Christ, by whom all Scripture was given, commands us to imitate, or *commends and praises, or which are in themselves moral*

and accordant to the light of nature, are obligatory at all times, and as well under the New Testament as under the Old. And finally those acts which were done *commonly* and *ordinarily*, it is right and proper for us *ordinarily* to imitate.

Now, we have already given examples of the recorded use of instrumental music by "the sons of God," under the *most ancient* economy. Under the patriarchal dispensation, we find a similar use of instrumental music recorded in connexion with seasons of solemnity, as in reference to the departure of Jacob from the house of Laban, (see Gen. xxxi. 27,) when, we have reason to believe, it was associated with blessings, etc., as in the case of Rebekah. Again, under the same covenant, the Spirit of Christ records the example of "Miriam the prophetess, (see Ex. xv. 20,) *the sister of Aaron*, who took a timbrel in her hand, and all the women went out after her with timbrel and with dances." Here, then, is a prophetess who said, (Num. xii. 2,) "Hath not the Lord spoken by us," and of whom the Lord himself says, (Mic. vi. 4,) "I sent before you, Moses, Aaron, and Miriam,"—that is in leading off the song of thanksgiving, triumph, and rejoicing, with timbrel and with dances on occasion of the glorious deliverance of the Israelites and destruction of the Egyptians. It may be objected to this proof, that if it sanctions instrumental music, it will also sanction an accompanying movement of the feet, which is in the English version rendered *dance*; but, as Dr. Clarke remarks, "*many learned men* suppose the original word means some wind instruments of music, etc. . . . pipes or hollow tubes, such as flutes, hautboys, (organs,) and the like, may be intended. *Both the Arabic and Persian understand it as meaning instruments of music.*" The timbrel was an instrument in use in every family of Israel, and regarded with such sacredness as not to be thrown away in the hour of their greatest distress and alarm. In this case, therefore, we have an example recorded by inspiration, sanctioned by God himself, in which God represents himself as being even the leader of the musical choir, and accompanied with the implicit approval of both Aaron and Moses, the great high priest and prophet of the Lord.

We may also recall to mind the coming out of the daughter of Jephthah, (Judges xi. 34,) as is evident from the whole tenor of the history, in the spirit of religious celebration, with timbrels and dances, where, of course, the word may have the same meaning. We would also refer to that remarkable passage in 1 Sam. x. 5, in which we are informed that Samuel, having by divine appointment anointed Saul, directed him to the hill of God, where he was met by "a company of prophets with a psaltery, and a tabret, and a pipe, and a harp, among whom Saul himself was to become a prophet and to be turned into another man." These prophets are believed to have been devout teachers and instructors of the sons of the prophets, and, as it is believed by all writers, "such instruments were then used by the prophets and other persons, to compose their minds." Musical instruments were therefore employed by holy men of God, under the teaching of the divine Spirit, *as a means of grace* for the conversion of sinners, the sanctification of the unholy, and the edification and inward spiritual revival of believers. And thus we read that "it came to pass, when the evil spirit from God was upon Saul, that David took a harp and played with his hand; so was Saul refreshed, and was well, and the evil spirit departed from him." (1 Sam. xvi. 23.) It will be noted that David at this time was in a state of acceptance with God, "with the spirit of God upon him," anointed to be king, and perhaps the most perfect type of Christ in the Old Testament; and that as such he was "a cunning player on the harp" and "the sweet Psalmist of Israel." "When David was returned from the slaughter of the Philistines, the women came out from all the cities of Israel, singing and dancing, to meet King Saul with tabrets, with joy, and with instruments of music," thus proving the *household* and *domestic*, as well as *public*, use of such instruments on all occasions, whether of festivity or worship. Thus we read that "David and all the house of Israel played *before the Lord* on all manner of instruments made of fir wood, even on harps, and on psalteries, and on timbrels, and on cornets, and on cymbals." (2 Sam. vi. 5; 1 Chron. xiii. 8.)

At the installation of Solomon, "all the people piped with pipes, (in margin, flutes,) and rejoiced with great joy, so that

the earth was rent with the sound of it, and among all the people were Zadok the priest and Nathan the prophet." Solomon "made harps and psalteries for singers." (1 Kings, x. 12.) Elisha said, "Bring me a minstrel. And it came to pass, *when the minstrel played*, that the hand of the Lord came upon him. And he said, 'Thus saith the Lord.'" (2 Kings, iii. 15, 16.) David "appointed certain of the Levites to minister before the ark of the Lord, and to record, and to praise the Lord God of Israel," and among them "Asaph the chief, and next to him Zechariah," etc., "and Jeiel with psalteries and with harps; but Asaph made a sound with cymbals;" "Heman and Jeduthun with trumpets and cymbals for those that should make a sound, and with MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS OF GOD." (1 Chron. xvi. 4, 5, 42.) And these all "with their sons and their brethren stood at the east end of the altar, and *with them an hundred and twenty priests* sounding with trumpets . . . and they lifted up their voice with the trumpets and cymbals and instruments of music, and praised the Lord, saying, For he is good; for his mercy endureth forever; and the house was filled with a cloud, even the house of the Lord; so that the priests could not stand to minister; for the glory of the Lord had filled the house of God." (2 Chron. v. 12, 13, 14.) Again, at the conclusion of Solomon's prayer, when God sent down fire from heaven to consume the burnt offerings and sacrifices, in sight of which "the children of Israel bowed themselves with their faces to the ground," even at this solemn time "the priests waited on their offices; the Levites with INSTRUMENTS OF MUSIC OF THE LORD, which *David the king*"—not Moses—"had made to praise the Lord." (2 Chron. vii. 6.)

Take another example of God's approval of the use of instrumental music in his worship and praise. The covenant of the people under Asa to seek the Lord was made "with a loud voice, and with shouting, and with trumpets and cornets. And God was found of them and gave them rest." (2 Chron., xv. 12-15.) In the reign of the good King Hezekiah, and the wonderful reformation and revival accomplished through his instrumentality, instrumental music was eminently serviceable, and with manifest divine approbation. He "set the Levites in the house of the

Lord with cymbals, with psalteries, and with harps, according to the COMMANDMENT of DAVID, and of Gad the king's seer, and Nathan the prophet; FOR SO WAS THE COMMANDMENT OF THE LORD BY HIS PROPHETS." (2 Chron. xxix.) When the foundation of the second temple was laid, "they set the priests in their apparel with trumpets, and the Levites, the sons of Asaph, with cymbals to praise the Lord after the ordinance of David, king of Israel." Again: "At the dedication of the wall of Jerusalem, they sought the Levites out of all their places, to bring them to Jerusalem, to keep the dedication with gladness, both with thanksgivings, and with singing, with cymbals, psalteries, and with harps." (Neh. xii. 27.) "My harp," says Job, "is turned into mourning, and my organ into the voice of them that weep." It is unnecessary to quote at any length from the Psalms in which the praise of God in the public worship of the sanctuary and on all other occasions, with the assistance of instrumental music, is *preceptively commanded and prophetically authorised and enjoined*. Thus in Psalm cxlix. : "Praise ye the Lord. Sing unto the Lord a NEW song" (which, of course, must refer to other songs than those in the book of Psalms, and to the present as well as to the past dispensation). "Let them praise his name in the dance (or, as in the margin, with the pipe); let them sing praises unto him with the timbrel and harp." Thus, also, in Psalm cl. : "Praise ye the Lord. Praise God in his sanctuary . . . praise him with the sound of the trumpet; praise him with the psaltery and harp. Praise him with the timbrel and dance (or, as in the margin, with the pipe); praise him with stringed instruments and organs." Now, as it is a matter of fundamental faith with *many* that the book of Psalms is the divinely inspired and exclusive book of praise for the Church in all ages, and as all Christians admit that they are intended, though not *exclusively*, for the use and as models of God's praise, it follows necessarily that they are to be sung with the accompaniment of instruments of music, ALL of which are found *combined* in the one sacred instrument, *the organ*. It is admitted also, by all critics, that the Psalms, not only of David, but of all whose divine compositions are preserved, are *by their very con-*

struction unadapted to our tunes, but are adapted to chanting and to antiphonal responsive chanting—one class of singers singing one sentence, and another class responding to it. The lines, therefore, are equal, and the sentiment is repeated. We have a representation of what we mean in the vision of Isaiah, where the seraphim are represented as answering one another; and we have another *specimen* of it in the ancient song of Miriam, which is both choral and antiphonal. We can hardly conceive how many of the Psalms—such as the 136th, the 118th, the 119th, the 24th, etc.—were sung, except by one party of singers stating a truth, to which another set of singers give response.

In Isaiah xxx. 29, a season of spiritual joy is thus represented: “Ye shall have a song, as in a night *when a holy solemnity is kept*; and gladness of heart, as when one goeth with a pipe to come into the mountain of the Lord, to the mighty One of Israel.” When the restoration of Israel is spoken of by the Lord through Jeremiah, (xxx. 4,) it is said—and this, be it remembered, is *spoken figuratively of the Church under its gospel dispensation*—“Again I will build thee, and thou shalt be built, O virgin of Israel; *thou shalt again be adorned with thy tabrets, and shalt go forth in dances (or with the pipe) of them that make merry.*” NOW these instruments are all embodied in the organ, and the term virgin implies that when used by the Church, she should be exalted to her condition of virgin purity and perfection. Tyre is commended as the garden of God and perfect in her ways till iniquity is found in her, when it is said of her (Ezek. xxviii. 13–15): “When the workmanship of thy tabrets and of thy pipes was prepared in thee in the day that thou wast created. Thou art the anointed cherub that covereth, *and I have set thee so.*” And as a punishment it is said: “I will cause the noise of thy songs to cease; and the sound of thy harps shall be no more heard;” (xxvi. 13.)

The association of instrumental music with divine worship, as suggested by the light of nature, and followed by the Hebrew exiles within his empire, is strikingly demonstrated by the order of Nebuchadnezzar, that when the people heard the sound of

“the cornet, flute, harp, sackbut, psaltery, dulcimer, and all kinds of music,” *they were to fall down and worship* the image which the king had set up. And to bring these examples to a close, Habakkuk terminates the prayer which concludes his book with the direction, “To the chief singer on MY stringed instruments.” An ampler demonstration of the divine right of the use of instrumental music in the worship of God, as based upon examples recorded in Scripture by divine inspiration, with the divine approbation, accompanied by divine acts and divine precepts, from the very beginning of the Bible history before the flood, and after the flood under every dispensation, through prophets, priests, kings, and people, could scarcely be given.

We come, therefore, to the New Testament and to the Christian Church, as established by our Lord Jesus Christ, *with the fact that in the worship of God under ALL former dispensations of the Church*, instrumental music was employed to aid and give more efficiency to the human voice in the praises of God in the public and private worship of his people. Like the law of infant church-membership, and all other laws, principles, and institutions which Christ, as the great Lawgiver and Head of his Church, HAS ASSUMED *as established, and has not by any positive enactment altered, abridged, or forbidden*, we must conclude that they are still authorised and sanctioned. If, therefore, we find nothing in the conduct or teaching of our Lord, or in the more full and perfect teaching of his inspired apostles, countermanding this use, then it must be considered as still permitted. Now, we do find our Saviour present when such instruments were used, not only in the way of festive enjoyment, but also of *religious funeral* ceremony, and speaking of them in such connexions *as to imply his approbation and express sanction*, and to throw the burden of proof upon those who allege Christ’s authority in condemnation of such use, to produce that law of Christ or his apostles by which it is condemned. “When Jesus came into the ruler’s house, and saw the minstrels (that is, players on the pipe, etc.,) making a noise,” (Matt. ix. 23,) he uttered no reproof. He does not hesitate to *liken himself* unto children calling unto their fellows and saying, We have piped unto you,

and ye have not danced ; *we have mourned unto you, and ye have not lamented*, (Matt. xi. 16, 17,) where he alludes to the universal employment of instrumental music, both in the way of festival and solemn rite, with implied approval. "I"—he as it were says, "played to you the part that the piper does, and yet ye have received me with neither joy nor solemnity." In his beautiful parable of the prodigal son, our Lord introduces instrumental music as a most proper medium of awakening religious joy and grateful praise to God for a returned prodigal, and as an emblematic representation of the joy of heaven over a repentant sinner. And when he himself had ascended and was seated in the midst of the throne with the redeemed at his feet, they are represented with harps in their hands, singing a new song, mingled with the voice of harpers harping with their harps ; (Rev. v. 8, xiv. 1-4 ;) thus manifestly teaching that what is in accordance with the purity of God's worship in the heavenly sanctuary, cannot be discordant to that worship in his sanctuary on earth.

In the instructions given by Christ on the subject of the praise of God in the Christian Church, the terms employed are so diversified as *necessarily* to *include*, and certainly not to *exclude*, the use of instrumental music as auxiliary to the human voice. These are found in Eph. v. 19 : "Speaking to yourselves in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord ;" and in Col. iii. 16 : "Teaching and admonishing one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, *singing* with grace in your hearts to the Lord." "These terms," says Poole, "*include all manner of singing.*" PSALMS are such spiritual songs as were anciently sung with the accompaniment of musical instruments, and must, therefore, to be sung with perfect propriety, be still united with instrumental music, to which they were originally, and as we have seen by the very nature of their composition, adapted. The use of instrumental music as an accompaniment to the singing of the voice in the praise of God in the Christian church is here indicated not only in the word *ψαλλόντες*, but also in the word *λαλοῦντες*, which alludes to a person under the excitement of great joy, who

not only *sings but plays on any instrument* which he is accustomed to use. So Christians are to give expression to the spiritual and living joy of their hearts by giving the additional power of instrumental music to vocal in swelling the volume of their adoring praise unto him that loved them and gave himself for them. We have also an implied allusion to the use of instrumental music, with choral and antiphonal arrangement of the parts, in the words "one another"—*inter vos*—in alternation, alternately. (See Poole, Synop. Crit.) "A PSALM means the touching, twang—that is, of a bow-string; of stringed instruments, a playing, music; tone, melody, measure, as played; a song as accompanying stringed instruments in praise of God." And the verb as here used, *ψάλλοντες*, means to touch or strike any chords—most frequently, to touch the lyre or any stringed instrument; to strike up, to play; in the Septuagint and New Testament, to sing, to chant, *as accompanying stringed instruments*; as is said by Dr. Robinson in Robinson and Duncan's Lexicon, who refer for illustration to James v. 13; Rom. xv. 9; Eph. v. 19; 1 Cor. xiv. 15, etc.

That Christians, in our Saviour's and during the apostolic time, did not use such instrumental music, is sufficiently accounted for by our Saviour's own explanation, that when he, the Bridegroom, should be taken from them, they would not for a season rejoice, but be in heaviness through manifold temptations. "I send you forth as sheep among wolves." Christian churches, be it remembered, were at first in the rooms of private houses, where Christians met in small numbers, dividing into different sections of the same church, through fear of their enemies, and with their doors locked. The answer of Justin Martyr to the Præfect by whom he was examined, "Where do you assemble?" was, "Where each one can and will. You believe, no doubt, that we all meet together in one place; but it is not so, for the God of the Christians is not shut up in a room, but, being invisible, he fills both heaven and earth, and is honored every where by the faithful." And he tells us that when he came to Rome, like the Apostle Paul, he hired his own house, where Christians were in the habit of resorting to unite privately in worship.

