

THE SOUTHERN
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW,

CONDUCTED BY

AN ASSOCIATION OF MINISTERS

IN

COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA.

Vol. XX. JANUARY, MDCCCLXIX.

No. 1.

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

1869.

CONTENTS.

ARTICLE	PAGE
I. Is Baptism Invariably Immersion? - - -	1
II. Relations of the Church to Civil Authority. By the Rev. JAMES A. WADDELL, Richmond, Va., - -	25
III. Historical Christianity. By the Rev. B. GILDER- SLEEVE, Abingdon, Va., - - - - -	38
IV. The Conditions of Success in Study. By the Rev. WILLIAM T. HALL, Canton, Miss., - - - -	62
V. A Denial of Divine Right for Organs in Public Wor- ship, - - - - -	69
VI. The Ministry and its Duties. By the Rev. J. M. ATKINSON, Raleigh, N. C., - - - - -	105
VII. Critical Notices, - - - - -	121
1. Ewer's Protestantism a Failure. 2. Wheeler's Ten Years on the Euphrates. 3. Spring's Negro at Home. 4. James's Earnest Ministry. 5. Dilke's Greater Britain. 6. Day's Grammatical Synthesis, Art of Discourse, and Elements of Logic.	

THE SOUTHERN
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW,

CONDUCTED BY

AN ASSOCIATION OF MINISTERS

IN

COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA.

• • •
VOLUME XX.
• • •

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

1869.

THE LIBRARY
THE UNIVERSITY
OF TEXAS

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Is Baptism Invariably Immersion, - - - - -	1
Relations of the Church to Civil Authority. By the Rev. JAMES A. WADDELL, Richmond, Va., - - - - -	25
Historical Christianity. By the Rev. B. GILDERSLEEVE, Abingdon, Va., - - - - -	38
The Conditions of Success in Study. By the Rev. WM. T. HALL, Canton, Miss., - - - - -	62
A Denial of Divine Right for Organs in Public Worship, -	69
The Ministry and its Duties. By the Rev. J. M. ATKINSON, Raleigh, N. C., - - - - -	105
The Southern Presbyterian University. By the Rev. JAS. A. LYON, D. D., Columbus, Miss., - - - - -	153
A Plea in behalf of the Widows and Orphans of Deceased Ministers of the Presbyterian Church in the United States. By the Rev. E. CATER, College Hill, Miss.,	181
Coöperation, - - - - -	194
Some Remarks on the Influence of Magazines and Reviews on Authorship, and a Suggestion for an Authoritative Canon of Classic English Authors. By Prof. W. J. RIVERS, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S. C.,	221
Authorship at the South, - - - - -	235
Doctrinal Preaching, - - - - -	293
Life Insurance, - - - - -	308
Is Baptism Immersion? - - - - -	329
The Transfiguration. By the Rev. W. A. CAMPBELL, Powhatan C. H., Va., - - - - -	355
An Efficient Ministry, - - - - -	372
The General Assembly of 1869, - - - - -	385
Unification, - - - - -	453

BIB. 52.00.8

The Amended Form of Government.	1	the Rev. J. A.	
SMYLLIE, Milford, Texas,	-	-	477
Christian Unity. By the Rev. B. W. Mc		J. Oakley, Vt.,	492
What is a Call to the Gospel Ministry?	-	-	508
Bannerman's Church of Christ,	-	-	520
Foreign Missions, - - - - -	-	-	555
Card of the Rev. Dr. F. A. Ross, - - - - -	-	-	572
Critical Notices :			

Ewer's Protestantism a Failure, 121. Wheeler's Ten Years on the Euphrates, 127. Spring's Negro at Home, 131. James's Earnest Ministry, 137. Dilke's Greater Britain, 141. Day's Grammatical Synthesis, Art of Discourse, and Elements of Logic, 147. Smyth's Catechism, our Form of Government, and the Committee of Publication, 362. Barnes on the Psalms, 269. Bunting's Manual of Nashville Church, 272. Bushnell's Moral Uses of Dark Things, 273. Wordsworth and Alford on New Testament, 277. Uhlhorn's Modern Representations of Life of Jesus, 280. Farrar's Seekers after God, 284. Ante-Nicene Christian Library, 286. Bickersteth's Yesterday, To-day, and Forever, 287. Life of Dr. Miller, 419. Sprague's Annals of the American Pulpit, 424. Pratt's Defence of Presbyterian Baptism, 426. Bickersteth's Hades and Heaven, 427. Christian Sabbath Vindicated, 432. Ecce Cælum, 436. Jewett on the Immersionist Revised New Testament, 439. Bungener's Calvin, 443. Tischendorf's New Testament, 575. Campbell's Theory of the Eldership, 578. Schele DeVere's Studies in English, 582. Conybeare and Howson's Life and Epistles of St. Paul, 586. Power's Pivot Words of Scripture, 588. Gibson's Public Worship of God, 592. Barnes's Notes on the Psalms, 596. DeFonvielle's Thunder and Lightning, 598. Marion's Wonders of Optics, 600.

THE LIBRARY
THE UNIVERSITY
OF TEXAS

THE SOUTHERN
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XX.—NO. 1.

JANUARY, MDCCCLXIX.

ARTICLE I.

IS BAPTISM INVARIABLY IMMERSION?

JAN 1 0 1938
1.25
47

We are not among those who draw into common discourse the sectarian questions of an unspiritual character, "which gender strifes and disputings about words," and which concern mere modes and forms, about which good and wise men differ in opinion. For that ground which has been held on the subject by some good thinkers, may after all have a measure of truth in it, that God has designedly hidden the mode of baptism, by withholding any express scripture on the subject, just as he hid the body of Moses upon Mount Nebo; and for the same reason—that it might not become an ensnaring object of idolatrous worship to those who chain down the power of their own consciences to unimportant rites and ceremonies, and allow themselves to be gradually seduced out of sight of the lofty spirituality of religion.

Yet when persistent efforts are constantly made to change the faith of our people, as if for life and death, in a way which it must be manifest to all is not for the better, to any practical intent or purpose, by the alleged binding force of a form which

VOL. XX., NO. 1—1.

can do no man's soul or character any good, we are willing to be definitely understood as no friends, under such circumstances, to an unhealthy and treacherous silence, with so much to say that is taught in the word of God and pertinent to be said.

Meanwhile we freely admit that, in the fearless use of our own rights, we pray that we may be withheld by the divine grace from insulting the consciences, or offending the feelings, or forfeiting the respect, of those who differ with us in opinion concerning the matters in dispute. We shall hope to lay every proper offering upon this altar of peace. But we do not promise or intend to restrain our tongues from speech appropriate to the subject, or in any wise to smother or suppress the convictions of our judgment, or emotions of our souls, about this matter itself.

Utterly unimportant of itself, it yet assumes a deep and grave importance, which all men are at last compelled to see and to feel, when it sunders the community through the most illiberal, strange, and extraordinary assumptions, by narrow lines of close communion; when it imposes entangling snares, made of mere ordinances, upon tender consciences, to carry them where things of solid merit, unconnected with ordinances, would never, *never*, carry them, and they would never go, except when entangled in that snare; and finally, when they have grown dissatisfied with the old impartial standard ENGLISH BIBLE, which has trained our fathers of all denominations for glory for many generations, which has held such a noble position as the common standard authority of all parties, which to day is the richest, purest, noblest "well of English undefiled" of any one single volume in the language, and which our ears are yet hardly rested from hearing claimed with stolid confidence as clearly enough in their favor; when that Book, hitherto sacred from rude sectarian hands, is now superseded by a new version of a thoroughly sectarian and partisan character, one which just begs the whole question in dispute, and by one grand sweep of the types, throughout the whole Bible, blots out the good old words *Baptism* and *Baptist*, and gives us *Immersion*, the *Immerser Church*, and *John the Immerser*: then indeed we deeply feel that if the

inspired wise man, who wrote of "a time to speak" and "a time to keep silence," were himself at our elbow, he would say the "time to keep silence" is past, and the "time to speak" has fully arrived.

And yet there is a peculiar reason for profound and genuine respect towards those, personally, who differ with us in these points. It is that in many cases, excessive conscientiousness alone—or what they thought to be such—has entrapped them in this snare of ordinances, and has carried them, often reluctantly, where they now are. And in some cases, the execution of God's great first word, *Let there be light*; let there be light on conscience; let there be light on religious conscience especially; and more especially, let there be light let in upon those easily ensnared consciences, around whose tender limbs the strange and fearful bonds of religious ceremonies have been carefully wrapped like fetters of steel, not to promote their edification, but to bind them to a denomination—this we firmly believe and confidently hope, would dissolve the snare and let them go free, with higher liberties and nobler hopes.

We now without further delay approach the questions, Does the word *baptism* always mean the immersion of the whole body in water? And are all the cases in the Scriptures where baptism was administered, clear cases of immersion—so clear as to imply moral obliquity in not conceding them to be such?

Nothing else can justify a bitter separation of families at the communion table, (attended, as it necessarily is, by a cool assumption of superior wisdom and honesty, and a plainly implied charge of dishonesty of judgment on the part of those from whom they separate,) but one invariable meaning of baptism as immersion, and one invariable form of baptism as immersion in the Scriptures. We wish to misrepresent no body and no thing. But we cannot venture to hope that we misrepresent this narrow scheme, or that it claims any thing less, or any thing else, than that its meaning of the word baptism is the only true meaning, and its mode of baptism is the only lawful mode of baptism, and that all other meanings of the word are but pretended and so-called meanings, and all baptisms administreed by other
TxU

denominations, are only and merely pretended and so-called, and not real and valid baptisms. Now if these claims are just—claims which, in any other department of Christian ceremonies, would obviously be liable to the charge of “all uncharitableness,” if they are just in relation to the mode of baptism, then it is obvious that we have herein a glaring exception to the general spirit, style, genius, and character of New Testament Christianity. Do the facts of the case establish this glaring exception? Do the facts of the case justify this bitter separation of families at the communion table? Do the facts of the case bear out this cool assumption of superior wisdom and superior honesty? Do the facts of the case sustain the implied charge of dishonesty of judgment, on the part of those who dissent from this iron uniformity of meaning, of mode, and of ceremony? We humbly think that they do not. Such a scheme can and ought to claim nothing at our hands but rigid impartiality. We shall honestly endeavor to yield to this demand.

Now the claim that any word has invariably but one single meaning—that claim so frequent in parties formed on low grounds and for trivial and narrow objects—the claim that such a word as baptism, or indeed any other kind of a word, has always but one invariable meaning,* is always rash and dangerous; and very rarely indeed is it a correct position with regard to any word whatever.

Take for example the word *cross*, denoting the cross pieces of wood upon which our Saviour suffered death for us all. One would think that must be a word, if there be any such, to have always but a single meaning, invariable in every place and in every connexion. But if this blind doctrine of one invariable meaning for all the chief words of religion in all places, be applied to the word *cross*, then it will follow that when the Saviour says, “Whosoever will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross and follow me,” he lays down the clear rule, (which we ought to refuse communion with men unless they agree to) that no man can be a follower of Christ, unless he in-

* See Dabney's “Fiction no Defence of Truth.”

cessantly bears about upon his back, a large square log of wood, just ready to be inserted into the ground!

Or apply this rule of a single invariable meaning of the chief words of religion, to the word *death*. One would think this must be a word to have but a single meaning, if there be any such. Then since God said to Adam, "In the day that thou eatest of the forbidden fruit, thou shalt surely die," but in the ordinary sense of the word *death*, Adam did not die for nine hundred long years after his disobedience, a contradiction of the word of God is made to appear. But the fact that even the word *death* has two meanings—temporal death and spiritual death—arises clearly to reconcile the divine word, and to disprove the shallow rule of interpretation.

Or apply the canon of one invariable meaning to the word *life* in the Scriptures. Then it will follow, when our Saviour says, "*He that eateth of this bread shall live forever*"—meaning the feeding of the soul by faith on his body and his blood—that it is herein asserted that no two human beings but Enoch and Elijah ever did truly believe on him and feed by faith on his body and his blood; because no other two human beings have escaped death and lived forever, in the common and outward sense of life, but those two.

Now, we firmly believe that in this absurd idea of one single invariable meaning to the chief words of religion, derived from the grovelling lack of light of other days, lies the larger part of the strength of the snare of immersionism over honest consciences. It is this blind rule of interpretation which has led the men of the new version profanely to make our Saviour say, "*I have an immersion to undergo, and how am I straitened till it be accomplished,*" concerning the bloody drops of his sacred sorrow in the garden, and the atoning drops from his bleeding brow and his bleeding hands upon the cross!

But what, now, is the meaning of baptizing and baptism? Bursting upon the world, like a morning star at midnight, or like a herald in the deep wilderness, comes the forerunner of Jesus, John the son of Zacharias, crying, "Prepare ye the way of the Lord," and administering baptism to great multitudes of

people. Now, when the people were invited to John's baptism, how were they who had never seen it administered to know what it was? And placing ourselves at the point of the first outburst of the voice of the herald, how are we to ascertain what meaning the word baptism bore to the ears of the people? And what is the proper and warranted meaning of the word now, with all the light of the whole Scripture, and all the light of the mind of the Spirit, in the whole course of divine revelation, thrown upon it?

The answer to these questions is to be sought in a legitimate, rational, and proper manner—in the *usage* of the word—just as we fairly seek for the meaning of any other word.

We have a wonderful farrago of second-hand wisdom among second-hand scholars about *dictionaries*. And yet any man of any real sense and learning must know that a dictionary is but the collecting together of the various senses in which a word is used. And a dictionary which gives as one of the meanings of a word a sense unsupported by the use of that word, is false and worthless. And a dictionary which leaves out a meaning of the word in which it certainly is used, is equally false and worthless. The usage of the word is therefore the very fountain of the dictionaries themselves. Now, of all the words in the New Testament, the words baptism and baptize are among the best illustrated by *usage*. 1. They are used in the doctrine of the Christian ordinance, and in doctrinal allusions to it. 2. In cases of the ordinance itself. 3. In sentences showing the *popular* usage of the word. The first two will meet us hereafter.

Now, we affirm that there are two or three cases of the popular use of the word baptize in the sacred writings, in cases of a kind disconnected with the Christian ordinance, and therefore all the better adapted to prove its usage, which manifest clearly to the dispassionate mind a meaning different from immersion. It is a singular fact that, in all these cases, the word *baptize*, in the Greek, is translated *wash* in the English. The modern clamor of the immersionists, that the English version is perverted *against* them, receives a good deal of light from the fact that if the word baptize had been properly transferred in these two

cases by *baptize* instead of by the false gloss of *wash*, more modesty of claim would in all probability have characterised the immersionist controversy, if it had not been clearly and fairly terminated in the visible absurdity of those claims. The two most special and pointed cases of the use of the word *baptize* positively to exclude immersion are in the seventh chapter of Mark and in the ninth chapter of Hebrews. In Mark, the rendering is, "Except they *wash*, they eat not." The Greek is, "Unless they be *baptized*, they eat not." In Hebrews, the English rendering is, "Meats and drinks and divers *washings*." The Greek is, "*Meats and drinks and divers baptisms*." And in both these cases, the fiery zealots, blind with the pride of *ignorance*, (which is far worse than the pride of learning,) often doubtless sweep over places decisive against them, without ever knowing that their idol ceremony is at all involved in them. The passage in Mark is as follows: "Then came together unto him the Pharisees, and certain of the scribes, which came from Jerusalem. And when they saw some of his disciples eat bread with defiled, that is to say, with unwashen, hands, they found fault. For the Pharisees, and all the Jews, except they wash their hands oft, eat not, holding the traditions of the elders. And when they come from the market, except they wash," (be baptized,) "they eat not. And many other things there be, which they have received to hold, as the washings (baptisms) of cups, and pots, brasen vessels, and of tables. Then the Pharisees and scribes asked him, Why walk not thy disciples according to the tradition of the elders, but eat bread with unwashen hands?" Mark vii. 1-5. Here, beyond dispute, are the words *baptism* and *baptize* applied to the common ceremonial ablutions of the Jews in domestic life. Here, also, what is called baptism in one verse, is in one parallel place (the third verse) called washing the hands with the fist—*πύγμῃ νίψονται*. And in another parallel place, the very tradition itself which the Pharisees held, and for which they found fault with our Saviour's disciples, is called "eating bread with unwashen hands." And this "eating bread with unwashen hands," for which the Pharisees found fault with our Saviour's disciples, is called by the evangelist Mark (under

the supervision of the apostle Peter, and under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit of God) being *baptized*. We can hardly conceive a case more strongly fenced around against the immersionist perversion. We must not omit to notice, also, that in this passage, the ceremonial purification of the *couches* on which three persons reclined at supper is also called "baptism"—where every impartial mind will see at once how improbable and absurd is the idea of a total immersion. And he who recalls the easy and sickening facility with which he has seen clear and unequivocal immersion patched up upon no grounds at all, save the blind zeal of the reasoner, out of these baptisms of cups and pots and ~~basen~~ *basen* vessels and *tables*, will, we think, thank us for detaining him with that piece of shallow criticism no longer than this passing notice.

It is also to be observed, that we have the positive authority of the divine word, in the narrative of the miraculous creation of the wine at the wedding in Cana of Galilee, (John ii.,) for saying that the "water-pots of stone" which the Jews used in these common domestic purifications and ablutions were not by any means large enough for an immersion, containing only "two or three firkins apiece." John ii. 6. We feel clear, first, that no such thing as immersion was found among these ordinary domestic ablutions; and, secondly, that it never would have been found in them, except to serve a purpose elsewhere; and, thirdly, that the use of the word *wash* in this case, instead of the original *baptize*, was a concession to the blind spirit of immersion which would better not have been made, as it has resulted.

We will take another case of the common *usage* of the word baptism in those times, not connected with the Christian ordinance.

In the ninth chapter of his Epistle to his countrymen, the Hebrews, Saint Paul is comparing the application of the atoning blood in the two testaments respectively. He shows that the real and efficacious purification under the new testament takes place in heaven; v. 23. He shows that the purification of a figurative nature, under the old testament, took place in the tabernacle; v. 21. He shows that both testaments were sealed

with blood; v. 22. He shows that this application of blood was by *sprinklings*: "For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to the law, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book, and all the people, saying, 'This is the blood of the testament which God has enjoined unto you. Moreover he sprinkled with blood both the tabernacle and all the vessels of the ministry. And almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood is no remission.'" Hebrews ix. 19-22.

Now, these various sprinklings in the tabernacle service, the apostle, in the very same connexion, calls "divers baptisms." No wonder that the Baptist influence among King James's translators shrank from the application of the plain rule, and the obviously proper rule, of the transfer of the word "baptism" from the Greek to the English in this case. It would have been absolutely fatal to their claims. And looking at this instance, and at the indubitable parallel exposition, by sprinklings after sprinklings, full out, clear, definite, and repeated, we make bold to say, that the dogma of one single invariable meaning of baptism in the word of God, and that *immersion*, is definitely a contradiction to the word of God, and therefore definitely an untruth. And wishing grace, mercy, and peace to every Christian soul upon the earth, we have no apology to make for definitely holding up the truth against the falsehood.

Let us take another case of the usage of the word "baptize," not connected with the Christian ordinance, before this time. When the Jews acquired the habit of removing into Egypt to reside, during the times of the successors of Alexander, there was a religious service erected in that country after the model of that in Judea, in which their worship might be conducted. And for the use of the Greek-speaking people who worshipped in that country, the Hebrew Bible was translated into Greek, by order, according to common report, of King Ptolemy Philadelphus. That Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible is called the Septuagint. It was the Bible in use by the Jews in Egypt who spoke the Greek language. It gives us the Greek of the Old

Testament of that day. It is believed to have been more frequently quoted from by Christ and the apostles than even the original Hebrew. The usage of Greek words in that book is, in the very highest probability, the same as that in the New Testament. It is the very fountain of the sacred Greek for the writers of the New Testament.

There are several instances in that Greek Old Testament little less decisive, if any, than those already adduced, to show that it is not true that baptism and baptize were understood to mean only immersion. We must select one of them. It is from the apocryphal book of Judith. The invasion of their land by the King of Babylon was, for long ages, the perpetual "thorn in the flesh" of the Jewish people. The captain of one of these great invading armies was Holofernes. Among other Jewish cities, he laid siege to the city of Bethulia, on the border of the plain of Esdraelon. Their plan to take this city was to cut off the supply of water from its fountain. We shall quote the language of the narrative. Traitors from Esau and Moab came and advised Holofernes: "Let thy servants get into their hands the fountain of water which issueth forth of the foot of the mountain; for all the inhabitants of Bethulia have their water thence; so shall thirst kill them, and they shall give up their city." Judith vii. 12, 13. It was so done by the Babylonian captain; and the water supplies of the people were cut off. "The cisterns were emptied, and they had not water to drink their fill for one day." In this situation of affairs, Judith, the widow of Manasseh, determined to destroy Holofernes through his baser passions. When she first devoted herself to this object, she "washed her body all over with water." We may see this idea and how it is expressed. It is not expressed by baptize, but by *περικλίω*, "to wash all around as the surge does the shore." This was the actual cleansing which she made for her great undertaking to fascinate this man by personal attraction. But when upon the verge of the deed by which she has made her name memorable, then she "went out in the night into the valley of Bethulia, and washed herself in a fountain of water by the camp," (Judith xii. 7,) in a ceremonial purification. It may

T x U

excite a smile that here, too, even in the Apocrypha, the English translators appear to have sought to screen the Immersionists by rendering "baptize" by "wash." In the original Greek, Judith "baptizes herself at a fountain of water in the camp." And that would not sound well! The common sickening criticism, with blind and stolid partisanship, can no doubt find immersion here, by force, if necessary. But it is not easy for a sober mind to think of this woman as immersing herself by *night, at the fountain, and in the camp!* And we do positively know that there was a different word, *περικλίσω*, by which the author of the book of Judith expressed immersion.

So much for the meaning attached to the word "baptize" in the Greek books, and by the Greek writers, inspired and uninspired, about the days of our Saviour. And so much for the one invariable meaning of "baptize" being "immerse," and nothing but immerse! In fact, these are the greater part of the specimens, nearly all of them, indeed, not relating to the Christian ordinance itself, to be found in the sacred Greek, that we could go to, to see what meaning the people attached to the word "baptism," when it first burst upon their ears from the hallowed lips of the venerable forerunner of the Lord Jesus.

With the light of these facts as to the meanings of the word, which are the correct roots of all definitions in dictionaries of the Bible, let us now approach the *second* question announced: "Are all the cases in the Scriptures in which baptism was administered clear cases of immersion?" It is here and hereabouts that the main power of the cause of immersion over tender consciences really lies. There are certain cant phrases, such as, "going down into the water and coming up out of the water;" such as, "baptizing in Enon, near to Salim, because there was much water there;" such as, "buried with Christ in baptism,"—lying on the mere surface of the whole subject, and really decisive of nothing but the shallowness of the ear which is influenced by them; or else some of them decisive upon the other side, when thoroughly examined; which, nevertheless, are so constantly dinned into inexperienced ears as to be made to produce all the effects of sound argument and patient investigation.

1. The case first in dignity and first separately recorded, is of course that of our Saviour himself, in the third chapter of Matthew, and its parallel in Luke. Whoever will look into those sacred washings of the Jews which had a spiritual meaning—such as the purification of an unclean person by taking of the ashes of the burnt heifer of purification for sin, and “putting running water thereto in a vessel,” Numbers xix. 17—will perceive the emblematic importance attached in the ceremonial law to running water, or “living water,” in those affairs. And he may perceive why it was that John the Baptist, whose baptism was to be the last scene of the old and emblematic dispensation, and the first scene also of the new and spiritual dispensation, should have taken his stand at first, for the administration of baptism, at Bethabara, a ford of the Jordan, but on the *eastern* side. John x. 40. And he who will examine the Old Testament baptisms of the unclean, and notice the numerous sprinklings, and washings of clothes, and bathings of himself, which the unclean had to perform, and will remark how seldom, or never, among those ablutions anything occurs which the strenuous ceremonialists of this day can construe fairly into an immersion of one man by the arm of another man, will then be prepared somewhat to appreciate the original improbabilities of an expected immersion, when “Jesus cometh from Galilee unto Jordan unto John, to be baptized of him,” “where all Jerusalem and Judca had been baptized of John in Jordan, confessing their sins.” Matt. iii. 6, 13. We mean by this simply to say, that the frequent use of flowing, or running, or *living* water in the ceremonies of the Old Testament, which were not immersion, removes almost the whole presumption in favor of immersion from “baptizing in Jordan.” They certainly used running water for many ceremonies which were not immersion. Therefore, the use of running water here does not prove that this was immersion; but is fully consistent with the idea that baptism was in form like some one of those non-immersing ceremonies of the Old Testament performed at running water. We find, upon close inspection, the objects of John’s brief career to have been: 1. To summon the people to that reformation of manners suitable to the approach of Christ’s

kingdom: "repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." 2. To select some certain ablution of the Old Testament, give it a name intelligible in both Testaments, as a connecting link between the two, and set it duly and properly forth, as the emblem of the baptism of the Spirit, in a dispensation of the Spirit: "preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins;" "upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost." 3. Through his brief introductory career, and through this ordinance, to introduce to the world its only real atoning priest and Saviour: "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world."

In accordance with this view, we attach no importance to the distinction between John's baptism and Christian baptism. The only sign we discover of a difference between them is a probably stricter adherence to running water in John's than in that of the apostles.

Let it now be remembered that the child Jesus had been duly united to the Old Testament Church, by circumcision, at eight days old, and then solemnly named JESUS; Luke ii. 21; a circumstance—this of Christ's being united to the Church as an unconscious infant—which perhaps may serve to moderate the derision of those *professing* Christians who make themselves profanely merry at the holding of religious ceremonies over unconscious infants.

Being thus in the Church from infancy, why now does Jesus come from Galilee to Jordan unto John, to be baptized by him? Why does he come to the baptism of repentance? What need has he, the Holy One of God, either of repentance or of the baptism of repentance? What is the true and reasonable place of Christ's baptism in that grand and well-ordered scheme in the Scriptures of things proposed to our faith? And why, too, does he delay his baptism until he "began to be about thirty years of age?" Luke iii. 23. Why was he not baptized at that age at which sinful men arrive at years of individual accountability? And is his waiting till thirty years of age to be baptized a pattern for us to delay the adult baptism of our chil-

dren until they begin to be about thirty years of age? Nothing of the kind. The old blind theory of cant phrases and surface views is utterly inadequate. There is a far richer and deeper meaning in the baptism of Christ than that theory appears ever to have obtained a glimpse of. His baptism is his introduction into the divine and real PRIESTHOOD. His public career is all one continual priesthood. Therefore his baptism is also his introduction into his public career. The often-repeated law of the old covenant was, that the sons of Aaron were to take the priesthood "from thirty years old and upwards." Numbers iv. 3, 39, 43, &c. Therefore did he, Jesus the Lord, delay his baptism till he "began to be about thirty years old." It is not the baptism of repentance; for he had no sins to repent of, and no repentance to be baptized into. It is not the baptism of membership into his own, the Christian Church; for it is not to be thought that his baptism would have been delayed from twelve years of age to thirty years of age, so as to leave him eighteen uncovenanted years. And he had already been united to the Jewish Church in infancy by circumcision.

No; the baptism of Christ was a different thing, in his case, from what baptism is in the cases of mere men. It was his solemn entrance upon the great work of an ATONING PRIEST for the whole world. It is his introduction to the world, as the LAMB OF GOD, to take away its sin. It and its sublime attendant circumstances are the seal of the eternal Jehovah upon his public work as Mediator and Saviour of sinners. Therefore does he wait for that priesthood, as the sons of Aaron had waited for it, for fifteen hundred years, till he began to be "about thirty years of age."

Now, therefore, we boldly demand the benefit of the likeness between the consecration of Aaron and his sons to the priesthood, and this consecration of the Lord Jesus to the priesthood at his baptism, as an analogy fit, proper, lawful, and right.

Now, this was the command of God to Moses, as to "the thing that thou shalt do" unto Aaron and his sons, "to hallow them to minister unto me in the priest's office": "And Aaron and his sons thou shalt bring unto the door of the tabernacle of

the congregation, and shalt wash them with water. And thou shalt take the garments, and put upon Aaron the coat, and the robe of the ephod, and the ephod and the breast plate, and gird him with the curious girdle of the ephod; and thou shalt put the mitre upon his head, and put the holy crown upon the mitre. Then shalt thou take the anointing oil, and pour it upon his head, and anoint him." Ex. xxix. 4-7.

There, then, at the ford of the Jordan, beginning to be about thirty years of age, stands our great High Priest, awaiting to receive that part of his consecration which shall obey the precept: "Thou shalt wash them with water at the door of the tabernacle."

The whole land of the chosen people is the tabernacle in which he is to minister. He stands at the door of that tabernacle—that is, at the ford of the Jordan, but beyond Jordan. Instead of Moses, there stands the equally lofty and unearthly servant of God, John the Baptist. As the holiest ablutions of the law are by *living* waters, especially those in which immersion is out of the question, (see Numbers xix. 17,) they descend to the living waters. There John "baptizes" or "washes" him, Jesus, for his great priesthood, as Moses washed or baptized Aaron and his sons for his priesthood. And from that ceremony of washing Aaron and his sons for the priesthood being brought forward from the Old Testament and established in the New, and glorified there by being made to convey the divine seal upon the priesthood of Christ, came the ordinance of Christian baptism.

A great crowd of prophecies cluster about the scene to be fulfilled, as with sandalled feet he stands there, *at or in* the water—it is of no consequence which—and receives, like a priest at the door of the tabernacle, the stream of living water descending upon his head, to wash him for his priesthood. Many carvings and engravings in the catacombs in Italy, some of them extremely ancient, show unmistakably the act of pouring the living water on the head of Christ; though the illustrious receiver himself stands up to the waist in water, in the most remarkable of them, old father Jordan *personi-*

fed stands near, and the baptizer himself upon the edge of the bank.*

But where is the *breastplate* of the priest? It is his *righteousness*. And the *girdle* of his loins? It is his *truthfulness*. But where are the *mitre* and the *crown* of the royal priesthood? They are, we believe, awaiting him in the skies, when his work on earth shall have been accomplished, and he shall pass within the veil, and form and shadow shall fall and fade on the verge of earth, and soul and substance shall appear in eternal scenes.

But where is that ANOINTING OIL which Moses was to take and pour upon the head of Aaron; which Samuel poured upon the head of Saul; which Elijah poured upon the head of Elisha? and which thus did consecrate prophet, king, and priest? Where is that unction of the Holy One at the consecration of Christ to the priesthood? Let us be still, and gaze upon the sublime scene, like the silent thousands who crowd the shores. It is coming. "And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water;" or with Luke, "being baptized, and praying, the heaven was opened, and the Holy Ghost descended in a bodily shape like a dove upon him; and a voice came from heaven, which said, Thou art my beloved Son; in thee I am well pleased." Luke iii. 22. There is the true anointing oil—the substance of all anointings of prophets, priests, and kings. And that is the sign, divinely appointed, to show to John that "the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost." John i. 33. And this "voice from heaven" introduces to men the divine High Priest, and pledges the high contracting party, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto, that he will abide by the terms which this High Priest shall lay down for the acceptance of sinners.

Here, then, stands the High Priest greater than Aaron. Here is his washing at the door of the tabernacle. Here is the true anointing oil, the Holy Spirit poured upon him. Here is the royal crown of his divinity proclaimed from heaven by the

* We earnestly recommend "Taylor on Apostolic Baptism," which shows these engravings, though it may sometimes be spoken of in the highest style of ignorant scorn.

herald voice of the eternal Father. And here is his commission to baptize men with the Holy Ghost. The great stream of prophecy is fulfilled: "Behold, I will pour out my Spirit unto you." The two testaments come and appear together at the pool of Bethesda, where the true Healer restores the man who could not be carried down after the troubling of the waters. The two testaments appear together when the passover and the Lord's supper come and stand side by side before us. So the two testaments appear together here, when the shadowy washing still appears, and the true anointing oil of the "Spirit without measure" is sent down from heaven upon him.

Now, looking at this sublime event as an *immersing to repentance* of one who had no repentance to make, or any need of any: or as an introduction into the Church—John's Church, or Christ's own Church, or any Church in any view of the subject whatever—of one already circumcised and solemnly presented to the Lord in the temple, in his infancy, and it is a dark, narrow, and well-nigh meaningless ceremony. But looking at it as now presented, and we submit that it is grand, significant, full of beautiful meanings, and beautiful fulfilments of ancient mysteries, and beautiful lights of hope and promise for spiritual minds.

To take that sublime scene, and strip it of most of its glory and of three-fourths of its lofty and far-reaching meaning, and make it a mere immersion, a mere door of some church, no man can tell what, a mere case of the one invariable pretended meaning of one of the great words of religion—and that one of the narrowest of all religious shibboleths—this, we own, seems to us sadly unworthy, as well as unnecessary.

2. The next case in order contains one of the noted cant phrases. It is the case of John baptizing in Enon: "And John also was baptizing in Enon near to Salim, because there was much water there." John iii. 23.

This would have been a good place for the men of the new version to have shown their impartiality, if their undertaking had aspired to that high quality at all. For it has long been seen that the "much water" at Enon near to Salim, was a mere sound and impression of the surface, so far as it favored

immersion. The "much water" at Enon is "many waters." It is not the word of *quantity*, but of *number*. It is not *ιδωρ πολλο*, much water; it is *ιδατα πολλὰ*, many waters. The very name of the place itself—ENON—signifies springs or fountains of water. The first syllable of this name is the Hebrew word for the human eye. It is applied to a fountain of water from its resemblance to the human eye. This may be seen frequently illustrated in the landmarks mentioned in the book of Joshua in connexion with the division of the land between the various tribes. See En-shemesh, En-rogel, En-dor, En-gannim, En-gedi, En-tappuah, En-haddah; and see also especially the *meanings* of these words. From which it would really seem that the cant phrase, "because there was much water there," when fully inquired into, turns its force in opposition to that confident cause which it is so blindly and by the mere sound pressed into the support of.

For look at the plain facts of the case. John has before this been encamped for baptizing, at Bethabara, beyond Jordan. He now crosses the Jordan from the east side to the west, entirely leaves the valley of the Jordan, retires westward and inward, and seeks as the second place of his encampment a place which by its very name is called a FOUNTAIN, and there resumes the administration of baptism. It seems impossible fairly to avoid the clear inference that depth of water for immersion was not his object. He wanted water to quench the *thirst* of the great multitude who crowded around him. He has therefore left the banks of the Jordan, and gone to the *springs* some twelve miles inward and westward. If the "much water" at Enon was depth of water for immersion according to the mere sound, will some one tell us, was there *more* water for immersion at *Enon* than at *Jordan*? If not, what is the force of John's reason for going there, "because there was much water there?" No; Enon was a place to quench the thirst of the multitude—not of pools for immersion. And the removal of the camp of the Baptist from Jordan to Enon *disproves* immersion, instead of establishing it. It is taken to a place suitable to pour or sprinkle clean water upon men, to show the outpouring of the Spirit of God. The language agrees with the facts. All is clear and harmonious.

The cant phrase proves to be a mere affair of surface and of sound. The real weight of the incident—the removal of a vast encampment from the bank of a great river to an inland position and to the locality of some springs—is *opposed* to the idea of immersion.

3. The next case of baptism to be examined is the baptism of the three thousand converts in one day, at the city of Jerusalem, on the day of Pentecost.

Here, for the first time, we meet with Christian baptism indeed. And here we feel our feet to be upon ground as firm at least as any which we have hitherto trodden.

From the very beginning of John's appearance in public as the forerunner of Christ, he had been informed by the divine voice that the ceremony which he administered was but the forerunning shadow of the baptism of the Holy Ghost. John i. 31: "I knew him not; but he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining upon him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost." This baptism of the Holy Ghost was a thing distinctly present to the minds of the divine men of that day. John the Baptist gave full notice of it during his career: "I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance; but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear; he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." Of course, this promise was not forgotten to be fulfilled by our Lord after his ascension. He commanded his disciples "that they should not depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the Father, which, saith he, ye have heard of me. For John truly baptized with water: but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence." Acts i. 45.

The first great prophecy of the Old Testament which looked over to the New for fulfilment, was the promise of the Messiah himself. The second was the promise of the Spirit: "It shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh." This second great prophecy had begun to be fulfilled at the baptism of Christ, when the dove descended

upon him from heaven. That promise was to have a more complete fulfilment there at Jerusalem. The parting words of the ascending Saviour commanded the disciples to wait for that fulfilment, and authorised them certainly to expect the powerful and precious gift.

When they came from the sublime scene of the ascension, they repaired to that sacred "upper chamber," such or the same as that in which they had heard breathings of peace from his lips; elected another apostle in the place of Judas; and then, with one accord, in one place, they awaited what the great promise might be. And as they thus awaited it, "suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting." Acts ii. 2.

In the struggle to find immersion in the Holy Ghost here, because it had been predetermined to find immersion in water every where, it has sometimes been pretended that this "filling of all the house where they were sitting" was equivalent to such immersion. But it was the *sound* which is here said to have filled the house. The word "sound" is the only nominative in the sentence, and the only material thing which could be spoken of as filling the house. But the baptism of the Holy Ghost was to be also one of FIRE. And the fact appears to be that the record of the fulfilment of that second great prophecy of the Old Testament—the gift of the Holy Spirit to man, the baptism of the Holy Ghost, the opening of that new and blessed fountain of life for the souls of men—is not intended to be made in this verse concerning the *sound* which filled all the room, but in the next verses: "And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance." Acts ii. 3, 4. This is the fulfilment of the great second promise of the Old Testament. This is the baptism of the Holy Ghost, which Jesus himself had promised them. Acts i. 5. This Peter expressly declares to be the fulfilment of the great promise of God by the prophet Joel: "I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh." Acts ii. 17.

The only thing about it to be immersed in was the sound of the wind. That it was which "filled all the house." The attentive reader will observe how materializing expressions are avoided. The Spirit sat like cloven tongues of fire *upon* each of them. They were filled (inwardly and in their spiritual parts) with the Holy Ghost. The gifts of tongues streamed from God inwardly upon their minds. And we must also bear along the fact that Peter, in his sermon that day, declares this to be *both* the fulfilment of the prophecy of Joel and also the fulfilment of the promise of the baptism of the Holy Ghost: "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." Acts ii. 33.

We have here a very strong presumptive evidence that baptism was by pouring. There are two inspired prophecies of the same act. One calls it the *outpouring* of the Spirit. The other calls it the *baptism* of the Spirit. And in the act of that baptism, the Spirit *sat upon* each of them. It was only the *sound* which immersed them.

Now, let us look farther into the sublime transactions of that great day. Peter's sermon had commenced about the third hour of the day, or 9 o'clock in the morning. When it was ended, many inquired what they should do to be saved. The reply was: "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For the promise is to you and to your children." "Then they that gladly received the word were baptized, and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls." Acts ii. 38, 39, 41.

We firmly believe, in spite of all efforts to manufacture testimony upon this point, that the baptism of so many souls in one day by the twelve apostles, under the circumstances existing at that day at Jerusalem, may be fairly written down as utterly improbable, most probably impossible, to have been performed by the idolized immersion. For let us calmly look now, and see what we have here.

First, we have the placing of baptism with the Holy Ghost

along with baptism with water, as the thing that Jesus would do to fulfil the thing which John did; and by consequence as the meaning of what John did. Acts i. 5.

Secondly, we have the announcement of an inspired apostle that this Pentecost is the fulfilment of an ancient prophecy of God by Joel, that he would *pour* out his Spirit upon all flesh.

Thirdly, we have a description of the coming and resting of the Spirit upon the apostles: as "appearing to them as cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them." Upon each one of them, the appearance to the eyes of the others was as cloven tongues of fire; and thus it sat upon each of them.

We ask, then, if the outward and visible ordinance corresponded with the spiritual ceremony, in what form was it probably received? The prophecy from Joel then and there quoted by the apostle Peter spoke of the *outpouring* of the Spirit. That the two baptisms—that with water and that of the Spirit—corresponded, is conceded. In what form, then, was most probably the baptism with water administered that day to those three thousand souls? We feel that there can be no other answer, without knocking the sense and meaning out of the whole transaction, than that these baptisms of the three thousands were performed just as *Moses* had once before baptized a greater crowd (Heb. ix. 19)—by sprinkling or pouring.

The apostles must have been obstinate and slow of heart beyond what we have any right to suppose, not to have administered baptism with water something after the same mode as that in which the Spirit had been promised by Joel and declared fulfilled by Peter—by *pouring*. They must have been obstinate and slow of heart indeed, when they had divine authority for tying baptism with water to baptism with the Holy Ghost, as the shadow to the substance, not to have administered baptism with water just as God administered baptism with the Holy Ghost, by putting the water on each of them, as God put his Spirit on each of them. We do not see how any other theory is consistent with the commonest understanding and the commonest spirit of docility, of obedience, of fidelity on the part of these Jewish apostles. With these plain lessons of Scripture and the

present governing Spirit of God clearly before their eyes on that occasion, we own that we *dare* not charge them with employing a mode of baptism of their own invention, having nothing to point to it or allude to it in any Scripture, or any event of the occasion.

But suppose for a moment the new version doctrine to be the truth, which sets out resolved to find immersion every where, and of course finds it here too, in compliance with its own slavish theory. Let us look a moment into the probability of the immersion of three thousand Christian converts in the city of Jerusalem at that time in one day. We must take the twelve apostles as the immersers. The violent cutting of the Gordian knot by some zealots, who say that *all the disciples* immersed, *lay* as well as *ministers*, shows too plainly that it is manufactured for an argument, and would never otherwise have been thought of, and could not have been the case without the most complete disorder, and has nothing to support it but the exigencies of a bad cause.

Dividing the three thousand converts equally between the twelve apostles, will give us two hundred and fifty apiece to be immersed by each of the twelve. Let us suppose that the sermon of Peter, which began at the third hour, or 9 o'clock in the morning, terminated in two hours, or at 11 o'clock. Then, if the ordinary computation of the season of the year be correct, there will be eight hours till night for the immersion of two hundred and fifty apiece by the twelve. This gives less than two minutes to each immersion, taking all the time till night! We have no idea that it is true that a single human being can be found in the Southern States of America who possesses the muscle and brawn to be capable of such exertion consecutively. Such a theory is a mere exaction of fanaticism, wholly unrequired by pure religion. He who should, at that Pentecost at Jerusalem, have felt himself obliged to lift from the so-called "watery grave" two hundred and fifty human bodies, in a rapid and unresting succession, and before the going down of the sun, might well have wiped his reeking brow at sunset, and asked himself, wherein is the yoke of the bondage of this ceremony

any easier to be borne than that which neither we nor our fathers have been able to bear?

And then where were the twelve different PLACES to be found, in or about Jerusalem, at which twelve different series of ceremonies of immersion could be going on at the same time and steadily during the whole afternoon?

The temple baths, say some. But to the high-priests pertained the keeping of the precincts of the temple. Annas, Caiaphas, and the other chief priests of the city, could of course control the use of the temple and its baths. It is a wide and fatal gap in any sound argument to represent such men as they had been, were now, and long continued to be, as affording facilities for proselyting men to Christianity in Jerusalem!

Was it in the pool of Siloam that all these twelve series of immersions were going on for eight hours? It was much too small for so many baptisms at once. And there is no more probability that the authorities would have allowed the use of the pool of Siloam than that they would have allowed the use of the temple baths. The brook Kedron was frequently entirely a dry channel at this season of the year. And then there is no mention or hint of the change of wet raiment and the trooping and bustling of crowds at the water's edge.

We deliberately declare that, so far, we find in the evidence on the subject *no support whatever* for the presuming and arrogant ground that all baptism is immersion, and nothing but immersion.

We wish to utter no uncharities, and we wish to do no wrong to any soul in fact, act, or argument. But when, at the bidding of such a scheme as this, partisan hands are laid upon the sacred word of God itself, (which theological professors will find to be going on far more boldly than they may suppose,) and the impartiality of that sacred authority itself is perverted and destroyed, then we feel that we would have cause to beg pardon of both God and man, not for speech, but for silence.

ARTICLE II.

RELATIONS OF THE CHURCH TO CIVIL AUTHORITY.

The roots of error generally run beyond the reach of ordinary observation. One generation is often found eating the fruit of seeds sown by another. The controversies of the present age are the necessary consequences of unfortunate mistakes made by the wise and good of other times. Truth cannot contradict itself; and yet the advocates of truth are continually arrayed in opposite ranks and often engaged in bitter strife, because their views of truth have descended to them, by tradition, through different channels, and have acquired, in their descent, a great variety of forms. As rivers take their hue from the nature of the soils through which they flow, opinions are colored and adulterated by the social *media* through which they have been transmitted. If we would see the truth in its purity, we must trace it back to its principles, and drink its waters at the fountain-head.

We have been led to such reflections as these by a recent fugitive publication, from the pen of a Presbyterian minister well known for his triumphs in controversy, and now occupying a position from which he seeks to exert a harmonising influence upon the various parties into which his Church is divided. In the article referred to, he uses the following language, the *spirit* of which every Christian patriot should cordially approve :

“The right and the duty of the Church to bear testimony against *rebellion*, as against any other sin, no one, I presume, calls in question; nor the right and duty of the Church to make deliverances on the moral aspects of slavery. But when a conflict arises between two legitimate governments, as, for example, the general Government and the States—a conflict growing out of different interpretations of the Constitution—I do deny the right of the Church to decide which side is in the right, or to assume that either party is in the wrong. Such a right can be maintained only on the monstrous assumption that the Church is authorised to interpret authoritatively civil constitutions. I do, consequently, deny the right of any Assembly to identify the Church with such civil conflicts; to do so is to make the unity

of the spiritual body absolutely dependent upon the unity of the State. For if in every civil war the Church must take sides, every civil war must necessarily divide the Church. And then, as in our own case, when the country makes peace, the Church will continue divided."

It is not with the purpose of controverting the position here taken that this passage has been cited, but simply to illustrate by kindly criticism the embarrassment into which the Church has been brought by a long series of errors. We wish to show that the language we have quoted, though popular and plausible, involves a logical defect and a grave departure from the simplicity of truth. The writer, in a spirit of charity and brotherhood, comes down to the very line that divides the Northern from the Southern Church, and extends his hands to both parties, offering, as it were, to negotiate a perpetual peace. For all this, he is entitled to our thanks. But, in point of fact, he remains on the other side of the line from ourselves, and argues in our behalf from premises which we are compelled to call in question. Indeed, we think it can be shown that his general proposition is utterly untenable, and that the logical use he would make of it would be equally efficient on the other side. It is a great mistake to assume that this proposition will be every where conceded. And this kind of assumption is the prolific source of much of our trouble. The great mass of superficial thinkers in our generation imagine that certain vague generalities, in morals and politics, are, and have long been, settled beyond question, and proceed, without misgiving, to push them to their logical results. Hence arise those impetuous torrents of popular excitement which occasionally threaten to overthrow the most sacred institutions in the Church and in the State.

Is it true that "rebellion" is a "sin," and that "it is the right and duty of the Church to bear testimony against it"? The Church has long been accustomed so to regard it. Authority and precedent are generally on that side of the question. If it is to be determined by the historical record, we yield the point at once. But that is not the aim of our present inquiry. It has another object more remote—to ascertain whether the pri-

mary proposition is true, and whether the practice of the Church has been in accordance with the fundamental principles of her great original charter.

The looseness of that popular language which forms the vehicle of our ordinary social communication is greatly to be deplored, on account of its influence on the minds of the people. The leaders of opinion and the pioneers of thought have adopted it as their own, and thereby increased the confusion of sects and parties. The catalogue of *sins* has thus grown to enormous dimensions. In this language, smoking, drinking, dancing, slaveholding, and rebellion, are all included in the black list of human offences, and have become by turns the objects of gross general denunciation, against which it has been fashionable in certain classes of paragraphists and orators to excite the feelings of the multitude. Grave ecclesiastical bodies have been, from time to time, so influenced by popular clamor as to meet its exactions with solemn "deliverances" on such undefined themes. Churches have been divided and governments overthrown, in consequence of their reckless action, and all for want of due precision in the use of words.

Before we undertake to say that "rebellion" is a *sin*, we should carefully define and limit our terms. Otherwise, we may find ourselves involved in difficulties from which we cannot easily escape. The Protestants of France, of Scotland, and of the Netherlands, the Puritans of England and the colonists of America, the revolutionists of Hungary, Poland, and Crete, have all been engaged in "rebellions" against the constituted authorities of their respective countries. If "rebellion" is a sin, they have committed that sin. But those who use such expressions would be among the first, no doubt, to applaud the actors in these historical scenes. It is therefore incumbent upon them so to define "rebellion" as to secure their own consistency. Nothing can be more absurd than to vote one day in favor of a *deliverance* that "rebellion" is a *sin*, and on the next to grow eloquent in memory of Washington. We *must* have a definition. We must draw it with such precision that the popular mind shall no longer be in doubt as to the character of those acts which impart criminality to the offence.

“To rebel,” says Webster, “is to renounce the authority of the laws and government to which one owes allegiance.” According to Worcester, it is “to take up arms, or levy war unlawfully, against the constituted authorities of a nation.” “All subjects,” says Vattel, “unjustly taking arms against the head of a society are termed *rebels*, whether their view be to deprive him of the supreme authority, or whether they intend to resist his commands in some particular affair, in order to impose conditions on him.” Not to multiply quotations, let us see what is the essence of rebellion, as defined by these leading authorities. There is a difference of phraseology, but a very obvious harmony of meaning. Superficially interpreted, they seem to agree that there may be cases in which authority is justly renounced, but that the term “rebellion” would not then be applicable. But on a close inspection, of their language elsewhere employed, it becomes apparent that such was not the intention of the writers. “The sovereign never fails,” says Vattel, “to term *rebels* all subjects openly resisting him; but when these become of strength sufficient to oppose him, so that he finds himself compelled to make war regularly on them, he must be contented with the term of civil war.” It is evident from this that the author of the “Law of Nations” was disposed to restrict the term “rebellion” to a very narrow compass, but admitted that *usage* applied it to all cases of armed resistance, whether right or wrong. Worcester quotes with approbation from a standard cyclopædia, that “revolution, in politics, is the *consummation* of a rebellion or revolt against the established or existing government.” And the same lexicographer gives us the definition of Brande as follows: “An extensive change in the political constitution of a country, accomplished in a short time, whether by legal or by illegal means.” And such an event attempted by simply *illegal* means is called by Worcester a “rebellion.” It will also be noticed that Webster uses the word “owe” in connexion with political allegiance. But he is far from limiting “rebellion” to the renunciation of *just* authority. “Every native or citizen,” says he, “owes allegiance to the government under which he was born.” And yet it will not be denied that he teaches the right

of resistance to such authority, notwithstanding the apparent obligation of allegiance. In other words, it is the doctrine of all these authorities that the forms of society, the literal terms of the social compact, bind us technically to a perpetual submission to constituted authority; but that *necessity* or *oppression* may justify us in resisting it. Rebellion, therefore, which is this act of resistance, may or may not be justifiable, according to the circumstances attending it.

But if we turn away from the lexicons and formal treatises on government to the language of history, we shall find ample evidence at hand to show that "rebellion" is used in familiar application to transactions now applauded by the world. It is indeed true, as stated by Vattel, that "all subjects *unjustly* taking arms against the head of a society are termed *rebels*;" but much more than this is true. For he acknowledges that oppression or cruelty may justify such resistance, and could not be ignorant that the same appellation is often used to designate those engaged in it. The word was originally one of reproach, but it has so often been borne by patriots contending for their rights, that its odium has almost vanished. The Reformers of Scotland who levied war against Mary were certainly "rebels" in the language of history, and as such have been long reproached by a class of writers whose romantic sympathies were stronger than their patriotic sentiments and their religious principles. But this is not the country, and Presbyterians are not the people, to condemn them. The Parliamentarians of England, under the leadership of John Hampden, were "rebels" against the king and the court in the conflict which ended in the execution of the monarch. And yet who among us will say, however much we may condemn them for this atrocity, that the rebellion itself was a crime? The Vendéans of France were "rebels" against the Convention which conducted the government of that country after the dethronement of the king. But where is the heart that does not feel its deepest sympathies engaged in their behalf, when we read the mournful story of their unfortunate struggle? And, finally, the American colonists were "rebels" against the King of England in the first Revolution, and were not ashamed to

bear the reproach or the responsibility which that appellation conveyed. Are we ready to brand our fathers with a disgraceful crime on that account? Surely not. But this we do, if we adopt the general proposition that "rebellion" is a *sin*. There is no possible escape from it, unless we choose to insist that justifiable resistance is not rebellion. This, we have endeavored to show, is contrary to usage, which applies the term to the most praiseworthy attempts to overthrow tyranny, when they terminate in disaster. The reason of this usage is obvious. When a popular movement against government fails, the result is practically accepted by the public, and the terms applied to their opponents by the successful party are employed in the literature of the country. History takes its language from documentary resources, and conversation naturally adopts the expressions of history.

But let us suppose that the term rebellion is restricted to *unjust* resistance. In this case, it is evidently the right and duty of the Church to bear testimony against sin. There cannot be any objection to an abstract "deliverance" on such a subject. But who shall determine the question practically? Is it the "right and duty" of the Church to sit in judgment, in every case of civil war, upon the merits of the parties? Leaving out of view the peculiarities of a federal government, can she in *any* country, where two parties are striving for mastery on the battle-field, determine the question of right that lies between them? Can she in China sustain the cause of one emperor, and condemn that of his rival? Can she in Japan adopt a "deliverance" in favor of the Tycoon and against the Mikado? She can do all these, if it is her "right and duty" to bear testimony against rebellion actually in progress. If civil war were prevailing in France at this moment between the Imperialists and the Republicans, the Church might, on this supposition, decide that the conduct of the latter party is "rebellious," and denounce their undertaking as a crime against heaven. Admit the principle, and we may multiply our "deliverances" without end. Instructions may be sent to all our missionaries to sustain the "powers that be" in every heathen land, and to apply

the discipline of the Church to all converts who may be found fighting on the other side.

Let us bring the illustration nearer home. Suppose secession to be universally reprobated, and the government fully consolidated. Suppose at a future day a large portion of the people should be found in arms, seeking the overthrow of the existing government, on the plea of oppression and necessity. Would it then be the "right and duty" of the Church to applaud the one party and condemn the other? Could she adjudicate the claims of the rival powers, and determine for the citizen the position he ought to take? If she could determine the question in *favor* of the government, she could, by the same jurisdiction, determine *against* it, and absolve the conscience of the citizen from his allegiance.

If the Church can do such things as these, she must derive her authority from the Scriptures. But where, we ask, do the Scriptures warrant her claim to settle *political* questions? And if she has this right, what becomes of her catholicity? If it be her duty to sustain one kind of government in the United States, and another kind in Turkey, and yet another in Hindostan, and to denounce all actual rebellion or resistance to their respective authorities as a crime, she must stand forever as a permanent bar to the most salutary revolutions, and a hated obstacle to the progress of free institutions. How can she be truly catholic in spirit, whilst she forbids the oppressed to assert their liberty? Surely this cannot be contemplated. But, on the other hand, if it be her duty to express herself firmly on the side of freedom, and to maintain that position in all parts of the world, how can she expect to be protected in her missionary enterprises by despotic governments? A practical difficulty meets us at every step. We are driven by these difficulties to inquire into her organic principles, and discover, if possible, the divine policy which ought to be her guide. The words of the Master and of his inspired followers must determine our duty for us, and settle the question how far our church courts may go in deciding the obligations of allegiance between the government and the governed.

Let us suppose a case in the apostolic age. It might have happened that the Greeks were engaged in a determined revolt against the Romans. Would Christians have been warned against the "sin of rebellion," and required to remain submissive to the empire? The general principle of good citizenship which the apostles laid down for the guidance of individuals, would apply to such a case as clearly as to any in our own day. If it is competent for the Church now to decide the merits of a political movement, it was competent for it then, under the instruction of inspired teachers who had seen the Lord. And surely these apostles had said enough to impress the duty of *loyalty* upon their hearers. If any government was ever legitimate, the Roman government was. Our Lord paid tribute to its rulers, and Paul appealed to its jurisdiction. It seems impossible to believe that either of them would have given express sanction to a revolt against its authority, either among the Jews or among the Gentiles. Imagine Paul making a "deliverance" in the case we have supposed, and declaring, in an epistle to the Corinthians, that the Roman government had forfeited all claim to the allegiance of the Greeks! How shockingly inconsistent would such language appear! But reverse the picture, and see if resolutions of an opposite import would better accord with the spirit of the gospel. How would it read, if the apostle had denounced the revolt of the Greeks as unjustifiable, and insisted that the brethren in that country should refuse fellowship to the *rebels*? What sort of impression would be made upon us by a suggestion on his part that the Roman eagle should be kept over the door of every sanctuary, and all who entered should do homage to the imperial ensign? If "the powers that be are ordained of God," in such a sense that *no* resistance could be justly offered to them, there would be nothing improper in such apostolic injunctions. But the doctrine of passive obedience and non-resistance will not now be maintained by any party worth refuting. All admit that the Greeks might have undertaken a justifiable revolution. An apostolic "deliverance" on either side would therefore have been indefensible, on any other ground than that of sufficient knowledge of the merits of the case, and plenary jurisdiction in

political questions. The Church must be in full possession of the necessary knowledge, and of the authority to determine such questions in accordance with it. But the Scriptures do not pretend to teach politics, and convey no authority to the ministry to judge in such matters. What is it, we would ask, which renders the supposed action of the apostolic Church so repugnant to our taste, and so incongruous in our eyes with the spirit and principles of primitive Christianity? The answer comes at once from the words of our Lord himself, indelibly impressed upon every devout mind: "My kingdom is not of this world." "Who made me a judge or a divider over you?" "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's."

What are we to understand by these and similar declarations of Christ? "The disciple is not above his master, nor the servant above his lord. It is enough for the disciple that he be as his master, and the servant as his lord." And the Church ought to be satisfied with a jurisdiction as restricted as that of her Divine Head. If *he* abstained from politics, she ought to be willing to do the same.

Now, if language, naturally interpreted, can convey any meaning, we ought not to misunderstand these declarations of Jesus Christ. If they mean anything, they teach us that he purposely refrained from controversies that pertained to the affairs of the present life. Refusing to act as umpire between brethren in a dispute about their inheritance, he clearly indicated that it would be a departure from the purpose of his mission to engage in such occupations, and inconsistent with the interests of his spiritual kingdom. And when the tribute money was shown to him, he based his decision upon the reading of the superscription, which was as evident to their eyes as to his own; and simply required them to return to Cæsar that which belonged to him. "My kingdom is not of this world." "In a temporal sense," he seems to say, "I am a subject of Cæsar's, and not his superior, and have no right, as an individual, to absolve others from their allegiance." "We circulate his coin in Judæa; let us not refuse, whilst we enjoy his protection, to respect his power."

Our Lord preserved a significant silence on a thousand secular questions. He could have thrown a flood of light upon them, if it had been consistent with the wisdom of his providence. He could have explained the mysteries of nature and of mind, the hidden principle of life, the secret of the will, and various other questions that interest philosophers and baffle their inquiries. But he has told us nothing of these things. In the same manner, he might have taught us the true principles of social organisation, and pointed out the best form of government for its preservation. But he maintained silence on all such points. This silence was intentional. It was designed for the guidance of his followers. It was intended to teach them that all knowledge is as nothing in comparison with the knowledge of spiritual truth. The gospel is a radical remedy for human ills, and is to be applied to them immediately. We are not to proceed by the diffusion of secular information as a preparatory process, but to proclaim at once the unsearchable riches of Christ. Other improvements are to be wrought out by reason. Religion is to be apprehended by faith. Hence the Church, to which is committed the oracles of God, if she copies the example of her divine Master, will not undertake to make "deliverances" on points of secular interest, or decide between contending parties into which nations may be divided. She will say to all such parties, no matter what interests are involved, "Who made me a judge or a divider over you?"

As we said at the outset, we have no intention to controvert the position taken by the writer of the paragraph under review. It is ours as well as his. But we object very strongly to the ground upon which he rests his judgment—the *peculiar* construction of our government. The argument is that the Church cannot decide between two legitimate governments; and the concession is apparently made that she might properly decide between parties differently constituted. In other words, the admission is implied that in cases of *revolution*, not involving a conflict of Federal and State authority, the Church may and ought to condemn the popular movement, if she judges it to be wrong, and is competent of herself to determine the merits of such a controversy.

Now, what must be the future history of the Church in the United States, if this prerogative is to be admitted? We devoutly pray that a long period of peace and freedom may follow the present scene of agitation. But there is no reasonable hope that we shall escape the recurrence of civil wars between popular parties contending for the mastery. The Church must either stand by the Government, however corrupt and oppressive, in all future conflicts of arms; or she must, in every case, decide whether the authority of the Government shall be sustained. Are we prepared for the former alternative? Are we willing that the Church shall stand pledged to the support of the most odious tyranny, provided it clothes itself in the garb of republican forms? Shall we say to all future administrations that the ecclesiastical influence of the country shall be wielded to maintain their authority, so long as they continue the regular succession of the Government, no matter what atrocities they may commit in the name of the law? Surely this is not intended. The Church of Rome may make such a bargain, but Protestants never can. It has been painfully proved in history that the grossest outrages against the rights and privileges of the people may be perpetrated by a government nominally free. The Church cannot pledge her sanction to such crimes, without betraying her own liberties, and exposing herself to the odium of mankind.

But what shall be said of the other horn of the dilemma? Will it ever be competent for the Church to decide *against* the Government? May she release her members from their allegiance? If so, our General Assemblies, and other ecclesiastical bodies of some future day, may be found adopting "deliverances" in favor of insurrections and pronunciamientos, and making *loyalty* an offence subject to discipline. Are we prepared for this? Who would be willing to plunge the Church into the mire of politics, and stain her robes with the blood of citizens shed on fields of civil strife? Something within us will ever protest against such a policy. History itself, from the altars where peace has been so often sworn between contending parties, declaims continually against it. Civil war must at last end in peace, however

long the strife may last. Amnesty and oblivion succeed violence and hate, and the civil powers are generally disposed to throw a veil over the painful past. But, with the Church, this cannot be so easily done. She has no right to condemn that which is not condemned in heaven; neither can she loose that which is not loosed in heaven. She has no authority, from motives of temporary expediency, to denounce certain courses of conduct as criminal, and then, under a change of circumstances, to remove her censures and embrace the offenders. Fixed principles of right and wrong are laid down for her government, and she cannot, in imitation of the State, condemn and absolve almost in the same breath.

The whole subject of ecclesiastical "deliverances" seems to us to require regulation and limitation. When the Church is led by the current influences of the times to issue her opinions on questions of public interest, she ought to have a high regard to her own consistency. Her "duty to bear testimony" against prevalent evils cannot be questioned; but there is great danger of being unduly influenced by the popular excitements that surround her. The resolutions adopted by these bodies at various stages of these excitements do not always harmonize with one another, and the moral power of the Church is weakened by these discrepancies. For it is understood by the Protestant world that truth is permanent, and that no additions can be made to the principles revealed in the Scriptures. If the moral sentiments of the Church are found to vary with the winds and tides of public opinion outside of her fold, she must suffer an incalculable loss of her influence over the world. Gradual revelations were made before the coming of Christ, and things were allowed in practice which were wrong in principle, "because of the hardness of the hearts" of the people. But when the promised Messiah appeared, truth was made known in its full measure to his followers. And the moral principles he taught were illustrated by himself and his inspired apostles in the practical application of them to the life of the Church. We may safely assume that what was then right or wrong still continues to be so, and the same rules of moral judgment must ever be

applicable to all questions which the Church may properly consider. No ecclesiastical body has the right, therefore, to depart from the line of consistency in its decisions of public questions. Apologies have been made for such errors by maintaining that the resolutions put forth by the men of one day are not binding upon those of another, but are only to be regarded as a legitimate expression of the sentiments prevailing at the time. But these deliverances do not generally purport to be thus transient in their character. The object is to influence human conduct, by giving utterance to the authoritative voice of the Church. Their individual sentiments could be promulgated through other channels. The Church does not die with its members. She is immortal like her Lord. Her decisions should therefore be uniform through all countries and ages. Her judgment should be independent of the ever-shifting currents of human opinion.

We are more especially concerned in the future course of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, and heartily desire to see her take a higher position than she has hitherto occupied—so high above the elements as not to be shaken by the storm. This can only be effected by limiting the discretion of the General Assembly. Some restriction might be imposed by the constitution of the Church, which would put a stop to the issue of hastily drawn papers, which so often emanate without due consideration from that body. Such documents might be kept under deliberation, for such a period of time as would enable the entire Church to form its judgment concerning them. The errors resulting from haste and impulse would thus be avoided, and a greater degree of consistency be stamped upon the future decisions of this important court. It would no longer be possible for a political party to tempt the Church into indiscretions from which it would be mortifying to retreat. There would be more stability and symmetry in her future course, and far more power in her influence for good over the world at large.

ARTICLE III.

HISTORICAL CHRISTIANITY.

The most formidable opponents of true Christianity are they who, "sitting in the temple of God," claim it as their prerogative to exercise supreme and exclusive dominion over the faith of his people. Confiding in the strength of their position, they speak with authority, and support their assumed *jure divino* right by an array of logical propositions at once "cunningly devised," compact, continuous, and defiant. They aver that the Lord Jesus founded his Church in the persons of his apostles; that he gave them a charter in rites and laws to be administered by them, and a living power and efficiency in the agency of the Holy Spirit annexed to that administration: that he provided for the transmission of these powers, in an adequate degree, to those who were to succeed them; and that by such transmission or delivery alone could the title to minister in the Church be completed, or the revealed conditions of its constitution be satisfied. And to corroborate this compacted series of positions, they employ with effect the powerful auxiliaries of *time and numbers*, claiming it as the unquestioned belief for fifteen hundred years throughout Christendom, and until now as maintained and expressed in the symbolic books, and as constantly applied in the practice of seven-eighths of the Christian world. It is a great mistake, say they, to regard all this as touching upon a mere matter of external order. It touches, in their view, upon the vital union of the Church, as a society, with Christ, its living Head; and it places the witness of that union upon a basis altogether independent of the fluctuations of the individual mind. The conviction of one man, derived through secret channels, however sincere and firm it be, is not a witness available for another: but continuous, external, *historical* testimony is a witness to all, and enables a man intelligibly to answer the solemn question, "By what title do I minister in the Church of Christ?" Not by virtue of my own persuasion, however earnest, nor by

that of others who immediately or who three centuries ago preceded me, but under a warrant transmitted in fixed forms by man to man, from Christ himself, along an outward and historical channel, open to the criticism and palpable to the common perception of mankind.*

Such we conceive to be a condensed but fair statement of the ground occupied by all prelatial Churches, whether Episcopal or Papal. But waiving, at least for the present, the mooted question, whether there has been any such "outward and historical" succession as they all claim—a question to which a negative answer would have to be given from the many broken links discoverable in the chain, and from the want of agreement among themselves how they shall be mended—we propose to submit to the arbitration of history this standing claim of "fifteen hundred years," supported as it has been, and still is, by the suffrages of "seven-eighths of the Christian world." In doing this, we shall aim to confront history with history—history that is genuine, authentic, and divinely inspired, with that which is apocryphal, traditionary, and human: the history of the Christian Church for the first fifty or sixty years, while it was under the administration of the chosen apostles of our Lord, with the history of the Church from the close of the scriptural canon to the present day.

Many seem to lose sight of the great fact that the New Testament is not only a continuous history of the Christian Church for about two ordinary generations, but that in its backward sweep over by-gone ages, it discriminates between that which is transient and temporary under the old economy, and that which is permanent and eternal—between the type and the antitype: and that in its prophetic foreshadowings, there are many sketches of the future designed for the instruction and comfort and warning of all ages, till time shall be no more. Keeping, then, in view the illimitable range of this one history, which as far surpasses all others as heaven is higher than earth, we shall only touch upon some of the salient points in this matter of contro-

* See *Edinburg Review*. December. 1848. No. 167—article "Duke of Argyll on Presbytery."

versy, without any higher aim than merely to indicate that the fortress in which our opponents have entrenched themselves is not altogether impregnable.

The first radical error in the claim of those who would be "apostles, and are not," (Rev. ii. 2,) consists in the allegation that "the Lord Jesus founded his Church in the persons of his apostles." But there is nothing in the history of the primitive Church, nor in the nature of the apostolic office, nor in the words which they uttered, nor in the works which they performed, that gives the slightest countenance to such an allegation. It is disproved by the fact that Christ is every where represented as the sole Head of the Church, and that he has never given his glory or transferred his power to another. Paul affirms that "other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." 1 Cor. iii. 11. And he disclaims any dominion over the faith of the Corinthians; immediately adding, "By faith ye stand." 2 Cor. i. 24. Faith in whom? Not in the apostles, but in Christ. Such a disclaimer could never have been made by the apostle, had he been invested with all the authority which the allegation implies. Who of the pretended successors of the apostles has ever uttered such a disclaimer? And who of them has ever failed to assert and practically to enforce this dominion? The apostles were but *servants of Jesus Christ*, and not "lords over God's heritage." (1 Peter v. 3.) If the apostles were ambassadors, they were simply "ambassadors for Christ," to do his will, to publish his offers of salvation, and had no other authority but that which was purely ministerial—such as a servant renders to his master. And so of the miracles which they performed; they were all wrought in his name and ascribed to his power. The main passage on which the claim of apostolic succession, with apostolic powers, is founded, is in the 16th chapter of the Gospel of Matthew, from the 13th to the 19th verses, inclusive. We need not quote them in full. Let it here suffice to remind the reader that he will find a solution to the great agitating question of that day—"What think ye of Christ?" or "Whom say ye that I am?"—in the answer which Peter gave to this interrogatory, when he said, "Thou art the Christ, the Son

of the living God." This *confession* of Peter, this open avowal of Jesus of Nazareth as the Messiah of whom the prophets had written, in conjunction with a like avowal of him as "the Son of the living God," which included his essential deity and equality with the Father, is the confession of faith which true Christianity has ever taught and enjoined. And this is the rock on which the Church of Christ is founded.* Again we may remark that Christ never said that Peter was the rock upon which he will build his Church. How could he, when he himself is the only rock, the only foundation? How could he, when "all power in heaven and on earth" is needed to save one lost sinner, intrust the keeping of the whole Church to a frail mortal like Peter? We will freely admit that the Lord Jesus conferred extraordinary powers upon Peter and upon his other apostles. But we have no intimation whatever that they did not all possess these powers in an equal degree, no intimation that Peter was the prince of the apostles, and no intimation that either he or any of the other apostles had the power of transmitting their extraordinary gifts to others, much less their entire apostolate to successors. It is not so written, and we shall see in the sequel that the credibility of such an assumption lacks the evidence necessary to support it.

As to "the charter in rites and laws" which the Lord Jesus originally gave to his Church by the ministry of his apostles, we hold it to be just as valid, just as obligatory now, as it was in the primitive Church, and accompanied with like blessings when administered and observed with like dependence upon the Holy Spirit and in the exercise of a like faith upon the power and grace of Christ. But the question in dispute relates not to "the charter in rites and laws," but to the power which is claimed by those in the assumed succession, to dispense with those rites and laws, to abridge or amend them, to substitute others in their place, to increase their number, to give them a mystical inter-

* If we admit that *πέτρος* and *πέτρα* both mean stone or rock, it is passing strange that if Peter was the rock on which Christ promised to build his Church, that he should change his gender from masculine to feminine.

pretation, and differing from their plain and obvious import; in a word, whether the power is claimed in so important a matter as rites and laws to legislate where Christ has not legislated, or in any way contravening the charter which he has given, either by additions or evasions, is a usurpation of his authority upon which the apostles never ventured. For they, like the prophets of old, received the law from his lips, and proclaimed it to all as his unalterable word—adding nothing of their own and keeping nothing back.

But the advocates of the apostolic succession—at least in our day—do not regard themselves as under any such restriction. “Never,” says De Maitre, a prominent continental theologian of the progressive or development school, “never has any important institution resulted from a law; and the greater the institution is, the less does it deal in parchment and writing; it springs insensibly with the growth of ages. Had St. Peter a distinct conception of his prerogative, and of the questions to which it would give birth? That I cannot tell.” Great institutions, then, such as the Papal Church, have not their charter in the Scriptures, and this the whole body practically confessed long before De Maitre took up his pen in her defence—practically confessed it, we say, by excluding the Scriptures from the people. And for a like reason, as there is nothing in the character or conduct or language of St. Peter, as delineated in the Scriptures, at all resembling the prerogative claimed by the Papal chair, the Bible must be a dangerous book for the people to read. The prerogative in question, like all other parts of this “great institution,” has been “the growth of ages.”

Take another witness, no less prominent than the one already quoted. From Hurter we learn that “to try to establish primitive Christianity as the rule and type of all Christian institutions, is an attempt as absurd as if one would have the Emperor of Austria model his court on that of the old counts of Hapsburg, his ancestors.” Just as absurd, all will admit, who would lay side by side the chaste simplicity of the one and the gorgeous display of the other.

But there is another witness still more prominent, or at least

better known to the readers of this REVIEW than either of the two whose testimony has been already given. We refer to Newman, who, in his "Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine," has laid down the rule upon which this growth or these variations proceed. He says: "The view on which this essay is written has, perhaps, at all times been impliedly adopted, but, I believe, has recently been illustrated by several distinguished writers of the Continent, such as De Maitre and Mohler, viz., that the increase and expansion of the Christian creed and ritual, and the variations which have attended the process in the case of individual writers and churches, are the necessary attendants on any philosophy or polity which takes possession of the intellect and heart, and has had any wide or extended dominion. But, from the nature of the human mind, time is necessary for the full comprehension and perfection of great ideas." Again, he says: "Here is but the germ. What the gospel reveals, be it doctrine, or church, or worship, or various observances, all should now be modified and become complete." And again: "If Christianity be a universal religion, suited not to one locality or period, but to all times and places, it cannot but vary in its relations and dealings towards the world around it. Principles require a very varied application, according to persons and circumstances." "I am not aware that most Tridentine writers deny that the whole Catholic faith may be proved from Scripture, though they would certainly maintain that it cannot be found on the surface of it."

But, lest it should be said that these are only the speculations of individual writers, and not the voice of the Church, it will be sufficient to reply, that the development theory of De Maitre and Hurter and Newman has been applied in a notable instance by the now reigning Pope. The theory of "the immaculate conception" was once but a "germ," and for ages it was a much-disputed question among their theologians, whether or no it had any signs of life, till it was vitalized and brought forth in full maturity, not a dozen years ago, by the fiat of his Holiness. So that now it is an established Catholic truth—an infallible article of faith, which none but heretics will venture from hence-

forth to deny. And how many such articles are in embryo, to be brought forth in due time, it is impossible to predict. But from the amazing "variations" from primitive Christianity to which the Catholic Church has already attained, we may form some approximating conception of what will be in the progressive future, when the "great ideas" of Mr. Newman shall be fully realised.

It may not be out of place here briefly to notice the external state of that "institution" which seems to have given rise to the "great ideas" whereby have been expanded the intellects and the hearts of its admirers. "The Prince of the Apostles," as he is called, has a temporal dominion, not so extensive as formerly, but still embracing twenty states, with a population of nearly three and a quarter millions. St. Peter of old had no such dominion; and we further conclude that he was poor in this world's goods, but rich in faith. For on one occasion he publicly said, "Silver and gold have I none." (Acts iii. 6.) The comparison of Hurter falls far below the mark; for there is a much wider difference between St. Peter of the primitive Church and the present St. Peter of the "Catholic" Church, than between the counts of Hapsburg and the court of the Emperor of Austria. But not to dwell upon temporal dominions and palaces and thrones, if we turn to the spiritual dominion of his Holiness, he has under him seventy-two cardinals, eleven patriarchates, one hundred and fifty-four archepiscopal and six hundred and eighty-six episcopal sees, and one hundred and one apostolic vicariates. Of his episcopal sees, fifty of them are in the United States, and the Papal population of this country is estimated at four millions. In Europe alone, he has six hundred and three dioceses, and affects to bear sole spiritual rule over a population of one hundred and forty-seven millions. Add to all this his spiritual dominion over other portions of the world—in Asia, in Africa and America; and over the immense host in clerical "orders"—priests, deacons, exorcists, acolytes—all, all yielding him implicit obedience—(such is the law;—when all this is duly considered, it ceases to be a matter of wonder that the occupants of the Papal throne, and that they who rank highest in

its favor, should fail in the grace of humility which was a peculiar characteristic of the primitive Church, and no less a characteristic of the apostles themselves.

Newman is right in saying that philosophy and polity have had much to do in developing this "great institution." It was at first the philosophy of the Stoics and the Epicureans and the Peripatetics which bewildered and perplexed and corrupted the minds of many of the apostolic or early fathers of the Church. In the middle ages, the Philosophy of Aristotle was the fascinating study of all ranks, and was interwoven with all their habits of thought; and to be familiar with his categories was deemed a much higher attainment than to be familiar with the oracles of God. But as neither of the philosophies referred to may be the one which Mr. Newman has embraced or would recommend, we venture to ask him what Philosophy is that with which Christianity must be found identical, in order to its being acknowledged as true and divine? Is it Deism or Pantheism? Is it the philosophy of Descartes or of Bacon? of Leibnitz or of Locke? of Condillac or of M. Cousin? Even in the great round of German philosophy, which is it? Is it that of Kant, or of Fichte, or of Schelling, or of Jacobi, or of Hegel, or of Fries, or of so many others less known, who have made changes in the thoughts of their masters, or tried new paths for themselves? Which of all these philosophies is *the* philosophy? Which is the one eternal truth which is to serve as a type, a criterion and standard, for Christian truth? Each of the scientific explanations of Christianity only lasts as long as the theory or metaphysical hypothesis from which it springs. A special theological school and a peculiar view of Christian doctrine is attached to each new view which philosophy assumes. What reliance, then, can be placed on it? It was not philosophy which the apostles taught. All the systems of philosophy then extant, whether of Jewish or Gentile origin, they regarded as utterly worthless and false—esteeming the wisdom of this world as foolishness, not to be admitted to a comparison with the wisdom of God as revealed in the gospel. Instead, then, of the philosophy which has modelled the "Catholic Church" into its present form.

what we simply want to know is, how to distinguish between the human and the divine. Tell us what *rites* Christ Jesus instituted, and by what *laws* his kingdom was originally governed, and we can ask nothing more. This, indeed, is the only true practical philosophy suited to all ages of the world, to all conditions and classes of society, and to all the relations which man sustains to his fellow-man, and to God his maker. And these rites and these laws were framed by infinite wisdom, with a perfect knowledge of the human heart, and with a perfect adaptation to the good of the Church and the glory of God.

Akin to the influence of philosophy in moulding the Church into a form so unlike the primitive model, is the *polity* which has actuated and controlled her proceedings. The germ of this great error is seen in the conduct of one of the apostles—even Peter, who exposed himself to the reproof of Paul for his dissembling or compromising polity. (See Gal. ii. 11, *et seq.*) And if the intrepid Peter dissembled through fear on this occasion, how great must have been the temptation to men less bold than he to pursue a similar policy, rather than to expose themselves to the loss and the peril which a steadfast adherence to “the truth of the gospel” would expose them. In the early persecutions of the Church, similar compliances with Jewish prejudices and Gentile customs from the same motive were not uncommon. But other motives—and these motives are many—had also their influence in later days, corrupting the purity of Christian doctrine and the simplicity of Christian worship, by engrafting upon the Church, as articles of faith and as ceremonies to be observed, many opinions and many rites which could lay no claim to a divine origin. And thus, little by little, the great institution which claims to be *the* Church has its form and shape much less “in parchment and writing” than in the accretions from foreign sources; and De Maitre is right when he speaks of it as “the insensible growth of ages.” To what extent the polity of the court of Rome may be modelled after that of the Cæsars, may perhaps be approximately shown by comparing the one with the other—both supreme, both universal.

But we turn now from the general to more specific views of

our subject. What philosophy and polity have done, may be seen, for example, by adverting to the Lord's Supper—an ordinance remarkably simple and remarkably significant, and remarkably instructive and comforting to the people of God. But how from this "germ" the sacrifice of the mass could spring, is a mystery transcending the reach of any but a mystical philosophy which adopts as its motto, "The greater the impossibility, the easier believed." But it has been so transformed; and there is nothing like it in the Jewish ritual, nor any where else, save in the unbloody sacrifice of Numa Pompilius or in the offering of Cain.

Springing out of this great "variation," we take leave to notice a minor variation of sufficient importance to attract attention. It is generally known that the Tridentine Council decided that laymen should communicate in only one of the elements—the bread. But Pope Leo (A. D. 443) is reported to have said that "the sacrilegious unbelievers who desire to communicate in the bread only are Manicheans." And he ordered the "expulsion of such by sacerdotal authority from the society of Christians."* Pope Gelasius (A. D. 495) denounced the division of one and the same mystery as a "great sacrilege."** Pope Urban, (A. D. 1095,) presiding in the Council of Clermont, determined that the communicant must partake of the bread and wine "separately." This was in opposition to the practice of dipping the bread in the wine and so partaking of it. And Pope Pascal (A. D. 1118) says: "Our Lord himself dispensed the bread and the wine each by itself; and this usage is always to be observed in the Church." † But without going far

* Sanguinem redemptionis nostrae haurire omnino declinent. Deprehensa fuerit sacrilega simulatio, notati et prodi a sanctorum societate sacerdotali autoritate pellantur. Leo, Serm. 4. Bin. 3, 618. Labb. 6, 283.

** Divisio unius ejusdemque mysterii sine grandi sacrilegio non potest provenire. Gelasius in Pithou, 454. Aquin. III. 80, XI., P. 393. Baron. 496, XX. Bruy. I. 265.

† Corpus Dominicum et sanguis Dominicus singulatim accipatur. Urban in Oderic. VI. Labb. 12, 897, 896, 905. Mabillon, 6, 13.

‡ Novimus per se panem, per se vinum ab ipso Domino traditum, quem morem sic semper in sancta ecclesia conservandum docemus et precipimus. Pascal, Ep. 32. Labb. 12, 999. Mabillon 6, 13. Il ordonne de donner a la communion les deux especes separement. Bruy. 2, 593.

out of our way for authorities to prove this "variation," let us refer to one well known to us all in these later times. The late Bishop England, in his little work on the "Ceremonies of the Mass," says (p. 130) that "decrees have been made by the Popes of the fifth century, that those who refuse to receive under the appearance of wine should be altogether denied communion." Here, then, is a direct issue between Popes of the fifth, eleventh, and twelfth centuries, and the Council of Trent; both infallable, and the one contradicting the other in a matter of essential importance. And there is a still further issue between the Council of Trent and the injunction of our Lord—the latter saying, "Drink ye all of it;" and the former, "Ye shall not drink it at all."

While upon the mass, as it would occupy much more space than we can spare to discuss it ever so cursorily, we shall touch only upon one point where there is a palpable variance between the teaching of Rome and the teaching of the gospel. The "unbloody sacrifice" of the mass, according to Bishop England's definition of it, is in part "offered to the Almighty as a propitiation for the sins of mankind." But from the Epistle to the Hebrews we learn that "this he (Christ) did once when he offered up himself." (Ileb. vii. 27.) "Nor yet that he should offer himself often," [the mass is often offered,] "as the high priest entereth into the holy place every year with blood of others; for then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world; but now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." (Ileb. ix. 25, 26.) "For by one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified." (Ileb. x. 14.) So all along it is one, once, one offering for sin, and no more, according to the gospel. But, according to Rome, it is a repeated offering as often as the mass is celebrated.

We turn now to one of the appendages of the mass. Passing by the *edifice* in which it is celebrated, with the symbolic meaning of its various fixtures and ceremonies, we simply refer to the fact that in the history of the primitive Church no reference whatever is made to a clerical costume. The apostles and evan-

gelists and elders and deacons, all seem to have been clothed in the ordinary attire of that age. But, in the work of Bishop England, already quoted, some pages are devoted to a description of the peculiar dress of the officiating "orders." On reading it, the thought occurred—and we hope to be pardoned if we offend in expressing it—that Monsieur Godey, who furnishes the ladies every month with the newest fashions, might find some capital hints, blending the antique with the Parisian, by a perusal of this part of the work. But we have not much reason to fear, as the *Taxa Cancellariæ Apostolicæ* can grant *indulgentes* for the gravest offence.

As in the primitive Church there was no clerical costume, so neither were there any clerical orders. But in the Church of Rome, there is a hierarchy made up of a dozen or more orders, rising one above another till they culminate in the Pope. How wonderful the development! And here it may be pertinent to remark, that it is altogether irrelevant to appeal to the Old Testament ritual to sanction a corresponding ritual under the gospel dispensation. For the Jewish ritual had fully answered the typical and symbolical purposes for which it was instituted when Christ, our great High Priest, had finished his work on earth. As the ceremonial law was then abolished, of which we have abundant proof in the gospel; and as neither Christ nor his apostles instituted any other ceremonial law in its place, any attempt to engraft such a law upon the simple institutions of the gospel is a flagrant act of disobedience, is an act of presumptuous disloyalty to the great Head of the Church.

But of all the "variations" between the primitive and the Roman Church, none are so important as those which relate to the gospel itself—the way of salvation which God has revealed. Salvation by grace or salvation by works—which is it? The primitive Church believed—for so they were taught—that "by grace they were saved through faith; and that not of themselves; it is the gift of God; not of works, lest any man should boast." (Eph. ii. 8, 9.) The Roman Church, on the contrary, believes and teaches that man is saved partly by faith and partly by works—works bearing the most prominent part in their scheme of salva-

tion, the *merit* of works meeting you every where; and so great are these merits, and so great is the ability of fallen human nature to keep and more than keep the divine law, that some succeed in amassing a treasure of good works which far more than cancels the claims of God upon their obedience and services; a treasure which, by a strange figment, the Church can use for the benefit of those whose works fall short of the divine requirements. If this be the gospel, Christ died in vain. And if the justification of the sinner is by works, then the apostles were false witnesses, for they every where testify that it is not by works, but freely through the grace of Christ that we are saved.

Again, the primitive Church was taught and believed that their acceptance with God was solely through the mediation of Christ, through whom alone they had access by one Spirit unto the Father. Rome, on the contrary, interposes a multitude of mediators between the sinner and the Saviour, on whose advocacy her people are taught to place an implicit reliance, and whose good offices and loving favor they are taught to invoke, paying them the worship which is due only to God. As the first is true, as an acceptance with God is solely through Christ, the last is false.

Then again: In the primitive Church, the doctrine of the new birth, or regeneration by the Holy Spirit, was taught and believed. The new creature was God's own workmanship, in which he replaced on the subject of it his own lost image. And the external rite of baptism was but a symbol or type of the effectual working of the Holy Spirit in this new creation. Rome, on the contrary, believes and teaches that the external rite of baptism is but a synonym of the new creation, and that, when duly administered, it is effectual in cleansing all those to whom it is applied from their original guilt and from their actual transgressions. The *opus operatum* principle, the merest materialistic figment that vain man ever imagined, secures this result, not only as to baptism, but as to any other ordinance of God's house, and confers on her priesthood the power of transmitting to their successors the authority which they claim for themselves. But

the Holy Spirit has revealed that his children—his sons—are “born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.” (John i. 13.) Here is taught a doctrine as widely variant from that of Rome as it is possible for the mind to conceive.

In like manner, we might pass in review a multitude of other variations from “the rites and laws” of the primitive Church; but, as their “name is legion,” these, for the present, must suffice as specimens of the rest. If we turn now to the prophetic history, as given by Christ and his apostles, we shall find “the growth,” “the development,” to correspond, in every particular, with the foreshadowings of divine inspiration. In the First Epistle of Paul to Timothy, fourth chapter, we are told that “the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith;” and this departure has been shown in the specimens already exhibited. Another specification of this departure is their “forbidding to marry:” the prophecy fulfilled in the enforced celibacy of the clergy. Another is their “commanding to abstain from meats:” of which every Friday and every Lent in the Papal communion is proof. Timothy was further warned “to refuse profane and old wives’ fables.” And of such fables the “developed” Church has been exceedingly prolific. In the First Epistle of John, second chapter, he speaks of that antichrist that shall come, and “even now,” he says, “are there many antichrists;” v. xviii. It cannot be expected that Rome will remain at ease when she is designated as the antichrist of the Scriptures, and with an air of triumph she replies that the antichrist of the Scriptures is described as “denying the Father and the Son,” (v. 22.,) which cannot apply to her, as she recognises in her creed the trinity in unity. While this is true, she may practically deny the Father and the Son in their relations in the plan of redemption. Holding, as we do, the equality of the Son to the Father, it has still ever sounded in our ears rather like Sabellianism than orthodoxy, when the mother of our Saviour is called “the mother of God,” or when it is said that “God died for our sins.” But this is the common language of Romanists, applying it even to the bread of the

eucharist, calling it "the body of God." If in these expressions there be not a virtual denial of the Father and the Son, there is a denial of both Father and Son by usurping the authority of God—countermanding what he has enjoined, and enjoining what he has positively forbidden. The first illustration is in her prohibiting the Scriptures from being read, and the next in her nullifying the second commandment. And who but antichrist could do either the one or the other?

We come now to the prophetic history in Second Thessalonians, second chapter, which foretells that the coming of Christ—that second coming "without sin unto salvation," which is the Christian's hope—will not occur, "except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition," etc., etc. As reviewers, we need only indicate the chapter, deeming it unnecessary to refer to the commentators—for they are many—who have illustrated it by showing an exact correspondence between the graphic delineations of the apostle and the Papal hierarchy.

But, as we have much matter to be disposed of before we conclude this essay, we must defer any further notice of the prophetic developments, which were in their "germ," even in the days of the apostles. Most of the variations which we have noticed are admitted by the advocates of Rome, but they are much more significant than they may suppose. For they include plain and palpable departures from the gospel—departures from its order, its discipline, its rites, its doctrines, and its ordinances; and hence it is preposterous that we, who totally eschew all such variations, should derive our "title to minister to Christians' souls" from such a source. Let her demand it, if she will. Let her insist that we must have her "continuous, external, historical" testimony from the days of the apostles, with her seal of approval affixed to it—what, we ask, is that testimony worth? What continuity can there be in a Church which has so far departed from the faith? Even could the continuity be established beyond a doubt, were there no broken links in the chain from St. Peter to Pope Pius the IX., we ask again, what is this historical testimony worth, passing, as it must, through Liberius

and Vigilius and Honorius, and a multitude of other Popes equally infamous? It is, in fact, of no greater value than traditional testimony from apocryphal sources, which the overcredulous may receive as unquestionable, because they have neither the means, nor the capacity, nor the disposition to test it.

But we have a much better witness at hand, always open, always accessible, always giving the same utterances, never varying, never contradicting itself—a witness which the weakest and the wisest can hear and understand alike. It is God's own infallible word, which testifies that "if there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine,"—*i. e.*, the gospel in its purity and truth,—“receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed; for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds.” (2 John 10, 11.) Here we find an express prohibition to give any countenance to the corrupters of the gospel; and much more does it prohibit us from receiving ordination at their hands.

Let it be remembered that the great Head of the Church, who, after his resurrection, called Paul to the apostolate, has never remitted, never laid aside, never intrusted to man his supreme authority, but has continued to call by his word and Spirit his ministering servants and to assign them their work to do. And when has the Spirit ever failed to bear his testimony to those whom he has thus called—his testimony to themselves and his testimony to others, by making them instrumental in “the perfecting of the saints,” and in “edifying the body of Christ,” which is the Church? As tests and as a matter of external order, nothing is more proper or becoming than that they should be examined and tried as to their experimental knowledge of the gospel, as to their motives, their moral character, their intellectual qualifications, and their aptness to teach; and that this examination be conducted by approved members of the Church. And if satisfaction is given on all these points, nothing is more proper than that they should be set apart to their work publicly and by appropriate rites. But these external rites are by no means the channels of grace. What can be more simple than ordination conducted in this form? What can be more in accordance

with the institutions of the gospel? And if the ordained be worthy of the office which they bear, they will commend themselves to the consciences of God's people by their fruits—"For by their fruits ye shall know them." What if they cannot trace their lineage, through channels of deep corruption and apostasy, backward to some remote past, where the severed chain cannot be mended? They have a better title, a far better, in the witness of the Spirit bearing testimony with their spirits, and in the seals which he gives to their ministry. This is the witness of their being sent to preach the unsearchable riches of Christ.

It is a great mistake to suppose that the higher the office, the nearer heaven; that

"A saint in crape is twice a saint in lawn:"

that the authority to minister in holy things, to be valid, must pass in succession through channels unknown to the gospel—through popes, cardinals, metropolitans, patriarchs, or priests, who have not themselves even a *titular* right, from anything which the gospel reveals, to the offices which they severally bear. Neither by the teachings of the Saviour, nor by the practice of the apostles, nor by the spirit of primitive Christianity, is there furnished the slightest ground for such a claim. The claim is preposterous. Look for a moment at the occupants of the Papal throne, and especially upon those who, in the pride of their hearts, have set their feet upon the necks of kings and claimed for themselves universal dominion. How unlike to the meek and lowly Jesus! How unlike Peter or Paul! And must we derive from them our authority to preach the gospel? Is this the historical testimony which either the Church or the world demands to impart validity to the ministerial office? "Tell it not in Gath; publish it not in the streets of Askelon!"

There is, besides, more than ordinary significance in the injunction, "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins." (Rev. xviii. 3.) The context of this historico-prophetic command clearly implies that there would arise a catholic or universal Church, so exceedingly corrupt as to imperil the spiritual life of God's people who were in the midst of

her. "All nations have drunk of the wine," etc., shows its universality, its corruption, and its doom. And when it is said, "Come out of her, my people," it implies that in this universal fold, embracing "all nations," some were left who had not departed from the faith, as Lot in Sodom, and as the seven thousand in Israel who had not bowed the knee to Baal, when the prophet thought that he was the only witness for God among all that people. If, then, the command be obeyed, as it was more than three centuries ago by not a few, it is preposterous to require her signature to the warrant of those who are called to the ministry. And it is just as futile as it is preposterous. For she will not recognise her own signature to the warrant of those who have departed from her communion. If she confers any gifts or any rights by her ordination or her induction into the ministerial office, she annuls and obliterates them all, when she excommunicates; and as she excommunicates all Protestants, the successionists of the Anglo-Catholic Church have no better title than their fellow-Protestants of other communions. And therefore we hold her blessing and her curse, her ordination and excommunication, equally nugatory. The Pope had no more authority to excommunicate Luther than had Luther to excommunicate the Pope.

The great conflict of Christianity from the beginning has been a conflict with error, and this conflict has turned chiefly upon principles. If the principles of any man, or of any body of men, be not in accordance with the revealed will of God, and more especially if their principles are subversive of the gospel, we are solemnly bound, on all fitting occasions, to bear our testimony against them. Nor is it any departure from true Christian charity to give publicity to this testimony, to "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints." It matters not what may be the semblance of piety in those whose principles we know to be false; what the devotion, the zeal, the works—all good in their place when rightly directed and in the right spirit, but insuring heaven to none whose principles are essentially wrong. Who more regular or more fervent in their devotions than the Pharisees of old, or who more zealous than

they, or who could boast of more works of benevolence? And yet none of these things withheld the meek and lowly Jesus from a public exposure of their principles and of their hypocrisy, the fruit of their principles. But we need not argue this point, which it would be easy to establish by a thousand familiar examples. Such, indeed, is the tendency of corrupt human nature, that the exposure of wrong principles leads to one or another of two results: either their abandonment, to be replaced by right principles,—and this gives to the gospel its fruit as “a savor of life unto life;” or their exposure rivets these principles more firmly upon the heart, becoming worse instead of better, and ending in proving “a savor of death unto death.” The Provincial Letters of Pascal, for example, in which he exposed the principles of Jesuit morality, may have had both of these effects. It may have been one of the instruments which led to their expulsion from the main kingdoms of Europe, and to the temporary suppression of the Order. But we have never learned that these Letters had any effect upon the Order itself of a reformatory character, terminating in the disavowal of their false principles, or in the laying aside of their enmity to the doctrines of grace. The reinstated Order is perhaps more bitter and uncompromising and erroneous than ever. Many a time Rome has seen the necessity of reform, and has labored hard to effect it, but without success. In the Tridentine Council, much the larger part of its records are occupied with this general subject; but as she struck not at the root, as her principles were retained, unaltered and unalterable—*semper et ubique*—save in a further development of her antagonism to the principles of the gospel, she stands now where she stood then, only a little more mature in her errors than she was when the Reformers of the sixteenth century uttered and maintained their solemn protest against her.

But what of Protestantism? Is it what it was in by-gone days? what it was in its youth and vigor and early manhood, when it marshalled its forces to battle with consummate skill, never surrendering its ground, and, though comparatively weak in numbers, achieving remarkable victories over her most puissant foe? What is it now? It is in a sad, a hopeless plight, if

we may believe a late distinguished prelate of the Papal Church. Let us remember that *fas est et ab hoste doceri*; and as we read, let us look well to our armor, and resolve, as our fathers did, to trust alone to "the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God."

"Protestantism," says Archbishop Hughes, "is drifting, or rather has drifted, in all directions from its primeval and central moorings. True, it still professes to cling to the Bible as its anchor; but thread by thread and twist by twist, its friends have been rending the cable by the strength of which it supposed itself riding in safety. The Bible among Protestants has been a common anchor for religious error, as well as for religious truth. Accordingly, when we reflect on the success with which Mormonism, Millerism, and other extravagances, have recently appealed to Protestantism for sympathy and sustenance, we are forced to conclude that, so far as the truth of revelation and religion are concerned, the Protestant mind has been weakened by the successive shocks which it has had to undergo, and is wearing down by the daily abrasions and attritions to which it is exposed between the bold enunciation of religious error, claiming a biblical sanction, on one side, and the ambiguous, timid, and stammering defence of religious truth, on the other. It began its own unhappy career by rejecting "the cloud by day;" and having thus violated the condition on which the privilege of guidance was vouchsafed to man by pitying heaven, the 'pillar of fire by night' has equally disappeared from its vision. If the Protestant mind be itself thus debilitated and defenceless, how can it protect Christianity against the stealthy and subtle approaches of the passion-god which the spirit of error is now introducing among men—to be worshipped under the name of 'Humanity?'"*

We introduce our comments upon this extract by sincerely thanking the Archbishop for manifesting a much juster discrimination than writers of his school are wont to exhibit. He has not, as they generally do, made Protestantism answerable for the errors of "Mormonism and Millerism, and other extravagances."

* See Introduction to "Religion in Society, by Abbe Martinet," vol. i., p. 6.

He has only represented these errorists as appealing to Protestantism "for sympathy and sustenance." And again we thank him for the implied admission that Protestantism is the defender of religious truth, with this single exception, that it has rejected "the cloud by day"—the Catholic Church—under whose guidance alone there is safety. And we thank him once more for the graphic sketch which he has given us of the Charybdis through which our *weakened* craft is still *drifting*, with its perils on the right hand and its perils on the left. And being thus forewarned by one of the most vigilant and skilful of our opponents, it will be our own fault if we do not return at once to our original moorings.

There is a familiar optical illusion which may serve to illustrate the actual position both of the observed and the observer. As in a drifting craft the observer may be insensible of his own progress, while he fancies all he sees to be moving in a contrary direction, so may it be with Protestantism. It may be drifting fast and far, while its friends think it firm as the everlasting hills. So possibly, from the archbishop's point of view, himself on a craft which has drifted to an immense distance from the primeval harbor, and is still drifting with amazing rapidity, as the *variations* and *developments* already noticed abundantly prove, he may imagine his faith a fixture, stable as the rock of ages, and Protestantism as floating, while the reverse may be true. But let not Protestantism be tempted to remissness by this illustration; let it rather correct its illusions by a steadfast and uncompromising adherence to its principles.

That religious error should "claim a biblical sanction," is "no new thing under the sun." The arch-tempter himself resorted to that artifice in his assault upon the "Son of Man," and was completely foiled by the same weapon in the hands of his victor. The Pharisees and the Sadducees relied constantly upon Scripture to sustain them in their opposition to the teaching and claims of the Saviour; and it was always by Scripture that they were discomfited and finally silenced. And who were they but the advocates of "religious error," who, in the days of the apostles, "wrested the Scriptures to their own destruction?" The Judaiz-

ing teachers all did it. And though the Bible is a proscribed book in the "Catholic Church," we have never yet met a layman of that communion who had not Scripture at command to support his faith. We never once heard them appeal to "the authority of the Church," but always to "the authority of God." Their obedience to the authority of the Church was always the result of what they had been taught to believe was scriptural authority. But when these authorities conflict, as they often do, what umpire is to decide the questions between them? Is it reason? Is it philosophy? Is it common sense? All these, like the witnesses at the trial of the Saviour, as they cannot agree among themselves, compel us to look elsewhere for an authority which is supreme and infallible. And as the authority of Rome is, at the best, a very questionable matter, though she claims it for herself; and as she has not yet drifted so far as positively to deny the authority of Scripture, there remains no other umpire—no other umpire that is supreme and infallible—but the Bible itself, in the conflict between truth and error.

The archbishop well knew that this was the umpire to which the Protestantism of the sixteenth century constantly appealed in its contest with Rome; and he well knew that it was by these appeals to the authority of Scripture alone that it gained many conquests over principalities and powers and prejudices, and prescription and pride and self-interest, and the customs and usages of many generations. And it would have been a wonder passing strange, if, in all things, it had strictly adhered to the Protestant principle: for the Reformers were but men, naturally fallible as other men, subject to like passions and prejudices. And it was no easy task for them to throw off at once all rites, all laws, all doctrines, all customs and usages, for which they could not find an explicit warrant in the word of God, and to substitute in their place the simple rites and ordinances of the gospel. Amid all the temptations, both from within and without, to swerve from the faith, we look back with wonder and gratitude at their achievements—so great, so scriptural in most respects, and presenting in so remarkable a degree "the marrow and the fatness of the gospel," not only the letter but the

spirit of primitive Christianity. It was the inner life, more than the outward work, that gave to the Reformation its distinctive and exalted character—the faith, the hope, the peace, the joy, both living and dying, so widely extended, proving it to be pre-eminently the work of God.

But the Protestantism of the Reformation had its imperfections—imperfections which have cleaved to it until now. In the primitive Church, there was a complete severance between the Church and the world. “Come out from among them, and be ye separate,” was an injunction which was literally obeyed by the churches which the apostles planted. But as in the Roman, so in Protestant Churches—the severance between the Church and the world, if made at all, was very incomplete. And under national establishments, the Protestantism, especially of Europe, has been groaning, shorn of its chief strength from that day to this. And even in this land, where no such unnatural and unscriptural union legally exists, the influence of this false principle is seen in the truckling subserviency which the courts of the Church have sometimes paid to “the powers that be.” To honor them is right, to obey them is right, when this obedience violates no law of God. But Christ never gave to his Church any politico-ecclesiastical authority to decide for his people to whom civil allegiance is due, and to punish them for disobedience to their behests. *

The slightest glance at the history of Protestantism clearly shows the sad effects of such a union. The Protestantism of the Anglican Church, with her papal liturgy, is but half Protestant—if it can claim as much as half. The Protestantism of the continental Churches, relying, as its ministry do, upon State patronage for their support, is but a weak and decrepid offspring of

* It would not be difficult for the Northern General Assembly to find precedents in the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland for the acts to which we of the South have objected. For “there are recorded in its books,” says the *Edinburgh Review*, April, 1849, p. 473, “several prosecutions of parties suspected of rebellion, or of harboring rebels in 1715; and on many public occasions it assumed much more the tone of an estate of the realm than merely a court of the Church.”

its hale and sturdy progenitors. And even the Protestantism of Scotland is less vigorous and manly than it would have been but for the *regium donum*,—"the loaves and the fishes,"—after which the Free Church even has had a hankering ever since it severed its connexion with the State in 1843.* And we very much question whether Protestantism in France has not lost more, much more, than it has gained by the edict of Napoleon I., which gave the same right to Protestant as to Roman Catholic ministers to draw upon the public treasury. Prior to the revocation of the edict of Nantes, Protestantism, though oppressed and persecuted, was a power in France which it has never since been; and from some recent reports we fear that it is on the decline.

But, instead of being discouraged by such a survey, let us return at once to our original moorings, and if "thread by thread and twist by twist" of the cable which was our security in past times has been undone or broken, we may take consolation in the belief that they are not undone and broken beyond repair. We may still "hope in God's word." But hope implies desire, expectation, patience, and joy. With this anchor sure and steadfast, and with "the word of God" as its foundation, drift who may and when they may, Protestantism, if true to its principles, is safe. But it is bastard and not true Protestantism

*The General Assembly of the Established Church of Scotland is opened by the Queen's Commissioner, and as it cannot sit but about a week, it appoints a Commission to complete its unfinished business. In our General Assembly of 1855, a strenuous effort was made to engraft this feature of the Scotch Church upon ours, for the trial of judicial cases; but it was put to rest by the report of the Judicial Committee, and has never been heard of since. The *regium donum* is a Crown gift of £2,000 a year, which the Assembly of the Established Church very thankfully receives; and for this and other favors from the State, she suffers the civil tribunals to interfere in her ecclesiastical affairs—such as the induction of ministers into churches whom the people would exclude. The Free Church, though protesting against this interference and separating from the Establishment on that ground, has shown a strong desire, notwithstanding, to participate in the royal bounty. But if they should receive it, would they be any longer free? Governmental interference has invariably followed, sooner or later, governmental gifts.

which extends either sympathy or sustenance to religious error, though it comes clothed as "an angel of light." And here is our great danger. It is the great danger which true Christianity has always had to encounter. The march of the foe is always stealthy and subtle, whenever he would tempt us by art, or by music, or by philosophy, or by reason, or by humanity, or by any of his thousand other devices, to give place for a moment to any substitute for the only "lamp to our feet" and the only "light to our path" which "pitying heaven has vouchsafed to man." We have said that our hope is in God's word; but this word, to avail us, must be sealed to the understanding and the heart by the power of the Holy Ghost. This word, thus applied, though the "Protestant mind" may seem now weakened, and its defences of the truth "ambiguous and timid and stammering," will yet grind into powder every authority that exalteth itself against it, be it the "passion-god," or be it the power—"the growth of ages"—which affects to hold at its disposal the keys of the kingdom of heaven.

ARTICLE IV.

THE CONDITIONS OF SUCCESS IN STUDY.

Bishop Butler maintains "that *the present world is peculiarly fit to be a state of discipline for our improvement in virtue and piety.*" He frankly admits, however, that very few avail themselves of the opportunities it affords. "Indeed," says he, "the present state is so far from proving, in event, a discipline of virtue to the generality of men, that, on the contrary, they seem to make it a discipline of vice." Here is a grave difficulty. He removes it in the following way: "But that the present world does not actually become a state of moral discipline to many, even to the generality—*i. e.*, that they do not improve or grow better in it—cannot be urged as a proof that it was not intended

for moral discipline by any who at all observe the analogy of nature. For of the numerous seeds of vegetables and bodies of animals which are adapted and put in the way to improve to such a point or state of natural maturity and perfection, we do not see perhaps that one in a million actually does. Far the greatest part of them decay before they are improved to it, and appear to be absolutely destroyed. Yet no one, who does not deny all final causes, will deny that those seeds and bodies which do attain to that point of maturity and perfection answer the end for which they were really designed by nature; and therefore that nature designed them for such perfection. And I cannot forbear adding, though it is not to the present purpose, that the appearance of such an amazing waste in nature, with respect to these seeds and bodies, by foreign causes, is to us as unaccountable as, what is much more terrible, the present and future ruin of so many moral agents by themselves—*i. e.*, by vice."

We may lawfully carry this mode of reasoning into another sphere. The mind of man is adapted to the acquisition of knowledge. It is as distinctly organised with reference to knowledge as the eye is with reference to sight. Our position in this world is favorable to the development of the faculties of the mind and to the acquisition of useful knowledge. The material of this knowledge is offered to us in the works of God, in his word, and in the recorded experience of mankind. Motives of the most exalted and the most practical kind are not wanting to engage attention and sustain application. The splendid achievements of a few show us what can be accomplished. But when we survey the condition of the world, we are forced to lament the same appearance of waste in the world of mind which Bishop Butler notices in the moral and material sphere. Only a few appreciate the value of knowledge. This small number is again reduced by the want of opportunity. And of the few who have a thirst for knowledge and the means of acquiring it, only a fraction can be considered successful students. The cause of waste in the material world we cannot determine. It belongs to the scheme of providence. The cause of waste in the moral sphere we know. It is sin. The cause of waste in mind is

also, in a good degree, known. It is the violation of the law of the mind. If the conditions of success in study were observed, a great deal of this intellectual waste might be prevented. Let us however, not forget that even then "the race is not to the swift nor the battle to the strong... but time and chance happeneth to them all."

1. The first condition of success in study we mention is love of truth. With all our commendations of the beauty, the glory and the excellence of truth, it is not saying too much to affirm that the earnest pursuit of truth, for its own sake, is of rare occurrence amongst men. The dispute about the mode of investigating truth, the existence of error, and the false importance attached to some departments of inquiry, evince a disorder in the understanding as clearly as obliquity in conduct manifests depravity of heart. The history of schools of philosophy, sects in religion, and parties in politics, displays how much the world is governed by prejudice, passion, and false zeal. And our own experience testifies how largely vanity, ambition, and love of applause, enter into our motives as students. Self-affirmation and self-seeking follow us even to the study; and if truth is not sought simply as a means to a selfish end, we are at least liable to pay her a divided homage.

Locke, who was a brilliant example of the spirit he inculcated, lays down two rules to guide our efforts in search of truth. "First, a man must not be in love with any opinion, or wish to be true till he knows it to be so." "Secondly, he must test whether his principles be certainly true or not." "In these two things, an equal indifference for all truth, and in the examination of our principles, consists the freedom of the understanding."

Under the first rule, Locke exhibits that state of mind best adapted to inquiry, and least liable to error. The indifference of which he speaks is not an indifference to the truth itself, but an indifference as to what shall appear to be truth. Nor does he commend a spirit which is indifferent to the vigorous search for the truth. Under the heads Presumption, Despondency, and Perseverance, he rebukes that overweening confidence in one

parts which abjures inquiry, encourages the timid spirit, and enjoins unyielding pursuit. He would have us free from lethargy and timidity on the one hand, and partiality, bias, and presumption on the other. The mind forestalled by prejudice, involved by interest, or influenced with passion, is insensible to the force of argument or the weight of testimony. In order to learn, the mind must be candid, clear, and earnest.

The second direction given by Locke is designed to shield the mind from imposition. It is embraced in the maxim that assent is to be graduated by evidence. Evidence is the light by which our judgments are to be guided. According as the evidence is partial or full, doubtful or certain, cloudy or clear, the assent is to range from the lowest probability to the highest moral certainty.

In order that our assent may be graduated by evidence, it is necessary that we employ the right standard of evidence and be in full possession of all the testimony. The mind exploring the realms of knowledge without a proper standard of belief, is like a vessel at sea without a compass or a rudder. It has nothing by which to determine its bearings or steer its course. The danger of not applying the proper standard is great. We come to years of study not utterly ignorant, but perverted. The circumstances under which our mental and moral character has been moulded furnish the mind with beliefs through which, as a prism, it views questions as they are presented. Thus previous education often supplies us with maxims which we take for the original data of the mind. Authority, too, often stands for proof. The text-book becomes the limit of inquiry. We seek to determine, not what is true, but what the author says. Custom, too, is a popular standard. The majority of men take their notions of the honorable and dishonorable, the true and false, the right and wrong, from the prevailing opinions of the age. Errors are thus perpetuated from age to age. It requires the courage of a reformer to rise above the dictates of custom and subject current opinion to the proper test. Such men usually receive from their contemporaries contempt and persecution; but posterity accords them justice. The mind is not a blank to be

impressed; nor is it a slave to the dictum of superiors. It is not merely a lumber-room for opinions; but every mind is fully equipped for the pursuit of truth. We carry about with us the touchstone of truth. If we cannot determine the truth by fair and thorough inquiry, our mind is useless, the thirst for knowledge is a mockery, and responsibility for opinions impossible.

If this love of truth were the motive in study, our progress would be incalculable. Books would no longer be hateful, study would no longer be irksome, vanity and ambition would be discarded, and mental dissipation at an end. We would come to truth as to the fountain of intellectual life. Its waters would be sweet and refreshing. Under the exhilarating effect of truth, we would go on from victory to victory, until we had proved all things and were possessors of the good. A distinguished writer has said: "To the man who from the ranks raises himself to a seat among princes, or who becomes a prince amongst princes, we attribute not only great powers of mind, but a restless ambition and its cognate impulses. Meanwhile, we imagine the philosopher to be so constituted as that mere reason is the whole of his nature; yet, in truth, the difference between Alexander and Aristotle, between Cromwell and Newton, between Napoleon and La Place, is not that of natural power, *with* or *without* emotional energies, but it is between one species of emotion and another: it is between impetuous and strong passions on the one side, and deep sensibilities towards truth on the other side."

2. The second condition of success in study we mention is humility. The powers of the human mind are a wonder even to itself. To speak of their reach, their vigor, and their accuracy, has been the pride of philosophers of every age. The mind, even under the mantle of sin, is the noblest part of creation. Its achievements, peaceful as they have been, constitute the glory of the race. There is no department of inquiry it has left untouched. Prompted by a desire to know, it has gone forth in every direction. It has determined the structure and laws of the material universe; the number, magnitude, and distance of the planets. Turning from those dizzy heights, it has descended into the bowels of the earth, deciphered the hieroglyphics of

former ages, read the history of the successive changes that have taken place in the physical structure of the globe, and held converse with extinct races. It has subdued the elements of nature, and made them the ministers and servants of society. Turning to the survey of itself, it has investigated the mode of its own operations, determined its own structure and parts, and proved the best means of its own discipline. Indeed, it is easier to say what it has not done than what it has.

Just, however, as these encomiums on the mind certainly are, there is yet a limit to its achievements. There are spheres of knowledge to which it is entirely incompetent, as unable to speculate upon as the blind man to speculate upon colors, or the deaf man concerning sounds. All human knowledge is relative and phenomenal. We know nothing of things except as they appear. Of the essence of things we are ignorant. It is within the apparent we are to labor. Things are to us as they seem. God has said to the human mind, "Hitherto shalt thou come and no farther." It has been the bane of philosophy that it has attempted things beyond the reach of finite intelligence. Guided by a thirst for knowledge, which was fatal to our first parents, and stimulated by that selfishness which is the essence of sin, it has attempted to explore the whole domain of truth. These irreverent aspirations have filled the history of philosophy with great confusion and lamentable failures. Omniscience belongs to God alone.

To be successful students, we must confine our inquiries within the limits God has assigned them. It is remarkable that the world owes that masterly work of John Locke, on the human understanding, to a reflection on this very fact. Its author says: "Some friends meeting at my chamber, we were discussing a subject widely different from this; but finding we made little progress, it occurred to me we commenced wrong—that it would be best to inquire first what was the sphere of human knowledge; what the mind was capable of knowing, and what it was not."

It is not proper, however, to attempt at once everything that is attainable. The mind, like the body, has its periods. The tender and elastic body of a child is strengthened by sports and

frolics; but the regular and severe toil of manhood would overtask its energies and cripple its growth. The body must be inured to toil by degrees. So the mind at all periods is not fit to grapple with all legitimate questions. Haste and impatience are characteristics of this age. The young are disposed to depreciate the day of small things. They would overleap the period of youth, forego its appropriate duties, and spring at a single bound on the arena of active manhood. But if we wish to be men and women, we must first be boys and girls. If we desire to be scholars, we must consent to be students.

3. The third condition of success in study we mention is labor. The primeval curse, "In the sweat of thy brow shalt thou eat bread," is upon us all. The habit of labor is essential to success every where.

This is true of the physical world. The foundation of national wealth and liberty is laid in tilling industriously the soil. Credit will never supply the place of the products of the ground. The independence which arises from the consciousness of having earned one's own bread is the parent of liberty and the terror of tyrants. It is the loiterer whose hand is open to the bribe, and whose neck will submit to the yoke.

It is true of the moral world. Virtue requires courage and energy. "Better is he that ruleth his spirit, than he that taketh a city." It is easy to let loose the tiger in our hearts, but it is hard to deny the uneasiness of evil desire, to beat down insurgent appetite, to crucify a bitter passion, to keep an unbroken watch against subtle temptation, and to remain steadfast with the faithful few against the jeers of the multitude. Fabricius, with his dinner of herbs, having sent back the bribes of Pyrrhus, shows a better dignity than Coriolanus at the head of the Volscians before affrighted Rome. Moral heroism is sublime; but it is the result of much suffering and much labor. The martyr is not made at the stake. The glorified now rest from their labors. Our Saviour "went about doing good."

It is true of the intellectual world. The heights of science are steep. It has passed into a proverb, that precocious youth seldom leads to able manhood. Physiologists may say that the

brain is overwrought; but the true reason, in most instances, is the lack of the habit of application. Facility of memory and quickness of perception allow much time for hurtful leisure. By degrees, a contempt is engendered for close and continuous study. And in after life, when success depends upon perseverance, the dunce of the class may take the lead in respectable usefulness. Success in study is due, in a great measure, to strict application and rigid abstraction. The student must obtain the mastery of the senses, passions, and faculties of knowledge. We may not shrink from labor. "Much study is a weariness to the flesh." But there is no royal road to learning. In intellectual, as in material pursuits, "the hand of the diligent maketh rich."

ARTICLE V.

A DENIAL OF DIVINE RIGHT FOR ORGANS IN PUBLIC WORSHIP.

An article in favor of organs, as instruments to praise God with, appeared in the last number of this REVIEW, from the pen of one of our most learned and eminent ministers. It may be fairly considered, therefore, (especially as it is well known that he has given years of meditation and research to the subject,) the embodiment of all that can be said on that side of the question. We propose to give the essay a candid and fair examination.

Dr. Smyth begins his argument for the use of machines in God's worship, with this statement: "It is by no means improbable that the mystic words attributed to Jubal," [*Lamech?*] (see Gen. iv. 23,) "*may be* [his own Italics] 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 he refers, apparently as authority for this conjecture, to "Smith's Dictionary of the Bible—Art. Jubal." That article says nothing like this. The article Lamech also, amongst various

explanations of this poem, makes no suggestion such as Dr. Smyth has allowed himself to ascribe to this work. The article concludes thus: "Herder regards it as Lamech's song of exultation on the invention of the sword by his son, Tubal Cain, in the possession of which he foresaw a great advantage to himself and his family over any enemies. This interpretation appears, on the whole, to be the best that has been suggested. * * * * This much is certain, that they are vaunting words, in which Lamech seems from Cain's indemnity to encourage himself in violence and wickedness."

From this altogether unsupported conjecture about Lamech's adapting his "penitential song" to one of Jubal's organs, our author immediately draws the weighty conclusion: "From the beginning, therefore, instrumental music, both mechanical and vocal, has been consecrated to God's worship in the aid of penitence and piety."

Waxing rapidly stronger as he advances, his very next sentence is: "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 every economy* [the Italics his own] of the church militant," etc. He even pretends to identify Jubal's organ with ours, declaring *this* to be "the most ancient of all" instruments. It is named, he says, in Job xxi. 12; we will not dispute it—that is an account of the music of the wicked. It is named, he says, Daniel iii. 5; suppose it be so—what of it? That is a description of Nebuchadnezzar's idol-instruments of music. Again, he says it is named in Psalms lvii. 8; but *our* Hebrew Bible does not read so. He says, once more, it is named in Psalms cl. but that is not exactly the same word. He may find it named in Job xxx. 31. But no where else in the Hebrew Scriptures, we believe, except in these three or four places, is this instrument mentioned. In truth, we know little, and Dr. Smyth knows little, (and that little not very good,) about Jubal's *organ*; but one thing is to be remarked—Lightfoot, in his elaborate description of the instruments of music in the temple

* Lightfoot on the Temple Service, chap. vii. sec. ii.

does not mention it at all; so that, even if it were identical with our organ, it does not seem to have got access to the house of God. It may serve to moderate Dr. Smyth's confidence in his opinion of the organ's being undoubtedly a development of Jubal's instrument, if we add that Smith's Dictionary gives reasons for identifying the *huggab* with "Pan's pipe;" also with the Italian *viola de gamba*, which is in the form of a fiddle, and is played on with a bow of horse hair; and also, thirdly, with the psaltery; and, fourthly, with the dulcimer, which last two are perhaps something like the modern guitar.

Recurring to our author's introductory statement respecting instrumental music, we would observe, that in the sequel and throughout the whole article, there is absolutely no evidence whatever furnished for his extraordinary theory. Building it on a "by no means improbable *may be*," he leaves it to stand alone, without any attempt at proof to keep it from falling. Some few irrelevant quotations from authorities of little weight in this discussion (such as Prof. Bush, the poet James Montgomery, and the pagan author Plutarch) are brought in, with frequent poetical extracts, the whole filling up six pages: but not a particle of evidence is offered to substantiate that opening conjecture nor the bold assertions founded thereupon!

The next eight or ten pages of this article contain nothing upon which it is necessary for us to make any comment, except that we cordially agree with the greater part of the distinguished author's sentiments as therein expressed. We join with him in urging upon every individual his duty, if possible, to take part in the praise of God publicly by joining in the singing. We iterate what he says, (p. 528,) that "in our Presbyterian churches this is the only portion of worship in which the people generally can take an active and audible part;" and we add, that this is now one great objection to the organ and the choir, that they do tend, both of them and either of them, to rob the people of this, their ancient privilege: and that like complaints are made in the Church of old. (See Bingham's *Christian Antiquities*, Book III., chap. vii., sec. ii., and Book XIV., chap. sec. xiii.; and also Kurtz's *Text Book of Church History*,

vol. i., p. 234.) We particularly like what Dr. Smyth says of the relation in which the praises of God stand to "the responsible direction and the supervision of the spiritual officers of the Church." We join with him in protesting that "it must therefore be considered as a most serious and fatal mistake when the whole order and arrangement and control" of this matter "is left so entirely, as it is in many of our congregations, to the choir or the corporation, instead of the spiritual government of the Church." (P. 529.) In the Presbyterian Church, it is not the business of the *congregation, directly*, or of any fraction of the congregation, to regulate the praise of God. As well might they undertake to direct what instructions should issue from the pulpit, or what decisions the session must make upon matters of church discipline. Independency commits these affairs to the people directly, but our church government does not. The idea of the congregation's meeting together and deciding to introduce or to exclude instrumental music; of their assembling to appoint a performer on the instrument, whether of good or of bad principles and morals; and the idea of a few members of the congregation, whether young or old, male or female, professors or non-professors of religion, assuming without a call from the rulers of God's house to direct and control the methods of his awful praise, are quite subversive of Presbyterianism. Dr. Smyth would render a good service to the Church, if he would exert himself to procure a deliverance on this particular point, agreeable to his views, from our church courts, and to have it enforced.

We come at length to perceive clearly the use which our author designed to make of his introductory conjecture. On page 530, we read: "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." Is he about to furnish the needful proof of his first assertion, as might now be expected? Not at all. He is only repeating his original assertion, for the sake of the impression he hopes to

make by it upon the mind, expecting the reader to be satisfied with his repetition of the assertion; and designing to draw from it the inference that mechanical praise once established by divine authority, an express prohibition of it from God is necessary to its abrogation. Again and again, therefore, we find this mere empty assertion repeated, and the baseless inference again and again made, that the Christian Church is not to be restricted to praise with the human voice alone, without positive injunction in the Scripture to that effect. And thus we are brought to Part II. of the essay: THE DIVINE RIGHT ESTABLISHED AND OBJECTIONS MET.

The author's *first argument* in favor of a divine right for using mechanical instruments in God's worship, is its accordance with the feelings and the practice of men, which he chooses to characterise as "the best feelings and most sacred and holy practice of men in all ages."

Dr. Smyth refers upon this point to the admissions of "*The London Ministers.*" Now, we are willing to accept what the authors of that celebrated treatise did really say on this subject; but it appears to us that our author has not exactly apprehended their meaning. They properly represent the light of nature as mere "relics," "fragments," and "glimmerings" of the original light; and they say truly, "So far as this light of nature, after the fall, is a true relic of the light of nature before the fall, that which is according to this light may be counted of divine right in matters of religion." It is not "the light of nature," but "the true light of nature" they value: just as we always distinguish between reason and *right* reason. Our author himself had told us (p. 259) that "man is by nature carnal, worldly, formal, and ritualistic in his spirit and taste." It is not, therefore, what this carnal and ritualistic taste approves in worship that can be said to be in accordance with the "true" light of nature. The London ministers say rightly (Part I., chap. ii., p. 23): "All human inventions herein, (that is, in doctrine, worship, or government,) whether devised of our own hearts or derived as traditions from others, are incompatible and inconsistent herewith [that is, with divine right]; vain in themselves and to

all that use them, and condemned of God." Surely Dr. Smyth does not need to be informed that every religious doctrine, and every religious institute which man's heart devises has always been and must always be abominable before God.

The *second argument* of our author is from Scripture examples. But most of these are from the Old Testament, and so we pass them by in silence. He comes at length to the New Testament argument, and we look now to see him put forth his strength. We expect at least several pages of solid Scripture reasoning. We are put off with only two pages, (pp. 543, 545,) not very solid, nor very scriptural. First and foremost, the introductory *conjecture* about Jubal, that had no proof, is appealed to. Instruments have been lawful under all former dispensations, and a prohibition is now requisite before they can be condemned. What a pity the author had not taken more pains with the foundation work of his edifice! Evidently he himself is not satisfied with it; but he proceeds to adduce his examples from the Gospels. These are of course very few, and the proof they furnish rather slender. Let us examine them.

The first is from our Saviour's "uttering no reproof" to the minstrels in the ruler's house; as though he must be understood to approve all which he did not in words reprove, and as though we could argue from his tolerating the hiring of minstrels for mourning in private houses to his sanction of the use of instruments in God's house. In point of fact, however, Dr. Smyth cannot say that our Lord uttered no reproof whatever; for Mark, narrating this same event, tells us that Jesus saw the tumult made by those noisy minstrels, and said to them, "Why make ye this ado?" and then put them all out of the house. (Mark v. 38, 39.) His first example, therefore, breaks down completely under the weight he requires it to carry.

The second example is where Jesus "does not hesitate to *liken himself* unto children calling to their fellows and saying, We have piped unto you, and ye have not danced," etc. Dr. Smyth says, in Italics, that Jesus likened *himself* to these children; but Matthew says he likened *that generation* to those children. Surely, however, this example, even if Christ's comparison had

been of *himself*, furnishes but slender proof for the use of machines in God's worship. It proves too much for Dr. Smyth; for it makes out, on his principle of interpretation, the divine right of dancing as well as organs in the house of God.

The third example is from the use of music on the return of the prodigal son; as though we could reason from such private customs of the Jews to the public worship of God. But we may say of this example, also, that it proves too much for Dr. Smyth. It warrants dancing as much as instruments in the house of God, for they are mentioned in the parable together.

Now, after searching the New Testament diligently for "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," (p. 537,) these three are all which our author is able to adduce. Let the reader consider them attentively, for they constitute the whole argument, from New Testament examples, for the divine right of machines in the worship of the New Testament Church. The noisy minstrels, whom Jesus *did* reprove, used instruments of music; the children in the market places piped and danced; and the prodigal's father rejoiced with music and dancing; and therefore the organ is of divine right in the Church!! Would not Dr. Smyth's argument have been a little better, if he had not made any appeal to New Testament examples at all?

Our author next refers to the symbolical representations in the Book of Revelation: "John saw and heard harpers in heaven." We need only remark, that if the Lord shall actually give his saints real harps to harp his praises on when they reach the upper sanctuary, they will, of course, have the highest divine right to be *there* used. All that is lacking in the divine right *here* is the commandment of the Lord by his apostles, either preceptively or by example. But with reference to the harps mentioned in this symbolical book, let it not be forgotten, that as truly as John saw *harpers*, so truly he saw a *lamb* in the midst of them, and that a *lamb as it had been slain*. Manifestly, it will not do to press any argument from these symbols, or it might be proved that the redeemed in heaven worship a

lamb in its blood, and also that we might introduce such an object of worship into our churches now. So also it might be proved that we should all be clothed in white robes and have branches of palm in our hands whenever we assemble in the house of God.

Dr. Smyth attempts only one more proof from the New Testament. It is founded upon Eph. v. 19 and Col. iii. 16, where "psalms and hymns and spiritual songs and melody in the heart to the Lord, and singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord," are enjoined. He argues that psalms were anciently sung with musical instruments, "and must, therefore, to be sung with perfect propriety, be still united with instrumental music." (P. 544.) But the apostles did not sing them with instrumental accompaniments, and was their singing therefore not "with perfect propriety?" And our Lord sang one of them with his disciples just before he was crucified, with no instrument accompanying; and was his singing, too, therefore not "with perfect propriety?"

But our author argues from the etymological derivation of ψάλλοντες (which is the touching or striking of the chords of a stringed instrument,) that we must praise God with machines. The difficulty with his argument is this: the word ψάλλοντες here is not used alone, but the apostle connects with it τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμῶν τῷ Κυρίῳ. And thus it is a *striking of the chords in our hearts to the Lord* which he commands; or, as our translators write it, "making melody in our hearts to the Lord." Indeed, the language of the apostle entirely excludes instruments, and authorises only praise with the voice; for he plainly tells us to *speak* to one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, and to *sing* and to strike the chords (not of harps, but) *of our hearts* to the Lord. We may well say, therefore: "*Non vox sed rotum; non musica chordula, sed cor; non clamans sed amans psallit in aure Dei.*"

But the Doctor brings in Poole's name, and would have us believe his views are sanctioned by that high authority. He will necessarily be understood by the reader as signifying that Poole asserts the word ψάλλοντες to allude to an instrumental accompaniment of the human voice in the apostolic Church!

As sometimes happens, however, when a writer is given to quoting, the very authority he appeals to is against him here. Upon this very passage, (Eph. v. 19,) Poole remarks as follows: "Psalms are songs, as those choice verses of David and others, which in the temple were accustomed to be fitted to harps and psalteries. In those are many things which Christians may profitably recite amongst Christians. But the *Response to the Orthodox No. 107*, by Justin, (or whoever the author may be,) teaches that the primitive Christians sang with the voice alone, not with any instruments accustomed to be added." *

* In the *Corpus Confessionum*, we have the *Orthodoxus Consensus* made up of testimonies from the fathers, and amongst them of Justin Martyr, who lived from A. D. 114 to A. D. 165. In Articulus x., p. 214, this sentence is attributed to him: "Ecclesia non cauit instrumentis inanimatis, sed cantu simplici." *The Church does not sing with inanimate instruments, but with simple singing.*

Referring to the book from which this is taken, viz., to the *Questiones et Responsiones ad Orthodoxos*, (published amongst his writings, though considered as not from Justin's pen,) we find the sentiment thus expressed in fullness: "Non cauero simpliciter parvulis convenit, sed cum inanimatis instrumentis canere et cum saltatione et crotalis: quare in ecclesiis resecur ex cauticis usus ejusmodi instrumentorum atque aliorum parvulis convenientium, ac simplex relictus est cautus." *Simple singing does not suit little children, but they must sing with inanimate instruments, and with dancing and clapping of hands; wherefore in our churches the use of that sort of instruments and of the other things which befit little children, is cut off, and simple singing is left.* The allusion evidently is to the puerile estate of the Jewish people, for whom, as children, instruments of music and things of that sort were provided. In the same way, Calvin speaks of instrumental music as "childish elements provided for the Jews as under age." See Comment. on Psalm xcii. 4. He adds: "Now that Christ has appeared and the Church has reached full age, it were only to bury the light of the gospel, should we introduce the shadows of a departed dispensation."

The "learned Joseph Bingham" himself, of the Church of England, gives a full account of the service of God's praise in the early Church. "From the first and apostolic age," he says, "singing was always a part of divine service in which the whole body of the Church joined together." "The whole assembly joined together; men, women, and children united with one mouth and one mind in singing psalms and praises to God. This was the most antient and general practice till the way of alternate psalmody was brought into the Church. Thus Christ and his apostles sung the

We have now considered the whole argument of Dr. Smyth, and we submit that he has not made a single point. Founding his edifice upon a mere conjecture, which will not bear the slightest examination, he argues all the way through from misconceptions and misapplications of Scripture. To show a divine warrant for using instruments in God's house under the Christian dispensation, he reasons, first, from what he conjectures may have occurred amongst the seed of the accursed Cain in their separation from the believing line of Seth; next, he builds on the feelings and tastes of our fallen nature; then he appeals to a variety of examples from the Old Testament—many irrelevant and not one of any force in the present discussion; coming after this to the New Testament, and professing thence to *establish* the divine right of instrumental music, it is the hired minstrels mourning and wailing, for show and for hire, in the ruler's house; and the children piping and dancing in the market place; and the mercenary musicians and dancers in the house of the prodigal's father, whom he would have our New Testament Church imitate, although we have inspired apostles to set us a different pattern of worship! Finally, the appeal is to some passages in the epistles of Paul, from which is wrung out a meaning which they

hymn at the last supper. and thus Paul and Silas at midnight sung praises unto God." The reader can find in Bingham's Antiquities a full account of that antiphonal singing which Dr. Smyth appears somehow in his argument to mix up so strangely with instrumental music. But he will also find, with this, the invectives of the fathers, quoted by Bingham, against the introduction of "secular musick into the grave and solemn devotions of the Church;" of "theatrical noise and gestures;" and of "singing after the fashion of the theatre in the Church." "Let the servant of Christ," says Jerome, "so order his singing that the words which are read may please more than the voice of the singer,"—an admonition which at once rebukes the levity of our choirs oftentimes, and condemns the very principle of any attempt, under a purely spiritual dispensation like the present, at praising God with solemn sounds which have no sense—mere wind. See Bingham's Antiquities, Book III., chapter vii., and Book XIV., chapter i. See also, for many interesting details of the history of psalmody and hymnology, Kurtz's Text Book of Church History, Vol. I., pp. 70, 124, 125, 233, 443, 481.

will not bear, and to a symbolic representation in the Revelation. And is our erudite divine forced to acknowledge that this is the whole of what can be said for the divine right of machinery in the praise of God?

We proceed now to set forth briefly the grounds upon which we object to instrumental music in the public worship of God. We say *the public worship of God*, because the question, as we discuss it, concerns nothing less and nothing else. In the language of John Owen, "it is of the instituted worship of his public assemblies that we treat." * In the private worship of the individual, there may be more liberty, because there is less rule. And we are commanded to stand fast in our liberty wherewith Christ has made us free. (Gal. v. 1.) Easy indeed is it for us to be "entangled again with the yoke of bondage," and dangerous to be volunteering the sacrifice of any portion of our freedom. Calvin says: "We are not forbidden indeed to employ musical instruments in private life, but they are banished out of the churches by the plain command of the Holy Spirit, when Paul, in 1 Cor. xiv. 13, lays it down as an invariable rule that we must praise God and pray to him only in a known tongue." † The same distinction he points out elsewhere, in these words: "Paul allows us to bless God in the public assembly of the saints only in a known tongue." ‡

To the following statement of principles we suppose true Presbyterians in general will cordially agree:

1. God is a jealous God: not less so now than he was under the former dispensation. God is also most holy, and cannot behold evil. Having violated law and become a fallen and polluted creature, man naturally could offer no greater insult to God than to draw nigh to him with institutes and forms of worship. Such presumption must provoke God to consume the insouciant offender. The offering of such worship at all to God by a fallen creature must, therefore, necessarily be a commanded thing, or else it will be insulting and wicked. In the very na-

* Discourse Concerning Liturgies, chap. ii., works vol. xix., p. 405.

† Comment on Psalm lxxi. 22.

‡ Comment on Psalm xxxiii. 2.

ture of the case, worship must originate not with man, but with God. It must not be a thing of man's invention, but of God's permission—nay, command; although, of course, the command might be general, and in many particulars the individual be left to the use of liberty.

But if God should condescend to set up his house on the earth, and to invite sinners into it for his worship; if he should take in hand to erect a Church in this world, which should be his chosen abode, where his people should enjoy the special manifestations of his presence; then might we expect to find him peculiarly jealous respecting all his own appointments in and for that house. Such an institute might be expected to be from beginning to end and in all its parts a positive one, having for its most essential feature and its most fundamental requisite a *Jus Divinum*. It follows that it would necessarily be a matter of pure revelation, and must always be practised precisely as revealed. Not earth-born, but descended from heaven, it would be not the offspring of our will, but of God's will made known. Our place would therefore be not to volunteer any additions to it, nor any improvements of it, but carefully to follow his directions concerning it. A most awful thing, this public worship of God would have to be paid by us in reverence and godly fear; not in a slavish but filial spirit. Now, God has done this very thing, and it becomes us to be afraid lest, by any corruption of his holy, revealed, public worship, we should prove to be offensive in his sight. He requires of us a docile spirit respecting the methods of our worship in his house. The reason why worship is so abominable is that it is essentially the offspring of irreverence and pride. Hence, the very thought of our undertaking to improve this institute of God ought to be dreadful to our minds. In vain could we hope to worship him acceptably according to the commandments or the devices of men. Such things have always been abominable with God, and he has repeatedly resented any intermeddling with his most sacred institutes.

The Scriptures furnish many signal instances of God's severity against those who, by ignorance or carelessness or wilful

neglect, have (to make use of John Owen's expression) "miscarried in not observing exactly his will and appointment in and about his worship." Such was the case of Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron (Levit. x. 1, 2); of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram (Numbers xvi. 3, 9, 32, 33); of Eli and his house, the iniquity of which was not to be purged with sacrifice nor offering forever (1 Sam. ii. 28-30, and iii. 14); of Uzza, in putting the ark into a cart when he should have borne it upon his shoulders,* (or perhaps for his rashness in touching it when shaken by the oxen,) referred to by the prophet David under the expressive phrase, "For that we sought him not after *the due order*" (1 Chron. xv. 13); of Uzziah the King, in venturing to volunteer the service of the priesthood in the very temple. (2 Chron. xxvi. 16.) In the revelation made by God to Moses respecting the tabernacle, and to David respecting the temple, God was very exact in the pattern each was to follow. (See Exodus xxv. 40, Numbers viii. 4, and 1 Chron. xxviii. 11, 19.) Indeed, throughout the whole history of God's Church on the earth, the acceptable worship of God has been always that which himself ordained. Man, having the breath of God in his nostrils and made in God's image, has the Sabbath given to him, and is placed in Eden with a specific revelation of God's will, and his own duty. When he sins, God teaches him how to worship by sacrifice. He manifests himself continually to those who, in faith, approach him thus with the sacrifice of blood. Thus to Adam, to Abel, to Seth, to Enoch, and to Noah, (but not to Cain nor to his immediate descendants, so far as we are informed, whether to Lamech or to Jubal.) God constantly reveals his will; and these and such as these constitute his Church upon the earth, calling on the name of the Lord and separated from unbelievers. In the matter of Noah's salvation by the ark, very specific directions were given, and he did "according unto all that the Lord commanded him." (Gen. vii. 5.) The religion practised by Abraham and his sons was a revealed one. It is by faith he leaves his country, dwells in tents, offers sacrifices, and practises circumcision. When we come down to Moses' time,

* See Owen's Short Catechism. Works, Vol. xix., p. 501.

God very expressly says to him: "Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it." (Deut. iv. 2, and xii. 32.) Of Jeroboam it is recorded that he made calves and made a house of high places and made priests, which were not of the sons of Levi, and ordained a feast like unto the feast in Judah, and appointed a month for it, which he "had *devised of his own heart.*" (1 Kings xii. 28, 31.) Of Israel it is said, they provoked God to anger with their own inventions. (Ps. cvi. 29, 39.) Jehovah denounces wrath and woe upon the people, because "their *fear* (that is, their worship) toward me is taught by the precept of men." (Isaiah xxix. 13.) Coming down to the times of our Lord, we hear him saying almost in the same words: "In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." (Matt. xv. 9, and Mark vii. 7.) Paul to the Colossians condemns all "will-worship," where the very idea he communicates is precisely this: that whatever in worship is volunteered, that is not commanded, is forbidden. (Col. ii. 18, 23.) Moreover, he proves that the tribe of Judah had nothing to do with Aaron's priesthood, from the *silence* of Moses: "of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning the priesthood." (Heb. vii. 14.) So that, in the words of an old divine, "we may use this apostolical argument against Popish inventions (and Protestant inventions, too): Neither Moses nor any other penman of Scripture spake any thing of worshipping God in such and such a manner; therefore these human appointments are no more acceptable to God than Uzziah's offering of incense."

2. In this aspect, God's worship appears to be just as far above the domination and control of man as are those other two divine institutes, viz., the doctrine and the discipline of his house. These three are equally of divine right; and alteration of either are equally dishonoring to God. All three are perfect and we insult him who reveals them whenever we pretend that either one of them needs improving, or that we are capable of mending it.

But God, who is the author of these three institutes, exercises his sovereign right of developing and completing the de-

trine and of altering at pleasure the forms and methods of the discipline and worship of his house. At first, every father of a family was the priest of it; then Aaron and his sons were called; now every Christian is a priest unto God. At first, sacrifices with blood were the most special and acceptable mode of worship to Jehovah; now they would be sins of the very deepest dye. Moreover, at first, these sacrifices were as acceptable to God in one place as in another; afterwards they were acceptable only when offered at the tabernacle, and after that again only at the temple; and to offer them elsewhere was extremely offensive to the august majesty of heaven. So, also, once there was a temple and a temple service divinely ordained, with its altars of sacrifice and incense, its priests of different grades, its holy and most holy places, with their different appurtenances; its purifications and its festivals; its choirs, its instruments of music, and all its gorgeous as well as complicated and burdensome ceremonial. But all these things were only for a time and a purpose. They were to be a schoolmaster to point to Christ and to train the Church, then childish and ignorant, for his coming. Then, when he came, it was abolished, and no part of it now remains. The Abrahamic covenant with its promises, and the government of the Church by elders and the simple forms of worship of the synagogue, continue and shall continue to the end, for so the New Testament teaches us. But we may not go back to the use of any part or parcel of what belonged to the temple. All of it might as well be introduced amongst us of the Christian Church, as any part of it. Once lawful, all of it, because commanded; now no part of it is lawful, because not commanded by the inspired apostles, either preceptively or in their example.

3. The only question open to us, then, respecting the divinely revealed doctrine, government, and worship, is, What did the apostles establish? Until they discharged their commission, all three of these institutes of God were yet incomplete; but it was their office to perfect and finish them. They were filled with the Holy Ghost, in order to complete the canon of Scripture; leaving then in our hands the whole word of God, unto which

which nothing is ever to be added. They were also inspired to organise the Christian Church and establish it in the world. They did so. Christ himself had ordained the Lord's supper and baptism. It was for the apostles to declare that these were to supplant circumcision and the passover. It was for them to declare the abolition of the ceremonial law and the confirmation of the moral. It was for them to make known the severance now and forever of Church and State, and that the Church was now to embrace Gentiles as well as Jews, and being no longer shut up in Judea, was to spread over the whole earth. It was for them to identify the Church of their day and of the whole future with the Church in Abraham; to proclaim the universal priesthood of believers and the sole eternal high-priesthood of Jesus; to make known a government by presbyters to be the only lawful rule in God's house, then and now, as of old; and to legalise for us and for the Church to the end—what forms of worship? the temple forms, or any portion of them? No! but the forms of another divine pattern lying far back of that. They gave us a copy of an ancient institute for the social and continual assembling of Israel every Sabbath and oftener, all over the land, in places convenient to them, and not, as in the distant temple at Jerusalem, only three times a year. They gave us for our model the synagogue worship, (as they did the synagogue government,) with its reading and preaching of the word, and its singing with the voice, without any instruments accompanying,* and its praying, and its fellowship in collections for the poor, and its discipline of charity and faithful love.

* Lightfoot says: "Every synagogue had its trumpet to publish the coming in of the New Year and the Sabbath day, and also the excommunication of any." Vitringa adds to these, the use of it for their "fast days." Lightfoot finds in no Jewish writer any account of the trumpet in the synagogue at almsgiving, and suggests that the Saviour spoke (Matt. vi. 2) metaphorically. In the *worship* of the synagogue of old, there appears to have been no use of instruments whatsoever, and it is inadmissible amongst the modern Jews, except where they forsake the strict rule of their ancient religion. But in the synagogue, Vitringa tells us, they made use of all "the moral worship of the temple, and sang God's praises with the voice;" and that "from the synagogue this practice was transferred to the orato-

Now, if it had been the pleasure of God that we should make use of machinery in his praise, why did he not so instruct these apostles? He has ever manifested his interest in all that concerns the worship of his sanctuary; nay, declares himself jealous about it. It was, of course, not ignorance on the part of the apostles which led them to adopt the simpler praise of the synagogue, instead of the instruments of the temple with which they were so familiar. Was it poverty? How easily, with the liberality of the churches in those days, could instruments of some sort—a harp or the psaltery, or some cymbals at least—have been provided in every congregation! Was it thoughtlessness or forgetfulness which caused their negligence and their silence? Impossible! They were the amanuenses of the Spirit! And yet they never commanded, either by precept or example, the use of any other instrument in praise but the human voice. Such is the teaching of men, sent by God, “*in these last times,*” to make known his sovereign pleasure respecting the worship of his sanctuary. There shall come no other teachers divinely inspired. The canon of Scripture is complete; the government and worship is established. And it is a solemn responsibility which any man assumes who ventures to add anything to the heavenly structure.

4. All which has been now said is agreeable to the doctrine of our fathers on the other side of the flood, that in the worship of God’s house, “*whatever is not commanded is forbidden.*” This doctrine flows necessarily out of the principle that God is the originator of worship and has himself revealed it to man. Nay, we must go further and apply this maxim to everything in religion, for religion is altogether devised and revealed by God. He

ries of the Christians.” Lightfoot also tells us that in the temple itself none but Levites were allowed “to join voices with the vocal music, which was the proper song and the proper service, but only to join with the instrumental;” a private person, if he had skill, might “put in with his instrument among the instruments,” but “among the voices he might not join, for that belonged only to the Levites.” (See Lightfoot’s *Exercitationes upon St. Matthew*, chap. vi. 2, and on the *Temple Service*, chap. vii. sec. ii. See also *Vitringa De Synagoga Vetere*, Lib. I., Par. I., cap. 10, and the *Prolegomena*, cap. 5 and cap. 6.)

is and must be its sole author, or else it is false and vain. Man had no part in originating it; nay, he has never of himself done any thing with it but corrupt it. And what is very remarkable, perhaps every one of the human corruptions of worship began in some apparently good way, and had its origin in the idea of improvement. To recommend Christianity to Jews and to Gentiles who considered it too bald and naked in its divine simplicity, "the Christian doctors (says Dr. Mosheim on the second century) thought they must introduce some external rites which would strike the senses of the people." (Vol. I., p. 133.) Pliny and Justin Martyr and Tertullian all describe the simplicity of Christian worship in the first two centuries; yet the temptation to mend it and improve it was already felt. What an excellent end, supposing the Almighty could consent to be assisted in his plans! Hence, "in order [we use Mosheim's words] to impart dignity to their religion," the mysteries of the Greeks and Orientals were imitated in the exclusion of all but the initiated from beholding baptism or the Lord's supper. In the third century, the passion for Platonic philosophy amongst the Christian teachers leads to exorcising the evil spirit out of the baptized. Early in the fourth century, Constantine adopts Christianity and undertakes to improve the worship as well as the government of the Church. Then is witnessed a great tendency to adorn church buildings with images of the saints, all intended to excite devotion, though operating really to bring in idolatry. By the time we get down to the period of Augustine and Ambrose, (which Dr. Smyth refers to with so much satisfaction, p. 546,) there is such a vast increase of rites and ceremonies springing out of this excellent desire to attract the Greeks and the Romans and the other nations to Christianity, that Mosheim tells us: "The observation of Augustine is well known, 'That the yoke once laid upon the Jews was more supportable than that laid on many Christians in his age.'" He adds: "There was of course little difference, in these times, between the public worship of the Christians and that of the Greeks and Romans. In both alike, there were splendid robes, mitres, tiaras, wax tapers, crosiers, processions, lustrations, images, golden and silver

vases, and numberless other things;" also, that "they supposed God, Christ, and the inhabitants of heaven, equally with us wretched mortals, to be delighted and captivated with external signs." (Vol. I., pp. 276, 7.) In his account of the fifth century, we read: "In some places, it was appointed that the praises of God should be sung continually, day and night, the singers succeeding each other without interruption; as if the Supreme Being took pleasure in clamor and noise and in the flatteries of men. The magnificence of the temples had no bounds." (Vol. I., pp. 351.) Of the sixth century, we read: "In proportion as true religion and piety, from various causes, declined in this century, the external signs of religion and piety—that is, rites and ceremonies—increased." And he speaks of "the new mode of administering the Lord's supper magnificently;" also of baptism now being only to be administered "on the greatest festivals." (Vol. I., pp. 413, 14.) So marched on the profane and wicked though "pious" attempts of well-meaning men to improve the institutes of God; culminating, at length, in the complete prostration of what the Almighty had set up, and the substitution for it, in his house, of a pagan system baptized into the Christian name! And yet, be it observed, so far down as we have traced the progress of these human improvements, there yet appears no sign of machinery to praise God with. That is the fruit of a later, and of course a grosser, development.

5. The doctrine of our forefathers, that whatever in religion is not commanded is forbidden, answers to the good old Protestant maxim, that the Scriptures are the sole and the sufficient rule of faith and practice. They are the sufficient rule—that is, they furnish every needful direction concerning either faith or practice. They are the sole rule—that is, no other rule is admissible. Not any thing is lawful for which you cannot produce a "Thus saith the Lord."