Under circumstances like these, it was of course impossible for the early Christians to revive and reestablish the forms and order in which the praise of God had hitherto been conducted. But as soon as circumstances permitted, we find those forms to a greater or less extent introduced. Our Saviour, after he had added the Christian to the Jewish sacrament, sang a hymn with his disciples according to the mode in use in the Jewish Church. The very first, greatest, and sublimest act of praise in the Christian Church, in which the Master and Head of that Church joined, was a *chant*. Such, also, must have been the form of praise in the first Christian assemblies. They did not change the Jewish language or deform the Jewish poetry. They had no metrical literature. The old songs continued with an adaptation to that Christian sense which was their fulfilment. And is it not delightfully probable that we have in the Apocalyptic representation of the songs and anthems of the heavenly service specimens of what the first Christians were singing upon earth—a kind of echo, as it were, of what was taking place in the Church? Tacitus says of the Christians that they were accustomed to meet together to sing hymns to Christ as God, and the very words he uses in his statement gives us the idea that in their singing they took alternate parts, all the people taking part in the service.

About the middle of the fourth century, Ambrose introduced this form of service from the church at Antioch into the church at Milan. And such was the effect of this choral chanting service, that Augustine alludes to it in several places. "How many tears," says he, addressing Ambrose, "during the performance of thy hymns and chants, keenly affected by the notes of thy melodious church! My ears drank up those words, and they distilled into my heart as sacred truths, and overflowed thence in pious emotions, and gushed forth in tears." "When," he adds, "I call to mind the tears that I shed when I heard the chants of thy church, and reflect that I was affected not by the mere MUSIC, but by the subject brought out as it is by clear voices and appropriate tune, then, in turn, I confess how useful is the practice."

With the Reformation came in psalms and hymns in regular

measure, suited to the construction of the modern language, and which had great effect in promoting the Protestant Reformation. In the time of Henry VIII. and Edward VI., there was a great deal of psalm singing in connexion with the Reformation, as many as six thousand people collecting at one time about Paul's Cross to unite together in singing the psalms of the recovered faith. Psalms were every where introduced into worship, and the psalter put into verse and the music adapted to the change. The organ, the concentration of all that is solemn and sacred in instrumental music, was silently and almost universally retained, except in Scotland and among the non-conformists. *And it was so because it was not any more Popish than any other part of the service of God*—such as prayer, reading, preaching, and singing. It is altogether unwarrantable to denounce the use of the organ as Popish, since it was never authoritatively introduced or required by that Church; nor to this day is any instrumental music permitted in the Sistine Chapel at Rome, where the Pope himself, with his cardinals, conduct their worship, not in adaptation to popular usage, but exclusively with the use of vocal music, and in accordance with the forms of chant, which, as we have seen, came down through our Lord and his disciples from the Church of God under every dispensation since the beginning of the world. If, therefore, there is any valid ground of objection to the use of instrumental music as auxiliary to the voice in the worship of God's house, because it has been in part used by the Romish Church, and also by the Jewish Church, while as yet our Lord and Saviour and his apostles remained in and recognised that Church, as in all previous times, the objection is equally strong against the use of vocal music, since *instrumental music constitutes no part of the Mosaic economy*, beyond the use of the trumpet and horn, and these for the purposes of signals rather than for worship.

The human voice is itself as certainly a musical instrument, though not of man's invention, as is any other musical instrument. The organ of the voice "is of the flesh flesh,"—earthy, carnal, sensuous, and our most unruly member; set on fire of hell, the instrument of lust and every evil thought that cometh

forth out of the evil heart; the syren voice of the tempter, the handmaid of vice and pollution, the chorister for every bacchanalian revelry and Vanity Fair; by which men curse God and worship the devil, and profane the temple of God, and offer God the incense of abomination, hypocrisy, and self-idolizing display. The exercise of the voice in God's worship, unsanctified and unsweetened, is in God's sight no better than "the calves of the lips and the sacrifice of fools."

The *organ* of the human voice is as truly *an instrument*, and *external to the soul*, as the *organ* of man's construction. It is the combination of manifold *organs* coöperating to the production, variety, and modulation of its sounds; of the lungs, the larynx, and the ligaments of the glottis, which vibrate like the strings of an instrument, and produce various sounds, as they are more or less tense; certain cavities in which tones are produced as in wind instruments; the length of the windpipe, which can be increased or shortened; the magnitude of the lungs in proportion to the width of the glottis; the greater or less length of the canal which extends from the glottis to the opening of the mouth; the influence of the nerves, and of the positive and negative poles as affecting these nerves. According to Gottfried Weber, the organ of the voice as a sounding membrane acts like the tongue-work in the organ. The uvula also has considerable influence in producing tones. Besides these, the finely arched roof of the mouth and the pliability of the lips, enabling us to give a great variety of form to the mouth, are of the greatest importance to the voice.

The human voice, therefore, is, in its nature, construction, and use, a musical instrument from the manufactory of heaven, displaying infinite skill, wisdom, and merciful adaptation to the necessities and comforts of man. The voice, like the organ and other instruments, is capable of indefinite cultivation and of artistic and scientific development. It demands time, patient practice, leaders or preceptors, tuning forks, music books, musical instructors and classes, choirs, and is therefore liable to multiplied abuses and uses; so that if the facts that organs are instruments and are liable to evils and abuses are a sufficient

ground for excluding them from the service of God in the sanctuary, then the human voice must be so excluded, since it is manifestly fallacious to consider *our voices as ourselves*. They are foreign matter. They belong to man, but they are not the man. They are ours, but not ourselves; and their use, except as the instrument of the soul in expressing its heart melody, is no more divine worship than what is called the artificial and mechanical music of the organ. When, therefore, it was argued in the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland that the "question is, Is the psalmody of the congregation to be led by an instrument commonly called the pitch-pipe or fork, or by an instrument more complicated, and commonly called an organ?" the real question before that Church was wisely stated. The statement was *wisdom*, and not, as Dr. Candlish fallaciously calls it, "*wit*;" and the answer of Dr. Candlish, though it called for laughter, was not *wisdom*, but merely *wit*, and must have made him "look very foolish" to those who looked beyond *wit* to the *wisdom*. For when Dr. Candlish attempts to make an *argument*, instead of a *diversion*, he says: "To make the parallel fair and the argument hold good, whenever the singing begins, the organ must stop. (Great laughter.) Will that satisfy our 'organic' friends? (Cheers and laughter)." Now, this is pure *wit* without *wisdom*, although coming from so great a philosopher, who is, however, as notorious for his sarcastic wit as for his logic. For, we confidently ask, *by what divine right* is the *tuning fork*, with the *tune board* and the *music books in the pews*, and the *leaders or precentors*, introduced into the sanctuary of God, during and as a part of the actual service and worship of God? Were these instituted by Christ? "Do these worship God in spirit and in truth? And is there any essential difference at *what moment* they are introduced, and whether employed during the *whole* time of the singing, or at the beginning of each verse? And as to the singing itself, did not God, by the prophet Ezekiel, denounce the formal hypocrisy of his pretended worshippers, because, while they sat before him and united in his worship as his people do, their vocal service was to him only as the "organic" sounds of "one who has a pleasant voice and playeth well upon

an instrument?" "Oh, but," Dr. Candlish would reply, "we are certainly required to *sing* in praising God in the sanctuary." "Well," we reply, "suppose we are required to sing, where are we enjoined to use *tuning forks*, etc.? And have we not seen that we are just as surely authorised by the Old and New Testaments to associate with singing instrumental music? And have we not seen that while neither the voice (with the aid of tuning forks, etc.,) nor instrumental music are in themselves acceptable as heart worship unto God, who must be worshipped in spirit and in truth, nevertheless God has been pleased to provide and permit the use of both vocal and mechanical organs for man's comfort and happiness, and both may be made helpful to his greater spiritual devotion and to God's acceptance and glory?"

Dr. Candlish and his organic friends seem altogether to forget that, upon his own arguments, the use of *the human voice* itself in the worship of God has been seriously controverted, and that all their satirical invectives heaped upon "organic" music, as "performances on musical machinery," and as constituting "Jewish and Romanish public worship," may be and have been as forcibly applied to the *organic music* of the voice, as not one whit less *organic, instrumental, Jewish, and Romanish*, than tuning forks, organs, or any other instrument. Even at an *advanced* period of the Reformation, many objected to singing altogether. They objected that, except as used by converted persons, singing was profanation, both of the Sabbath and of the house and worship of God. This question is learnedly discussed even in one of the Eastcheap lectures delivered in London by eminent and learned men. Mr. Keach, a minister at Mazepond, in England, who wanted to introduce singing into his congregation, had to fight and contend *twenty-two* years for it. The controversy about *singing* was as fierce, (and its controversial pamphlets as thick and many,) as was that about a funeral service and other parts of divine worship in Scotland. At one period of the controversy in Mr. Keach's congregation, we are informed by veritable history, there was a sort of drawn battle between the disputants, when a compromise was agreed upon, that while one part of the congregation was engaged in singing, the other

part should quietly go out and walk about among the graves of the SILENT dead, and then come in again after the singing was over. "We know it as a fact," says Mr. Binney of London, "that in the old church-book of the New Bond Street Church, there is a resolution to the effect that the congregation *might be allowed* in future to sing ONCE in the course of each Sunday." Equally inveterate, and on as strong a ground of alleged scriptural authority and divine right as Dr. Candlish's argument for using *tuning forks*, etc., etc., has been the controversy waged in England, Scotland, and in this country, about singing the Psalms of David, *to the exclusion* of the Psalms of Miriam the prophetess, Job, Hezekiah, Isaiah, etc., etc., and about singing them in a doggerel version (neither good prose, good rhyme, nor good sense) of a certain fierce Erastian member of the Rump Parliament; and about giving out these psalms in one line at a time and in a nasal intonation of voice; or whether they should sing two lines at a time or four lines at a time; or whether, as now, they should give out the whole psalm. And we remember one person who took a change in this respect so much to heart that he left his church and walked a distance of seven miles every Sunday, to go to a church where only one line was given out at a time. And we also remember that when a part of the English version of the Bible was sung as a chant, as Christ sung psalms, one old man said to another, "What do you think they have got to now? They have actually sung part of a chapter." This was traditional feeling, ancestral habit, and inveterate prejudice; and like that still felt against organic music by tuning fork singers, is not only without any scriptural authority whatever, but against everything bearing upon the subject from Genesis to Revelation.

What we plead for, therefore, is not a law making it *imperative* upon a particular church or congregation to introduce the organ or choir, or perfectly scientific and harmonious music, or precentors, or tuning forks; but that every congregation shall be left to the exercise of that liberty in these matters with which Christ has made them free, and not be brought into bondage by the traditions of the fathers, and the prejudices, indifference, and

unmusical taste of either ministers, church courts, or individuals. The one great object of supreme desire is that the praise of God in the sanctuary should be regarded as intrinsically one of the most important and interesting parts of his worship; that to be acceptable, therefore, it must be offered in spirit and in truth, with melody in the heart, and with the understanding also; that it should therefore be as much under the direction and control of those who have spiritual oversight over the congregation as reading, preaching, and praise; that as—like all the other parts of God's worship and the holy Sabbath itself—the praise of God is adapted to man's nature and tastes, and especially to that love of music which is such a universally potent principle in our nature, it should be arranged so as most perfectly to gratify and draw out all the devout feelings of the soul; that to this end fitness and preparation for this part of God's worship should constitute a *necessary* part of home and Sabbath-school and scholastic instruction as included in the teaching of "all things whatsoever Christ has commanded;" that it is plainly the duty of every individual worshipper to be qualified by general and special preparation for uniting in this as well as in the other parts of the divine service of the sanctuary—the duty to praise God being of as individual obligation as that of praying and hearing the word; that the praise of God should therefore be rendered by the whole congregation and by every member of it, and not by any choir or any few; that, in order to secure the end designed in this part of God's worship, it is of paramount obligation to seek those things that will preserve unity, harmony, and peace—none seeking his own things or to please himself, but all seeking what may please all, the strong and the skilful bearing the infirmities of the weak and the unskilful, in love preferring one another, and so fulfilling the law of Christ, that all things should be done decently and in order; and that when a congregation is able to secure an organ or melodeon, and the services of one who playeth well upon an instrument, and a majority are anxious to do so, the minority should study the things that make for peace and comply with their wishes.

It was on this principle the Westminster Assembly acted—

neither condemning nor commending the use of instrumental music, but leaving the whole ordering of the singing to the churches. The use of instrumental music is not included among any of the multiplied specified violations of the first and second commandments in the Larger Catechism, and in the singing of psalms the voice is to be *tunably* and gravely ordered.

In the Church of Scotland, therefore, the use of instrumental music in the worship of God is an open question. It is now reported that an organ is to be introduced into the Cathedral Church at Glasgow. And although the Presbytery of Edinburgh last year refused to grant permission to a congregation to introduce an organ, the deliverance of Presbytery was distinctly based upon the fact, *not that such music was in itself wrong or contrary to the laws of the Church*, but on the fact that the congregation seeking for it was divided on the subject, and was very largely represented by petitions both for and against it. It was decided that "the Assembly remit the case to the Presbytery, with instructions to disallow, *in present circumstances*, any proposal that may be made to them with that purpose." Very similar was the decision and the discussion upon this subject by the Scottish United Presbyterian Synod. At a late meeting of the English Synod of the United Presbyterian Church, after an earnest debate, occupying a large part of two days, the following resolution was adopted by a vote of 36 to 14: "That, in the opinion of this Synod, the use or non-use of instrumental music as an aid to praise *is not a case for enforced conformity*, and should be made an open question for individual congregations, to be settled by them in accordance with constitutional regulations."

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States has long since established it as a principle that the use or disuse of the organ or other instrumental music, such as the bass viol, was not a matter upon which it had authority to legislate, it being a part of the liberty of every congregation to determine the question for themselves. (See Baird's Digest.)

Such also is, we believe, the law upon this subject in the Episcopal churches, in the Methodist Episcopal churches, and in all the other evangelical churches of this country.

In conclusion, let us baptize this whole discussion in the spirit of divine love and charity, by taking a glimpse of the upper sanctuary as gloriously imparted to us by the Apostle John in Patmos. (Rev. xix. 1.) "I heard," says he, "a great voice of much people in heaven, saying, Alleluia; salvation, and glory, and honor, and power, unto the Lord our God.....AND A VOICE CAME OUT OF THE THRONE, SAYING, Praise our God, all ye his servants, and ye that fear him, both small and great. And I heard 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."