This doctrine is set forth in the Westminster Confession, which is ours, in these words: "The whole counsel of God concerning all things necessary for his own glory, man's salvation, faith, and life, is either expressly set down in Scripture, or by

good and necessary consequence may be deduced from Scripture; unto which nothing, at any time, is to be added, whether by new revelations of the Spirit or traditions of men." (Chap. i. 6.) All that concerns God's glory, which of course includes his *worship*, is in the Bible, and for us, in the New Testament; and unto what is there written, or thence deducible, nothing may be added. The Almighty has a definitive will or counsel respecting his worship, and he has revealed that counsel to us in the New Testament; and therefore we must not venture to attempt any improvements of it.

In like manner, our Larger Catechism sets down among the sins forbidden under the second commandment, "all devising, counselling, commanding, using and any wise approving any religious worship not instituted by God himself."

This doctrine was very fully held and taught by Owen, and was applied by him, specifically, in more than one of his works, to the matter of human inventions in worship. We are confident that we have not, in this article, put forth one sentiment for which we could not produce Owen's authority as an interpreter of God's word. Speaking of the "outward worship of God," he says its "sole foundation was in his will and pleasure."* Quoting sundry scriptures, he says: "That which these and the like testimonies unanimously speak to us is this, that the will of God is the sole rule of his worship; * * and consequently that he never did, nor ever will, allow that the will of his creatures should be the rule or measure of his honor or worship. * * * It is enough to discard any thing from a relation to the worship of God, to manifest that the appointees of it were men and not God. Nor can any man prove that God hath delegated unto man his power in this matter. Nor did he ever do so to the sons of men—namely, that they should have authority to appoint any thing in his worship, or about it, that seemeth meet unto their wisdom. With some, indeed, in former days, he intrusted the work of revealing unto his Church and people what he himself would have observed; which dispensation he closed in the person of Christ and his apostles. But to intrust men with

* Discourse concerning Liturgies, Owen's Works, Vol. xix., p. 405.

authority, not to declare what he revealed, but to appoint what seemeth good unto them, he never did it; the testimonies produced lie evidently against it. Now, surely God's asserting his own will and authority, as the only rule and cause of his worship, should make men cautious how they suppose themselves like or equal unto him herein. * * * But such is the corrupt nature of man, that there is scarce any thing whereabout men have been more apt to contend with God, from the foundation of the world. That their will and wisdom may have a share (some at least) in the ordering of his worship, is that which of all things they seem to desire. * * * The prohibition is plain—'Thou shalt not add to what I have commanded.' Add not to his words, that is, in his worship, to the things which by his word he hath appointed to be observed; neither to the word of his institution nor to the things instituted. Indeed, adding things adds to the word; for the word that adds is made of a like authority with him. All *making to ourselves* is forbidden, though what we so make may seem unto us to the furtherance of the worship of God."*

Owen thus continues: "It is said that the intention of these rules and prohibitions is only to prevent the addition of what is contrary to what God hath appointed, and not of that which may tend to the furtherance and better discharge of his appointments." His answer is, that "whatever is added is contrary to the command that nothing be added." He proceeds to reason from our Lord's direction to the apostles to teach his disciples "to do and observe whatever he commanded them." And the conclusion which Owen draws is, that "the whole duty of the Church, as unto the worship of God, seems to lie in the precise observation of what is appointed and commanded by him." † Elsewhere he says: "A principal part of the duty of the Church in this matter is to take care that nothing be admitted or practised in the worship of God, or as belonging thereunto, which is not instituted and appointed by the Lord Christ. In its care, faithfulness, and watchfulness herein, consists the principal part of its loyalty unto the Lord Jesus as the head, king, and law-

* Ibid, pp. 441-4.

† Ibid, p. 445.

giver of his Church, and which to stir us up to, he hath left so many severe interdictions and prohibitions in his word against all additions to his commands upon any pretence whatever." *

Again, in the work last quoted from, Owen says: "The ways and means of the worship of God are made known to us in and by the written word alone, which contains a full and perfect revelation of the will of God as to his whole worship and the concernments of it." He quotes, to prove this, many passages of the word: and he proceeds to say that the Scripture every where "supposeth and declareth that of ourselves we are ignorant how God is, how he ought to be, worshipped. Moreover, it manifests him to be a jealous God, exercising that holy property of his nature in an especial manner about his worship; rejecting and despising every thing that is not according to his will, that is not of his institution." He proceeds to set forth, from the Scriptures, how God hath frequently altered and changed the ways and means of his worship at his sovereign pleasure; particularly that "fabric of his outward worship" established in the temple; and still further to show that no other alteration by him is to be expected, for he has made his last and complete revelation in his Son, the Lord of all. †

Further on, we find Owen, in the same work, discussing the the question whether the Church may not appoint what may "further the devotion of the worshippers, or render the worship itself in its performance more decent, beautiful, and orderly?" His answer is: "No devotion is acceptable to God but what proceedeth from and is an effect of faith; for without faith it is impossible to please him, and faith in all things respects the commands and authority of God. * * * To say that any thing will effectually stir up devotion, (that is, excite, strengthen, or increase grace in the heart towards God.) that is not of his own appointment, is, on the one hand, to reflect on his wisdom and care towards the Church, as if he had been wanting towards it in things so necessary (which he declares against in Isaiah v.

* Owen's Short Catechism on Worship and Discipline—Works, Vol. xix., p. 487.

† Short Catechism—Works. Vol. xix., pp. 463-71.

4—‘What,’ saith he, ‘could have been done more to my vineyard that I have not done unto it?’); so, on the other, it extols the wisdom of men above what is meet to ascribe to it. Shall men find out that which God would not or could not, in matters of so great importance unto his glory and the souls of them that obey him?”*

We quote another passage, wherein Owen says it is evident that “the suitableness of anything to right reason or the light of nature is no ground for a church observation of it, unless it be also appointed and commanded in especial by Jesus Christ.” † Thus is the principle plainly and broadly stated, that whatever in religion is not commanded is forbidden.

Similar to Owen’s is the testimony of Cartwright, the distinguished opponent of Whitgift and Hooker. He goes so far as to say that “Scripture is, in such sort, the rule of human actions that simply whatever we do, and are not by it directed thereunto, the same is sin.” “I say,” says he, “that the word of God containeth * * * whatsoever things can fall into any part of man’s life. For so Solomon saith in the second chapter of the Proverbs: ‘My son, if thou wilt receive my words, etc., then shalt thou understand justice, and judgment, and equity, and every good way.’” Again we quote: “St. Paul saith, ‘That whether we eat or drink, or whatsoever we do, we must do it to the glory of God.’ But no man can glorify God in any thing but by obedience, and there is no obedience but in respect of the commandment and word of God: therefore it followeth that the word of God directeth a man in all his actions.” Again, Cartwright argues: “That which St. Paul said of meats and drinks, that they are sanctified unto us by the word of God, the same is to be understood of all things else we have the use of.” Once more, he says that place of St. Paul “is of all other most clear, where, speaking of those things which are called indifferent, in the end he concludeth, that ‘whatsoever is not of faith is sin;’ but faith is not but in respect of the word of God; therefore, whatever is not done by the word of God is sin.”

Replying to this last named point made by Cartwright, his

* *Ibid.* p. 494.

† *Ibid.* p. 505.

skilful opponent, Hooker, insists that Paul means nothing else by faith in this place except "only a full persuasion that that which we do is well done." * But Cartwright rejoins: "Whence can that spring but from faith? And how can we persuade and assure ourselves that we do well, but whereas we have the word of God for our warrant?"

Whitgift, in replying to Cartwright, said: "It is *not true* that whatsoever can not be proved in the word of God is not of faith; for then to *take up a straw*, to observe many civil orders, and to do a number of particular actions, were against faith, and so deadly sin; because it is not in the word of God that we should do them. The which doctrine must needs bring a great servitude and bondage to the conscience; restrain, or rather utterly overthrow, that part of Christian liberty which consisteth in the free use of indifferent things, neither commanded nor forbidden in the word of God; and throw men into desperation." † But Cartwright answers: "Even those things that are indifferent and may be done have their freedom grounded in the word of God. So that unless the word of the Lord, either in general or especial words, had determined of the free use of them, there could have been no lawful use of them at all. And when he (Dr. Whitgift) saith that St. Paul speaketh here of civil, private, and indifferent actions, as of eating this or that kind of meat, (than the which there can be nothing more indifferent,) he might easily have seen that the sentence of the apostle reacheth even to his case of *taking up a straw*. For if this rule be of indifferent things, and not of all, I would gladly know of him what indifferent things it is given of, and of what not? And the same, also, I require of him in the other general rule of doing all things to the glory of God. For if that reach unto all indifferent things, it must needs comprise also this action of his; which, if it do, then as no man can glorify God but by obedience, and there is no obedience but where there is a word, it must follow that there is a word. And seemeth it so strange a thing to him that a man should not take a *straw* but for some purpose, and

* Ecclesiastical Polity. Book I., section 4.

† See note to Ecclesiastical Polity. Book I., introductory paragraph.

for some good purpose? And will he not give the Lord leave to require of a Christian man endued with the Spirit of God as much as the heathen require of one who is only endued with reason, that he should do nothing whereof he hath not some good end; and that in all his doings, whether public or private, at home or abroad, whether with himself or with another, he ought to have regard whether that which he doth be in duty or no?"

Such was the ground maintained so ably by Cartwright. On the contrary, Hooker, his able but unsound opponent, cautiously questions whether "all things necessary unto salvation be necessarily set down in the Holy Scriptures or no?" "How can this be," he demands, "when of things necessary the very chiefest is to know what books we are bound to esteem holy, which point is confessed impossible for the Scripture itself to teach?"* Advancing still further in this semi-Popish strain, he more boldly avers: "It sufficeth, therefore, that nature and Scripture do serve in such full sort that they both jointly, and not severally, either of them, be so complete that, unto everlasting felicity, we need not the knowledge of any thing more than these two may easily furnish our minds with on all sides."† And so his ground (resembling too much that of our brother who now argues for the divine right of organs) is, that God "approveth much more than he doth command:" that "his very commandments in some kind, as namely his precepts in the law of nature, may be otherwise known than only by Scripture:" and "that it cannot stand with reason to make the bare mandate of Sacred Scripture the only rule of all good and evil in the actions of mortal men."‡ Still further on, this eminent and eloquent defender of the prelacy lays down four propositions, which have too much the same sound with a large part of what has been just written by our brother. The first is: That since the public duties of religion excel in dignity all other things in the world, and since the best things have the perfectest and best operations, therefore they should have a *sensible* excellency correspondent to the majesty of him whom we worship; and the external form of religion

* Ecclesiastical Polity, Book I., section 14.

† Ibidem.

‡ Ibid. Book II., section 8.

should be such as appears to beseeem the dignity of religion. The second is: That we may not, in this case, lightly esteem what hath been allowed as fit in the judgment of antiquity. The third is: That the Church hath power no less to ordain that which never was, than to ratify what hath been before. The fourth is: That some divine and apostolic ordinances and constitutions the Church has the right and power to dispense with.* These four propositions, as they will easily bring in the use of instruments by the Church, so they will also as easily bring in the vestments, the liturgy, the Apocrypha, and every other exercise of illegitimate Church power, and every other kind of will-worship ordained by the Church of England; for not submitting to which, as imposed on them, our fathers of old did grievously suffer.

We have thus brought forward, in support of our Confession of Faith, † (as the interpreter of God's word,) some high authorities against Dr. Smyth's position—Owen and Cartwright, as holding forth to us the testimony of that grand body of theologians whom they may be said to represent. Let us ascend the stream a little higher, and consult that prince among the teachers of God's Israel, John Calvin. First, let us hear him, in the Institutes, tell how God declares in Isaiah that he is our only lawgiver, so that none may "take it on them to order any thing in the Church without authority from the word of God." Again, he says Paul declares it (Col. ii. 20) to be "a thing intolerable that the legitimate worship of God should be subjected to the will of men." Again, he says that "when once religion begins to be composed of such vain fictions, there is no stopping till the commandment of God is made void through their traditions."

* Ibid, Book V., sections 6, 7, 8, 9.

† The Cambridge Platform (adopted by the New England churches in 1648, in the days of their early purity of doctrine,) sets forth with great distinctness the very same views respecting the substantial and the circumstantial of church government which our Confession of Faith exhibits. (Chaps. i., vi.) It declares that "the parts of church government are all of them exactly described in the word of God;" while the "circumstances, as time and place, etc., belonging unto order and decency, are not so left to men as that, under pretence of them, they may thrust their own inventions upon the churches."

He refers to the well known fact that the pretended improvements of God's worship which are found in the Romish Church, "took their model partly from the dreams of Gentiles and partly from the ancient rites of the Mosaic law, with which we have nothing more to do than with the sacrifices of animals, etc." He quotes Augustine upon the simplicity of the rites in which "our Lord Christ bound together the society of his new people;" and he contrasts with this gospel simplicity the mass of childish ceremonies and all the external show which had been brought into the Christian Church, insisting that we are no longer children under tutors, and have no more need of these puerile rudiments. He declares that God "denounces this curse in all ages" uniformly: that he will "strike with stupor and blindness those who worship him after the doctrines of men." He insists that it is nothing but "rash human license, which can not confine itself within the boundaries prescribed by the word of God, but petulantly breaks out and has recourse to its own inventions." "The Lord cannot forget himself, and it is long since he declared that nothing is so offensive to him as to be worshipped by human inventions." He demands if it can be "a small matter that the Lord is deprived of his kingdom, which he so strictly claims for himself? Now, he is deprived of it as often as he is worshipped with laws of human invention, since his will is to be the sole legislator of his worship." *

Elsewhere we hear Calvin saying: "No worship is legitimate unless it be so founded as to have for its only rule the will of him to whom it is performed." He adds (what Owen, as we have seen, says also): "The wantonness of our minds is notorious which breaks forth, especially in this quarter, where nothing ought to have been dared. Men allow themselves to devise all modes of worship, and change and rechange them at pleasure. Nor is this the fault of our age. Even from the beginning of the world, the world sported thus licentiously with God." †

* Institutes, Book IV., chap. x., sections 7, 9, 10, 12, 14, 16, 17, 23.

† Calvin on "the true method of giving peace and reforming the Church."

"Irenæus," (Rev. Dr. Priney,) of the *New York Observer*, a high authority in such questions on the one side, recently writes: "In Russia, the bell is an instrument of music for the worship of God as truly and

Let us take a witness from amongst the very prelates, and he no other than Jeremy Taylor, Lord Bishop of Down, Connor, and Dromore. In his "Ductor Dubitantium," we meet this question: "Whether in matters of religion we have that liberty as in matters of common life? Or whether is not every thing of religion determined by the laws of Jesus Christ, or may we choose something to worship God withal, concerning which he has neither given us commandment or intimation of his pleasure." He lays down this principle in reply: "Since, therefore, that God accepts any thing from us is not at all depending upon the merit of the work or the natural proportion of it to God, or that it can add any moments of felicity to him, it must be so wholly depending upon the will of God that it must have its being and abiding only from thence. He that shall appoint with what God shall be worshipped, must appoint what that is by which he shall be pleased: which because it is unreasonable to suppose, it must follow that all the integral constituent parts of religion, all the fundamentals and essentials of the divine worship, can not be warranted to us by nature, but are primarily communicated to us by revelation. *'Deum sic colere oportet,*

really as the organ in any other country. * * * It appears to be stupid to cast bells so large as to be next to impossible for convenient use, in danger always of falling and dragging others to ruin in their fall. But when the bell is a medium of communication with the Infinite, and the worship of a people and an empire finds expression in the mystic tones of a bell, it ceases to be a wonder that a bell should have a tongue which it requires twenty-four men to move, and whose music should send a thrill of praise into every house in the city and float away beyond the river into the plains afar." Whether this "praise" with bells found its way acceptably into the ear of the Lord of hosts, of course the writer does not pretend to say. That was, of course, a secondary question altogether. The idea seems to be a thrill of delight in every house floating afar into the plains beyond the Moskva River! Like the organ's, this music of bells pleases the people's ears, and that is the main point, whether God is pleased or not. This writer describes in glowing terms one particular occasion thus: "And all the churches and towers over the whole city, four hundred bells and more in concert, in harmony, with notes almost divine, lift up their voices in an anthem of praise, such as I never thought to hear with mortal ears—waves of melody, an ocean of music, deep, rolling, heaving, changing, swelling, sinking, rising, sounding, overwhelming, exalting. I had heard

quomodo ipse se colendum præcepit,' said St. Austin. Who can tell what can please God but God himself? For to be pleased is to have something that is agreeable to our wills and our desires; now, of God's will there can be no signification but God's word or declaration, and therefore by nothing can he be worshipped but by what himself hath declared that he is well pleased with. * * * To worship God is an act of obedience and of duty, and and therefore must suppose a commandment, and is not of our choice, only that we must choose to obey. Of this God forewarned his people; he gave them a law and commanded them to obey that entirely, without addition or diminution, neither more nor less than it: 'Whatsoever I command you observe to do it, thou shalt not add thereto nor diminish from it.' * * * So that in the Old Testament there is an express prohibition of any worship of their own choosing; all is unlawful but what God hath chosen and declared. In the New Testament, we are still under the same charge; and *θελοπροσκεία*, or 'will-worship,' is a word of an ill sound amongst Christians most generally. * * * So that thus far we are certain: (1.) That nothing is necessary but what is commanded by God. (2.) Nothing is pleasing to

the great organs of Europe, but they were tame and trifling compared with this. The anthem of nature at Niagara is familiar to every ear, but its thunder is one great monotone. The music of Moscow's bells is above and beyond them all. It is the voice of the people. It utters the emotions of millions of loving, believing, longing hearts, not enlightened perhaps like yours, but all crying out to the Great Father, in these solemn and inspiring tones, as if their tongues had voices, 'Holy, Holy, Holy Lord God Almighty, heaven and earth are full of thy glory!' This, of course, is very fine writing after the New England style, such as our untutored Southern ears are not prepared to appreciate; and, of course, these bells of the Greek Church can utter the emotions of believing hearts just as well as the organs in Protestant churches; but the difficulty is to know what either bell or organ ever does utter—whether truth or lies—and to whom it speaks its praise—whether to the true God or a false one. Certainly it is no Christian way to depend on bells to jingle or organs to blow the heart's emotions, while we have human tongues in our heads to speak God's praise. We once read of a machine used by a Hindoo to pray with, and surely praise by machines is no better than prayer by machines. Both are, as Calvin says, a "licentious sporting with God."

God in religion that is merely of human invention. (3.) That the commandments of men can not become the doctrines of God; that is, no direct parts of the religion, no rule or measures of conscience."*

Let us go to the Church of Scotland for two witnesses. Thomas Boston says: "The Scriptures are a perfect rule, and also it is the only rule. Every doctrine taught any manner of way in religion must be brought to this rule." He adds that this doctrine may give us "a just abhorrence of the superstition and ceremonies of the Church of England, whereby they have corrupted the worship of God, rejecting the simplicity of gospel worship and regulating their worship in many things, not by the Scripture, but the dregs of antichrist. * * * As if they were ashamed of simple Scripture worship, but they must deck it up in the whorish garments made by their own brains." Elsewhere he says: "The command says: '*Thou shalt not make, etc.*'—that is, 'but thou shalt receive' the worship and ordinances as God hath appointed them, and not add to them of men's inventions. Deut. iv. 2." Again: "What we call for is divine warrant: Who hath required this at your hands?" †

Hear also what the great Presbyterian teacher, Gillespie, says: "The Jewish Church, not as it was a church, but as it was Jewish, had an high priest, typifying our great High Priest, Jesus Christ. As it was Jewish, it had musicians to play upon harps, psalteries, cymbals, and other musical instruments in the temple, (1 Chron. xxv. 1.) concerning which hear Bellarmine's confession (*De Bon. Oper.*, lib. i., cap. 17): '*Justinus saith that the use of instruments was granted to the Jews for their imperfection, and that therefore such instruments have no place in the Church. We confess, indeed, that the use of musical instruments agreeth not alike with the perfect and with the imperfect, and that therefore they began but of late to be admitted in the Church.*'" ‡

* Doctor Dubitantium, Book II., chapter iii., Rule XIII., 7, 8, 9.

† Boston's Body of Divinity, Vol. I., pp. 35, 36, 37, and Vol. II., p. 427.

‡ Gillespie's Assertion of the Government of the Church of Scotland, Part I., chapter iii.

Let us take a witness from the Reformed Church of France, the famous John Claude, born in 1618. He says: "Religion is called a *commandment*, (1 Tim. i. 5,) because in all its parts it ought to proceed from God. For, as he hath not left it to the choice of man to have or not to have a religion, so neither has he left it to his fancy to invent such a worship as he chooses; therefore St. Paul calls superstitions *ἰδωλοπροσκείαι*, *will-worship*. * * * Whatever does not bear the divine impress can never be acceptable to God." *

Let us close this argument with a testimony from another of the non-conformists of the Church of England. The Rev. John Wesley, Senior, (grandfather to the founder of Methodism,) said to Gilbert Ironside, Bishop of Bristol: "May it please your lordship, we believe that *cultus non institutus est ineditus*—worship not instituted is not due. * * * Bishop Andrews, taking notice of *non facies tibi*,—'Thou shalt not make to thyself,'—satisfied me that we may not worship God but as commanded." †

In answer to our argument, we anticipate a twofold reply. In the first place, it will be said that the necessary circumstances of worship are not specifically commanded and yet are not forbidden; and that instrumental music is a mere circumstance of the praise of God, and as such is lawful. Now, we freely admit the necessity of the limitation upon its own doctrine, that all things necessary for God's glory, man's salvation, truth, and life, are revealed in Scripture, which the Confession places, viz., that "there are some circumstances concerning the worship of God and government of the Church common to human actions and societies, which are to be ordered by the light of nature and Christian prudence, according to the general rules of the word, which are always to be observed." (Chap. i. vi.) This limitation, "so cautiously and exactly stated," is, as Dr. Cunningham says, a "necessary" one. "Common sense requires this

* Essay on Preaching, with notes by Robinson, London, 1788, Vol. I., pp. 215, 16.

† Wesley's Works, Vol. IV., p. 207, and Palmer's Non-conformist's Memorial, Vol. II., p. 169.

limitation, and Scripture itself sanctions it. And it is the more necessary to attend to it, in stating and discussing this question, because it is very easy to misrepresent and caricature the Presbyterian doctrine upon this subject, as is done even by Hooker in his *Ecclesiastical Polity*; and because it is chiefly by means of this limitation, * * * that the unwarrantableness and unfairness of the common misrepresentations of it [our doctrine] by Episcopalians are exposed." *

But what is the meaning of the doctrine of our Confession with this limitation appended? It is tantamount, we suppose, to the London Ministers' statement of the true doctrine as applied to church government, in these words: "All the substantials of the government under the New Testament are laid down in the word in particular rules, whether they be touching officers, ordinances, censures, assemblies, and the compass of their power, as after will appear; and all the circumstantials are laid down in the word, under general rules of order, decency, and edification." †

The "circumstances" and the "circumstantials" are, of course, the same. † Owen explains the term. "Circumstances (he says) are either such as follow actions, as actions, or such as are arbitrarily superadded and adjoined by command unto actions." He gives an example of the first sort: "Prayer is a part of God's worship. Public prayer is so appointed by him. This, as it is an action to be performed by man, cannot be done without the assignment of time and place and sundry other things, if order and conveniency be attended to. These are circumstances that attend all actions of that nature to be performed by a community, whether they relate to the worship of

* See Cunningham's admirable remarks on human inventions in worship, in his discussions on Church Principles, pp. 249-256.

† *Divine Right of Church Government*. Part II., chap. iv.

‡ The London Ministers prepared their work on the *Divine Right in 1646*, during the meetings of the Westminster Assembly. The statement concerning "circumstances," as now found in our Form of Government, occurs nearly word for word in the "First Paper of Proposals" offered by the Presbyterians to Charles II., in 1660, preparatory to the Savoy Conference.

God or no. These may men, according as they see good, regulate and change as there is occasion; I mean, they may do so who are acknowledged to have power in such things." But he proceeds: "There are also some things which some men call circumstances also, that no way belong, of themselves, to the actions whereof they are said to be the circumstances, but are imposed on them, or annexed unto them, by the arbitrary authority of those who take upon them to give order and rule in such cases. * * * * "These are not circumstances attending the nature of thing itself, but are arbitrarily superadded to the things that they are appointed to accompany." §

Now, our Confession, of course, speaks only of the former of these two classes of circumstances—of circumstances belonging to God's worship, as it is an action by a society, just such as attend all actions of all societies; circumstances which are so essential that without them the actions cannot be done. All such circumstances are really commanded in the commanding of the action; for if men are commanded to come together to pray, they are commanded to agree upon a time and place of coming together.

Certainly it cannot be maintained that the organ is a circumstance, in this sense. Clearly, it is something *annexed* to the worship. Under the law, such things were a necessary part of the divine worship, as Owen says.* Who will pretend that they came in then as mere circumstances, or by human authority, and not by special divine authority given to inspired David? But if, confessedly, they came not in then as mere circumstances nor by decree of man, no more may they now find entrance in this way.

As to the tuning fork, if it be a necessary circumstance of rightly pitching the voice, without which God's ordinance of singing cannot be properly carried into execution, then it must be held to be one of the things commanded: and so the question of its use must be left to Christian liberty and prudence.

This plea of the organ's being a mere circumstance of wor-

§ Owen's Discourse concerning Liturgies. Works, Vol. XIX., p. 437.

* Ibidem, p. 439.

ship, whilst it may be offered by others, is not and could not be employed by Dr. Smyth. With characteristic frankness, he boldly defends the organ as a competent part of the worship of God under the New Testament. This is the only manly and fair position its advocates can take. But whenever they do take it, they have to encounter the condemnation which awaits all those who presume to add to God's commands respecting his worship.

The other reply which we anticipate to our argument affirms this principle, that whatever was appointed of old, and was acceptable to God under a former dispensation, and has not been specifically abolished by name, may now be employed by us in the public worship of God, provided it seem good and proper to ourselves; because the Church has liberty. Sacrifices and all other typical things having been fulfilled in Christ, have, it is said, passed away, of course; but the instruments of music had no typical meaning, and so they may stand firm in the New Testament worship, provided we think proper. It is further urged in this reply, that instrumental music having been acceptable to God formerly, it may be presumed that it cannot now be unacceptable to him, since he has not specifically forbidden it.

Now, 1. Has the Church any liberty beyond the mere circumstances which belong necessarily to God's appointments? So does not our Confession teach. So did not our forefathers in England and Scotland teach. So do not the Scriptures teach. The Church has not liberty to appoint rites. Worship of her will is not acceptable. In vain do we worship after the commandments of men. It is for God only to determine how he is to be approached.

2. Are we authorised to say that the instruments used in public worship of old had no typical meaning? Fairbairn tells us that the tabernacle or temple, "*as a whole*, is affirmed in the Epistles to the Hebrews and the Colossians to have been of a typical nature."* Nor can this statement be disputed. But if the whole be represented in Scripture as typical, which of us shall venture to say of any part that it is not typical? Fair-

*Fairbairn's Typology, Vol. I., p. 29.

bairn goes on to say, (p. 60,) that "while New Testament Scripture speaks thus of the whole, it deals very sparingly in particular examples; * * * it no where tells us what was either immediately symbolized or prophetically shadowed forth by the holy place in the tabernacle, or the shewbread, or the golden candlestick, or the ark of the covenant, or indeed by any thing connected with the tabernacle, excepting its more prominent offices and ministrations." Even the Epistle to the Hebrews, he says, "which is most express in ascribing a typical value to all that belonged to the tabernacle, can yet scarcely be said to give any detailed explanation of its furniture and services beyond the rite of expiatory sacrifice. * * So that those who insist on explicit warrant and direction from Scripture in regard to each particular type, will find their principle conducts them but a short way, even through that department which they are obliged to admit possesses throughout a typical character." It would seem to be enough for us to know that worship by instruments was a part of the public worship of the temple, * to satisfy us that it was abolished with the whole of that temporary and peculiar institute of God. Clearly, this was one of the "carnal ordinances imposed on them until the time of reformation," (Heb. ix. 10,) to pass away with the other "elements or rudiments of the world," to which the Church in her juvenile estate was "in bondage" and under pupilage "as to a schoolmaster." Fairbairn dwells (p. 59) on this idea of the Church being prepared for higher, simpler, more spiritual methods of instruction and worship by the use of these merely animal, fleshly, sensuous, material, temporal things; and describes her passing with intel-

* We are by no means prepared to admit that the use of instruments in the temple belonged to the stated or ordinary worship there. Upon some extraordinary occasions, it did undoubtedly make a part of the temple worship, however, and that by divine command. It is amusing to see how delighted Dr. Smyth is when he can quote one of the references to "a commandment of the Lord" to this effect, (see p. 511.) as appears from the capital letters he employs. That is all which the use of organs in the New Testament Church lacks—the command of the Lord by the apostles, either preceptively or by example; either expressly or constructively by good and necessary consequence.

ligence and delight "from rudimental tutelage under the *shadows* of good things into the free use and enjoyment of the things themselves." It must accordingly be worse than childishness in her now to go back to a delight in using any part of this antiquated and therefore abolished system. We follow in the track of Paul when we reason that what is decayed and waxen old should vanish from use in the New Testament Church. (Heb. viii. 13.)

3. Is it to be taken for granted always that a mode of worship once acceptable to God is always acceptable? It is not. God claims the sovereign right to alter and to abolish his own institutes. It is indeed "a fallacy that whatever is appointed by God can never become obsolete." * Circumcision is obsolete. Once imperatively necessary to secure God's friendship, now, "if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing," and you shall be lost. Before Moses, it was right and acceptable to offer sacrifices to God on high places. Afterwards they were abominable if offered any where but at the tabernacle. Still later, the tabernacle gives way to the temple. Shiloh and Gibeon are profane, and "in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship;" but now it would be wicked to insist on any such rule. Once, incense in clouds arose acceptably before God. Now, we may not dare to borrow any such thing from an abolished ritual. The Church could not plead that this was once acceptable to God; has not been specifically abolished; would be a very seemly and beautiful appendage to public prayer; and must therefore, of course, be lawful to us and pleasing to God. No! the Christian Church had inspired apostles to set up her doctrine, government, and worship. This was one especial part of their apostolic work. They were not capable of forgetting any thing required of us by the Lord, for they had the Spirit to guide them. And now we may not impute imperfection to their work, by essaying any improvements upon it whatsoever.

* Killen's Ancient Church, p. 78.

ARTICLE VI.

THE MINISTRY AND ITS DUTIES.

We propose to consider the nature of a call to the gospel ministry, the responsibilities and duties of the gospel ministry, and the considerations which should impel, sustain, and guide the minister of Christ, under the burden of his responsibilities and duties. The irrepressible outburst of the Apostle Paul, in the contemplation of the everlasting issues of the gospel ministry, "Who is sufficient for these things?" swells up in the heart and trembles on the tongue of every true gospel minister. It expresses justly the deepest conviction of all such, not only in the first and general and distant view of their awful task; not only when agitating the momentous inquiry, Shall I devote my life to the service of my God and Saviour in the sacred ministry? not only on some marked and memorable epoch of his existence, in some dark and trying period of his experience, or when his conscience has been terribly shaken and burdened by the heavy weight of unwonted responsibilities. It expresses the settled habit of his mind when he considers his sovereign judge, God; his life-mission, the gospel ministry; the endless and immeasurable results to himself and others of the manner in which he fulfils it; and, above all, reflects that the highest manifestation of the divine glory is inseparably connected with the dispensation of the gospel of the grace of God.

An awful sense of the sacredness of God and of his more immediate service, of the dread responsibility of representing him in any sense and in any character; a profound impression of their own personal inadequacy and unworthiness, has been the uniform attribute of all his faithful servants, and is indispensable to efficient and acceptable service. So appalled have his best ministers been by the magnitude of the issues involved in the undertaking, by the conscious feebleness of their own powers, in comparison with the vastness of the work to be done,

that they have been forced and lashed into the service as by a whip of scorpions. When called to be the leader and lawgiver of Israel, Moses at first positively declined. And Moses hid his face, for he was afraid to look upon God. "And Moses said unto God, Who am I, that I should go unto Pharaoh, and that I should bring forth the children of Israel out of Egypt?" "And Moses answered and said, But, behold, they will not believe me, nor hearken unto my voice; for they will say, The Lord hath not appeared unto thee." "And Moses said unto the Lord, I am not eloquent, neither heretofore, nor since thou hast spoken to thy servant; but I am slow of speech, and of a slow tongue."* In like manner, Jeremiah, "Then said I, Ah, Lord God! behold, I cannot speak; for I am a child."

Ezekiel was evidently terrified at the prospect of his mission; for the Lord assures him, saying, "Be not afraid of their words, nor be dismayed at their looks."

It is not a little remarkable that three of the most illustrious of the Reformers evinced the same solemn dread of entering on the responsibilities of the gospel ministry, under a painful conviction of their own personal incompetency. The most picturesque and vigorous of all writers who have sought to interpret Luther to the English mind, Thomas Carlyle, thus describes the tremendous struggle through which he passed to the pulpit: "Often did there seem to meet in Luther," says Carlyle, "the very opposite points in man's character. He, for example, of whom Richter had said, 'his words were half battles;' he, when he first began to preach, suffered unheard of agony. 'Oh, Dr. Staupitz, Dr. Staupitz!' said he to the Vicar-General of his Order, 'I cannot do it; I shall die in three months; indeed, I cannot do it.'" Dr. Henry tells us, in his "Life of Calvin:" "As the voice, on the road to Damascus, thundered through the soul of Paul, so did the words of Farel so impress themselves upon Calvin's conscience that he never forgot them. Even in the year 1557, he said: 'As I was kept in Geneva, not by any express exhortation or request, but rather by the terrible threatenings of William Farel, which were as if God had seized me by

* Exodus iii. 11; Exodus iv. 1, 10; Jer. i. 6; Ezekiel ii. 6.

his awful hand from heaven, so was I compelled, through the terror thus inspired, to give up the plan of my journey, and yet without pledging myself, for I was conscious of my timidity and weakness to undertake any definite office.' Elected preacher and teacher of theology, he would accept only the latter appointment; but the following year he was obliged to submit to the wishes of the citizens who chose him as their preacher." *

The violent assault made upon John Knox in the public congregation, solemnly charging him, in the name of God and of his Son Jesus Christ, not to refuse this holy vocation, together with its effect upon the heart and conscience of the Scottish son of thunder, is graphically given by Dr. McCrie. "Overwhelmed by this unexpected and solemn charge, Knox, after an ineffectual attempt to address the audience, burst into tears, rushed out of the assembly, and shut himself up in his chamber. His countenance and behavior, from that day till the day that he was compelled to present himself in the public place of preaching, did sufficiently declare the grief and trouble of his heart; for no man saw any sign of mirth from him, neither had he pleasure to accompany any man for many days together." †

"Fools rush in where angels fear to tread." But they who are truly called of God, and justly estimate the cares, the labors, the dangers, the responsibilities, the perplexities, and the results of the gospel ministry, cannot but shrink from it; and nothing but a constraining sense of duty to God, and a cheerful trust in his gracious promise to be with them "to the end of the world," could impel them to undertake it. But they know that responsibility cannot be evaded by inaction, and they hear the awful voice that rang in the apostle's ears echoed in their own hearts—"Woe is me, if I preach not the gospel."

The man who assumes the responsibilities and enters on the duties of the gospel ministry, under the same considerations and impulse with which he might enter a lawyer's office, a merchant's store, or a mechanic's shop, is not likely to discharge those duties with patient and zealous fidelity. His estimate of the

* Vol. I., p. 105.

† McCrie's "Life of Knox," page 47.

peculiar sacredness and force of a divine call to a special service of danger and glory is widely different from that of the prophets, the apostles, and the reformers. They felt that the charge of souls was not a common allotment of Providence, but a special dispensation of grace—the most awful charge ever committed to man to be attested by extraordinary evidence, and to be discharged with sacred diligence. The real motive that underlies the low and lax view of the gospel ministry, now becoming prevalent, is the felt inadequacy of our numbers to our needs, and the competition between rival theological seminaries and between the different religious denominations. The strength of the ministry, however, it should be remembered, does not consist in its numbers, but in the spirit of consecration, humility, zeal, and love, which rests upon the body; as the strength of the Church at large does not consist in her numbers or wealth, her social authority or political favor, but in an enlightened and immutable attachment to divine truth, in love to God, and charity to all men.

“ Ah, Constantine ! of how much ill was cause,
Not thy conversion, but those rich domains
That the first wealthy Pope received of thee.”

When a call to the gospel ministry is supposed to be nothing specific, imperative, individual; a constraining sense of solemn duty, springing from a special and spiritual impulse; a fire in the bones; a vision in the soul of gracious recompence, or deserved and deadly wrath; a voice in the ear, crying, “ Woe is me, if I preach not the gospel;” but is supposed to be of the same general providential nature with a call to the service of God in any secular employment, the spirit in which it will be embraced and abandoned will be the same which animates ordinary men in the choice of a secular business. Instead of imbuing the followers of secular pursuits with a sacred spirit, the danger will be of importing a secular spirit into the sacred office. The element of truth in the doctrine of “ apostolic succession,” and that which gives to the doctrine plausibility and power, is the profound conviction that men must have a divine and authen-

ticated call to serve God in the ministry of the gospel. The error is in supposing that provision has been made for the manifestation of such call in this particular form; in a word, that any corporate body is intrusted with such powers, and can confer such authority exclusively and at will. The call to preach the glorious gospel of the blessed God is internal, individual, and of God. The only function of the Church in the matter is to ascertain, authenticate, and enforce the divine call.

Even with the end in view—which is to multiply ministers—this superficial estimate of the nature of a call to the ministry argues ignorance of human nature and of the tendencies of our own time in particular. If the call to the ministry be put on a level with a call to serve God in an ordinary profession, the latter will, in a majority of cases, be found incomparably more attractive. This politic expedient will be seen to work badly, as human wisdom is apt to do, when it usurps the place of the divine method, and seeks to supersede or to improve upon it. It is on a par and of a piece with those ingenious devices, to give additional currency to the doctrines of the gospel by corrupting, diluting, or suppressing them; or to render the worship of God more agreeable to carnal eyes and ears and hearts, by false and meretricious attractions, degrading it from a divine service to a mere æsthetic exhibition. In these the gospel Church, our own Presbyterian Church at least, can never compete with the opera and the oratorio in magnificent scenery, and splendid decoration, and soft and sensuous music. We would not be understood as condemning the use of instrumental music in the service of God, when properly conducted. But scenes of vicious enchantment will always prevail over any attractions of the same kind which our conscience and our ecclesiastical traditions will permit us to employ.

The Church of Christ is strong, invincibly strong, but she is strong in the Lord and in the power of his might. She is rich, not in corruptible riches, as silver and gold, but in a precious treasure of truth and grace. Hers is the dowry of Achsah, the upper and the nether springs, the truths and ordinances of heaven. She is radiant and lovely, but it is in the “beauties of

holiness" that she shines—a beauty brighter far than any born of art and man's device. She is mighty in the simple majesty of heavenly truth. She is fair to look upon in the unadorned simplicity of evangelic worship, alive with a saintly glow, bright with the garments of unperturbed and unpolluted praise. The Church of the Lord Jesus, the crucified one, the earthly dwelling place of the eternal God, is indeed stately and grand, but not as was the Parthenon at Athens, that "miracle of rare device," constructed wholly of Pentelic marble and ornamented by the master-pieces of Phidian genius; nor even the sacred and costly temple of Solomon, the noblest pile ever reared by human hands, which in all its glory, compared with the simple and spiritual worship of a better dispensation, established upon better promises, might be called, in the language of the apostle, "a wordly sanctuary, the abode of carnal ordinances." Samson, shorn of his sacred locks, was weak as another man; and the Church divested of that divine heritage of truth and love, which is at once the badge of her Master's favor and the secret of her mysterious might, becomes corrupt and impotent as any mere human organisation.

In some points of view, there is indeed not a confusion or identity, but a striking analogy, between the call of God to be a Christian and to serve him as a Christian, and the call of God to be a minister and to serve him as a minister. No man is capable of exercising the affections and discharging the duties which are distinctive of a believer but he who has been translated out of the kingdom of darkness into the glorious kingdom of God's dear Son; and no man will endure the self-denial and dedicate his life to the arduous services of a true gospel minister, who is not smitten with the sacred love of souls, and does not feel assured that God has specially called him to the good work of preaching the gospel. To make a minister of the gospel, then, it is needful, 1. That he be called to the service of God generally as a partaker by like precious faith in Christ of the common salvation. 2. That he be specially called to this sacred function by the constraining sense of duty to God, and to the souls of those for whose redemption the Lord of glory died.

8. That his individual convictions of duty have the sanction of the authoritative voice of the Church.

The higher the work, the higher the faculties needed for it. The work of the ministry, as the most exalted on earth, requires, 1. Moral qualities of the noblest nature, and in the largest measure, faith, hope, charity, wisdom, zeal, righteousness. 2. Intellectual faculties, reason, judgment, knowledge, imagination. 2. Physical powers, strength, endurance, a body trained to labor, and accustomed to obey the imperial behests of the soul.

The work of our redemption being the highest ever undertaken in the universe, required the most marvellous person, the everlasting Son of the Father, God manifest in the flesh, endowed with the gifts and graces of the Holy Ghost, absolutely and without measure. The arrangements of God's providence and grace with direct reference to the special needs of those whom he employs in the most exalted and sacred spheres of service, are such as reflect the highest honor on his own perfections, and inspire his willing and obedient servants with a just and noble confidence.

The gifts which he bestows upon his children are always the best in their kind and of their kind; not the blessings always of earthly prosperity, health, riches, the favor of the great, but the choicest and clearest tokens of spiritual adoption, the secret joys of the Holy Ghost, and the blessed hope of eternal life.

The office of the Christian ministry contemplates the most illustrious manifestation of the glory of Christ, in the dispensation of the highest possible good to men, an incalculable accession to the sum of holiness and happiness on the earth, and an inheritance in heaven, "incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away." To discharge his duty aright in any measure, to bring him into sympathy with his gracious aims and ends, our Father, God, has made ample and special provision; giving unto him "exceeding great and precious promises," and breathing into his soul the Spirit of his own divine benignity and love. Every thing that can be conceived of or alleged to create and enhance responsibility, meets in the calling of the Christian min-

ister; the magnitude, the importance, the difficulty, and the sacredness of the work; the results of his ministry to the man himself and to those who hear him, so incalculable, so immeasurable; the awful and acknowledged fact that the brightest forms of the divine glory, as capable of being made manifest to creatures, are to be evinced in the everlasting salvation or perdition of immortal souls. We may embrace propositions in words, intelligible enough in themselves, whose full significance we can never fathom or compass. They recede or melt away when we seek by any effort of the mind or will to detain, or grasp, or measure them. They melt away, and are lost in the vast horizon of thought, of the impalpable and the eternal, the illimitable and the unknown. This is principally and emphatically the case within the awful domain of religion: the ideas of the soul, of sin, of God, of eternity, of grace, residing in the bosom of the Father as in its sacred and original habitation; of redemption by the blood of the Lamb, slain from the foundation of the world; of the Holy Ghost in his person, nature, and offices, as truly and properly divine, proceeding from the Father and the Son, the immediate author to us of saving illumination and spiritual quickening, our sanctifier, comforter, and guide.

These high truths of divine revelation are capable of being stated in words, but not of being estimated by mortals. "Canst thou by searching find out God? canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection?" The substantive realities which these words stand for, which they reveal and represent in themselves, their relations and results, can never be adequately known by us, or by any other than by God himself.

Eternal truth and eternal wisdom can never grow old; but the forms and aspects which they may be made to assume, the cases to which they may be made to apply, the diversified conditions and combinations of circumstances, may be endless. Hence the Bible must not only be studied and pondered by the private Christian, but expounded and applied by the instructed and accredited minister; and hence the sermons of one age are wholly unsuited, or at least inadequate, to the needs of another. The forms of thought, the modes of apprehension, the topics of spec-

ulation, the systems of philosophy, the literary code, the condition of political societies, the matters of practical inquiry and pressing interest ; in a word, the spirit of the age and the needs of men, are peculiar to each generation. And what we may well marvel at, in the inspired Scriptures, is their amazing elasticity, their inexhaustible fertility of just application, their infiniteness and perfect adaptation to the altered condition of human society and all the emergencies of human experience. Who that considers the practical difficulty and the personal responsibility of selecting and applying the truths of Scripture to the actual cases before us, the men with whom we have directly to deal, can repress the exclamation, "Who is sufficient for these things?" Here is a celestial armory, abounding with all weapons for attack or defence: which shall he select for the error or the adversary occurrent? Here are medicinal springs and herbs of healing virtue for all the various forms and types of spiritual disease and suffering; which shall he prescribe and apply to the special malady before him?

The minister of the gospel is to present the truth of God, not merely in its integrity and harmony, without reserve or abatement, as it is in the Bible, keeping back nothing that is profitable, whether men will hear or whether they will forbear; but he is to present it in its divine proportion and order, with nice discernment of times and needs, with sound judgment and exact distribution, giving to every one his portion in due season. It requires strong faith to preach the gospel as it ought to be preached. Faithfulness to man is founded on faith in God, and never more than in this age, when there are so many received and applauded systems, philosophical and ethical, directly at war with the first principles of the doctrine of Christ; an age in which so many accredited teachers of divine truth would be better than the Bible and wiser than God.

As for an ordinary Christian, so more especially for a minister, the great thing is to keep God and eternity constantly in view; to live as ever in his great task-master's eye; to endure as seeing him who is invisible; to look not at the things which are seen, but to the things which are not seen; for the things

which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are eternal. He is to remember that for him, and for those whom he ministers, all other possessions sink into insignificance compared with the divine favor; that when he looks back on his life from the bed of death and the borders of eternity, all things will seem worthless and vile but truth, duty, the grace of Christ and immortal glory. "When in your last hour, think of this," says Richter; "all faculty in the broken spirit shall fade away, and die into inanity—imagination, thought, effort, enjoyment, then at last will the night-flower of belief alone continue blooming, and refresh with its perfume in the last darkness." The minister of Christ is not to seek his recompence in any thing that man can give, but in the salvation of souls, in the reward of eternity, in the delightful sense of the divine favor. He should feel that nothing is so important to him and to his hearers as their salvation. He is not to consider himself, except in the light in which he is exhibited in the Scriptures, as the special servant of God. It is enough that he be made the instrument and the channel of conveying the highest spiritual gifts to God's creatures. Through him, as an earthen vessel, flows the wine of life, the truth and grace, which bring salvation.

The minister of the gospel must abound in study, abound in pastoral labor, and abound in prayer, if he would be wise to win souls and accomplish the great end of his spiritual calling. His only ambition should be, not to win the applause of men, but to please God; not to gain a name, but to save souls. His first and leading function is to expound and to apply the truth as it is in Jesus. He is an ambassador for God, and the authoritative instructions which, as an ambassador, he is to adhere to, to exhibit, and to enforce, are contained in a particular volume. That volume, then, should naturally receive his prime attention, be the matter of his principal thoughts and studies. These considerations are incomparably heightened when we reflect that this book, in the character of its contents, in the sacred sovereignty of its sense and tone, stands apart from all other books, that God dwells in it as in no other book, in no other structure, as he dwells not in the light of setting suns, as he dwells in

now in the mind of man; that it is in the strictest sense θεόπνευστος God-imbreathed, God-inspired; and according to the truth and according to the faith of our Church, not only is the general sense inspired, but the inspiration extends to the very words, which holy men spoke or wrote, as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. If the minister himself is a sacred person, because specially set apart to a sacred service, because specially near to God, more sacred still are the Holy Scriptures, because not merely do they testify of him especially, but because they proceed from him immediately. They are the very breath of his wisdom and love, making immortal music in the soul of man. Even under the old dispensation, it was required that the priest's lips should keep knowledge, although the proper function of the priest's office was not to teach, but to offer sacrifices. The prophetic order was ordained to receive, retain, and interpret the will of God, for the instruction and guidance of the people. If, then, the people were to seek instruction at the priest's mouth, how much more from the appointed interpreters of the counsels of heaven. Accordingly, aptness to teach is made an indispensable qualification for a Christian minister.

In the study of the Bible, three things are to be considered: First. The knowledge of the letter; the literal text; the grammatical construction and coherence. Second. The rational propositions which the terms embrace and embody. These two things a man may acquire by the diligent use of his natural faculties of understanding and memory. The third is the spiritual apprehension, the religious appropriation of the truth as it is in Jesus. The truth seen in this light is seen in the true light and tasted in its proper sweetness. In this respect, sacred truth differs from natural truth, and is incomparably higher. To be discerned in its peculiar glory, it must be apprehended in its peculiar nature. It must be irradiated by a light higher than that of nature and reason. The light of the knowledge of the glory of God is seen in the face of Jesus Christ. "For the natural man receiveth not the things of God, neither can he know them, for they are spiritually discerned." The knowledge which the interpreter of the counsels of heaven is to seek is a

transcendent, a superhuman, a divine knowledge. He therefore needs not merely a human, but a heavenly teacher; not merely natural reason, but divine grace. The gospel of our salvation can be truly known by no other method, on no other terms, by no other agency, than by the effectual and interior illumination of the Holy Ghost. This will pour upon the sacred page an abundant flood of heavenly light. It will invest the word of life with a hallowed beauty; imbathes it with a heavenly glory; impart to it an imperishable interest; and at the same time communicate "a precious seeing to the eye." The true corrective of the dangers of a mere critical and intellectual study of the Scriptures is the warm and loving and life-giving Spirit, under whose inspiration they were indited.

It is the essence and sum of the basest hypocrisy to preach what we do not practise, or what we do not strive to practise. Every word we speak to men, urging upon them duties which we do not ourselves strive to fulfil, will rise up against us at the day of judgment. Nothing worse could be said of the ancient Pharisees than that they bound upon men's shoulders heavy burdens, which they themselves refused to touch with one of their fingers. To ministers of the gospel particularly, as to professing Christians generally, it should be an awakening consideration that a sacred profession does not make a man sacred in spirit and character—only in his calling and functions. Such should strive to have an inward subjective holiness, to correspond with the peculiar sacredness of their official station. Not that we are to make our own personal conduct the standard of our religious teaching. We are to preach the whole counsel of God; the whole sum of duty; the doctrine of revelation, in its integrity and in its totality; the law of God, as the rule of duty, the standard of obedience, and the test of character.

As a rule, we think it best that the mornings be devoted to study and prayer. A certain transient and flashy popularity may doubtless be gained by universal and unlicensed visiting—visiting every person and at all hours; but we shall be more pious, more happy, more learned, more useful, and ultimately and permanently more honored, if we are known to set a value

on our time. A long visit from a minister who has nothing to do and does it, is hardly felt to be a very important favor; but a call of a few minutes from a man who husbands his time is justly regarded. The books of the Sibyl were reckoned at their original cost, when reduced in number; and so, in many cases, are the visits of a minister of the gospel. Most real pastoral visits are made by those who are least abroad. Nothing deserves the name of a pastoral visit, unless it be accompanied by prayer, or by the reading of the Scriptures, or by the effort to lodge some sacred truth in the soul. Dr. John M. Mason, in his valedictory to the people of his charge, tells them plainly that if he had visited them as often as they were kind enough to wish and unreasonable enough to expect, he would have had no time to prepare for preaching to them. For a strictly pastoral visit, however, we should always hold ourselves ready, and make every thing give place to it, even the study of the Scriptures and private prayer. The minister is, for sacred service, the personal property of every man that needs him. He is bound to visit the poorest white man or colored man, at any hour of the day or night, who may really need his ministrations, or his mere presence and sympathy in his sins and sorrows. The faithful discharge of pastoral duties will not injure or impede our preparations for the pulpit, but greatly promote and facilitate them. It will help our prayers and our preaching, and give to our preaching a power which no eloquence can impart. The very sight of a family or an individual in affliction may be promptly suggestive. It may supply a topic of great value in the prayer or the sermon. God has established a perfect harmony and concurrence among all our duties. He has made a proper and proportioned attention to each essential to the right performance of any. The very element that gives life, simplicity, reality, adaptedness, effectiveness, and power to a sermon, and discriminates it from an abstract theological essay, is supplied by the fact that we are preaching to men, whose sins and sorrows, wants and struggles we know and care for. No preaching is so likely to do the people good, and to be listened to with respect and sympathy, as that of a man who is known to care for their bodily and spiritual needs.

The habit of religious reflection should be carefully cultivated, and of writing down our thoughts any way suggested—in our reading, in our Bible studies, in our pastoral visits; above all, in our private prayers. The best thoughts, in any sense, the soul ever conceives, are those suggested in private prayer, when she is concerned only with God, with the truth, and with herself. The deepest views we ever get of sin—its deceitfulness, its subtleties, its windings, its tenacity, its pollution, and its torments—are those which we gain when we bare our bosoms to the searching eye of the All-seeing Heart-knower. The truth and grace of God never shine out before us in a light so serene, so bright, so benignant, as when we look to Christ in the luminous solitude of our own chamber.

It were well to have a book in which every valuable thought should be recorded while it is fresh, and kept for after use in our pulpit preparations. A man who shall study the original Scriptures, and live in the constant habit of hearty prayer to God in secret, and take care to note down his best thoughts as they arise, shall not want for matter, and truly original matter, for his preaching.

The preaching of the gospel ought to be a real outpouring of the heart—an outpouring of the heart before God in our prayers, and an outpouring of the heart before the people in our sermons. Such was the spirit and habit of Paul: "We pray you, in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God, beseeching you even with tears." True, profound, practical wisdom is the wisdom of the heart; not the cold, dry deduction of the mere intellectual principle, but the indwelling spirit of love, the baptism of all the forces and faculties of the soul by the spirit of love. This is the benign and blessed atmosphere in which the preacher of the gospel is to live and breathe and move; through whose golden, heaven-born rays—rays of glory from the eternal sun of righteousness—he is to behold with one glance, or with alternate glance, God and man, heaven and earth, time and eternity, saint and sinner. He is to speak the truth in love, not coldly, not harshly, with bitter and self-righteous scorn of his fellow-sinner; but warmly, kindly, lovingly, is he to speak of the common salvation, and of

the gracious and life-giving Saviour. The minister of God should have a high and sober disdain of all worldly ease, and worldly gain, and worldly glory; be taken up in all his faculties and hopes in his heavenly work; absorbed in the love and adoration and service of his heavenly King. He is evermore to feel that to be the friend, to be the follower, to be the fellow-worker of the Lord Jesus, is the most glorious exaltation to which he can himself aspire, or to which he can seek to attract others.

To a Christian minister, there should be no moment of lukewarmness, or insensibility, or indifference. with such prospects to enchant, with such interests to agitate him, with such motives to arouse and impel him to thought and action. He has continual and welcome access to the eternal throne of the heavenly grace. He has all the power of omnipotence, and all the resources of infinite wisdom, and all the unfathomable depths of divine tenderness, to draw upon for his defence and supply. The glorious Lord of heaven and earth is not ashamed to be known as his elder brother, and the uncreated Spirit of the Almighty is his promised guardian and guide. What we want is a tender feeling of solemn responsibility, that what we recognise as true and binding may sink into the soul and sway it absolutely, altogether, and at all times: so that there shall be alike in the soul and in the life a response to the voice of truth and duty—an instant and an answering echo. All the powers and passions of the soul ought to be enlisted in the service of our God. There should be an intense and unremitting energy in these things, beyond the highest enthusiasm of worldly men for the most glittering objects of worldly ambition.

It is faith in God which produces spiritual sensibility and spiritual activity, and the truths and revelations of the Scripture are the food and fuel of a divine faith. All that is necessary is that we receive those truths in their full import and proper force, and then we shall feel them and act upon them. Our blessed Lord tells us that our self-deceptions and deceptions of others are only for a time; that there is nothing hid that shall not be revealed, or secret that shall not be known. Now, if we held this before our minds distinctly, and believed it fully, what dis-

position should we have to cover up our hearts and our dealings from our own eyes, or from those of our fellow-men, seeing that all will come out at length in the open light of day? And why should we fear pain or loss, when the very worst that men can do is to kill the body; and if we die martyrs, all our troubles and disgraces end with our lives, and the gracious rewards of immortality begin? And how should we be able to shake off the constraining fear of God, if we firmly believed that he was able to destroy not only the body, but the soul in hell forever?

The grand and governing inspiration of the true minister of Christ is love to the person of his Saviour. What the attraction of gravitation is in the material universe, love to Christ is in the spiritual—the all-subordinating, the all-controlling principle. It is the principle of gravity which binds the planets to their orbits and causes them to revolve in harmony around their central sun; and it is love to the person of Christ which makes each member of the Church content and laborious in his proper sphere, serving the Lord with efficiency and ardor. This it is which makes all the true followers of Christ and ministers of Christ accomplish without conflict or confusion their appointed and appropriate work, trusting in the promised presence of their glorious Lord, “Lo, I am with you alway, even to the end of the world.”

CRITICAL NOTICES.

Sermons on the Failure of Protestantism and on Catholicity.

By the Rev. FERDINAND C. EWER, S. T. D., Rector of Christ Church, New York. 1868. 12mo., pp. 168.

These sermons have already received more attention than they deserve on account of their own individual qualities. They have importance, however, as one of the outgrowths of a "movement," as the author calls it, "among us," *i. e.*, Dr. Ewer's "us," which he represents as a mighty and most happy piece of business. The substance of it is that a party, perhaps a majority in the Episcopal Church, are "moving" away from the doctrines hitherto held in common by the churches generally known as Protestant, to those known as the fundamentals of Popery.

The Rev. "Rector of Christ Church, New York, S. T. D.," appears to be in a state of mind well fitted to move our compassion—or our mirth, as our mood may happen to be. He seems, at first, to be in a lamentable condition of distress and consternation. In his view, Christianity in all Protestant countries is about to be swallowed up in general infidelity and irreligion. We had not read far in his pages before we were vividly reminded of that instructive nursery tale which records the terror of the little chicken at the falling of a rose leaf, and the woful consequences thereof. The little creature in its fright ran to its feathered parent, "Oh, Henny-penny, the sky is falling! I saw it with my eyes, I heard it with my ears, and a piece of it fell on my tail!" Henny-penny caught the alarm, and together both hurried with the awful news to Turkey-lurky. The panic spread, until the whole fowl-yard, including Ducky-daddle and Goosy-poosy—*especially* Goosy-poosy—hastening to carry the tidings to the king, were seduced into the den of Foxie-woxie, who devoured them at his leisure. This was to be observed, that not one of them ever came out of that *hole* again. Here, as in a

prophecy, let Dr. Ewer read the fate that awaits him and others like him. Their "movement" will end in the arms of the old fox of Rome, and the Episcopal "branch" of the Catholic Church will be depopulated and tenantless.

Protestantism a failure! Is it so? Dr. Ewer asserts that it is. He attempts to prove it by giving his own unfair and fallacious definition of Protestantism, and then by accusing it as the cause of all the folly, fanaticism, infidelity, wickedness, and misery, moral, religious, social, and political, to be found in Protestant countries. Such reasoning is not worthy of serious refutation. He speaks of "Protestantism as a religious system," which it is not. And yet the whole argument of his sermons, so far as they have any show of argument, depends on that fallacy. He says "Protestantism founds the Church on the Bible," which it does not. And yet much of his curious logic is founded on that falsehood. He says his Church protests against the errors of Popery, and yet it is not a Protestant Church, which is puerile. The name "*Protestant* Episcopal Church" seems to make him sick. He nauseates it. He says it was "foisted" upon his Church by "fifteen or twenty wise gentlemen," in the eighteenth century, without authority, rhyme, or reason. He says the fundamental question "which divides us from all Protestant sects" is "what is election?" and that "the Protestant idea is that election is of individuals directly to life eternal," which is not true again. He does not tell us expressly what "the Church idea" of *election* is, but that its idea of the *elect* is that they "are identical with the baptized," which may be so for aught we know. Dr. Ewer should be good authority on that point. But whether it means that they are elected *to* baptism, or *by* baptism, we are very sure it is not the idea of the inspired word of God.

Dr. Ewer accuses what he calls Protestantism of "failure" in two particulars: first, that it leads to infidelity; and secondly, that "it fails to reach the masses" of the people, and make them Christian. He attempts to prove the first both logically, by endeavoring to show that infidelity is the necessary logical result of its fundamental principles; and historically, as a matter of fact. But his logical argument is mere assertion, with no shadow

of a demonstration of any logical nexus between the premises and the conclusion. It may amuse our readers to know the several steps in this descent from Protestantism to infidelity as our author presents them. They are as follows: 1st. Protestantism. 2d. Calvinistic Presbyterianism. 3d. Congregationalism. 4th. Unitarianism. 5th. Parkerism. 6th. Infidelity. If any one wishes to know what are the syllogistic links between these, especially between Calvinistic Presbyterianism and Congregationalism, we confess it is a funny question, but we must refer them to Dr. E. for further information. These sermons do not enable us to explain it.

In proof of his second charge, he adduces mainly what he asserts to be the facts of the present times in Protestant countries. He says that the masses of the people in these countries are not Christians, and he puts the blame of it on Protestantism.

Well! our readers will no doubt ask, how about Dr. Ewer's Church?—in England and America. Has no infidelity sprung up in and from that Church? Have not the rationalism, scepticism, and the whole tribe of infidels of various sects, which have chiefly assailed Christianity among the English-speaking peoples for two hundred years, come forth from his "Anglican Catholic" Church? And how about that Church and "the masses?" Dr. E. is ready with an answer. He sees this difficulty, and is prepared to meet it—in his way. He says "Our Church is a Catholic Church which has been worked on Protestant principles." "We have run our Catholic and Apostolic wheels in the Protestant, Calvinistic, and Lutheran ruts, which they do not fit, never will, and never can." How this feat, in that case, *could* be accomplished, is for Dr. E. to explain.

But this sorry shuffle will not avail him. At best it only removes the difficulty one step further back. On his own showing, "in Henry the Eighth's time" the Anglican Church had a pure "Catholicity." It was "reinstated," "rehabilitated," "reformed." Moreover, she had then entire and exclusive possession of the ground. All England was hers. "Protestantism" was put down with halter and fire. And on Dr. E.'s own showing again, "Catholicity" "*failed*," signally, shamefully, failed to keep the ground it had won, failed to protect itself from

sects, schisms, and "Protestantism," "failed to reach and control the masses," who under "Cromwell and his Roundheads," "broke into her" and "tore out of her the old Catholic modes and appliances." If "Protestantism" is to be blamed for all the heresies, schisms, and other evils which spring up in Protestant communities, it is fair to hold "Catholicity" responsible for those which arise in Catholic countries. So at the restoration, under Charles the Second, "the old Catholic modes and appliances" were again restored to the Anglican Church with even more sovereignty and energy than before, as everybody knows. Perhaps we should except Dr. Ewer. It is dangerous to assume what he knows. With what result? The infidelity and Arianism of the eighteenth century in the bosom of the Anglican Church were a part of it. The great Methodist schism was another, succeeding because it accomplished what "Catholicity" failed to do, in Christianizing "the masses."

Indeed, every one, except blind Dr. Ewer, will see that if his argument is good against Protestantism, it is good against Christianity itself. Infidels in fact use it, and with equal reason, against any and all forms of the gospel faith. One of their loudest cries is that "Christianity is a failure!" And it is true just so far and in every sense that Protestantism is a failure. In truth, if Protestantism is what Dr. E. represents it, it furnishes itself no small part of a proof that Christianity has failed. He gives us in a note, occupying three of his pages, in small print, an astounding and very amusing catalogue of "sects which have buzzed about the Catholic Church." What a tremendous argument it is against "Catholicity," nay, against Christianity!

But, says our author, "I do not mean to imply that there is no infidelity and no tampering with the Holy Bible in Roman Catholic lands. But I assert that such infidelity as there is in Roman lands has sprung out of the extravagances and errors which Rome has superadded to her Catholic system." A fellow feeling makes us wondrous kind. The evils which spring up in Catholic countries are not to be ascribed to "Catholicity," but to "extravagancies and errors" which have been added to it; while in Protestant lands they are to be laid at the door of Pro-

testantism itself. Facts, in the hands of Dr. Ewer, are not the stubborn things they are commonly supposed to be, but like noses of wax can be twisted at pleasure. But how come those same "extravagances and errors" in Roman lands themselves? Could not "Catholicity" keep them out and protect itself against them? If not, is it therefore a failure?

Some of our readers may wish to know what is this Catholicity of which Dr. E. is so zealous an advocate. Its principal elements are, first, the figment of "apostolical succession"—of prelatial bishops who have succeeded to the office of the apostles in a regular unbroken line of ordination from them. These bishops are essential to the existence of the Church. There can be no Church without them. Secondly, the Church is the mediator between man and God. Thirdly, the Church imparts the grace of salvation and unites man to God by the sacrament of baptism; and perfects the work of grace in the soul by the sacrament of the Lord's supper, "the other sacraments," as Dr. E. calls them, and the various means employed by the Church for the spiritual improvement of its members. *Baptism* appears to be the great thing with Dr. E. Over and over again he says by that the sinner is "grafted into Christ," "united," and "made one" with Christ, becoming a member of his mystical body. This is just what his "Catholicity" comes down to at last, the point where it touches practically the vital, everlasting hopes of men—the poor, dry, wretched figment of "baptismal regeneration." "The Catholic gospel of salvation is simple. Be baptized into the Church, for that Church Catholic is one with Christ, and Christ is one with the Father." "Simple," he says. Our readers will say "Ycs, in more senses than one!"

Dr. E. recognises three churches as severally parts of the one Catholic Church and holding the Catholicity which he speaks of, each of them with some errors added thereto by itself—namely, the Roman, the Greek, and the Anglican Church. In one place he adds to these the Armenian. He pleads most earnestly that his own Church, (the "Anglican" he calls it, but the people know it as the "Episcopal,") has an equal claim to be recognised as "Apostolic and Catholic" with the others, and pitifully entreats

them not to "quarrel with" and cast it out, as they always have done. We can imagine the scorn, pity, or ridicule with which a Romanist will hear his pretensions or his prayers. Rome has for some three hundred years excommunicated him and all his "Anglican Church," and pours its anathemas and contempt on it as he does on Protestantism. And as for the "extravagances and errors" which he charges on Popery, Rome will tell him that he is no "Catholic" unless he swears that he believes them to be a part of the true faith. The Romans and Greeks have for centuries mutually excommunicated each other. Neither recognises the other as a true Church at all. And it is the simplest folly for Dr. E. to preach as he does his "one visible Catholic Church," in his sense, and his "Catholicity" as the panacea for the ills of the Christian world, and especially for the evils of Protestantism. His Church and his Catholicity are one thing, the Greek's another, and the Romanist's still another, altogether different. Let his "Catholic family," which he is so sweet upon, settle their domestic quarrel before he persuades us to take refuge in its bosom.

Our author makes one confession for which we are thankful, and we commend it to the attention of those who think that it is a matter of small importance for a member of one of our evangelical Protestant churches to leave it and unite with the Episcopal. He says, speaking of his own Church and the "Protestant denominations:" "The difference between her and them is so radical that any compromise between the two is a logical impossibility." "It is nothing short of two different modes of salvation through Christ, which are presented to the world. * * * It is nothing short of two different Christs, * * * and finally, two different Gods that are presented to the world." Speaking of what he calls "the Catholic presentment of Christianity," he says "it is fundamentally different from the Protestant." "It is simply Christianity as distinguished from Rationalism. Any thing less than or outside of it is Rationalism." He does not leave us to doubt his sympathy with the feeling when he says, "Thousands upon thousands, here and across the water, have been feeling for a long time that Protestantism is Satan clothed

in the garments of light." He says expressly, "What is Protestantism, then, but Rationalism * * * concealed in a Christian cloak? It is my part, as your pastor, * * * to strip off that cloak, and show the demon within."

If there is such a radical fundamental difference between the Episcopal and the Protestant churches, it is not surprising that Dr. E. should say, "It is our warning that the sons and daughters of the Church avoid all Protestant religious systems." "Protestantism should be avoided by every one who loves his brother man and the cause of our blessed Saviour. Its houses of worship should never be entered by the sons and daughters of the Church." "When a mother, leaving our Church goes to Presbyterianism, she thinks she is merely exchanging one form of Christianity for another; that it is, to all intents and purposes, a venial, a harmless change." But he would have her understand that she is very much mistaken. Protestantism is "a far worse evil" than Rome—it is "an awful and most dangerous heresy."

Well! if all this is good advice to Episcopalians, from Dr. E.'s side, it is just as good to our own people, from our own side. The warning has of course just as much force to Presbyterians and all Protestants to avoid Catholicity, Anglican or Roman, and its houses of worship. If the difference between us be so radical, fundamental, awful, and dangerous, one party has just as much reason to keep away from its opponent as the other. We thank Dr. E. for the weapon he puts in our hand.

Ten Years on the Euphrates; or Primitive Missionary Policy Illustrated. By Rev. C. H. WHEELER, Missionary in Eastern Turkey. With Introduction by Rev. H. G. CLARK, D. D., Cor. Sec. A. B. C. F. M. American Tract Society, Boston.

This is a valuable contribution to missionary literature by an earnest working missionary. To our "Presbyterian Church in the United States," whose missionary efforts are just beginning to expand, it ought to have a peculiar interest. It is not only a record of missionary toil and success, but it throws light upon the question, *how* shall we best labor for the evangelization of the world? The author, in his third chapter, entitled "The

work to be done," sets forth his convictions and the principles that govern the conduct of the missionary work on the Euphrates. We quote freely from the chapter, which is appositely headed with the saying of our Lord, "The kingdom of heaven is like unto leaven, which a woman took, and hid in three measures of meal, till the whole was leavened:"

"The question, 'What is the missionary work? what object have Christian men and women in view in forming missionary societies and sustaining them by their contributions and prayers?' is differently answered by different persons. There is doubtless at bottom a general feeling that it is for the temporal and eternal good of those sitting in darkness; and yet comparatively few take the trouble to examine and decide how this object is to be attained. The little child sees the picture of the heathen mother casting her babe to the crocodiles, or exposing it to beasts of prey, and brings her offering of pennies to teach that mother to do so no more; and this, for the little child, is enough. But for those who are to spend those pennies, it is fundamentally important that they have some definite idea; that they look beyond this work of mere outward reform to the higher spiritual aim of the missionary work; since, if we fail here, if we merely persuade the cruel mother to desist from child-murder, and do not Christianize her and those about her, we may only rescue the body of her little one to destroy its soul.

"Probably all who take any efficient part in this missionary work assent to this idea, that the ultimate object aimed at is to *Christianize* those to whom missionaries are sent." And yet, upon the question what this implies and how it is to be done, it is to be feared that some persons have very erroneous and many others very indefinite ideas.

"In entering the Harpoot field, my associate and myself discarded the popular notion that the missionary work is a vast system of almsgiving, or even of supporting gospel institutions among the unenlightened at the expense of Christians at home. Not thus do we find it defined any where in the gospel commission, nor in the practical illustrations of that commission in the first missionary work. The disciples at Jerusalem did indeed have all things common, but only, as it appears, during a temporary crisis, and then the most generous giver was Barnabas from that *foreign* country, Cyprus.

"Paul and his companions gathered money from their converts in the foreign field for the poor saints in Jerusalem, but we have evidence that any funds were sent in the contrary direction. The

things need to be remembered by the missionary, at least in Oriental lands: 1. That he is in danger of overrating the poverty of the people. To one fresh from the thrift, tidiness, and comfort of even the humblest homes here, the best of those in Oriental lands appear poor and wretched enough. 2. While Orientals are generally ready to make almost any professions to secure the good will of those from whom they expect any temporal advantage, they, at the same time, look upon the advantage bestowed as a mere *trap* by which the giver hopes in the end to secure some gain to himself, and are thereby prejudiced against any instructions which he may give. Had the physician who dispensed medical advice and medicines gratis to the Moslem crowd, on condition that they would first listen to religious truth, but realised that those who crowded his dispensary congratulated themselves on their shrewdness in getting a real good in a harmless wrapper to be at once thrown away, he would have counted his patients with less satisfaction.

"When the kind-hearted missionary, instead of teaching his converts the grace of Christian liberality, and calling upon them from the first to give of their substance for Christ, practically treats them as paupers, not only giving them the gospel free, but adding, in one form and another, pecuniary help, and thereby increasing the universal Oriental greed for 'bakshish,' he not only harms the man, but inflicts a greater wrong on the church of which he is to be a member, by teaching it also to sit and beg. A church made up of such members, persons who have merely learned to adhere to the missionary, and sit from Sabbath to Sabbath and listen to a free gospel, with perhaps the added argument of cheap bread from the missionary's hand during the week, cannot be trusted.

"Feeling, then, that if we would make the gospel really a blessing to the people, if we would teach them to value it, we must offer it to them in its true character as God's message, demanding *sacrifice* on their part, we put away all false shame and false sympathy for their poverty, and with the gospel, presented and urged the idea of paying for it. It was hard sometimes to resist appeals from 'poor' men that we would give them a Bible, and yet we never gave one, and in the few cases in which we gave a Testament, we had afterwards occasion to regret doing it. The recipient did not value and read it. Tracts were by rule, on former days, to be given away, and the result was that nobody cared for them, till we gave out that we should hereafter only sell them, and then, at the people's request, began to sell, and sold thousands of copies."

Does not the author lead us to the true cause of the comparative inefficiency of all aggressive effort by the Church upon the world in the home and foreign missionary work? Are not feeble churches, destitute neighborhoods, and heathen communities, treated substantially as paupers, who are not expected to make sacrifices to sustain the gospel? One thing has impressed us in reading this book, viz., the great service which some master mind might render to the Church universal by collating the reports, histories, etc., of all the missionary associations of Christendom, with a view to ascertain the shortest and best methods of preaching the gospel to every creature. Such a service as Lieutenant Maury rendered to navigation by conning over cart-loads of log-books from hundreds of ships, might thus be rendered to the cause of missions.

The author's dedication of his work is touching and suggestive. It is dedicated to his mother, "who, from his earliest years, led him to the prayer meeting and the monthly concert, and thus to Christ and an interest in missions; and then, in her age and widowhood, sent him to the foreign field." Missionaries will multiply by the thousands when the Church has multitudes of such mothers.

One thing only pains us in the book. It is sad that a work of so much excellence should be tainted with the passions of the hour; that its beauty should be marred by an occasional allusion to the late war, in such a way as to obtrude upon the reader the author's devoted adhesion to one side of the controversy. When will our Northern brethren get rid of that provincialism of thought which obtrudes its strange local accents into the discussion of world-wide themes, where "there should be neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free; but Christ is all and in all." Against such a desecration of the things of God, whether they come from the North or the South, "with both hands and our hearts," we protest. With this abatement, we cordially endorse the remark of Dr. Clark in his introduction, that "the whole volume may well become a *vade mecum* to every missionary candidate, and will hardly fail to furnish useful hints to the tried veteran in the service."

The volume is very neatly gotten up, and made the more interesting by illustrative maps of the missionary region which it describes.

The Negro at Home: An Inquiry after his Capacity for Self-Government and the Government of Whites; for Controlling, Leading, Directing, or Co-operating in the Civilisation of the Age, its material, intellectual, moral, religious, social, and political interests, etc., etc., etc. By LINDLEY SPRING. New York: Published by the Author. 1868. Pp. 237, 12mo.

The author is a son of the Rev. Dr. Gardiner Spring, of New York City. He dedicates his work "to the people of the United States, with the hope that it may be of some use to them." It was published previous to the late Presidential election, and was designed, we judge, for a campaign document. Mr. Spring cherishes strong sympathies with his white Southern brethren. He does not approve of the transfer of the government of the Southern States from the whites of those States to the blacks; of the political and social subjection of eight millions of his own race to four millions of a different race, lately their slaves; nor of effecting this by military force, under despotic military authority. He raises the question: Is the negro fit for this position?—fit to administer the civilisation of this age—its material, political, and religious interests? And are those who seek to give him such power the friends or the enemies of their country and the human race? In seeking to answer these questions advisedly, he inquires what the negro has ever done for himself; what he is at home; what he has ever done for his race and country; what have been his notions of labor, production, agriculture, trade, commerce, manufactures, arts, science, society, civilisation, government, law, religion, morals. But he meets immediately with the objection that this is not fair, because the negro never had our advantages, never was civilised. His retort is: Why was he never civilised? How does it happen that the white race are in advance of the negroes? Is the negro naturally their equal or their inferior? If the equal of the white race, why has he never been as civilised? And if the inferior

of the white race, why do you engage in the foolish, mischievous, and wicked attempt to reverse the laws of nature and make that superior which God has made inferior?

Pursuing his inquiry, the author visits the negro first in this hemisphere, in St. Domingo, Jamaica, the Northern States and Canada, and subsequently in Africa. His native land is an earthly paradise, considered with respect to by far the largest portion of it. All the modern travellers assert this fact. But man in Africa is debased beyond comparison. He is a child, a savage, a brute. As he was four thousand years ago, so is he now. In some of the tribes, there is apparently no conscience and no idea of God. Slavery appears to be indigenous in Africa, and man is literally the currency of the country. The African has no natural affections. Parents sell their children upon any temptation; children abandon their parents to starvation. It is father against son, brothers against brothers, neighbors against neighbors. Society there is none, or it is at war with itself.

In truth, this book is a tale of horrors. We have never read any thing so horrible from one end of it to the other. Yet we do not question the correctness of any of its statements. The author makes no assertion for which he does not give authority. Amongst many others, it is Moffat, the South African missionary, Livingstone, the celebrated explorer, Lander, Forbes, Alexander, Rose, Burton, Du Chaillu, and the recent discoverers of the sources of the Nile, Speke and Baker, who furnish the materials which he employs. Moffat, for example, says: "I have seen a small circle of stakes fastened in the ground, within which were still lying the bones of parents bleaching in the sun who had been thus abandoned." Duncan describes a barbarous execution in Dahomey, where an "old wretch stood with a small calabash in his hand, ready to catch the blood from each individual, which he greedily devoured before it had escaped one minute from the veins." Burton says: "The Wabendi devour besides man, all sorts of carrion, grubs, and insects, whilst they abandon to wild growth a land of the richest soil and most prolific climate. They prefer man raw to roasted, whereas the Wadde of the coast eat him roasted." Speke says of the same

people: "When they can not get human flesh otherwise, they give a goat to their neighbors for a sick or dying child, regarding such flesh as the best of all." But these examples are actually nothing to what might be quoted, if we had a taste for the horrible, or could ascribe such a taste to our readers.

But Africa is heathenish, and heathenism is every where and always horrible. Our own forefathers, not many centuries ago, were bloody and brutal idolaters. The most impressive chapters of the book are those which treat of the emancipated negroes of this hemisphere. Let us look at them first in the Island of Hayti. "When the San Domingo negro began business on his own account, (says Mr. Spring,) the place was civilised, highly cultivated and improved, every thing flourished and everybody. * * * The cultivated places have become a wilderness, in the depths of which he enjoys the filthy rites of a detestable paganism; * * * in short, * * he has done little else but relapse toward the barbarism from whence he was taken." The testimony of Mr. E. B. Underhill, of the London Baptist Missionary Society, and a great friend to the free negro, is quoted that the island is "uncultivated, unoccupied, and desolate." "The present inhabitants despise all servile labor, and are content for the most part with the spontaneous productions of the soil and forest." Mr. Underhill describes the idolatry practised in the island under the name of Vaudoux or serpent worship—a native African superstition. The object worshipped is a small green snake, placed in a box on a stand in some secluded place. The rites are introduced with something like the following chorus:

" Eh, eh Bomba, hen! hen!
Canga bafia te,
Canga mourne de le,
Canga de ki li,
Canga li."

The king and queen take part, and the latter utters oracles and dark sayings. A delirious whirl or dance, bacchanalian revels, and the triple excitement of drunkenness, darkness, and lewdness, ensue. But let us look at the statistics of production in the island in 1790 and 1849. At the former period, 163,405,220

lbs. sugar; at the latter, none. At the former, indigo, 980,016 lbs.; at the latter none. At the former, coffee, 68,151,180 lbs.; at the latter, 30,608,343 lbs. Coffee grows wild and is picked by the women and children.

Let us look at the negroes in Jamaica, after twenty-three years of self-government. Once very prosperous, ever since the emancipated slave was put in charge, the island has been going to decay:

PRODUCTS.

1805.	1856.
Sugar, hhds., 150,352	Sugar, hhds., 25,920
Pimento, lbs., 1,041,540	Pimento, lbs., 6,848,622
Coffee, lbs., 17,961,923	Coffee, lbs., 3,328,147

The pimento grows wild, spreads rapidly over the abandoned plantations, and requires no cultivation; women and children pick the berries.

“Enormous tracts of land are thrown out of cultivation, and on these the negro squats, (says the *London Times*,) getting all he wants with very little trouble, and sinking in the most resolute manner to the savage state. Lying under his cotton tree, he refuses to work after 10 o'clock in the morning. ‘No, tankee, massa, me tired now; me no want more money;’ or, * * * ‘No, massa, no starve now, God send plenty yam.’”

Let us proceed to the Northern States of this Union. From the First Annual Report of the Boston Prison Discipline Society, June 2nd, 1826, Mr. Spring quotes as follows:

“In Massachusetts, where the blacks are as 1-74 to the whole, they constitute $\frac{1}{6}$ of the convicts; in New York, where they are as 1-34 of the whole, they constitute $\frac{1}{4}$ of the convicts; in Connecticut and Pennsylvania, where they are as 1-34 to the whole, they constitute more than $\frac{1}{3}$ of the convicts; in New Jersey, where they are as 1-13 to the whole, they supply more than $\frac{1}{2}$ of the convicts.”

“Nor do matters improve with time. The census of 1850 shows:

In Massachusetts, 1 negro convict to every 192 of negro population,			
against 1 white	“	“	2,533 “ white “
In New York, 1 negro	“	“	190 “ negro “
against 1 white	“	“	2,208 “ white “
In Pennsylvania, 1 negro	“	“	492 “ negro “
against 1 white	“	“	6,884 “ white “
In Ohio, 1 negro	“	“	574 “ negro “
against 1 white	“	“	5,400 “ white “

Let us go to Canada—the *Ultima Thule* of the underground railroad and the promised land for thousands of fugitives from bondage. The Rev. John Rennie, clergyman of Buxton, one of the settlements of free negroes in Canada, “with all his desire to see the colony prosper, was compelled to admit that the experiment had not answered the expectations of its projectors. * * * They seem to require a guiding and directing hand, and to be entirely deficient in forethought and settled purpose. The men who are in health no sooner find the warm weather at hand than they leave their homes to ‘work out,’ either as barbers, boot-blacks, waiters, or in any other position that may offer on board a steamer or in a hotel. This is at the season when they could most profitably labor on their land; but their sole ambition seems to be to obtain some light employment, where no thought of to-morrow is needed, and where they can gain a little money without hard work. They return to their families in winter, and lay idle so long as the little money they have saved will last. * * * * Wherever the negroes have settled, property declines in value, farms are abandoned, poor-houses and jails are filled. * * * In one township, nearly every sheep belonging to the white farmers had been stolen, cases of petit larceny were of incredible frequency, and high crimes nothing unusual. Especially were they addicted to rape of white women.”

The conclusion to which this wide investigation leads Mr. Spring is, that the negro is utterly unfit for the authority and place with which Congress has invested him.

We have presented our readers this sketch of Mr. Spring's argument, believing that it can not fail to interest them. It will commend itself also to their judgment as in many respects unquestionably a true account and a just view. The freedman in Canada and elsewhere, as this volume describes him, is a picture for which we could all produce easily the answering original. Yet we feel bound, as impartial critics, to object to several leading features of this book. We have, in the first place, no sympathy with the author's implied denial of humanity to the negro. Mr. S., not openly and distinctly, yet substantially and really, signifies that the African is of another species from our-

selves. The horrid facts which he details of their condition in their native land, prove no such thing. Paganism every where degrades and brutalizes man. The Greenlander was half fish when Christianity first lighted on those shores. The natives of Australia are as low down on the scale of humanity as the most savage tribes of Africa. In the next place, we object very decidedly to the representation that Christian missions have failed of their ordinary results on that dark continent. Witness the South African missions, which have been as successful as any in the world. Witness the distinguished success of missions along the western coast of Africa. We condemn, in the third place, the whole spirit of the argument. The author writes as if he would stir up the utmost contempt and the bitterest hatred for our poor brother with the dark skin. Moreover, the argument we consider unfair in the manner of it. Mr. Spring quotes all the bad things possible, and says nothing good of his subject. But is there really not one good thing true of the miserable people of Africa? Has he never read or has he forgotten the tender and gentle humanity with which Mungo Park was treated by women in Africa, when he lay exhausted and apparently dying under the tree, and they came and relieved his wants, singing songs to the white man about his wife and children far away? We can easily conceive how publications in the manner and spirit of this one, long enough continued to be made and spread abroad by hundreds over the United States, might engender in white breasts such a hatred of the negro that a crusade for his extermination, on this continent at least, might be the result. The picture is certainly drawn with skill enough, and with apparent spite enough, to warrant this remark. And was not the battle waged for forty years by the North against the institution of slavery carried on precisely in this manner and with this result? Was not Mrs. Stowe's novel, *Uncle Tom*, written upon this very principle of arraying together every possible allegation of evil which could be made against slavery, and sedulously omitting from the description every favorable item?

There is one very pleasant thought which this able production must set clearly before the mind of every reader who was ac-

quainted well with the now abolished institution of slavery in these States. It is that no where under the broad heavens was there such another body of Africans as were our slaves; so contented, so comfortable, so prosperous, so improving, as well in religion and morals as in civilisation. Two hundred years of bondage certainly had done great good to them in every way. Witness the faithfulness of the negro to his white friends during the war; and witness his moderation and good conduct, all things considered, since the war. Of course, it is absurd, and wicked too, to put the government of these States into his hands. But all that will soon, and, we hope, peaceably, come to an end. The ballot will regulate it. Education and virtue must make the superior race dominant. Meanwhile, let white men give them every encouragement. Let us help them to prosper and to improve. Ignorance and poverty bring their necessary temptations to do evil. We must do what we can to teach the negro the right and the good—and especially let us teach him by example. We slaveholders have already been vindicated from all the aspersions cast on us by narrow prejudice, through the excellent behavior of these pupils, whom we and our fathers were providentially called to train in our school of domestic slavery. And may we not indulge the hope that we shall hereafter be still more fully vindicated in the moderation, kindness, and forbearance we shall ourselves be enabled to display towards these *quondam* friends as well as dependents, who certainly must be our dependents still, and we as certainly believe to be still our friends?

An Earnest Ministry the Want of the Times. By JOHN ANGELL JAMES. With an introduction by Rev. JONATHAN B. CONDIT, D. D., Professor of Sacred Rhetoric and Pastoral Theology in Auburn Theological Seminary, New York. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, No. 821 Chestnut Street. Pp. 288, 12mo.

This work was published a good many years since in New York and was extensively circulated, but has for a long time been out of print. A friend of the Presbyterian Board of Publication

lately found opportunity to purchase the stereotype plates and presented them to that institution, which has now reproduced the work. The author, a Dissenting minister whom we have often heard in his church at Birmingham, England, was himself an illustration of the earnestness he urges upon the ministry. The book is the expansion of a sermon preached at one of the Dissenting colleges. The idea which he presses throughout the volume is, that while a learned ministry and a pious ministry are needed, it is an *earnest* ministry that is especially to be desired; that not natural talent, not academic training, not mere ordinary piety—all of them together, can constitute the ministry we need; that, in our time, supreme devotion to the work and intense and burning as well as enlightened zeal, is the great requisite for preachers. The chief deficiency of the modern ministry is a deficiency of personal religion, for this is the main spring of all our power in the work. "We are weak in the pulpit because we are weak in the closet." Trace either Whitefield or Wesley in their career and you will see how "beaten was the road between the closet and the pulpit—the grass was not allowed to grow on that path." The secret of their power lay in the ardor of their devotion and the strength they thus derived from on high.

What, asks the author, is the present spiritual condition of the great bulk of the professors of religion? "A combination of zeal and worldly-mindedness—great activity for the extension of religion in the earth, with too much indifference to the state of it in the soul—in short, vigor in the extremities but too much torpor at the heart. Multitudes are substituting external zeal for piety, liberality for mortification, and a social for a personal religion." The Christian profession is sinking in its tone of piety; the line of separation between the Church and the world becomes less and less perceptible; and genuine Christianity, as expounded from pulpits and delineated in books, has too rare a counterpart in the lives and spirit of professors. "How is the spirit of piety, (asks Mr. James,) to be revived?" He asks another question: "How did the spirit of slumber come over the Church?" The true answer which he gives is: "It came from

the pulpit, and therefore a thorough revival in the Church requires a previous revival in the ministry."

Respecting the condition of things in this country, the American introduction to Mr. James's book dwells upon the incessant and hurried movement of mind amongst the entire people. A diffused mental activity, somewhat superficial, often sustained by unhealthy means, is everywhere discernible. Not one system of religious ideas prevails, but a diverse mixture of errors are struggling here against the truth. And we require beyond Christians in other lands to have a ministry so earnest that it can powerfully arrest the common mind in the midst of its warm conflicts and bring the gospel in its full power to the sympathies and hearts of the people. The gospel ministry in this land must be eminently spiritual and practical in its character. None can dispute the necessity of complete intellectual furniture. It is settled that our ministry must possess thorough literary and theological attainments. The demand for a learned ministry is too loud to be disregarded. But we do not want in the ministry or from the ministry abstract philosophical preaching, metaphysical subtleties, or frigid argumentation; a cold, dry light, shining without warmth. We want ministers having a blessed facility in guiding souls to Christ, and then in edifying them in their most holy faith.

Mr. James's book is adapted to impress our ministers and our candidates for the ministry with solemn awe as they consider what a work has been bound or is to be bound upon their shoulders. Men, dying yet immortal, are going to perdition all around us, and ours is to be the work, under God, of converting them; and after their conversion, of feeding them as a shepherd his flock. It is the *care of souls* which constitutes the sacred office. Ministers are to watch for souls. They are to win souls. They are to be fishers of men. It is therefore not "to acquit themselves learnedly nor to acquit themselves elegantly" that they stand up in the pulpit, but to save the souls of those who hear them. It is not literature, nor science, nor philosophy, nor eloquence, the preacher must pursue as his chief end. What he is to aim at is not high position or great influence in the Church.

It is not a city pastorship, nor a professorship, nor a secretaryship of one of the Executive Committees; not service in the more settled East as distinguished from the newer West; not service at home as distinguished from foreign service among the heathen. His end and object is to add to his Master's joy in saving what his soul did travail for—men perishing in their sins. Well may Welsh, the son-in-law of John Knox, have been found weeping before daylight in the morning by his wife about the "three thousand souls committed to his watch, many of whom were in great danger of destruction." Well did Baxter cry, "Methinks I see them entering on final woe and hear them begging for help." The wonder is that every faithful minister is not absolutely consumed of his own zeal. It is mercifully ordered that the full impression of eternal things is not made upon us, or we must all die outright in our dismay, and the Church of God perish on the earth at once.

Bishop Butler explains how principles differ from emotions. A good man appealed to daily about affecting cases of suffering may find his excitability grow less while his charity increases. Here appears the superiority of principle to frames of mind. But it is necessary for such a pleasing result that the emotions should always lead to proper action. It is action which strengthens principle. We become more zealous, indeed, for the honor of Christ and the good of men, not in proportion as we shed tears or manifest our emotion in any other like way, but only as we labor patiently, humbly, tenderly, zealously, for their salvation.

We do not hesitate to say that the ministry is chiefly responsible for all the evils which afflict the Church. As rulers, the elder is equal to the minister, yet infinitely higher and more responsible is the teaching than the ruling function! There is no duty the Church might not be led to perform if the ministry were only what they should be. If she does not pray and labor and give and live in all respects as she should, it is because her teachers do not their part fully and faithfully. It is ministers who are chiefly responsible when sinners die unconverted. It is ministers, perhaps especially our young ministers, who are chiefly to be held responsible for the bringing in of the heathen nations.

Mr. James quotes one of the old Non-conformists, (Doolittle, a convert of Baxter's, and much such a preacher as he was,) calling on ministers to be found "eyeing eternity." He quotes Baxter expressing his wonder that ministers are not "a thousand times more strict in their lives and more laborous and unwearied for the crown;" and professing his own "shame of every sermon he preached," and his "dread lest in his best sermon" he should be "guilty of their blood." He quotes the Bishop of Calcutta in his introduction to Collins's edition of Baxter's Reformed Pastor lamenting for his ministerial brethren: "We have been divines, we have been scholars, we have been disputants, we have been students, we have been everything but holy, self-denying, laborious, consistent ministers of the gospel." He quotes many similar passages from many quarters, which are fitted to stir the hearts and rouse the zeal of the men of God. We close this notice by referring to the history of Payson, who wore himself out in the work of the ministry, and then from his sick and dying chamber dictated warm and thrilling expostulations, admonitions, exhortations, to individuals and to bodies of those he loved. Finally, he directed a label to be fixed to his breast when he should lie as a corpse, for all those to read who should come to take the last look at him: "Remember the words which I have spoken to you while I was yet present with you." And the same words were afterwards, at the request of his people, engraven on the plate of his coffin, and read by thousands on the day of his interment. Payson had what ministers should all have—a passion for saving souls; and that, his ruling passion, was strong in death.

Greater Britain: A Record of Travel during 1866-7. By CHARLES WENTWORTH DILKE. Two volumes in one, with maps and illustrations. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. London: McMillan & Co. 1869. Pp. 340 and 348, 12mo.

The author set out, he tells us, "to follow England round the world;" and "in essentials" found "the race always one." He considers the mission of the English race, if it have any mission, to be "the making it impossible that the peace of mankind on

the earth should depend upon the will of a single man." Like a true John Bull, filled with the cool commercial spirit as well as with conceit, he concludes his travels with this summing up: "In America we have seen the struggle of the dear races against the cheap—the endeavors of the English to hold their own against the Irish and Chinese. In New Zealand we found the stronger and more energetic race pushing from the earth the shrewd and laborious descendants of the Asian Malays; in Australia, the English triumphant and the cheaper races excluded from the soil, not by distance merely, but by arbitrary legislation; in India we saw the solution of the problem of the officering of the cheaper by the dearer race. Everywhere we have found that the difficulties which impede the progress to universal dominion of the English people lie in the conflict with the cheaper races. The result of our survey is such as to give us reason for the belief that race distinctions will long continue; that miscegenation will go but little way toward blending races; that the dearer are on the whole likely to destroy the cheaper peoples, and that Saxondom will rise triumphant from the doubtful struggle." He proceeds to state that "the countries ruled by a race whose very scum and outcasts have founded empires in every portion of the world, even now consist of nine and a half millions of square miles, with a population of three hundred millions of people; while, in power, they would already be more than a match for the remaining nations of the earth, whom they surpass considerably in wealth and intelligence. Russia, he admits, gains ground steadily, but comparing the Russian with the English-governed countries of fifty years ago, the Saxon is found to have outstripped the Muscovite both in conquest and in colonization. Chili, LaPlata, and Peru, he thinks, must eventually become English, for the Red Indian race there cannot stand against our colonists. And the future of China, Japan, and the table lands of Africa, is quite as clear—only in the tropical plains the negro will be able to withstand us. In 1970 the English race itself, he says, must against "any possible series of events" number three hundred millions. Alongside of such a people, he declares, that "Italy, Spain, France, and Russia, become pig-

mies." "The power of English laws and English principles of government is not an English question—its continuance is essential to the freedom of mankind."

We cannot be indifferent to such a speculation. But we consider the author to have left out of view the grandest part of it. His book gives plentiful evidence that he feels no interest in the propagation amongst the existing races of that true Christian faith which is committed at present peculiarly to the keeping of the English-speaking peoples. "Cheaper," and therefore despicable, let them vanish—this seems to be his idea concerning the native tribes, though not in so many words expressed. But he fails to remark even once, so far as we have observed, the true magnificence of his own conception, viz., that within a short period, not remote, the larger portion of the world's population and power may be Christian,—for not only English law and English principles of government only, but English faith also is spreading over the world. Even should the inferior races not remain to be Christianized wholly, the race that takes their place is to be a Christian race in the Protestant sense. This is the conception of the author, if he had only perceived it in its fullness. But it is evident to us that his Christianity is of the cold-blooded type. A thorough radical in politics, his moral tone is low and gross, rendering him equally at home with the humanitarians of New England and the Mormons of Utah. He travels everywhere amongst degraded and miserable heathen, but he never utters a Christian sentiment. All the aspects in which he regards them are those of trade or politics. Accordingly with him missionaries to the heathen have had little success, and are doing little good—always excepting however the Roman Catholic ones.

Mr. Dilke reached this country from England on the 20th of June, 1866, spent a few days in Richmond, went to Washington, New York, Boston, Canada, thence to the West and the further West by Utah, and on to the Pacific Coast. From California he went to Pitcairn's Island, to Australia, Ceylon, and India generally, and got home again by way of Egypt some time in 1867. Within eighteen months he learns all these various and

wide-spread regions, and then in two small duodecimo volumes tells us all about all English-speaking countries! What if some one should profess to have learned in one year and a half all philosophy, law, medicine, theology, and what if he should then undertake to expound it all in two little volumes? The impudence of our modern professed book-makers is sublime.

We can only judge of the actual performance of our author from that portion of his work which relates to the countries known to us personally. They say travellers, like historians, tell many lies. The saying is certainly true in general. Frequently their information is derived from untrustworthy sources, or else they reason from individual facts coming under their own observation to incorrect general conclusions. Oftentimes the party of whom the traveller inquires respecting a certain matter ought to know, but does not know, the real truth about it; although sometimes when he does know it, he amuses himself at the verdant tourist's expense by spinning him a yarn to be put into the book. It is wonderful indeed how ignorant many persons are respecting ordinary and familiar things in their own immediate neighborhood, such as roads, distances, number of the population, number and character of the schools, social customs of the people, prevalent general opinions upon common topics, and a great variety of other such affairs. Mr. Charles Wentworth Dilke is no exception to this general rule with travellers. He may tell the truth correctly concerning Australia or India; but, judging from his representations of our unfortunate "South," we are not at all sure of it. About ourselves he certainly does manage to tell some of the most absurd falsehoods ever published by a traveller. For example: "Every day that you are in the South, you come more and more to see that the 'mean whites' are the controlling power." "These 'mean whites' were the men who brought about secession." "Secession was the act of a pack of noisy demagogues." (See p. 28.) "Slavery gave us but two classes besides the negroes—planters and 'mean whites.' The great planters were but a few thousand in number; they are gone to Canada, England, Jamaica, California, Colorado, Texas. The 'mean whites'—the

true South—are impossible in the face of free labor; they must work or starve.” (P. 30.) “Across the Atlantic, a broad brim denotes less the man of peace than the ex-member of a Southern guerilla band—Morgan’s, Mosby’s, or Stuart’s.” (P. 4.) “If you hear a man warmly praise the Mormons, you may set him down as a Southerner, or at the least a Democrat.” (P. 145.) “That the negro slaves were lazy, thriftless, unchaste, and thieves, is true; but it is as slaves, and not as negroes, that they were all these things.” “The faults of the plantation negro are every one of them traceable to the vices of the slavery system.” (Pp. 20, 21.) Our traveller either had never read or else forgot the concurrent testimony of every visitor to Africa, that every one of these vices luxuriates amongst her benighted children. He could not conceive, of course, of slavery as a school of civilisation and virtue, elevating savages to orderly, peaceable, and useful laborers, who multiplied as well as improved under its mild sway. An English radical, with him to set free the thievish, unchaste, lazy slaves, was necessarily to transform them at once into virtuous and intelligent citizens, qualified to rule the country. Slavery, however, and its defenders, can afford to bear with the ignorant malice of such insular revilers, as well as of those of both continents, seeing that, in spite of them all, it must come in for the praise of having been a good school, should emancipation prove to be a success.

The simple fact is, that Mr. Dilke put on a pair of Yankee spectacles when he looked at the South, which at once accounts for much of what he says about us, and much also of what he says about New England. Under this inspiration, he does “get off” some rich things. For example: “To New England is chiefly due, in short, the making of America a godly nation. It is something in this age to come across a people who believe strongly in any thing, and consistently act upon their belief; the New Englanders are such a race.” (P. 52.) Alongside of this, put this serious speech: “New England Yankees are not always so filled with the Puritan spirit as to reject unlawful means of money-making.” But hear him, after

VOL. XX., NO. 1—10.

getting far away from Boston, describe two New England missionaries whom he met in India: "There had been no loss of national characteristics in these men—they were brimful of the mixture of earnestness and quaint profanity which distinguishes the New England Puritan. One of them described himself to me as 'just a kind of journeyman soul-saver, like.'" (P. 148.) Again he meets a Southern planter, who tells him: "Our officers were good, but considering that the rank and file were just 'white trash,' and that they had to fight regiments of New England Yankee volunteers, with all their best blood in the ranks, and Western sharpshooters together, it's only wonderful how we weren't whipped sooner." (P. 28.)

We notice only one more point. Mr. Dilke coolly declares his conviction that "the white man and the red cannot exist on the same soil;" and hails "the extinction of inferior races" as "a blessing to mankind." (Pp. 99 and 105–109.) Just so we saw that he predicts the certain passing away of the "red Indians" of Chili, La Plata, and Peru; and also of the black men of the table lands of Africa before Saxon colonists. With his Yankee spectacles on, however, he perceives a wide distinction when the question comes to be of black men and white dwelling in the "South" together on terms of equality. The fact is, that "rebels" and "rebellion" are terms which dwell as familiar on his lips as if he were a genuine "down-caster," and forgetting his admiration of Saxon race and blood, he seems to be well satisfied to have the "bottom rail on top" in this particular case. He is a Briton who has not the first conception of "constitutional freedom," or that "regulated liberty" of our English forefathers for which the South contended. Of the rights of the States of this Union as it was, and the duty a citizen owed to his sovereign State, he does not dream. For the sake of such persons, both in his native island and on these shores, it may well be regretted that the present government of this country should have succeeded in preventing Mr. Davis from being brought to trial, so that they might see some of the light that investigation must have shed on the causes and character of the late war.

Grammatical Synthesis: "The Art of English Composition."

By HENRY N. DAY. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1867.

The Art of Discourse: A System of Rhetoric. Adapted for use in Colleges and Academies, and also for Private Study.

By HENRY N. DAY. New York: Scribner & Co. 1867.

Elements of Logic. Comprising the Doctrines of Laws and Products of Thought, and the Doctrine of Method, together with Logical Praxis. Designed for Classes and profitable for Private Study. By HENRY N. DAY. Charles Scribner & Co. 1868.

These are neat duodecimos, and cost \$1.50 apiece. The Art of Composition comprises 343 pages, the Art of Discourse 356 pages, and the Elements of Logic about the same number.

Every one of these compact treatises is marked by knowledge, good sense, acumen, originality, and modesty. We shall first speak of the Logic. We confess that at first we suspected the author of a little temerity, when we saw that on certain points he had "locked horns" with Sir William Hamilton; but we now think that in all these encounters the American teacher has acquitted himself creditably, and, on some points at least, has made good his positions. None of these differences, however, between the two writers affect seriously any vital points in Hamilton's system. Yet the whole *form* in which the system is presented by Hamilton is changed and freed from its discursive or digressive tendencies on the one hand, and, so far as seemed possible, from its repulsive technicality on the other. The grand result of Hamilton's matchless but ponderous labors will here be found in a nutshell. It is equally adapted to the beginner, as preparatory to the indispensable work of the Scotch philosopher, and to the ripe scholar, who reads the Scotchman by the side of Mill and De Morgan. The book was intended in the first instance for learners, and we have known it to be useful in the case of such; and the author's aim has been to develop the science in strict method. "From the determination of the single radical principle of thought, its laws and the forms of its products have been methodically evolved; and the doctrine

of method with the exercises is but the end and result toward which the unfolding of the doctrine of the elements of thought have steadily tended." The exercises here referred to were prepared specially for the help of the teacher. It would hardly be fair to say that this work is a mere "redaction" of that of Hamilton. Recognising fully all that Sir William Hamilton and others have done for the science, the author is an independent thinker, and has introduced novelties, if not improvements, of his own. Several of these new points have been approved and accepted by prominent college professors in different parts of the country. And we have ourselves been favorably struck with several of these innovations. The book has been lauded by the Presidents of the College of the City of New York, of the University of Kansas, of Geneva College and of the Indiana State University, and by that fine scholar and estimable Christian gentleman, the late Professor Robinson P. Dunn, of Brown University.

We now come to speak of the Art of Discourse, which we are disposed to consider the most philosophical work on rhetoric with which we are acquainted. It may be that Campbell's Philosophy of Rhetoric is a greater book, but it contains glaring errors of analysis, which are corrected in the little volume before us. The same may be said of Whateley. A few extracts from the preface will serve not only to set before the reader the plan and scope of the discussion, but also as samples of the writer's freshness of thought and purity and exactness of style: "The present work is a reconstruction of the author's 'Elements of the Art of Rhetoric,' first published in 1850. The distinctive peculiarities of that work were the elevation of *invention*, or the supply of the thought, to the first and commanding rank in rhetorical instruction; the reduction of the principles of rhetoric to more exact system and method, both in respect of its internal properties and also of its relations to kindred sciences; and the stricter treatment of rhetoric as an art rather than as a science. . . . The principal changes in the text will be found in the more definite indications of the relations of rhetoric to logic and to æsthetics and the fuller and clearer application of logical and æsthetic

principles to the construction of discourse; the fuller and more definite development of the nature and processes of explanation, or the unfolding of thought; and the more exact classification of the properties of style. A leading aim in the reconstruction has been to exhibit the grounds of all the principles of the art in the nature of thought and of language, so as to enable the learner to discern the logical accuracy and completeness of its divisions, its processes, and its properties. The design has been not merely to present a collection of doctrines and observations for acquisition as bare knowledge, but to make practical thinkers and writers. An indispensable condition of such continuous growth is an intelligent apprehension of the essential nature and laws of each of the diverse processes in which thought may be presented to other minds. A moment's reflection will satisfy any candid mind that the expectation of reaching any high skill in the construction of discourse, whether written or *ex tempore*, without separate study and practice in each of these general processes, is just as preposterous as the expectation of attaining mathematical skill by general practice in computing, without specific study of the elementary principles of quantity and practice in the fundamental rules of computation."

We believe this statement, if unqualified, to be liable to exception; and that men have been known to show great practical genius, without any knowledge, or at all events any "specific study," of theoretical "rules," whether "fundamental" or "elementary." Witness Shakspeare, and after him, *longo intervallo*, Lord Erskine. It is nearly certain that neither of these ever made "a specific study" of the "art of discourse;" and yet it will not be questioned that they were both high masters of that art. There have been negroes and idiots, also, who have been high masters of the art of computation.

Our author continues: "Having well-grounded himself thus in these processes, the student of discourse may go on ever perfecting his skill in the handling of thought, in the shaping of it for the various objects of his discourse, and in the ultimate embodiment of it in fit and effective verbal expression." Pro-

ceeding in this way, the training in discourse—in writing compositions—instead of a drudgery, to be shirked whenever possible, Professor Day thinks, becomes an attractive as well as rational and useful procedure.

Exercises are subjoined to the several departments of invention and style; and in the author's valuable "Rhetorical Praxis," may be found two thousand or more themes for rudimental trial in all rhetorical processes. The examples are chosen for the most part from the great writers of our tongue, such as Barrow, Hooker, Milton, etc., or else from the sweet masters of mere charm and elegance. The book reads with the zest of a story, and is conspicuously happy in its plain, lucid, unaffected style.

Like all other writers on *Belles Lettres*, Professor Day puts such men as Addison and Goldsmith and Burke to the torture of his very sensible but fallible rules, and condemns them without compunction where their immortal sentences lack or exceed the right measure; but he does not sin in this way so dreadfully as that pink of propriety, dapper little Dr. Blair. For ourselves, we prefer the good old English classics as they stand, with all their racy idiomatic peculiarities untouched, to all the volumes of artificial or rational criticism that have been constructed on the basis of their conceded excellence, and to all the melodious uniformity and tameness—all the great, but purely negative merit—of such Scottish imitators of the true old English as Dugald Stewart and the timid Edinburgh school. We hold the same high opinion of one or two sterling writers of the last generation.

But we would not be understood as censuring Professor Day. The best writers are imperfect, and he has been very keen in espying an occasional shortcoming in the men whom he admits to be our great teachers of style. In painting, in sculpture, in architecture, in music, in poetry, and in the art of correct and tasteful prose, there is nothing that makes a man learn so surely or so fast as familiarity with the best models. On the very same principle, then, that we would send a young artist to Italy, we would send a young writer of English to the pages of the *Tattler* and *Spectator*, to the old State Trials, to the Elizabethan

literature, to Bacon, to Temple, to Bolingbroke, to the recorded *talk* of Samuel Johnson, to the inimitable ease and suavity of Goldsmith, to the brevity of Cobbett, and the magnificence and energy of Burke.

We have not left ourselves much room to speak of the Art of Composition. This is something quite new, and as good as it is strange. It is a sort of practical English Grammar, for the aid of one who desires to know how to make sentences, and is based upon the latest improvements in the fields of rhetoric and logic. The last feature is the more noticeable of the two. To employ the author's words: "Experience has decisively proved that the study of grammar, composition, and rhetoric, must regard the thought that is to be expressed in language as the ruling element in discourse—its organic, originating, and determining principle. The reversal of this, the putting forward of the word, of style, and making this the prominent and commanding object in the study, has caused the general failure in these branches of instruction. . . . The fundamental distinction between thought itself and the matter of thought, between thinking and that of which we think, so essential to all correct thinking and speaking, . . . is definitely drawn and maintained throughout. This distinction solves some of the most serious difficulties that present themselves in grammatical studies, such as those that occur in the treatment of the verb; in the distribution of modifying elements in the sentence; in the discrimination of prepositions and conjunctions. Next, the broad distinction between the object of which we think and that which we think of it, the distinction between the subject and the predicate and the various forms of words, of modifying elements, of verbal expression generally growing out of this distinction, is definitely presented and recognised every where throughout the entire development of the work." The author shows, in this effort, his ingenuity and fine practical sense, and his power of brief and luminous definition; and has almost won a title to the name of *magister sententiarum*.

**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. Dr. WOODROW, Columbia, S. C. No subscription discontinued unless a special order is given, and all arrearages are paid, or after first number of a volume is published.

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

☞ Ministers of the Gospel, and others, who shall obtain new subscribers, and remit the regular price, (Three Dollars each,) will be entitled to a copy of the REVIEW for one year 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. The 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 uttered in their pages. Each author is responsible for what he expresses. This is a matter of convenience where there are minor differences between editors themselves, or between editors and their brethren. Free discussion, too, is important to the interests of truth, if kept within just limits. These limits should be strictly observed. Editors would be worthy of censure should they allow opinions to be expressed, subversive of the 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. XX.

APRIL, MDCCCLXIX.

No. 2.

COLUMBIA, S. C.

PRINTED AT THE OFFICE OF THE REVIEW.

1869.

CONTENTS.

ARTICLE	PAGE
I. The Southern Presbyterian University. By the Rev. JAMES A. LYON, D. D., Columbus, Miss., -	153
II. A Plea in behalf of the Widows and Orphans of Deceased Ministers of the Presbyterian Church in the United States. By the Rev. E. CATER, College Hill, Miss.,	181
III. Coöperation, - - - - -	194
IV. Some Remarks on the Influence of Magazines and Reviews on Authorship, and a Suggestion for an Authoritative Canon of Classic English Authors. By Prof. W. J. RIVERS, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S. C., - - - - -	221
V. Authorship at the South, - - - - -	235
VI. Critical Notices, - - - - -	262
1. Smyth's Catechism. our Form of Government, and the Committee of Publication. 2. Barnes on the Psalms. 3. Bunting's Manual of Nashville Church. 4. Bushnell's Moral Uses of Dark Things. 5. Wordsworth and Alford on New Testament. 6. Uhlhorn's Modern Representations of Life of Jesus. 7. Farrar's Seekers after God. 8. Ante-Nicene Christian Library. 9. Bickersteth's Yesterday, To-Day, and Forever.	

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XX.—NO. 2.

APRIL, MDCCCLXIX.

ARTICLE I.

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN UNIVERSITY.

The time has been when the name "Presbyterian" was a synonym for an intelligent and cultivated gentleman. The fact of being an ordained minister of the Presbyterian Church was *prima facie* evidence of learning, talent, and piety. Three-fourths of all the colleges on the continent were, a few years ago, under Presbyterian influence—using the term in its widest signification, to include Congregationalists, (Dutch) Reformed, Associate Reformed, and other branches of the great Presbyterian family. One-half of the Presidents of the United States were nominally Presbyterians; and a large proportion of all the great men who have taken a prominent part in the civil affairs of the country have been educated by Presbyterian teachers. So that our precedence as a learned denomination was universally conceded, and we had some right to be proud of our name.

But we must not disguise from ourselves the unpleasant fact that our enviable *prestige* is gradually but surely passing away from us; not that we have lowered our standard, but that we have stood still, content with past honors. One is never in

VOL. XX., NO. 2.—1.

greater danger than when he is lulled into indifference by fancied security. "Let him that thinketh he standeth, take heed lest he fall." Other denominations—all of them—provoked by our good example, are, with commendable zeal, exerting themselves to win the renown of being the first to carry the "torch" to the temple of knowledge. The Cumberland Presbyterian Church—our young and prosperous daughter—has entered into the contest with remarkable vigor and determination. Their University at Lebanon, Tennessee, under the ecclesiastical control of the whole Church, has, in an incredibly short time, become a first-class institution, especially in the law department. And there is no one thing that contributes so much to the respectability and success of that denomination as the influence of that University alone. The Episcopal bishops have by no means abandoned their grand scheme of establishing their "University of the South" on Cumberland Mountain; and with concentrated episcopal action, they will in due time succeed. Our Methodist brethren, so zealous in every good work, and of late so active in elevating the standard of ministerial education, are establishing colleges and universities in different parts of the country, exclusively under ecclesiastical control. And who does not know that the great secret of the success of the Roman Catholics in this country is wholly attributable to their untiring activity in establishing schools and colleges and convents in every portion of the land, and then tempting Protestant patronage on the score of cheapness and safety? *Small cost and bolted doors* are the two principal recommendations of Roman Catholic schools. There is nothing that threatens greater damage to Protestantism in this country than the influence of Roman Catholic institutions, every one of which is strictly under the supervision and management of the Church. From these facts and considerations, so plain that he that runs may read—nay, so patent that it is criminal to be blind on the subject—it is manifest that we are in imminent danger of losing our long established *prestige* as the leading educators of the land.

Nor is the simple danger of being outstripped by other denominations the only or the most important consideration. We

are falling behind the rapid progress of knowledge. Science does not stand still, but marches forward with giant strides. The curriculum that was ample and honorable fifty years ago is wholly inadequate for the domain that now constitutes human knowledge. It is a literal impossibility for the four years' study of our collegiate course, and the three years of our theological course, to place our ministry in the front ranks of learned men and alongside of the distinguished men of science of the present day. Hence the necessity that the Church should elevate the standard of learning, and provide the means for a more thorough intellectual cultivation in the qualification of our clergy for pastoral, professorial, and evangelistic work.

Moreover, such a step on our part is not only essential in order to keep pace with the rapid strides of science and human learning, and necessary in order to maintain our previous honorable precedence as the educators of the land, but it is indispensable as a precautionary measure in order to maintain our own ground as a denomination. No intelligent person need be told of the ineffaceable influence of educational teachers upon the minds and hearts of the young. The soft wax is not more susceptible of the impress of the seal than are the plastic minds of youth of the influences which a wise and adroit teacher may exert upon them. The influence of a teacher is, in some respects, even greater than that of a parent; not only because he possesses for the time the delegated authority of the parent, but because, in nine cases out of ten, the teacher is presumed to be wiser than the parent. Is it, therefore, any cause of wonder that a child trained in a Catholic school should return home a Catholic? or that a son who studies law at a Unitarian university should become a Unitarian? or that a young man who attends the medical lectures of an infidel—as too often happens—should himself be incurably tainted with the virus of infidelity, or so shaken in his religious sentiments, that he is never after of any use to the Church? How very important, therefore, is it that we should have institutions of our own, under our own influence, manned by our own men, and free from the objectionable features just hinted at.

It is a humiliating reflection that we, as a denomination, have no first-class institution of learning, fully up to the times, under our influence and control. Who has not of late years been painfully impressed with the dragging and fruitless efforts to establish presbyterial and synodical colleges in different parts of the Church? The sole cause of failure, in nine cases out of ten, has been the want of funds. These abortive efforts have involved great waste both of labor and money, and are followed by despondency and prostration of denominational zeal. It is literally impossible for a synod embracing only a few score of churches, most of them small and weak, to establish a first-class college. They can provide neither the funds nor the patronage that will guarantee the success of such an attempt. Hence it is a lamentable fact that nearly all our synodical colleges are in a crippled and dying condition. Some are already dead. With an insufficient endowment, a slim patronage, and little to attract in the shape of libraries, apparatus, cabinets, etc., it follows that the salaries of the president and professors are wholly insufficient to command the first talent of the country. A clerk in a bank, or a book-keeper in a dry-goods store, will command a larger salary than is offered to the presidents and professors of our synodical colleges. The *honor* of being an officer in a third or fourth-rate college, struggling for doubtful existence, is not sufficient to compensate for the deficiency of salary. Consequently, as a general thing, the chairs of our colleges are not filled by the first talent of the Church. There are exceptions, of course. We mean no disparagement of present incumbents. Many of them are noble men, and worthy of much higher positions and more generous remuneration than they now enjoy. But the fact, nevertheless, is incontrovertible. Moreover, this is not the only evil. The poverty of these institutions necessitates high tuition to supplement inadequate endowments. The result is, that the poor of our people are not able to patronise them, but are tempted to send their children to Roman Catholic institutions, whose teachers, having taken upon themselves the vow of poverty and consecrated themselves wholly to the service of the Church, labor without any other remuneration than that of

a bare but comfortable subsistence. This is no "cry of wolf"—no idle alarm. There are but few of our readers who would not be amazed with painful astonishment, were they informed of the exact number of Presbyterian children—the children of elders and deacons as well as of private members of the Church—that are now in the institutions of Catholics and other errorists full of deadly hostility to the Presbyterian Church. There is a crying demand, therefore, that we should have institutions of our own, so amply endowed that we, too, could furnish educational privileges to the poor of our Church at small cost. Such institutions, however, cannot be furnished by synods—much less by "voluntary associations" within the bounds of synod, actuated, it may be, by some local interest. But such *can* be easily provided by the united and harmonious action of the whole Church.

These and similar facts having impressed themselves deeply upon the minds of some of our younger clergy, who, as chaplains in the army, had observed the mighty power of concentrated and systematic action in producing great results, with their minds and hearts full of the subject, they came up to the Nashville Assembly (1867) with the hope of inaugurating a grand scheme of education, under the supervision and control of the whole Church, which would not only restore our former precedence, but form a bulwark against the open and insidious encroachments of enemies and errorists. These brethren were not themselves members of the Assembly, but they engaged one who was fully in sympathy with their views to bring the matter before that body, which, although it met with some opposition, yet was received with general favor, and the following paper was adopted and referred to the presbyteries, with direction to report on the subject to the next Assembly:

"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 in 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.

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

"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."

This action looks to the establishment of a great institution of learning, under the exclusive supervision and control of the whole Church—a grand university, concentrating all the appliances for the development and cultivation of the human intellect and the improvement of the human heart—whose several departments shall embrace the whole sphere of human knowledge; whose chairs shall be filled with great and good men of our own faith and order; where the poorest of the gifted youth of the Church can receive instruction in any and every department at a nominal cost; and where our clergy, if they are so minded, can attain an eminence in mental and moral cultivation and learned acquirements, that will entitle them to no second seat amongst the learned men of the age.

The only difference of opinion was on the *first* resolution, viz.: "Resolved, 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." The ground taken by the few in the Assembly that opposed the resolutions, was, that it is *not* the province of the organised Church of God, as such, to engage in what is termed in the resolution the "*mental*" culture of the youth of the Church. As the subject was introduced just at the close of the sessions of the Assembly, there was not sufficient time to discuss its merits on the floor of that body. It was, however, the intention and expectation of the friends of this great scheme to discuss it *in extenso* during the too short interval that elapsed

between the dissolution of the Nashville Assembly and the convening of the Baltimore Assembly in the following May. But, in consequence of the deepening gloom that brooded over the land, and the despondency that weighed heavily upon the public mind, disqualifying it for giving just heed to any new enterprise looking to a large expenditure of money; and also in consequence of the ill health of some of those most interested in the success of the proposed undertaking, the subject was not discussed through our public journals and in our presbyteries, except to a very limited extent. The result was that the great body of the Church either never heard or lost sight of the overture of the Assembly; whilst many of the remaining few wholly misconceived the real *animus* of the resolutions, and by a strange misnomer, or a singular perversion of terms, interpreted "the mental culture with the view to the highest attainments in active and vital piety," to mean "*secular education!*"* The result was, as might have been expected, that there was no decisive action, on the part of the presbyteries, on the subject. Only *twenty-two* presbyteries out of forty-eight took any action on the overture. And of these, only "seven deny the *right* of the Assembly to engage in the work of (so-called) secular education." From these facts, it is clearly manifest that the Church has made no utterance on the subject. In compliance with the suggestion of some of the friends of the enterprise, the Baltimore Assembly made no deliverance touching the matter, but simply postponed it to an indefinite future, leaving the whole subject open for discussion, and the authoritative decision of the Assembly at some other time. (See Minutes of Baltimore Assembly, page 266.)*

* It never once came into the mind of the Nashville Assembly to commit the Church to what is *strictly* and *properly* termed "*secular*" education—that is, to teach men the art of becoming blacksmiths, wagon-makers, farmers, ship-builders, and other purely secular trades and handicrafts, with secular purposes or ends in view; but so to superintend their mental as well as their moral training as to guarantee their receiving a *Christian education*. There is not a word or a syllable in the overture that can by possibility be construed to mean "*secular education*" in the sense just defined.

There can be no question as to the IMPORTANCE of such an institution as contemplated. The only difference of opinion relates, *first*, to the "right" of the Church to engage in such an enterprise; and, *second*, the *feasibility* of so great an undertaking. We have profound respect for the opinions of those brethren—few in number, as we believe—who take the ground that the Church has no *right* to engage in "the *mental* as well as the moral culture of the people of God," etc. When we see to what lamentable results latitudinarian views as to the legitimate province of the Church have in other places and in times past led, we cannot but respect the excessive caution of brethren who err on the other extreme. We have no sympathy whatever for that loose construction of ecclesiastical prerogative which converts the Church into colonization, temperance, antiquarian, and such like societies, or allows its ministers to preach politics, and its courts to make political deliverances. This is to convert the temple of God into a house of merchandise. But, at the same time, there is error in the opposite direction. Appalled at the unhallowed lengths to which latitudinarian views have beguiled others, we are in danger of being driven to the other extreme, which, whilst it is error on the safer side, is nevertheless error, into which it is not desirable for the Church to fall. Error is necessarily and essentially an evil, it matters not on which extreme it is found. Whilst we avoid Scylla, let us not founder on Charybdis. *In medio tutissimus ibis*. The energies of the Church may be greatly weakened by being too strict in our construction. Let us not hamper her power by being too straitened. The Church should have free action and room to exert herself. Without this she fails to fulfil her true mission. Whilst the Church is a FOLD into which the people of God are to be gathered for their mutual safety and edification, yet it is at the same time a FORTRESS—a barracks of strength—a magazine of moral forces for the invasion and overthrow of the kingdom of darkness. Nothing is more plainly taught in the word of God than that the Church is an aggressive power in the earth, destined to overcome all antagonisms and conquer the whole world. "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." Consequently, it is a great mistake to suppose that the Church is only a fold of safety, a city of refuge from our enemies, a school of piety and devotion for our own individual comfort and growth in grace. If this was the only design of an organised Church in the world, then its true mission would be accomplished by prayer and praise, and the exposition, in the most contracted sense, of the plan of salvation through the Lord Jesus Christ. This being true, monachism would not be so far wrong after all. But the Church has another, and, in its organised capacity, a higher destiny: it is to "pull down the strongholds of Satan," and to plant the standard of the cross on the battlements of all opposition.

All agree that "Christ's kingdom is not of this world." Consequently it is not to be set up and maintained by worldly means—that is, by bayonets and bomb-shells, by standing armies and garrisons, by constabulary forces, fines and imprisonments. This is what our Saviour means in his memorable answer to Pilate: "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." (John xviii. 36.) We stoutly maintain, therefore, there are certain prescribed boundaries defining the legitimate province of Christ's visible kingdom, which it is not lawful to transcend. It is not lawful for the Church to usurp the prerogative of Cæsar—to make and administer civil law, to become an arbiter in civil or political matters, or to engage in any purely secular business, with secular aims and ends in view. But, at the same time, does any one imagine that Christ's kingdom is not *in* the world, and composed of living, moving human beings, clothed with flesh and blood? What, therefore, is the distinguishing difference between the kingdoms of this world and Christ's kingdom? Simply and plainly this: The former demand obedience from, and exercise control over, the bodies of men; *the latter* over the minds and hearts of men. The one is a carnal kingdom, the other a spiritual. The one cultivates the material part of man, the other the immaterial. The dominion of the

one takes hold on that which is mortal in man, that of the other on the immortal. Consequently, all that is mortal of man belongs to the kingdoms of this world; all that is immortal to Christ's kingdom. It is therefore an exceedingly narrow and mistaken view of the province of Christ's kingdom to suppose that it is to be restricted to the affections and moral faculties of man, passing by his intellectual attributes. Nay, in a religious point of view, the heart and the intellect are inseparable. To cultivate the former to the neglect of the latter is to make a fanatic. To cultivate the latter to the neglect of the former is to make an infidel or an atheist. Satan's emissaries diligently and sneeringly inculcate the figment that the Church's legitimate province pertains only to the *moral* part of man, his heart and affections, developed by "*faith*," in their own contemptuous sense of that term, meaning blind and authoritative belief, whilst the reason and the intellectual powers must stand clear of "the shackles of superstition!" Doubtless the great enemy of souls would gladly compromise with the Church, by reserving to himself the development and cultivation of the intellectual faculties in man, freely resigning to the Church his heart and affections. For whilst he might not be sure of winning, yet he would be sure of circumscribing and greatly embarrassing the power of the Church for good. These two parts of man's nature, therefore, must be cultivated in conjunction, in order to make a well-balanced and normal Christian.

That the great mission of the Church is to save souls by the overthrow of error and the promulgation of divine truth, none will deny. On this subject there can be no difference of opinion. But there may be difference of opinion as to *how* this great work is to be accomplished. It would seem from the position taken by some who oppose the scheme of the united and concentrated action of the entire body in the great work of educating the youth of the Church, that the sole and restricted duty of the organised Church, and of its ordained ministers, was simply and literally to "*preach*." And not only to preach, but to be consistent, to preach in the exact manner and style of the apostles, using the very words of Paul and Silas to the jailer, "Believe

on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house;" and of the apostles on the day of Pentecost, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." But how utterly impracticable and absurd this would be! The position taken by our strict construction brethren would be more appropriate for the millennium, after the whole world should be gathered into the Church, than for the present times, when the Church is emphatically militant, contending with great opposition. What success would our foreign missionaries have in their arduous labors if they were confined in their work to the simple utterance of the plan of salvation through the atonement made by Christ? The attempt would be like trying to build a stately edifice upon a heap of rubbish. The sand must be first cleared away, and the rock made bare before a house can be built that will stand. The Church was organised and the apostles were commissioned for *missionary* work, so that missionary work is the *normal* work of the Church. This is its true and legitimate province. Consequently, what is lawful for the missionary in a foreign land cannot be unlawful for the Church at home. Paul said that he was "made all things to all men, that he might by all means save some." Does not this manifestly imply that any and every instrumentality whose exclusive aim it is wisely and righteously to bring about this glorious consummation, is legitimate means for the organised Church of God? The only question, therefore, to be decided by the regularly authorised ministers of the gospel, or by the properly organised Church, is, what is *necessary* to the advancement of Christ's kingdom in the world? what will contribute most wisely and effectively to the salvation of souls? Whatever is *necessary* to this end *is* lawful. If making *tents* will effectually contribute towards the furtherance of the gospel, then the Church may engage in tent-making with that sole end in view. If building a ship will contribute directly to the planting of the gospel on a distant island or a foreign shore, then the Church may build a ship. If making and laying bricks, or squaring stones, or hewing cedars on the mountains, or making fine twined linen,

will contribute directly to the salvation of souls, then the Church may lawfully engage in these several works. If casting and setting types, making paper and printing it, and binding books and selling them, is one of the efficient means of advancing Christ's kingdom, then the Church may legitimately engage in these works. This is no *new* doctrine. Its opposite is the *novelty*. Ever since the day that God commanded Noah to build the ark, and Moses to erect the tabernacle, down to the present time, it has been the settled policy and practice of the Church to control all the agencies and appliances necessary to the advancement of Christ's kingdom in the world. Was it not for this very principle that our fathers, many of whom still live, contended so earnestly thirty-five years ago, and won so glorious a victory? The theory of "voluntary associations" to do the Church's work has long since been repudiated by the Old School Presbyterian Church. So that now the Church does actually make paper, cast type, print and bind books, build houses, navigate the seas, and do whatever else is deemed necessary to preach the gospel to a dying world. And yet with these facts staring us full in the face, shall we take the ground that the Church has not "the right" to superintend the education of her baptized children and youth, and to train them in the nurture and fear of God? How preposterous! Some will not allow bricks to be made for the Church, funds invested, stocks managed, or books printed, by irresponsible agents; yet they will allow the plastic and immortal minds of the children of the Church to be moulded with ineffaceable impressions, lasting as eternity itself, by agents not responsible to the Church—nay, in multitudes of instances, by secret and bitter enemies of the Church! What can be more absurd? Alas! absurdity is not the worst that can be said of it—it is wicked! Do not the Bible and the Confession of Faith recognise baptized children as legitimate members of the Church? And, as such, do they not come under the care and supervision of the Church to train them up in the principles of the Christian religion? And how can this be done if infidels and errorists and worldlings have control of their early education? And how can we prevent this, unless we have schools of our own—great

schools, attractive and cheap, and commanding in their influence? Do you say that the Church may not provide such schools, but that she may *recommend* our people to establish and patronise such? Where, we ask, do you find in the word of God authority for the Church to *recommend* anything? Where do you find an example of God's *recommending* the performance of any act? Where did God's prophets *recommend* any line of duty? When and where did Christ recommend or advise the discharge of any line of duty, or the abandonment of any vice? Are not ministers the "*ambassadors*" of God? They are not sent to recommend, but to *command* in the name of the Lord God. Is not the Church "the bride of Christ," and is the bride of Christ clothed only with *advisory* power? Has not the Church the right—nay, is she not commanded to speak with authority, whether men will hear or whether they will forbear? This reducing of the Church from an authoritative institution to an advisory council is not only to degrade the bride of Christ, but, in the case under consideration, it is trenching upon dangerous ground. For if the Church may not engage in, but *recommend* "*secular* education," on the supposition that education is "*secular*," why may she not recommend colonization, temperance, and other good things? No; if the Church has no *right* to establish institutions of learning for the mental and moral development and training of her children, on the ground that they are purely "*secular*" institutions, then she has no *right* to recommend their establishment, any more than she has to recommend African Colonization or historical societies. It is not the province of the Church to recommend, but to command. It is true that the different courts of the Church have fallen into the habit of "*recommending*." But such phraseology is not the Church's genuine vernacular. She is driven to the use of it from a conscious sense of weakness and consequent timidity. But when she shall "look forth as the morning, fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners," she will not *recommend*, but COMMAND.

If it were necessary to add any thing more in vindication of the position taken by the Nashville Assembly, that "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;" or, in other words, that they might be useful members "and intelligent office-bearers in the Church of God, whilst at the same time they may pursue different professions and callings in life,"—we would refer to the general practice of the Church, and point to schools, academies, and colleges throughout her entire border, established by ecclesiastical authority, and strictly under ecclesiastical supervision and control. If the new and extreme doctrine which we have been combating be true, then this is all wrong, and the sooner the Church abandons these institutions, the better. Nor can we consistently stop here. We must send an order to our missionaries in foreign lands to close their schools, or to hand them over to "voluntary associations," since the Church has no more right to teach an African than an Englishman, a Mongol than a Caucasian, a Chinese than our own baptized Anglo-Saxon! Nay, we must go still further, and stop the printing and publishing operations of our "Committee of Publication;" since it is perfectly manifest that if the Church has no right to establish a school and superintend the education of the baptized children of the Church, with the view to their highest attainments in piety and active usefulness, *a fortiori*, she has no right to engage in type-setting, book-binding, and such like "secular" employments! But this is not all. We must not only reform our practice of establishing synodical schools and colleges, and of appointing publication committees, but we must *revise* the Confession of Faith itself; for it expressly provides that "to the deacons also may be properly committed the *temporal affairs* of the Church." (See Confession of Faith, *in loco*.) Now, it follows, as we think, conclusively, that if one part of the regularly organised Church of God may engage in what is termed "the temporal affairs" of an individual congregation, with the sole purpose of advancing the religious interests of said congregation, then, by parity of reasoning, a higher court—a presbytery, for instance—may engage in like affairs for a like purpose. And if a presbytery may do this,

then may a synod; and if a synod, then may the General Assembly. And, *vice versa*, what is unlawful for the General Assembly, that is, forbidden by the word of God, is unlawful for a synod, for a presbytery, for a bench of deacons. Consistency, therefore, will require our new theory brethren to strike that particular clause from the Confession of Faith.

Still another perplexing question springs up in our path as we contemplate this new doctrine. It is this: May a regularly ordained minister of the gospel, as such, teach school or become a professor in a college? We doubt it, provided the new theory be true; because it would be "secular" business, which the Church has *no* right to engage in, and consequently no right to authorise any one of her consecrated ministers to engage in. It is plain that if one minister, as such, may lawfully engage in teaching—which is "secular" business, according to the assumption—then may another and still another; nay, every minister in the whole presbytery may be lawfully engaged in "secular education." But the moment the "last moderator present" constitutes these teaching brethren into a presbytery, *presto!* their calling becomes unlawful! Is a presbytery, therefore, more holy and more consecrated to the sole work of "preaching the gospel" than an individual minister? We think not. Consequently, according to the theory, the presbytery has not the right to authorise one of its ordained ministers to engage in any work which the presbytery itself might not do. If this be true, then another question of great practical importance immediately presents itself for solution. It is this: May an ordained minister of the gospel, who has been "called of God," and solemnly consecrated and set apart to the service of the Church, who belongs to the Church and has vowed obedience to it, engage in any kind of secular business whatever, without the permission of presbytery? We answer in the negative. If, therefore, teaching school is "secular business," in which the Church may not engage, and if the Church has *no* right to authorise her ministers to engage in secular business, and if her ministers are not allowed to engage in any business which the Church may not sanction, then, in this dilemma, what is the duty of the legion of ministers already

engaged in the "secular" business of teaching school? The adoption of this new theory will involve the Church in a mass of inconsistencies out of which it will be difficult to extricate herself.

But we are willing to answer as well as to ask questions. Do you ask us whether the Church may deliver lectures on **ASTRONOMY**? We unhesitatingly answer yes, if thereby you overthrow heathen cosmogony, and prepare the way for the reception of the gospel. Should the Church deliver lectures on **GEOLOGY**? By all means, we answer, if an infidel or atheistic theory is thereby shown to be false. Is it allowable for the Church to teach **NATURAL SCIENCE**? Most assuredly, we answer, by her appointed and responsible professors; so that not pantheism, or materialism, or positivism, or naturalism, but genuine Bible theism shall be taught to our baptized youth. The extent to which anti-biblical sentiments are inculcated or insinuated by officials in many distinguished institutions of learning, is alarming to a believer in the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures. We ourselves have heard the declaration of the Apostle Paul, that "God hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth," ridiculed by a fascinating medical professor in lecturing to his class; thus infecting with the poison of scepticism those whose superior learning and intelligence gave them more than ordinary influence in society, and whose profession introduced them to the privacy and confidence of our families. Even the great Agassiz, whose name is a mighty power in the scientific world, publicly declared in a course of lectures delivered to the students of Cornell University, at Ithaca, New York, that "Moses was not reliable authority." He also controverts the doctrine of the "unity of the races." Here, then, is a danger, appalling in its menacing attitude and insidious in its workings, that, unheeded, will ere long sap the foundations of Christianity. Even on the supposition that great institutions can be found in this country and elsewhere, in which no such error is promulgated, yet is not *godlessness* itself a horrible heresy? Will the Church be satisfied to have her sons trained in Godless and Christless schools? **This**

is a dreadful mistake. The apostle exhorts the Church and her ministers "to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints." When and where shall this contest begin? Shall we allow the child to be subjected to the influence of the Catholic, the Ritualist, the Unitarian, the Infidel, the Atheist, the Godless and Christless, to be indoctrinated, moulded, trained, biassed, prejudiced, corrupted with error or irreligion, and then, after that, to be reformed by "preaching the gospel?" Do you say, Let the Church discountenance such institutions, and warn her people against patronising them? This is all very good in its place; but what will such warning amount to? A few, perhaps, may respect the recommendation of the Church. But, after all, will it not be requiring too much, to expect all our people to patronise some little local third-rate log-college, controlled by a "voluntary association" of irresponsible trustees, a majority of whom happen to be Presbyterians, and officered by three or four second-rate men, struggling with poverty, and consequently compelled to place the price of board and tuition at high figures? Is it reasonable to expect our people to patronise such institutions, when the doors of the greatest universities of this and other lands are open to them at comparatively small cost, and where they can sit at the feet of the most learned and scientific men of the age, and drink at inexhaustible fountains of knowledge, though their tempting waters be impregnated with some deleterious ingredients? To expect this would betray a deficiency in the knowledge of human nature, and an ignorance of the secret springs of human action. No; the only successful method of remedying this evil is to establish rival institutions of our own, second to none, and whose halls shall be open, free of tuition, to all who may choose to enter them. Such, however, cannot be built up by local and circumscribed efforts. It is an impossibility. But they can be easily by the united and harmonious action of the whole Church.

But let us inquire of those who deny the *right* of the Church to engage in what they call "secular education," what is the distinction between that and theological education? What is it that renders the one unlawful and the other lawful? In con-

trasting the course of instruction given in a "secular" institution with that given by the Assembly's Executive Committee of Education, we find that the one teaches the elements of a common education; so does the other. The one teaches the ancient languages; so does the other. The one teaches natural science; so does the other. The one teaches mathematics; so does the other. The one teaches history and the fine arts; so does the other. The one teaches metaphysics and philosophy; so does the other. The one teaches moral science; so does the other. So far, the two courses of instruction run precisely in the same channel. What, then, makes the difference? Wherein is the one unlawful and the other lawful for the Church to engage in? Do you answer that the difference does not lie in the instruction given, nor in the manner of giving it, but in the *end* for which it is given?—that is, for the qualification of pious youth to preach the gospel. It is the end that justifies the means. True, in this instance, the end fully justifies the means. And for the same reason precisely, we advocate the right and the duty of the Church to exercise a supervision and control over the education of the baptized youth of the Church, in order that their minds may be shielded against injurious and dangerous error, and that their mental and moral faculties may be developed and cultivated in harmony with the truths of the Bible and in subjection to the benign principles of Christianity. This certainly is a justifiable end. In these and similar instances, we have no doubt about the end justifying the means, any more than we have about the right of Paul to make *tents* at Corinth, or of the Church to print books at Richmond. This we maintain, even on the supposition the education was a "secular" and not a religious business.

And this suggests the important inquiry whether the developing and training the mental and moral faculties of youth, and storing their minds with knowledge and ideas that are to be incorporated with their spiritual being and lasting as eternity, to be placed in the category of "secular" or religious things. On this subject, our convictions are very clear and decided. We have already pointed out the difference between the kingdoms of this world and Christ's kingdom. The one exercises dominion

over the bodies of men; the other over the spirits. The one includes the material and mortal part; the other the immaterial and immortal. The duration of the one is limited by time; the other reaches into eternity. It cannot be, therefore, that any thing that is immortal and spiritual in man does not come directly within the purview of Christ's kingdom. How absurd the idea that a *part* of man's immortal and spiritual nature belongs to the kingdoms of this world, which come to an end, and another part to the kingdom of Christ, which is everlasting! Whilst the corporeal and the spiritual may be separated in thought and in fact, yet the latter cannot be divided into parts. We cannot draw a line across the immortal attributes of man's nature, and say, Over *this* part Christ's kingdom has a *right* to exercise its influence and to take supervision; but over *that* the Church claims no direct authority. *This* the Church may legitimately look after; *that* leave to the kingdoms of this world! Is not the inference inevitable that it comes clearly within the province of the organised Church of God to look after all that is *spiritual* and *immortal* in man? Is not this the legitimate field of the Church's labors? Can the Church fulfil her true mission in the neglect of such supervision? Therefore, to educate, to draw out, to exercise, to cultivate the mental and moral faculties of youth in accordance with the principles of Christianity, is not a *secular*," but a *religious* business. Any supposition to the contrary strikes us as a dangerous delusion, akin to that which forbids to marry, and commands to abstain from meats, which God has created to be received with thanksgiving."

We have observed one or two other objections—not involving ecclesiastical prerogative—urged against this grand scheme, which it may not be amiss to notice in passing. The danger of "centralised power" has been made a ground of opposition to the whole Church's engaging in the establishment and support of one great institution like the one proposed. This is a very remarkable objection, the exact force of which it is difficult to state. The Presbyterian theory is, that the Church is a *unit*—that synods, presbyteries, and individual congregations, are but component parts of one grand whole. This being granted,

wherein consists the danger of centralised power? Danger to what? Who is to suffer? Not the Church; for the power belongs to the Church, and is the Church itself acting. The institution in question is to be the creature of the Church, the child of the Church, the agent of the Church, the servant of the Church—a part and parcel of the Church itself. The Church has already centralised its influence upon other and kindred schemes, as, for example, upon the Executive Committee of Education. Where is the danger of that? Also upon the Committees of Sustentation, Publication, and Foreign Missions. Where is the danger of such centralised power? It is a fallacy—it is a phantom. The truth is, the UNITY of the Church requires *unity* of action. This is its normal condition; and every thing that tends to distract and dissipate its power tends to weakness. As one Committee of Foreign Missions, Publication, etc., is better than many, so one great and efficient institution of learning, supported by and under the supervision and control of the whole Church, is better than a score of little ones scattered throughout the borders of the Church. Simplicity and unity of action are the two great elements of power in the Church.

This great undertaking has also been objected to on the ground that “it would cost a great deal of money!” Such a plea is not allowed in the Bible. It is forbidden by the letter and spirit of the word of God. It is weak, it is wicked, it is infidel! Where in the whole range of the Scriptures do you find the slightest ground of justification for putting *money* in the scale over against the *glory* of Christ’s kingdom? The ministers and people of God, in consulting with regard to the perfection of Christians and the salvation of sinners, ought never to *think* of money. Let it not be once named among you as an *objection*. The only question to be considered is, in right, is it desirable, is it duty, will it promote the salvation of souls and the glory of God? To oppose, or hold back, or hesitate in a scheme demanded by the interests of the Redeemer’s kingdom, because it will cost money—nay, a great deal of money—is to take sides against the woman who anointed the Saviour’s head with “ointment of spikenard very precious.”

Suppose the life of a child in jeopardy, and the father should hesitate to fly to its rescue on the score of *expense*—would not the whole world condemn him? And is not the life and prosperity of the Church of greater importance than any earthly interest? No; the Church can do any thing that is fit and proper to be done, provided her heart is in it. Therefore, in discussing this great subject, let no one object on the score of the scarcity of money. Let us begin. Money will not always be scarce. If the scheme be right, and the heart of the Church becomes interested in the matter, money will not be wanting.

It is not the design of this article to set forth, in minute detail, a PLAN for the proposed institution. This would be premature. Sufficient, however, at this stage of the discussion, to state that as the matter now lies in the minds of its friends, nothing less is contemplated than a FIRST-CLASS UNIVERSITY, in the broadest acceptation of that term. It is intended to embrace the various fields of ancient and modern learning and literature, together with law, medicine, and theology; the whole to be under the control of a directory appointed by the General Assembly, and over whose appointments and operations the Assembly shall exercise a *veto* power. It is not contemplated that this institution shall be *sectarian* in any department except the theological. In that, of course, the distinctive tenets of the Church will be inculcated. But not in the other departments. Over these the supervision of the Church will be satisfied in guarding the instruction given against any thing inconsistent with a pure Protestant Christianity. The entire establishment will embrace about nine different colleges or departments, viz. :

I. THE DEPARTMENT OF ANCIENT LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE.

II. THE DEPARTMENT OF MODERN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE, INCLUDING THE ENGLISH.

III. THE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL SCIENCE.

IV. THE DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL AND MORAL SCIENCE AND PHILOSOPHY.

V. THE DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS—PURE AND MIXED.

VI. THE DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY AND THE FINE ARTS.

VII. THE DEPARTMENT OF LAW.

VIII. THE DEPARTMENT OF MEDICINE.

IX. THE DEPARTMENT OF THEOLOGY.

These several departments shall each be independent of the other—having their separate faculties, presided over by their respective presidents, and shall be authorised to confer diplomas or certificates of proficiency in the course of study pursued in that department. The presidents of all the several departments shall constitute the FACULTY of the university. A chancellor appointed directly by the General Assembly shall be *ex officio* the president of the faculty, and also of the board of directors; and shall be the official organ of communication between the University and the General Assembly.

It is not without hesitation that we have ventured to suggest this outline of a plan. But it may serve as a starting point for such as are better qualified to elaborate a plan than we are ourselves.

Just here, perhaps, we may have to engage in a final skirmish with regard to the “*right*” of the Church to appoint instructors in law and medicine. But, when we take into consideration the mighty social and moral influence exerted for good or evil by these two learned professions, we think the contest will be brief. We have already, in this article, alluded to the lamentable fact that many of the professors in the medical colleges of this and other countries are infidels and scoffers, and, to say the least, utterly godless. There are noble exceptions, it is admitted. But the fact remains notwithstanding. The moral influence of this profession is great. A godless, scoffing physician has it in his power to do much evil; whilst a pious, devout one, whose professional duties take him to the house of suffering, distress, anxiety, fear, and danger, has it in his power to administer balm to the troubled spirit as well as medicine to the suffering body.

Moreover, medical knowledge is of great advantage to the foreign missionary, in that it is a means of obtaining the respect and confidence of the heathen, and opening the way for the speedy reception of the gospel. The evangelist Luke was a

physician, and doubtless practised his profession at the same time that he preached the gospel. And the blessed Saviour spent most of his ministerial life in healing the sick and removing the physical maladies of the people, whilst he preached the gospel of his kingdom. In view of these facts, therefore, the Church certainly has the right to guard her people against the malign influence of godless and scoffing physicians. And there is no more effectual method of doing this than by superintending the professional education of such of her sons as devote their lives to the healing art.

The moral influence of the legal profession is greater and more responsible than that of the medical, from the fact that the one comes more directly in contact with the public mind than the other. Whilst the physician practises his occult art, and whispers his advice in the secluded chamber of the sick, the lawyer vociferates his harangues in the hearing of a multitude. He is therefore, in a certain acceptation, a public instructor. If, therefore, the lawyer be a courageous Christian, he can, in every speech he makes before judge and jury and listening crowd, inculcate the morality of the gospel. But if he be an infidel, or a scoffer, or an unscrupulous worldling, he may, as is exemplified in too many instances, make deadly thrusts at Christianity, her ministers, her morality, and her sacred ordinances. Here is a great and telling evil in the land, which the Church ought to guard against if she can. It is confessed that the Church cannot prevent men from becoming infidels; but she can prevent her own sons from being taught infidelity, by providing able and pious instructors of her own to teach such as enter the learned professions.

But great as is the moral influence of the lawyer in the ordinary practice of his profession, yet there is another aspect in which his influence may be viewed of perhaps greater responsibility. It is the fact that a very large proportion of the LEGISLATORS and RULERS of the land are taken from the legal profession. The transcendent influence of this class of the community may be appreciated when we reflect that legislators are, for the most part, armed with *threefold power*. *First*: As a general

rule, they are selected from the most *intelligent* class of the community, so that they possess the power consequent upon superior intelligence. *Second*: The *dignity* of their office, as law-makers, invests them with more than ordinary moral influence. And *third*: They wield the mighty power of law itself, which they themselves make. Law is not only powerful in that it holds the sword, but in that it possesses a *moral* power within itself. Multitudes are not able to distinguish between the obligations of moral and civil law. "So tremendous is this influence that the terms *unlawful* and *immoral* have become in the minds of unreflecting people synonymous! To pronounce an act contrary to law is regarded by many as the same thing as pronouncing it morally wrong. Consequently, in the minds of multitudes, the standard of moral right and wrong is not the table of the ten commandments or the precepts of the gospel, but the civil code." (See this *Review*, Vol. XV., p. 597.) Hence it is exceedingly important that the law-makers of the land should be free from atheistical taint or bias, as well as from the shackles of despotic superstition. The danger of infidel legislation is illustrated by such enactments as render it unlawful for a dying Christian to leave, by bequest, one farthing for any Christian charity whatever, as exemplified in the civil code of the State of Mississippi, and by such provisions as disfranchise ministers of the gospel, not for felony or crime, but simply because they are ministers of the gospel, which characterise the constitutions of other States. When, therefore, we take into consideration the fact that the great majority of the law-makers and rulers of the land are taken from the legal profession, it becomes a part of Christian prudence to provide that so many of the sons of the Church as practise the legal profession shall not, whilst engaged in the prosecution of their studies, be so perverted in their religious sentiments as to prejudice them against the Christian religion, or to bias them in favor of dangerous error. This precaution can be effectually exercised only by establishing institutions of our own of high order, affording such advantages and facilities for a professional education as will obviate all temptation to go elsewhere.