In this dark and sinful world, amid tumults, conflicts, and manifold tribulations, and even in the visible Church, where there are so many discordant and jarring voices, we cannot look for perfect harmony; but the hour cometh when to every true believer the gate of heaven will be opened, and all discords melt into harmony—all hearts be full of love, and joy, and gratitude, and all voices retuned and restored. Blessed be God, eternity is near, heaven is all around us, and through the opening chinks of dissolving nature the sound of blessed voices uttering praise swells upon our ear, and sounds seraphic ring. We can sometimes, like a late dying believer, weep for joy. "For," said he, "I thought if the singing is so beautiful here, what will it be when angels help in it! I wept for joy that this blessedness is so near." Thus do we walk, as it were, "in the crypt or subterranean chamber of life, whence we can hear from the great cathedral of glory that is above us the pealing of the organ and the chanting of the choir; and ever as a friend goes upward at the bidding of death, and joins that sublime chorus, and waves of richer and louder melody roll down, till our hearts vibrate in unison with eternal praises, occasionally a flash of the heavenly light streams into our spirit and reveals to us fathers, and mothers, and sisters, and brothers, and friends, as harpers with their harps, singing the song of Moses and the Lamb. Occasionally, too, a blessed invitation is heard from the lips of some familiar one, now a chorister before the throne, 'Come up hither, my son, there is a place empty, a seat for thee.' And again we

hear the anthem pealing louder than the loud thunder, 'Thou art worthy; for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation—blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, to him that sitteth on the throne, even the Lamb!' " Let, then, our hearts cherish the bright prospect of entering the company and joining the chants of the blessed, with the harp and the trumpet, and the loud diapason chorus roll.

"Jerusalem, my happy home,
My soul still pants for thee;
Then shall my labors have an end,
When I thy joys shall see."

Then shall we hear "the harp of David sound a yet nobler music," and the voices of Isaiah¹ and Jeremiah no longer tuned to sadness, and the adamantine Luther singing in a nobler strain yet nobler victories, and Milton rising to the utterance of songs worthy of Paradise actually regained, and Cowper's spirit no longer benighted, desolate, and unstrung, and confessors from the catacombs of Rome, and martyrs from their flaming shrouds, and missionaries from distant isles of the ever-sounding sea, and Africa, and Asia, and Europe, and America, presenting the rapturous spectacle of the prophets' strain upon a world's lips—a chorus, every chord in which is joy, every heart in which is love, every utterance in which is deep and glorious harmony. We move to that blessed land. Our march is amid the music of the redeemed.

"There trees forevermore bear fruit,
And evermore do spring;
There evermore the angels sit,
And evermore do sing.

"There David stands, with harp in hand.
As master of the choir;
Ten thousand times that man were blest
That might this music hear.

"Te Deum doth St. Ambrose sing—
St. Austin doth the like;
Old Simeon and Zachary
Have not their song to seek.

“There Magdalene hath left her moan,
 And cheerfully doth sing
 With blessed saints, whose harmony
 In every street doth ring.

“Jerusalem, my happy home!
 Would God I were in thee;
 Would God my woes were at an end,
 Thy joys that I might see.”*

ARTICLE IV.

THE GREAT COMMISSION.

An article on Popular Revivals, in a former number of this REVIEW, having met the approbation of many judicious brethren throughout the country, the writer feels encouraged to offer a few additional reflections, growing out of the same or a kindred subject.

In the execution of redemption, three instrumentalities are mainly employed—the preacher, the gospel, and the Holy Ghost. Take either away, and the economy is marred. Before the Saviour’s ascent, he selected and commissioned certain disciples, whose business it should be to preach. The ministry, therefore, is an office of divine appointment. “Go ye therefore,” etc. “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.” Paul says: “Let a man so account of us, as of the ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God.” “Who also hath made us able ministers of the New Testament.” Once again, it is said: “Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, or bishops, to feed the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood.” And once more: “I will give you pastors according to mine heart”

* From the fine old ballad version.

which shall feed you with knowledge and understanding." None, therefore, but the lawfully ordained may preach and administer the sacraments. Paul's directions to Timothy on this subject were as follows: "And the things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same *commit* thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also." The forms to be observed are also laid down explicitly. "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the *presbytery*." No man, therefore, taketh this honor to himself, but he must be called of God, and the divinely appointed arrangement and order of God's house should be respected throughout. The Confession of Faith says: "The word of God is to be preached only by such as are sufficiently gifted, and also duly approved and called to that office." The call of the candidate must be measured by his qualifications. It need hardly be said that the Church which we represent demands convincing evidences of piety in those who seek the sacred office. If any one fails at this point, no measure of talent and no amount of learning will compensate. "If a man desire the office of a bishop, he desireth a good work. A bishop, then, must be blameless, the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, of good behavior, given to hospitality, apt to teach; not given to wine, no striker, not greedy of filthy lucre; but patient, not a brawler, not covetous," etc. "Moreover, he must have a good report of them which are without." No unconverted man should ever look for a moment toward the gospel ministry. Nor should every regenerate person even consider himself called. A desire for the work in conjunction with manifest and acknowledged fitness—these are the indispensable conditions. Not only must there be moral worth on the one hand, but aptness to teach on the other. These two things must not be separated. For it is impossible to conceive of a successful teacher in any field who does not combine, to some extent, vigilance, sobriety, good behavior, patience, and a blameless life, with a preference of and aptness for his chosen profession. The command of the Master is, train, disciple, educate the nations. A man, therefore, who teaches others, must himself be taught. Three years did the Master himself instruct the

first preachers. With a world's necessities as large then as ever, the Lord Jesus kept back apostles until their preparatory work was fully complete.

The Church of the present day, especially, cannot afford to lower her standards. There is urgency now, more than heretofore, for scholarly attainment. Congregations, the people generally, demand the instructed scribe. A preacher, in these times, should blush for shame, who, from week to week, feeds the flock of Christ upon dried husks and unbeaten oil. That man mistakes the matter altogether who supposes that any teacher in the pulpit ever failed on account of learning. If human love is only made tributary to the cross, and if to the garnered treasures of genius there be also added that fire that comes from heaven, then shall the minister's power be enhanced beyond calculation.

The Master has commissioned his ambassadors to teach, and this teaching is to be effected chiefly *by preaching*. "Whom we preach," says an apostle, "warning every man, and *teaching* every man in all wisdom; that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus; whereunto I also labor, striving according to his working, which worketh in me mightily." He who spake as never man spake understood most fully the capacities and power that dwell in outspoken truth. Without its apostles and ministers, the history of Christianity might have been signally different. Matins, vespers, statues, pictures, robes, temple adornings—no earnest soul can be satisfied by these. To sound the lowest deeps, there must be *life*. Even the written word, although altogether true, is not enough. A messenger must *speak* to us. The living truth must be borne to our inmost souls from *lips* that have been touched with live coals from off the altar.

We are told that Dr. John Mason so read the Scriptures that it was a commentary upon them, and that Dr. Nettleton so read the hymn that it often proved a sermon. We would not by any means turn the sacred desk into a stage, and fill the morning papers with advertisements of one claptrap and another; for whatever of apparent success is temporarily secured by such unhallowed devices, truth makes its reprisals in the end, and all honest minds are disgusted. But it is most clearly the preacher's

duty to study deeply all methods and models of the Holy Spirit, and to preach as to manner with dignity, independence, gentleness, simplicity, and earnestness, and with an humble dependence always and every where upon the divine promise, *Lo, I am with you alway*. So much for the preacher, the first great instrumentality.

In the second place, the minister is not only to preach, but to preach the *gospel*. That is, Christ and him crucified. Whatever relates to the priestly, prophetic, or kingly work of the Master, is to be faithfully unfolded. This is the glad tidings. The *cross* should be the preacher's glory. In such preaching, there is power. The missionary went to Greenland and tried logic. He began with first principles. The law was discussed, and the attributes of God reasoned about. But the heathen were unmoved. The preacher grew despondent. What shall be done? Must he go away and meet the scoffer? Is there no gospel for Greenland? Can this be admitted? Aye; but the missionary considers, Has he tried the *gospel*? Has he preached to these heathens as Peter preached on the day of Pentecost? He goes back to the people; but this time it is the Lord's message, and not man's. There is a change instantly. The strangers are moved. Lips tremble and the eye is moist. Tell us again, say they, that story about Jesus. And again and again the story is told, till hundreds, who could not be moved by philosophy, are thrilled and converted by the *gospel*. The multitudes need the truth very plainly spoken. It has been well remarked that unlettered men, the masses, must have something far better than that meagre system which arrogates to itself the title of philosophical Christianity. On this subject, we have the testimony of such men as Mason and Dwight and Edwards. To be unintelligible to the illiterate, is not to preach the gospel to every creature. Elegant dissertations will not do for the sick, the sorrowful, the perishing. The gospel is for the poor. The preacher is to deal with relations which are eternal. To-day he is to preach, to preach plainly and scripturally; for to multitudes there will be no to-morrow.

Whatever is subtle and refined, says Hannah More, is in

danger of being unscriptural. If we do not guard the mind, it will wander in quest of novelties. The preacher is ambassador for God, and ambassador to men, whose actions, words, and thoughts, go up to the judgment.

The most literary and scientific men are not always the best preachers. Such persons are often ignorant of the wants of ordinary humanity. They live apart, and affect to crucify the common feelings and sympathies which bind them to their fellows. They speak down to human nature, instead of standing on its level, as Jesus of Nazareth did, when he stood on that last and great day of the feast, mingling in its joys and its sorrows, and crying, If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink. Bethany and Olivet, Jerusalem and Gethsemane—all are hallowed by tenderness surpassing and grand. And yet the whole was so simple! No philosophical style, no scientific formula, no new terminology, no puzzling abstractions, no far-fetched argumentation! The lily, the thorn, the mustard-seed, the little birds, a fallen tower, the rain, an angry sky, and the like, gave occasion for the utterance of high and imperishable ideas. His language was that of the common people; and yet those who listened to him oftenest could faithfully testify that his word was with power. The Master did not stand apart and wait for the people to grow up to his measure, but he went down after them, and never man spake as this man. Jesus spake as if he knew that men did not need proof, and that they already had within them the highest of all proof.* He could afford to be simple, for his speech abounded in ideas, and it was not necessary to conceal the poverty of *thought* by a very forest of verbiage.

Whilst we even insist upon learning, this, of itself, must not be relied upon. We are told that Isaac Barrow was more cultured than John Newton, but Newton was Barrow's superior in the pulpit. Ezra Stiles was the most learned man of his day, but his neighbor, Joseph Bellamy, could outpreach him. Samuel Stanhope Smith was a finished scholar, but not comparable to Davies in winning souls to Christ. Says an intelligent writer: "There are biographies which are replete with instruction in

* Young's Christ of History.

regard to the secret of ministerial success, and warn in emphatic terms against the mistakes into which some good men have fallen. We have been exceedingly struck by the comparative fruitlessness of certain kinds of preaching, particularly that sort in which metaphysical refinement undertakes to reason out everything from first principles." Metaphysics is good, and philosophy is good, in the right place; but the gospel is better, infinitely better; for it is here, and here only, that we have *the power* of God unto salvation.

A preacher, remarks Dr. Edwards, has nothing to do to invent new truths. The law of the Lord, *as he reveals it*, is perfect, converting the soul. The testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple. The Bible must be to us what the pillar of fire and cloud were to Moses. Where that goes, we must go; where that stops, we must stop. Go without this, and we go without God. *The promise is to my word.*

And after all, the holy volume contains the widest, deepest, truest philosophy; a philosophy that not only excites the intellect, but begets emotion; that deals not alone with the head, but brings into captivity the heart. No hideous monsters are germinated; but taking the creature as it finds him, it cultivates every part. The entire individual, with *all his members*, is cast into a gospel mould, and we are presented at last with a perfect man, but perfect only in Christ Jesus. Nothing else but the word of God will do this; for nothing else is the sword of the Spirit. It is before the edge and glitter of this weapon that the god of this world cowers, retreats, and yields. Strange, too, as it may appear, here is a word that wounds and heals, breaks and binds, casts into prison or gives quick deliverance, is the savor of life unto one and the savor of death unto another.

It has been well said, "that the minister who preaches every Sabbath against heresy will soon have a whole congregation of heretics." On the contrary, if we would break down and eradicate every stronghold of error, no instrument, for efficacy, can be compared with the simple, unsophisticated gospel. German intellect cut loose from the ancient moorings and went out upon the wide, wide sea of speculation, to measure the immeasurable.

But, for all this, were the people better instructed? Did the truth gain adherents? Do German multitudes know more of Jesus Christ because of philosophy? Has not pantheistic conjecture proved a wretched failure? And now, after a hundred years of sorrowful roaming, this very philosophy, in its last stages of analysis, has to accept of the Godhead as he is revealed in the Scriptures. And hence the deepest thinkers of Germany and the continent are coming back again to the old and precious doctrine of the divine personality. The writer does not offer these observations in any narrow spirit of depreciation. All honor to Germany for the wealth of thought which her industry has unfolded. But revelation meets a want that reason and nature cannot satisfy. We may inquire now, as of old, "Canst thou by searching find out God? Canst thou find out the Almighty to perfection? It is as high as heaven, what canst thou do? Deeper than hell, what canst thou know?" In the Sacred Scriptures, and not elsewhere, is the genuine Eureka. Life and immortality are brought to light in the gospel.

In the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, *every* want of man's spiritual nature was anticipated. Is it pardon? Christ suffered, the just for the unjust. Is it justification? "Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth." Is it sanctification and deliverance from sin? "They go from strength to strength; every one of them in Zion appeareth before God. Sanctify them through the truth; thy word is truth." Is it consolation that we seek? "He bore our griefs and carried our sorrows." Is it blessedness in a world to come? "I go to prepare a place for you." In the long list of man's infirmities and sins, not an item was overlooked. All was foreseen, and all was provided for. It matters not who it is or what it is, in this divine storehouse there is a remedy. The relief, too, is as free as it is perfect.

It is a great mistake, therefore, when short-sighted man attempts improvements upon the wisdom of God. The race is not always to the swift. According to every rule of rhetoric and of art, Robert Hall was a greater preacher than Thomas Chalmers. What could be asked for that was not actually found

in the best of Hall's discourses? His audiences, too, were intellectual, crowded, and attentive. To this day, his sermons are regarded as classics. All this is a tribute to his genius. But what then? Did these splendid discourses ever smite upon the conscience? Did the convicted sinner often cry out under them? Look, again, at John Foster, who, as a profound and original thinker, was as superior to Hall as Hall was to Chalmers; but when we take the two and compare them with Chalmers as ambassadors for God to the Church and the world, then it is that we see Chalmers moving as a bright and burning light whither neither Hall nor Foster could follow. The Scottish orator did not seek to delight a highly educated audience with theistic speculations, with deep and distracting surmises, with bold and startling paradoxes; but the holy earnestness of his spirit and the cumulative propensities of his intellect bore him onward, with majestic power, to the *cross*, and as the mighty *redemption* rolls up before his spiritual vision, the jargon of the schools is forgotten and the rapt ambassador exclaims, I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ and him crucified. Such was the testimony of one whose experience and observation constituted him a competent judge.

It has been observed that the true child of God has a relish, a spiritual discernment, which the gospel, and only the gospel, can satisfy. With philosophy St. Paul certainly was conversant; but *he* preached neither Seneca, nor Plato, nor an angel, nor himself, nor the highest among the created. *He preached Christ*. Not as a man merely, not as a teacher, or an example, or a pattern simply, but "Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling block and unto the Greeks foolishness; but unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God."

It will be seen, after a while, that every innovation upon the New Testament plan inevitably paralyses all true Christian sensibility in the end. The darkness of the middle ages had its origin in the first departures from apostolic order. All went well as long as the divine arrangement was strictly adhered to; but with unscriptural deviations trouble quickly appeared.