The FEASIBILITY of so great an undertaking is the only thing that remains to be discussed in this article. There are many, especially amongst those who have formerly participated in the abortive attempts of presbyteries and synods to establish colleges, that are appalled at the thought of engaging in a scheme involving the outlay of so much money; whilst there are others who seem to think that it is their peculiar mission on earth to serve as *brakemen* on the train of human progress, and to *scotch* the wheels of every noble enterprise. They not only do nothing themselves, but they hinder others from doing. So "*canis jacebat in præsepì bovesque latrando a pabulo arcebat.*" They feel sure that they will be on the popular side in opposing any enterprise that costs money. This class we have no hope of convincing, except by actual success. We expect, therefore, to prosecute the great scheme not only without their aid, but in the face of their opposition. The first named, however, are constituted of different material. They have already shown by their works that they appreciate the importance of the proposed institution, and would rejoice at its success. But they fear that it is impracticable. Such, nevertheless, are the very men we need, as they have already learned wisdom by experience. Having been over the road, they can point out where the danger lies.

All undertakings are difficult or easy in proportion to the means at command and the power exerted for their accomplishment. A Pharaoh could erect a pyramid as easily as a peasant could build a stone cottage. What *one* man cannot do, *two* can. "And if one prevail against him, two shall withstand him; and a threefold cord is not quickly broken." That which would be a great labor for ten men, would be but play for one hundred. Consequently, an enterprise that might be difficult or impossible for a presbytery, or a synod, or two synods, would be of easy accomplishment for the united energies of the whole Church. Our Church, including those that are friendly and would cooperate with us, can, with God's blessing, accomplish any thing it may undertake. Consequently, the first thing to be done is to awaken a general interest in the Church on the subject. This cannot be done in an instant. It will take time, and a longer

time than many impatient spirits imagine. There must be "precept upon precept, line upon line, here a little and there a little." Every great enterprise, as well as every great reform, begins in a minority of one. It must at first contend with opposition—often determined and continued opposition. But as truth is mighty, success is eventually certain. God's word shall not return unto him void, but it shall accomplish that which he pleases. Therefore, let none of the friends of this great and philanthropic scheme be discouraged at *this* stage of the discussion. Little as has been said on the subject, it is perfectly manifest that its friends have multiplied tenfold since it was projected. It takes time to stir the foundations of great masses of people. A nation cannot, any more than the ocean, be moved in a minute. But as the uniform and constant wind will in time agitate the whole sea and lift into action irresistible waves, so of this great enterprise—if it be right, if it be wise, if it be eminently desirable, if it will redound to the honor and glory of God and the advancement of Christ's kingdom, as we sincerely believe it will, then its friends must not become weary or impatient, but in a Christian temper and spirit and in faith continue the discussion, until the mind of the whole Church is stirred and brought to make an intelligent and an authoritative utterance on the subject. Consequently, it will require time—we trust, no great while—to bring this great scheme fairly before the mind of the whole Church, and elicit united, harmonious, and energetic action.

But we must enter another *caveat* for the benefit of the too sanguine, and of such as do not sufficiently reflect on the magnitude of the undertaking. Even after the Church puts forth her mighty hand and commences the gigantic work, we must not expect it to become an accomplished fact in a day. This would be folly. Solomon consumed seven years in building the temple, although his father David had previously made all the necessary preparations for the work. It will require at least that length of time to establish and perfect in all its arrangements the great scheme contemplated. But whilst we may not hope to see so grand an enterprise perfected short of six or seven years,

or even a longer period, yet we may make a useful beginning much sooner. Should it accord with the judgment of the several synods which have under their control colleges and seminaries to surrender them into the hands of the General Assembly, to be united and consolidated into one, the foundation of the aforesaid university would at once be laid. Should the endowments, and libraries, and apparatus, and cabinets, and all the appliances of these several colleges, be concentrated into one institution, and should those who control our two theological seminaries in like manner surrender them unreservedly to the General Assembly, to be united into one, as the theological department of the proposed university, then, in that event, the Church could at once, without delay, establish an institution greater far than any now under our control or within our borders. Such an event would instantly be hailed with joy, and inspire the whole body of the Church with hope, activity, energy, and the certainty of success. *

But suppose that this consolidation, which seems so easy, if all the brethren concerned were so minded, is *not* effected, what then? The Church would only be a little *longer* in perfecting the scheme. She certainly has ample power and means. Taking into the count the synods of Kentucky and Missouri, which would doubtless coöperate with us, and we may calculate that we have in round numbers *a thousand* ministers and *fifteen hundred* churches. Let the Assembly appoint three of our *younger* clergy, free from cranks and crotchets, up to the times, full of hope and energy, whose experience in the army, whilst chaplains, taught them what mighty results can be brought about by rigidly systematic means, and to them let the whole business of *speedily* bringing this subject before the mind of the entire

* We can now call to mind some seven or eight colleges and skeletons of colleges under synodical control, viz.: Fulton, Mo., Danville, Ky., Stewart and Lagrange, Tenn., Austin, Texas, Oakland, Miss., Oglethorpe, Ga., and Davidson, N. C. If all these, including libraries, apparatus, etc., were consolidated into one, in some central and healthy part of the Church's territory, we should at once have the foundation laid for a magnificent institution, which, in a very few years, would rank second to none on the continent.

Church be committed. For on the shoulders of such will rest the burden, and on their brows the honor of carrying into successful effect this magnificent scheme. Their first labor, of course, will be to see that this matter is brought fairly and intelligently before the mind of every minister, elder, and member of the entire Church, in order to a free, full, and decisive expression of opinion on the subject. If this decision shall be in favor of the scheme—as we doubt not it will—their next duty will be to organise and put into execution a rigid system of contribution, by which every member of the Church throughout our remotest borders shall be reached, and have an opportunity of contributing money, lands, books, and whatever else is necessary to thoroughly furnish a great institution of learning. Let us suppose that we put the machinery in motion with the view of raising a half a million of dollars, as the *minimum*, with which to begin—postulating that no subscription, or instalment of a subscription, shall be due until a half a million of dollars are subscribed. Let the subscriptions be made payable in five annual instalments, thus running through five years. This would place in the hands of the directory one hundred thousand dollars a year for five consecutive years. Can any one imagine that a *thousand* ministers, whose hearts were engaged in the matter, with *fifteen hundred* churches equally alive to the subject as the field of their operations, could not raise this amount with all ease? Could not each one of these thousand ministers average within the circle of his influence at least *one hundred dollars* a year? If so, then that will make the half million to begin with. The enterprise is accomplished! But, assuming that a lively interest in so great and so good a cause should move the hearts of the whole Church, might we not *double that* amount? might not each minister within the bounds of his own congregation or field of operation obtain contributions, on an average, to the amount of two hundred dollars per annum for five years? This will amount to a *million* of dollars.

With these facts and figures before our eyes, who can doubt the FEASIBILITY of the undertaking? Let the grand scheme once start under the unfolding flag of success, and it would

soon, like Harvard and Yale and Princeton, become a favorite legatee of great and good men, who, nobly ambitious, would, with their unstinted munificence, embalm their names in an institution that will become a monument to future generations of the wisdom, piety, and energy of the Southern Church, which, with renewed life and vigor, arose, phoenix-like, out of the ashes of a wasting and desolating war.

ARTICLE II.

A PLEA IN BEHALF OF THE WIDOWS AND ORPHANS
OF DECEASED MINISTERS OF THE PRESBYTERIAN
CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES.

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, at the sessions held in November, 1867, at Nashville, Tenn., adopted the following minute and resolutions, being a report of the Committee of Bills and Overtures, in reply to Overture No. 10; the said overture being a letter from the Rev. J. T. Pollock, asking aid from the Assembly for the family of a minister of this Church recently deceased:

“Inasmuch as this Assembly has control of no funds for the purpose proposed, and this request cannot at once be granted, and yet the Assembly appreciates the importance, not only of this special case, but of all such as it represents:

“*Resolved*, 1. That the Committee of Sustentation be authorized to appropriate five per cent. of all contributions to its object to the relief of destitute widows and orphans of ministers, and to indigent ministers in infirm health: *Provided*, That no such per centage be appropriated from the contributions of any church or person prohibiting such appropriation: *And provided further*, That this plan of operation shall not continue longer than the meeting of the Assembly for the year 1869.

“2. That this present application be referred to the Committee of Sustentation, who are hereby charged, in the exercise of due diligence and discretion, with the duty of considering it and all others of like character.”

The Committee of Sustentation reported to the Assembly at the sessions held in Baltimore, Md., in May, 1868, the discharge of that trust in the following manner :

“The Assembly, at its meeting in Nashville, directed the Committee of Sustentation to devote five per cent. of all its receipts to the relief of disabled ministers and the widows and orphans of deceased ministers. Due notice was given of this arrangement through all the weekly religious journals, and Presbyterial Committees, as well as others, were requested to send up applications in behalf of all such persons and families. In consequence, applications have been made in behalf of twenty-three such families, all of which have been met in sums varying from \$25 to \$50, but chiefly of the latter amount. It is not supposed that these families have been placed in circumstances of comfort by these small sums, but perhaps some of their more urgent wants have been relieved. The arrangement, therefore, was wise and judicious, and perhaps ought to be continued until the circumstances of the country will justify the effort to raise a special fund for this purpose.” (Minutes 1868, p. 287.)

In reference to that part of the report of the Committee of Sustentation, the Standing Committee recommended the following resolution, which was adopted :

“*Resolved*, That it be recommended to all the churches under our care to take up a collection for the relief of disabled ministers and the widows and orphans of deceased ministers, on the first Sabbath in July next, or as soon thereafter as may be convenient.” (Min. 1868, p. 280.)

The efficiency of the foregoing plan is now to be tested by experience. The resolution of the Assembly has carried the subject to the churches for their consideration and action. We are of the opinion that the churches will respond promptly and liberally, if they are made to understand the necessity and importance of this charity.

The subject being of great importance to the ministry and the Church, we shall endeavor to give some prominence to it by a brief discussion in the pages of this *Review*.

That it is the duty of the Church to make an adequate and liberal provision for the comfortable maintenance of the distressed families of her deceased ministers, is a doctrine neither

new nor of human origin. It is as old as the Church herself in her organised form, and is found among the divine statutes of the Mosaic economy. Under that dispensation, the priestly tribe had no part nor inheritance among their brethren, and were to be supported in all their generations by the tithes paid by the other tribes. This was an annual provision larger than that which was gathered into the storehouses of the rest of the people; for, though they were but the twelfth of the population, they were to receive the tenth of all the increase of the land. The priests in the immediate service of the sanctuary obtained an additional compensation, as certain portions of the sacrifices were retained for them by divine appointment.

With the Jewish dispensation before our eyes, we can readily believe that the fact recorded in Acts vi. 1, and the custom to which the Apostle Paul alludes in 1 Tim. v., are evidences of a provision made under the gospel for the support of widows. Every person conversant with the Scriptures is fully aware that in numerous places we are commanded mercifully to relieve the fatherless and widow; to plead their cause; that such acts are described as pious and well pleasing to God; that such cases of necessity will always be in the Church, to be a test of true religion; that the neglect of such persons is always displeasing to the Father of mercies, and for its punishment he has sent heavy judgments upon the earth, as he is the Judge of the fatherless and widow.

The Presbyterian Church did early feel and acknowledge her solemn and religious obligation to make a wise and suitable provision for the comfortable support of the indigent families of her deceased ministers. Nearly one century and a half ago, her attention was attracted to the subject, as her records show; and she began to raise a fund for the pious purpose. A society for the more successful accomplishment of this laudable object was formed in 1755, under the auspices of the Synod of Philadelphia; which society, in 1759, was incorporated by a charter from the Proprietary Government of Pennsylvania. In the petition to the Proprietors for a charter, the Committee of the Synod used the following language: "We have often with sor-

row and regret seen the widows and children of great and good men, who were once of our number, very much pinched and distressed by want and poverty, without being able to afford them suitable relief. To remedy these evils as far as we can in our circumstances, your Honors' petitioners, in imitation of the laudable example of the Church of Scotland, have agreed to raise a small fund for the benefit of ministers' widows and helpless children belonging to this Synod, by obliging ourselves to contribute a small sum out of our yearly income for this purpose."

To commiserate and relieve the wants and distresses of widows and orphans are among the most praiseworthy acts which spring from the most generous impulses of humanity. They are prompted by the feelings of an elevated and heavenly charity. They are such acts of noble tenderness as beings of the purest and most exalted natures rejoice to perform. They are acts of the highest and most disinterested philanthropy, and we always witness them with feelings of the most decided approbation. We love to behold and are eloquent in the praise of those who have been distinguished for such deeds of mercy. They are the benefactors of the afflicted, and the noble exemplars of the brightest virtues which adorn human character.

Sympathy is always refreshing to the soul when passing through the dreary and chilly night of adversity, but has a peculiarly balmy and benign influence upon the stricken widow and the tender children, who mourn the irreparable breach made upon the happy family circle by the premature death of the beloved husband and affectionate father. Its generous light dispels the gloom from the house of affliction, and its genial warmth is full of consolation to the widow's heart, bleeding and crushed beneath the overwhelming sorrow springing from the most devastating of earthly bereavements.

Men, banded together by such ties as exist in Masonic and Oddfellowship associations, are influenced by the principles of common brotherhood to make some provision for the distressed families of their deceased members. We profess to be associated by the bonds of a purer benevolence, and consequently we ought to excel, rather than fall below, their standard of love and charity.

Is it not a reproach to the name we bear, that so many of the widows and orphans of the beloved ministers of God, who once labored with us, are permitted to pine away in poverty and want, unpitied and unnoticed? Can the compassionate Jesus be otherwise than displeased with such unfraternal, unmerciful, not to say unchristian, neglect? Will not the cry of the widow and orphan pierce the heavens and reach the ears of the Judge of the widow and fatherless, bring down his withering indignation upon those who ought to, and yet do not, relieve the destitute? Has religion so far changed in its nature and claims since the days when the Apostle James so pointedly condemned the inconsistent conduct of those professed Christians who simply said to the needy, "Depart in peace, be ye warmed and filled," that its divine claims for a merciful and substantial charity can be liquidated now by the cheap and unfelt sympathy expressed in words of unsubstantial condolence by a presbyterial or synodical resolution, entered formally upon the records of the body, published without cost in the newspapers, and a copy sent to the poor heart-broken widow and almost starving children? Does not the whole thing seem to be a cruel mockery? It resembles an outrage upon the sanctuary of mourning for such word-professions to enter its sacred walls. Our fathers did not think that resolutions of condolence, however eloquent and eulogistic, were a sufficient and Christian expression of sympathy for the weeping family of a dear and honored deceased brother. They did not imagine that words could warm and clothe, or that newspaper *uffs* would answer as bread to the famishing widow and orphan. Their charity was not in words merely, but in pious deeds of substantial benevolent aid. In those days, the families of the ministers who had fallen in the service of religion were not permitted, unaided and friendless, to meet the desolating storms of adversity; nor with their untaught and unskilful hands, to guide their *unmanned* bark amid the breakers of life's tempestuous sea. Then the widow was enabled to feel that she was loved and cherished for the sake of her honored husband, and that his death had not broken, but only more closely cemented, the ties which connect her with the sacred associations of Christ's min-

isters. She felt that her dire calamity had not cast her forth upon the unfenced grounds of a cold and heartless world's charity. She felt that she still had a warm place in the loving bosoms of the cherished Christian fraternity. The fatherless child was permitted to feel the quick, the generous pulsations of the living heart of the blood-bought Church of our precious Jesus. That was religion indeed—fresh as spring, warm as summer, fragrant as the breath of heaven.

The ample provision for which we plead will endear the Church to the ministry. This point needs plain illustration and patient explanation, in order to avoid misconception. The preaching of the gospel is emphatically a work of love; and under the sweet constraining influences of the Holy Spirit, ministers voluntarily enter upon the self-denying duties of the arduous vocation; they consult not with flesh and blood; their eyes are not fixed upon human applause and temporal rewards. They rejoice to preach the gospel, because they ardently love their heavenly Father and their precious Redeemer. They thus glorify their beloved Saviour by the spread of his gospel and in the establishment of the kingdom of heaven upon earth. We hazard nothing in saying that ministers, in witnessing the success of their ministrations by the grace of God in the hopeful conversion of sinners, experience a happiness unknown to the votaries of the world, and in which angels participate. Such results every minister of Christ most vehemently desires; still they are men, and are subject to like passions as other men. They must feel concern for the temporal wants of their families, and for those wants they must provide; otherwise, they deny the faith, and are worse than infidels. In that compulsory labor, much of their time and talents are expended, and consequently withdrawn from the Church. Such an arrangement is as unwise and impolitic as it would be to employ the most cultivated and accomplished man to perform the most menial work of the drudge. This difficulty is not obviated by increasing the annual salary of the minister for it would still leave the necessity of managing some form of temporal goods, with all its perplexing cares and tendency to produce worldly-mindedness. Ministers generally will tea

that these things are among the most obstinate hindrances to an exclusive devotion to the appropriate duties of their sacred vocation. All things which tend to distract and draw off the attention and efforts of the ministry from the special work of their heavenly mission, are prolific sources of serious evil to the Church, and their removal would be greatly to her advantage.

From the peculiar nature of the heaven-appointed vocation, all the incumbents of the office are wholly consecrated to God in the service of his Church, and are removed from mere worldly employments as inconsistent with their exclusive dedication to the gospel. Most generally, ministers are subjected to certain civil disabilities in consequence of their calling. To his profession attach no emoluments, no social and civil honors. The world, though largely indebted for many of its greatest blessings and richest legacies to the noble moral, civil, and intellectual achievements of preachers, yet often treats the profession with the most studied scorn and contempt. The obligations of the human family to the labors of such men as Luther, Calvin, and Knox, and a host of others, are great beyond calculation; yet for them no garlands are woven; to their memories no colossal monument is erected. The historian fills his page with the results of diplomatic intrigue and with deeds of violence and blood; yet he seldom deigns to mention the labors of these men of God.

No facilities are furnished preachers to enable them to amass property and leave an inheritance to their families. They have no opportunities to make a sagacious provision against the day of adversity. They are often overtaken by temporal calamities in a most unprepared condition; and frequently are doomed to lose their toils and finish their earthly pilgrimage upon a bed of languishing in the comfortless hamlet of poverty. When the eye of faith of the dying preacher rests upon his Saviour's face, his soul is filled with heavenly ecstasy, and he earnestly desires to depart and be with Jesus, which for him is far better; but when he turns his eyes upon the pale and careworn face of his loved wife and the tender forms of his dear children, he remembers, with feelings of indescribable anguish, the melancholy, the

hopeless condition in which he is about to leave his dear family. One of the most touching scenes in the history of the divine Redeemer is where, in his dying agonies on the cross, he committed his mother (perhaps then a widow) to the filial care of the beloved John. But no such tender and faithful earthly friend usually stands by the death-bed of the poor minister of the gospel, to whose compassion he may confide his wife and children. The bitter pangs of that dreadful hour to the poor servant of Jesus may be imagined, but cannot be described. Hard and icy must that heart be that feels no pulsation of deep commiseration for such suffering, and is not prompted to some generous effort for its relief. The only support to the dying minister is that precious promise of God, addressed to all Christians, "Leave thy fatherless children; I will preserve them alive; and let thy widows trust in me." But here his faith, in this hour of bodily weakness and pain, may stagger; he may not be able to grasp the consoling promise, which even to the strongest is hope against hope; for he knows that the Church, constituted the guardian of the orphan and protector of the widow, has long neglected the trust, and has ceased to nourish the helpless ones. Is it not time for the Church to return and obey the divine appointment? Humanity advocates it; justice pleads for it; mercy requires it; religion demands it.

The compensation the Church usually allows her ministers is given of the things of earth in such stinted measurement as barely to meet the most urgent of their bodily wants by the most rigid and exact economy. Such a policy is calculated to exert a very degrading and contracting influence upon the disposition of ministers. To expect them to lay up any thing from this small pittance is most unreasonable; for the whole amount only permits the minister to support his family in such poor style as the larger portion of his congregation would never consent to have imposed upon their families. And is it not demanding too much to require men of the highest social and intellectual faculties, capable of holding the first positions in society, to descend to the humblest and poorest walks of life? It is manifestly unjust.

The equity of the plan of operation proposed by the Assembly appears again in the fact that ministers are given to the Church to be exclusively employed in the service of religion, and in many instances they are prematurely consumed in that service. The arduous and self-denying duties of the sacred vocation consume the minister's vital energies. In giving light, the oil in the lamp is exhausted. "The zeal of thy house hath eaten me up," may properly be inscribed as an epitaph upon the premature graves of many preachers of the gospel. The agony of their interminable travail for the salvation of sinners burns up life's marrow. They are exposed in every climate, and in visiting the sick and dying, they come in contact with every form of disease. Thus their pastoral duties place their lives in jeopardy. The Old Testament priesthood was not more entirely consecrated to the interests of true religion than are the preachers of the gospel. The former "lived by the altar," and the Apostle Paul informs us that New Testament ministers are to enjoy a like provision and "live of the gospel; and as the family of the priest was equally embraced with him in that provision of the ancient economy, as well after his death as during his life, so the same regulation ought to prevail under the gospel.

It is a principle universally admitted that "the workman is worthy of his hire," and his wages ought to be in proportion to the advantage his employer reaps from his labor. Upon that principle, it may be demonstrated, by an appeal to the most disputable historical facts, that ministers ought to receive a higher remuneration than any class of men; for none other can bestow such rich blessings upon society.

Two plans may be suggested for the liquidation of the whole claims of the ministry to a support for themselves and for their families. The one is to increase the salary of the preacher so far above the comfortable support of his family as to enable him to accumulate property, as other men do, as an inheritance for his widow and orphans. The other plan is to provide for the minister's present temporal wants in such liberality that he may support his family, at least in the middle walks of life, and then

to make some sure and comfortable provision for his family in case of his death.

The first plan is evidently objectionable for these, among other reasons: It would be so burdensome to feeble churches as to be impracticable; only very wealthy churches could carry out the plan. Then it does not guard against the improvidence of the minister and his family; the remains of the old Adam stir up an impulsive desire even in the preacher's family to keep fully abreast with the extravagances of fashion. Then the cares and temptations incident to the management of secular matters are too cumbrous and ensnaring to be consistent with the faithful discharge of ministerial duties.

The tendency of this plan would be to produce a profligate and worldly-minded ministry, than which there is no source of danger so great to the Church of the Lord Jesus.

The other plan proposed to meet the claims of the ministry and their families is free from the foregoing objections, and would be in unison with the desires and wishes of the great majority of ministers: would cement more closely the bonds of fraternity among the ministers themselves, and between the ministers and the churches.

Such provision as that for which we have been pleading for the widows and orphans of Presbyterian ministers, is liberally made for the widows and orphans of the clergy of the Methodist Episcopal Church. The fiscal regulations of Methodism exhibit a system of great uniformity, of wonderful efficiency, of a wise policy, and of remarkable equality and justice. The system of that numerous and powerful denomination, both in their mode of raising and disbursing funds, *under their Book of Discipline*, deserves to be profoundly considered by Presbyterian Church rulers. Among Methodists, the death of the circuit rider does not annul the connexion of his family with the fostering care of the Conference, and does not materially affect their temporal support.

A similar provision, but much more liberal, was made by a society under the patronage of the Protestant Episcopal denomination in the State of South Carolina. That society was organised so early as 1731; was regularly incorporated in 1762; was

in a very prosperous condition before the Radical hordes invaded the South; and numbered among its members or annual contributors the most influential of the clergy and laity of the denomination. That society administered relief to the widows and orphans of Episcopal ministers with a generous and Christian liberality, and its existence was highly honorable to the sect by whom it was, and, we hope, is still sustained. The annual festival of that society was so managed as to give satisfaction to the members and popularity to the cause.

A society was also formed by the Independent or Congregational Church in the State of South Carolina. The society was formed somewhere about 1765, and was incorporated by charter in 1789, by the name of "The Society for the Relief of Elderly and Disabled Ministers, and of the Widows and Orphans of the Clergy of the Independent or Congregational Church in the State of South Carolina." The preamble to the constitution of that society contains a sentiment so admirably just and scriptural that we are constrained to give it to our readers. "As it is an obligation of the gospel on Christians of all denominations to encourage and support its ministers, who are their pastors in the Lord, and as it appears to us that due encouragement may be more certainly and extensively provided and secured, by adding to the usual support afforded to the gospel ministers during their health and usefulness, an assurance of aid and relief when they are disabled for the services of the vineyard, and of provisions for their widows and orphans when they are removed without leaving them a competent support: we, the subscribers, desirous of carrying this good purpose into effect, and of testifying our regard to them, who have faithfully labored amongst us in the gospel, do hereby solemnly associate and bind ourselves under the following rules." That preamble contains the whole doctrine for which we are pleading, and provides for the whole relief contemplated by the action of the Assembly at Baltimore.

The early records of the first Presbytery formed in the United States inform us that the Church exercised anxious solicitude for the comfort of the families of deceased ministers, and made annual appropriations for their support. In 1755, some twelve or

more members of the Synod of Philadelphia formed a society for the more effectual relief of the widows and orphans of ministers, and, in 1759, it was incorporated by a charter from the Proprietors of Pennsylvania. That society accumulated an immense vested fund, but has not in recent years been of much advantage to the Church in consequence of some radical defects in its management. In 1841, the corporation said, "Notwithstanding, however, the great advantages which are thus presented to the ministers of the Presbyterian Church, and the facility with which they may be secured, the efforts of the corporation to extend its usefulness have heretofore been attended with very partial success. Very few annuities have been secured to the families of ministers." That society was originally a charitable institution, but ceased to be either charitable or Christian when it incorporated the principle of "Life Insurance" in its terms.

If the contingent event in the duration of the life of the insured does not involve the very principle upon which all lotteries and games of chance are condemned as immoral, then our judgment is at fault. True, men of reputed piety have advocated "Life Insurance;" multitudes have insured; yea, "Life Insurance" seems to be a mania of this present time; but the multitude is not the arbiter of ethical questions. We submit it as a case of conscience for Christian people.

That society having failed to carry out the purposes of its organisation, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America have been inviting for many years charitable collections and donations to relieve those cases of distress. But we fear that that charity has been too much neglected for more showy labors.

Some fifteen or sixteen years ago, "The Society for the Relief of Superannuated Ministers and the Indigent Families of Deceased Ministers" was formed under a remote connexion with the Synod of South Carolina, and for the benefit of the ministers of that Synod who might become members of the Society and contribute to its funds. We are not informed as to the fate of that Society.

The late Hon. John Perkins, of Lowndes County, Mississippi,

by deed of trust formally executed on the 15th of January, 1859, conveyed ten thousand dollars to the Board of Directors of the Theological Seminary at Columbia, South Carolina, as the nucleus of a fund for the use, benefit, and support of disabled ministers of the gospel and their widows and orphans, belonging to the Presbyterian Church in the United States. The corpus of said fund was not to be used, but only the annual interest or proceeds, and the preference in the distribution to be given to the citizens of Mississippi and Louisiana. The said Board of Directors were enjoined in the said deed of conveyance to use all proper means in bringing said subject to the consideration of the Church, that the fund may be augmented; that it may be a permanent benefit to the Church. The donation was in the form of a note on certain parties, and the note was not due until January, 1863, at which time our circulation was Confederate paper; and when the note was collected, the proceeds were vested in Confederate bonds and lost.

We have noticed these various efforts for the relief of elderly and disabled ministers, and of the widows and orphans of ministers, not simply as matters of history, but to show that the duty to make some suitable provision for the relief of such persons has been clearly recognised in the consciences of the people of God. The conviction was not a transient furor, but a deep abiding sentiment, resting for authority upon the Sacred Scriptures. But it is painfully evident that the Presbyterian Church has as yet accomplished but very little in the direction of that important charity. Why, we are not prepared to say. The debt against her is rapidly increasing; the onus of the charity is also increasing—perhaps twenty-seven families of widows and orphans and several disabled ministers. But we cannot hope for more cheering results until the General Assembly gives more prominence to the charity, and gives more consistency and permanence to her efforts than mere annual resolutions. Perhaps the work would prosper in the hands of a special committee, organised as the other committees by the General Assembly. We ask attention to the suggestion.

ARTICLE III.

CO-OPERATION.

It is not easy to decide the question as to whether the word at the head of this article is the title of a new social science, or merely the name of the mainspring which is to regulate the machinery of social life. That the general subject of coöperation is attracting considerable attention all over the civilised world, is very evident; and the underlying theory of the power of combined and associated energies was most ably set forth in the opening discourse of the Rev. Dr. T. V. Moore, at the Baltimore Assembly, in 1868. The sermon was upon "the corporate life of the Church," and in it perhaps all that could be said on that side of the question was well said and forcibly. The drift of the argument was something like this: The grand mission of the Church was to develope this organic, corporate life, so as to culminate in the terrible army with banners, and thus possess the world. And the plainest inference was, that the Church, in her corporate capacity, was to assume the absolute custody of all human interests, by whatever process you please—by enlightening and educating the world up to her standard, by moral suasion, by the influence of godly example; but all or any of these, by regularly organised coöperation, instead of and in contradistinction from individual effort. This apparent tendency to the secularization of the Church has already been noticed in a former number of this periodical,* and has nothing to do with the present topic. The high principle of coöperation in this, the ecclesiastical side of the subject, appeared to lie at the foundation and to pervade all the parts of Dr. Moore's discourse, and will in due time be examined in another part of this paper. Let us first look a little at this matter of coöperation as applied to merely temporal interests.

The first illustration of the power of this principle that presents itself is found in the enactments of legislative bodies,

* *Southern Presbyterian Review*, July, 1868, page 431.

especially in the formation of laws which affect separate classes of citizens. Take, for example, the tariff bills that have been adopted for the past forty years. It is probable that some readers of this *Review* will remember the fierce opposition the tariff of 1828 excited, especially in South Carolina. The genius, patriotism, and statesmanship of John C. Calhoun, were pre-eminently displayed in his long-continued opposition to the single theory of protection. The most formal enactment was the Revenue Tariff of 1832, with its "sliding scale" of *ad valorem* duties; and then the protective principle, looming into operation once more about 1842, and continuing in force, with slight modifications, down to the present time. The present mingling of specific and *ad valorem* duties, applying to the same articles of import, is a curious instance of the absurdity of compromise legislation. The first, being a square yard or pound tax, is a most palpable sop to the Cerberus who guards the interests of the manufacturer. The other, a tax based upon the value of the commodity at the port of shipment, is as plain a sop to the Cerberus of the Democratic party, whose time-honored maxims called for revenue with or without protection. All of this is perfectly familiar to the merest tyro in politics. Now, notice the facts in the case: The entire South, the entire West, have always found the protective principle inimical to their interests. The consumer of foreign products is manifestly the payer of the tax collected at our ports of entry. And so the second point is reached, to wit: The fact that the working classes—that vast majority of the sovereign people whose will is law—North, South, East, and West, have been enduring this exaction for forty years, in order to benefit a few manufacturers in Pennsylvania and Massachusetts. This innumerable body of taxpayers elected the legislators who imposed these burdens, year after year, for nearly half a century.

In all this long period, there have not been wanting able expounders of the theories of free trade. Indeed, any unprejudiced on-looker would probably decide that the preponderance of brains was manifestly on this side of the question. It is true that many other and distinct issues have been combined with

tariff questions in the formation of parties ; but it is also true that no other issue of equal importance to the prosperity of the masses has been presented to the American people since the days of Jackson. Any one who will undertake to read the interminable debates in Congress, when new scales of duties were under consideration, will be astounded at the array of facts and arguments against these enactments. But, with very few exceptions, the unequal legislation prevailed, to the detriment of nine-tenths of the voting population, and to the positive loss of revenue to the national treasury.

These are not cunningly devised fables ; they are not crude theories suggested by partisan proclivities. It is marvellous that such a matter should ever have been made a party question at all ; but a conspicuous plank in all party platforms for forty years has been a declaration for or against "protection ;" and no better illustration of the power and success of coöperation can be found than that presented in the continued triumph of the manufacturers.

There is perhaps no single organisation so thoroughly arranged and manipulated as the combination of mill-owners in America. They are, almost without exception, men of enormous wealth. In those localities where their influence is more directly felt, no nominations for office are made without due reference to these magnates. It does not much matter what may be the political preferences of the nominees with regard to other national questions, so that they be sound in their "protective" views. Nearly twenty-five years ago, the writer of these lines saw two canal boats, both from the interior of Pennsylvania, each bearing a flag on her prow. On one was inscribed "Polk, Dallas, and the Tariff ;" on the other, "Clay, Frelinghuysen, and the Tariff." It is said by travellers who have visited those sylvan localities, that the worthy sovereigns of Bucks and Berks counties are still voting for Andrew Jackson at each presidential election. The genius that invented the banners, at agreement upon the tariff question, and the poles apart upon all others, and that enlightens the voters who still cast their suffrages for the sake of the Hermitage, is the combined genius of the Pennsylvania mill-

owners. In New England, the case is different. There it is a matter of dollars, and the manufacturers have them and know how to use them. By steadfast coöperation, they control the primary meetings, the nominations for the national legislature, the elections of United States senators, and, to cap the climax, they employ the most efficient of the vast body of lobbyists, and so control the legislation of the nation.

It is perhaps pardonable to digress for a moment just here, for the purpose of instituting a brief comparison between the present condition of affairs and the manifest design of the fathers of the Republic. These worthies, in providing rules for the guidance and government of posterity, seem never to have considered the probability of such legislation. The power of Congress to enact revenue laws has never been doubted, and during the sessions of the first Congress this identical question of protection was debated. But the unanimous conclusion reached, on that occasion, was that the great aim of protective tariffs was to foster "American industry." The great object of all protection in the present day is to enrich American mill-owners, and in exact proportion as this object is obtained, the energies of the industrial classes are crippled. It requires no argument to show that increased gains to the manufacturer necessarily involve diminished resources to the consumer. This slight digression, therefore, actually leads to the first conclusion, to wit, that the most prominent result of coöperation thus far discovered is to secure the triumph of capital over labor.

Throughout the civilised world, these two things are antagonistic—the one to the other. In the nature of the case, it must be so. Political economists and statisticians of world-wide reputations have written voluminously to prove that these rival elements are really at agreement, because they are interdependent, the one upon the other. Mr. John Stuart Mill, in a comparatively recent statement, seeks to dispose of the popular myth of antagonism, by an attempt at an algebraical analysis, in which he places demand and supply on opposite sides of the equation. Nothing could be more taking at the first glance, yet nothing could be more superficial. You cannot reduce the providences

of God to a mathematical equation; and upon this very matter of the hire of the laborer he has specially legislated, and does undoubtedly exercise a watchful and discriminating providence. The ever-present antagonism is as constantly recognised in his word and as clearly stated as the doctrine of man's original depravity. A multitude of texts corroborating this statement will occur to any reader of the inspired record. There was no trouble about the laws of demand and supply in Abraham's day, and none in these Southern States before they were cursed by the advent of the Bureau and its agents. Mr. Mill's equation was applicable *here*, and no where else upon this planet.

But in other localities, and especially in Old and New England, the algebra is at fault. As you cannot resist or deny the providences and revelation of God, neither can you contradict the patent facts of contemporaneous history, to wit, the universality of trades unions and the prevalence of "strikes." These unions and the strikes they beget are notable instances of the power of coöperation, and fall directly in the line of this discussion. In the Southern States, both these developments of coöperative principles are little known; but these blessings will doubtless be added in due time to the countless benefits showered upon the South by the parental government at Washington. In the meantime, a brief description of these trades unions is next in order.

These societies, so numerous in Great Britain, have recently acquired far greater influence and importance from the extension of the franchise and the growth of democratic theories. Before the introduction of the late reform measures, a Royal Commission was appointed to investigate the formation, tendencies, and actual legality of these organisations. This Commission has presented four or five reports, consisting mainly of testimony taken, first from the manufacturers, against whose interests the unions militated, and secondly from the artisans themselves. It is remarkably easy to invent and publish abstract theories touching these vexed questions, while it is remarkably difficult to arrive at a clear conviction as to the rights invaded or the duties incumbent upon either side. The vital and undying

antagonism existing every where between free capital and free labor is fully recognised in the reports, and the main object before the minds of English legislators appears to be to define the rights and duties on one side, and to extend or limit the rights upon the other. It is proper to observe here, that the riotous demonstrations of the clubs of workingmen, as at Manchester for example, do not affect the question touching the legality of their combinations. The crimes of which the rioters were guilty were the offences of individuals, and the law provided its sanctions to meet the cases. It is also just to notice the fact that absolute opposition to known law has very rarely been charged against these societies, and only against those at the lowest place in the scale—such as the ordinary laborers, as distinguished from the artisans.

The most prominent object in the formation of trades unions was, of course, the attainment of such a position by coöperation as to make effectual resistance to the exactions of capital. Isolated strikes could accomplish nothing. The demand for higher wages from a single operative would be promptly answered by his dismissal, so long as he could be replaced. But it is quite a *different* affair when the demand is presented by the secretary of a union which embraces within its fold *all* the workmen, or at least a very large majority of the workmen, in the kingdom. And this is very nearly the condition of the skilled artisans of England. Another grand element of strength in these combinations is the mutual benefit system which obtains in nearly all of them—universally, in those formed of the better educated classes, such as the engineers and carpenters. By this system, which is similar to that of all beneficial societies, a fund is provided, not merely or mainly to sustain members in times of compulsory idleness during strikes, but chiefly to secure a fund for *aged* or disabled members. Provision is made for this fund, first by weekly subscriptions, and secondly by fines: and some of the more prosperous societies have already accumulated a large capital. In America, there has been no similar official investigation; and under democratic institutions, the social distinctions between employers and workmen are not so clearly defined, and

the antagonism which seems to be the rule in England is here more accurately the conflict between capital and labor.

A clearer apprehension of the case may be reached by considering labor a commodity offered for sale, occupying the same position in the market as any other commodity that can be purchased with money. The famous equation comes in here, with wages on one side of it. But it is not possible to fix any stable, inherent money value upon labor, below or above the sum requisite to supply the actual needs of the laborer—that which will purchase food, raiment, and shelter—no more and no less. Because it is indispensable that the laborer shall *live*, while nothing else enters into the calculation. This appears to be a very inhuman view of the case, but it is the precise view that capital always takes. All beyond mere subsistence is so much extorted or wasted—yielding no margin of profit. Now, on the other side of the equation, you place the cost of a man's life, and the problem is solved.

But the coöperative principle spoils the arithmetic. The artisans combine and the tables are turned. The question is now propounded by the operatives themselves, and is thus stated: How much money, in daily wages, can the mill-owner afford to pay? There must needs be a margin of profit, else the capital will be withdrawn, or turned into remunerative channels. Labor cannot do without capital, unless you place man in his primitive condition or reduce him to the dead level of the savage tribes. So the strikes are never inaugurated upon frivolous pretexts, nor are the demands of the strikers ever beyond the ability of the mill-owner. The argument presented is not merely that a dollar *per diem* will not supply the common necessities of life to the worker, or that twelve hours of toil cannot be endured without damage to the health of the laborer, but also that higher pay and shorter working hours will not exhaust the margin of profit. The intrinsic value of the manufactured article includes something more than the cost of raw material and interest on cost of machinery. It also includes the toil of the workman and the profit of the proprietor. Hence the contest is narrowed down to this point: How shall this profit be distributed? what propor-

tion shall accrue to the owner of the money, and what to the owner of the muscles and of skill to use them?

On the side of the capitalist, there are many prerequisites to success in his enterprises, exclusive of the mere possession of money. He must have certain outlets for his products—a knowledge of markets, an acquaintance with multitudes of buyers, either directly or through agencies which cost a certain percentage of his gross gains. He must know the probable extent of crops or the probable extent of importations of the raw material. He must be able to invent styles, or able quickly to imitate styles as fast as a capricious fashion brings them into favor. The successful mill-owner ordinarily serves as long and as arduous an apprenticeship in his own sphere as the artisan does in his. But while the worker has no accurate knowledge on these various points, and no responsibility beyond his legitimate vocation, he is marvellously well informed upon all of those that touch his interests. The executive ability of the officers in the trades-unions has excited the wonder and compelled the admiration of the Royal Commission. A common charge preferred by the mill-owners, is, that these secretaries delude the members, extort their hard earnings in the shape of dues and fines, and oppress non-members of the same craft by various forms of persecution, until, like the lady who married her husband in order to get rid of him as a lover, these outsiders are driven into the fold. But the testimony of the skilled workmen is all on the other side. There are unanimous attachment to the "society," unvarying confidence in their secretaries, and the purest form of democracy in the constitution of all the unions. The officers—artisans themselves, and workmen of known ability—are elected by the direct vote of all the members, who, out of the business meetings, form a peerage in which there are absolutely no gradations. And this vast army of workingmen is inspired by one desire and labor to attain one object, to wit, the payment of the highest possible wages for the fewest possible hours of toil; and this is the very mainspring of all their coöperative machinery. Thus another step is reached. The workingman's coöperation, in all its departments, tends to the triumph of labor over capital.

These two opposing interests, in their multitudinous ramifications, include all the interests of humanity—regarding humanity as a race of traders. The inevitable tendency of capital is to combine, positively or indirectly; to attract by its inherent gravitation more particles to the mass; to accumulate, and with each new acquisition to develop new power of attraction. In banking, mining, and manufacturing, some new feature or evidence of the wonderful power of coöperation is constantly presented. The plainest proposition among the maxims of the rich is, that capital may be increased *ad infinitum*, but must never be diminished. It may be diverted from one channel into another, but this is rarely done save to increase its efficiency and its power of aggregation. It utters but one voice, and that is the old cry of the daughters of the horse-leech, "Give, give."

And so the inevitable response to this voice from the sturdy workers of the earth, or at least of that portion of it where the English tongue is vernacular, is a cry of defiance. It is an inherent quality of capital to combine. It is *not* natural for labor to combine, and in fact coöperative societies among Anglo-Saxon workmen contradict Anglo-Saxon individuality—that grand element of Anglo-Saxon greatness. Money is one, and thews and sinews combine as against a common enemy. The coöperative associations of workmen are produced by the necessities of the case. The native and intense selfishness of capital has forced labor into coöperation for self-preservation.

Nor is this, or any part of it, in opposition to the decree and purpose of God. In his wisdom, he has made these distinctions and gradations, and they will doubtless continue while the earth abides. He furnishes wings to the riches whenever it seems good to him, and they are scattered over new fields of labor and pass into the possession of new manipulators, and then the process of concretion begins anew, by virtue of the law which he has stamped upon them.

There are two points here suggested, which should be especially observed. The first is, that capital and labor are essentially antagonistic, not because of the world's growth in civilization, but by the absolute decree of God. There is no passage in

the Bible in which these two are recognised as positive entities, which does not also contain an express or implied recognition of this antagonism. Nor is it at all clear that a contrary state of case would be beneficial to humanity. Because (and this is the second point) God has instituted the relation of master and servant, and has surrounded it with special, explicit, and unchangeable legislation. It is not possible that the Deity revealed in Scripture could create a race constituted like the one that inhabits this planet, and present for the climax of its development one universal equality. There is no such thing revealed or promised. Even in the bright realm beyond Jordan, one star differeth from all other stars in brilliancy and glory, and on the hither side of the separating river, no distinction is more accurately marked than that dividing between capital and labor, and between master and servant.

Consequently, there can be no true "marriage" contract betwixt these opposing parties. Coöperative societies may and do unite them for the nonce, but no permanent union can be effected by any agency. The capitalist becomes a worker, or the worker becomes in some sort a capitalist, by the operation of unions for joint-ownership and joint-employment of forces. But whenever the status of the laborer is positively merged in the status of the capitalist, an inevitable antagonism is established between him and all other workingmen who have made less progress. As his means increase, the employment of subordinate agencies is necessary; and outside of the specified operations of his society, he is the master wherever he pays for service.

In this discussion, the article, money, has been treated as a personality, endowed with intellect and will. Some such idea as this prevails in the world, against the patent fact that money can never be any thing else than a standard of values, and thus the representative of every thing else that can be purchased. But the true power of capital is, of course, in the keen intellects of its possessors, who combine to purchase labor and to keep the price of labor at the minimum point. It is a mere matter of bargain and sale, regarding it only on its economic side, and no ethical question has any thing to do with the course of the pre-

sent argument. In fact, most, if not all, the agrarian theories that fools and scoundrels have ever advocated, proceeded upon the assumption that some *moral* obligation rested upon the owners of property, compelling them to dispossess themselves for the benefit of humanity. This burlesque upon the beautiful doctrine of Holy Writ can never deceive the Christian. God is proprietor of all the silver and gold, and the so-called owner is merely the steward of God, distributing his Master's goods with due reference to the account of his stewardship which he must one day render. Whether or not he can make out a satisfactory account of moneys employed in coöperation against labor is a separate question, to be treated upon totally different grounds. He may not oppress the poor, he may not be a hard taskmaster—in short, he may not so use his money as to violate Christ's golden rule; but the legal rights and immunities defined in all the legislation of the civilised world are on the side of capital. And the security and clear definition of the rights and immunities of labor is precisely what the Royal Commission is endeavoring to attain.

This is so, because God has so constituted society that the distinction between master and servant must continue and abide on the hither side of the millennium. And the subordination of the latter is a necessary consequence of this distinction. It is not true that he made all men free and equal. He never made any two men equal. And he has endowed some men with certain rights, not inalienable, and has enjoined upon other men certain duties, not unchangeable. Both rights and duties grow out of the relation, which is itself unchangeable. In the providence of God, it is quite possible that the person owning the rights and the person owing the duties may change places; but the relative rights and duties are unaltered and unalterable.

This statement should surely commend itself to the common sense of every thinking man; yet in democratic countries, there is a certain squeamishness prevalent, forbidding the announcement of theories which fail to glorify humanity. When will the world learn that the first fatal lie on record was the devil's promise of equality?

In the controversy between the manufacturers and their workmen, which called for the appointment of Commissioners in England, two widely different pleas were entered. The capitalists asked for the suppression of all trades-unions, and fortified their plea by three or four formal charges. First, they claimed that these combinations were illegal and revolutionary. Next, that they led to strikes, (the only outward manifestation of coöperation of which the societies were capable,) and that, during the continuance of strikes, the enforced idleness of the workmen was vicious in its tendencies, reducing the industrial products of the nation, and productive of no possible good. Next, that the majority of the laborers would prefer work at less wages, but were kept in idleness by the pressure of the stringent rules of their unions. On the other hand, the artisans pleaded that their associations contravened no existing law, and asked that they might be *legalised* by positive acts of incorporation. They denied the other charges in the indictment, and challenged the proof, which proof has never been presented in any satisfactory form. English legislation is, on the whole, generally equitable; and the probability is that these societies will be legalised, with certain needful restrictions. The concrete fact evolved, however, is that labor has not rights—only duties. If you have money, so long as you commit no assault upon the rights of others, you are free. If you have not money, you must work—voluntarily in the mills, or involuntarily in the workhouse. Stripped of all verbal drapery, this is the deliberate decision of the wisest, freest, and most highly civilised nationality on the face of the earth. And it is right. The rule is invariable and inflexible; and the worker on a strike is the only tolerated exception—tolerated only so long as the coöperative principle provides money. This coöperative principle is precisely the thing now asking for legislation; and as the most promising development of it is found in what are called “the Rochdale Societies,” it is proper to look a little at them and their imitators.

It has been fully twenty-five years since this form of co-operation had its small beginnings. The membership was small, and the weekly instalments insignificant. At the end of the first

year, the organisation had amassed a capital of little over one hundred dollars, (twenty-eight pounds sterling,) and with this sum they commenced operations. They rented a store, purchased goods at wholesale prices, and distributed these goods among the membership at a small advance upon the cost. They incurred no debts, and they gave no credit. From this point, the Rochdale unions have been uniformly successful. The latest published report, now two years old, reveals the following astounding facts: Nearly 700 of these societies are in successful operation within the United Kingdom, and the Registrar's report only included about two-thirds of them. Yet these 430 or 440 societies possessed a positive capital of five and a quarter millions of dollars (gold). Later investigations have revealed still larger figures, which, however, have thus far found no place in official reports. There are now fully one thousand organisations, with a membership—all working men—of two hundred and fifty thousand, a cash capital of seven and a half million of dollars, and an annual trade of twenty-five millions—all within the limits of Great Britain.

In all of these societies, the *modus operandi* is extremely simple. Two or three foundation principles lie at the root of the system. They aim to dispense with "middlemen," dealing with producer and consumer, as the case may be. They aim to buy in the cheapest markets and to sell in the dearest. Artisans of various crafts combine for the common benefit. Millers, butchers, shoemakers, clothiers, and builders, unite to furnish food, raiment, and shelter for the brotherhood. In all this, there is no "communism;" but, on the contrary, each member, while a partner in the joint-stock association, is proprietor of his own house, by the stated payment of small instalments into the common fund. Similar associations exist in America, but they have hitherto met with indifferent success; partly owing to their departures from a rigid cash basis, partly to the speculative character of their enterprises, and partly to the mismanagement or misappropriation of the common fund. In speaking of these enterprises, a recent writer observes: "The distinguishing characteristic of American officials occupying offices of trust is

their ability to steal with both hands." In France, the despotic system of government has prevented the full development of the co-operative principle, if, indeed, Frenchmen are capable of appreciating any other form of it than communism, which is diametrically opposed to the doctrines of the Rochdale societies.

Summing up the points thus far presented, it will be observed that labor has changed its status, and become a portion of its old antagonist. The workman is the capitalist—absolute owner of a proportion of the machinery with which he operates. Every thing in these last named organisations tends to elevate the artisan in his own esteem, and to secure to him the respect of the world. There can be no strikes in these unions, because each member makes or loses an exact per centage of the common gains or losses. Each worker is part proprietor, and the individual interest of each is calculable. The good of the society is identical with the good of each member of it, and a thousand eyes are constantly watching its interests. The daily rewards of daily toil are certain and invariable, with the ever-present prospect of a share in final profits. In the case of the trades-unions, the chief benefit promised or sought is support in times of idleness under a strike, with the additional comfort of knowing that the capitalist is incurring loss and damage so long as the roar of his machinery is hushed. In the case of the Rochdale unions, every laborer is interested personally in preventing waste and in keeping all the common forces in full operation, earning by diligent toil his daily wages, and augmenting the dividend at the end of the year by each effort he puts forth. The antagonism between capital and labor has disappeared, because the capitalist is the worker in this instance.

There is probably no more striking example of the successful operation of this principle, in another aspect of it, than is found in the structure and conduct of the various forms of insurance societies. These organisations may be divided into two classes. First, the stock companies in which the stockholders subscribe certain moneys, obtain legislation by acts of incorporation, and then assume risks of loss by sea, by fire, or by death, for the sake of a specified percentage. The other class, daily increas-

ing in number, is composed of those corporations which proceed upon the mutual or coöperative principle. With these latter the present discussion is alone concerned.

Taking marine insurance first, it may be observed that the mutual principle, although made a prominent feature in the organisation of such companies, has really not been so fully developed. The Mutual Marine Underwriters do profess to distribute all the net gains of their business among the clients or customers of any given company. But it is at best only a modified form of ordinary sea insurance, in which the merchant is a stockholder so long as he covers his risks in such a company. It is true that the merchant incurs no risk beyond the stipulated rate he pays for his policy; but it is also true that he has no chance of gain beyond a specified percentage on this rate. So mutual marine assurance societies have, for the most part, very little more than the name of coöperation in their charters.

In fire insurance companies, the mutual principle does not obtain at all, except in rural districts. Here is a simple and perfect illustration of combination for mutual security and protection. The citizens of a county, owners of houses and barns, each subscribe a certain fixed sum, beyond which their liability ceases. The fund thus accumulated is used to defray losses by fire, if such losses occur within the limits of the combination. A thousand property owners pay into a common fund ten dollars each per annum, and any one of this thousand draws from this fund a sum to aid in rebuilding his house or barn, if destroyed by fire. All this is plain enough, and the benefit of this mutual protectorate is manifest.

There is one other form of insurance, which demands a little more thorough examination; though the subject is important enough, and perhaps interesting enough, to form the staple of an entire article. There is a widespread prejudice existing against all forms of life insurance, probably because of a misunderstanding of the general theory upon which the system proceeds. The other forms of insurance already noticed are for the most part only *quasi* coöperative, and, indeed, the majority of life assurance corporations are merely joint-stock companies,

formed for the ostensible purpose of making money for stockholders. Some of them, however, are strictly mutual, and it is to these last mentioned only that the present discussion applies.

The census returns, in the United States for example, reveal in their tabular statements the main facts upon which the system of life insurance is based. So many men die between the ages of twenty and thirty, so many in the next decade, and so on. The rate is ascertained with almost incredible accuracy. Thus the tables are made to reveal, so to speak, each man's exact "chance of life,"—which is the technical expression in use among these underwriters. From this average "promise of life," a certain percentage is deducted, to provide for contingent expenses of management, and the society is ready for business. Now for the *modus operandi*. A man aged forty wishes to secure \$1,000 to his family at his death. The tables say he will live twenty years, and the society undertakes to pay the \$1,000, if he will pay \$50 per annum as long as he lives.* The reader perceives at a glance that he will have paid the full amount that his heirs will claim, if he survives the twenty years. But if he die one day after making the first payment, his heirs get the \$1,000; and here is the inducement offered to the clients. The insured man is liable to death from a hundred causes every day, but ten thousand men *are not*—at least, such is the testimony of the census tables. So a society with a large number of clients makes money. If it pays the widow of one member, it makes up the loss by the annual payments from the multitudes who do not die.

In the co-operative or mutual society, these gains are equitably distributed among the assured. Those that are most prosperous, especially in the large cities, really accumulate enormous profits—to be added to the stipulated amount of the policy when it is eventually claimed; or these profits are distributed in annual dividends, reducing the annual payments of the assured. In either case, the co-operative principle applies; and on this account the mutual societies are the most popular.

* These figures are not accurate; they are only given to illustrate the system.

As to the morality of the general system of insurance, it may be observed that even *quasi* co-operation removes some of the objections often urged against it. A thousand men combine for mutual protection, and when one of them incurs loss or damage, the remaining nine hundred and ninety-nine repair his losses by insignificant individual contributions. The subject is complex, however, and has many sides to examine, and the limits of this article will not permit any thing like an elaborate investigation. We hope to discuss the topic more fully in the succeeding number of the *Review*; when it may appear, perhaps, that life insurance, instead of being an evil invention of men who distrust the good providence of God, is really one of the most beneficent and praiseworthy institutions of the present century.

One other example of beneficent co-operation remains to be noted, and this is doubtless the offspring of the Rochdale experiment, now grown into a positive success. In the city of Edinburgh, a most remarkable illustration of successful combination for purely benevolent ends has been recently presented. Within eight years, the "Edinburgh Co-operative Building Company" has wrought a positive revolution in the condition of the working classes of that city. The following extract tells the whole story—setting forth first the enormous attainments of the young society, and then presenting, in appalling contrast, the converse of the picture:

"One evening in the month of April, 1861, six or seven masons, plain but clear-headed men, met with a friend in a dingy room, down a dingy close, not far from where Hugh Miller, the prince of masons, used to write his sagacious 'leaders,' and issue those chapters in his life-history which have inspired and directed many a lowly worker in Scotland. There was long and anxious consultation. The necessity of doing something to provide better house accommodation was fully realised; the difficulties in carrying out any comprehensive and complex scheme were perceived; the prospects of success and the chances of failure were put into the scales with deliberative impartiality. It was evident that, for purely commercial purposes, builders would not invest in workmen's houses, and too many of the common house-property class were interested in keeping up the monopoly which their wretched abodes had so long enjoyed.

"Trusting to charity was altogether out of the question; and this half-dozen humble but brave-hearted men determined that, with the assistance of their fellows in need and suffering, they would try a great, and, so far as this country was concerned, a new experiment in co-operative enterprise. In faith not unmingled with fear, they bade each other adieu that night—to meet a few days hence, with clearer insight and firmer resolve.

"At a general meeting of masons, held April 17th, 1861, which was not very largely attended, it was resolved to form a co-operative building company, to be registered under the Limited Liability Act, with a capital of £10,000, in shares of £1 each. It was a bold but not a reckless venture; decision was needed to meet the old enemies—ignorance or indifference among the multitude, and the hostility of a privileged and powerful class. Based upon sound commercial principles, and entered upon by the originators with an intelligently conceived and distinctly avowed desire to elevate the general body by elevating themselves, the movement took root, and the first seven years of its history have proved the practical wisdom of these men, and realised the highest expectations of the few who helped them with an enlightened sympathy. From small beginnings great movements often spring. The Rochdale pioneers, with over 1,000 members, with a capital of £130,000, and an annual business of £290,000, yielding a clear profit of £40,000, commenced twenty-four years ago with £28—the accumulated result of the two-penny weekly payments of forty poor weavers. The amount actually subscribed at first by the Edinburgh co-operators was £25—certainly a small beginning. And the economic results are highly significant. By 1865, all the shares were taken up, and the number of members is now 836. The working capital has been turned over ten or twelve times, at an average of fifteen per cent.; and the proceeds go on and may go on indefinitely. About 400 houses, providing ample and healthful accommodation for at least 2,000 individuals, have been erected and sold for £70,000; the dividends, which would go to augment the comforts of several thousand recipients, varying from seven and half to twelve and even fifty per cent., according to the nature and amount of work executed. Had nothing more been done, that would indisputably have been a great industrial triumph. But the work did not end here; it is many-sided, and bears the impress of a high moral and social purpose. As a commercial undertaking, as a means of social amelioration and industrial advancement, as a practical demonstration of what unity, economy, and perseverance can accomplish, the Edinburgh

Co-operative Building Company must be accepted as a signal success.

“Edinburgh, beautiful for situation and rich in noble and historic buildings, has long been shamefully deficient in respect to the dwellings of the people. In course of years, the old town mansions were deserted by their wealthy tenants, and converted by a process of partitioning into houses for the working classes. To make way for new streets, railway stations, and other improvements, whole blocks of buildings were swept away, and no adequate provision was made for those whose dwelling-place had been removed. While the demand for houses was increasing from the natural growth of the population, the number of houses was being steadily diminished. The inevitable result, seeing that the erection of suitable buildings had not sufficient inducement for speculators, was that houses already too small and over-crowded were still further sub-divided; families and lodgers were crowded into lightless boxes; and the so-called ‘lands’ became more like rabbit-warrens in their accommodation and density of population than the abodes of human beings. High Street, and the lanes and alleys which extend from it on either side like so many arteries, formed the chief centre for the working population; even the sober and industrious, able and willing to pay a reasonable rent for a comfortable house, were compelled to seek shelter in these dark and loathsome regions. It is so to a large extent still; it is the same in Glasgow and London, and many other large towns; and personal observation alone can reveal the full enormity of the evil, which, it is earnestly believed, co-operation is destined to eradicate. Some conception may be thus conveyed: An archway four or five feet wide leads through the breadth of the first ‘land’ into a close, not much wider; where the houses rise storey above storey, till the light of heaven is almost excluded. Hundreds of men and women, many of them in the various stages of filth and degradation, pass through this archway. Enter one of the open porches: a long, narrow, winding stair leads through darkness and dilapidation to what is meant for a door. Knock; the door, hingeless and broken perhaps, is opened, and you are admitted with ostentatious civility. Here, then, is a room ten feet by eight, with what seems but a hole in the wall, though it is dignified with the name of ‘a decent bedroom;’ the roof is cracked; the walls bear traces of damp and rain; the window is small, and the light admitted scarcely sufficient to reveal the faces of seven inmates—a father, a mother, and five children, doomed to this living death. The rent paid is at the rate of five pounds ten shillings per annum

Through streets and lanes, it is the same weary round, differing only in imperceptible degree, till you are appalled and sickened with the sight. The census of 1861 revealed the startling facts that in Edinburgh 121 families lived in one-roomed houses, without a window; and that 13,209 families—not less than 66,000 individuals—lived in houses of a single apartment, 1,530 of which had from six to fifteen inhabitants living in each! Glasgow was worse; and were the same test applied to some English towns, the condition would be found not less objectionable. It is a lamentable fact, to the removal of which co-operators are earnestly directing their efforts, that thousands of working men and their families are dragging out a miserable existence in houses where comfort and refinement are unattainable. Small, without properly separated apartments, badly lighted and defectively ventilated, their internal conditions obstruct and discourage the pursuit of knowledge, and mar all domestic and intellectual enjoyments. This is not all, nor is it the worst. The houses are situated where the drunken and the impure congregate, and where it is often impossible for the sober and virtuous to escape the sound of their voices and the sight of their iniquities. Is it strange that the moral perceptions are blunted; that the power, nay, the very desire, to resist temptation is weakened; and that vast numbers of those who are habitually subjected to such contaminating and debasing influences become the victims of disease, debauchery, or a revengeful discontent even more to be dreaded?" *

Five distinct phases of co-operation are here presented—two of them bad and three good. There is first the combination of capital *versus* labor, and the almost invariable success of the former, by virtue of this solitary principle. No plainer illustration can be imagined than that furnished by tariff legislation in the United States.

Secondly, the combination of labor *versus* capital, and the development of latent antagonism, more or less revolutionary and harmful, engendering strife and bitterness between masters and workmen—opposition on one side and insubordination on the other. The fairest possible view of trades-unions is not attractive, and no better example of this evil tendency can be given than the frequently recurring strikes, involving weary days of idleness, with the formation and growth of pernicious habits.

* *Westminster Review*, No. clxxvii.. Article 3.

Although the demands of strikers are never beyond the *ability* of the employer, they are frequently unjust and always destructive of values. As the manual labor expended upon any article is a portion of its value, it is plain that the world is poorer whenever its inhabitants refrain from labor. In January last, there was a strike of the book and job printers in New York. The employers resisted their demands, asserting that the wages already paid were higher than wages in Boston or Philadelphia, and that any increase would compel them, in turn, to advance their charges, and so drive trade to those rival cities. This special example accurately represents the animus of almost all strikes, as the fruit and flower of trades co-operation, whenever this co-operation is among the wages-earners of the world. It is a tyrannous exercise of power, and nearly akin to that form of government called mobocracy. It affects to decide what proportion of the employer's gains shall accrue to the employed—these gains being estimated *after* the wages is included in the cost of production. Another very objectionable feature belonging to trades-unions, which was merely referred to on a preceding page, is the ostracism of non-members, workmen of the same craft. It is a common practice, both here and in England, to insist upon the exclusion of operatives who do not belong to the "society;" and one of the prominent demands of strikers—almost universally—is, that non-strikers shall not be employed in the same shop with themselves. It is manifest, upon a slight reflection, that such a contract is immoral and illegal in its nature, being a compact betwixt two men to injure a third, and is therefore, to all intents and purposes, a conspiracy.

Thirdly, an example of beneficial co-operation is found in insurance companies which work upon the mutual benefit principle; but upon these we will not now say any thing more.

Fourthly, there is another beneficial example in the history of the Rochdale pioneers. It is not easy to find fault with their organisations in their animus or their operation. Although they begin in an attitude of hostility to capital, yet they wage a warfare that is purely defensive; and as they grow in strength, the antagonism disappears, because their accumulated capital

their strength. In most respects, it is a new thing in the annals of mankind; and disinterested on-lookers see in this rapidly growing movement the seeds of an entire revolution in the great world of workingmen. The improvement in the intellectual and social status of the laboring population, the deliverance from dependence upon the higher class, the direct contact of the positive worker with the positive consumer, and the consequent exclusion of "middle men" and other expensive agencies—all of these changes, wrought by the unaided efforts of artisans themselves, have demonstrated the power of co-operation, when employed in legitimate and beneficent channels.

Fifthly, the illustration drawn from the wonderful story of the Edinburgh laborers caps the climax. This instance commends itself more directly to the attention of our people in this sorely stricken South. The contrast presented between the condition of the Scottish laborer in the populous cities and the condition of the Southern citizen in this sparsely settled land, is a contrast that is in favor of the latter. By the application of this principle of combination, the laborer in Edinburgh becomes *owner* of a dwelling-place for himself and his family, by an annual outlay no greater than his former annual *rent* for far inferior accommodations. Now, suppose you combine these two last mentioned plans of co-operation. Apply the theories of the Rochdale unions, as far as applicable—in dealing directly with producers and consumers, for example—and the theories of the Edinburgh societies in giving each member some tangible *individual ownership* as well as participation in productive profits, and you will have taken an enormous stride in the right direction. The list of rules found in the note apply, most, if not the whole of them, to similar organisations in America.*

* The "Rochdale Pioneers" publish now an annual almanac, in which they give the public from year to year the benefit of their own experience in managing their vast corporation. In one of their latest editions, under the title of "Hints," they modestly present their advice as follows:

1. Procure the authority and protection of the law by enrolment (incorporation).
2. Let integrity, intelligence, and ability be indispensable qualifications the choice of officers and managers, and not wealth and distinction.

As to the application of this principle to the industrial interests of the South, there is little to be said beyond self-evident propositions. In the cultivation of large tracts of land there are, no doubt, many opportunities to reduce the expense of culture and increase the product by a combination of forces; and so in the procurement of the ordinary necessities of life, there may be saved in more ways than by the mere wholesale purchasing. A co-operative society, well organised and officiously managed, would buy in the best markets and from first hands; and would stop the numerous leaks incident to multiplied agencies. A commodity that passes through many hands before it reaches the consumer, leaves an appreciable percentage of its value to each manipulator. But the main point to be suggested here is that co-operation, when successful, is only the aggregation of separate and individual energies, skill, wisdom, and courage. Each member of the community contributes to the common good by these qualities and attributes, as well as his share of money.

If there is an ethical side to this subject, it is not readily perceived. There is such a thing as a wicked combination to

3. Let each member have only one vote, and make no distinction regards the amount of wealth any member may contribute.

4. Let majorities rule in all matters of government.

5. Look well after money matters. Punish fraud, when duly established, by immediate expulsion of the defrauder.

6. Buy goods as much as possible in the lowest markets; or if you have the produce of your industry to sell, contrive, if possible, to sell at the highest.

7. Never depart from the principle of buying and selling for money.

8. Beware of long reckonings in societies' accounts. Quarterly accounts are the best, and should be adopted when practicable.

9. For the sake of security, always have the accounted value "fixed stock" at least one-fourth less than its marketable value.

10. Let members take care that the accounts are properly audited by men of their own choosing.

11. Let committees of management always have the authority of the members before taking any important or expensive step.

12. Do not court opposition or publicity, nor fear it when it comes.

tariff legislation by which a whole nationality may be defrauded ; there is such a thing as cruel co-operation to oppress the poor in his wages ; there are such things as a covenant with death and an agreement with hell ; but none of these facts fix any moral quality upon the mere act of co-operation, which can only be good or evil according as its objects are good or evil, or according as the means employed for the attainment of these objects are in agreement with or in opposition to the law of God.

Finally, there is a word to say concerning the operation of this principle in the Church, and here none of the arguments drawn from the economical view of the subject have any place. There is undoubtedly such a thing as the corporate life of the Church, and the full development of that life will be found in the Church triumphant. Already once or twice, in the preparation of this article, it has been the purpose of the writer to erase what was said at the outset touching the masterly discourse of Dr. Moore, and to confine the discussion to material interests alone. It is no part of the present purpose to criticise that discourse, to which the writer listened with unmixed pleasure. But that which may appear to be the logical drift of Dr. Moore's

13. Choose those only for your leaders whom you can trust, and then give them your confidence.

These "Hints" contain simple and plain rules, particularly the seventh—never to adopt the credit system. Taking or giving credit has been the death-blow to more than one society. In England, it has been generally found to work mischief, and societies which have succumbed or are kept in a languishing condition attribute the cause to the credit system. A general convention of German societies, held at Stettin in 1865, passed strong resolutions against it, and advised all who had adopted to abandon it. With this is connected closely the second cause of failure, as mentioned above. Most societies that have been originated in this country are in great haste to commence operation, and therefore, not wishing to wait till the subscriptions will gradually furnish the required capital, to open business with a less amount of ready cash and borrow the balance, either in money or goods, on time. Wherever this has been tried, it has brought losses and disasters, if not entire ruin. The third cause—improper use of the funds—is an incident to all human enterprises now-a-days, but it may be guarded against by following strictly the "Hints" of the Rochdale Pioneers given above.

VOL. XX., NO. 2.—5.

positions, to wit, the substitution of large schemes of collective enterprise for the separate and individual labor of Christian men and women, is perhaps appropriate enough for the present discussion.

Now, concerning the principles upon which God conducts the government of world, it may be observed that certain inviolable laws underlie all human enterprises. Some of these are well known, because God has, so to speak, written them upon the surface of things; others are not so universally recognized, though they are equally potent and inflexible and in constant operation. Therefore, taking one branch of human industry as an example, the percentage of successful merchants is very small. It was stated several years ago, probably in *Hunt's Merchants' Magazine*, that only three or four per centum of the traders in America escaped bankruptcy. The inevitable inference is, that ninety-six or ninety-seven per centum of traders are ignorant of the laws of trade. It is not conceivable that such a fatality should belong to the occupation, but much more probable that the failures are the penalty affixed to some inexorable law, ignorantly or recklessly violated. Indeed, it can be demonstrated that a large proportion of commercial disasters are directly traceable to the violation of established commercial principles, such as over-trading, undue extension of credit, speculation, and the like. The superintending providence of God does verily give success to the tradesman, when he is successful; but the cases in which this overruling providence is exercised in favor of the thriftless and incompetent are extremely rare. Diligent attention to the details of one's daily occupation is indispensable to success; and commonly some considerable knowledge of the *hidden* laws of trade, to be acquired only by persistent study, is indispensable also.

So all trades-combinations proceed upon this principle: the promise of success is the balance of the probabilities when the known laws are observed. Larger measures of success are attributable to the acuteness that discovered less well known laws, and the boldness that acted upon the discovery.

But in the Church none of these principles apply, and

God has not dealt with this organisation as he deals with the world. Behold how marvellously he marks the distinction! The same man is a daily toiler in the thronged marts of the world, earning his daily bread by assiduous attention to the maxims of his craft, and is also a co-worker with God in restoring the allegiance of a revolted creation! He may take the maxims of his higher profession into all the ramifications of his worldly calling, writing "holiness to the Lord" upon his looms, his ploughshares, and his merchandise; but he may not bring the maxims of his temporal business into the sanctuary. And when he moves in this higher sphere, he finds his pathway accurately marked—every step of it—with precise directions for every possible emergency. "This is the way; walk thou in it."

In commending religious co-operation, nothing is more common than for Protestant teachers to commend the example of the Papacy. And, beyond controversy, the most striking illustration is found in the history of Jesuitism. Here is an example of corporate life, which has no parallel in human annals. Throughout the habitable world, these children of the devil have spread themselves, penetrating with resistless energy into the very centres of power amongst civilised nations and into the remotest villages of the savage tribes. No attainment has been too high for their audacity; no depth of degradation among the barbarians of the earth has been below the reach of their patience and their faith; no privations, no perils have been great enough to deter their missionaries or extinguish their flaming zeal. The same amount of intellect, energy, patience, and courage, if devoted to the attainment of merely political power, would have revolutionized the world. The same combination of forces devoted to the mere accumulation of wealth would have regulated and controlled the commerce of the earth. And now what is the condition of the order? In spite of the irrational dread which the sound of their name produces, the Jesuits are to-day little more than a company of baffled conspirators, without influence even at the very seat of the beast which they have served so long and so faithfully. An order of religionists composed of a vast multitude, more thoroughly organised than any other

association in the world, with a corporate life of such potency that, according to their own maxim, each member is a "dead corpse" in the hands of the order, has, after centuries of unending effort, culminated in a gigantic failure.

Perhaps the above maxim, the very extreme of self-abnegation, explains one cause of this failure, while it affords a notable contrast to the vital principle of the Christian creed. The Jesuit yields unquestioning obedience to his superior in the order, rank by rank. The Christian owes fealty to the one Lord, Christ, and jealously resists all intermediate authority. The Jesuit avows himself a "dead corpse," rendering servile obedience to an authority which he dreads. The Christian proclaims himself a living warrior, fighting a life-long battle in the cause of his Lord, whom he loves. The Jesuit's strength lies in his membership in an alliance whose cardinal principle is ferocious enmity to every human interest outside its pale. The Christian's strength is the word of the Captain of salvation, and his kindly charities embrace the entire population of the earth.

In conclusion, look a moment at the examples furnished in God's revelation, and you will look in vain for any striking instance of the power of co-operation. The valor that broke through the hosts of the Philistines and brought water from the well at Bethlehem was the individual valor of the three mighty men. An army environed the devoted city when the walls of Jericho fell; but each soldier in that host passed over the crumbling ruins into the heart of the city, "every man straight before him," fighting as if all depended upon his individual prowess. There is something in the idea of combined effort that militates against the idea of personal responsibility, and detracts from the glory of individual heroism. The triumphs of the Church hitherto have been achieved in single combats. There is no co-operation among those inward lusts, which the warrior must conquer single-handed. The unregenerate world is combined against the solitary missionary laboring in far distant heathendom, against each separate preacher of righteousness in its civil capitals. And the powers of hell combine against Jehovah against his Anointed, and against each separate soldier in

army of believers. The illustrations of the Bible—such as the race with one winner, the strife of the athletes with one victor—all appear to presuppose this individuality, this separate vitality, distinguished from a corporate life. The Christian wages no warfare upon his own charges, nor does he provide his own weapons. But clad in the panoply which his Captain furnishes, he is required to present a dauntless front to the world, the flesh, and the devil. And the reward at the end of the conflict is a special crown of rejoicing, adorned with jewels which the soldier has won by his individual daring and endurance. There is no promise of a general distribution of spoils; but, on the contrary, the significant exhortation, "Let no man take *thy* crown."

ARTICLE IV.

SOME REMARKS ON THE INFLUENCE OF MAGAZINES AND REVIEWS ON AUTHORSHIP, AND A SUGGESTION FOR AN AUTHORITATIVE CANON OF CLASSIC ENGLISH AUTHORS.

Since the days which were gladdened by the recurrence of the *Quarterly* and the *Spectator*, English periodical literature appears to have unfolded itself in two directions. The one, pointing toward the masses, is distinguished by the productions of a countless number of writers, by whom every conceivable subject of fact or fiction has been seized upon with avidity. These productions, though for the most part ephemeral, are generally entertaining and instructive; and are appropriately published, at short intervals, in what are styled magazines. So insatiable a habit of reading has been engendered in the people by the increased facility of communication between writers and readers, and so acceptable to all has literature become in some shape, however meagre, that even newspapers find it necessary to com-

bine with their political and commercial intelligence the graceful effusions of the poet, novelist, and historian.