Former moorings abandoned, the old ship drifted hither and thither, as this wild wind and the other blew upon it. Wreck, at the last, was inevitable. A few determined souls, however, disembarked in season to preserve a faithful seed and to make the promise sure. With the blessing of God upon the simple truth, the Church in primitive times increased with amazing rapidity. Peter preached the *gospel* on the day of Pentecost, and they that gladly received his word were baptized, and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls. In the days of persecution, "they that were scattered abroad went every where, *preaching the word*. Then Philip went down to the city of Samaria and preached Christ unto them. And the people with one accord gave heed unto those things which he spake." Philip falls in afterwards, by divine opportunity, with a man of Ethiopia, a eunuch of great authority under Candace, Queen of the Ethiopians. "Then Philip opened his mouth, and *preached unto him Jesus*. And as they went on their way they came to a certain water. And the eunuch said, See, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized? And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, *I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God*." Paul and Silas, "on the Sabbath, went out of the city by a river side, where prayer was wont to be made; and they sat down and spake unto the women which resorted thither. And a certain woman named Lydia, a seller of purple, of the city of Thyatira, which worshipped God, heard them; whose heart the Lord opened, that she attended unto the things *which were spoken of Paul*." At midnight, in the Philippian jail, Paul and Silas prayed and sang praise. The jailor, ere the day dawned, was convicted, and said, "Sirs, what must I do to be saved? And they said, *Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ*." It was while Paul reasoned of that righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come, which the *gospel* inculcates and unfolds, that Felix trembled. These able ministers of the New Testament never dreamed that any other agency was necessary to give strength and efficacy to the blessed gospel of the Son of God. Armed with the sword of the Spirit, the soldier of Jesus was fully equipped. This weapon, forged in the divine

furnace, had its edge and form so adjusted and perfected as that, in every case, from a king to the beggar, when properly wielded, it pierced to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, joints and marrow, and was a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart. The New Testament preacher took this and *nothing else*, and the word of God grew mightily and prevailed. If the scriptures which relate to this subject are faithfully collated, it can be easily demonstrated that the greatest results invariably follow, when the human mind is least corrupted by any human device, *from the simplicity that is in Christ*. In joy and in sorrow, in assemblies of wicked men and in the society of saints, in seasons of revival or in times of religious decline, the sole instrument that the Spirit authorises is the gospel. The minister, therefore, that introduces any "means" or "measures," as supplementary to the inspired word, incurs a fearful responsibility; for such a one *charges*, virtually, *incompleteness and imperfection on the divine plan*, presumptuously substitutes man's wisdom in the place of God's, and blunts the edge of the only weapon that the Holy Ghost has pledged himself to use in the conviction, conversion, and final salvation of fallen man. Under such circumstances, it is no wonder if the Holy Spirit should be grieved and the people given over to strong delusions.

The world in which we live is the arena on which it was determined of old that God would exhibit the attribute of his *mercy* in the redemption of a chosen people. All events are secondary, and in some sense subsidiary. To this end, we can trace the thread of divine providence throughout successive families, tribes, and nations, from Adam's time down to the present moment. Every where and in all generations, however, the same agencies have been employed. Noah, in antediluvian times, was a preacher of righteousness. And after the world had been destroyed by water, Jehovah again raised up prophets and teachers, who guided the people, and upon whose labors a blessing was promised, provided both minister and people took heed to the commandments of the Lord to do them. For Jehovah is ever jealous of his honor and authority, and all deviations from the divinely perfected arrangements shall, sooner or later, be

rebuked. All things must be executed "according to the pattern." Under the New Testament economy, as was the case under the Old, human agents are largely employed. But the commission is explicit: *Go preach my gospel*. The laborer is called by different names: "First apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers...then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues." The great business of every teacher, however, is to *preach the word*. "The cross," "Jesus Christ and him crucified," which is the gospel, was the only measure resorted to and the only power depended upon. *We shall insist upon this point until an inspired example or a divine precept can be produced to the contrary*. With what propriety can it be said that one rule is applicable to the pastor and another to the evangelist? The apostles and primitive preachers were all the "sent out" of God. They were missionaries and evangelists in the widest sense of the word. These men were commissioned of the Master to visit all nations, to enter all classes of society, and *if extraordinary measures were ever needed* to attract the multitudes together to some place of worship, the necessity would seem to have existed then; and yet the Scriptures are as dumb as the grave in regard to any such adventitious appliances. Whatever was the condition or situation of the people, these apostles of the New Testament brought into requisition no means or instrument but the gospel. For when they had at command the sword of the Spirit, no other weapon was demanded. Now, if all Scripture be given for our instruction, that the man of God may be *thoroughly* furnished, upon what shadow of proof can it be claimed that the *evangelist* is to be guided by one set of forms, and the *settled pastor* by another? We are the sincere advocates of evangelization. We would award, too, all praise to ministers of any name, who practise self-denial in order to carry the gospel to the poor and perishing. The writer hopes to see the day when every presbytery shall send forth faithful men to labor, not for the most part in congregations already supplied, but to preach the truth in those frontier and destitute regions where the gospel is seldom, if ever, heard. Without the evangelist, church machinery is incomplete. God "gave some, apos-

ties; 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; till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ: that we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine by the sleight of men and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive; *but speaking the truth in love*, may grow up into him in all things which is the head, even Christ. From whom the whole body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love." Eph. iv. 11-16. In this passage of Scripture, it is clearly intimated that the design of all preaching, whether by pastors or evangelists, is to witness for God, and to gather a chosen people from among the nations. Now, to this end there may be "diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit; and there are differences of administrations, but the same Lord. And there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God which worketh all in all." 1 Cor. xii. 4-6.

The business of the preacher, however, is not to pitch his tent in any particular spot and resort to extraordinary influences to draw multitudes of people after him, but the command is *to go* into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. The missionary is directed to enter cities, villages, and houses; to go every where, preaching the word. This is the only plan which has a shadow of authority, either by divine precept or from apostolic example. The gospel of the Son of God, as exemplified in the life and as proclaimed from the heart, is the most powerful attraction that the minister can use. If extraneous measures to any extent are allowed, it is an entrance upon the path that leads to a doctrine whose terrible application extracted tears of blood from the Church throughout all the dark ages, to wit, the doctrine that "*the end sanctifies the means.*" The truth in its simplicity is the only safe way. Let this plan be thoroughly tested before any are bold enough to object and denounce. For if the

Almighty did not foresee and provide for every emergency, then the divine arrangements are incomplete, and the gospel scheme proves a failure. But if he did foresee and provide, then these provisions are to be found in the Scriptures, in that rule which all Protestants boast of as complete; and, as a consequence, he who adds to or takes from it, not only grieves the Holy Spirit, but endangers his own soul.

Although not exactly in the line of our argument, we may as well remark, that, in a certain sense, it is the duty of every man to preach. The child of God is called upon to let his light so shine that men may see his good works and glorify our Father in heaven. That saying of the Master, "Ye are the salt of the earth, ye are the light of the world," is applicable to all true believers. The sun in his circuit refreshes, enlightens, reveals, and quickens, while salt preserves bodies which would otherwise corrupt. What these material substances accomplish in the physical world, this, and much more, the holy living of Christ's disciples is to effect for the souls of perishing men. We are not our own. No man liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself. It is true, that, as to degree, a larger measure of responsibility devolves upon the minister, but the obligation which falls on the private member is also complete of its kind. The man of one talent must so employ his gift as to insure interest in some form. The voice of the Master rings out in the market place to all the unemployed, "Why stand ye here all the day idle?" The encouragements, too, are large. "Whosoever shall give to drink unto one of these little ones a cup of cold water only, in the name of a disciple, verily I say unto you, he shall in no wise lose his reward." The Master said concerning a poor widow who cast her two mites into the treasury, "She hath cast in more than they who cast in of their abundance." The woman who poured the ointment on Jesus' head was commended, because she had done what she could. The promise is not to ministers alone, but to church members of every degree, that they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars forever and ever.

Moreover, the church member must not only labor in his own appropriate sphere, but it is obligatory upon him likewise to afford all needful assistance to both pastor and evangelist. For it is the law of God's house, that they who preach the gospel shall live of the gospel; for the support of the ministry is no optional *charity*, but a sacred and imperative *obligation*. The Levite had no part in the land of Canaan, but the support of the priest was solemnly devolved upon the tribes. The Almighty calls and separates a certain number of persons to be pastors, teachers, evangelists, etc., and then enjoins it, by the law of conscience, upon the people, to sustain these men by prayers, coöperation, and the Levite's portion.

The point in discussion may be made yet plainer by reference to military customs. Let it be supposed that our country was in danger, and that in order to marshal armies for the conflict, the draft had to be resorted to. Now, the fact that the lot falls upon A, while B is exempted, does not release B from the obligation to perform every patriotic act in his power. One individual, by reason of infirmity, may be excused from the burdens of actual warfare upon the field, but it is expected and demanded of this man that he shall use all moral and pecuniary influences at home. They who go a warfare at any time must not do so at their own charges. The hardships of military life are sufficient, even when every alleviation is offered. This is witnessed by the eagerness with which multitudes hasten to procure substitutes. If the draft overtakes the wealthy and ease-loving, such a one looks out at once for a suitable person to take his place. The mind is busy with contrasts: on the one side is home, and friends, and family, and luxury; on the other side are tents, and marches, and bivouac, and hard fare, and the deadly missiles of actual conflict. The decision is quickly made, and large sums, if necessary, are readily paid down for a substitute. The whole country may complain of a pecuniary stringency, but, somehow or other, the money is raised for this purpose. Now, shall it be admitted that patriotism or selfishness are stronger sentiments than the love of Christ? Or will the professed child of God plead "hard times," when the Saviour asks his aid, and

yet ransack town and country to procure means to exempt his person from the light afflictions of this transitory world? Shall it be admitted that Christian men will eagerly spend their thousands when self and pride or the law's strong arm are the incentives, and yet respond reluctantly and with niggardly contributions when the object is the soul, and the motive appealed to, the amazing love of God as manifested toward a fallen world, in the gift of his Son? He who will go farther to secure earthly exemptions of any kind than to answer the calls of the divine Master, should be deeply concerned about the sincerity of his faith. The following words, at least, should be prayerfully pondered: "If any man come to me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple." "And whosoever doth not bear his cross and come after me, cannot be my disciple."

Here, then, is the Church, with its machinery complete. Some are to preach the gospel in person from the pulpit; others are to preach it by proxy, through their purses; while all are to preach it by an example of self-denial and holy living. There is no discharge in this war. If any professed servant of Jesus Christ fails to respond, let him remember those terrible words, "Curse ye Meroz, curse ye bitterly the inhabitants thereof; because they came not to the help of the Lord, to the help of the Lord against the mighty." But in all this mighty warfare, there is but one instrument authorised or to be relied on, and that is the simple word of God, which is the sword of the Spirit. In the very wildest regions, this is sufficient. For when Paul directs Timothy to do the work of an *evangelist*, he clearly indicates the methods. His words are: "I charge thee, therefore, before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom, *preach the word*, be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine." And then the apostle foretells what will come upon the Church when the wisdom of man begins to modify the purposes of God. "For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts

shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; and they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables. But watch thou in all things, endure afflictions, do the work of an evangelist, make full proof of thy ministry." 2 Tim. iv. 1-5. He who will take pains to examine, can ascertain that the apostle was no false prophet.

The condition of public sentiment at present, in regard to preachers and preaching, is matter for profound and solemn thought. The time seems to be rapidly passing when the people will listen patiently to exhaustive and scholarly presentations of sacred truth. There is demand for advertising, sensational orators. If it be known to the community that the themes to be discussed are those old but fundamental doctrines of faith, justification, original sin, God's sovereignty, providence, perseverance, etc., the multitude at once grow indifferent. The public taste is clamorous for something new and exciting. The things which belong to Cæsar are caught at more eagerly than the things which belong to Christ. Extravagant panegyrics, bold speculations, fanciful theories, dashing and brilliant manner—discourses executed upon this model will, in many localities, gain far more hearers than a sermon from the very ablest divine, whose staple is precious scriptural truth. With some congregations, there is scarcely an inquiry about the preacher's orthodoxy or theological attainment. But it is eagerly asked, Is he eloquent? Can he attract? Let it be distinctly understood that we do not undervalue the importance of style and manner in the pulpit. These are of great price. No public speaker can expect to gain the popular ear unless some regard is paid to the rules of elocution. A humdrum, droning manner in the pulpit deserves rebuke. While a minister of Jesus Christ should shun profane and vain babblings, yet he should study to show himself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth. There was a time when able ministers of the New Testament were heard by the people gladly. A Davies or Alexander, a Baxter or Speece, could draw more hearers than every shallow and perfunctory declaimer in the land. The people of that generation had no taste for teachers

who paid more respect to "itching ears" than to the burden of a solemn "dispensation."

But how are we to account for the change which has come over our congregations in the last fifty years? We answer that the cause is attributable, in a large degree, to the preacher himself. A specific armor is provided for every minister who goes forth to do battle for the Master. First of all, he is to take to himself the girdle of truth, having on the breastplate of righteousness; the feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace; above all, taking the shield of faith, wherewith he shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked; and taking the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God; praying always with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit, and watching thereunto with all perseverance and supplication for all saints. Nothing else is needed to spoil principalities and powers, and make a show of them openly. To succeed under this plan, however, long and patient self-denying labor was demanded, and not a few chafed under the weight of such an armor. In other words, it is far less difficult to the flesh to be proficient in declamation than to gain the mastery in solid learning and edifying scriptural truth. We need not go far for a solution of the remainder; for in this fallen world the descent in morals is rapid and facile. It is far easier to educate a community downward than upward. The very moment that the preacher himself tampers with his commission, the congregation are not slow to claim their privileges too. If "extraordinary" measures are introduced, then the people are clamorous for "extraordinary" preachers, and preaching to match. The truth therefore loses ground on every side. As a consequence, the descent is rapid and mournful; and if correctives are not speedily applied, the day is not distant when no sermon will be tolerated which reproves or rebukes. Denunciation of prevalent sins will be considered personalities. "Itching ears" demand entertainment alone; and every discourse that denounces transgression as it stalks abroad, and points to retributive justice either here or hereafter, is regarded as ill-timed and vulgar.

Let conscientious ministers, who expect to give account, be-

ware. They who resort to extraneous influences will ascertain in the end that the way has been opened to pulpit demoralisation. These extraordinary influences are illusive. Those who, in days gone by, maintained the longest hold on congregations and continued the loved and useful pastors of one people a lifetime, were faithful men, who abounded in sound doctrine, and resorted to no measure but the faith once delivered to the saints. Congregations were attracted not only at home, but in missionary journeys abroad, not by new themes, or startling declamation, or newspaper advertisements, but by diligence in business and that fervor of spirit which arises from intimate acquaintance with "a form of sound words." There was a "blood earnestness" about those old preachers, but it had its sources in that "fear of the Lord which is the beginning of instruction." They spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, and, as a consequence, their word was with power. Woe to the preacher who remodels an inspired "pattern," and thereby imperils the dignity and authority of his own divinely appointed office; for when the minister himself handles the word of God, or anything appertaining thereto, with licentious or irreverent hand, the contagion soon spreads to the people, and, as a consequence, sermons from the pulpit are quickly placed in the same category with speeches from the tribune. When this point is passed, there is but one more round of descent to reach—indifference and unbelief. For whenever a preacher ascends the sacred desk in any other capacity than that of ambassador for God, to utter the mind of the Spirit, he compromises his own lofty position, and opens a wide door to license and unsanctified will-worship; for whenever, again, the preacher cannot produce "a thus saith the Lord" for what he says and what he does, his discourses and devices are but the opinions and actions of fallible man, and the hearer feels at liberty to receive or reject, according to inclination. For if it is only the uninspired preacher who judges thus and thus, then the opinions of other men in the community may be far more valuable.

The only safety, therefore, for the Church of God and its ministers, in this or any age, is to cleave to the old landmark.

Defections from the faith have always had their origin in what are called "non-essential" deviations. The beauty or strength of a building may be seriously marred by changes in the plan of an architect, which, to the eye of an apprentice, appear altogether unimportant. A preacher is shorn of his power the very moment he cannot appeal authoritatively to his credentials and commission. He is no longer the ambassador of a great King, but a private individual simply. Alas for Christianity! her garments have been sadly defiled in these latter days. To behold that Church of God which is the ground and pillar of the truth prostrate at the feet of Cæsar, is a spectacle over which the angels might weep. And the thought is far more appalling when we remember that Cæsar did not make the first advances. But let it be deeply pondered that whenever the Church affiliates with and appeals to human governments in things spiritual, or whenever a spiritual court of Jesus Christ allows itself to dragoon for Cæsar, the period is near at hand when the divine law and pattern, in every particular, will utterly disappear. He who allows any king to sit, even conjointly, on Christ's throne, is already apostate; for the Church cannot have two heads, neither can she serve God and mammon. The very feeblest minister is an overmatch for the disputers of this world, if he only cleaves to his commission and speaks by authority; but if our credentials be discredited, then the strong shall be as tow and the maker of it as a spark, *and they both shall burn together, and none shall quench them.* There are beacons in the past which should warn us from the fatal shore.

The amazing enormities of the dark ages, therefore, as we verily believe, were the judgment of God upon a Church which apostatized from the economy of the New Testament. Every agency, down to minutiae, had been provided for with loving foresight. But with this wisdom of God the creature was not satisfied. Hence one priestly addition after another had to be appended, until the world groaned under the mighty superstition. The light kindled at heaven's true altars was put under a bushel, and the pale, sickly tapers of this earth substituted in its place. He who looks closely into those ten centuries of vice,

cruelty, and ignorance, will arise from the investigation profoundly convinced that every evil might have been averted, if religious teachers, the ages through, had sternly resisted every departure, however minute, from the divinely authorised plan. The inspired directions would have preserved the Church in its purity to the end. But when man began to tinker and improvise, paths became divergent, and a dishonored Master left a presumptuous servant to reap folly's harvest to the full. Inquisitions, spiritual bondage, papal tyranny, in forms most absurd as well as terrible, this was a rebuke stern indeed, but altogether legitimate. Against these very things the gospel had provided; but the servant thought himself wiser than his Lord, and he who ruleth over all gave up the creature to his own delusions. Looking backward, therefore, to the past, from any point of observation, either secular or religious, the testimony is the same—that he who rejects a true Messiah will follow after any benighted teacher, who says with bold though ignorant confidence, Lo here, or lo there.

The very design of the gospel is to divest man of spiritual reliance on himself; for self-righteousness is a rock upon which thousands have beaten and perished. The truth of God is adapted *precisely* to reveal the pit into which man is fallen, and to unfold, in unmistakable terms, the impossibility of escape, unless superhuman power is employed.

At the present moment, when apostasy in certain quarters is imminent, not to say rife, it does seem to the writer that the position of our Southern Zion is surrounded with unusual responsibilities. She should hold on to the divinely appointed landmarks with wrestling pertinacity. The watchword must be Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to-day, and forever. The Church, as such, has no head but Christ. Thrones may crumble, dynasties change, but the crown rights of the Redeemer are immutable. There are things which belong to Cæsar and things which belong to Cæsar's Lord; but if the Church dallies with State and State with Church, the Bridegroom's honor will be endangered, and the fair name of the bride, the Lamb's wife, shall be deeply imperilled. The voice of Zion's King cannot be mistaken—*my kingdom is not of this world.*

We have already seen how, at an early period of the Christian era, the creature attempted improvements upon the divine commission, and with what results. Is it true that history repeats itself, and are we, of this age, to witness another apostasy, and are other lessons of persecution and gloom to come upon the earth? Let the note of warning be sounded in time, and let every watchman on our walls take heed. Our only safety is in keeping steadfastly to the law and the testimony. In these days, especially, let no measure receive the Church's sanction that cannot be proved to have a divine warrant. Let us ponder deeply those words which were spoken to Moses when he was admonished of God in regard to the tabernacle. "For, See, saith he, that thou make *all things according to the pattern* showed to thee in the mount." Let us act boldly and faithfully upon the confession that the Bible is a perfect rule; for while the individual or denomination that works according to this pattern appears, at first sight, to move slowly, yet it shall be demonstrated in the end that these, and these only, are master builders. For they build according to directions, and the edifice, when complete, will exhibit symmetry, perfection, and beauty. This much is guaranteed by the divine architect. Let Cæsar also himself beware; for his image of iron, mingled with clay, shall be broken into shivers when the Ancient of Days rolls upon it that stone, cut without hands out of the mountain.

Now, if in that which was typical it were unlawful to deviate a hair's breadth from the divine pattern, who shall be bold enough to alter and remodel that sanctuary and true tabernacle which the Lord pitched, and not man? As in a great earthly edifice the plan itself is first perfected and each stone laid by number in its place, so in this heavenly building the divine architect forecasts so particularly that nothing is left to the underworker but faithful execution. There is reason to believe, if Moses had altered, on his own authority, the plan of the tabernacle in the smallest particular, even down to a curtain or a board, the Holy Presence would not have descended and dwelt between the cherubim. Now, if exactness of execution, down to minutest details, was imperative in a sanctuary that was sym-

bolic, who can foretell the disasters which shall fall upon the Church of this generation, when the folly of man is substituted in the place of the wisdom and power of God? It is useless to say that such and such a measure is but a slight variation; the command to Moses, and through him to us, was, that there should be no deviation *at all*. The very life of the world was at one time conditioned upon that apparently small thing—the not eating of an apple! Any event is made great or small according as God commands or forbids. As the symbolic import of the tabernacle was incomplete until the last and minutest order had been rigidly and faithfully executed, until the very last pin had been driven into its place, so it is true that no substitute for the gospel, however subtly introduced, can be accepted as that precise power of God unto salvation which the Spirit reveals.

So that from every conceivable standpoint, it can be demonstrated that innovations or measures of any kind are not only not needed, but dishonor God and jeopard the soul; for the gospel contains all that man needs to know, points out all that man needs to do, and offers at every step such aids, warnings, rebukes, encouragement, and consolations, as cannot possibly flow from any other source. What the gospel cannot do for a man is impossible of accomplishment at all, unless it be confessed that the created understands better than the Creator the necessities and nature of man, and unless, again, the perfected wisdom and power of God, to a specific end, can be supplemented and improved upon by sagacity of mortal minds, which are both finite and depraved.

If this matter, therefore, be looked into deeply, the fundamental error will be found in a neglect of systematic and reverential Bible study; for “all Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be *thoroughly* furnished.” For in the divine economy, no emergency, from whatever cause or quarter, has been overlooked, but all was foreseen and abundantly provided for. When, therefore, the Master says, Go preach my gospel, he clearly limits the teacher’s authority to the agency and instrumentalities and powers that can be legiti-

mately discovered in the revealed truth itself. Every alteration or shadow of change is a dead fly in the ointment; for the gospel was adjusted, from of old, in the divine mind, to meet the creature's wants *exactly*. No trimming is demanded, no experiment allowable; but, on the contrary, the efficacy of redemption depends, for the most part, upon the very *precision of its application*. To add to or subtract from the inspired plan is not only presumptuous, but impertinent; for the gospel is either final and perfect as a revelation and moral restorative, or it is not. If it is, why seek to improve upon perfection? If it is not, then which of all the sons of men shall be accepted as an all-sufficient teacher? The writer is fully persuaded that the evils of the present day cannot find a remedy until the unperverted word of God is reverentially trusted both by individuals and the Church. It is only while the branch is kept in lively contact with the vine that life circulates freely through all the members. If we set aside the sure word of prophecy and give heed to fables and commandments of men, it need not be surprising if profaneness takes the place of praise, and the priesthood of babbling and opposing philosophy is seen ministering at the holy altar.

The command is definite—*Go preach my gospel*. St. Paul says, "*Preach the word*; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all longsuffering and doctrine." *Do this*, and I am with you. *Do this*, and all is done that can be for man's recovery. For the truth cuts to the heart and destroys all self-confidence; and as the hope of salvation through obedience perishes in the soul, the gospel lifts up its voice and says, "Look unto me, and *be ye saved*, all the ends of the earth; for I am God, and there is none else."

Away with the idea that the gospel is commonplace. If it is objected, however, that the same truth repeated from Sabbath to Sabbath must of necessity grow stale, our reply is, that the **same** argument would be good against all that is grand and lofty in the natural world; for the heavens now above us are the **same** that ages ago declared the glory of God. The identical **stars**, from century to century, have lighted up the mighty dome. It

was to the sweet influences of the Pleiades, the bands of Orion, and to Arcturus with his suns, that the finger of the Almighty pointed when he answered Job out of the whirlwind. And night after night does the astronomer gaze with enlarged and ever expanding admiration. The callous heart, the dull, uncultured head, may weary of the sight, and clamor for fresher revelations; but the man of true science returns to his observations with interest ever increasing, whilst the only thought that appals is this, that man's allotted time on earth is a period far too short in which to comprehend the wisdom and beauty that are garnered in the firmament. Age after age has inquiry, keen, scrutinizing, and lofty, proceeded; and to the eye of genius that looks up to-night, the heavens are as grand and glorious and beautiful as when the morning stars sang together and all the sons of God shouted for joy. In one sense, the gospel is never old. He only can weary of it who studies it least. For if the heavens declare the glory of God, in Jesus Christ dwells all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. While, in one sense, the same truth is declared in every sermon, yet in another the *instructed* scribe is ever bringing forth things *new* as well as old. As with no material but the light the kaleidoscope creates and exhibits a variety of beautiful colors and perfectly symmetrical forms, so it is true that the grace of God, as it shines in the face of Jesus Christ, is capable of boundless diversity and infinite beauty. The industrious preacher need never be at a loss for noble themes. The mine here is inexhaustible; for, rightly considered, the cross of Jesus Christ is the central object of our fallen world. All certified history, for thousands of years, foreshadowed the atonement; and after God was manifest in the flesh, the life, doctrine, and crucifixion of Jesus, left for all time a lively impress upon the nations. Calvary, therefore, is the focus from which all truthful history should enkindle its inspiration. For, the purposes of Jehovah with individuals and nations, the centuries through, are indissolubly connected with the mission of his Son. He, therefore, who aspires to the dignity of a teacher must fully understand at the start that the world was not created as a theatre on which kings and warriors and statesmen were to

exhibit pride, gratify ambition, and illustrate diplomacy; but the earth is the Lord's, and he created it for himself, that here on this fallen arena he might show the exceeding riches of his grace in his kindness toward us, in Christ Jesus.

Then why go afar for remedies, when a physician, the best in the universe, stands at the very door? What need we more than the gospel provides? For if man be a sinner and God's vengeance impends, the creature who flies to philosophy for a refuge will receive mockery, and only mockery, for an answer. The gulf of separation is too wide for any but an omnipotent arm to reach over. The blood of bulls and of goats and the ashes of a heifer cannot atone. Neither can self-righteousness, in any form, present an acceptable offering. The only possible escape is to be found in the gospel.

Nor is it enough, as Dr. Dwight well remarks, that sermons contain the truth, important and indispensable as this is. A sermon may contain it *in such a manner* as to prevent a great part of its efficacy. Nor does the evil stop here. Instances have existed in the world in which preachers have uttered nothing but what is strictly evangelical, and yet have only amused, wearied, or disgusted sober, pious, and candid hearers. The *spirit* in which truth is preached is a consideration which cannot well be overestimated. The gospel should, by all means, be preached plainly, and with much tenderness, meekness, and holy fear. And this is not at all inconsistent with great boldness of speech. Abstract discussions, as far as possible, should be avoided. St. Paul, one of the most profound of all reasoners, always seems to adopt with pleasure a mode of disclosure which is *simple*, when the subject will admit of it. And he who spake as never man spake treated every subject in the most direct manner of common sense, although he often discourses concerning things of a profound nature. If the minister, therefore, would preserve a good conscience, he must take nothing from and add nothing to the inspired record. If he fails essentially *here*, the error is fatal. The voice of Gabriel would fall powerless, if he should venture to offer strange fire upon this altar. To be a master workman, the preacher must live in faith and walk with

God. His text, his sermon, his motives, must be for eternity. For if this wilderness and solitary place is ever to be made glad; if the desert is ever to rejoice and blossom as the rose; if the eyes of the blind are to be opened, and the lame man to leap as an hart, and the tongue of the dumb to sing; oh, if ever in this wearied, toil-worn earth, there is to be a highway of holiness—this and all else glorious shall be accomplished when the ransomed of the Lord are returning and coming home to Zion, and singing as they come, “With joy will we draw water *out of the wells of salvation.*” No voice but *this* can ever cry, Breathe, breathe, upon these slain. Great is the mystery of godliness, but great, too, is its power. Here is a hope that maketh not ashamed. It lives in life and swallows up death. The shining ones, mounting ever upward in glory, break forth and sing, Thou art worthy, for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God; worthy is the cry, and ten thousand times ten thousand and thousands of thousands cry, Worthy, worthy is the Lamb. This is their song, and it wears not old. There is no languid heart, no faltering voice, no tired tongue; but ever and forever is the cry, Worthy, worthy, worthy, blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne and to the Lamb.*

The writer has dwelt at length on this part of his subject, because he earnestly desires to see, in these days of perplexity, the unadulterated word and power of God fairly applied to the individual and public conscience. This is all that remains to us now; for it must be evident to every thoughtful mind that under the lead of eccentric and irreverent teachers, faith has been driven nearer and nearer to an eclipse.