In the other direction, there has sprung from the inadequateness of such resources to satisfy the more educated and intellectual a higher species of periodicals. These assume the weightier task to criticise the authors of every nation; to exalt or discourage, to discipline and rectify, to repel error and to vindicate truth. The learned censors of these reviews extend their arment over every department of letters. They claim the right to use, at their own unrestricted pleasure, every mode of attack and every weapon of offence. From this marshalling, as it were, of a nation's erudition and mental strength, from this grand Areopagus of self-appointed critics, we should expect numerous and most important benefits to literature—among which may be designated the dissemination and establishment, in the minds of all readers, of sure criterions of judgment in matters of taste and literary excellence, and the settlement of the relative worthiness of authors, ancient and modern, to be our educational guides, according to the indubitable power of each to elevate and purify as well as to please and instruct. These benefits, we venture to assert, have not been realised. We stand in regard to them nearly as the world stood before reviews existed. For too often has a desire for praise or emolument, or some other selfish motive, sat enthroned with the critic, perverting his judgment from the pure and simple seeking after truth, or else prejudice and the influence of the evanescent standards of the time have rendered the mass of criticism placed in our hands unsatisfactory, disputable, and unauthoritative.

We shall return to this topic; but will here remark, that collect together and make effectual for educational purposes the results—whatever they may be—accomplished by reviews, there is need that some literary Justinian shall arise to inaugurate a work of analysing the hundreds of volumes of criticism which have been issued to the world. At the thought of a labor brain-oppressing, we are tempted to wish, in behalf of those whom such a task would be imposed, that there could be a tribunal of unerring judges before whom every critic would

compelled to appear, as Plato pictures the souls of men coming before Æacus and Rhadamanthus—nameless and without intimation of their earthly dignity—to have each his placard pinned to his back, consigning him to honor or to the punishment he has justly deserved. There surely should be some punishment somewhere for those who, without compulsion, but wilfully and of their own “mere motion,” have written and given to the world erroneous or unnecessary criticisms.

It is not intended, however, to depreciate the importance of reviews, particularly those established for the advocacy of certain objects of a political, social, or religious nature. It will be found that the influence of these, in their special fields of operation, has been most decisive. Men—we may say almost without exaggeration—they have pulled down and set up; public abuses they have reformed; statutes they have altered or rescinded; institutions they have created and destroyed; and they have meliorated the condition of nations, introducing a new power among the elements of society, inasmuch as they furnish the means for the concentrated and militant activity of the opinions of the “thinkers” of the community—a power to be pondered over by those who shall unfold to posterity the history of modern civilisation.

It is my purpose to speak of reviews only as they have for their object the criticism of literary productions or admit such criticism; and much that shall be said will apply also to that less grave but no less important class of periodicals whose object is to give at shorter intervals critiques, memoirs, essays, poems, and tales of such compass as may afford an entertaining pastime, or contribute, in a lighter style, than reviews, to the instruction of the people.

The influence of these periodicals, in the restricted view in which we are considering them, is various and extensive. Few will deny that vast benefits are derived from them. They are the traveller’s companion on the highways, a library for the poor, recreation for the student and the man of business, and a source of instruction and amusement in the household. They fill the land with the light of knowledge, and, with ever-varying novelty, impress even the unreflecting with lessons of wisdom.

Perhaps half the adult readers in our country look for their only literary entertainment to magazines and reviews, which come to us, as though, with fluttering pinions, the learning long pent up on bookshelves were buzzing about our ears. A general recognition of the influence of periodical publications is evinced in the fact that every important interest of society seeks to control some portion of such influence for its own benefit, weekly, monthly, or quarterly.

But we have prescribed for ourselves only to consider the influence of such magazines and reviews upon authorship. It would be interesting first to exhibit, if we had the means of doing so accurately, the increase in the number of authors in recent times. We believe there has been a large increase corresponding with the greater mechanical facilities for book-making, and with the general habit of reading consequent upon the extension of popular education. And we are inclined to attribute this increase of authors chiefly to magazines and reviews. In them many an aspirant for literary honors begins to use his newly fledged wings; and in them many an inchoate volume expands (if we may be allowed the expression) into bookly proportions and prepares for its coleopterous transformation. At the same time, many portions of books slip out from their substantial coverings and flit through the pages of periodicals; and spreading more widely the author's name and merits, bring back to his quiet study-room words of praise and encouragement to stimulate him to renewed exertion. We are aware that several causes operate together to effect the wonderful activity of modern book-production, and we do not mean to ascribe this wholly to the influence of magazines and reviews. But if there were statistics which might enable us to separate the reprints of old or standard books from the number of new books published, and to compare the number of new authors within certain periods with the number of periodicals or the extent of their circulation. At the same time, there is little doubt that it would be found that the increase in authorship corresponds with the increased circulation of periodicals, and is, in a great measure, attributable to it, for the reasons already stated.

The subject which next suggests itself is, how do these authors, whether they be many or few, who may certainly be said to spring up through such influences, compare in the true qualities of authorship with the writers who preceded them? Here we shall be led into a labyrinth, unless, avoiding induction, we content ourselves with a general treatment of this question. And in our attempt to treat it in this general way, we would first invite attention to the qualifications of successful authorship—namely, genius and knowledge and patient toil. These cannot be separated in the producing of any work worthy of lasting fame. Of the two last named qualifications, we are as capable now as men ever have been; and the first—namely, genius—we do not regard as a mysterious thing, for the lack of which the generations now on earth dare not compete in authorship with the great writers of former days. Let us dwell a little on this point; for on it depends our argument adverse to the beneficial influence of periodicals on authorship.

Of genius, as of liberty and poetry, there are various definitions—no one, perhaps, complete enough to satisfy us all, though each may contain some truth concerning the thing defined. As in Protean transformations the “*variæ species*” elude our grasp, baffling us with exhibitions which astound the mind or slipping away like a sparkling stream—though, if we can hold fast to what we seek, we shall discover at length only the simple form of the “*vates qui omnia novit*”—so with genius: we may fail to discover what it is in the melody and pathos of a ballad, in the wonders of a romance, in the grandeur of an epic, in the absorbing fascination of a drama, in the philosophic calmness or picture-like vividness of history, or the startling thunders of oratory. Disconcerted in scrutinising the subtle power which enchants us, we are apt to regard the genius of the author as a gift from heaven, indescribable, incomprehensible—an inspiration producing, without one’s own effort, the thrilling thoughts and harmonious words that electrify the souls of men. But this genius, if we hold fast to our Proteus long enough, will be found to be but mental power, and accomplishing nothing great except through careful toil. Quickness of perception, clearness of

reason, and a retentive memory, with more or less of imagination, are sufficient to make what we would call a genius in any branch of literature or science. Add the faculty of analysis and synthesis in preponderance, and we have the genius of the philosopher; or add, in preponderance, the imaginative faculty with sensibility of heart, and we have the genius of the poet. And so we would make up the compound of the genius of other professions. And wise men have always known that a broad substratum of patient assiduity underlies every notable production of the great geniuses. We have not followed with the eye the steady progress of the sculptor, nor watched the long and thoughtful application of the architect: we see only the polished statue unveiled, or gaze upon the gorgeous temple, complete in its perfection of exquisite workmanship. Beneath the rose, in its stem and far down in the unseen root, lies the secret work that gives to the petals their beauty and fragrance. The plodding of Virgil and Horace's elaboration are as well known as Gray's fastidious revision, or Dante's "*sudor in studiis*," or the "*limæ et mora*" of Ariosto, or Milton, or Dryden, or Addison.

But though many may think it nothing strange that Bishop Butler spent twenty years on his Analogy, or that an arduous life-time has been devoted to the preparation of a single treatise in mathematics or philosophy; and hear without astonishment Pliny's methodical care, or Gibbon's research, or Kant's study-chamber, or the exhausting toil of Newton; yet their idea of the least poetic genius will be satisfied only with something swift and moving like the sunbeams, joyously flitting in far-off spiritual realms, or making its abode in fields of light and splendor, dwelling always amidst melody and pleasing phantasy. Some of themselves—eccentric souls!—believe (or is it all their pretence) that they are filled with an ecstasy divine, and would fain be couched on fleecy clouds or wafted on winged hippogriffs. They would say, "*Est Deus in nobis, agitante calescimus illo*," without reflecting that this is but the "*animus, qui, ut ego opinor, divinus est*," says Cicero, "*ut Euripides dicere audeat, deus*." To attempt to fix some definite meaning to the term will not be to undervalue what they call their inspiration of genius—what

seems to us to be, not, as Socrates considered it, an *enthusiasm* displacing or overwhelming the power of reason, but simply an excitation of mind, more or less prolonged, giving to thought and imagination their clearest, most vivid, and undisturbed exercise, such as most men may at times have felt in themselves, though not to the degree in which it is experienced by the more powerful intellects of particular individuals, who, being previously skilled in knowledge and the harmonies of language, have, as it were, intuitively, the means of expressing and perpetuating their conceptions.

It is true, Goethe tells that the exercise of his indwelling poetic talent, in its "most joyful, its richest action, was spontaneous—nay, even against his will." "I was so apt," says he, "to dictate a little song to myself without being able to recall it again, that sometimes I ran to the desk, and without taking time to adjust a sheet of paper that happened to be lying obliquely, wrote down the poem, from beginning to end, diagonally, without moving from the spot." But such productions are short and expressive merely of a felicitous thought or sentiment, and, though seemingly impromptu, are the springing up of flowers in a soil already carefully husbanded and rich with hidden germs of truth and poesy. Take, as another example, what Johnson says of Pope: his good sense and genius, and the great strength and exactness of his memory, "he improved by incessant and unwearied diligence. He had recourse to every source of intelligence, and lost no opportunity of information; he consulted the living as well as the dead; he read his compositions to his friends, and was never content with mediocrity, when excellence could be attained." "To make verses was his first labor, and to mend them was his last. From his attention to poetry he was never diverted. If conversation offered any thing that could be improved, he committed it to paper; if a thought, or perhaps an expression more happy than was common, rose to his mind, he was careful to write it; an independent distich was preserved for an opportunity of insertion; and some little fragments have been found containing lines or parts of lines to be wrought upon at some other time." Many such

examples may be found; and where we are permitted, by our own confessions, to contemplate the inner life of poets, we find the same training and perfecting of their gifts, the same struggling and pains of intellect, the same recension, elimination, amending, and remodelling of their works, as we know to have been the necessary means of success in the case of the most celebrated prose writers.

It may be concluded, then, that to whatever field of literary labor genius may apply itself, whether in prose or poetry, it must fail, if it be not united with knowledge and patient toiling, the other two requisites of successful authorship. Leaving out of view considerations of climate, language, and such influences as are assignable at particular periods of a nation's history in the development in highest perfection of any species of composition, we may ask if it is not probable, whatever may be understood by genius, that there is as much of it latent in the world now as there was in olden times? There surely have been many who may have been considered giants in intellect, had they exhibited their strength, but who have

“compressed

The god within them, and rejoined the stars,
Unlaurelled upon earth.”

And we may ask, comparing ourselves with the ancients, if there is not in the world now more knowledge and greater facilities for mental culture, and an equal appreciation of literary merit? “Though I acknowledge myself an admirer of the ancients,” said the younger Pliny, “yet I am very far from despising, and do some affect to do, the genius of the moderns; nor can I suppose that nature in these latter ages is so worn out as to be incapable of any valuable production.” If these things be so, the failure in authorship must be ascribed not to a lack of genius, nor, it is presumed, to a lack of knowledge, so much as to a deficient and pains-taking labor in production. With us, often authors are cast into oblivion, foundering like vessels at sea, because they set out on their voyage without the sails of genius to catch the favors of the sky, or without the guiding rudder of knowledge, or without

having bestowed labor enough to caulk the seams and make the hull staunch against the billows of an un pitying criticism. But in most instances, even with sails and rudder well supplied, yet with gaping chinks from impatient preparation, they sail from shore with plaudits of the crowd, only to spring a leak and sink to bottom. But, dropping metaphor, let us ask what is the principal difference between authors of our own time and those who for centuries have been our instructors and our models for imitation? Does it not consist in a hasty and imperfect style, in a deficiency of patient toil to reach perfection in all that appertains to literary excellence? And if so, may we not assign chiefly to magazines and reviews this hurrying of authors into the imperfections inseparable from hasty production?

Contrast the clearness, elegance, and precision of ancient and modern classics, with the common-place outpourings of some magazine and review writers who perhaps have stipulated to furnish a monthly or quarterly amount of written matter, and must fulfil their contract whether their productions be excellent or otherwise; and consider the fact that the very nature of periodicals is that a certain number of pages must be issued at stated times, whatever may be their quality; and the fact that they do not always contain—indeed, that very many of them seldom contain—what is strictly excellent; and may it not be justly said that all but the highest class of periodicals, instead of fostering patient labor on the part of their contributors, are satisfied with such rapidity of execution that in their pages we would seek as much in vain for models of style as we would seek in novels for the facts of history or in the old metrical romances for our principles of morality? And this deteriorating influence on authorship cannot be remedied so long as subscription lists are the lungs through which periodicals breathe, and so long as it is obligatory on them to issue to subscribers at stated times a certain quantity of so-called original composition. Such alone as have won an independent position through the distinguished ability of their editors and contributors are conservative of the appropriate functions of magazines and reviews, and promotive of excellence in authorship.

We would still further contrast the labor bestowed on the writings by the great ancient authors and those of our own age. The Athenian may have been stimulated to authorship by the influence of the periodical literature. The Athenian, it is probable, first brought his production into notice by submitting it to perusal, by reading it to a circle of friends or having it read perhaps many times in various places. Criticisms and corrections no doubt followed each rehearsal whether before a few persons or at some frequent resort. Every copy made of a song or drama or treatise by the author may have been a corrected and amended edition of the work. He knew that its intrinsic value alone must win the commendation, and for himself lasting fame. The limited circle, at best, to whom he addressed himself necessarily suggested a more imposing judgment, in the future, of entire generations before whom his works would compete amidst formidable rivals of patient, pains-taking, ambitious laborers for the reward of literary excellence. But with us a whole nation of readers may be reached almost instantaneously. Copies printed by state power are borne by steamship and rail-car, and may be poured like a flood into towns and villages. Why should an author labor in seclusion for perfection in order to gratify posterity when renown and a competence may be made at once by gratifying a people whose appetency for reading is satisfied with quantity rather than perfection? We may be permitted to say that our present author seems, with hastily-prepared volume in hand, to be haranguing his world-audience to-day; and to-night he will be getting ready to harangue the world again.

The Athenian, furthermore, was necessarily restricted in his training in his native classic writers, conning from infancy the best passages of the finest models of composition. And his ear was exquisitely attuned to the harmonies of his language. How thoroughly was he taught to appreciate the minutest shades of meaning in the words he used. In the Greek authors, the student is impressed so soon as their verbal accuracy is perceived. A word, even in extensive treatises, can well be removed or changed without detriment to the sense of the passage; the smallest particle or a preposition almost hiddenly conjoined with a

points, as by a speaker's wave of the hand or intonation of voice or suggestive glance of the eye, to the qualified signification the whole sentence is intended to assume. How is English studied, inferior as it is in all respects to the language of the Greeks? Are we from infancy taught its most accurate use? Are our minds stored and imbued with its happiest expressions and the noblest passages of its prose and poetry? Are we trained in its utmost purity until, as with an Athenian, a golden eloquence dwells as by nature forever on our lips? By no means. On the contrary, any other language appears (to our teachers, if not to ourselves,) to have charms for us rather than our own. This important subject, in all its bearings, is not sufficiently elucidated by magazines and reviews, whose province, as arbiters in literature, brings peculiarly under their supervision the elevation and perfection of style. Although the modern diffusion of a certain amount of learning among all classes is better for a people than remarkable literary excellence in a few individuals, yet there is no incompatibility in the existence at the same time of both these benefits to a nation. Their coëxistence would appear to be in accordance with the normal condition of an educated people. And it is the duty of magazines and reviews to maintain an exalted standard in every species of composition, lest, while they foster an increased popular demand for literary entertainment, they should fail to prevent an inferior and adulterated supply. We do not overlook the truth that a great book owes its greatness not to the garb alone in which it appears, but to the adaptation of its principles to the refinement and elevation of humanity, to the intellectual power displayed in the treatment of its subject—in general, to qualities emanating from the inborn capabilities of the author, and which are beyond the sphere of the influences of periodical literature; and we must recall to the memory of our readers that we limited our remarks to such specimens of authorship as may have sprung up under the influences of which we are speaking.

Having shown, imperfectly it may be, that much of our periodical literature is apt to lead to hasty production with all its imperfections, let us notice next certain charges which may be brought against reviews in particular.

It is amusing to look over the prefaces of some new works. They are more pitiable than the prologues to old plays. An ingenious conceit is used to avert or mitigate the attacks of critics. Pleadings are set forth, in some cases, more than to the dignity of authorship than the fulsome dedications of the last century. For such dedications, aimed to secure some personal benefit to the needy or ambitious author; while the allusions are designed to palliate dispraise, or by timorous mission, escape criticism altogether. Now, one might expect this to be an indication of a wholesome terror on the part of authors just emerging into the light of public notice. Instead, it seems to us rather indicative of a dread of unmerciful slaughters and indiscriminate fulminations—of being crushed by a hirsute giant may crush a butterfly. What critic has power to judge who in their first efforts should be treated with the fluent words of encouragement, and who should properly be crushed? While one, more impervious, resists, another, more sensitive and vulnerable, perishes, not having for the protection his encounter the magic ring of Ardanata and the sword of Crystabell, which neither stalwart limbs of giants could wield nor toughest hide of monstrous beasts.

Reviews may be charged also with the opposite fault, namely partiality or unjust favoritism. On taking into our hands the work of a new author, we usually inquire who he is, and what his work relates to facts, we inquire why he wrote and what amount of information he had; if not to facts, we look at once to the intrinsic merit of the composition. But often a critic asks the first question; and friendship, political alliance, or other considerations, lead him straight into panegyric without regard to literary merit.

On account of these departures from their true function as impartial judges, the moral influence of reviews is diminished, and the benefits they are calculated to confer are lost in the hostility or disdain of those unjustly criticised or unduly praised. The effect is not only that authors abandon the decision of the public, which has proved, in their case, a fallible tribunal, but a positive aversion ensues to authorship when men of genius are forced away

the judgments of the learned and the wise—as critics ought to be—and make popularity, which is still more fallible, their aim and their standard of success. This antagonism sets genius adrift to find its own compass and construct its own chart; which would be well enough if reviews are in possession of no settled principles that regulate literary productions, or are indolently willing to leave the whole subject of the true laws of criticism choked up in a chaotic mass of heterogeneous contributions.

We are in some doubt whether we should consider it a benefit or an injury to authorship that magazines and reviews tend to produce a fragmentary literature. “Fragmentary” does not convey all our meaning. We mean that since it has been discovered that men have now much more to do in the world than their forefathers had, literature, to suit the hurry we are in, comes to us in smaller quantities at a time, in parts either complete in themselves, or in detached, chapter-like portions of extensive subjects. Heavy tomes and cumbrous quartos which suited our ancestors, and which can only be read propped up on a table, have given place to lighter volumes which we hold in our hand while we read. Poems in twelve or twenty-four books, requiring several months to peruse, have given place to such as may be read in an evening. Bulky treatises of all kinds are issued in serials, and in such divisions as may divert us for the time from the contemplation of the ponderous aggregate of the whole production, perhaps on the principle that we can digest our dinners day by day more comfortably than we could an hebdomadal accumulation of the same. But if subdivision or diminution, not of material bulk alone, but in the extent of modern productions compared with that of ages past, be an advantage, a still greater has been caused by magazines and reviews, inasmuch as they furnish an outlet for those ebullitions of genius which, if suppressed, might be allowed to subside and evaporate. With the opportunity afforded by magazines and reviews, the ebullition terminates in an essay. On the whole, the result of chapter-like productions, over a wide range of subjects, is a very important effect of periodical literature, and perhaps beneficial; although the world values more one large diamond than its equal

weight of small ones. We at least secure the fruits of experience and varied studies of thoughtful men who might have been induced under any circumstances to prepare what is called a book.

So much may be said in favor of literary periodicals that it is really no pleasure in concluding that their influence on authorship has been unproductive of the highest benefits which reasonably have been anticipated from them. They are a necessary outgrowth of modern civilisation. When rightly conducted and devoted to the moral improvement of the people, they are a blessing to a country. If they have failed to be promoters of the highest excellence in authorship, we must turn again to institutions of learning to supply us with guidance in this respect and to be the true expositors of the principles which should govern literary productions.

We promised to revert to the subject of the failure of reviews to settle the relative worthiness of authors to be (in the most comprehensive sense) our educational guides. From what has been said, it may appear probable that they never will be able to accomplish such a result. It may therefore be not altogether visionary to suggest that the celebrated Universities of England should undertake to prepare a canon of English authors like the famous canon of the Alexandrian critics; placing in respective lists of authorship those whose excellence indisputably entitles them to the rank of classic writers. Such lists would be more highly prized if accompanied with discriminations as to the style and intrinsic usefulness of the productions of each author. Indeed, the few points discussed in this essay have not been designed as a full treatment of the subject with which we began, but rather as a suitable introduction to the suggestion now offered. Our life is short, and the opportunities of learning are not very great to most of us. We would be saved from a waste of labor and a misdirection of our preferences, if by competent authority our attention were called at once to the most important authors in each department of literature and science. Among the many public benefits for which we are indebted to institutions of learning, none would be more valuable to the people at large

than the establishment of the relative rank of English poets, historians, philosophers, essayists, novelists, and writers on subjects connected with religion, statesmanship, and science. The Universities, before giving their final decision, should propose that within a year any advocate of the claims of any author may send to them his reasons for the rank which he thinks ought to be assigned to his favorite. The claims of living authors for a position in the canon would properly be excluded from consideration. But to them the plan of such a decision, with the expectation of similar decisions in the future, would operate as an incentive to excellence which no review in the world could inspire; while the honors conferred upon the dead, would be honor conferred upon the land that gave them birth, nurtured their genius, and reveres their memory.

ARTICLE V.

AUTHORSHIP AT THE SOUTH.

The reproach is sometimes brought against Southern men that they have contributed less than their share to the book-making of the country. Our once rich, prosperous, and happy States have made comparatively few contributions to the standard volumes of the libraries. It is a matter of some interest and importance to us to inquire whether or not this is a just reproach; and if it be, what are its causes, and by what means it may, by the blessing of God, be removed.

Now, in the first place, our Southern States have usually been more intent upon the production of men than of books. We have, whether wisely or not, preferred a living and spoken voice to a dead and embalmed and printed voice. There can be but little doubt in any candid and well-informed mind that skill in popular public speaking existed to a greater extent among the educated classes of the South, down to 1860, than in any other

population of the English-speaking nations. There is no doubt at all in relation to either New England or Old England. The only doubt we feel is concerning the North-western States. We have preferred the power of "men, high-minded men," to that of books; even those of which it would have been good for us to have had more—"books which are the precious life-blood of a master-spirit, embalmed and treasured up on purpose to a life beyond life." We have rather striven to emulate Demosthenes and Chatham, than Plato and Bacon. We have felt that the problems of liberty and self-government were on experiment here and now, in this land and in the present age; and that he who could and would contribute to their maintenance on the floor of counsel and debate would deserve more of his race than even he who should have treasured up, in ponderous volume, the mental "seeds of things," which should fly through the air, and then at last lodge and germinate in many a place, but after the "summer was ended" and the experiment of free government a failure.

Observing minds every where will have noticed the great predilection of Southern men for the bar and for political life. Some sought political life through the apprenticeship of the bar, because that was the consecrated route to posts of public trust; and many sought political life by the direct road, and for its own sake. It was because *there* lay the experiment of the age. The thing on trial in the American States, as Northern men thought, was *power*: the power of the central government to maintain itself against all claims of rights whatever, whether they were State rights or individual rights. They always took the side of a large and loose construction of the Constitution, except where their own purposes were concerned. The east of Time has hardly yet recovered from its deep amazement at the ridicule heaped by Northern tongues and pens upon a jealous guarding of the written Constitution of the country by Southern statesmen as "dealing in *abstractions*;" and at their derision of men jealous of all infractions of the charter of the liberties of the country, as "*abstractionists*." There never was a deeper, a blinder, a more doomed fatuity, except that of those who, in any

degree, felt the ridicule. The thing on trial in the American Union, as Southern men thought, was *liberty*—constitutional liberty; the power of the States, the power of persons, to maintain all their constitutional rights, against all claims of power whatever; against the irresponsible constructions of the extent of its own powers by the Federal Government; against reckless and passionate majorities; against all overriding of rights which men in cooler moments established for their own guidance, and bound themselves by written constitutions not to override. Southern men did not have time to produce books. The great battle of historic and chartered liberty, they believed, would be fought, and won or lost, before those coming generations should arise, to whom books of any intrinsic value are addressed. There never was a wiser, juster, or more beautiful system of human rights, guarded by all those checks and balances and rightful and peaceful remedies, which the watchful and studious care of the most profound political sages of any age could desire, than that which existed in this country while the Southern mind had controlling influence in it. It is the robe of Nemesis that this was what the hating fanaticism of the North called the **SLAVE POWER**. And the overthrow of the slave power is so manifestly the overthrow of all jealousy of constitutional right, that Northern leaders do not now scruple to own that long courses of Congressional action are "outside the Constitution," and that Northern statesmen stoop to say that war, arms, numbers—mercenary Dutch and Irish numbers—have decided the most vital points of human liberty.

The best minds of the South, in the better days of old, were occupied in a closer study than that of him who makes a book, with those plans and devices of human rights which consider how to restrain the power of mad majorities; how to protect minorities; how to establish the reign of constitution, of law, of opinion, and of the consent of the governed. And while this plan of government prevailed in this country, it created a temple of liberty worthy the high principle, the lofty magnanimity, and the unsullied public virtue of that high-mettled race who guarded and frequented it.

Our Rubicon was crossed when men, acting under the constitution only, having sworn to *support* the Constitution, having no rightful power of any sort but what the Constitution gave them, felt no guilt of perjury in enacting laws "beyond the Constitution." There rolled the waters of the fated day. It is true we hear pæans over the death of the ancient and entered but troublesome rights of the States and of the people. Who knows not that rights of any kind are ever vexatious and unwelcome things in the ear of unlimited power? Who does not now see that ridicule of the jealousy of the South over the rights as "abstractions," was the first and cheapest weapon of their destruction, which was tried for economy's sake before the trial of force? And in the light of the low trick of emancipation, *as a necessity of war*, admitted to be in thorough compliance with the convention of that sacred compact which formed the Union, who does not see what this nation has now to expect from any conscientious obligation of constitutions, of compacts, or of contracted obligations? Who does not see the intended tendency of all those teachings in other days which sneered at constitutional scruples as "abstractions?"

The South has had little hand indeed in the change by which we have crossed the Rubicon; and have passed from the days of the old republic of the Scipios and the Catos, to the empire of the days of the bleeding Julius and the silent and politic Augustus. In such days, all men indeed do not even know that the liberties are lost and gone. The ancient citadel of those liberties still stands. Some puny Hirtius and Pansa still wear the ancient names of consuls. The Senate still sits, the laws still stand. All ancient hallowed names still live in men's vocabularies like lifeless shadows. The only living words are *treasure* and *sword*. They are still alive. Precedents and partisan passion have made great gaps and breaches in the citadel of the ancient liberties. It is disloyal to see those breaches. It is disloyal to call in question any of the laws by which they were made. All jealousy of right is disloyal. It is saying or thinking that the sword is no logician; that might does not make right; that the righteous cause does not always

triumph in one particular age, and that the voice of the people is not ever the voice of God, is disloyal. Then be it so. The Southern men were not hitherto a book-making race. They thought it their calling, as the sons of their fathers who won liberty at Runnymede, and at the Boyne, and at Yorktown, to guard the bulwarks of constitutional right and chartered liberty. Their occupation is gone. It is well that the sovereignty has been given to the *negroes*. There will be no "abstractions" among them. They are fitting guardians of liberty when she is to be murdered—fitting custodians of those old sacred chartered and hereditary liberties of the Norman race, when the Constitution sinks and the will of the majority ascends the sacred throne of supremacy. We stand before God and the future, willing and anxious to declare that we take none of the honor of having sought the empire—none of the blame of having introduced it. However its annals may hereafter be studded with the shining names of Aurelius, of Trajan, of Vespasian, and of Titus; however rich in glory and in treasure it may hereafter sweep on through the long tracts of time, till the Goths and Vandals shall come, it was not we who did it, in intention. We desired to abide among the Catos, the Scipios, the Marcelluses, and the Fabriciuses.

And we take no pleasure (except such as proceeds from marking the deep movements of the hand of God) in observing that keen sting of Nemesis with which, as years roll on, she stings the fomenters of stealthy revolutions and those who rob States and persons of their rights and liberties; how, after the malice and ferocity are over, and they awake from the delirium of their artfully generated rage, it is but to find themselves forever enslaved by a master, who, whether monarch or mob, shall with great accuracy and by the decree of God "measure to them the measure they have meted to others." So it was of old; so it is now; so it will be hereafter. No ghost of murdered liberties can ever shake his gory locks at us, while yet the echo rings through the arches of the temple of liberty, of the laugh of the friends of power at our "abstractions;" or while the rattle of the musketry is yet in men's ears, with which we attempted to

assert those ancient RIGHTS OF THE STATES, whose chartered and rightful existence we had learned from our wisest, and most trusted sages and patriots; or while the voluntary debasement of liberty and sovereignty, by bestowing the poor African, remains, among other wonderful things, in the memory and sight of men. Madly and in besotted blindness France followed the levellers into oceans of blood and crime and anarchy. Levelling is the deluge which breaks all the dikes of human law. It is the spring-thaw which dissolves all restraints upon the selfish passions. It is the turning loose of the wild beast of plunder upon human society. It is the lunacy of human logic. It is the Circean cup which in our very sight converts our fellow men into swine, and we feel that they have parted the common bonds of our humanity. Others will rejoice, nay, they do already rejoice, in the triumph of levelling. Now, over the possession by the poor negro of every privilege, every immunity, every liberty, which can, in the remotest degree, be any real gain to him of any kind, we scarcely trouble ourselves to say that we heartily rejoice with all who have sought those blessings for him from pure motives. In this, of course, we mean not to embrace the designing and envious and malignant demagogue, or the man who makes the Southern negro the despised tool of Northern hatred to the South; but all pure Christians and patriots, who have thought, whether correctly or not we care not to inquire, that freedom would be a boon and a blessing to the slave, which *they* neither expected to gratify their malice nor to enrich their purses, nor to build up the selfish power of their party. Take out such malicious and selfish emancipators, and we rejoice with all others over the freedom of the negro. But we summon the leveller to the tribunal of the Past. We summon him to the tribunal of the Future. With a clear conscience, but not without apprehension for the welfare of those who, amid all their wrongs and insult, are still our fellow-creatures, we leave him and his deeds there, to await the rolling of those wheels of providence whose "rings are full of eyes round about," and ascend so high that they are dreadful."

The best minds of the South, we have said, were not of

the men to produce ponderous volumes of learned lore. Washington, Mason, Taylor of Caroline, Jefferson, Madison, Henry, and Giles, of Virginia, with Rutledge, Drayton, Gadsden, the two Pinckneys, of South Carolina, and others like them in other States, were men who rather strove to build the temple of liberty in act and fact than to write about it. They were not cloister men, but actors in deathless deeds, in men's sight, and in the brightest of earthly light for all time to come. Builders of the temple of constitutional liberty on these shores, they left the recording of that work of building—the memories of themselves and their deeds—in some cases not with entire impunity, to Northern men. Marshall, indeed, gave us a native history of the great Southron, Washington; and Prof. George Tucker another of Jefferson; and W. C. Rives still another of Madison; but we wonder why memoirs of some of them have never been written at all.

And there is a name of one, more modern, who well deserves to have a place among the highest and purest of the guardians of constitutional liberty, the name of one whose bust, we learn, has been removed from the public hall at West Point, lest it might contaminate the future blind fighters for power, who are to be trained there; the name of one now unpopular, because the liberties and rights he guarded so well are dead, and lost, and gone; and who has left on record defences of those rights, as constitutional and sacred, which have never been answered and never probably can be, or could legitimately have been; one who requires no apology for not having made books. There stand upon our shelves four massy volumes of his thoughts, embalmed in record. They consist of a Disquisition on Government in general; a discussion of the Constitution and Government of the United States; and Speeches and Reports on all the whole range of subjects which occupied the thoughts of the American statesman for forty years before he passed from among us. No man can be said to have lived in vain who left only such printed expositions of constitutional liberty as he has left. No man can be said to have lived in vain who left only the record which he left, of personal contests for

constitutional rights. When he disappeared from the scene of this life there was nothing to be alleged against his personal character even by those who desired to dislike him. There was nothing against him but those opinions as a statesman, for which he made the defences of a giant, and which produced far more of personal dislike than of candid and fair answer. No man could dislike him without forfeiting all claim to magnanimity, and constituting himself so far a persecutor for opinion's sake. Some disliked him as the intended invader of your home dislikes the sleepless watch-dog; others because he made arguments for constitutional rights which they could not answer, and did not wish to yield to, to believe in, or to respect; and others still, because his name was a trusted, revered, venerated authority on the side of that invincible logic of State rights, which, they themselves being judges, no similar weapons of logic could refute, but for that purpose the logic of the musket and of military necessity must come in. His is a name now under a cloud, and not to emerge into sunshine, with many other deep intrinsic things, until the wild theories of the levellers shall receive in their turn the refutation it is pretended his theories of State rights have received—the refutation of the logic of events; and the minds of men shall subside, through anarchy, social convulsion, and bloodshed, to the sober level of law, order, and respect for social worth. We need not say that we refer to the illustrious name of John Caldwell Calhoun.

The volumes of Washington's writings, although, we believe, with characteristic Southern diligence, and with characteristic Yankee honesty, edited in Massachusetts, are still Southern books, books of rebeldom, and full of deep resolved rebellion against unjust and persecuting power. The volumes of Jefferson's writings, always excepting the unfortunate infidelity which never ought to have been foisted into them, and never would, we believe, if the wishes of the writer of them had prevailed, are Southern books, and the deep thoughts of a rebel and of a revolutionary sage and patriot. We may also enroll among Southern classics Wirt's *British Spy* and *Old Bachelor*, and his *Life of Patrick Henry*, where again we strike that peculiar Anglo-

Saxon and Norman thread of gold, of resistance to oppressive and unjust authority; and our youth are sent to primeval forests to commune with him who said "Give me liberty, or give me death!"

And when we pass our eyes over the unwritten annals of the bar, and of public life in any and every Southern State, for years past, our own patience has need of the best apologies we can discover, when we observe, taking out, of course, some vicious and worthless characters, how rich are the remaining materials, how rich in worth, genius, patriotism, true eloquence, and true honor which have been permitted, save and except only a few such books as Baldwin's *Flush Times* in Alabama, to dissolve away like the precious pearl of the Egyptian queen, in the dull waters of Lethe! We look back with surprise and deep regret that the bar of Virginia has not yet had its historian. There has scarcely been a more readable book issued from the English press, in recent years, than *The Lives of the Lord Chancellors*. Through what varied scenes of history, and among what rich specimens of character, it conducts its readers. And beginning with the wigged, and starched, and ruffled counsel for the crown in colonial times, including that splendid man, Peyton Randolph, who encountered Samuel Davies at Williamsburg on the subject of religious liberty; and descending through the annals of the State, while there were reverence and reason among men to heed her warning and jealous voice concerning constitutional liberty, down to that true and splendid man, John Randolph Tucker, who held the seals of her first legal office when the sword became her sceptre; we question whether Lord Campbell had a much richer subject than he would have who should properly conceive and adequately execute a history of the lives of the Judges and Attorney-Generals of Virginia. Nor would "every charm of wisdom and of worth," by a long measure, be embraced in even that rich and glorious list. There have been legal Titans of the land who never ascended the bench nor held the seals of the State; such as, in our own early days, were Chapman Johnson and Benjamin Watkins Leigh, whose names were an ornament and a strength to the land; and

whose existence caused every man to feel that, while they were wrong was less potent against right, lawlessness against law, falsehood against truth, than if such men had not been beaten upon us. Of the Judges and Attorney-generals of South Carolina, from the beginning down almost to the present time, when the sun of both institutions seems to have gone down for the present in clouds and darkness, we have some record in the late Chief Justice O'Neale's work, "The Bench and Bar of South Carolina." What learning, what eloquence, above all, what *character*, did ever adorn, down to this present day, the Bench of the Palmetto State! And what a list of honored names belong to the past history of her Bar, where Pringle and Lowndes, Hayne and McDuffie, Cheves and Grimke, Preston and Legaré, Elmore and Petigru, illustrate so nobly the glory of their profession! Hugh S. Legaré's writings have been collected and published; and a brief notice is given by the author named above of each of these other eminent lawyers. Yet how brief and insignificant! Of these and many more in their State, and of many illustrious sons of other Southern States in their line of service, we have sadly to say, with an implication not altogether without reproach to our men of letters, and with adaptation to the Christian spirit in which we desire to write:

"Vain was the chief's, the sage's pride,
They had no poet and they died;
In vain they toiled, in vain they'bled,
They had no poet and are dead."

The life of Washington has been written by Sparks and Irving; that of Jefferson by Tucker and Rayner and Randall, and none of these writers, we believe, had any thing in common with the present fashionable school of malignant vituperators, all we have and are, whose misrepresentations are designed what to excuse to themselves their persecutions. But let the literary men of the South look well to it that these men are not left to write biography for our children much farther down than the life of Jefferson or John Randolph. For, in that event, upon their pages we shall not be able to recognise or to identify

the plainest facts of modern history. If it should chance, as often has been the case amid the events of time, that they should deem *truth* itself *disloyal*, then they will boldly lift their eyes to the face of God and maintain the falsehood of truth, the right of wrong, and the evil of good. We shall not know ourselves; we shall not recognise our glorious mountains and plains; we shall not recognise the very names or forms of our own sires or sons, in their narratives.

In the department of the history of their own States, Southern pens have not been altogether idle. We do not pretend to make a complete catalogue of what they have prepared, but we may refer to the collections made and published by Historical Societies in Virginia, South Carolina, Georgia, and other States. Histories of Virginia have also been produced by Beverly, Burk, Howison, and the Campbells; of North Carolina, by Williamson and by Wheeler; of South Carolina, under different forms, by Ramsay, Lawson, Drayton, Moultrie, Hewatt, Garden, Mill, Simms, Carroll, Gibbes, Rivers, Logan, LaBorde; of Georgia, by McCall, Stevens, and White; of Florida and Louisiana, by Latour; of St. Augustine, by Fairbanks; of Louisiana, by Marbois and Stoddard; of Tennessee, by Ramsay. Besides these, there may have been published such works relating to others of the Southern States. There have been some other Histories and Biographies: as Chief Justice O'Neale's Annals of Newberry District; Judge Johnson's Life of Greene; James's Life of Marion; and Dr. Joseph Johnson's Reminiscences of the American Revolution in the South. There have also been some scientific histories of several of these States; for example, Elliott's Botany of South Carolina and Georgia, Tuomey's Geology of South Carolina, Holbrook's Herpetology, Dr. A. W. Chapman's Southern Botany; Dr. Peyre Porcher's Resources of Southern Fields and Forests, besides some other works of his; Mrs. Ryan's Southern Florist; sundry agricultural and scientific works by the two Gibbeses, and by the Ruffins; Bachman's labors in conjunction with Audubon and his learned defence of the Unity of the Human Race. Here, also, let us allude to Dr. Cooper's works, to Fitzhugh's, to Bledsoe's, and to Professor

Dew's very able and philosophical writings in defence of slavery; and to the same Professor's Exposition of the Laws, Customs, Manners, and Institutions of the Ancient and Modern Nations; to Professor George Tucker's works on Political Economy, and his Constitutional History of the United States; to Professor Henry St. George Tucker's Lectures on the Constitution of the United States; to Professor Lieber's Political Ethics, published whilst at the South Carolina College; and to that work of the sage of Monticello, with which we might well have headed this list, Jefferson's celebrated Notes on Virginia.

Besides these Histories of the several States, there is a Southern book which deserves to be called historical in more senses than one—Mr. Stephens's Constitutional History of the War between the States. So too, Alfriend's Life of Jefferson Davis deserves ever to be honorably mentioned by every Southern man, both for its own sake and for its noble subject. Matthew F. Maury's Geography of the Sea is a Southern book; so are Garland's Life of Randolph and Cooke's Life of Jackson. And there is another book of great literary interest, written by a Southern scholar in the true sense of that term, and published magnificently in England during the war, by Theodore Wagner of Charleston, which reflects honor at once upon its writer and its munificent patron, as also through them both upon their native Carolina—Jamison's Life and Times of Bertrand du Guesclin, a History of the Fourteenth Century.

Moreover, the South has had a few poets and successful writers of fiction; amongst whose names we can easily recall those of Mrs. Le Vert, Mrs. McCord, Mrs. Preston, Miss Evans, (now Mrs. Wilson,) Mrs. Ritchie, Mrs. Gilman, and Susan Archer Talley; those also of John Esten Cooke, Beverly Tucker, James E. Heath, Albert Pike, Grayson, Simms, Hayne, Timrod, Barron Hope, Thompson, Philip P. Cook, Professor W. H. Peck, and others.

In that vitally important department of school-books and of text-books for the higher institutions, what has Southern talent accomplished that is adequate to our wants? The Professors at the University of Virginia have published some good text-books.

The two LeContes, now, alas! partly driven, partly drawn away from the South to the University of California, have, it is understood, prepared, but not published, some more. And Wm. Bingham, of North Carolina, deserves honorable mention for what he has accomplished. A few other Southern teachers have exerted themselves in this direction, but how few! The country is flooded with Yankee school-books in every department and of every degree of merit. We have not room to say here in full what we think on this subject. A very high educational authority in Virginia is of opinion that our State institutions of learning are all to be *radicalized*. If we will let them, these busy people will gladly dispense their ideas in every form to our children and youth. Teachers in pantaloons and teachers in petticoats will swarm to these genial climes from cold New England. Let them come. The door is open, and we would by no means have it shut. Let them come in swarms to teach both black and white; and the good which they may do we will accept as good and rejoice in it. But if we would counterwork their evil influence, we must teach our own youth, both white and black; and to this end we must support our own schools and make our own text-books.

We are not able to say what the legal and medical professions of the South have published; but we know that her ecclesiastical men, compared with their Northern brethren, have published but few books. Some few of her sons have indeed had the honor of publishing translations of the Scriptures and of Christian books into the languages of different nations whom they went forth to evangelize. And then, with reference to publications by Southern ministers at home, there recur to our thoughts several volumes of sermons by Drs. Kollock and Preston, of Savannah, and Drs. Keith and Buist and Rev. Mr. Ashmead, of Charleston; Elements of Moral Philosophy, by Dr. Jasper Adams, and Philosophic Theology, by Rev. Professor Miles; Cassels on Paedobaptism; Dr. Smyth on Apostolical Succession and on Presbytery, besides several minor works; Dr. J. L. Dagg's and Dr. C. F. Deems's theological writings; Dr. T. N. Ralston and Dr. L. Rosser on Divinity; Dr. Hazellius's History of the American Lutheran Church and his History of the Christian Church

from the Earliest Ages; Dr. T. O. Summers's various productions; Dr. Thornwell's Essays on Truth and his work on the *Apocrypha*; Stuart Robinson's Church of God and his Discourses of Redemption; Dr. Breckinridge's Theology, Objective and Subjective; Dr. Armstrong on Baptism and on the Theology of Experience; Dr. Dabney's Defence of Virginia and the South, and his Life of Jackson; a variety of critical, practical, and theological works, by Drs. Plumer and Scott; Dr. B. M. Smith's share in the joint commentary on the Poetical Books of Scripture, by Fausset and Smith; Dr. Moore's Commentary on the Prophets of the Restoration; Hoge's Blind Bartimeus; Otta's Nicodemus; Dr. C. C. Jones's History of the Church of God; Dr. Daniel Baker's Sermons; Dr. Sampson on Hebrews; Dr. Ruffner's Fathers in the Desert and his work on Predestination; Dr. White's African Preacher and Letters to a Son; Dr. Matthews on the Divine Purpose; and no doubt a good many other works which have not occurred to our recollection. Indeed, there is one man's works which we must not fail to add to the Southern books above named, because the South only lent him for a special service to be performed at a Northern place of residence, but he remained ever Virginian and Southern. Training for many years successive classes of ministers in theology, he made his mark on the whole Church through them, and then the evening of his life yielded a harvest of other good fruits—the fruits of his Southern pen. We must claim Archibald Alexander as of us, and his writings as of ours; and if any demur, we shall go further and lay claim even to his two gifted sons, James Waddell and Joseph Addison, and to all which they produced.

To all this, let us add that in the department of Southern Church history, we have four volumes by Dr. Foote, of Romney, two of them Sketches of North Carolina and two Sketches Virginia—the Froissart of the State, full of diligent labor, full of particular fact, worthy of all honor, not justly ever to be forgotten—devoted to the Presbyterian Church chiefly. And then we have Dr. Hawks's Ecclesiastical Sketches of Virginia, written, of course, from the very churchly stand-point of the

author. And we have also that valuable contribution to the history of the State, of course also from the Episcopalian point of view, Bishop Meade's Old Families and Old Churches of Virginia. Here, also, we recall the work of Dalcho on the Episcopal Church in South Carolina, and Strobel's History of the Salzburgers in Georgia. But why have we not had histories of every Christian denomination in every one of the States? And why has not the list of theological, critical, and practical writings given above, been made to be one hundred times longer? Have all our Southern ministers except these few been asleep? Or have they not known what a mighty power for good and for evil the press can and does wield? Or have they really been so busy preaching as to have had no time for efforts with the pen? And why have Southern poets been such rare birds, and treated us so seldom to their sweet songs? And why have her scientific men been so well content to commune with but not communicate to their fellows? And why have her scholars so generally and to so great an extent eschewed the types? We own ourselves somewhat at a loss for the answer to these questions, notwithstanding what has already been said, and what remains to be said, in extenuation of the neglect of authorship at the South.*

It is to be remembered, we grant, that much of the best writing of the day, both in this country and in Great Britain, has been given to the world in the shape of contributions to the reviews and magazines. And some of the best volumes of current writing are composed of the productions of a single writer, thus brought together as the offspring of a single mind. The miscellanies of Macaulay, Jeffrey, Sidney Smith, Carlyle, and Sir James Mackintosh, from the *Edinburgh Review*; those of Sir Walter Scott, from the *London Quarterly*, and the *Noctes Ambrosianæ* of Wilson, from *Blackwood*, have constituted a very large share of the desirable polite literature of the last

* In the hands of a literary gentleman of this city, we have seen a list of some two hundred names of living Southern authors. That gentleman has a work nearly ready for the press, giving some account of all these authors and their various productions. Yet, what are two hundred authors to the eight millions of our population? [EDS. S. P. R.]

forty years. In a little over that time, we have had issued from our own presses the *Southern Quarterly Review*, at Charleston; the *Evangelical and Literary Magazine* and the *Southern Literary Messenger*, both at Richmond; *The Southern Presbyterian Review*, at Columbia; *The Land We Love*, at Charlotte; and the *Southern Review*, at Baltimore. Three of these do not and three do still exist. And from the sides of those three which do not now exist, we firmly believe that volumes might have been cut off, of solid intrinsic value, which would not have been unworthy of reproduction, and which would have been of more use to the Southern people than the English books which they have substituted in their place, because nearer to their sphere of life. Of those three which do still exist, it may be wisest to say little; but we have no fear that the truth of the same remark concerning them would be denied by any one of just judgment.

One of the best books of the *Spectator* and *Rambler* species is the *Mountaineer*, first published in series in the *Republican Farmer*, of Staunton, Virginia, by Doctor Conrad Speece, between 1813 and 1816, and put into a volume in 1823. And, though not having it now before us, we remember to have seen a copy of the *Golden Casket*, by old Governor William B. Giles—a volume of admirable political essays, which had their history and accomplished their work—first published in the columns of the Richmond *Enquirer*, between the years 1825 and 1828, in the administration of the younger Adams, and afterwards collected into a volume. The reprint of such volumes is not now demanded; although in many places they would be worth their weight in gold. And why have not volumes of the productions of such men and such thinkers as John H. Rice and James H. Thornwell been demanded, published, read, treasured, cherished among us? * Few voices will be found to reply that it is from the want of intrinsic merit to be expected in such volumes. To explain it, but not to account for it,—needing itself to be accounted for,—there lies that strange unfaithfulness of the South to its own thought, its own books, reviews, magazines,

* We hope it will not be long before this reproach shall be wiped away, so far as concerns Dr. Thornwell's works. [Eds. S. P. R.]

which is to-day the very worst foe to all literary enterprise in its borders.

We mention, then, as second among the causes of the neglect of authorship at the South, the want of appreciation, among our own people, of our own productions. There has been a habitual and deeply-seated fondness among our country gentlemen for English literature of the reign of Queen Anne. It is barely yielding recently, but yielding, not to home thought and writing altogether; but still yearning for the English, if it must accept the modern. Many planters of cotton and tobacco appear to have felt that the problem of literature was solved by the mother country; that the office of books, to furnish elegant instruction, culture, amusement, was fulfilled by English letters. And then Yankee literature, which ever assumes to itself the title of American, and which has concurred with our own readers and buyers in the one point of undervaluing our own writers and their productions, has been so justly offensive to our people that they have preferred at once the writings of the English. The South has a sovereign disgust for the malignant humanitarianism of Boston, the favorite centre of Yankee literature. She has long had that disgust; and the bitter oppressions of reconstruction, every sane man can see, will have no tendency to diminish it. We were never very ardent admirers of the cold Unitarianism of Dr. Channing, with all the elegant and finished splendor of his periods; nor of Mrs. Stowe, with all the genius for which her sympathisers give her credit; nor of Theodore Parker's flat pulpit infidelity, with all his blaze of pulpit brilliancy; nor of Professor Park's incessant attempt to try how near he can come to heresy without heresy, for all his powerful and clear current of sense. We preferred the silly humanitarianism even of the spoiled boy, Leigh Hunt, who so fiercely rebukes Dante for seeing and describing perdition in the Divine Comedy, because we believed that his silly, sickly, and sentimental humanitarianism was but the whim of a spoiled boy, to that of Channing, of Mrs. Stowe, or of Theodore Parker, because we knew their humanity to one race to be largely composed of envy and malice to the other, and because we know

them to be conspirators against the Constitution, the liberty, and the peace of the country. It is not, then, wonderful that that which was called American literature in America, being in very large part from Boston, was not popular at the South. There was indeed sometimes unfriendly fanaticism in the utterances of the British press; but there was far more of magnanimity and less of unfriendliness to our Constitution in them.

But it was a great mistake which the Southern people made, when they thought that English literature, old or new, would serve for this country. It is a great mistake to suppose that because the human mind has been well expressed in one age, it needs not to be expressed in a subsequent age. It is a great mistake to think that because Shakspeare so thoroughly fathomed human nature in the reign of Elizabeth and James, that there was no need for Walter Scott in the reign of George and William; or that because Shakspeare and Scott have heretofore so thoroughly understood and exhibited human nature, there is no need for great masters of human nature hereafter. For human nature is ever new and ever unfathomable in its depths, because, with all its perversities and dislocations and gigantic ruins, it was the work of God. It is a great mistake to suppose that the works of Taylor, and Barrow, and Leighton, or of those master spirits of the British pulpit of any age, Howe, and Hall, and Chalmers, have left no further need for the production of divinity in the English language. For, granted the fact that new religious doctrines are not to be desired or expected, still the contact of the sublime and awful truths of the word of God with the mind of man must and will have its restatement in every age, because the mind of man is ever original and ever unfathomable in its depths by all but the word of God. And the contact of the word of God with the mind of man, in every age, will emit bright new sparks, not altogether similar to those which any former age has seen, leaving no place whatever, as we do not mean to leave, for heretical glosses or infidel speculations. Along that line of sparkling contact lies the path of a true and sincere and heart-speaking religious literature of every age for itself. It is a great mistake to suppose that the *Spec-*

tator, the *Tatler*, the *Guardian*, and the *Rambler*, have left no room nor necessity for any other essayists than Addison, Steele, and Johnson, because those exquisite masters of other days have left us their works, and have tastily exhibited the social side of human nature and life. For the social side of human life is perhaps as different now from what it was in the days of Queen Anne as it ever was in any two ages while the same language lasted and the same words were understood and spoken in both ages. For a whole world of history has been enacted since then, and a whole world of new thoughts been born among the people, which must make society differ, notwithstanding those great substantial identities which endure from age to age. The life and thought of a people, the life and thought of the whole race of man, is forever moving onward. There are certain respects in which human nature is the same in every age. There are certain other respects, easily distinguishable by a candid mind, in which human nature differs in every age from what it was in any former age. There are in every age new points of contact between the mind of man and the providence of God. That is the real vitality of history when it sheds some intrinsic light upon man's nature and destiny and duty, by showing us the character of that age in the mental pursuits of that age, and construing the providential events of that age. An age of liberty, of prosperity, and of the piping times of peace, and an age of bondage, of gloom, of the hiding of all signs, and the slow waiting for the coming of the morning; an age when Fabricius and Regulus are possible, and an age when Nero and Caligula appear; an age of the jealousy *for* liberty and *against* power, and an age of the jealousy *against* liberty and *for* power; an age of the republic and an age of the empire—are essentially different phases of nature and providence, and will be marked by different utterances of the human soul. If we do not now bear our full share of the use of the printing press, it will be abundantly used for all that; and used by those who will not only not do us justice, but will do any thing, even down to deliberate violations of historic truth, rather than to do justice to us or appreciate our men of worth and merit. The

men whom we esteem the saints of the age will be made the sinners; and the men whom we esteem the sinners of the age will be made the saints. Not that we esteem the utterances of the Southern mind alone, or of the Northern mind alone; the utterances of the American mind alone, or of the British mind alone; those of the Anglo-Saxon mind alone, or of the continent of Europe alone, to be the mirror of the shape and form of that age, to be sent to future years as its full and fair picture; but every people who have a character of their own, and feelings, wishes, and aspirations of their own, are bound, in justice to history and to posterity, to leave upon record the showings of their own mind, thought, purposes, ends, and aims.

In the third place, the sparseness of the population in the country at the South has hitherto been a great hindrance to literary pursuits. Our country has been too purely agricultural; the homes of our people have been too isolated and too far apart; the type of our society has been too patriarchal; there have been too few accessible to each other of the cultivated ranks of people, and too many around them of the servile class, for literature of some descriptons. And then the classes of people to be found in these sparse and scattered homes of the South were not of that simple and bucolic race among whom the literature of sweet rustic simplicity flourishes, such as grew around the Grecian Theocritus. But they were modern people in the patriarchal state—people who frequented the cities in the winter and the watering-places in the summer, and who caught the spirit, and in some measure kept up with the ideas, of the noble and unmalignant of their own race, while they governed the teeming African race around them with the interest-bound munificence and generosity of Abraham and Job, but with that necessary firmness of a magistrate which good government and social order required and scriptural Christianity regulated. They were not book-makers, but hereditary rulers. And when the musket shall be held to be logician of sufficient force to overturn that eternal truth of God which has hitherto survived all wars, and risen unconquered from all assaults of infidelity, then may the Southern people pause to make apology for having built

upon the pure revelation of God. And while they would firmly, and we believe almost unanimously, decline a restoration of their old responsibilities as slaveholders, yet they as firmly and as unanimously decline any share of the responsibility of the abrogation of those old and benign institutions which are now things of the past, and are gone up to appeal to the Judge of all the earth, who sees correctly and will judge justly. But such patriarchal institutions were not favorable to literature, except that deeper literature of the statesman, which was too ponderous for general circulation or for the gossiping surface of men's minds. The Southern people were devoted by their inheritance and by the necessities of their position to the raising up of the African race from the beastly barbarism of the most wretched of untutored races. They were training and governing barbarians, rather than making books. The white people were too often foregoing the pleasures and privileges of the society of their own race, in order to discharge themselves those duties which the Sacred Scriptures enjoined upon them as masters and mistresses. Many of them felt the calls of duty to be louder in their ears than those of pleasure—even of that pleasure which is among the purest and noblest, the pleasure of literature and the elegant arts. On the crowded plantations of the South, the lives of the proprietors were, in many cases, for long parts of the year, lives of solitary and self-sacrificing duty, deemed by them to be laid on them by God's providence, and submitted to calmly by them for that reason. But it is by the constant attrition of frequent intercourse with other equal minds, that we may best read and interpret our own minds. Iron sharpeneth iron; so a man sharpeneth the countenance of his friend. Modern literature has therefore frequented the cities, where man knows and reads both books and men. Cities there are, and have ever been, no doubt, in the South. But it has not been the case in the South, as in the North and West, that the best type of its society has been in the cities. We avoid comparisons which are invidious and "odorous." But the characteristic Southern type, in the era which is just past and gone, was the plains of the planting regions, their vast fields of cotton, tobacco, wheat,

and corn, surrounded by enclosures stretching too many miles for hedge, or post and rail, or post and plank; deep in the recesses of which, in that central grove, upon that central hill, stood the dwelling of the proprietor; and in that other grove stood the huts and cottages of the laborers who tilled these fields. That was the South. The cities were simply its marts. They were its cosmopolitan features. They were its reluctant and often puny attempts to conform to the world's will and the world's way. But those planting plains; those tree-embosomed mansions three miles apart; those other tree-embowered cottages, over which hung rich shade in summer and the smoke of the broad cottage-fires in winter; those vast pastures and their wealth-looking denizens; those vast sheds, folds, shelters from winter winds; and those large hamlets of clustered out-houses, all in the same seigniory—those were the South, properly so called. Never was any society less literary in its structure, if we take literature to mean the mere extemporaneous gossip and chatter of the pen, substituted for that of the tongue.

We wish we had time and space to discuss some of the questions presented in Macaulay's famous article on Milton in the *Edinburgh Review*, which would be pertinent here. We especially refer to his remark, that "as a magic lantern acts best in a dark room, poetry effects its purpose most completely in a dark age;" and also to those other remarks by which he seeks to show, we believe successfully, that Milton had extraordinary difficulties to contend with as a poet in the age in which he was born. "Every generation," he says, "enjoys the use of a vast hoard bequeathed to it by antiquity, and transmits it, augmented by fresh acquisitions, to future ages."

"But it is not thus with music, with painting, or with Scripture. Still less is it thus with poetry. The progress of refinement rarely supplies these arts with better objects of imitation. It may, indeed, improve the instruments which are necessary to the mechanical operations of the musician, the sculptor, and the painter. But language, the machine of the poet, is best fitted for his purpose in its rudest state. Nations, like individuals, first perceive and then abstract. They advance from particular

images to general terms. Hence the vocabulary of an enlightened society is philosophical; that of a half civilised people is poetical." Without accepting as true all the dicta of this famous essay, of which we have somewhere read how the distinguished author himself said, that in mature years there was scarcely a sentence or a sentiment which he would adopt without modification, yet there is unquestionably a certain truth in the principle that the increase of light and the increase of self-consciousness which cultivation produces are not favorable to that illusion of the mind upon which the highest literature, such poetry as Homer's, depends for its success. And we have ever felt that the mingling of the different lights of different ages, at the same time, in the South, had much to do with accounting for her failure to bear her full part in authorship by the English-speaking people. As literature is analytic and philosophic, the South could not addict herself freely and fully to its influence and spirit, as the highly developed consciousness of her Caucasian children would have prompted her to do, because that race had so much to do with the inferior servile race, in its ignorance and superstition. And as literature is poetical, she could not addict herself freely and fully to its influence in all the dark and gorgeous romance of superstition, because she was in communion with the world of the English and Caucasian race around. Her social mind had not been able to find a firm and settled unity. And with some diffidence, we suggest this to the people of the South for the justification of their land in the past, and for their cautious reflection and guidance in the future.

Again, fourthly, the tranquility of our career as independent States hitherto, until recently; the barrenness of historical romance which has marked our localities; and the absence of those times of trial, of suffering, and of heroic deeds, which invest localities with golden charms, and are the true staple of the best historical romance—these things have had their share in repressing the growth of literature among us heretofore as they will not do hereafter.

We shall come more fully into view of the force of this consideration, if we think back in the history of England and Scot-

land, and inquire what the literature of that island was previously to the distressing era of the civil wars of the seventeenth century, and what contributions to it grew out of that era. The only books now known out of public libraries or antiquarian book-stores, which were in circulation when the royal standard of Charles I. was first raised at Nottingham Castle, in August, 1642, are Spencer's Fairy Queen and Shakspeare's Plays. Perhaps to this brief list we must add, in divinity, the works of the British Reformers, with Hooker and Chillingworth; and in law, the Institutes of Sir Edmund Coke; and in Scotland, George Buchanan and Drummond of Hawthornden; and they can hardly be said to be known out of public libraries or antiquarian book-stores. But from out of the era of the civil wars, and out of the events of the civil wars, have sprung a large share of the glory of Britain—a very large share of the romance which irradiates her history: Milton, Herbert, and Bunyan, among her poets (we mean to put Bunyan among the poets); Howe, Baxter, Bates, Flavel, and Alleine, Taylor, Barrow, South, and Cudworth in divinity; Locke and Newton in philosophy; and in law, the Petition of Right, and, springing therefrom, the soul of liberty and the essence of liberty, to animate its martyrs in every succeeding age. The whole face of literature had been changed. She had ceased to be a trifer in the haunts of human life with "rare Ben Jonson." She had ceased to be adorned with jewels of paste. She had cast off the fetters which bound her to the stage and the drama. She had become earnest, intense, deep-hearted. She wore for jewels genuine diamond of Golconda. She deeply feasted upon the Greek classics; and with them she strangely and richly blended the deep-toned godliness of that age. The Muses had had a resurrection to new life, which, differently from that which awaits man in the world to come, was not merely a resurrection of that which had been under a new form. But the Muses, in the sleep of their death, had received into their being the gorgeous ideas of the Grecian mythology. They had discovered, in their reawaking, that though they were to be baptized into Christ, yet that the classics were still their friends and not their enemies. Occasion in liter-

ature is golden-slippered. Beautiful upon mountain and upon plain are her feet. The thick "drop serene" had fallen upon the eyes of Milton, and the grand song of Paradise Lost sung itself through the ears of his soul, like the roar of the waves on the shores of eternity. Bedford jail had received John Bunyan into its dismal chambers, and the track of the Pilgrim had risen to his view in that gloomy repose. Chalgrave field, Naseby, Worcester, and Marston Moor, had received their consecration, not soon to fade away. Deeds had been done, words had been spoken, principles had been announced, which had far more vitality in themselves than all human weapons of war, or any of the power and pride of transient success, could give them.

The tranquility of our career, the barrenness of romance of our localities, have departed. We have had our trials and our sufferings. We have deathless names to care for and defend, of those who have wrought heroic deeds, investing localities with golden charms. We have made acquaintance ample with that adversity,

" Which, like the toad, ugly and venomous,
Wears yet a precious jewel in his head."

Occasion golden-slippered has come. Beautiful upon mountain and plain are her feet, if we can forget the dread time which brought her to our literature. Upon our soil and in our story are a bead-roll of battle-fields, to which Chalgrave, Naseby, Worcester, and Marston, were mere skirmishes. Upon our recent annals are names which yield nothing in real lustre to those of Hampden, of Russell, and of Sidney. Deeds have been done, words have been spoken, principles have been announced, which have far more vitality in them than all human weapons of war, or any of the power and pride of transient success can give them.

Never were any people placed in circumstances which called more loudly for diligence and fidelity in history, than those which at this time encompass the people of the South. We have every reason to believe that the people who, in former years, avowed their purpose to have an anti-slavery Bible and an anti-slavery God, whether they were the true Bible and the true God or not, will have a radical history of their attacks upon the

South before the war, a radical history of the war, and a radical history of the persecution since the war. Such histories will be written; they are being written in great numbers. The important question is, are they loyal?—not, are they true and impartial? And there are few sane men, North or South, out of the radical party, who can accept such histories as either impartial or true. It is held to be the bounden duty of such historians to represent their armies as always victorious (if it can be done and yet account for the four years' fighting) and ours always defeated; to represent all the fearful colors of cruelty to prisoners as shown at Andersonville, and none at Camp Chase or Fort Delaware; to represent Davis, Lee, Beauregard, Johnston, Jackson, Hampton, and Hill as fiends, and Lincoln, Seward, Brownlow, Butler, and Hunter as sages and saints. The practice of loyalty to the powers that be, will be esteemed as much a duty in history as in other walks of life. It will be deliberately chosen and preferred to truth in the sight of God, if truth is seen to be in favor of the *rebels!* And he is already subject to severe reproach, and a very poisonous name is ready to be applied to him, who feels called on to speak the truth, when the truth is in favor of the rebels. It is as much a part of the common law of the land that justice shall not be done to the South, nor to its cause, nor to its leaders, nor to its armies, nor to its principles, nor to its battles, as it was before the war that the Bible was to be forced to be an anti-slavery Bible, the Constitution an anti-slavery Constitution, and God an anti-slavery God. Under these circumstances, every man who has brain and nerve to wield a pen, and a heart in his bosom which loves truth for truth's sake, is called on more solemnly than has often been known in all the history of historic truth the world over, to see to it that materials for a correct judgment of our cause, our conflicts, and our heroes, shall go down to posterity.

And never were any States more enriched than ours have been with all the romance of true heroism. Never were any set of homes such a series of "altars of sacrifice" as ours have been. Never were any fields of conflict better baptized with the

best blood of the youth of the land than ours have been. No Spartan mothers were ever superior to ours in fidelity, nobleness, and self-sacrifice. And never, that we now recall, were a set of heroes clustered together in any single cause, in whose breasts, as far as man can judge, so much of pure Christianity breathed.

Dead and cold and ignoble, indeed, must be the heart of any generation to whose ears such voices as these shall speak in vain. But we shall not permit ourselves to think that such voices will utter themselves in vain in the ears of our men of letters. Already we have the earnest of the vintage. History, biography, and romance, press as eagerly forward to the notice of our impoverished people as if they were not impoverished. Once they were able pecuniarily to encourage their home authors, but unfaithfully sighed after English literature. Now English literature utters but a cold voice over the ruins of their cause—but a cold, unsympathising voice over the trampled good names of their Christian sages, patriots, and heroes; and they sigh for the means which they once possessed, but would not employ, to encourage Southern letters which may speak the voice of truth and eternal right.

Without friends in Europe who understand our cause, or who will risk any thing in its defence now it is fallen, any more than they would risk any thing for it before its fall; without friends in the North and West who have the power to shield us from legislative persecution—still we occupy a sublime position. We are witnesses for the good names of our fathers and mothers who have gone to glory to meet the spirits of their own slaves trained by them for that glory. We are martyr witnesses for the good names of our patriot brothers and sons who died for the maintenance of the old and sacred cause and Constitution and rights of our fathers. And we are witnesses against the humanitarianism and the semi-infidel ideas which have trampled boldly upon the plain dictates of the word of God, and have threatened both God and his word with constraint and force by the spirit of the age, if they would not speak in accordance with that spirit. And we are witnesses for a pure revelation, uttering God's mind,

unswayed by the passions of men, and heard high above the heads of the busy ones of this world, now as of old, as the voice of one crying in the wilderness. Happy shall we be if it be a forerunner of the presence and power of him in this world, with some new vestments of power, whose pure word it is, and upon whose pure word we have relied.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

Smyth's Ecclesiastical Catechism, our Form of Government, and the Committee of Publication.

We embrace the earliest opportunity which has been allowed to this journal of recurring to a subject discussed by us in the October number. For some time we have had reason to believe that we then gave offence to some of our brethren. Very recently we have been informed distinctly and publicly that we were understood to charge our Committee of Publication "with nothing less than *official corruption*," (*sic*.) and that "it was so regarded by every member of the Committee." The editors of this *Review* hold themselves responsible for whatever is uttered in these critical notices, and stand ready always to give full and just satisfaction in these pages to any whom they may offend. We should grieve over an injury done by us to the feelings of any member of the whole Church; but there are some of our brethren who occupy official stations, and may therefore claim our respectful as well as affectionate regards. We should be no Presbyterians if we did not recognise the right of all those who represent the Church by her own appointment to reverent honor, for her sake as well as their own. Accordingly, we take the earliest opportunity to assure the Secretary and Publication

Committee of our Church at Richmond that we cherish for them the warmest affection and esteem, and also that it was not our design to utter one word at variance with the fullest manifestation of these sentiments for them, in our remarks upon their adoption of Dr. Smyth's Catechism. When we spoke of the Committee's "lending itself to party purposes," we referred in all simplicity, integrity, and kindness to the plain fact that it had allowed the Church's seal to be affixed to a work expressing views regarded by many in our Church as unsound and unsafe. We did not mean to charge them with any design to do wrong. And so, when we said it had "taken upon itself to publish what is not generally acceptable amongst us," we simply wished to signify that they had done, of course with no evil design, what the Church had not authorised them to do. We may differ with our brethren of the Committee and they may differ with us respecting this matter, but we here publicly declare that we hold them in high honor; that we accord to them the character of honest, faithful, and conscientious men, albeit we regret their official action in this case; and that we repudiate as unfair and unjust the interpretation which has been put upon our language. Having read the statement publicly made, that these brethren regard our words as so injurious and insulting, we here publicly express our profound regrets that we should have been so much misunderstood. And as we did not purpose to wound, we hope they will do us the justice to let our language be thus interpreted by ourselves, and give us the same credit for honesty which we accord to them.

We might well have excepted one of the Committee from this offered explanation and disclaimer. That brother did us the injustice of forcing an offensive interpretation publicly upon our words, and indulged in criticisms not so much of our words as ourselves. We bear our brother however no ill-will; having the charity to hope that he did not really design, after all, to inflict much pain. The simple truth appears to be that he never can carry on a public discussion without these personalities—they seem to be, like a lame man's crutch, essential with him to all progress. But we do not believe that our brother is conscious

of the extent or degree of the personal offensiveness which frequently attaches to his words. That is just his way of going on a controversy. In this case he evidently misconceived and was irritated. We certainly did not anticipate the replies which have followed our few and calm words of respectful criticism.

The clouds of dust raised on this occasion, and hiding the view so long the true issue, having in some degree settled again, let us revert once more to the point made by us in the number for October, and let us look at the position in which the Committee of Publication have been placed by him who claims the right to tell us that he is their self-appointed defender.

The point made by us is simply this, that our Church's Committee of Publication may not use the common funds or the common seal in publishing what does not agree with the standards of the Church. This point has not been met at all by our brother who says that he takes it upon himself to advocate the proceeding of the Committee; for he contents himself with the endeavor simply to make out the superiority of this Catechetical doctrine to the one held by us. What Dr. Smyth teaches and accepts by our brother as true, and therefore the Committee he considers, is doing well to publish it; but the views of those who differ are foolishness with him, and therefore the Committee need not mind our being dissatisfied.

The point we made is, that these matters are in controversy amongst us, and that our common agent, the Committee, should not to publish the party views of either side, but confine themselves strictly to that which is agreeable to the common standards and accepted by the whole Church. But from one end of the argument to the other our brother does not, we believe, where, insist that these party views are in accordance with the standards; but is satisfied to assert that Dr. Smyth and other esteemed theologians and pastors approved of them, and that the General Assembly of 1844 held the same.

This defender of the Committee has chosen to represent the object to Dr. Smyth's teachings as few, weak, and insignificant—"High Church," "New lights lately risen up among

us;" and he seems to think the Committee ought to pay no attention to our dissatisfaction, but publish whatever they may think fit, regardless of any complaints from us that it differs from our standards. Thus the Committee are made *of purpose* to be representatives of one portion and not of the whole Church; made by one of its members to be *of purpose* that which we gave great offence by saying they had in this one case allowed themselves to *appear*—partisans. Thus, a Committee which we must help to support, may use a seal belonging in part to us, and money contributed in part by us, to undo amongst us what we hold to be the *truth of God!* And then, when we protest against this, insult is to be added to injury by our being told over and over again, through many long editorial columns, that we are a contemptible set of "New Lights," deserving no consideration! And yet, strangely enough, these poor abused "New Lights" are found to be crying out all the time only these words, "Give us our old standards unchanged and uncorrupted in your new Catechism and in all your issues."

But, in point of fact, who are the "New Lights" whom the brother stigmatizes as holding these "crotchets," not worthy of any respect by our Committee? The answer is: Thornwell and Stuart Robinson; Smith, Dabney, and Peck, Professors in Union Seminary, members of the Committee which prepared the revised Form of Government; Miller, of Charlotte; Welch, of Arkansas; Witherspoon, of Tennessee; Atkinson and Ramsey, of Virginia; Stillman, of Alabama; Palmer and Flinn, of New Orleans; Wilson, of Augusta; Porter and Girardeau, of South Carolina; Baird, the Publication Committee's own Secretary; the whole Assembly at Memphis, excepting a small minority; besides many other representative men of our Church, and in fact, as we believe, the majority of all our ministers and elders.

But our brother is one of those who hold Dr. Smyth's views of the eldership. Hence he considers it quite the thing for our Committee to publish these views, regardless how many and who of us may be offended. We are not willing to believe that our Committee of Publication can be satisfied to be put into such a position by any advocate. Nor, if we could suppose our Com-

mittee willing to take such a position, can we believe that our Assembly will sanction their publishing *on one side or on both sides* of matters now in controversy amongst us, or their putting forth any Catechism *differing at all from our standards*.

This is the one only question we have raised or care to discuss with our brother. But we cannot help following him, beyond this one only point under legitimate consideration, into his remarkable argument from the Assembly of 1844. He would actually have our Committee carry the Church back to that Assembly and insist on putting her on the platform of half-developed, semi-prelatic Presbyterianism which that Assembly enacted. Let us explain and justify our words. Popery came out of Prelacy, and this out of the denial of the parity of presbyters. All presbyters in the New Testament are equal rulers, but some of them were likewise teachers. Immeasurably greater and higher is teaching than ruling, yet all rulers of God's house are equal *as such*; and to deny this, is and was the beginning of Prelacy. Now, Popery makes ordination a sacrament—a ministerial act. So does Prelacy. But what does the Assembly of 1844 say? It likewise makes "the rite of ordination a declaratory ministerial act." A declaratory ministerial act! What kind of a thing is that? Preaching the word, in the various forms of that service, is a declaratory ministerial act, and to administer either of the sacraments is a declaratory ministerial act. But, besides these, we do not know of any other declaratory ministerial acts, unless it be marriage—which may be an act of the magistracy just as well as of the ministry, and which also, considered in an ecclesiastical light, the Church at Rome makes to be a sacrament. Now, ordination certainly will not be called preaching the word; but if we call it a sacrament, then we come at once upon Prelatic and Popish grounds.