The great commission is catholic in its spirit, and devolves upon the preacher a work coextensive with the globe. “Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature.” The field lies wide, but the command is imperative. *Go* preach. At this point, we have apostolic example; for after Paul’s conversion he carried the gospel into Arabia. The same apostle, in company with Barnabas, made a missionary journey of two

* Edwards.

years. Afterwards St. Paul passes through Asia Minor and makes a visit to Corinth. The apostle winters at Nicopolis, and then goes to Ephesus. It was at the last named city that the Macedonian cry reached him. He obeys the call, and departs for Macedonia. After wintering in Achaia, Paul goes the fifth time to Jerusalem, where he is imprisoned. As a day of release approaches, the eye of this zealous missionary is turned, yearningly, toward the imperial city. He longs to see the faithful there, and to proclaim that gospel of Christ which is the power of God unto salvation to the Jew first, but also to the Greek. That the gospel was to be carried to the nations, is distinctly intimated by the events of Pentecost. For on that day, Parthians, and Medes, and Elamites, and the dwellers in Mesopotamia, and in Judæa, and Cappadocia, in Pontus and Asia, Phrygia and Pamphylia, in Egypt and in the parts of Libya about Cyrene, and strangers of Rome, Jews and proselytes, Cretes and Arabians, *all heard in their own tongues* the wonderful works of God. The providences of God throughout clearly indicated that all middle walls of partition were broken down, and that Jehovah was not a God of the Jew only, but also of the Gentile; that "the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him. How, then, shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? And how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a preacher? And how shall they preach except they be sent? as it is written, How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, and bring glad tidings of good things." "And this gospel of the kingdom," says the Master, "shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come." It was in obedience to the spirit of this command that the apostle labored at his work. "Yea," says Paul, "so have I strived to preach the gospel, not where Christ was named, lest I should build upon another man's foundation. But as it is written, To whom he was not spoken of, they shall see; and they that have not heard shall understand." "From Jerusalem and round about unto Illyricum, I have fully preached the gospel of Christ."

The field, therefore, is the world, every part of it, from sea to

sea. Other religions are for latitudes and castes, but Christianity is universal. Far as the curse is found, so far must the antidote be supplied. As death came upon *all* in consequence of Adam's sin, so life must be offered to all upon the ground of that righteousness which is in Christ Jesus our Lord. The commission, therefore, was, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature; he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be damned."

To this great commission is annexed a promise of ineffable sweetness—Go preach; "*and lo! I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.*" Here is the third grand instrumentality—the Spirit's influence working mightily. For that the Master's allusion here was to the Holy Ghost cannot be doubted, when we recall his own words elsewhere to the disciples: "Nevertheless I tell you the truth: It is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you." "And I will pray the Father that he may abide with you forever." It is true, that the *primary* end of all preaching is the salvation of an elect people. But in the proclamation of the truth, there are also other important purposes to be subserved. If, therefore, the number of the saved seems small, as the vastness of the field is considered, let the minister of Jesus Christ remember that to gather even this little flock and to keep them safe from the wolves, whilst, at the same time, the gospel is preached to the teeming nations as a witness, is work enough for an angel's strength. It is from misconception of the matter just now under discussion that much sorrow often fills the preacher's heart. He anticipates a success that has not been promised. Almost every young minister is eager for results of a specific kind. Mankind are expected to take heed forthwith to the gospel. But after many days of toil, it is ascertained that the human race now, as of old, are slow of heart to believe. The preacher is discouraged. Tears are his meat day and night. But go back to the commission. Does the Master say, Go preach, and men shall be ready to hear and obey? Is not the contrary distinctly intimated? Remember the word that I said unto you, The servant is not greater than his Lord. If

they have persecuted me, they will also persecute you. To be comfortable at all, the preacher must ever keep it vividly before his mind that it is not his duty to create sensations or "get up revivals," but to preach the word, to be instant in season, out of season, to reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all longsuffering and doctrine. If he does *this* faithfully, there will be small room left for despondency and depression when extraordinary results do not immediately appear. For he who preaches the gospel *simply as a witness*, performs a great work; for even such an apostle is a sweet savor of Christ unto God, in them that perish as well as in them that are saved. The heralds of salvation must anticipate discouragements and prepare for them. Stephen was commanded to preach, but the multitude gnashed on the messenger with their teeth. They cried out with a loud voice, and stopped their ears, and ran upon him with one accord, and cast him out of the city, and stoned him. The message of the preacher was rejected, and death lay in wait. But even while he spake, all that sat in the council, looking steadfastly on him, saw his face as it had been the face of an angel. And when the last moment came, he being full of the Holy Ghost, looked up steadfastly into heaven, and saw the glory of God and Jesus standing on the right hand of God. And they stoned Stephen, calling upon God and saying, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit. And he kneeled down and cried with a loud voice, Lord, lay not this sin to their charge. And when he had said this, he fell asleep. Christ's engagement had been fulfilled. *He was with his servant to the end.* It is clearly intimated that the preacher's mission shall sometimes apparently fail. The Master instructs the disciples in reference to such cases: "But into whatsoever city ye enter, and they receive ye not, go your ways out into the streets of the same, and say, Even the very dust of your city, which cleaveth on us, do we wipe off against you."

The ambassador for God is commanded to work and wait. His expectations are one thing, and the Lord's purposes another. He should therefore fight against presumption and impatience. Grief may endure for a night, but joy shall come in the morn-
ing. Not as *I* will, but as *thou* wilt, should be the preacher's

prayer. And thus, not preaching *ourselves*, but the *Master*, that God who commanded the light to shine out of darkness will shine in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God as it shines in the face of Jesus Christ. We may be "troubled on every side, but not distressed; perplexed, but not in despair; persecuted, but not forsaken, cast down, but not destroyed; always bearing about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our body....For all things are for our sakes, that the abundant grace might through the thanksgiving of many redound to the glory of God. For which cause we faint not; but though our outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day by day. For our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory; while we look not at the things which are seen, *but at the things which are not seen.*"

Difficulties, apparently insurmountable, encompassed the apostle at every step of his journey. "Of the Jews, five times received he forty stripes save one. Thrice was he beaten with rods, once was he stoned, thrice he suffered shipwreck, a night and a day was he in the deep; in journeyings often, in perils of waters, in perils of robbers, in perils by his own countrymen, in perils by the heathen, in perils in the city, in perils in the wilderness, in perils in the sea, in perils among false brethren, in weariness and painfulness, in watchings often, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness. Besides those things which were without, that which came upon him daily, the care of all the churches. Who is weak and I am not weak, who offended and I burn not? For I think that God hath set forth us apostles last, as it were appointed to death, for we are made a spectacle unto the world and to angels and to men. We are fools for Christ's sake and despised. We both hunger and thirst, and are buffeted. We are made as the filth of the world, and are the offscouring of all things unto this day." Yet, notwithstanding this fearful opposition, there was a spirit and wisdom in the hearts of these primitive preachers, which all their adversaries were unable to gainsay or resist. None of these things

moved them. Preach, says the Master, and the word that goeth forth shall not return void; but whether it prove the savor of death unto death or of life unto life, is a matter that need not overwhelm the preacher's mind. It certainly shall accomplish that which God pleases, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto he sends it. With this idea fully established, the faithful minister need not be discouraged. He can preach to the multitudes whether they hear or whether they forbear, and they shall know that a prophet hath been among them. To the upright there ariseth a light in the darkness, and to such God gives songs in the night. The responsibility, therefore, is thrown where it belongs. "If thou warn the wicked and he turn not from his wickedness, nor from his wicked way, he shall die in his iniquity, but thou hast delivered thy soul." It is true, that the faithful minister, who trembles at God's word, should watch for souls as they that must give account; but if the burden be heavy and the harvest long delayed, the consolation of the promise never fails—"Lo! I am with you *always*;" "be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee the crown."

Let the preacher, therefore, go forth with manly heart and sow beside all waters. The fruits may not immediately appear, but it is a law, even in the material world, that nothing is absolutely lost. The place, the form, the visible aspect—these can change. Our bodies die and turn to dust. There are periods of growth and of decay. The waters wear the stones, they wash away the things that grow out of the earth. But in this change there is no loss or destruction of elementary particles. Dissolving elements, we are told, appear again in new combinations and new forms of utility and beauty. And now will he who watches over the changing elements of senseless matter, so that one particle never entirely disappears or comes short of its destination, permit any influence that ever originates in faith to fail of its end and perish? The blood of the martyr may be poured out—yea, his very bones be disinterred and their ashes sifted on the waters—but the Avon shall flow into the Severn, and the Severn into the sea, and the waves of old ocean waft to all kingdoms the doctrines which he taught and the deeds which he did. What is

true of John Wickliffe shall be true of all others. Whatsoever a man sows, that shall he also reap. The sentiment is altogether false, that only the evil which men do lives after them, whilst the good which they do is interred with their bones. Every word which a man speaks and every action which he performs will live on forever. The great heroic deeds of the past have been the inheritance of all succeeding generations. *God with us* is the preacher's strength. He makes the wrath of man to praise, and the remainder he restrains. When this breath comes from the four winds and breathes upon the slain, they live. All opposition is vain; for the strong shall be as tow, and the maker of it as a spark, and they shall both burn together, and none shall quench them.

Not in man, therefore, but in the Spirit's influence working mightily, is the teacher's hope. It is true that a Paul may plant and an Apollos water, but the increase is from God. In God's own way and at the appointed time, a better day shall dawn. For of Zion glorious things are spoken. "And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it." "I will say to the north, Give up, and to the south, Keep not back; bring my sons from far, and my daughters from the ends of the earth." "God shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people; and they shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." Even at this moment our old earth is wearied with her toils, and creation groans to be delivered; while pious hearts, in every land, yearn for that redemption Sabbath, whose blessed light shall shine on brightly through a thousand years. The trial may be severe, but those days of blessedness shall be reached by-and-by.

Here, then, are the agencies—the living teacher, the inspired word, and the Holy Ghost. It is enough. A voice from the great deep of man's necessities cries, "Work, *work*, WORK, for the night cometh." "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned."

CRITICAL NOTICES.

An Ecclesiastical Catechism of the Presbyterian Church. For the use of Families, Bible Classes, and Private Members. By Rev. THOMAS SMYTH, D. D. Sixth Edition, revised. Richmond: Presbyterian Committee of Publication. Pp. 112. 16mo.

The title of this work, its author's name, and the auspices under which it now comes forth amongst us, invite a thorough scrutiny. A catechism to teach us and our families the true principles of church government, which one of our most distinguished and influential ministers puts forth over his own name, declaring at the same time that it has been revised again and again; and which our Committee of Publication at Richmond publishes with the high sanction of its *imprimatur*, may reasonably be expected to be sound to the core. We propose to exercise our legitimate office as critics in examining whether, in all respects, this work is worthy of the confidence of our pastors and people, regarded from the point of view of our acknowledged standards. This it will surely be admitted is the true point of view from which to regard such a work as this, put forth by our Publication Committee.

1. It appears to us that Question 44, with its answer, is fairly open to criticism. The doctrine undertaken to be expounded there is the doctrine of our Confession of Faith, chap. xxv. i. It is in these words: "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 our Lord Jesus Christ, the house and family of God, out of which there is no ordinary possibility of salvation." Now, this Catechism asks: "What, then, are we to understand by the doctrine that out of the Church there is no

ordinary possibility of salvation?" And the answer which it furnishes is: "By this doctrine we are to understand that faith, and consequently salvation, are ordinarily bestowed by God through the instrumentality of his ministers, and that it is only in this way that men are ordinarily introduced into the invisible Church, out of which there is no salvation. But it does not teach that salvation can not be obtained out of any particular visible church, by whatever name it may be called; neither is such claim on the part of any church to be otherwise regarded than as impious and vain." Our objection is not that the Catechism enunciates any false doctrine, but that, enunciating a different doctrine from the Confession, it would persuade us that *we must understand the Confession as teaching it*. We have all seen great evils resulting to the Church from this way of understanding Confessions of Faith differently from their plain and obvious meaning. It certainly will be held to be just ground for criticism if a Committee representing our Church, while explaining, in a work which they publish, a doctrine of our Confession, actually explains it away and substitutes another in its place.

The doctrine of Rome is that out of the Church, (that is, the visible Church, for they acknowledge none else,) there is no possibility of salvation. This is to exaggerate greatly the importance of the visible Church. But it will not do to run to the other extreme, as is now so much in vogue amongst Protestants, and make her out an insignificant thing. To the visible Church is committed the truth. She has the word and the sacraments, and they are the only channels of saving grace. She is the body of Christ, and membership in the body is involved in communion with the Head. But there may be exceptional cases, where a man may get access to the truth independently of the visible Church, and so be in communion with the Head, without being a member of the visible body. Hence the limitation of the Confession—there is no salvation outside of the Church except in extraordinary cases.

Now, this is the plain meaning of the doctrine. The idea is to set forth the value and importance of the catholic visible

Church, unto which (as the Confession goes on to say) "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." It is an idea very useful and necessary to be held forth. Why should this Ecclesiastical Catechism substitute any other one for it? Because some exaggerate the visible Church, let us not be found disparaging it.

2. We consider the answer to Question 71 *defective*, inasmuch as it does not name amongst the essential principles of Presbyterianism the *unity* of the Church, which separates us from Congregationalists. It is true, the next answer refers to this idea as "further essential;" but we cannot see why Answer 71, which undertakes to recount all the *essential* principles, should leave out this one only to introduce it in the next answer as "further essential."

In like manner, we hold Answer 72 to be *redundant*, for it names as "further essential" other two principles distinctly set forth in the preceding answer.

3. We must criticise the answer to Question 115, as being contrary to our Form of Government. It teaches that the preaching presbyter is to be set apart "with the laying on of the hands of the ministers present, belonging to the Presbytery." Our book says it is to be "with the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery," which includes ruling as well as teaching elders. And the history of this expression of the book is notable. The Westminster Form had changed the language of the Second Book of Discipline from "imposition of hands of the eldership" to "those preaching presbyters to whom it doth belong." But our fathers changed this again, and said, "With the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery." Just as immediately afterwards they say "all the *members* of the Presbytery" shall give the right hand of fellowship to the newly ordained minister, whereas the practice followed in Scotland confines it to "all the *ministers* of the Presbytery." The Italics, of course, are ours.

It is undeniable that our Form of Government has upon this point got nearer to the scriptural idea of ordination than the Westminster Form. Ordination is an act of government, which

belongs, every part of it, to the whole court. This is the idea of our Form and of the Bible. But the Catechism before us squints at ordination being an act of *the clergy*. The idea seems to be that only ministers can make a minister. This is the imperfectly developed Presbyterianism of the Westminster Form, which we are very unwilling should be officially taught to "our families, Bible classes, and private members."

4. In connexion with the preceding criticism, we would call attention to the answers to Questions 135 and 146. In the latter, it is very scripturally said that in the ordination of deacons, the pastor and elders are to lay on hands, and the sixth chapter of Acts is referred to, where the seven deacons were ordained by the college of apostles. And this view of the matter would be altogether acceptable to us, if the matter under consideration were *Amendments of the Form*. But that is not now before us. What we are now examining is whether the teachings of this Catechism are, as they should be, in exact accordance with our standards, and also whether they are always consistent with themselves. Now, Answer 135, relative to the ordination of the ruling elder, stops a good deal short of the other. It gives a very uncertain sound. It says the ordination of the ruling elder is to be "with prayer, or with prayer and the imposition of hands;" but it does not tell us *whose hands*—whether those of the presiding minister or of the session. But why should this Catechism be thus inconsistent with itself as well as with our book? On the one hand, if the deacon, according to this teaching, is to be ordained with the imposition of the hands of the parochial presbytery, why does not the same authority tell us plainly and distinctly that the ruling elder *a fortiori* is to be so ordained likewise? For, is the deacon a higher officer than the ruling elder, that he is clearly entitled to the hands both of the minister and of the whole court, but the ruling elder may be set apart by the former alone? Or will this authority turn the thing round the other way, and say the ruling elders are worthy to lay hands on the deacon, who is the lowest officer, but are not worthy to lay hands on one of themselves? But, on the other hand, if our book treats of the deacon and the elder together in

one and the same chapter, and prescribes that they are to be ordained by the minister with prayer without imposition of hands, who gave the Committee of Publication authority officially to separate betwixt the deacon and the elder, and teach that the one is to be set apart in any way differently from the other? The Church has a Form of Government which, unless constitutionally altered, should be maintained by every Executive Committee which she appoints. We are aware that the Assemblies of 1833 and 1842 said the churches might do as each of them pleased in this matter. But that was an acknowledgment of the imperfections of our book, which, if it did become the Assembly to make without lifting a finger to correct the same, no Committee of the Church is entitled to act on as is done here. To have one thing taught officially in the Form of Government, and another thing taught officially by the Publication Committee in a Church Catechism, seems to us a way of confusion.

5. We object to the answer to Question 122, because it represents the elders as acting a subordinate part in the rule of the Church. "He is appointed," says this Catechism, "to assist the pastor, who is the teaching elder, in the government of the Church." But the language of our book is that the elders are chosen "for the purpose of exercising government and discipline *in conjunction with* pastors or ministers."

Elsewhere, it is true, the equality of the elders, as rulers, has been admitted in this revised edition. Here again, then, is a double inconsistency—an inconsistency betwixt the different parts of this Catechism, and an inconsistency betwixt it and the Form of Government.

The inequality of the elders, as rulers, is also implied in Question 125: "Are ruling elders recognised in Scripture?" Such a question as that in the Catechism of a Church which gets its very name from its government by presbyters or elders! *Recognised* in Scripture, forsooth, and appointed to *assist* the teacher in a government where the only title of this latter to have any share of rule himself is, that he is also a presbyter or elder as well as a preacher!

6. It appears to us that the answer to Question 133 is open to

serious criticism, in that it speaks of the ruling elders as representing "the respective congregations which they serve," while "the pastor represents the church at large." This is to make the ruling elder a mere deputy,* instead of a true and proper representative. Such a representative, while he is chosen by a particular church or community, and acts as its organ, is nevertheless what is called a *general* representative, the representative of the *whole* Church, or of the *whole* State. He is empowered to act, and is expected to act, for the whole body, and not to regard merely the interests of his own constituents. Such is the only proper working of the representative system, which finds its model and prototype in the Presbyterian Church government.

7. The answer to Question 134 is objectionable, because it makes another unfounded and unwarrantable distinction betwixt the two classes of elders. "134. By whom are ruling elders chosen to their office?" "As they represent the members of the church, so are they elected to their office by them." Are ruling elders elected to their office by church members, and are not teaching elders also elected by them? This leads us to consider the succeeding answer, (135,) where also it seems to be signified that ruling elders are *called by the church*, but teaching elders some other and better way. And then we are led to look at Questions 110, 111, 112, 113, respecting a call to the ministry, where all reference to the call of a particular congregation, which is so important an element in vocation, seems purposely excluded. Whether the author really intends to make out (as would seem to be implied in Question 112 and its answer) that there is a difference between the teaching and ruling elders, based on the idea that the Presbytery calls the former, while but a single church calls the latter, we cannot undertake to determine; but certainly it is very remarkable that in all which is here said about a call to the ministry, there should be an entire omission of any reference to the people's call, and apparently an entire

* See Lieber's Political Ethics and Brougham's Political Philosophy, quoted by Dr. Thornwell, S. P. REVIEW, Vol. I., p. 18.

forgetfulness of all which our Form of Government so fully sets forth on that important point.

8. We must criticise the answer to Question 199, in which the principle is broadly laid down that the church courts can delegate "to other bodies" the powers committed to them. Nothing stronger or broader was ever said in the controversy amongst us about the old boards by those who advocated them.

In concluding this critical notice, we are constrained to say, that we regret the adoption by the Committee at Richmond of this work as one of its issues. We do not believe that the Church authorised or that she expects it to issue publications representing the views of any party. Nor would it mend the matter, if it were to say it stands ready to issue something on the opposite side. The Church cannot afford to have its seal, in the hands of that Committee, rendered questionable in any case. When our Committee of Publication has stamped any book with its approbation, it must be current reading for the whole Church and for all classes of the brethren and members, just as the bullion is made current money for all the people as soon as the government stamps it with its die. We desire it to be distinctly understood that we are not now objecting to the private publication of partisan views. There will always be parties, in every body of men, who will differ in opinion from one another. It is a wise and good arrangement that these parties should have their several presses constituting their party organs and disseminating freely their several ideas; moreover, individuals can make use of printers and presses for their own purposes *ad libitum*, at their own charges. But what we are now insisting upon is, that it is inadmissible for our Committee of Publication to lend itself to party purposes. As this is the first time, to our knowledge, that the respected Committee at Richmond has taken it upon it to publish what is not generally acceptable amongst us, we have considered it our right and our duty to call the marked attention of the Church to the matter. The question calls for settlement, whether the Church approves or disapproves the course which we have impugned:

The Centurions of the Gospel; with Discourses on "The Choice of a Profession," "Our Responsibility for our Fellow-men," and the "Piety and Patriotism of Praying for our Rulers."

By Rev. W. A. SCOTT, D. D., Pastor of the 42d Street Presbyterian Church, New York. Second Edition. Anson D. F. Randolph, 710 Broadway. 1868. Pp. 443, 12 mo.

A thoroughly *slipshod* book—slipshod in its preparation, its thought, and its English. We have no quarrel with Dr. Scott. He is a courteous, kindly, worthy gentleman, and an excellent brother and minister. But this book is the representative to us, for the time being, of a class of books cuphemistically spoken of as religious literature, against which it has become absolutely necessary to make protest.

The very title of the book provokes a look askance. What have we not had of that sort? There are "The Women of the Bible," and "The Children of the Bible," and "The Birds of the Bible," and "The Sacred Mountains," and "The Bards of the Bible," and "Memories of Olivet," and ditto "of Galilee"—*ohé, jam satis*, though we are not half through! It is impossible to escape the feeling that a set of writers are practising upon the reawakened and child-like desire, which the gracious Father has breathed into his people, to understand and love his word; and that every taking name has been levied on, by which inexperience and reviving curiosity may be made available.

We are not so absurd as to object to a taking name on its own account, if only it introduces that which is really valuable, and which might fail of a hearing if left to its intrinsic merits. But there are many cases in which a popular name, a flashy binding, or a few tawdry pictures, are depended on to force upon the public a work which, but for such adventitious attractions, would fall still born.

What, now, is the work before us? It is a republication (see the opening sentence of the preface) of "The Church in the Army; or the Four Centurions;" and the title is said to have been changed so as to "express more satisfactorily the nature of the volume." Perhaps there is a shade more of appositeness now; and yet so slight is the difference as to provoke a query

whether the first edition was not a disappointment in respect of success, and the change of title is not a change of venue, and a plea for a new trial.

It is wonderful that a man of Dr. Scott's erudition can produce a volume for popular reading on such subjects as Capernaum, the Crucifixion, Cæsarea, and the voyage and shipwreck of Paul, and convey so little information about places and scenery as he does. How could he avoid drawing on Thomson or Porter for a sketch of Tell Hûm or Khan Minyeh, or of the desolations of Cæsarea as it is, or its glories as they were? How could he hope to make these faintly outlined men—one of them, at least, little more in the record than a suit of armor and a voice—live for us, unless he *painted them in* into the hills and palaces, the daylight or the dark, to which historically they belong?

Then the spreading out and spinning out of what he has to say, is equally surprising. Take the question of the rightness or sinfulness in itself of a military life—a question that grew old while Dr. Scott was young, and has now for long been obsolete. It occupies the introduction; it reappears upon the forty-fifth page, upon the seventy-first page, upon the seventy-fifth page. Farther than that, we have not pursued it. In all this, too, not one new suggestion—not a breath of fresh air.

We object to the expenditure of a whole chapter, and, as it seems, a whole sermon, upon the attempt to prove the centurion who stood guard at the crucifixion a converted man. He may have been so; but how can it be proved from the single exclamation, "Truly this man was the Son of God?" And why is it of so much importance to establish that belief, that more than a passing paragraph should be given to it?

To illustrate this dilution of a little sense in many words, we quote *ad aperturam libri*.

"*My servant*—literally 'my boy'—a common and familiar term, as *garçon* in French, or as we use the word *boy* for a favorite servant without regard to his age. Luke calls him a slave, and so interpreters generally understand the word *doulos*." P. 35. *Quære*: Does the author mean that Luke construes the word

doulos as meaning slave, and that other interpreters agree with him? That is the plain grammar of the sentence, though it cannot be the intention of it.

“*Grievously tormented*—terribly, fearfully distressed—is in great agony and at the point of death, as in *Luke*. Now, it is entirely a mistake, as some critics say,” [the author evidently meant to write, “It is a mistake to say, as some critics do,” etc.; whereas the phrase as written makes the critics the authors of the correction, and not of the mistake,] “that in such a case of palsy there was no consciousness, no agony, no suffering. It may be true that torment or agony does not always accompany the palsy; but there is a form of this disease that is attended by violent cramps and strong pains, and is exceedingly dangerous. Trench says the disease in this case was paralysis, with contraction of the limbs and joints, and was therefore a case of extreme suffering as well as of great danger. The Greek term for *grievously tormented* is from the name of a Lydian stone, upon which metals were proved, and hence it came to be used for applying an engine of torture in the examination of criminals, and metaphorically to afflict, torment. And hence here it is applied to a paralytic who is suffering violent pains.” P. 36. Could language be made much more bald, disjointed, or jejune?

“FAITH, then, is not a mere abstraction, nor the invention of cunning priests by which to put a yoke upon the people’s necks *to hold them down while they help themselves to their purses.*” The Italics are ours, to signalize this new use of a “yoke.”

“This was certainly an extraordinary profession of faith for a man to make *in a Hebrew*, who had not himself been brought up in the creed and catechism of Abraham.” P. 43.

“There is then no *handle* here for the enemies of the gospel with which to *work up a discrepancy* between the Evangelists.” P. 33.

“May not a deist, who does not believe in the Bible, bind a poultice *to his wounded hound?*” P. 52.

“Flunkies affect to be lords, and ‘the queens of society’ are in the kitchen.” P. 57.

“Public sentiment must be elevated and purified from *the*

vulture-seeking of a neighbor's wrong doings, and by speaking only the truth, and the truth only when necessary." P. 77.

"But the centurion has no *if*, nor idea of space in his faith, and hence our Lord's commendation was unqualified" ! P. 82.

"For as Jesus was crucified for claiming to be the Son of God, so, if he was righteous, that is, innocent of any crime or wrong in what he said of himself, then he was unjustly condemned; and if so, then he was truly the Son of God. There is *then* no real discrepancy between the two expressions. What then is the meaning of the centurion's testimony concerning Jesus?" P. 96.

The simple truth is, this book is not the fruit of conscientious labor. A man as eminent in position as Dr. Scott has no right to do the Church such harm as, we will not say to lower, but actually to throw away, the standards of correct and elegant speech; and that, too, after such a whet to criticism as this: "In the opinion of some intelligent and thoughtful and pious men, much of the popular religious literature of our day is lamentably wanting in devotion and elegance of style." Preface, p. v. It flushes the cheek with mortification, that one who ought to be a champion, should furnish food for derision to the adversaries. If we have spoken strongly, it is due to the pain we feel in seeing great opportunities come to nought.

In the School-Room. Chapters on the Philosophy of Education.

JOHN S. HART, LL.D., Principal of the New Jersey State Normal School. Philadelphia: Eldredge & Brother, 17 and 19 South Sixth Street. 1868. Pp. 276.

We have read this book with mingled regret and pleasure, but with much more of pleasure than of regret.

Prof. Hart is eminent in his profession—than which hardly any is more vital to the general welfare—and not there only. He has long been widely known as a zealous and successful laborer in Sunday-schools, and as editor of the *Sunday-School Times*, a paper founded by the American Sunday-School Union, but now, we believe, the property of the editor. He brings the experience of a thoughtful, fruitful, wisely-expended life-time to

the discussion of his subject. His style is admirably clear, vivacious, apt. It draws you on with an unflagging interest from point to point. And the thoughts so happily expressed are almost all of them just, many valuable, some exceedingly important and precious.

His book—we are hardly prepared to call it his *work*—contains thirty chapters; some of them very brief and sententious, others longer and descriptive. Some relate to the arts involved in the profession of teaching—as the “Art of Questioning,” Chap. ii.; others, to general topics needful to be understood—such as “The Study of Language,” Chap. x.; others, to prejudices and errors common among teachers, and likely to hinder or impair their work—as those on “Loving the Children,” and “Gaining the Affections of the Scholars,” Chaps. xviii. and xix.

And here emerges one subject of our regrets. These chapters are so detached and independent as to bear evidence that they were prepared independently of each other, and without proper regard to what had been or was yet to be said. There is, therefore, and particularly in the early part of the book, a great deal of needless repetition; which is the less to be excused in Prof. Hart, because he really has so much to tell us, and might be adding, from his vast store of experience, so much to the actual knowledge of the world of thinkers and of teachers. Indeed, one cannot but see that these chapters, or most of them, are the author’s editorials in the *S. S. Times*, hardly even revised for more formal publication. Consequently, the style is often careless, needlessly diffuse, and even at times—*horrescimus referentes*—ungrammatical.

A much more serious matter, however, is the way in which this Christian author treats the exclusion of religion as a subject of study from the public schools. P. 250, *et seq.* He admits that there is not such an inclusion of it as even he would like to see. He alleges—and we concede it, with thanks to God—that a pious teacher conveys religious instruction of a certain kind *necessarily*—even (often) unconsciously. And we also concede that Sunday-schools are a precious supplement to the irreligious day-schools, and undo a portion of the mischief they do. So far, we agree.

T-U

But he proceeds to contest the main position, that irreligious education is an evil. He insists that it is only a defective good. Against this we feel it necessary to protest. To teach man's mind to consider all things, and to teach him to omit God in the study of all things, is something more than a deficiency: it is a positive perversion and miseducation.*

There is a wide difference to be noted between the abstract and the concrete treatments of the subject of education in this book. Where the writer enunciates general principles and laws, there is almost nothing that is new, while almost every thing is wise. But where he brings in examples from his own experience or practice, all is fresh, characteristic, individual. And one is led thus to believe that Prof. Hart is a philosophical teacher, rather than a teaching philosopher.

The main and the very just and important thought, is, that the order of the development of the human faculties is a law to the teacher, to be observed faithfully through the whole course of his labors. While, of course, no one faculty is at any time to be disciplined *to the exclusion* of others—such a thing being nearly impossible as well as unwise—the leading matter, the objective point, in the various stages varies according to a fixed and ascertainable law.

Memory necessarily and wholesomely heads the list; both because it is necessary to the acquisition of any knowledge, and because it is to be brought into play at every turn, and in connexion with every power subsequently summoned into action. Memory is to the intellectual world what the attraction called of gravitation is in the material world. It enters into and underlies and modulates every power and every operation in the whole kingdom to which it belongs.