The Scriptures do not represent ordination as a ministerial act, but say it is to be "with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery." And our standards follow the Scriptures. From the beginning to the end, there is not one word in them respecting ordination, excepting what the Form of Government contains. And why should only that book treat of it? Because

ordination belongs to the government of the Church. It is an act of Church government. And what say our standards respecting it in the Form of Government? They say the Church is to be governed by courts parochial, presbyterial, and synodical, made up of elders of the two kinds. They say the presbytery, thus made up, is to "ordain, install, judge, and remove ministers." They say the presbytery, constituted of elders of the two classes, shall take candidates for the ministry on trial; shall assign their parts of trial; shall examine and sustain or not sustain the same; and then, finally, that the ordination of the minister shall be "with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery," and that "all the members of the presbytery, in their order," shall give him the right hand of fellowship. And precisely answerable to this is the doctrine of the Second Book of Discipline, that sound and good formulary of the Church of Scotland, in these words: "Ordinatione is the separation and sanctifying of the person appointit, to God and his Kirk, efter he be weil tryit and fund qualifiet. The ceremonies of ordinatione are fasting, earnest prayer, and imposition of hands of the elderschip. Elderschips and assemblies are commonlie constitute of pastors, doctors, and sic as we commonlie call elders, that labor not in word and doctrine." But when the Westminster Assembly speaks, (composed in part of zealous and sturdy Independents, and also largely of English Presbyterians prelatially educated and prelatially ordained,) it says: Ordination shall be with the laying on of the hands "of those preaching presbyters to whom it doth belong." And for the sake of uniformity in the two kingdoms, then considered so desirable, the Scotch Kirk agreed to accept this form. But our fathers, in 1787, when they would make our Constitution, went back again to the ground of the Second Book of Discipline their fathers in Scotland so loved and believed in, and said, scripturally, it should be "with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery." Our brother remarked concerning these statements, made before by us, that they were "rather curious statements." Is it not a little "curious" that one who allows himself to write so confidently of such matters should seem not to be aware of the truth

of these statements? Let him look on page seventy of the second edition of Baird's Digest, and he will find some similar statements, which are also worthy of his consideration.

Now, this denial by the Assembly of 1844, that ruling elders may lay on hands, is necessarily the denial that they are presbyters, just as it is the assertion that ordination is a sacrament. And both these, multitudes amongst us hold to be very serious errors. And they never will consent for our Church to be put upon any such platform by any Committee, or by any advocate of its right to put us there; neither yet by any General Assembly. Many were the "unfaithful Assemblies" of the Church of Scotland, which harbored and abetted Prelacy within that Church, and were disowned by her afterwards. Does our brother not remember this? Is he not also aware of the progress of opinion within our Church (especially as distinguished from the Northern) since 1844 respecting the eldership? If, indeed, he will insist on our being carried backwards for a quarter of a century, and also Northwards a good many degrees of latitude, to the Assembly of 1844, that we may hearken to its denial of the rights of ruling elders in contradiction to our own more recent and more sound Assembly at Memphis, and to our Book and to the Scriptures; then must our call, which so disturbed his nerves, for a *settlement* by our Church of what our Committee may disseminate amongst us, be made still more loud and urgent. Where does our Church really stand? Is she with the Assembly of 1844, or with that of 1866? And does she take ground with any Assembly against her own standards and against the New Testament? And does she intend to permit her Committee of Publication to define what her position is upon any moot question, or to place her upon one or both sides of such questions?

But, regarding this particular publication, there is, we should suppose, no need of urging any further our earnest desire for entire conformity between the issues of our Committee and our Church standards, seeing that Dr. Smyth has publicly expressed his readiness "to have the answers to which exception has been taken made conformable to the words of our present Form of

Government." The motives under which this willingness is expressed by Dr. S. are the "prevention of further controversy," and "to render the work as generally useful to the cause of Presbyterianism as possible." These are honorable motives. Dr. Smyth's proposition is also as wise as it is honorable to him. Why offend many in a book designed for all? Our brother, who has been defending what we objected to, says Dr. Smyth is willing to give up three only of the points objected to. Dr. Smyth himself puts no such limit. Nay, he even declares that he had availed himself substantially of every suggestion for conformity made by the Committee, and moreover that he had "authorised them to make any other alterations they thought desirable or necessary." We own that this statement somewhat surprises us, as seeming to fasten on the Committee the responsibility of not fully conforming this Catechism to our standards, when authorised so to do by the author. But we hope now that this controversy may be brought to an end by the Committee's publishing without delay their intention to adopt Dr. Smyth's suggestion in all its manly and Christian fulness.

Notes, Critical, Explanatory, and Practical, on the Book of Psalms. By ALBERT BARNES, Author of "Notes on the New Testament," "Lectures on the Evidences," etc., etc. In three volumes. Vol. I. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1868. Pp. 374. 12mo.

We have in this volume the first portion of a new commentary on the Book of Psalms, which has been a manual of worship to the Jew and the Christian alike, and holds the same prominent position in the estimation of God's people, now that the Christian Scriptures are added to the canon, which it did when that included the Old Testament alone. It is the last work this veteran in Scripture-exposition expects to offer in this line for the instruction of his fellow-men. The notes were commenced, he informs us, more than twelve years ago, and he rightly judges that he could have no more appropriate, serene, and satisfying employment than their revision and completion in the evening of his days. His expository works have covered a larger portion

of the Scripture than those of any other writer of our own country that we now remember ; embracing the whole New Testament, Isaiah, Job, and Daniel, and now the Psalms. In our own view, there has been a gradual improvement in the method and value of these productions of his pen, which, we trust, will not be found wanting in this, the first portion of which is before us. These labors have been extended through forty years, and have been rewarded by a most extensive appreciation, both in this country and abroad ; more than half a million volumes of his commentaries having been printed in this country, and perhaps a greater number in England, Scotland, and Ireland, while to a limited extent they have been circulated in the French, Welsh, Hindostanee, and Chinese languages. And what is remarkable, they have all been composed in the early morning before the hour of nine was reached, that the time devoted to pastoral labors might not be invaded. Others have toiled by the midnight lamp and protracted their studies often into the morning hours at which Mr. B.'s commenced, reversing the order of nature and converting night into day. It may be that his failing sight is the result of his early studies, which are a greater trial to the organs of vision, perhaps, than the artificial glare of the midnight lamp.

The volume before us covers the first of the five books into which the Psalms were divided in early times, ending with the 41st Psalm. These divisions the author does not regard as arbitrary, but as indicating independent collections, made at different times till the canon was closed, or perhaps by Ezra at its completion—an opinion which Hengstenberg and Delitzsch have also maintained. As is usual, he considers in his introduction the difficulties connected with “the imprecatory Psalms,” so perplexing to many. He assumes that there were reasons for recording these expressions consistent with the claims of the Bible to be a divine revelation ; that we are to consider what is due to the spirit of that age ; and that the same difficulties might be felt at the language of the Covenanters and Puritans of more modern times ; that a portion of these are an expression of what ought to be and will be the fate of impious men ; that some are a rep-

resentation of what the feelings of others would be and not of the writer himself; that, in regard to those which were invocations of vengeance upon the wicked, it is to be considered that David was a magistrate, and as king supreme, by a divine appointment the civil and military ruler of the nation; that punishment is right and approved by the righteous and good; that there must needs be arrangements for punishing crime, as a detective police, constables, jurymen, judges, sheriffs, jailors, and hangmen; that all these are honorable employments; that each of them may pray for success in their vocations; and that the "imprecatory Psalms" bear no more signs of malice than such prayers would do.

Another line of remark adopted by the author savors somewhat of rationalistic expediency, and will approve itself less to readers of the Scriptures. It is that these Psalms merely record faithfully what was in the mind of the psalmist; that neither David nor any other mere man spoken of in the Scriptures was indefectibly perfect; that it was needful, in order that revelation should meet the wants of man, that it should be a true representation of religion as it exists in fallen men and not in spotless angels; that expressions and acts of this kind are not set before us for our imitation; and that all that inspiration is responsible for is the correctness of the record. These considerations can hardly be admitted as any resolution of the difficulty.

The commentaries of Mr. Barnes are popular rather than critical. He has passed in review the commentaries of others, not neglecting to compare them with the original text, and has given the results of his judgment. They are the commentaries of the well-read pastor, rather than of the professor whose life-long labors have been directed to the study and elucidation of the original Scriptures, and who might give forth the doctrines in a more scientific form, and the idioms of the original in accordance with those nice shades of thought which the language expresses; and with more elaborate proof. They are for this cause all the more acceptable to the majority who read. His style is perspicuous and flowing, and the main thoughts of the text are brought forward with suitable directness. We did not

expect to find in these pages those objectionable views brought forward, in his early life, in his Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, touching the nature and extent of the atonement, Christ's active and passive obedience, imputation, and the ability of the sinner, which contributed their share to rend asunder the Presbyterian Church. So far as we have read, we have not met with them, and trust we shall not. The Psalter leads to the discussion of those practical truths of religion in which all denominations of believers agree, rather than to those points in which they differ. The volume before us will occupy a useful place among the numerous commentaries upon the Psalms—a book so attractive by its spiritual contents, so full of instruction and comfort, so replete with images of sublimity and beauty, so far transcending all the lyric productions of every land of poetry and song, that he who writes upon it may well despair of satisfying the heart which loves it.

Manual of the First Presbyterian Church, Nashville, Tenn.; with a Brief History from its Organisation, November, 1814, to November, 1868. Prepared by the Pastor, the Rev. ROBERT F. BUNTING, D. D., for the use of the Congregation. 8vo. Pp. 102.

We have looked over this Manual with much interest and pleasure. It testifies of an earnest, active pastor, and of a church well organised and prosperous. Besides much valuable and interesting historical and biographical matter, it presents complete lists of the officers and members of the church, a detail of its plans and operations for its own spiritual improvement and for the extension of the gospel to others, and a statement of regulations and arrangements for the internal affairs of the congregation. It is gratifying to find that the large and noble congregation of this church has been so admirably ordered and organised for its work, and so efficient and successful in it. There can be no doubt that these two must go together. Order, plan, system, organisation, are essential to success. And just here is one secret, at least, of the inefficiency and failure of many of our churches in all the ends and purposes of a church. They

have no well-digested, systematic plans about many of their interests. Every thing is at loose ends, helter-skelter, and hap-hazard. Of course, little or nothing is done to any good purpose. One of the wants of our Church is a thorough and somewhat detailed plan for the arrangement and organisation of the whole operations and machinery of our individual congregations. In our standards at present, there are laid down only the most general and fundamental principles in regard to this matter, and each minister and congregation are left to devise for themselves their practical application in the details and actual working of our church system. Comparatively few men have a turn and talent of the organising, administrative cast. Our young preachers enter on their work for the most part without any instruction on the subject. The consequence is, that in few of our churches is there any system at all in their affairs, while in those that have any, there are endless differences and even contrarieties. If a member remove from one congregation to another, however familiar he may have been with the plans by which the former carried on and managed its affairs, he will have every thing to learn anew in regard to the second.

In the absence of any general system authorised and sanctioned by our General Assembly, it would be a useful thing if every church which has attempted to attain for itself a complete and thorough organisation would publish a manual like the one before us, and that there should be an extensive interchange and circulation of these among our churches and ministry. One could learn from others, and a happy idea, a successful contrivance, could be spread and communicated to all the rest.

Moral Uses of Dark Things. By HORACE BUSHNELL. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1868. Pp. 360.

We esteem Dr. Bushnell much more as a writer, when he has to do with the outworks of religion, than when he deals with the more distinctive features of the gospel. We have to forget what he has put forth on the atonement and kindred topics, before we are prepared to enjoy what he says in the present volume. A man who is really a profound thinker may be supposed to

undergo great changes in twenty years; and if he is a lover of the truth, it ought to be more distinct to his mental vision after the lapse of so long a period. Leaving out of view that clearly marked rationalism which tinged some of the author's earlier works, we have tried to read these pages without prejudice.

The leading idea which runs through this whole book, and which the author attempts to enforce and illustrate, is, that there are moral ends to be effected by every thing in this world, even that which is most mysterious and repulsive. In these "moral uses," he finds more satisfactory manifestations of Deity, and shows them to be of much greater importance, than the merely physical ends on which Paley and the Bridgewater school expend so much strength. He says in his Preface: "Our treatises of natural theology are commonly at fault in tracing what they call their 'argument from design'—assuming that physical uses are the decisive tests or objects of all the contrivance to be looked for in God's works. Whereas they are resolvable, in far the greater part, by no such tests, but only by their moral uses, which are in fact the last ends of God in every thing, including even the physical uses themselves." This is a grand thought and worthy of the most profound study—that the whole constitution of nature is set up, and that all events occur for ends of intelligence and goodness, for the discipline of souls, for the formation of moral character, for the education of intelligent creatures. We are put to school here, and the lessons brought before us and the training to which we are subjected are simply intended to prepare us for acting on a higher stage. All nature is replete with moral instruction, and most precious truths are uttered from a thousand voices. The opposite view—that we are to look no further than physical contrivance in the works of God—is gross, materialistic, and infidel, while this is Christian and scriptural.

The author grasps his leading idea with a firm hold, and not in the spirit of reckless speculation, but calm, sober inquiry, applies it to many separate topics. The book is not a continuous treatise, but is made up of independent essays illustrative of the general thought we have announced. The following are some of

the subjects treated: Night and Sleep, Want and Waste, Bad Government, Physical Pain, Non-intercourse between Worlds, Insanity, Animal Infestations, Distinctions of Color, the Sea, etc., etc.

Some of these chapters are admirably written, in which the most captious critic would find little to condemn. But there is one dark stain on this book, which, however, has not surprised us. Nothing could be more unexpected than that a New England divine should speak of the Southern Confederacy, slavery, slaveholders, treatment of the freedmen, as an impartial historian or a really Christian philosopher should speak. Accordingly, when Dr. B. comes within view of the hated South, all his heart is turned into stone, all mercy leaves his breast, and he throttles it, and mauls it, and treads it in the mire; but after he has emptied upon it all the vials of his vengeance, he seems to feel that he has handled it very tenderly, and that it has not received a thousandth part of what it ought to have suffered. And it would seem that the poor South is not only hated, but feared. Thrown to the ground in her struggle for independence, the North fears to let her rise out of the mud and mire, and so the treading and the trampling keeps on out of *fear*. We copy two or three samples of Dr. B.'s way of dealing with the subject; and our readers will please bear in mind that there are only about six or seven pages of such stuff in the whole volume:

“We have just passed through a great public contest, for example, not with our thirty tyrants, but our thirty or three hundred thousand tyrants of slavery, to reduce and bring to the ground the malign power they were asserting above our laws and institutions. They have been educated to be tyrants, and could not be republicans. There was never any possibility that a leadership trained by slavery should not make a magistracy contemplating right and the restraints of law. They now lie prostrate, and their many-headed tyranny is broken; and yet there is nothing done for true liberty in them by merely forced emancipation of their slaves. Give them power, and it will be bad power still, until the gain is utilized and made fast in their feelings and opinions. They can never be republicans till they get into the divine principle of law, as the guardian of liberty.”
P. 69.

“But few, alas! of all the agitators and forward leaders of the rebellion—none of all the people concerned in it but the poor victims who were forced into it against their loyalty—appear to have become truly sensible, as yet, of the enormity of the crime. They still smoke and smoulder in the pride of their defeat, defiant, for the most part, of control, relieving their impotence by the violent epithets they heap on the friends of order, and claiming even the right, as before all rights were forfeited, to make their own terms of pacification! All which we duly understand when we speak the word *slavery*—it is the solidarity of wrong in human slavery; that which overawed dissent, and hunted the friends of order into the ranks to die; that which, having organised a vast savage empire, in the domineering instincts of absolutism, can not be suddenly tempered to order and reason.” P. 157.

Some astronomer—Sir Isaac Newton perhaps—calculated that a certain comet which made its appearance in the latter part of the seventeenth century approached so near the sun that it would have been two thousand times hotter than red-hot iron if it had been a body of that metal; and he further estimated that if it had been as large as the earth and at the same distance from the sun that the earth is, it would take it at least fifty thousand years to cool so as to recover its natural temperature. This is the only thing which now occurs to us as a suitable metaphor by which to exhibit the intense, burning rage of New England against the South. It is just about as hot as that comet when it made its nearest approach to the sun. And if it would have taken it five hundred centuries to cool, we can by a mathematical process arrive at the conclusion that both we and our readers shall have long passed away before New England gets back to its original calm. As New England, in its own estimate, is not less than one-fifth of the whole earth, we may infer that at least ten thousand years must elapse before any writer there (especially among her preachers) will be able to acknowledge that the Southern Confederacy was other than the hugest monstrosity, both political and moral, that was ever produced; that there were some Christian people in the South in the year 1869; or that the late war was a noble but unsuccessful effort to found a better government than “the best government the world ever saw.”

But anything we could say would be like throwing a bucket-full of cold water on this seething red-hot mass; and so we will only suggest to Dr. B. that the moral uses of such bitter hate to the South as this book exhibits in two or three places, would furnish a suitable theme for a supplementary chapter in a second edition.

We must criticise our author's diffuseness. His matter is spread over too much space. He seems to enter upon every subject with the determination that it shall furnish material for a whole chapter. There is no compression, no condensation; but whether the topic deserves it or not, it must be hammered out to the required dimensions. This is unpardonable in an age when there are so many books produced, and when the readers cannot often be supposed to live longer than a hundred and twenty years.

We have no praise to bestow upon the style in which this volume is written. It is simply Germanized English. It is not the language in which an American should write. It has the same faults with Emerson and Carlyle, though not to the same extent. More tolerable than they, there are yet many gnarled and knotty places, instead of the fine straight grain. Deep the stream may be, but it is not clear, and its flow is not smooth and straightforward, but over rough places and through many windings. The symmetry of the figure is often spoiled by the grotesque habiliments in which it is clothed. With all the mistiness which generally characterises the style of our author, it has, however, sometimes a vigor and expressiveness making a near approach to the proper purpose of language.

The New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, in the original Greek; with Notes and Introductions. By CHR. WORDSWORTH, D. D., Archdeacon of Westminster. Sixth edition. 2 vols., Royal 8vo. Rivingtons: London. 1868.

The Greek Testament with Revised Text, etc., and a Critical and Exegetical Commentary. For the use of Theological Students and Ministers. By HENRY ALFORD, D. D., Dean of Canterbury. Sixth edition. In 4 vols., 8vo. London: Rivingtons. 1868.

The first portion of Wordsworth's Commentary, the four Gospels, was first printed in 1856, and has gone through six editions; of the second and third, embracing the Acts and the Epistles of Paul, there have been five; and of the fourth, embracing the Catholic Epistles and the Revelation, there have been three editions. The parts were published separately, and are now issued in two royal octavo volumes of over eight hundred pages each.

Alford's Commentary was also published in parts, the first edition of the four Gospels in 1849. The last portion was published during the continuance of the war from which we have so recently emerged. We have been shut out from the European world, first by the hostilities that were waged, and since by the poverty which has oppressed us, so that our students and ministers have but a limited acquaintance with the religious literature which has been long in the hands of others. This is our apology for mentioning these valuable contributions to exegetical literature at this late hour.

These commentaries have each their own peculiar excellences and defects. Both are the productions of scholars trained in the English Universities, who have risen to high distinction in the English Church, and have enjoyed every facility their country, rich in the treasures of wealth and learning, could afford for the elucidation of the sacred text.

As to the theological sentiments of these writers respectively, Wordsworth adheres to the old view of plenary verbal inspiration. In doctrine he holds to universal redemption, baptismal regeneration, falling from grace, inclining to the Arminian rather than to the Calvinistic theology. He is a strong churchman, illustrating much from the fathers, and the able and learned divines of the English Church. His work is rendered more complete by its copious indices of words explained, and of subjects and authors cited. There is appended also Scrivener's collation of the Codex Sinaiticus with the Stephens text of 1550.

Alford's views of inspiration are less definite and more accommodating. "Inspiration is not verbal, yet it is plenary. The men were inspired, the books are the results of that inspiration."

He has made use of the biblical works of continental scholars, and his own comments have been greatly enriched, especially in his last volumes, from these sources. His method is far more critical, exact, and philological than Wordsworth's, and, as to the true meaning of words and phrases, more to be depended on. His doctrinal statements are in general correct; and even when we differ with him, we accord him the credit of setting forth his views with much clearness and definiteness. The Greek text is printed at the top of the page in both these commentaries, and in Alford's the various readings compiled from critical editions are found beneath it, after which, on each page, the expository notes follow. This arrangement places everything beneath the eye of the student, but at the same time it greatly enhances the cost of the publication, and, except in England, the Greek text is generally omitted in commentaries, and probably for this reason. One does not need nor wish to purchase the Greek text so many times over as he must do if he multiplies commentaries. Alford's Prolegomena are especially valuable. The last one, which completes the exegetical labors of eighteen years, closes with the prayer to God "that in the stir and labor of men over his word, to which these volumes have been one humble contribution, others may arise and teach, whose labors shall be so far better than his, that this book and its writer may be utterly forgotten"—a prayer which acknowledges the progress now making in these studies, and the modest estimate which an ingenuous mind makes of its own products. Rivingtons' price for Wordsworth is £4 3s. 6d. sterling; for Alford's £5 6s.

Both these works are necessary to put our students abreast of the English biblical commentary in its present advanced state; and if to these could be added the commentaries of the Lange series as edited by Schaff, they would also be made acquainted with the exegetical labors of Germany. One must have his own doctrinal opinions well grounded, and learn *in verba nullius magistri jurare*, and then by a wise eclecticism he may be taught even by his enemies.

The Modern Representations of the Life of Jesus. Four Discourses delivered before the Evangelical Union at Hanover, Germany. By Dr. GERHARD UHLHORN, First Preacher to the Court. Translated from the third German edition, by CHARLES E. GRINNELL. Boston: Little, Brown & Co. 1868. 12mo. Pp. 164.

We have been delighted with these discourses. They have the high merits of great condensation, remarkable perspicuity, and conclusive argumentation. At the same time, their style is animated and warm, presenting a very successful example of the best manner of discussing erudite and abstruse questions in a spoken discourse before a popular assembly. There is no trace of unintelligible German philosophy about them, nor any wearisome burden of ostentatious learning. Except, perhaps, a little squinting towards a doctrine of "the Church" to which we might object, the theology of the author appears to be evangelical and orthodox. It is very gratifying to note the proofs of this. While Germany contains defenders of the true faith as sound and able as Dr. Uhlhorn, there is no reason to despair of the good cause in that battle-field of the Reformation.

The first two discourses are chiefly occupied with an examination of the theories of Renan, Schenkel, and Strauss, in regard to the life and character of Christ. The third discusses the question whether we have in the four Gospels really trustworthy authorities for the life of Jesus. The fourth treats of "miracles," their historical proof and possibility.

We would like to present a synopsis of these valuable discourses, but their matter is so condensed that it is difficult to do this satisfactorily in the limit allowed us. The author begins with a reference to the modern attacks upon Christianity, which are more manifold and powerful than ever before, and have for their object to destroy its very existence—at least, the existence of that which has always been known as Christianity. They have essentially one aim—to set aside the supernatural in Christianity, which is fundamentally and essentially supernatural. The point where the supernatural concentrates is the person of Jesus Christ. Therefore, the chief attack is against this point,

and the attempt is made to show that he did not live and act as the Church has always believed. These attacks are nothing new. The works of Renan and others of recent date have had many predecessors. And it confirms the doctrine of the Church to look over the whole series and succession of attempts to overthrow it, and to mark that each new attempt begins in the same way—by showing the preceding one to be unsatisfactory. “It is as if we heard at the door the feet of them who shall come in to carry out those also who lord it over the present day.” We might spare ourselves the labor of answering these attacks on the truth. They successively answer one another. Renan refutes his predecessors; Schenkel refutes Renan; Strauss, Schenkel; another arises to refute Strauss. We have “*Ecce Homo*,” and then “*Ecce Deus*.”

The old “Rationalism” had pretty much died out. After the first thirty years of this century, its rule was entirely overthrown. Then Strauss published his first “*Life of Jesus*.” He said the Gospels contain substantially no history; neither of supernatural events, as the Church believes, nor of natural, as rationalism declared, but merely myths, legends, fables. And we know next to nothing about Jesus, only that there was a person of that name. Who or what he was, we know not. Only this is certain, that he was not what the Church affirms. But Christianity and the Church exist. This is a fact. It must have a cause. What was that? Strauss only repeats a negative answer—not from supernatural causes. Then from what natural causes? He cannot tell. Instead of solving a riddle, he gives us a much harder one. Those who deny a supernatural cause are bound to prove that Christianity sprung from merely natural causes.

Then arose the Tübingen school, led by Baur, which attempted to find the origin of Christianity in the apostolic and post-apostolic times, without going back to Christ, and held the Gospels and most of the Epistles to be controversial treatises, written on one side or the other of a religious dispute. But the folly of attempting to account for Christianity without a reference to Christ was manifest. The character ascribed to the Gospels was

evidently imaginary. Besides, criticism has compelled all parties to ascribe to them an earlier date than the Tübingen theory required, and it has fallen to pieces.

The investigation has therefore been forced back to the very founder of Christianity, and the question must be, "What think ye of Christ?" This Renan attempts to answer. He finds much more true history in the Gospels than Strauss—enough to describe the person and character of Jesus as perfectly as those of any other of ancient times. But he rejects every thing supernatural. In his view, Christ was a mere man, a youth of humble parentage, uneducated, amiable, pure, and enthusiastic, who conceived the idea of a religion without priests or ritual, consisting only in the feelings of the heart, in the pure love of God and of our fellow-men. He began to preach this doctrine. But circumstances—the opposition of enemies and the errors of friends—led him on from the purity and simplicity of his first ideas to a position, to pretensions, to doctrines, and to actions, which are not consistent with his beginning. In short, stripped of its colorings, Renan's idea of Jesus is, that at first he was a pure, pious enthusiast, then an amiable fanatic, then a gloomier fanatic, then an impostor against his will, and finally an intentional impostor.

In a manner very complete and masterly, Dr. U. exposes the nameless absurdities of Renan. He shows that his use of the Gospels is perfectly arbitrary, self-contradictory, and preposterous, and that for much he draws only upon his own imagination; that his theory is wholly insufficient to account for the facts of history, and involves things more incredible than the received doctrine of the Church; and that Renan apologizes for lying and imposture.

Schenkel's view has a general resemblance to Renan's, but is different. He represents Jesus as a child of the people, who espouses their cause against the tyranny and oppression of established customs, institutions, and dogmas, and comes forth to deliver them from their bondage to the traditions, rites, and creeds of the ruling party, to revive "the life of the nation," and to inaugurate the era of free opinions, free institutions, and

free customs. He endeavors to avoid the injurious imputations which Renan attaches to his character and conduct, but not successfully, as he makes him to connive, at least, at the mistakes of his friends and to sanction false beliefs. In Schenkel's view, he is the great preacher of human worth and human rights, of the worth and rights of man "as man;" in short, he is a radical "of the first water." Renan's Christ is a fanatic, Schenkel's a demagogue; Renan's work is a romance, Schenkel's a party document.

Our author, with a power unsparing as it is successful, exposes the errors and inconsistencies of Schenkel. He shows that it carries absurdity on its face in pretending now, for the first time, to present a true character of Christ; that he is, equally with Renan, perfectly arbitrary, inconsistent, and uncritical in the use of his authorities; that his conclusions are contradicted by the facts admitted by himself; and that his views are throughout moulded by his own preconceptions and theories. He admits or rejects the Gospel histories only as they agree with his own theories.

Strauss's recent work is substantially but a new edition of his first. It takes the same ground long ago shown to be untenable. But he does good service by a clear and conclusive refutation of Schenkel. He assumes the incredibility of miracles, and denies not only the supernatural statements of the Gospels, but their entire historical truth. He affirms that the Christ of the disciples was not the true Christ, and the religion they preached not his religion. He would have us believe that within a few years after the death of Christ, they had an entirely erroneous idea of his person, character, and life, and a wholly false conception of the religion he taught; and that it was this error, this false religion, which conquered the world and reformed society. As in his former work, so in this, he utterly fails to account for the facts of history; and for the problem he attempts to solve, gives us in his solution one yet more difficult.

We will not attempt to follow our author through the other two discourses, though to our minds they are the most interesting and valuable of all. In the third, the main argument sets

out with the fact, now admitted, that our first four Epistles of Paul and also the Apocalypse are genuine, written by the very authors to whom they are ascribed—which is a great point gained. The discussion then passes to the first three Gospels, and afterwards to the fourth, and by irrefragable proofs establishes their genuineness and authenticity.

In the fourth discourse, the vexed question of miracles is taken up and discussed in a manner at once remarkably simple and perspicuous and remarkably conclusive. The point is reached that this question turns upon our doctrine of God and his relations to the world. The atheist, materialist, or pantheist, must of course reject miracles. On his theory, they are impossible. They require a free, personal God, who rules over the world and still works in the world. The present position of the Church is therefore in the highest degree a grave position. The question is whether nature shall take the place of the living God, the Lord of heaven and earth.

The author closes with a thought suggested at the beginning—“the best defence of the life of Jesus is the life of a Christian in whom Jesus lives.” “The final, thorough, heart-winning proof of the truth of the Christian faith must be set forth by our lives.”

Seekers after God. By the Rev. F. W. FARRAR, M. A., F. R. S. J. B. Lippincott & Co., Macmillan & Co., Publishers. 12mo. Pp. 336.

This is a very readable book, historical, biographical, scholarly. The design of the author is to present us in Seneca, Epictetus, and the Emperor Marcus Aurelius, examples of what ancient heathen moralists and philosophers attained in the knowledge of human virtue and duty and of God.

The author labors to exalt the character and the philosophy of the three men whom he selects from antiquity as the best of its records, the three most entitled to our admiration. But it is emphatically a *labor*, especially in regard to Seneca, the famous and the infamous philosopher of Nero's reign. He can find little in the life of Seneca to praise, and is compelled to admit

much that convicts him of gross and grievous sin. He endeavors to exalt Seneca by exhibiting the excellence and purity of his written opinions. He seems to overlook the fact that the purer and more perfect the sentiments expressed in his writings, the worse does his actual life and conduct appear. What he did only appears the viler by contrast with what he said and taught.

As applied to the three men whose lives and opinions are the subject of the volume before us, its title seems to us a great misnomer. They were all Stoic philosophers. And by Mr. Farrar's own showing, they were not so much "seekers after God" as *seekers after men*. The end and aim of the Stoic philosophy was to find in man himself that which was the true end and the highest happiness of his existence. And with this investigation, God and our relations to him had little to do. This is evident in the generalisations of Epictetus. He divided all things that concern man into two classes—first, those over which he has power, and, secondly, those over which he has not. In the latter, he included our relations to the Deity, and so excluded them entirely from the considerations of philosophy. As Mr. Farrar shows, the Stoic was either a fatalist or a pantheist—properly both. Properly, therefore, and inevitably, all considerations of our relations to the Divine Being were shut out of the Stoic philosophy. In fact, it aimed at the glorification of man. Every false system of ethics has sought to reform man and overcome the moral evils of his character and conduct, by exalting some human principle or passion to the supremacy, and subjecting to that every other. The Epicurean aimed to put in this place of sovereignty our love of happiness. The Stoic found the redeeming, regenerating principle of human virtue in *pride*. Stripped of its false glosses and rhetorical ornaments, Stoicism is nothing more than this, "A man must be *too proud* to do wrong." Vice is disgrace, dishonor; and a man must think too much of himself to commit it. It sought to exalt man, *self*, above all circumstances and conditions, and it is an absurdity to call the devotees of this philosophy "seekers after God."

Mr. Farrar, moreover, is guilty of frequent and glaring inconsistencies and self-contradictions. While he admits, he denies

the very same thing, and utters Christian truth directly opposed to his sentiments at other times.

His whole work is based on the error that Christianity is a system of ethics—an error which has wrought unspeakable mischief. It does indeed teach an ethical code, but it is essentially a plan of salvation for sinners. This is its peculiar, preëminent characteristic. Reason and conscience may reveal duty, right; they may point man to what he ought to be; but how he can be saved, that is the question the gospel undertakes to solve. Seneca, Epictetus, Aurelius, and the whole pagan world, knew nothing of it, and there is nothing of it in Mr. Farrar's work.

Ante-Nicene Christian Library: Translations of the Writings of the Fathers down to A. D. 325. Edited by the Rev. ALEXANDER ROBERTS, D. D., and JAMES DONALDSON, LL.D. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 38 George street. 1867.

We have received ten volumes of this collection, containing: The Apostolic Fathers; Justin Martyr and Athenagoras; Tatian, Theophilus, and the Clementine Recognitions; Clement of Alexandria, Vol. I.; The Writings of Hippolytus, Vol. I.; The Writings of Irenæus, Vol. I.; Tertullian against Marcion; The Writings of Cyprian, Vol. I.; Irenæus, Vol. II., Hippolytus, Vol. II., and Fragments of Writings of Third Century; Writings of Origen, Vol. I. Each volume contains some five hundred pages, beautifully gotten up, and the cost laid down at our library door is only \$2.10, *in gold*, per volume. These ten volumes contain the issues of two years and a half, and the publication is steadily going forward. The *first* volumes mentioned will all be duly followed by their proper successors.

The editors are unknown to us, further than that Dr. Roberts is the author of a work entitled "Discussions of the Gospels," and that Dr. Donaldson is Rector of the Royal High School, Edinburgh, and author of "A Critical History of Christian Literature and Doctrine from the death of the Apostles to the Nicene Council." The translators seem to be generally Masters of Arts of some Scotch University, and we do not question are competent to their task. We have not had time to compare

their work with the originals. The British press commend the execution of both translating and executing very highly, and many eminent scholars in England and Scotland are subscribers to the undertaking.

There are valuable indexes appended to each completed work, and also interesting introductory notices.

No words of ours are necessary to set forth the usefulness of such a publication. Few ministers in our country can hope to possess these works in the languages wherein they were first set forth; but most will be able to buy these translations at the low price at which they may be had. Many exaggerate the worth of patristic testimonies; many, perhaps, disparage them unduly. This undertaking of the Messrs. Clark will enable us all to form an intelligent and candid judgment for ourselves concerning both these earliest of the fathers and their opinions.

Yesterday, To-day, and Forever. A Poem in Twelve Books.

By EDWARD HENRY BICKERSTETH, M. A., Incumbent of Christ Church, Hampstead, and Chaplain to the Bishop of Ripon. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 530 Broadway. 1869. Pp. 441. 12mo.

It is a long time since a sacred epic of the proportions of this poem of Mr. Bickersteth has been issued from the British press. It has met a singularly favorable reception. No Juno seems to have presided cross-legged at its birth. In this, it has had the advantage of Milton's great work, which had almost come into the world still-born; but whether this good beginning furnishes an augury, according to the old saw, of a bad ending, remains to be seen. It is now attracting very general attention. The poem is written in decasyllabic blank verse, and consists of twelve books, the topics of which are as follows: I. The Seer's Death and Descent to Hades. II. The Paradise of the Blessed Dead. III. The Prison of the Lost. IV. The Creation of Angels and of Men. V. The Fall of Angels and of Men. VI. The Empire of Darkness. VII. Redemption. VIII. The Church Militant. IX. The Bridal of the Lamb. X. The Millennium Sabbath. XI. The Last Judgment. XII. The Many

Mansions. The plan of the work is this: The author imagines himself as having died, and, under the guidance of a guardian angel, whom he names Oriël, to have passed in his disembodied spirit, clothed in some shadowy and ethereal form, to a place different from heaven, which he describes as the paradise of the blessed dead. Here he meets his children and the members of his flock who had preceded him to the unseen world, and here he is introduced into the presence of his Saviour. His angelic guide, who is his constant attendant, then gives him, at his solicitation, an account of the places and events which are treated of from the third to the eighth book. The recitals of the seraph close with the description of the struggles of the militant Church, and thenceforward the author, *propriu persona*, rehearses the circumstances attending the bridal of the Lamb, the glories of the millennial period, the solemnities of the last assize, and the blessedness of the celestial state.

We have read this poem of Mr. Bickersteth with profound pleasure. He touches the harp of pöesy with the hand of a true minstrel. His diction is rich and musical, never descending to meanness; his imagery oftentimes magnificent and sublime; and his tenderness and pathos such as to draw upon the fountain of tears. The momentous themes upon which he expatiates so glowingly are precisely those which lie nearest to the hearts of God's people, and his poem is one which treats them with so much power and beauty as to secure for itself, if we do not err, a permanent dwelling-place in the affections of those who wait for the consolation of Israel. At the same time, we venture the criticism, that the author has made a mistake in traversing ground which already bore the footprints of a giant. It was a bold adventure in him to produce an epic which sings the loss of paradise and the fall of angels and of men. It is just here, we think, the poem flags. We could not expect to find the freshness of Milton, and the writer has invited a comparison which robs him of the palm of majesty and strength, if not of beauty itself. Milton's descriptions of the horrors of Hell-gate with its infernal guards, of the realm of Chaos and of Night, and of the beauties of man's primeval Paradise, still stand unrivalled.

Our author would have made his success more perfect if he had reduced the dimensions of his plot. The action sweeps with vehement rapidity from the creation of angels and men, along the whole field of human history, to the final consummation of all things. Had the work begun where Milton's immortal, though unfinished, *Paradise Regained* commenced, with the deeds and sufferings of an incarnate Redeemer, and followed the developments of the plan of redemption to its glorious termination, it would have avoided the hazard of an inevitable comparison with the *Paradise Lost*, and might have won for itself the distinguished honor of being regarded as a worthy supplement of that incomparable production. As it is, its glory must be derived from its treatment of redemptive themes. Its description of the last judgment is perhaps unequalled in the domain of poetry, except, as we venture to think, by that contained in a fragment of an American poet who appears to be too little known or appreciated. We allude to James Hillhouse.

We notice, in closing, the theological complexion of Mr. Bickerteth's poem. He differs with Milton, and with common opinion, as to the order in which he regards the fall of the angels and that of man to have occurred. He makes the creation of human beings the occasion which led to the apostasy of Lucifer and his fellow-conspirators; so that, according to his view, the sin of angels and that of man were almost simultaneous. Upon this question, as we know nothing, we have nothing to say, except that if the idea of some theologians be correct of a very brief interval between the creation of Adam and his fall, then the probabilities are against our author's position; for it is unreasonable to suppose the revolt of the angels developed in so short a period. The conception of the work, in those parts of it which treat of the progress of redemption, is thoroughly pre-millennial. If we apprehend it aright, the author's scheme is this: Just before the millennial period will begin, the Lord Jesus will descend from heaven into the atmosphere that environs the earth, but will be visible only to the Jews, who will have been previously restored to their own land, and who will then look upon him whom they pierced and mourn. In this descent, the

VOL. XX., NO. 2.—10.

Saviour will be accompanied by the spirits of departed saints, which will then be reunited to their bodies raised from the grave. At the same time, the saints then living on earth will be changed and translated. The Church of the First-born will thus be rendered complete, and, reascending with Christ into the heavenly regions, will celebrate the bridal of the Lamb. Meanwhile, antichristian fury will rage on the earth, particularly against God's ancient people; but after a brief interval, Christ will again descend, and having, by an immediate application of his power, destroyed all antichristian opposition to his kingdom, will reign in person over the nations in the flesh, seated upon the throne of David in Jerusalem. The millennium will then begin. All overt resistance to the authority of the universal sovereign will be immediately subdued; but a latent infidelity will lurk in the bosom of the Church, which at the close of the thousand years, at the instigation of Satan, will burst out into open and widespread rebellion. This will be summarily put down; the last judgment will be instituted; the wicked will be consigned to hell; and the glorified saints, having been taken up to heaven for a season, will finally come down to the renovated earth, and occupy it as their permanent abode. We leave these views to the consideration of our readers, refraining from making any comment of our own.

There are other tenets of the author, which, although we do not consider them as involving fundamental error, we regret to see recommended to the many readers of his book by the beautiful poetry which enshrines them.

The first is, that there is a paradise for the disembodied spirits of the saints different from heaven, and a place of confinement for those of the wicked different from hell. We are aware that this opinion has had many advocates in the Anglican Church, to which the author belongs; but there is a short argument affording, to our mind, a presumption fatal to it. The Scriptures teach that the souls of believers at death go to be with Christ; but they equally teach that Christ is in heaven prosecuting his intercessory work. The inference is clear that to be with Christ is to be in heaven. The author feels the force of

this; for he is reduced to the necessity of supposing the Saviour to be perpetually changing place from heaven to paradise and from paradise to heaven.

The second view to which we take exception, is, that the human species inhabiting the earth in its glorified condition will propagate itself, overrun the limits of the world, colonize other orbs retained in an unpeopled state in order to provide for that result, and thus the song of redemption will be communicated from system to system until the universe becomes vocal with the anthems of redeemed saints. We almost rubbed our eyes as we read. The curious part of the hypothesis is that this extraordinary propagation will take place in conformity to the original law, "Be fruitful and multiply." That command, we had always thought, had reference to marriage, and our Saviour tells us that "in the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage; but are as the angels which are in heaven." The author in a note vindicates his hypothesis; but, as he has not told us of any other mode of propagating the species than that of marriage,—and that is out of the question,—we content ourselves with rejecting his new revelation.

The third notion which appears to us objectionable, is, that the final state of devils and lost human beings will be one of complete and unresisting submissiveness to the divine will. Overt resistance may be crushed, and yet the temper of hostility remain. To our mind, the antagonism of consummate wickedness to perfect holiness will constitute one of the chief terrors of hell. The wicked will "gnash their teeth" in fierce but impotent rage. This grace of submission in the lost is something to us inconceivable. But, as the author's idea is that divine love originates the penal fires of the pit, it may be consistent in him to hold that it assuages the flames which it raises. We had always supposed that justice lay at the bottom of eternal punishment.

With these exceptions, we have no fault to find with the author's orthodoxy. His views of sin, of redemption, and of the glory of Christ, appear to be altogether scriptural. The poem is fragrant with the love of Jesus. It is a coronal of beauty which the author reverently places on his Saviour's brow.

ERRATA.

Page 194, eight lines from bottom, read "single" instead of "high."

Page 195, ten lines from top, read "coming" instead of "looming."

Page 207, seven lines from top, read "partner" instead of "portion."

Page 207, three lines from bottom, read "legalisation" instead of "legislation."

Page 218, six lines from top, read "the," omitted between "of" and "world."

**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. J. WOODROW, Columbia, S. C. No subscription discontinued, unless a special order is given, and all arrearages are paid, or until the first number of a volume is published.

☞ A few complete sets of the back volumes can be had for 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 new subscribers, and remit the regular price, (Three Dollars each,) will be entitled to a copy of the REVIEW for one year, 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 the 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 their name should they allow opinions to be expressed, subversive of the 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. XX.

JULY, MDCCCLXIX.

No. 3.

COLUMBIA, S. C.

PRINTED AT THE OFFICE OF THE REVIEW.

1869.

CONTENTS.

ARTICLE	PAGE
I. Doctrinal Preaching,	292
II. Life Insurance,	308
III. Is Baptism Immersion?	329
IV. The Transfiguration. By the Rev. W. A. CAMPBELL, Powhatan C. H., Va.,	355
V. An Efficient Ministry,	372
VI. The General Assembly of 1869,	385
VII. Critical Notices:	419
1. Life of Dr. Miller. 2. Sprague's Annals of the American Pulpit. 3. Pratt's Defence of Presbyterian Baptism. 4. Bickersteth's Hades and Heaven. 5. Christian Sabbath Vindicated. 6. Ecce Cœlum. 7. Jewett on the Immersionist Revised New Testament. 8. Bungener's Calvin.	

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XX.—NO. 3.

JULY, MDCCCLXIX.

ARTICLE I.

DOCTRINAL PREACHING.

The revelations of the Bible, apart from its histories, may very properly be divided into doctrine to be known and believed, new life to be experienced, and duty to be performed. The first of these departments gives us doctrinal theology; the second, experimental religion; the third, practical piety. Hence faith, implying knowledge, experience, and practice, constitute the sum and substance of Christianity.

Inculcating these in due proportion, and showing their relative importance, harmony, and bearing in the divine life, we regard as the very perfection of preaching, in as far as the term perfection is predicable of preaching in this imperfect state; while their embodiment and relative development in the individual believer constitute the perfection of Christian character, just in as far as perfection is in the present life attainable.

Wherever the individual is found "strong in faith, giving glory to God," "rejoicing in God through our Lord Jesus Christ," and "abounding always in the work of the Lord," there you find all that constitutes genuine Christianity—all that makes up the eminent believer.

VOL. XX., NO. 3.—1.

For some time we have been of opinion that the first of these departments of Bible teaching—viz., doctrinal theology—has not been obtaining, in the pulpit exhibitions of many of our modern divines, that prominence to which its vast importance and superiority so justly entitle it.

Doctrine, or the truth of God as revealed in his word, received in the love of it, rightly understood and firmly believed, is undoubtedly the instrumental cause, as well of all experimental religion, as of all practical piety. "Sanctify them through thy truth; thy word is truth." Now, sanctification, having to do with both the heart and the life, consists in both experimental religion and practical piety. But it is the truth of God, to be known, embraced, and believed, by which both these are produced and nourished up unto perfection.

Where, let it be asked, are to be found those who "rejoice in the name of God all the day," who are "steadfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord," and "ready to every good work?" Is it not those who are "rooted and built up in Christ, and established in the faith, as they have been taught, abounding therein with thanksgiving?" Yes; these are your settled, rejoicing, growing, practical Christians. While, on the other hand, they "who are 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," are those who have little knowledge of the truth and but a weak faith. They are not *indoctrinated*. They do not understand, as they should, the great leading fundamentals of our holy religion. These doctrines have not been clearly stated and ably defended and enforced by their spiritual guides. They may have been alluded to in passing. But that is one thing, and discussing thoroughly a doctrine is quite another. It is the latter of these, not the former, that the wants of the Church now demand.

There would seem to be certain great and radical defects marking much of the "*piety*" of the present age. One thing appears to be well nigh universal in the Church—the pursuing our every day business as if it were entirely distinct from the service we owe to God, and as no part of our religion. Chris-

tians live one day, after a fashion, for God, and six days wholly for themselves. We lay up all that we can "by foul means or by fair," and call it and regard it as wholly our own. The want of entire consecration to God of all that we are and all that we have; the want of an eye single to God's glory in every thing we do; the want of self-denial for Christ; the want of faith; and the want of earnest zeal in Christ's cause—these are all radical defects in religion which abound in our time. All these evils need to be plucked up by the roots. To this end the power of the Holy Spirit must be invoked, and the means of grace made use of with diligence. Doctrinal preaching stands high on this list. The doctrines of revelation are the life of the soul of man; they are the foundation of all experimental and practical religion. "A man's creed influences his conduct. Opinions are the seeds of practice. The basis of a vigorous and intelligent piety can be laid in correct Christian doctrine only. Neglect these doctrines wholly, and your piety withers like a tree severed from its root, or is driven like a paper kite cut loose from its string." "The Bible in our day is too much a neglected book. The knowledge possessed of it even amongst intelligent Christians is exceedingly superficial. This holy volume has been crowded out by the pressure of publications of a light and ephemeral character." "And is it not worthy of serious inquiry whether the exclusion from many pulpits of thorough doctrinal preaching has not contributed greatly to this superficial religion? It is but seldom that we now have presented from the pulpit a clear statement and a forcible elucidation of fundamental truths. When preached at all, it is incidentally and feebly." (Pr. Piety Revived.)

The absence from so many of our modern pulpits of any thing like thorough doctrinal discussion, under which "the things that remain are ready to perish," has led us instinctively to ejaculate, Oh for another generation of Luthers, Calvins, Owens, Bostons, Erskines, Traills, Ambroses, Durhams, Flavels, and a host of others well worthy to be named, who fed their flocks not all the time "with milk," but who nourished them up with good doctrine until they could bear "strong meat," and under whose pulpit ministrations their people grew up "in the unity of the

faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God unto a perfect man, to the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ."

Some of our readers will hardly coincide with us in opinion when we affirm that in most of the sermons of the Erskines or Thomas Boston will be found more fundamental theology than you will hear in most of our modern pulpits in a whole year—aye, more than could be heard in thousands of them in a lifetime of threescore years and ten. This, we are aware, is no flattering assertion; one for which we shall hardly receive the praises of the present generation of preachers. In no invidious, disrespectful spirit do we make it; but with a hope to awake both ourselves and others to emulate those bright and shining lights of by-gone days in the Church.

And after all that has been said, it is most cheerfully admitted that we *could have* much more substantial doctrinal discussion than we have, did our preachers but make the requisite effort. For if they do not possess the divinity now, they could most of them soon acquire it by the proper amount of reading and *thinking*. That it would require ten times, or more than ten times, the labor to prepare a sermon of the kind contemplated that it does to come forth to their people with an indiscriminating, superficial, wordy harangue, dealing in generalities and skimming the surface, without point, we are well aware. But for what have we the Bible and books on theology, if not to peruse them? For what have we our minds, if not to be employed in thinking? For what have we hearts, if not to love above all things the study of the glorious mysteries of godliness, "into which the angels desire to look?" And for what have we time, but with a zeal for God's glory and a becoming compassion for the souls of perishing sinners, to "give ourselves wholly to these things?" And then the increased earnestness of attention and improvement of those desirous of growing in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, would be more than an ample reward for the increased labor and pains on the part of the ministry. The beaming countenance, the sparkling eye, and the fixed attention of the children of grace, would make manifest that their hearts were

burning within them under the hearing of those great and precious truths that make wise unto salvation; and "like as the hart panteth after the water brooks," so would they long to sit under the teachings of such a sanctuary. The ministry, too, would be repaid in their own souls. They would, in the contemplation of such themes, "be filled with all the fulness of God," and "his word would be in their hearts as a burning fire shut up in their bones," and, like the prophet of old, they would be "weary with forbearing, and they could not stay."

Systematic doctrinal theology should receive a much higher degree of attention in our theological seminaries, and doctrinal preaching should be inculcated and pressed upon the attention of our students in divinity much more than it has been done in most of our divinity schools. Not, indeed, a dry, dead, abstract, Antinomian discussion of doctrine, without relation either to faith, experience, or practice, but in its relation to all these and as the only basis of all these.

In view of the immense importance of able and correct training in systematic theology, preparatory to the kind of preaching on which we are so urgently insisting and for the lack of which so many of our churches are languishing, how are we to estimate the loss, to our Church and our rising ministry, of Dr. Thornwell! To say nothing of his uncommon powers of mind and high scholarship, he was a profound and eminently orthodox theologian; an enthusiastic admirer of such men as Calvin, Turretin, Witsius, Owen, and others of like soundness. After the Bible, these he made his study. He studied no divinity unless profound. His gigantic powers found nothing to do unless taken down to the deep wells of the Spirit, whence are brought up those waters that are life everlasting. How he admired "Calvin's Institutes" has not been forgotten by his pupils. Nor did he less esteem the massive treasures found in the deep rich mines of Owen. In a conversation with him twenty-five years ago, within the bounds of the first charge of each of us, he said: "Calvin and Owen and such men are the divines to be read, if you would make a theologian." Our impression is that he placed Owen before any of the others. "I

would not," continued he, "allow a man to attempt to preach until he has mastered 'Owen on the Spirit.' It is in relation to the Spirit's work we have so much error in the churches."

The writer never attempted to conceal the high gratification he felt when Dr. Thornwell was placed in the chair of Systematic Theology in our Seminary. Frequently had we expressed the hope that the Doctor and his coadjutors would be employed to train for the Church a race of divines well-furnished for their work—not timorous, time-serving men-pleasers, afraid boldly to speak out the truth; not a milk-and-water sort of preachers, without either the ability or nerve "to declare the whole counsel of God;" but men richly clad with the panoply of divine truth, and deeply imbued with the Holy Spirit. If a teacher impresses the great leading features of his mind and theology on his pupils; if they are likely to reflect his views and feelings; if through them he preaches and manifests his spirit; then what might we not have hoped for the Church and the world from Dr. Thornwell, through his students in divinity! But, alas! alas! in the very prime of his days, he is gone! Not dead; he shall live in the Church forever. May his mantle fall on some Elisha, whom the Head of the Church shall raise up!

It is a matter of profound thanksgiving to the King of Zion that our illustrious friend was not called away until after he had aided in furnishing the Church with not a few laborers, who, we trust, are imbued with his spirit, reflecting his sentiments, imitating him in boldness for the truth, zeal for the Master's glory, compassion for the souls of perishing sinners, and in earnestness for the coming of Christ's kingdom in the world. Long may their lives be spared; and however many they be, the Lord add to them a thousandfold—make them burning and shining lights in his golden candlesticks, and instruments of great good to his Church.

That Dr. Thornwell had not completed his lectures on theology is to us matter of the sincerest regret. We will await, however, with impatience the publication of what he had prepared, as supplying one of the richest possible contributions to our Christian literature. These lectures, when they appear, we trust will

inspire our ministry, both young and old, with a more ardent delight in proclaiming a fundamental theology—the kind of pulpit exhibition for which we plead.

Greatly do we rejoice that his place in our Seminary is at length filled by one so devoted to the cause of Christ, so favorably known, so sound in the faith, and promising so much good to the Church. Long may his life and the lives of his co-laborers in the same “school of the prophets” be spared. May they have granted to them abundantly the high honor and pleasure of training up many, very many, right-hearted men, sanctified and made meet for the Master’s service—who, burning with zeal for his glory, and with the most ardent desire for the salvation of perishing sinners, shall esteem it their chief joy and highest honor to spend and be spent in building up the Redeemer’s kingdom in the world.

But to return from this digression. If able doctrinal discussion be made the test, then are we shut up to the conclusion that the present age is distinguished for superficial preaching. Some there are in the sacred desk whose chief object seems to be what they denominate beauty or sublimity, without proper conceptions of either. To entertain their hearers with the flowers of a gorgeous rhetoric; hurry them on the wing of the lightning from world to world and from system to system; dive with them into the depth of ocean, and thence ascend to the stars, you would think to be their special mission. Again will they paint for you the rainbow; give you the poetry from the lily to the violet; talk to you of the song of the stars and the music of the spheres; draw the evening cloud as it lies cradled near the setting sun, a gleam of crimson tinging its braided snow, or, as with its yellow fringe of golden hue, reposing serenely in sunset’s fading beams, it sleeps itself into night’s peaceful rest!

Now, it is too clear that in all such entertainments the main object of the preacher is to be himself admired; and the admiring crowd do indeed go away pleased and praising the fop who has been desecrating before them the office of the holy ministry; while, were his so-called sermon winnowed as Satan desired to sift Peter, not one grain of aught save chaff would

it be found to contain. And this is called preaching the gospel!

A still more alarming form of desecration has for some time been finding its way into the American pulpit, under the form of an *ad captandum vulgus* address. It would perhaps be better expressed by denominating it playing the buffoon. As the political declaimer often finds it necessary to resort to anecdote to awaken and keep up attention, so oftentimes our modern preacher, as he finds attention beginning to lag, must act the clown a while, and have his laugh to prevent sleep and drowsiness. This mode of disgracing the pulpit—to our mind the most fearful that can be perpetrated—finds its chief leader in one much-admired popular preacher, who was, as we recently learned, in early youth a most inveterate jester, and who to-day seems incapable of saying any thing serious. God save the pulpit from all such men! And yet he will have his imitators, or rather those who will attempt it. Great men will always have their admirers, however far they may go wrong. But what can induce a man to enter the pulpit who cannot speak of God nor of things sacred with reverence, and who is perverting the pulpit from its sanctity, as the place for proclaiming “redemption through the blood of Christ, even the forgiveness of sins according to the riches of God’s grace,” to a theatre on which to act the merry-andrew, publish error, and declaim politics? What are we to think of a professed minister of the gospel saying to his congregation just after the dispensation of the Lord’s Supper, “We will have service again this evening; but as I am going to *preach* on the Kansas-Nebraska Bill, you good tender old Christians had better not come out!” Alas, alas, for the preacher who can thus act! And alas for the people who can endure such a man for their preacher! What a reckoning are such triflers in the pulpit laying up for themselves against the day of final accounts!

Not only beautiful preaching, and sublime preaching, and political preaching, but *legal* preaching we believe as much obtains in the present age as any that has preceded it, and is surely one great reason why the gospel meets with so little suc-

cess. "For we cannot expect that the warm influences and powerful operations of the Spirit will be conveyed any other way than by the hearing of faith." We find the Church of Scotland, more than two hundred years ago, lamenting over many ministers in these words: "Who labor not to set forth the excellency of Christ in his person, offices, and the unsearchable riches of his grace; the new covenant and the way of living by faith in Christ; not making this the chief theme of their preaching, as did the apostle—1 Cor. ii. 2; not preaching other things with a relation to Christ, and pressing duties in a mere legal way; not urging them as by the authority of God's commands, so from the love of God and grace of the gospel; not pointing and directing people to their furniture for them in Christ, often craving hard, but giving nothing wherewith to pay." One would think the present century had occupied the seat when this portrait was taken.

While in many places the free agency of man and his responsibility are preached to death, the sovereignty and grace of God are hardly noticed even in passing. Where sovereignty and grace are believed, a secret fear seems to be entertained lest something be said that may be used by the sinner as a palliative to his conscience. To proclaim that by the grace of God men are what they are, the legal preacher imagines would be to destroy man's moral agency, and cut up by the roots every inducement to exertion. He feels that every thing must be suspended on the will of the sinner, or he will give himself up to unbridled licentiousness. Much is heard of what we must do, but little of what has been done for us and of the promises we are authorised to plead.

We want man's moral agency preached, his responsibility, his accountability. We want him to hear that the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and that the violent take it by force; that he cannot perish except through his own fault; that his happiness or misery is so in his own hands, that if he be lost the sin will lie wholly at his own door, and he will have only himself to reproach throughout eternity. But we want him, at the same time, to be told that he is dead in trespasses and in sins; that

his help is in God; that he can as easily create a world as convert himself; that, if saved, God will have all the glory, and that to God the glory of right pertains.

These things our modern preacher too often declares contradictory and opposed to common sense. They may be, and we believe are, contradictory in the view of unsanctified reason. But is either of them opposed to revelation? Are they not both fully and clearly taught us in the Bible? If we are saved, it will be of God; if lost, it will be of ourselves, are propositions so frequently and forcibly taught in Scripture, that it is truly astonishing they have ever been controverted.

But some men must understand all mysteries; nay, they must have no mysteries. Their doctrine is, that where mystery begins, religion ends. Indeed, they differ from Paul, who denominates ministers of the gospel "*stewards of the mysteries of God.*" Should we apply this principle to the book of nature, and say where mystery begins philosophy ends, how much philosophy would we have where one mystery follows another in every thing around us?

The difficulty is that men think they must be able to reconcile these propositions, and show their reconciliation or reject one of them. They forget that the Bible proceeds on the principle of informing us *that* things are so—not *how* they are so; and that the question for us is not do we comprehend, not are we able to reconcile, but is it revealed?

To sum up in the shortest possible compass what we wish to say, we insist on doctrinal preaching, not forgetting the *peculiar* doctrines of our holy religion. "Neglect the peculiar doctrines of Christianity," said Dr. Thornwell, "and what is left will not be worth contending for."

Doctrine, we have said, or the truth of God received in the love of it, clearly understood and firmly believed, is manifestly the great instrumental cause of all saving faith, genuine experience, and practical piety. "They that know thy name shall put their trust in thee," and "This is life eternal to know the only true God and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent." Again: "Blessed is the people that know the joyful sound." But to

insist on the proposition that doctrinal instruction must precede **faith**, repentance, and every Christian grace, would surely be a **work** of supererogation. Every one must see the absurdity of **calling** upon people to believe that of which they are ignorant. Hence we infer that the business of the pulpit consists largely in **imparting** instruction. The ordinances both of reading the word and preaching it proceed on the ground of our want of knowledge. Accordingly, *teaching* enters prominently into the commission of Christ to those sent forth to preach. In the Old Testament, the Church had the promise of pastors according to God's heart, who should feed his people with knowledge and understanding. But how are the people to be fed with knowledge and understanding in the absence of doctrinal preaching? Will a mere hortatory, inflammatory harangue to the passions do for instruction? Away, then, with the notion that it does not matter how little the preacher knows, provided he is a pious man and can exhort the people to duty. As to the necessity for knowledge on the part of the ministry, Paul says of his bishop, that he must not be a novice, lest, being lifted up with pride, he fall into the condemnation of the devil. And he exhorts Timothy to commit the same things he had heard of him to faithful men who should be able to teach others also. That Old Testament passage, too, which says, "The priest's lips should keep knowledge, and the people should seek the law at his mouth: for he is the messenger of the Lord of hosts," demands knowledge on the part of the ministry. A learned ministry, then, that shall be able to teach others, apt to teach, good men and full of the Holy Ghost, is the *first article* of our creed on this subject.

And the *second* is that they do what they are able to do, *viz.*, that they teach the people; that, as good pastors, they feed their flocks with knowledge and understanding; that they instruct them fully in the great doctrines as well as in the various relative moral duties of our holy religion. Away, we say again, with the idea that it does not matter whether the people know any thing, or what they believe, if their life is in the right. Let this nonsense be given to the winds. We are aware that a great

poet, much more distinguished for the smoothness of his verse than the soundness of his divinity, has said :

“For modes of faith let graceless zealots fight—
His can't be wrong whose life is in the right.”

His faith cannot be wrong who is living as he should. But, in the name of common sense, how is the life to be in the right while the person is ignorant of the right, or is firmly holding the most dangerous error for the truth? “If ye know these things,” says the Saviour, “happy are ye if ye do them.” Here knowing precedes doing, and is made absolutely requisite in order to doing. Suppose your church member, in his ignorance, to blunder upon duty, and discharge it without knowing it to be duty,—is that the kind of Christian practice Christ requires? Surely not. Besides, if “opinions are the seeds of practice,” or if a man's belief influences his life, how are we to have a correct practice from a corrupt faith? We admit that oftentimes the truth is held in unrighteousness; the man's head is correct, but his heart bad; his knowledge, although correct, is but theoretical; it has no influence on his life. Of all men, these must receive the sorest punishment. Peter says of them: “It had been better for them not to have known the way of righteousness, than, after they have known it, to turn aside from the holy commandment delivered unto them. For if we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries.”

Notwithstanding that the truth of God may be thus held in unrighteousness, exerting on those thus holding it no salutary influence, but, on the contrary, serving to aggravate their guilt and condemnation, does it thence follow that ignorance is the mother of devotion, or that a knowledge of the truth is not important? .By no means. The misimprovement or abuse of a good can never render it dispensable. It is the truth of God brought in some way to bear upon the understanding, the heart, and the conscience, that is the instrument of conversion and

salvation ; and without such knowledge and belief of the truth as to transform the heart and life, there can be no salvation. "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul ; the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple. "Sanctify them through thy truth." Hence the prayer of David : "Lead me in thy truth and teach me." It is not so much practical as doctrinal truth that is the instrument of conversion and salvation. So much importance does Paul attach to doctrine, that he makes the salvation of both ministers and people to turn on a proper attention to it. "Take heed," he cautions Timothy, "unto thyself and unto the doctrine ; continue in them : for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee." And when reminding Titus that he must show himself a pattern of good works, he adds : "In doctrine showing uncorruptness." A gospel practice must always have for its basis gospel principle. And this gospel principle is faith in Christ, which is the result of gospel doctrine. The difference between a legal and an evangelical preacher is not that they do not both preach good works,—for this they both do,—but one preaches good works in order to faith, the other faith in order to goods works. "The one expects motion," says Jay, "without life—the other looks for life in order to motion ; the one waters dead trees and obtains no fruit ; the other living trees, that bring forth fruit abundantly."

In the *third* place, we would have doctrine and precept preached *in due proportion*—*i. e.*, in that proportion and relation to each other in which they are found in the Bible. The Epistles of Paul are a fine specimen of what we mean. You find him beginning by laying a good foundation in doctrine, and concluding by a practical application. Nor is there a doctrine in the Bible but admits of an application bearing directly on practice. Take, for instance, the being and perfections of God, which seem the most didactic and abstract ; and what is calculated to exert a more powerful influence on the practice than these great and important truths ?

But would you have the doctrine of *election* preached ? We reply, not unless it is found in the Bible. But if there taught, let it be preached, unless we are wiser than God. But will it

not cut the sinews of exertion, and either drive to despair or lead to licentiousness? We do not think man ought to be wiser than God. If God reveals a doctrine, it is not on the principle of submitting the wisdom and propriety of preaching it to man's superior judgment. Had God feared the evil effects from this doctrine feared by some of us, he would never have revealed it as a part of his counsel. We do not say that the doctrine, through perversion, has never done harm. What good thing has not been abused? But election destroys none who would not be destroyed without it. It is not the doctrine, but its perversion, that works the evil. The man wrests the difficult. But rather than not have something to pervert, he would wrest the plain and easy. Satan has in his armory all kinds of weapons for the destruction of souls; and if he cannot prevail on the man to use a ruder and less polished instrument, he will persuade him to take the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God, and therewith slay himself. It is not election, but the love of sin and the determination to live in sin, that kills.

We do not, however, want election alone. We are quite partial to Newton's mode of using the doctrine. He said that he used it in his writing and preaching as he used his sugar, (putting some into his coffee,) not alone, but mixed and diluted. We cannot say that we like the term *diluted*; but we want it mixed; not to counteract its evil effects—for, properly used, we deny that any evil can result from it—but because the Bible mixes it so strongly—taking its whole record—with moral agency, responsibility, and accountability. Let the man know (but he does know it) that he is as free, as untrammelled, and as responsible as if there were neither foreknowledge of God nor decree in the case, and the doctrine cannot do harm.

It would be a great attainment in divinity, could people learn that they have nothing to do with hidden decrees *as a rule of life*, but only with commands, warnings, promises, invitations. The condemnation at the last will not be that the man did not read the hidden counsel, but because he disobeyed the revealed command, rejected the warning, disregarded the promise, turned a deaf ear to the invitation. "Because I have called and ye

refused, I have stretched out my hand and no man regarded," etc. . God no where says you are welcome if you have searched out the secret counsel; but, if you believe the revealed promise, if you accept the known invitation.

Let us, then, have fundamental theology, not forgetting the *peculiar* doctrines. Let us have them in their relation to faith, repentance, love, and new obedience, together with all the graces of the Spirit and obligations of the Christian life. Let us have them according to the analogy of faith, not one or two only, but all, and that in due proportion. Let us have them in the proper order. Not the gospel before the law, not repentance before faith, not faith before regeneration, not good works or holiness in order to faith; but faith in order to holiness. Finally, let us have them all in relation to the great central truth of the Christian system—"Christ and him crucified." What the sun is to the solar system, that is the cross of Christ to the Christian. Hence the determination of Paul not to know any thing else in his ministry "save Jesus Christ and him crucified." But, alas, how often do we leave the great apostle here! We are not to understand by Paul's determination that he did not teach the *duties* of Christianity. Farthest from it. Such Antinomianism finds in Paul no countenance. Our apostle is very practical. But he does not insist on repentance, love, joy, peace, gentleness, goodness, meekness, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness, and charity, apart from their relation to faith as the great leading grace of the Spirit, and apart from Christ crucified as the great object of saving faith. He shows in one word that all acceptable obedience must flow from faith in Christ and from love to him. Hence the obedience of faith is the obedience on which he insists; while the love of Christ is the great constraining motive in the enforcing of every duty. Husbands are to love their wives as Christ loved the Church. Then are our services well-pleasing to God and acceptable in his sight, when we act, as to *the principle*, from faith in Christ and love to him; as to *the manner*, in the strength of the grace that is in Christ; and as to *the end*, with an eye single to his glory.

Now, we think we know what the great apostle means by

“nothing save Jesus Christ and him crucified.” It is preaching every thing in its proper relation to the Cross as the grand central truth, apart from which it will be mere law, or advice, or moral declamation. And we think that we have here a clue to what we used to hear the old divines insist so much upon, viz., that *we must have Christ in every sermon*. Once we could not see how Christ could be preached in the practical duties of Christianity; but now we see, as above explained. May God in great love and condescension baptize all his ministering servants “with the Holy Ghost and with fire,” that their discourses from the pulpit may take rank above mere law, or advice, or moral dissertations!

ARTICLE II.

LIFE INSURANCE.

There are three forms of insurance against loss or damage which are common in all civilised countries. They are intended to provide against loss, or to repair damage, caused by fire, by marine disasters, and by death. With the first two, except incidentally, the present article has nothing to do; though it may be said at the outset that all of these three forms differ from other kinds of common contracts betwixt individuals and corporations, in that the latter undertake to make good to the former losses resulting from the total annihilation of property. The destruction of a warehouse and of the merchandise it contains, or the sinking of a ship and its cargo, takes from the world certain values which can never be restored. In all ordinary contracts where risks are assumed, there is very rarely a risk of total loss. Take, for example, the case of a banking institution, which is understood to make its profits by lending money to its customers upon interest. It is liable to losses from failures, but there is usually some percentage of the original debt recovered. Again, sup-

posing the debt wholly lost by the dishonesty or misfortune of the client, still the wealth of the world is not lessened, though the money has passed into different ownership. But the heap of smouldering ashes that remains after the costly building has been consumed, or the fragments of the stately vessel that float upon the storm-tossed waves, have no appreciable value. All the money that the house or the ship represented has vanished forever, and the world is by so much poorer. Therefore, it is plain enough that these underwriters merely agree to replace, out of their own coffers, the money that has been lost, not only by their clients, but by the world as well.

This leads to another point, which it is proper to state in connexion with this. The percentage of premium required, in what are termed first-class risks, is very small. In New York, for instance, "first-class" buildings may be insured against losses by fire for about one-half of one per centum per annum. The rate for sea-insurance is about the same, on voyages from Europe to America. Yet underwriters *always* make money, if their business is large enough,—that is to say, if their risks are largely distributed,—because the proportion of values that are annually annihilated is ascertained with tolerable accuracy. In rural localities, where fire insurance is usually arranged upon the mutual or coöperative system, the annual percentage of loss is very far below the city average; and there being no exact system of valuation, it is probable that no formal tabular statement of country risks has ever been formed in America. But in closely packed cities, and especially in the business portions of them, the precise money value of a warehouse full of merchandise is easily ascertained, even after the building is a mass of smoking ruins. Fire-proof safes, in which the records of receipt and delivery are secure in the midst of devouring flames, give up these records, and in the large majority of cases "adjustments" of losses are made with remarkable facility. So tables are readily compiled, and the proximate probability of loss is definitely settled.

So, also, with sea risks. There is a law of storms, and the underwriters have mastered this law in all its details. A vessel

is rated according to her seaworthiness, and the percentage of insurance on her lading depends upon this rating. The system of marine insurance is somewhat more complicated than the other, owing to difference in peril in different voyages or in different seasons, and depending upon the status of the vessel at "Lloyd's," and finally modified by the application of marine laws, more or less complex and confusing to landsmen. Yet a percentage of loss annually occurs, and the ratio appears to be both known and invariable.

These introductory hints have seemed necessary, because the entire system of life insurance is based upon precisely similar general principles. Regarding man merely as a bread-winner—an earner of daily wages—his death is a positive annihilation of value, and the life insurance company simply undertakes to repair the pecuniary losses involved in his death. In the progress of this discussion, the first point presented for consideration is on this, the economical side of the topic.

To state the case definitely and simply, that which represents the universal standard of value, gold and silver, (or more accurately, gold, as all other metals have only a relative value,) is called money. Next, the absolute value of a man—measured only by this standard—is the amount of money, over and above the cost of sustentation, he may be able to earn with hands or brains, or both. When he goes out of the world, there is so much irretrievable loss of value, and this loss the life insurance company proposes to repair. How this is done will appear from their tabular statements, from which some extracts will be necessary to elucidate this part of the discussion.

These tables are not hap-hazard conjectures. They profess to show what they term the "probability of life" in any given case. But in reality they reveal the existence of a law of mortality much more stable than the laws of the Medes and Persians. It is not possible, of course, to predict the exact duration of any individual life. Out of a thousand men, so many will die at forty, so many at forty-five, so many at fifty; and the statistics extend to a century, where the margin of probability is extremely small, though there is still a margin. These calcu-

lations are made from the census returns ; and the last two—seventh and eighth—have been remarkably elaborate, and have fully confirmed the uniformity of the law above mentioned. Concerning this law, it may be observed that it is as inflexible as those which regulate the motions of the planets. Each separate orb that revolves around the sun is held in its place by the direct application of the same Power that first launched it upon its wide circuit ; yet no fact in the natural sciences is more fully established than the existence of the law of gravitation, the mediate power that binds these mighty creations to the central luminary and controls their motions in every part of their orbits. It is possible that God should arrest these vast globes and alter their diurnal or annual revolutions, by the mere exercise of his will ; but it is not probable. So, also, he holds in his hands the mortal and eternal destinies of all men. He kills and he makes alive, and none can stay his hand or say unto him, “ What doest thou ? ” But, in point of fact, he kills and he makes alive with regularity and precision. Some races have disappeared and some are disappearing, destined apparently to early extinction ; but the human family is daily increasing, in spite of pestilence, famine, and war. In densely populated localities, where statistics can be framed upon a large scale, the experience of a hundred years demonstrates the unfailing regularity of the law of mortality by averages and percentages. The observation of thirty years has convinced us that an undiscovered law underlies all notoriously fortuitous events, such as the drawing of numbers from a lottery wheel, which compels accurate recurrence of the same result with inflexible regularity. Aside from, or rather in obedience to, the overruling providence of God, this hidden law of recurrence seems to pervade all the domain of what men call chance. It is chance, so far as finite, or at least *human*, wisdom is concerned ; but there are thinkers in the world who cherish the confident expectation that they shall investigate and perhaps unravel these mysteries throughout the unending cycles. And if so, what magnificent demonstrations will then be given of the wisdom that founded and established the KOSMOS—the universe and its order !

It will not be forgotten that these suggestions, in so far as they relate to the duration of human life, apply only to the *quantity of life*, so to speak, in a given locality. They affect the sum of the lives in a hemisphere, if you please, or in a nation or a state. To the insurance company, which deals with ten thousand lives, it makes no sort of difference, pecuniarily, which one of the ten thousand lives fails to attain the measure promised in the tables. A man of forty-five, in full health, has the promise of thirty years more, and the underwriters agree to pay his family the stipulated insurance, if he die before his time. If he live the thirty years, he will have paid in premiums *and interest* a sum equivalent to the amount of his policy. But out of the ten thousand, so many will die the first year, so many the second, and so on. The uncertainty of life is a present fact with each individual of the multitude. The certainty of the full attainment of the promised years is as real a fact—by equation—as applied to the whole number. This is the sum and substance of the tabular statements, which are freely accessible to any citizen who chooses to seek the information they furnish.