But the author has felt as well as known the cardinal necessity of Love in the school-room. Mutual affection and mutual confidence are as vital to good education as light to vegetable and

* A very impressive commentary on these principles, and on the worth of feeble regrets where there ought to be valiant fighting, is to be found in a late number of the *Southern Review*, in a criticism of the Public School System of Illinois.

animal growth. But he goes farther, and with an impressiveness and courage above praise in this age of moderatism and indifferentism and infidelity, urges the indispensableness of prayer and the blessing of God to success, either of pupils or of teachers. For this, especially, we feel that he deserves our thanks. The present time is one in which the tendency of the world is to a religiosity without God, and a show of Christianity without Christ. And it is good, in such a day, to meet one who has proved himself shrewd, energetic, full of common sense, ingenuity, and science, who does not shrink—yea, who cannot, in the interests of truth, refrain—from commending personal piety as an integral element of any success worth having.

We cannot conclude without commending Chapter xxv., on "Practice Teaching," to the studious consideration of every teacher to whom these lines may come. It contains more matter entirely new to most of us than all the rest of the book put together, and will furnish beginners, and many veterans too, with a treasury of tests for self-examination and helps to improvement worth many times the price of the book.

Lectures on those Doctrines in Theology usually called Calvinistic.

By the Rev. RUEL KEITH, D. D. Delivered to his class in the Theological Seminary of Virginia. New York: J. Inglis & Co., 26 Cooper Institute. 1868. Pp. 48, 12mo.

These lectures are sound and scriptural. The topics are three: The Will of God, the Decrees of God, and Election. Coming from a minister of the Episcopal Church, they are invested with peculiar interest. Being dead, he yet speaks, and speaks the dialect of Paul as well as of Augustine and of Calvin. As a specimen of the author's style and manner, we quote some paragraphs:

"Having thus stated what appears to me to be the scripture doctrine of election, I now proceed to examine and confute the other different views which are taken of the doctrine. Of these there are but *two*. All agree that the Scriptures speak of an election; but it is contended by some that this is nothing more than an *election of the Gentiles, in general, to the privilege of having the gospel offered to them*; and, by others, that it is an

election of individuals, founded upon their *foreseen faith and obedience*.

"With respect to the first of these views, I have but little to say. I can only refer to the declarations of our Saviour and his apostles, already cited. It would be useless to attempt to argue with one whose mind is so differently constituted from my own as to perceive in these declarations only an election of the Gentiles to the outward privileges of the gospel.

"The other view of the doctrine—namely, that which makes election depend on foreseen faith and obedience; which teaches that God elected some men to salvation because he saw that, through his grace, bestowed equally upon them all, they would be better than others, would believe and obey the gospel—if equally groundless, is yet more plausible, and is entertained by so many wise and good men, that it ought to be thoroughly examined, and its utter repugnance to the word of God clearly pointed out. That it is so, appears evident to my mind from the following considerations, among many others which might be urged:

"I. *Faith and obedience*, as we have already shown from the Scriptures, and as our 17th Article plainly declares, *are the fruit and effect of election*. To say, therefore, that they are the cause, or foreseen condition, is just as absurd as to put the second cause for the first effect, as in any other case; just as absurd as to say that the morning light caused the sun to rise. It is impossible to reconcile this view of election with such passages as Romans viii. 29: 'Moreover, whom he did predestinate, them he also called'—called not because they had faith, but *as their calling is the effect of their predestination*. Eph. i. 4: 'He hath chosen us that we should be holy,' and, *therefore, (not because we were holy,) predestinated us unto the adoption of sons, and therefore to faith, as the means whereby we obtain this privilege of sonship*. John i. 12. And Acts xiii. 48: 'As many as were ordained to eternal life believed.' Those, therefore, who are elected, *believe*: and they believe *because they are elected*; and hence faith is called in Scripture 'the faith of God's elect.' Titus i. 1.

"II. Because election is every where said to be according to God's 'good pleasure,' and not of works, *of any kind*; for example, Rom. ix. 11: 'That the purpose of God according to election might stand, *not of works, but of him that calleth*.' Hence it is added, (v. 16,) 'So then it is not of him that willet, nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy;' and

chap. xi. 5, 6, it is called 'the election of *grace*.' Matt. xi. 26, Christ, speaking of the things of salvation being hid from the wise and prudent and revealed unto babes, says, 'Even so, Father; for so it seemed good in thy sight.' And in the same strain Paul declares, 2 Tim. i. 9, 10, that God had saved and called himself and Timothy, not of works, but of his own 'purpose and grace.'

"III. If we say that election is founded on foreseen faith, and yet allow, according to the uniform doctrine of Scripture, and the belief of all evangelical Christians, that faith is 'the *gift of God*,' or that he does more for one than another, either in providing the outward means of grace, or in the blessing accompanying them, we are justly liable to the charge of inconsistency. For we deny with one breath a doctrine which, in effect, we acknowledge with the next.

"IV. If this view of election were just, then *the whole language of Scripture* on the subject *would be reversed*. For it is plainly man that chooses God, and not God that chooses man. And our Saviour should have said, 'I have not chosen you, but ye have chosen me.'

"V. What seems, if possible, still more conclusive than any thing else, is this: If election arises from foreseen faith, if God chooses men to salvation on this ground, then there would be no place for objection against it, and nothing would be easier than to answer the question, why he chooses one rather than another. How insipid, then, would be the exclamation of Paul, at the close of his discussion of the subject: 'O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How *unsearchable* are his judgments, and his ways *past* finding out!' How unmeaning his reply to the objections to his doctrine: 'Who art thou, O man! that repliest against God?' How absurd his comparison of God to 'the potter,' who had 'power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honor, and another unto dishonor!' Nor, however admirable the economy whereby those who believe are saved, and those who believe not are damned, yet nothing is more simple in itself, nothing more clearly revealed, than the ground of God's proceeding in this respect. Very different, therefore, must have been the apostle's view of the doctrine. The election of which he treats was an election for which no cause in man could be assigned or imagined. It was an act of divine sovereignty, to be contemplated with the most profound humility, reverence, and awe, as a deep and inscrutable mystery. Had Paul held the Arminian view of the doctrine of election, he would have had no occasion to appeal to

the sole 'good pleasure of God's will,' who 'has mercy on whom he will have mercy.' For, if the ground of discrimination were in man himself, nothing would have been more easy than to reply, that, if God has chosen any of mankind to salvation, he has done it because he foresaw they would repent and believe.

"In conclusion, it may be well for me to remark, that if God predestinated man to faith, as a means of his salvation, it by no means follows, on the other hand, that he also predestinated those who perish to unbelief and impenitency, which are but the natural offspring of the human heart. But 'by grace are we saved through faith; and that not of ourselves: it is the gift of God.' Eph. ii. 8."

Light and Truth; or, Bible Thoughts and Themes. Old Testament. By HORATIUS BONAR, D. D. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 530 Broadway. 1868.

"The pages that follow," the preface informs us, "are an attempt to bring out, as briefly as possible, the thoughts of God, as contained in the words of His book." It is a series of short meditations, often very tersely expressed upon suggestive passages selected from the Old Testament.

Dr. Bonar has quite a happy gift of clear and simple speech, and often succeeds in putting old truths in very clear light, and touching them with a freshness due to a vigilant, genial, perspicacious mind. The book will make an excellent closet companion for many intelligent and thoughtful worshippers.

We subjoin a few examples of his way of treating such "themes:"

"How frequent throughout Scriptures are the divine 'fear not;' how ready God is to utter them, even as a father to his trembling child. To Isaac he said, '*Fear not*, for I am with thee.' (Gen. xxvi. 24.) To Jacob he said, 'I am God, the God of thy fathers: *fear not* to go down into Egypt.' (Gen. xlv. 3.) Frequently to Israel he said the same words, '*Fear not*, for I am with thee.' (Deut. xxxi. 6; Isa. xli. 10.) And in many cases, as here [Gen. xv. 1,] he names the name of him whom he is cheering; fear not, *Zacharias*, fear not, *Mary*, fear not, *Paul*! God takes for granted that his servants may have cause for fear, that at times their hearts may fail them; fight-

ings without and fears within ; sorrows, storms, dangers, burdens, troubles, enemies. To meet and counteract the influence of these upon the soul, he says, 'Fear not.' Yes, it is God, our God, who thus speaks. * * * * Thus Jesus spoke on earth, and thus he speaketh still from heaven." P. 49.

"There is but one tabernacle ; one altar ; one fire ; one sacrifice ; one Priest ! Not two ways of approaching God, or two ways of pardon ; only one ! He who accepts and uses that one is safe ; he who tries another must perish forever. Yes, there is but one cross, one Christ, one Saviour. But he is sufficient. 'Christ is all, and in all.' " P. 73.

And the whole of the twenty-fifth section is in the author's very best vein.

A History of the New School, and of the Questions involved in the Disruption of the Presbyterian Church in 1838. By SAMUEL J. BAIRD, D. D. Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen & Haffelfinger, Nos. 819 and 821 Market street. 1868. Pp. 564, 12mo.

Dr. Baird has evidently prepared this work with the hope of affecting the question of the reunion with the New School now urged upon Old School Presbyterians of the North. We have little idea that it will be of any avail in that matter. And that matter, of course, is no affair directly of ours. Still it is impossible for us to be so divested of all interest in the recollections of by-gone days, or so indifferent to the purity of Presbyterian doctrine any where and every where, as to be without concern for the author's success. Aside, however, altogether from any such purpose on Dr. Baird's part, this work possesses inherently very great interest and value. Its author is especially competent to produce a trustworthy account of this controversy, from his long and assiduous devotion to the study of Presbyterian Church history as respects this continent, as well as from his well-known integrity and candor. And so long a time has elapsed since the separation, that it has become perfectly possible for a history of those events to be dispassionately and fairly written. Thirty years may be a short time for men in the old world to cool off from the heats of a long and bitter controversy, but in this new

world things move very fast. It is the present which occupies our minds, and the past is dead and the future not thought of. The fathers have no great weight of influence upon the judgment of the sons. Every thing old is effete. So that what the great men of thirty years ago said, or thought, or did, may be taken up now, and very calmly and impartially considered, if the age will but pause to consider it at all. And surely, if any subject may set up a claim to be considered well by us, it is the history of the doctrines of the grace of God.

Indeed, we consider the antiquated aspect which this matter must needs wear among the younger ministers of the Old School Church of the North to be the great obstacle in the way of any success for Dr. Baird's effort. With them this controversy is likely to be regarded as just an old and foolish quarrel inherited by them, which the sooner they settle the better. For this age is very charitable as well as very fast, and does not consider or understand that charity to error is treachery to truth.

Whoever amongst our own ministry is not old enough to remember what happened thirty years ago, would do well to read this history. Beginning with an account of the first planting of Presbyterianism on this continent, Dr. Baird makes one acquainted with the creeping in, at an early period, of New England ideas of theology, and polity also, into our Church. It is just thirty years since the disruption; it is just about twice thirty since the adoption of the plan of union which led to it. The Congregationalists of New England, abjuring the theology of their forefathers, and also their polity, (as to the Eldership on one side, and as to Independency on the other,) sought to destroy both the theology and the polity of our Church likewise. What measure of success attended their efforts, and how they were foiled at last, and the truth of God was vindicated respecting both interests amongst us, this work well sets forth. It deserves to be studied with attention by all our younger ministry; it is sure to be read with pleasure as well as profit by the older.

One thing made plain and clear by this history, but denied by some both formerly and of late, is that the division of 1837 grew out of doctrinal differences. It is here demonstrated that

slavery was not the wedge which split the Church then, any more than in the late separation betwixt North and South.

One thing more is made plain by this volume, viz., that the Church owed her deliverance in that day from the swelling tide of error not to Princeton, nor any whom she could control. At first, and for a long time, that centre of influence stood in the way of the reform. We are simply referring to facts, and not undertaking to explain them; let our author be consulted for the explanation as well as the detailed history. Princeton has done great services to the Church in her generation. Yet, let it be understood and acknowledged that in the day of this trial and danger, deliverance came not from her. She acquiesced at length in the reform, and followed; but she did not lead, nor was she easily led.

One thing more is impressed upon our minds very strongly by the contents of this volume. Should it please God, in his inscrutable wisdom, to suffer a consummation of the union betwixt the Old and New School, it would seem that additional reasons must appear why the separation of our Church from that of the North was made providentially necessary. Should the Old School Church of the North repudiate practically the protest our and their fathers in common made thirty years ago against heresy, be it ours to carry alone down into the long future the standard of the truth they shall thus have dishonored and cast away. Upon two fundamental points at least they have already gone astray—making Christ's free Church subject to the State, and making slavery a sin. Should they be permitted to take this other step, it will but render more clear and strong the justification of our standing in our lot as separate from them, and maintaining alone that testimony which their fathers and ours once maintained together.

**SOUTHERN
PRESBYTERIAN DEPOSITORY,
COLUMBIA, S. C.**

ESTABLISHED, JULY, 1865.

THIS DEPOSITORY was established with the design of furnishing a point from which persons residing in this and the adjacent States could readily procure

SUNDAY-SCHOOL

AND OTHER

RELIGIOUS BOOKS.

All the *BOOKS, TRACTS, ETC.*, published or recommended by the EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF PUBLICATION at Richmond, Va., are kept on hand and sold at the *retail price* of the Publishers.

In addition to these, a general assortment of

THEOLOGICAL AND RELIGIOUS WORKS,

And also of

SCHOOL BOOKS, STATIONERY, ETC.,

Will be kept for sale at very reasonable rates.

Large additions have recently been made to the Stock on hand.

When the amount of an order is \$20.00 or upwards, the package will be sent to any Express Office in South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, or North Carolina, *free of cost* to the purchaser. And a proportionate reduction will be made on packages sent to more distant States.

A liberal deduction will be made to ministers, and to teachers and others who buy to sell again.

Orders should be always accompanied with the money.

Address,

SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN DEPOSITORY,
Columbia, S. C.

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW

Is published Quarterly, in January, April, July, and October.

TERMS.—Three Dollars per Volume, payable in advance. Single numbers, One Dollar.

☞ All Communications should be addressed to the Rev. JAMES WOODROW, Columbia, S. C. No subscription discontinued until a special order is given, and all arrearages are paid, or after the first number of a volume is published.

☞ A few complete sets of the back volumes can be had at Three Dollars per volume. Single back volumes, when they can be furnished without breaking a set, Two Dollars per volume.

☞ 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, one dollar for each new subscriber.

☞ Subscribers changing their Post Office are requested to give immediate notice of the same to the Publisher, or their REVIEW will be sent to their former office.

☞ The Editors of the SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW think it is due to themselves and to their subscribers to announce that they do not endorse in every particular what is uttered in their pages. Each author is responsible for the views he expresses. This is a matter of convenience where there are minor differences between editors themselves, or between them and their brethren. Free discussion, too, is important to the interests of truth, if kept within just limits. These limits must be strictly observed. Editors would be worthy of censure, should they allow opinions to be expressed, subversive of any doctrine of the gospel; nor would it be becoming to allow their own views, or those of their contributors, to be rudely attacked in their own pages.

Their desire is, to make the REVIEW worthy of the Presbyterian Church in the United States—the representative of its views and its literature, the means of disseminating sound doctrine, and a stimulus to the genius and talent of our ministers and people.