Now for the figures. The actual "expectation of life" at forty-five is thirty years; but the assurers curtail the tables, and make the expectation twenty-three years; that is to say, a man at forty-five may expect to live until he is sixty-eight. But the same tables give a man of sixty-eight the promise of nine years and nearly a half; and if he live to seventy-seven, they give him five and a half years more. Even at ninety-nine the tables promise half a year more. For the purpose of showing the exact gradation of this expectation, the following extract from the tables of the Mutual Life Insurance Company of New York is presented. The intervals are ten years long, but the intermediate ages have the exact proportion of expectation. The promise of life is given in years and decimal fractions of years:

At 10 years, the expectation is	-	-	-	-	47.5
" 20 " " " "	-	-	-	-	40.1
" 30 " " " "	-	-	-	-	33.1
" 40 " " " "	-	-	-	-	26.3
" 50 " " " "	-	-	-	-	19.7

" 60	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	13.6
" 70	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	8.5
" 80	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	4.7
" 90	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	2.1
" 99	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	.5

Upon the basis furnished in these figures, policies are issued, and the rate is invariable.

The next point to be illustrated by figures is the rate of annual premiums, and the six following examples will suffice to show the application of the general principle. The ages, from twenty-five to seventy, inclusive, omitting all but the decimal years, are given:

At 25 years, the annual premium on \$1,000 is	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$19.89
" 30	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	22.70
" 40	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	31.30
" 50	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	47.18
" 60	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	77.63
" 70	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	137.76

By a comparison of these two tabular statements, it will be seen that a margin of profit is reserved by the company. Take the annual premium at thirty, when the expectation of life is a little over thirty-three years, and the yearly premium is \$22.70. In thirty-three years, the client will have paid about \$750 to the company, and the *interest* on these annual payments, compounded, will swell the sum of his payments to nearly double the amount of his insurance (\$1,000). The same result will be revealed taking any one of the ages given in the two tables. At seventy, the promise of life is eight and a half years, and the annual premium is \$137.76. Multiply this premium by the promise of life, and you have about \$1,170, which, with compounded interest, nearly doubles the total insurance of \$1,000.

We are now prepared for the first argument against life insurance, drawn from the economical side of the question. The man of thirty years who regularly invests the amount of these annual premiums, with their accumulated interest, will have twice as much money at sixty-three as the company will pay his heirs, if he die at that age. It is therefore *not* the same thing

as putting money in the savings bank, but a far less profitable thing. Again,—for this argument is cumulative,—the man must *die* at sixty-three to gain the \$1,000; while, in point of fact, the tables promise him another dozen years of life, if he attain this age; and if this last promise be fulfilled, he will again double the already doubled amount of insurance, in the unceasing annual premiums and *their interest*. It is hoped that this statement is lucid, inasmuch as no more forcible objection to the economy of life insurance can be produced.

There are two answers to this formidable argument, either of which is sufficient to demolish it.

The first has already been suggested. While the expectation of life, as set forth in the foregoing tables, is undoubtedly well-founded and reasonable, it is the expectation of the insurance company, and not the expectation of any individual policy-holder. It is based upon the known *average* duration of life, ascertained by combination of the history of ten thousand separate cases. The detached fragments of an equation teach nothing. The separate algebraic sign may stand for any thing or nothing; but when measured by regular mathematical processes, an infallible result is reached. So in the case of any individual life. The assurers promise *themselves* that the man of thirty will attain to sixty-three. He is liable to sudden death at any time, and, in fact, *some* of the individuals among the ten thousand will die every year. It must be remembered that it makes no sort of difference to the underwriters *which* of their clients will fail to reach the promised age. But it does make considerable difference to the individual client. Out of the ten thousand, his prospect is as good as any; and the probability of an early death is also as violent in his case as in any other. In spite of fatal epidemics, of fatal railway or steamboat accidents, of the numberless modes of exit called casualties, the tables are true by equation. But no tables can be constructed, in the nature of the case, that will infallibly reveal any separate destiny. This ought to be plain enough; and if so, the economical argument is perfect. It is true economy for each individual of the ten thousand to provide against the possible contingency. And if he

can spare from his earnings the annual premium, it is wiser to invest this sum in life insurance than to deposit it in savings banks, if the saving is intended for the benefit of his family : because the bank will only return his deposits and the interest upon them, if he should happen to die *inside* of the promised term ; while the insurance company will pay the assured sum if he die the day after his first payment is made.

But the other rebutting argument, as applied strictly to the economical phase of the topic, is overwhelming. By the application of the great principle of coöperation, all objections on the score of true economy are forever removed. The most popular insurance societies of the present day are undoubtedly those that are conducted upon the mutual plan ; and the figures quoted in this article are all taken from the published statements of the Mutual Life Insurance Company of New York, which is at once the largest and the most successful moneyed corporation in this country. Beginning as a chartered corporation twenty-six years ago, without one dollar of capital, its growth has been so enormous that its cash receipts in 1867 amounted to over ten millions of dollars. From the first, it has been conducted upon the principle of pure mutuality, and there have never been any stockholders except the policy-holders, who are themselves the owners of the entire assets of the company.

On the first of January, 1868, the published statement of these assets was as follows :

Cash,	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 1,500,000
Bonds and mortgages,	-	-	-	-	-	15,000,000
Government stocks,	-	-	-	-	-	5,000,000
Real estate,	-	-	-	-	-	1,000,000
Total,	-	-	-	-	-	<u>\$22,500,000</u>

There were various other items, such as unpaid premiums, interest accrued but not collected, value of stocks over cost, etc. ; in all, amounting to two and a half millions more.

As an example of the practical working of this mutual system, the following case will be sufficient. This is taken directly from the records of the company, and has been selected for illus-

tration only because it began in the infancy of the organisation and terminated less than two years ago. It is the history of Policy No. 37, issued on February 7, 1843. The holder was forty-nine years old at that date, and his annual premium on \$5,000 insurance was \$217.50. His expectation of life, according to the tables, was twenty years and a fraction. He died in October, 1867, having paid twenty-five annual premiums, as he overlived his expectation of life some five years. At his death, his widow received:

Amount of policy,	-	-	-	-	-	\$5,000.00
Additions (dividends accumulated),	-	-	-	-	-	5,063.17
Total,	-	-	-	-	-	<u>\$10,063.17</u>

If this client had invested the amount of his annual premiums, at compound interest, at five per centum per annum, the net yield at his death would have been \$10,161.60; at six per centum, \$11,714.55. His actual payments, without interest, amounted to \$5,437.50.

This case, which is rather remarkable, tell its own story, and effectually settles the question of economy. It is remarkable because the proportion of men who pay insurance premiums for the quarter of a century is very small. He died at seventy-four, an age very far beyond the ordinary expectation of any man who, at fifty, seeks the security of life insurance. And his widow received, clear of all taxes, commissions, and incumbrances, within one hundred dollars of the legitimate product of his outlays carefully invested and compounded.

In reality, however, the money that is ordinarily expended in these annual premiums would not be laid away to accumulate. In the majority of cases, the payment involves the denial of some other want, and the outlay is a portion of the man's yearly expenditure. The fact that the corporation is a kind of savings bank, and the fact that the old system of forfeitures does not obtain in mutual societies, are incentives to this special saving. In the stock companies, the rule of forfeiture was universal a few years ago. A client might pay his annual premiums through a long course of years, and reap no benefit at last, if he allowed

the annual pay-day to pass without renewing his premium. But the mutual system, which was always more equitable, is gradually forcing all the societies into juster practices. At present, there are two methods of settlement offered to the choice of the customer who may wish to discontinue his payments. He may take the "money value" of his policy in cash, or he may take a "paid-up" policy for a larger sum, which his heirs receive at his death. This fair mode of settlement with delinquent contributors is more strikingly apparent in the system of "endowments," which is another grand improvement upon the original method, and deserves a more extended notice.

An endowment policy is one in which the company undertakes to pay the specified sum, with accumulated dividends, to the *insured man himself* at a fixed date, if he should live so long; or to his widow, if he should die in the meantime. The date of payment is fixed at five, ten, fifteen, twenty, twenty-five, thirty, or thirty-five years from date of policy. One illustration is as good as a thousand to exemplify this system; and as ten year endowments are probably the most popular, attention will be confined to this term for illustration of the general principle.

As a matter of course, the annual premium upon endowment policies, especially upon those that mature within a proximate period, is considerably augmented. The company not only covenants to pay in case of death, but to pay the face of the policy, with its accumulated earnings, at a fixed date, generally far short of the average term stated in their "expectation" tables. Thus, the expectation of life at thirty is thirty-three years, and the annual payment on a "life" policy is \$22.70 on each thousand dollars. On an "endowment" policy maturing in ten years, the annual payment is \$104.58, beginning at the same age (thirty years). Multiplying the yearly premium by the ten years will show that the insured man pays \$1,045.80, and (should he live) receives only \$1,000. But here the mutual system appears to most advantage, as his percentage of dividends will increase the value of his policy to a sum nearly equal to his annual investments compounded at five per cent. One example of a matured policy which has been actually paid happens to illustrate this

point very accurately. It is the history of Policy No. 19,574; was issued in 1857, and matured and was paid in 1867. The amount insured was \$10,000, and the annual premium was \$1,060.40. The ten payments, therefore, amounted to \$10,604; and the company paid in 1867 \$13,989.18, or nearly \$3,400 more than it had received in premiums. While this policy was in force, the insured man was a partner in the corporation, and his share of the profits was about equal to seven per cent. interest on his outlay, as a little calculation will show. It will be remembered that the examples taken from the records of the company have not been selected as revealing particularly satisfactory results; but, on the contrary, have been taken just as they happened to come to hand. No doubt much more favorable examples might have been selected, although those herein presented are abundantly sufficient to show the economy of life insurance on the mutual plan. And finally, upon this branch of the topic, it will be remembered that the payment of *one* premium secured the wife of the insured man the full amount of the policy any day in the ten years through which it ran, if she became a widow. It will also be borne in mind that no risk of forfeiture was incurred after two annual payments had been made; but the man or his heirs had secured to them the exact proportion of insurance corresponding with the amount of premium actually paid. Thus, two years' payments secured two-tenths of the whole sum, with accumulated dividends, at the maturity of the policy.

To sum up the argument thus far, there are five points presented for consideration.

First. Life insurance does not profess to restore life, because death is positive annihilation of value. The system, therefore, only proposes to replace this value, (which is estimated by the party applying for insurance,) upon the payment of a stipulated percentage. It is, consequently, a distribution of the money loss among ten or twenty thousand people, instead of allowing the crushing weight of this loss to fall upon one stricken household.

Secondly. The annual payments required are not excessive,

and the burden imposed upon the insured man is not onerous. Competition among many underwriters, first, and the introduction of the mutual or coöperative system, second, have reduced the ratio of premiums to their proper level. Moreover, the ratio is determined by reference to tables of mortality that are founded upon a law of mortality which has been found invariable, (by equation,) by close and careful observation, throughout a hundred years or more.

Thirdly. That this law of expectation, which long experience has proved infallible, being only infallible "in equity" or by average, no law can be imagined that will affect the condition of individuals. The covenant, therefore, betwixt the corporation and any individual client is simply an agreement to pay his heirs a stipulated amount of the premiums collected from the general multitude. In mutual companies, the covenant is extended, and contains a promise to return, in dividends, all excess of premiums over the positive loss incurred and the cost of management.

Fourthly. The annual outlay is proved to be an economical investment in policies issued upon the mutual plan. If the society is prosperous, the client is a partaker in the prosperity. And inasmuch as the often mentioned law of mortality is a stable law, all large corporations dealing with multitudes of clients must be prosperous. The history of the largest corporation in America, with its growth in the quarter of a century from nothing to twenty-five millions of dollars, sufficiently demonstrates this point.

And, finally, the endowment method of insurance is shown to be analogous to the system of savings banks in its operation, with this important addition, that while the latter only covenant to restore the deposits, with accrued interest, the former also undertakes to pay the face of the policy, (with its percentage of earnings,) if the client die before the policy matures. If these five points have been made out in the preceding pages, the argument touching the economy of the system is perfect beyond controversy.

The remainder of this discussion, which relates to the moral side of the topic, must be conducted upon very different grounds.

It may be admitted that life insurance, in so far as it affects merely material interests, is beneficial to humanity, in the provision it makes for the helpless and otherwise destitute widow and orphan. But it is not sufficient to demonstrate this fact, if it can be shown that the system militates against the divine law, either in theory or practice. Nothing can be good in abstract speculation, or in concrete manifestation or working, that opposes the government of God, that resists his authority or contemns his providence. And all of these heavy charges have been presented against the system under examination.

It will not be denied that there exists a strong prejudice against life insurance among godly people, founded upon some vague idea that the system invades the prerogatives of the Lord of life. The very title of it gives some color to this prevalent opinion. God holds in his own hand the life of each individual of the race. It is in him that they live and move and have their being. Moreover, he has fixed the bounds of their habitation, and has definitely appointed a day as the limit of their earthly existence. The proverbial expressions relating to this matter belong to both Church and world. The world will tell you that no man can die until "his time comes;" the Church tells you that the saint is immortal until his work is completed. Yet here is a soulless corporation, which affects to reverse the decrees of God or of fate, and promises life or *its equivalent* to both saint and sinner, disregarding all limits except those that are found in its statistical records. The word "equivalent" is used advisedly, because the corporation deals only with the money value of a man's life—a value fixed by the man's own estimate. And it will be perceived that the insurance company potentially *promises* the continuance of life. Its tables say that the man of thirty will live thirty-three years longer; and if the company did not believe in the accuracy of its tables, it is not credible that the contract would be made. No client would be accepted by the agents of the corporation if they expected the tabular promise to fail in his individual case. So this charge appears to be made out, to wit, that life insurance arrogantly promises duration of life, which God reserves in his own power.

In answer to this objection, it may be observed, in the first place, that precisely similar arguments apply to all things and all events that are hampered by contingencies—that is, to all the events of the present life. The insurance against sea risks comes clearly under the same category; because God rules the winds and the waves as really as he rules the destinies of men. Indeed, he plainly declares that he holds the winds in his hands, and makes the storm and the calm simply according to his own will. To insure against possible marine losses is therefore to resist his will. The insurance against loss or damage by fire is equally against his word and prerogatives; for fire is expressly named with stormy winds as the fulfiller of his counsels. These are self-evident propositions; and no dexterity of hair-splitting can define the difference between one case and the other. But the argument has much greater extent, and presses with resistless energy against every form of “speculation,” so-called, and touches all the interests of humanity. The merchant who buys a bale of cotton at twenty cents, hoping to sell at twenty-one, violates this identical principle. The buyer of gold, the buyer of cotton, and the buyer of government bonds, all occupy the same platform. It is the margin of profit that all of them seek, and in each case this profit hangs upon contingencies, which are to be determined by one of two things, to wit, either by the holy, wise, and powerful decree of God, or by chance.

It is commonly supposed, and not without reason, that the agriculturist is most free from the temptations which beset men in all the occupations of life. He seems to get his returns more directly from the hand of the Giver; and in the slow processes by which bountiful nature carries on her system of reproduction, the tiller of the soil has fewer incentives to speculation and greed. But the contingency attaches to each cotton seed, each grain of corn, and the hopes of the planter are fixed upon the prospective price of his products. Ten thousand unknown forces are in operation, destined to affect this price at the end of the harvest; and both the extent of the harvest and the money value of it hang upon ten thousand chances, or else upon the determinate counsel and special providence of God. You cannot invent

or imagine any form of labor more innocent than this ; yet the reward in money that is at the end of the labor, is the only tangible reality in the case.

In the second place, life insurance is really more conservative and beneficent than the majority of business operations, particularly when this form of insurance is conducted upon the coöperative principle. It does not say that the insured shall live ; but it does say that he may die. Nay, it asserts that one out of a given number *will* die, and therefore it invites *all* to provide against the contingency. So far from appealing to chance, it expressly forbids any dependence upon chance. It is *because* no man can predict the day of his death, or the duration of his life, that life insurance urges men to put by a provision for their helpless families. No other conceivable motive can be presented. No other form of appeal would arrest the attention of the world for a moment. Look at the case. Here is a corporation as far removed from the reach of ordinary contingencies as is possible. It is not *positively* secure, because it is possible for God to engulf the totality of its assets by an earthquake. But government bonds are not *positively* secure. They may be lost, stolen, burned up, and perhaps, in the dim future, may be repudiated. But, arguing upon probabilities, the corporation will always be more than solvent. It invites you to join its membership and participate in its gains. And if you die, it only continues the partnership to your heirs—giving them the money value of your individual interest in its assets. This is an accurate statement of the case, and you may as innocently participate in its profits as in the profits of any cotton factor who offers you a partnership for a consideration. In the latter case, you incur more numerous risks, and are dependent upon a multitude of contingencies. In the former, you incur no risk, save the risk of some violent and extraordinary dispensation of Providence, against which the combined wisdom of angels and men avails nothing. But it is not “a lottery,” not a “game of chance,” not “immoral.” It is the most magnificent illustration of the principle of coöperation, in its beneficent aspect, that the world has ever seen.

A more plausible argument against the morality of the system

is here suggested, and it is remarkable that none of the objectors have formally presented it. It may be thus stated :

The corporation, relying upon certain tabular statements, so often referred to in the foregoing pages, says to each healthy man of thirty that his "expectation" of life is thirty-three years. Upon this basis the ratio of premium is formed. The company relies upon its tables, and *bets* each client of this age \$1,000 against \$22.70 that the promise of the tables will be fulfilled. The bet is renewed every year at the same odds, until the man dies or ceases to deposite his stake. It is a safe business for the company, because it can "hedge," as the gamblers call it—that is, it will be sure to win in the long run. An example of the accumulation of these annual deposits, with interest compounded, has already been given; and it is plain that the corporation would make enormous gains if the tables told the exact truth in each individual case. But a proportion of healthy men die at all the ages in the wide interval between thirty and sixty-three. If it were not so, the company could afford to bet \$1,000 against \$11.35.

Suppose one man in fifty is known to die at fifty instead of sixty-three, then any individual of the fifty has forty-nine chances to one of passing this age. Yet, in point of fact, according to the "law of chance," each man of the fifty is equally liable with any other *one* to die. He will certainly do one of the two things, and the insurer bets he will live. Here, then, is a plain case of gambling, differing from throwing dice in that the die has six sides, while only two contingencies are presented in life insurance. This objection is fatal, if fairly stated; because it can never be moral to lay wagers upon any contingency, and the very idea of gambling upon a man's own chance of life is simply horrible. On the other hand, if this objection can be fairly met, the ethical argument against the system falls into fragments. The reader's candid and careful attention is therefore specially requested at this point.

First. The inaccuracy of the general statement should be apparent, because it is not conceivable that any man would bet against his own life. The gambler never makes a bet which he

intends or wishes to lose. His object must needs be to win. No matter what proportion of chances may be for or against him, his settled purpose must be to *gain*, or he is a fool as well as a sinner. But in the case of the life insurance gambler, he *bets* to lose! because he cannot win unless he die, and no gain in money can compensate for the loss of his life. Just think of it: it is the insurer who bets that his client will live; it is the insured who bets that he will die—that is, he bets on his own death. This disposes of one element, and one of no mean importance in the charge—one count in the indictment; inasmuch as you cannot conceive of a man who makes a bet which he hopes to lose. The desire and expectation of gain are essential in all games of chance. It may be said here that men do bet sometimes hoping to lose. For example, a politician bets that his candidate will be defeated in an election. If he should be injured politically, he will be benefited pecuniarily. It might be answered that election bets proceed upon a “dog eat dog” platform, and moral qualities cannot be predicated of the betters. But, in reality, the cases are not analogous, because the political gambler hopes for the money only as a solace, if he be disappointed politically; or he hopes for success in the canvass to console him for his loss of money. Whereas the insured man must *die* before he can *win*.

Secondly. It has always been held by Christian men that the lot is a sacred thing, and that all light and trifling, irreverent or selfish appeals to it are in their nature profane. We may not use lightly or irreverently any thing whereby God makes himself known. His providence is as holy as his name. Neither in sport nor for gain may his creatures legitimately call on him to decide any contingent or doubtful events. But when the dice are cast, men do, in an irreverent and trifling way, compel God, as it were, to determine—for *they* cannot—which face shall be presented; and this must be allowed to be as much a profaneness as it is to take God’s name in vain.

Now, this is one part of the vice which there is in gambling. But there is another part which identifies the gambler with the covetous man, who is an idolater, being devoted to Mammon.

He aims to secure for himself the goods of another without giving for them a fair equivalent. At once profane and selfish, despising God and defrauding man, the gambler is essentially wicked and mean.

But coöperation for mutual assurance of family support can not be condemned as any casting of lots at all. As to the contingency involved, that element, we all know, enters necessarily into every human calculation.

Neither does coöperative assurance deserve to be called a selfish struggle to get the property of others without giving the fair equivalent. It is amusing to see how the objectors sometimes charge this selfishness upon the assured and sometimes upon the assurers. The truth is, it applies to neither of them. Both parties get a full equivalent. And so it follows that there is no element of gambling whatsoever in life insurance.

Thirdly. In the endowment system of insurance, there is a double contract. The corporation promises two things: first, to pay the stipulated sum at a fixed date; and, secondly, to pay it at any anterior date in the event of death. In one case, it occupies the precise position of a savings bank, paying a small interest on annual deposits, annually compounded. In the other, it adds to the savings bank feature the provision which secures the widow of a depositor a continuation of interest in the profits of the firm of which her husband was a member. This is a perfectly fair statement, and is demonstrable from the published plan of the Mutual Life Insurance Company, of New York. There is a risk and there is a contingency; but neither risk nor contingency can avail to make this transaction an act of gambling. There are risks and contingencies attending the shipment of a cargo of cotton to Liverpool. The market may depreciate or advance. The ship may be wrecked or delayed. But it will be urged that the cotton shipment is regular and legitimate, and in the due course of established trade. Pray, what makes the life insurance system illegitimate?

Fourthly. In its practical working, there was a somewhat similar system in operation eighteen hundred years ago. A distinct organisation of men and women deposited all that they owned in

a mutual coöperative union. The fund thus accumulated was distributed to the members of the community as necessity required. Doubtless the widows and orphans of members were sustained out of this common fund. There was provision made against fraud, and two cases are on record in which fraudulent contributors were deprived of expected benefits. Special officials were appointed—Presbyterians say by divine authority—to administer this charity. It was a mutual insurance association, to all intents and purposes. In modern times, this system has been more fully developed; and experience, the accumulation of facts and figures, the careful observance of laws of equation, have all tended to produce a method of distribution which accurately assigns each widow her just proportion of these accumulated assets. It is not intended to claim for life insurance associations, in their best form, an equality with the apostles' fund; but, as a mere matter of money accumulated for the *destitute*, the underlying principles in the two institutions are not dissimilar. In the case of the early Christians, no element of greed and no hungering after prospective gain entered into the mutual arrangement. In the case of modern sinners, each contributor is seeking his own and not another's good. But the principle of coöperation is the same in both cases. Life insurance is not a Christian institution, but it is not heathenish either.

Finally. If the charge cannot be sustained that "the contingent event in the duration of the life of the insured involves the very principle upon which all lotteries and games of chance are condemned as immoral," then the argument herein presented is perfect. If a verdict can be obtained upon this count, as applied to ordinary life insurance schemes, what is to be said concerning the system of endowments, against which this objection cannot lie? In all the affairs of life touching prospective interests,—from the "ploughing of the wicked," which is sin, to the most moral labors of the most righteous,—there must needs be a constant appeal to one of two higher powers. Either the controlling providence of the Lord God of Sabaoth, or the decrees of the idol god, chance, are perpetually invoked by the world's workers. It is not possible to appeal to God in games

of chance, because those who engage in them say in their hearts; "No God." But in life insurance there is of necessity no such appeal. It is *because* the insured husband recognises the fact that God only can know how long he will be continued in life, that he makes this safe provision for his wife and children. The corporation with which he contracts demonstrates by invariable statistics that it can *afford* to make the agreement. So the transaction is void of the objectionable feature, that the gain of the insured is dependent upon the loss of the insurer.

In all this discussion, any reference to the apparent beneficence of the system has been carefully avoided, except incidentally; and in cases where it was necessary to make the argument clear. In the preceding number of this periodical, an article entitled "A Plea in Behalf of Ministers' Widows and Orphans" contained the foregoing quotation concerning the identity of principle involved in lottery gambling and in life insurance. And as no plea could be presented to the people of God more certain to enlist their sympathies, a word may be added in their behalf. How many desolate households may be found in this fair land, made desolate by the translation of the house-band! Widowhood and orphanage are terms that penetrate the crust of selfishness surrounding human hearts, if that incrustation is not utterly impenetrable; and it will probably be admitted that the charity they evoke is about as pure as any emotion native to humanity. Now, life insurance is built upon this kindly emotion, and upon nothing else. It is not the corner-stone nor the keystone, but the entire foundation. If the death of the husband and father did not frequently involve poverty and privation to his helpless family, there would be no life insurance companies in the world. And it would be difficult to invent a system that could so accurately meet the case and be so beneficent in its working as this undoubtedly is. Nothing has ever been urged against it, except the two charges herein examined, to wit, that it is unthrifty and that it is immoral; and both of these objections disappear when the coöperative principle is applied.

If this principle, in this, its purest and most unselfish manifestation, were applied to the cases of those whose wants evoked

the "Plea," their wants would be met, and the plea would be useless. But there are difficulties in the way: inveterate prejudices in the minds of godly men; foggy apprehension of the general subject on the part of those who have given it but slight investigation; and a general distrust of the scheme as a mere human invention. All of these obstacles will doubtless disappear sooner or later, as the drift of the age tends to coöperative effort in all directions. And as the positive destitution of dead ministers' families is an ever-present fact, pressing upon the hearts and consciences of Christian people every where, a remedy will surely be evolved out of the discussion. The equity of the contract betwixt the insurance corporation and the individual client is demonstrable by an infallible algebraical equation; just as it can be proved that a railway company can afford to transport a passenger from New York to Buffalo for less than ten dollars, and that the passenger can well afford that outlay for the service. But the cost of the trip, in wages, in fuel, in wear and tear of machinery, and the like, is enormously greater than the price of a single passage. And, on the other hand, the single passenger pays many hundred times more than his individual journey costs; inasmuch as all the wages, fuel, wear and tear, would be the same if he did not travel in the train. Is this statement plain? Now for the "contingent event"—that inevitable *bete noir* lying at the very threshold of insurance schemes, and turning an innocent civil contract into dice-throwing—transforming a savings institution into a faro-bank! The railway corporation gambles viciously, because its conductors cannot certainly know that a single passenger will apply for a ticket on any given day of the year! And the traveller gambles as viciously, because he cannot certainly know that any other passengers will be with him on the train, and, if not, he gets a service costing thousands of dollars for a sum that scarcely pays for lubricating the axles of his car! If the application of this illustration is not evident, no amount of words could make it plainer.

Deliver your widows and orphans from the world's cold charity, by the application of the great law of averages and the other great law of coöperation—neither of which is opposed to "all that is called God or is worshipped."

ARTICLE III.

IS BAPTISM IMMERSION?

In a former article, we examined the dogma of one invariable meaning to the great religious words, and found it untrue. We then examined the use of the word "baptize" at and before the time of our Saviour, and found that certainly not to be invariably immersion. We found that usage much nearer not embracing immersion at all than embracing nothing else. Then we considered some cases of the administration of baptism recorded in Scripture. We found no traces of invariable immersion. All men know that a fanatic purpose to find immersion every where succeeds in finding it every where. But we do not write for such eyes, but for those who judge of the question without incurable prepossession and upon fair evidence.

Neither would we imitate the petty high-churchism of refusing communion with God's people upon such a point of baptism. We have not undertaken to prove that there is no immersion at all in the Bible. Fully measuring our words, we have asserted and do assert that baptism is not invariably immersion. We shall not imitate the low and little immersionist high-churchism, by an anti-immersionist high-churchism on the other side. We deeply feel that neither high-churchism is in accordance with the spirit of Christ. And it is amazing that there should be any diversity of views upon that subject. For, say what men may about the mode of baptism, there is no point in the matter half as clear as is the revealed will of God that his people shall not separate into miserable sour schisms on account of their different consciences on that subject. Rom. xiv.

We formerly examined the baptism of the divine Saviour, the baptizing of John in Ænon, and the baptism of the three thousand converts at Jerusalem at Pentecost. The case of the eunuch baptized by Philip the evangelist, Acts viii., is the next in order to be examined. We believe this has stronger claims to

be a case of immersion than any which has yet been examined. We could respect the conscience which finds immersion here, as its own justification, without proceeding to condemn others. It is the easy facility which finds it every where, even where it certainly is *not* to be found by unprejudiced eyes, and delights to discover it as "hid treasure," and values it as the means for the delightful casting out of Christ's people, whom they dare not deny to be as good as themselves—it is this easy facility which forfeits our respect.

To that mighty outpouring of the Spirit of God at Jerusalem, at the Pentecost after our Saviour's ascension, Hellenistic Jews, the representatives of many nations, had been gathered. The continent of Africa had shared the blessings of that great day with Europe and Asia. There had been present there "dwellers in Egypt and in the parts of Lybia about Cyrene." The chariot-wheels of the north and the south, the east and the west, were turned towards Jerusalem at that season. Either an impulse of the scattered word of God, or of the Spirit of God, or of the wonder-working providence of God, summoned them from the four winds to Jerusalem, to receive a visit of "the day-spring from on high." Among those who had thus come up to Jerusalem at that season to seek God in worship was the noble Treasurer of Candace, Queen of the Ethiopians. A man of high authority, he was rolling southward and homeward in a stately chariot. Things had been done at the feast at Jerusalem, and things had been said there, which awakened deep thoughts in his soul. He wished further to investigate the wonderful things he had heard said about the Christ. For this purpose, he had procured, during his visit to the holy city, a roll containing the writings of the prophet Isaiah. In this sacred book, he was reading and pondering, as his chariot advanced along its desert road to the south. Acts viii. 27, 28. Philip the evangelist had just then been preaching Christ with blessed effect in Samaria. The angel of the Lord commanded him to go to the south, so as to intersect the road through the desert from Jerusalem to Gaza. When Philip had so done, he came in sight of the man slowly moving forward in his chariot, and attentively

reading the prophet Isaiah. "Then the Spirit said unto Philip, Go near, and join thyself to this chariot." Twice heaven-led thus, Philip ran to the chariot, and heard the eunuch reading the words of the prophet. "Understandest thou what thou readeest?" said the evangelist. "How can I," said the eunuch, "except some man should guide me?" And then he invited Philip to become his guide, seated with him in his chariot. Then, commencing at that clear prophecy in the fifty-third of Isaiah, which the eunuch had himself been pondering, "he preached unto him Jesus." And as the chariot rolled on, and the light broke in upon his mind, "they came unto 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. And he commanded the chariot to stand still: and they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him." Acts viii. 38.

We can easily see how a conscientious mind may find immersion here at the first blush. We do not know that there was no such thing as a case of baptism by immersion in Scripture times. We do not know that this was no such case. The circumstances of this case differ widely from some others, in which there is no possibility of immersion. But here we meet with another of the celebrated "cant phrases," "going down into the water" and "coming up out of the water," which are intrusively made to settle what they do not settle, and to mean what they do not mean. The schismatic immodesty of the claim of conscience is not contented with judging for itself. It must also condemn others. We must therefore examine its foundations. We could concede to a modest conscience what we shall not concede, without evidence, to an arrogant conscience.

In the first place, these words, "into" and "out of," have no such definiteness of usage and meaning as to be relied on to describe a ceremony about which you are to be excommunicated on a point of rigid form.

It is the Greek preposition *εις* which is here rendered *into*. In looking over this very chapter, the eighth of the Acts, in which

the baptism of the eunuch occurs, we find that this preposition *εις* is used eight different times in the one chapter; and in those eight different times of the occurrence of the word, it is not rendered *into* a single time but in the sense where *men's* ideas of the mode of baptism were to be served. Four times it is rendered *to*, in the third, fifth, twenty-seventh, and fortieth verses. Once it is rendered *unto*, in the twenty-sixth verse. Twice it is rendered *in*, in the sixteenth and twenty-third verses. Once only in the whole chapter it is rendered *into*, in the thirty-eighth verse, *to immerse the eunuch*. We say that once out of eight times, in every chapter, is not sufficient grammatical force of evidence for a Christian man to stand on to excommunicate his brethren, or to question their integrity, or to tamper with the integrity of the word of God.

Then take also the following cases of the usage of this word *εις* in other places, and notice whether they are not decisive of the fact that *εις τὸ ἕδωρ* give no evidence of the immersion of the eunuch:

When Christ, on a certain day, went into a ship with his disciples, and fell asleep, "there came down a storm of wind on the lake"—*εις τὴν λίμνην*. Luke viii. 23.

When the same ship is saved by his power and comes to land, "they arrived at the country of the Gadarenes"—*εις τὴν χώραν*. Luke viii. 26.

When the tax-gatherer came to Peter and asked him if his Master did not pay tribute, the Saviour told Peter, in order to avoid offence, "to go to the sea"—*εις τὴν θάλασσαν*—and take a fish in whose mouth a piece of money should be found to pay the tribute. Matthew xvii. 27.

When that sublime deed of power was about to be performed, the resurrection of Lazarus, the divine Redeemer, groaning in spirit, is recorded as slowly and solemnly coming to the grave of Lazarus, which was a cave with a stone lying upon it: he "*οὐρανὸς εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον*." John xi. 38.

When Paul is defending himself in his speech on the stairs at Jerusalem, he relates his conversion on the memorable occasion on the way to Damascus. He says that when that awful light from heaven came around him, he "fell unto the ground"—*εις τὸ ἕδωρ*.

These cases have been casually caught up out of many. Let us look at them. The grammatical construction of the preposition *εἰς* which we are excommunicated for declining to accept as rigidly uniform, not only occurs but once out of eight times in the particular chapter in which the eunuch is to be immersed, but it immerses *the wind* into the sea of Galilee on the day of the great storm. It immerses Christ and the disciples *into the land* of the Gadarenes on the same day. It immerses Peter into the sea when he went to catch the fish in whose mouth was to be found the *stater* which would pay the tribute. It immerses our divine Lord himself into the sepulchre of Lazarus, which was a cave in which lay the four-days dead. And it immerses Saul of Tarsus into the earth on the way to Damascus, when he was stricken blind by the heavenly light. Can we speak in vain to ingenuous minds when we counsel them to avoid that position which imposes the necessity of such grammar as this?

Nor is this all. In the record in the Gospel of St. John of the resurrection of Christ, Mary Magdalene first discovers the astounding and glorious facts by an early visit to the sepulchre. Then she runs to bear the intelligence to Peter and John. Peter and John immediately went forth, and "came to the sepulchre"—*εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον*. "So they ran both together, and the other disciple"—the writer himself, the youthful apostle John—"did outrun Peter, and came first to the sepulchre"—*εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον*. "And he, stooping down and looking in, saw the linen clothes lying; yet went he not in"—*οὐκ εἰσῆλθεν*. "Then cometh Simon Peter following him, and went into the sepulchre"—*εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον*.

We have here some remarkable and decisive light upon these words of motion with the preposition *εἰς*. We see, first, that the word which is relied on so surely to immerse the eunuch, that those who do not so receive it cannot be acknowledged in Christian communion or as honest men; this same word which carries the eunuch, not only *into the water*, but *under the water*; this same word carries the apostle John only *to the sepulchre*—"howbeit he went not in." John xx. 5. Second, we see that the inspiring Spirit takes pains to show us that, in this case, the motion denoted by this preposition is *not immersion*. "Howbeit

he went not in." And, thirdly, he gives a form which would certainly have immersed the eunuch, if that had been the design of the record—as it certainly and clearly did immerse Simon Peter into the sepulchre—*εισήλθεν εις*.

So it seems that these words *into* and *out of* mean what immersion demands only a few times out of many, in the very chapter of the baptism of the eunuch. The sense forbids them to be so rendered in many promiscuous cases through the Bible, the inspiring Spirit having observed *nothing resembling* that rigid uniformity of usage upon which excommunications ought to be built. And that the Spirit of inspiration puts an express denial upon the grammar which immerses the eunuch, by giving us a clear case where the same construction leaves the apostle John on the outside of the object of the preposition. He puts this construction in *opposition* to that which expresses immersion. This does really seem to be sufficiently plain for a candid mind.

Nor does the *place* at which the baptism of the eunuch was performed particularly favor the idea of immersion. It is said to have been *desert*. We are not unaware of that particular criticism here which tinkers with the text so as to make it say, not that the eunuch's road was through the desert,—which is an appropriate thing to say,—but that *Gaza was desert*, which is a very idle thing to say, except to escape the clear sense of the record against immersion. Philip appears to have been plainly directed by the angel of God, in the twenty-sixth verse, to go southward till he met the road from Jerusalem to Gaza, in a desert place. Having obeyed these directions, he saw in that desert place the chariot approaching, and received further instructions from the Spirit of God to approach that chariot. And upon that desert road the baptism of the eunuch soon occurred. Those who have attentively learned from travellers what *deserts* mean in Eastern lands, and especially in these borders of Arabia, will hardly think it accidental that the free and unfanatical Spirit of inspiration threw in here the circumstance that this baptism was in a desert place. Nor can a free and unfanatical mind feel sure enough to launch the thunderbolt of excommunication against brethren from the cloud of his angry confidence,

that "See, here is water," means water of sufficient depth for immersion. On the theory of the immersionists, it is difficult to see why the record informs us that there was "much water" at "Ænon near to Salim" for baptism, but thinks that circumstance needless to be mentioned in the *desert* towards Gaza. The plain fact is, that the "much water" at Ænon was wanted to quench the thirst of a large encampment. And there was no need to speak of the quantity of water at all, and so the quantity of water is not spoken of at all, in the baptism in the desert of Gaza.

There is also the highest probability that Philip the evangelist, having been at Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, and having seen the baptizing of those three thousand converts in a single day by the despised Christians, in a hostile city, and among a hostile people, when few, if any, places of immersion were accessible to the followers of the Crucified One, should have administered baptism to the eunuch, here in the desert, in something of the same manner in which he had seen the apostles of the Lord administer it at Pentecost. We think it has been shown that there are a thousand probabilities to one, to an unbiassed mind, that this was rather as MOSES had baptized "all the people" at the beginning of the old covenant—Heb. ix. 19—than by immersion.

If, then, we do not, in all candor, claim the baptism of the eunuch as a case of baptism by pouring or sprinkling, still there are too many of the intrinsic and significant circumstances of the case looking that way to justify us for a moment in conceding this, the strongest of all cases for the narrow dogma, as a clear and certain case of baptism by immersion.

Advancing a single chapter in the book of the Acts, we have a more illustrious conversion and baptism.

When Stephen was martyred, the witnesses laid down their clothes at a young man's feet, whose name was Saul. Though he sprang from Tarsus, in the State of Cilicia, in Asia Minor, yet he had been educated at Jerusalem, under Rabbi Gamaliel, was of completely pure Jewish blood, and was a great Jew in feeling and principle. He had consented unto Stephen's death with all his heart. The lamentation made over the dead body of Stephen appears to have inflamed the malice of Saul. After

that event, he made havoc of the Church. From every house in which dwelt followers of Christ, he dragged men and women to prison. When the fierce work appeared to be done at Jerusalem, he took it up at Damascus. With a spirit breathing threatenings and slaughter against all Christians, he obtained from the willing high priest letters to the synagogues of Damascus, which would authorise him to make havoc of the Church there also. He expected to bring Christian men and women, bound in fetters, across the weary miles which separate the two cities.

When, in this bloody and hating state of mind, in the insufferable light of a Syrian and a summer sun, he approached the city of Damascus, "suddenly there shone around him at midday a light above the brightness of the sun." The fierce persecutor fell upon the ground beneath the power of that light from heaven. Then he heard a voice calling him repeatedly by name, using his own ancient sacred Hebrew tongue, and inquiring why he persecuted Jesus of Nazareth. Trembling, astonished, and humbly inquiring what the glorified Christ Jesus would have him to do, and stricken with blindness by the "glory of that light," he was led by the hand, like another blind Bartimeus, into the city of Damascus. "And he was three days without sight, and neither did eat nor drink." Acts ix. 9. There, in that feeble, fasting, and stricken condition of body and of mind, two things were sent to him from God: first, the vision of a man named Ananias coming in and putting his hand on him that he might receive his sight—verse 12; secondly, the man Ananias himself fulfilling the vision, entering the house in reality, putting his hands on him, and saying unto him, "Brother Saul, the Lord, even Jesus, that appeared unto thee in the way as thou camest, hath sent me, that thou mightest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost"—ix. 17. The transaction is so glorious and blessed that it is irksome and fettering to be compelled to look at it thus, to snatch it from a narrow and sectarian use. "And immediately there fell from his eyes as it had been scales, and he received sight forthwith, and arose, and was baptized. And when he had received meat, he was strengthened"—verses

18, 19. This is the man afterwards called PAUL, the splendid and cardinal figure in apostolic Christianity, the great missionary to the Gentiles. He was cowering in Damascus in the street called Straight, at the house of Judas. Ananias was sent into that house, by the voice of God, to find him. Here is the record of his conversion and baptism. We are Gentiles; and this man was God's apostle to our fathers. His baptism is the completest pattern, model, example to us of any in the whole Bible. It is a far more appropriate pattern, except in misleading shallow minds by words without real understanding, than that of our divine Saviour himself, who was never a sinner, and whose baptism was not the baptism of repentance and conversion, but probably was a washing for the priesthood. What kind of baptism was, then, the baptism of the apostle Paul?

He is in the house of Judas, probably his countryman, in the street called Straight, in the city of Damascus. There he gropes in blindness, prays, and wonders what this all may mean. His strength is exhausted by three days' fasting. Thus Ananias finds him; thus he put his hands upon him; thus was he when the scales fell from his eyes, and God's blessed light burst upon both bodily and mental vision. And thus, before he receives food and is strengthened, (see verse 19,) while yet faint and exhausted, "he arose and was baptized,"—*ἀναστὰς*—*standing up he was baptized*. This latter seems the more accurate rendering. There is not a hint of leaving the house, nor about finding *immersion-clothes* for the weak and faint man; nothing about "much water;" nothing about the stupid miracle believed in by the ignorant and fanatical, that colds cannot be caught in the waters of immersion. There is not any ground whatever to think that the apostle to the Gentiles received immersion for baptism. There is obviously every ground to think that the water, like the Spirit, was *poured* upon him in his then fasting and faint condition.

The next case of baptism with which we meet, is that at the house of Cornelius in Cesarea. This is the Gentile Pentecost. The Spirit was now poured upon the Gentiles as it had been poured upon the Jews, and upon all the crowd at Jerusalem, at

the beginning. It is the scene of Pentecost over again upon a smaller scale. "While Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word. And they of the circumcision which believed were astonished, as many as came with Peter, because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost. For they heard them speak with tongues and magnify God. Then answered Peter, Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we? And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus." Here the Holy Spirit descends, like the dew, upon the hearers of the word. The terms are significant, and not accidental, by which the baptism of the Spirit is here expressed: *he fell upon them*. In the next verse, the writer says that the gift of the Holy Ghost was *poured* out upon the Gentiles. These two expressions—the falling of the Spirit upon them like the dew, and the pouring out of the Spirit upon them—stand as parallel and explanatory of each other. One of them is the inspired writer's account of the solemn scene; the other is his statement of it as a doctrine. Taking our Saviour's ascending words, placing the baptism of the Spirit and that of the water as parallel to each other, we much question whether these words are consistent with immersion at all—whether they do not *exclude* the *exclusives*. They manifestly favor baptism by pouring.

There is also, in this record, another allusion to the mode of baptism entitled to its just weight. It is Peter's question: "*Can any man forbid water* for the baptism by water of these men, who have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?" And their reception of the Holy Ghost is their baptism by that holy power, if the promise of the Saviour is to be held as fulfilled, which led them to expect that baptism soon after his ascension. Acts i. 5. In addition to this analogy, which is telling, Peter's question implies that the water is to be applied to the subject, by pouring or sprinkling, and not that the subject is to be applied to the water, by immersion. The apostle's question is, "*Can any man forbid water?*" and not, "*Can any man forbid these men to go to the water?*" Let us imagine this case to be

reversed. Let us suppose that there were as clear an image of immersion here as the falling of the Spirit upon them and the outpouring of it upon them is of pouring; let us suppose that there was language employed which conformed as readily and naturally with the theory of immersion as Peter's question, "*Can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized,*" conforms unforced, naturally, and easily with the theory of pouring or sprinkling; what a clamor would be heard around the land, excommunicating those who would not see a thing so plain!

But let us advance. Saul the persecutor has become Paul the Apostle. He has thrown himself with as whole a heart into the work of glorifying Jesus of Nazareth upon the earth, as he had thrown himself into the work of persecuting that holy name. He went from city to city then; he goes from city to city now. He then had a warrant from man; he now has authority from God. By his instrumentality, God has lighted the golden lamps of Christian churches in the cities of Asia Minor. By his instrumentality, God is about to kindle the light of Christian churches, like a fringe of jewels, around the Ægean shores. Upon the old classic shore where the wondrous tale of "Troy divine" had occurred, (Acts xvi. 8,) and all but in sight of the isles in which Homer had sung that wondrous story, stood Paul, having assayed to go into Bithynia, and being forbidden by the guiding Spirit. That guiding Spirit sent him a vision in the night. "There stood a man of Macedonia and prayed him, saying, Come over into Macedonia and help us." Acts xvi. 9. He therefore passes immediately across the blue Ægean sea, before a fair wind, touching at the middlemost island of Samothracia, and the next day into the harbor of Neapolis. Then, about ten miles further inland, he reaches Philippi. He has come thither heaven-led. It is in obedience to a distinct call of God. He is in Europe. The gospel of Christ, brought by the most intellectual of its preachers, has crossed into that quarter of the globe in which it is to wage its mightiest conflicts with the antagonist ideas of this world. The first place in Europe at which that gospel is to be preached is the place at which the

spirit of old republican Rome was defeated by the power of the usurping Cæsars. It is the place at which old Rome had, not long before, committed suicide in the persons and upon the swords of Brutus and Cassius. At this time, a philosophic eye might see that power over the world, approaching in the person of this converted Jew of Tarsus, of which old Rome, spirit and power, was but the parhelion. It approaches very unpretendingly. Its first convert is an Asiatic woman—Lydia, a seller of purple of the city of Thyatira. As the Lord sent Paul, so the Lord opened Lydia's heart to receive his message. *She and her household* receive baptism. We shall make use of their cases in another branch of the subject.

The second conversion at Philippi, under the preaching of the apostle Paul, was that of the jailor. The spirit of persecution showed itself very speedily after the gospel entered Europe. The reason for the persecution of Paul and Silas, was, that they taught customs which were not lawful for them to receive, neither to observe, being Romans. Acts xvi. 21. The immediate occasion of it was that they had, by the power of God, cast out the evil spirit from a soothsaying damsel who brought her masters much gain by her divination. They were rudely arrested, condemned, beaten with many stripes, thrust into the inner prison, and their feet made fast in the stocks.

At midnight, the Spirit of God came down from heaven into the hearts of these bruised and imprisoned ministers of Christ. "They prayed and sang praises unto God, and the prisoners heard them. And suddenly there was a great earthquake, so that the foundations of the prison were shaken; and immediately all the doors were opened, and every one's bands were loosed. And the keeper of the prison awaking out of his sleep, and seeing the prison doors open, he drew out his sword, and would have killed himself, supposing that the prisoners had been fled." Acts xvi. 25-27. This was the classic city of suicide. Near it Brutus and Cassius, and many of the army which stood for the ancient liberties of the Roman republic, had fallen by their own hands. This jailor is about to imitate the example, to escape official dishonor. But Paul, learning the suicidal intention of the

innocent official, cried with a loud voice, "Do thyself no harm; for we are all here." Then was the jailor brought to see clearly the divine presence with these prisoners. He saw that the power in whose hands they were, was too independent and mighty to need the poor device of a midnight escape. "Then he called for a light, and sprang in, and came trembling, and fell down before Paul and Silas, and brought them out, and said, Sirs, what must I do to be saved? And they said, Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved and thy house. And they spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house. And he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes; and was baptized, he and all his, straightway." Acts xvi. 33. Upon another branch of the subject, these two cases of the baptism of whole families, upon the faith of the heads of those families, will be important. The reason why infant baptism is not seen clearly here, is to be sought for in the eye which reads, and not in the record which is read.

But, for the present purpose, we ask attention to the midnight hour at which this baptism is administered, to the washing of the recently inflicted stripes of the prisoners "the same hour of the night," and to the administration of baptism to the jailor "*and all his*," immediately after this washing. Could any probability be more fairly and justly apparent to a mind emancipated from the partisan necessity of finding immersion every where, than that this water by which their unjustly inflicted stripes were washed, and none other, was also the water by which God's sign and seal was set upon them in baptism? The record of this washing is closely connected, in the language of the Holy Spirit, with the record of their baptism. If thus closely connected in the language of the Spirit, they were probably also closely connected in his idea; and if closely connected in his idea, so were they closely connected in the order in which the facts actually occurred. This appears to be little short of demonstration that this is a case of baptism in the form of the ordinary religious ablutions of the times. The Spirit seems to teach us here, by the connexions of language, and by logical necessities which speak more plainly than words, not to look for the

idol immersion in the Philippian prison and at the midnight hour.

Agreeably to a plan laid down at page 6 of this volume of the REVIEW, we have discussed the usage of the word *baptizé*, and we have investigated the cases of the administration of baptism in the Scriptures. We now come to a third branch—*doctrinal, didactic, and historical allusions* to baptism in the Scriptures. Some of our best light will be found here. We shall see the inspired writers apprehending baptism as a matter of instruction, and shall have opportunity to observe how they present it to their readers.

First among these cases, we have another of the famous cant phrases—"Buried with Christ in baptism." Col. ii. 12. There is also a parallel expression—"We are buried with Christ by baptism into death"—in Romans vi. 4. The subject of the passage in Romans is the wicked absurdity of continuing in sin after we have professed Christ before men. This is called Antinomianism. It is a general impression in the Church at large, occasioned in part by the heavy blows struck against Antinomianism by that grand man, Robert Hall, in writings chiefly, we believe, directed to Baptists, that this error prevails more among immersed Christians than others. Such is our own impression also, from the number of persons we have known among immersionists who have held that sin was not sin to *them* after baptism. One reason of this probably is, that these loud warnings of Scripture against Antinomianism are pressed by perversion into a service to which they do not properly belong.

Let us look clearly at the whole passage in the Romans :

"What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid. How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein? Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection: knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be

destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin." Romans vi. 1-6.

Here the apostle speaks of making a profession of Christ as "being baptized into Christ,"—using the ceremony as a short expression for the spiritual thing which the ceremony exhibits. The key of the passage we take to be the third verse: "So many of us as were baptized into Christ were baptized into his death." The death of Christ has a significance to the Christian. He is to die with Christ; he is to rise with Christ. Christ's death was bodily; his is spiritual. He is to live a new life after his conversion, just as Christ lived a new life after his resurrection. The apostle's great mind lays hold of this typical signification of the death of Christ in the gospel scheme as the appropriate view of that event to be employed for rebuking the idea that the law does not bind us as a rule of conduct after we are Christians. The argument is this: the very order and frame of the facts in the history of the last days of Christ show that we must lead a new life after coming to Christ, just as he led a new life after his crucifixion and resurrection. There is another great fact signified in baptism—the outpouring of the Holy Spirit of God to bring the dead soul to life. But we do not think that fact alluded to here. It did not fit into the great scheme of thought just in this place. But Christ's death, being one thing professed at our baptism, did fit into that great scheme. It stood forth in connexion with his resurrection, following as a plain, simple, and recent pattern of a Christian's death to sin and resurrection to a new life in this life. To show that we must die to sin on becoming Christians, *three* illustrations in fact are presented: 1. The *sepulchre* in which a dead body is laid—v. 4. 2. The *ground* in which seed are planted—v. 5. 3. The *cross* on which Christ died—v. 6. By baptism, or what it signifies, we are *ensepulchred* or *entombed* with him, that we may live new lives afterwards, as there were new laws in his life afterwards; by baptism, or by what it signifies, we are *planted* with him in the ground, that there may be the new springing plant in our lives, as there was in his; by baptism, or by what it signifies, we are *crucified* with Christ, that the old man—the body of

sin—might be put to death, as Christ was put to death, and so that body of sin might never hang *victoriously* on us again. We think that this scripture looks to the last days of Christ,—the days of crucifixion and resurrection,—and not to his early days, or the days of his baptism and reception of the Holy Spirit. We submit, therefore, to the candid reader, that any legitimate allusion in the phrase, “buried with Christ by baptism into death,” to the mode of a ceremony, must be to his crucifixion and entombment equally. It claims to be based, not on Christ’s *baptism*, but upon his *burial*. It appears to be thought that the wrapping of the sacred body of the Redeemer in a clean linen cloth, Joseph of Arimathea’s laying it in his own new tomb, which he had hewn out in the rock, and his rolling a great stone to the door of the sepulchre, may bear some analogy to plunging a subject into the so-called “watery grave” in which colds cannot be caught! The analogy is not very easy to be traced by an ingenuous mind. Possibly it owes much of its force, with unlettered minds, to the fact that the English *bury*, which here translates the original *entomb* or *ensepulchre*, has come in modern times to convey the idea of covering with earth, instead of laying away in a sepulchre. Imagination may trace some likeness between modern burial in loose earth and the “watery grave.” Imagination itself can hardly trace a semblance of likeness between entombing Christ’s body in the sepulchre of Joseph of Arimathea and the incessantly canted “watery grave.”

We do not enter into a separate discussion of the passage in Colossians, because it seems substantially parallel to that which we have examined. Both of them have a deep religious and spiritual meaning, which is obviously degraded by their being pressed into the ceremonial controversy.

The reader will perhaps sometimes have observed with what a desperate air of triumph, scarcely credited by themselves, the Baptist preachers and writers refer to concessions made to some of their notions by some Pædobaptist writers, especially Calvin, Chalmers, and Olshausen. We are entirely persuaded that such concessions are impolitic and mischievous. The good and great men who have made them, no doubt hoped and intended by them

to soften the fierce fanaticism on the other side. This cannot be done, and is neither to be hoped for nor attempted. For the other side would cease to be the other side, if its fanaticism on that subject should be materially softened.

And the answer is very plain and very telling. Whatever concessions Calvin, Chalmers, and Olshausen made to Baptist notions, these concessions were notoriously not of sufficient weight to carry Calvin, Chalmers, and Olshausen under the water and make them Baptists. Why, then, should it be expected that concessions by those great men should have a weight with other people which they did not have with the men themselves who made them? And if those concessions were deemed consistent with heartily declining immersion, and all the immersionist narrowness and bitterness, by the very men who made them, why should they not be held consistent with the same course by us, who did not make them and do not believe in them?

On the other hand, the investigations of that profound scholar and able man, Doctor Conrad Speece, were of sufficient weight *with himself* to carry him out of a Baptist into a Pædobaptist Church. And it is not yet five years since the writer of this saw a petition presented to a Presbytery of Virginia for the formation of a church of that denomination in a neighborhood which had been known to be almost unanimously Baptist. On inquiry of the minister presenting the petition, he was informed that the church to be organised consisted almost entirely of persons who were desiring this change in their ecclesiastical connexion in consequence of long and deliberate study of the subject. Of course, there are cases of the opposite character; but it is remarkable to what a very great extent these latter are the result of surface impressions, by the mere incessant din of the cant phrases, and in payment of mere "sound-dues."

Next among historical allusions stands the famous and eloquent passage in the tenth chapter of the first Corinthians: "Moreover, brethren, I would not that you should be ignorant, how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea, and did all eat the same spiritual meat; and

did all drink the same spiritual drink: for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them: and that Rock was Christ." 1 Cor. x. 1-4. Upon this we have the following note in the Baptist edition of the Comprehensive Commentary: "From this we learn that the cloud *concealed* the Israelites from the Egyptians from behind; and the sea, standing as a wall, *concealed* them on either side; and as the concealment was complete, through the *united* instrumentality of the cloud AND the sea, as complete as is the submersion of the candidate for baptism in the water, this suggested to the mind of the apostle the figurative language he has employed." See Comp. Com. *in loco*. These are the italics and capitals of the annotator. The reader will perceive at once the new invention here of the baptism of CONCEALMENT. He will also see the new theory, here devised, that two different substances may combine for an immersion—the sea "AND" the cloud; the lid of the box being of a different substance from the bottom of the box; both inventions being wholly gratuitous and unwarranted, save by the distress into which a darling theory is here brought. The New Version, published in 1866 by the Campbellites and some of the Baptists, begging all questions and cutting all Gordian knots with the sharp sword of a fixed purpose to lay partisan hands upon the word of God itself, of course renders this: "And were all immersed unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea."

Let us refer to the inspired account of the sublime events here referred to:

"And the angel of God, which went before the camp of Israel, removed and went behind them; and the pillar of cloud went from before their face, and stood behind them. And it came between the camp of the Egyptians and the camp of Israel; and it was a cloud and darkness to them, but it gave light by night to these: so that the one came not near the other all the night. And Moses stretched out his hand over the sea; and the Lord caused the sea to go back by a strong east wind all that night, and made the *sea dry land*, and the waters were divided. And the children of Israel went into the midst of the sea upon the dry ground: and the waters were a wall unto them on their right hand, and on their left. And the Egyptians pursued, and went in after them to the midst of the sea, even all Pharaoh's

horses, his chariots, and his horsemen. And it came to pass that in the morning watch the Lord looked unto the host of the Egyptians, through the pillar of fire and of the cloud, and troubled the host of the Egyptians, and took off their chariot wheels, that they drave them heavily: so that the Egyptians said, Let us flee from the face of Israel; for the Lord fighteth for them against the Egyptians. And the Lord said unto Moses, Stretch out thine hand over the sea, that the waters may come again upon the Egyptians, upon their chariots, and upon their horsemen. And Moses stretched forth his hand over the sea, and the sea returned to his strength when the morning appeared; and the Egyptians fled against it; and the Lord overthrew the Egyptians in the midst of the sea. And the waters returned, and covered the chariots, and the horsemen, and all the host of Pharaoh that came into the sea after them; there remained not so much as one of them. But the children of Israel walked upon dry land in the midst of the sea; and the waters were a wall unto them on their right hand, and on their left." Exodus xiv. 19-29.

This is one of the cases, and not the only one, where we feel that it is a pity to have to review such sublime transactions as are here recorded of the redeeming hand of God, on such a miserable errand. And yet it will not be found to be either useless or worthless to snatch these grand and glorious scriptures from the hands of those who press them into the enslavement of the service of a worthless and humanly-contrived idol.

By this sublime transaction, the fathers of the Hebrew people were baptized unto Moses, in the sense that they clearly saw his divine commission as God's instrument for their redemption from Egypt—saw the power of God upon their enemies in confirmation of that commission, and felt the blessedness of his protection in and through that commission and that great leader. It is another case in which the thought of the apostle is evidently moving upon the high spiritual road, when it is drawn down, and attempted to be made a partisan, in probably the most useless and bitter schism—save, perhaps, the pronouncing of Shibboleth at the fords of Jordan—which was ever permitted to divide the people of God.

There is no warrant for the before-mentioned box of baptism, made, bottom, of the walls of Red Sea water, and, top, of the

divine cloud. There is neither proof nor probability that the fathers were at any time immediately under the cloud—that the cloud was at any time immediately above their heads. The preposition employed by St. Paul, when he says they were *under the cloud*, evidently has the nobler and more important meaning that they were *under the guidance of the cloud*. The expressions “in the cloud” and “in the sea” are the obvious expressions of manner, means, or instrument. And then for this box for the baptism of concealment, there was absolutely nothing to form the eastern side of the Israelites that was towards the shore of deliverance. The theory of immersion puts into the apostle’s mind, instead of the deep and spiritual baptism which ought to have bound these people to trust the divine commission of Moses, as baptism now binds a Christian to trust the divine commission of Jesus Christ, a low image of a ceremony, and withal a very imperfect image of that ceremony—an image of a box, totally deficient of one end! But the transgressions of these people, after their passage of the Red Sea, are like the sins of Christians after baptism; and on that subject they are our “examples to the intent that we should not lust after evil things, as they also lusted”—v. 6.

If, however, it is still insisted that the apostle threw his mind back to this sublime transaction for the purpose of finding in it not only that religious meaning and effect of baptism which he himself presses upon his readers with clear practical effect, but that he saw there some analogy of the “submersion of the candidate for baptism in water” some how or other, let us look at the images of modes which might surround this sublime piece of history in the mind of a learned Christian Jew.

A cheerful but not fanatical acquaintance was once asked if he did not think the Bible was full of immersion; and when the question was pressed upon him with the usual life-and-death desperation of such a vital matter, he replied that he could not say exactly that the Bible was full of immersion; but there were some cases about which he confessed he had no doubt at all. And when this answer had produced congratulatory good humor on the other side, and he was kindly requested to name those

unequivocal cases, he said he had no doubt that the men upon whom the flood came were immersed; he had no doubt that the Egyptians who pursued after the Israelites into the Red Sea were immersed; and he had as little doubt that Jonah's was a clear case of immersion. These three at least he considered *unequivocal cases of immersion*. Our playful friend was right. If the Hebrews were immersed in the Red Sea, it was that strange kind of immersion, by no means, we believe, considered canonical in these days—an immersion *dry-shod* and indeed *dry-clad*. And if, as some men think, there was a ceremonial form present in the apostle's mind, when, with thoughts flaming and flashing upon the high spiritual road, he threw his thoughts back to the Red Sea, it must have been by the spray from the cloud, or from the miraculous walls of the mighty waters, that in that backward glance he saw the Hebrews baptized. For the Egyptians at that place afford an unequivocal instance of the complete immersion and submersion of the person in water. It is remarkable that the very thing the immersionist theory makes the cloud and the waters—a box of two different substances, and incomplete at that—do for the Hebrews, that the inspired word of God makes the waters alone, in the regular style and form of canonical immersion, do for the Egyptians: "And the waters returned and covered—*ἐκάλυψε*—the chariots, and the horsemen, and all the hosts of Pharaoh." Exodus xiv. 28. There was then a baptism of *concealment* at the Red Sea; but of the Egyptians, not the Israelites. St. Paul, in looking back to that sublime piece of spiritual history for practical purposes, and conceiving an image of immersion, would much more readily, easily, and naturally have seen that mode receive an illustration in the hidden and covered Egyptians than in the *dry-shod* and *cloud-led* Israelites.

Of these doctrinal and practical allusions to baptism, another is found in the tenth of Hebrews:

"Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the Holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way, which he hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say, his flesh; and having an High Priest over the house of God; let us

draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water." Heb. x. 19-22.

This is in that Epistle to the Hebrews, and in the very loftiest thinking part of it, which exhibits a constant parallel between "the shadows of good things to come" in the law, and the good things themselves when they have already come in the gospel. Those wonderful preaching and prophesying ceremonies of the Jews of old are shown to have always had the gospel in the soul of them. This pondering parallelism appears especially in this tenth chapter. 1. "The shadow of good things to come" is compared with the very substantial presentation of the things—v. 1. 2. The "blood of bulls and of goats" (v. 4) is compared with the real doing of God's will in the mediatorial body prepared for the incarnation of Christ, as an efficient sacrifice—vv. 9, 10. 3. Then the imperfect purging of men's consciences under the law (v. 2) is compared to the perfect accomplishment of the remission of sins, the "perfecting forever them that are sanctified," under the gospel—v. 14. And then 4. The gloomy necessity for a remembrance to be made of sin again every year, under the ceremonial law, as a thing which the blood of beasts could not effectually take away, but it would rise again in the sight of God incessantly forever when no better blood than theirs did satisfy it, (v. 3, 4.,) is compared with the one offering for sin in the gospel, after which its High Priest forever took his seat at the right hand of God, to await his divine kingdom—v. 13. And then there are rich and beautiful allusive comparisons between the *cautiousness* of entrance into the Holiest under the old covenant, (v. 19,) and the "*boldness*" of approach allowed under the new; between the old way, by lifting the veil for the high priest, under the old, and the new and living way, through the very torn flesh of the High Priest himself, under the new—v. 20. And then there is a parallel between the ablutions of himself, which the high priest had to perform under the old covenant to enter the holy place, (Exodus xxix. 4,) and the ordinance of Christian baptism, by which men in the new covenant obtain their access to Christ: "having our hearts sprinkled from

an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water." The allusion to baptism is here unequivocal. It is thrown into parallel with the ablutions of the priests of old to prepare them for the holiest place. There does seem to be some allusion to modes here. And to us it seems little short of a fairly decisive consideration that not one of the priestly ablutions of old was the immersion of one person by another. The reference of the apostle, therefore, *could not be* to immersion. And this is not all. There arises another form of parallel in these weighing, balancing, meditative sentences. It is the parallel between the form and the substance, the outward and the inward, independently of dispensations, the ceremony and the efficacy, the act performed by man and the effectual application of it by the Holy Spirit. When, therefore, the apostle says, "Having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water," we think we have fairly shown that no immersion was to be found among the ablutions of the priests, from which it is perfectly clear that the image here is drawn. But whether that be admitted or not, one thing must be admitted beyond a peradventure, and that is, that when the inspired writer comes to state the substance of baptism—the inward power of it, the efficacy, the effectual application of it by the Holy Spirit to the hearts of the redeemed—he uses a word which is one of the very objects of immersionist derision, and the new hearts of which he treats are "hearts SPRINKLED from an evil conscience." This would not St. Paul have done, had he been an immersionist.

The only remaining historical allusion to baptism in the writings of the apostles, here to be noticed, is that in which Christ's preaching to the spirits in prison is spoken of:

"Which sometime were disobedient, when once the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water. The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us, (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." 1 Peter iii. 20, 21. The rendering of the New Version here is: "Which in an antitype, immersion, now saves us also."

The doctrine of the apostle unquestionably is, that there is a resemblance between our salvation now, who have been baptized into Christ, and Noah's in the ark. Our baptism is an antitype or likeness to Noah's salvation. Christ is to us what the ark was to Noah. And pains are taken by the inspired writer to show that he does not mean the mere ceremony of baptism—not the ceremonial cleansing, not the mere putting away of the filth of the flesh, not the mere ablution; but an answer to the demands of conscience, which requires us to confess, love, and serve Christ. This requirement of a good conscience is by many fanatic sectarians represented to mean the requirement of conscience on you to observe their modes. It is probable that the conscience the apostle means is that which binds one who has experienced the love of Christ in his own soul to confess him before men. Observe, now, that it is Noah and the eight souls with him in the ark whom these New Version men would immerse in antitype of their notions of baptism.

The deluge, like the passage of the Red Sea, is a dangerous place to go to, for those who can see no baptism but immersion. At both places, there were two parties—the one saved *from* the water, the other destroyed in it and by it. At neither place was there any such thing as the immersion of the redeemed. At neither place does baptism receive any illustration whatever, considered as immersion. At both, it receives beautiful exemplification, as employed by the inspired writers, considered in that spiritual import in which they use it. In both cases, the immersed are not the ransomed. In both cases, the deliverance of the redeemed from immersion is their salvation. And so far as the salvation of the eight souls spoken of by St. Peter may guide us as a type of the form of baptism, if at all—that form in which they were safely borne above the vast waters and unhurt by them—that salvation certainly bears no analogy to baptism by immersion. When, therefore, St. Peter declares that we are now saved by water, in like figure, or in like manner, to the salvation of Noah and the eight souls in the ark, and that that like figure, or like manner, is in our baptism not in reference to its outward form or outward action, he affords, it would seem to

us, no aid or countenance to modern immersion, except upon the imaginary theory that the eight were *dragged through the water* to be placed in the ark. There appears to be no immersion in the type. So far as this allusion goes, we must infer that there is no proof of immersion in the antitype. In fact, the New Version here, as elsewhere, has done the fearful deed of attempting to palm off upon the world the prejudices of men, instead of the word of God.

And now, in review of what has been gone over, it seems beyond a doubt that the immersionist tenacity of mode is wholly unscriptural. There is nothing of that tenacity of mode in the records of the cases of baptism in the Scriptures. There is nothing of that tenacity of mode in any of the historical, doctrinal, and practical allusions now quoted. Those allusions are all to the spiritual meaning of baptism—every one. It seems a dragging down, a belittling, a degrading of every one of these passages to bring it into the controversy on the mode of baptism. The mode of baptism does not appear to have been in the thoughts of any of the writers. If the mode of baptism was in the mind of the Holy Spirit in inspiring any of these scriptures, it certainly was not in his mind for the purpose of enjoining or encouraging a scrupulousness for the outward mode against those who make much of the moral, spiritual, and religious meaning of baptism.

There are a great many sayings of our Saviour preserved by the four evangelists upon a great variety of subjects; but not a word or hint in any of them about the importance of the mode of baptism or the tenacity with which it is to be held in the Church. He seemed rather to lean away from any importance in the ordinance itself: "Howbeit Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples."

Then there are fourteen apostolic letters of St. Paul; but not one single hint any where, in all these fourteen letters, about the life-and-death necessity of clinging tenaciously to the mode of baptism, and about refusing to commune with those who practise a different mode from ourselves. These, too, are letters upon religious subjects—letters of warning, encouragement, and

practical instruction, on the subjects needed by the Church then, and which would be needed for all time. The canon of Scripture for all time was then forming.

There are one letter of James, two letters of Peter, three letters of John, and one letter of Jude. They have a very rich variety of subjects. They turn over the Christian life in a great variety of attitudes. They contain warnings against a variety of present and coming evils. They contain instructions and encouragements for present and coming duties. But not a single word is to be found in any of them about the tenacity of standing up for a particular way, manner, or mode of baptizing. Probability can hardly rise higher than that this omission of all warnings not to neglect immersion would not have occurred in these twenty-one Apostolic Epistles, if the writers of them had been modern Baptist ministers. And this probability rises still higher yet, when we remember that our Saviour, after his ascension, came down to visit his exiled friend and apostle, St. John, in the isle of Patmos; that he delivered a great variety of warnings to the apostle for the seven churches in Asia, and through them to all the churches of all the world and of all ages. But not a single word is to be found in any of these seven epistles to the seven churches, any more than in any of the Gospels or any of the Apostolic Epistles, about the duty of holding fast to the mode of baptism and separating from others on that point, upon whatever else the parties might be agreed. The sad truth is, that a New Testament religion built upon the tenacity of the mode of a sacrament, is a false and unscriptural religion precisely so far as it is such.

ARTICLE IV.

THE TRANSFIGURATION.

The transfiguration of Christ stands forth as singular and unique in the narrative of his life, as does the isolated Tabor, which tradition tells us was the scene of the occurrence, upon the plain of Esdraelon. It seems not to belong to that state of humiliation which the Son of God had assumed, and to have no place in his life of toil and teaching, of sorrow and suffering. And yet it is narrated in three of the Gospels, is spoken of by Peter, one of the eye-witnesses, in his second Epistle, and is probably alluded to by John, another eye-witness, in the introduction to his Gospel. It cannot, therefore, be an unimportant portion of Scripture, nor an unprofitable subject of investigation. Before inquiring into its meaning, as we propose to do, let us look at the facts of the narrative, as we gather them from the three evangelists.

The transfiguration is mentioned by each of the three historians in connexion with the same instructions of Christ, although a week elapsed between the events. Jesus began to disclose to his disciples that he must go up to Jerusalem and suffer at the hands of the rulers, be put to death, and be raised again the third day. Peter could not bear the thought of such a fate for his Lord, and undertook to rebuke him. For this Jesus reprovved him, and gave him and the other disciples some wholesome admonitions. They were at this time in the neighborhood of Cæsarea Philippi, on the northern confines of Galilee. Just a week after this solemn disclosure to the disciples, Jesus took Peter, James, and John, and brought them up into a high mountain apart from the other disciples, who were probably left at its foot. Whether during this intervening week, of which the history is silent, our Lord and his apostles travelled from Cæsarea Philippi southward a distance of fifty miles to Mount Tabor, or a shorter distance to Mount Hermon, or to some other neighboring mountain, must

ever remain a matter of conjecture. A discussion of the probabilities of the question would involve matters of geography, history, and chronology, for which we have not space. And, after all, mere probability is all that could be reached. It may be remarked, that most modern interpreters reject the old tradition of Tabor, and fix upon Hermon as probably the scene of the transfiguration.

Our Lord went up to the mountain on this occasion to pray. The fact that on other occasions he retired for prayer by night, and especially the fact mentioned, that they came down from the mountain the next day, favor the opinion that the transfiguration occurred at night. As he prayed, his countenance was changed, and his face shone as the sun; and his raiment became white as the light; as Mark graphically adds, "so as no fuller on earth can white them." And there appeared with him in glory Moses and Elias, who talked with him. The subject of the conversation of these heavenly visitants was "the decease which he should accomplish at Jerusalem." When the transfiguration first occurred, the three disciples "were heavy with sleep;" but "when they were awake," (or perhaps we may translate, "having aroused themselves,"—*διαγρηγορήσαντες*) they saw his glory and the two men that stood with him. They beheld the scene with mingled feelings of awe and delight. "They were sore afraid," and yet they were so entranced as to wish to abide in such glory. And as the heavenly beings were departing from their Lord, Peter said to Jesus, "Master, it is good for us to be here: and let us make three tabernacles—one for thee, and one for Moses, and one for Elias." The writer adds the remark, "not knowing what he said." The most natural explanation of this remark is, that the disciples were bewildered by the unearthly glory that surrounded them, and that Peter uttered a request without fully considering its import. Or is there a deeper meaning in his language, which he himself knew not, like the prophets of old, who searched "what the Spirit of Christ that was in them did signify?"

Whilst Peter was speaking, a bright cloud overshadowed them, probably the Shekinah in which God manifested himself; and

they were afraid as they entered into it. From this cloud of glory the voice of God addressed them: "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye him." The disciples were overcome with awe when they heard this voice, and fell upon their faces. Jesus then came to them and touched them, saying, "Arise, be not afraid." When they looked up, they saw no man save Jesus only. The voice, and the cloud, and the heavenly visitants, had passed away together. The curtain had fallen upon the glorious scene.

As they came down from the mountain, Jesus charged them to tell no man the things they had seen until the Son of man was risen from the dead. In obedience to this charge, they kept it close, and told no man, in those days, any of the things they had seen; but they questioned among themselves what the rising from the dead could mean.

Such is the simple scripture narrative of this most singular event in our Lord's life. What view shall we take of it? That there is no settled opinion with regard to its design, is evident. A reference to almost any two commentaries will give us two different views of the transfiguration.

The view of it that regards it simply as a mythical narrative is too absurd to claim serious consideration from those who receive the Bible as the inspired word of God. Nor does the opinion supported by Neander, that it was not an objective reality, but "a subjective psychological phenomenon," deserve a much more serious consideration. It may suit the workings of a speculative German mind to regard this scene as merely painted in the imaginations of Peter and his associates; but this will not satisfy the plain common sense of the Anglo-Saxon mind. We must regard it as a simple uncolored narrative of an actual occurrence.

But, after excluding all those explanations of this transaction that are inconsistent with the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures, we still have a great variety of opinions. Some of these will be here stated, and briefly considered, in order to prepare the way for the view we wish to present.

It has been thought that the transfiguration was designed

merely for the personal comfort and support of our Lord himself. The Rev. Dr. Moore, in the "Last Days of Jesus," says: "The great object of the transfiguration terminated in the mind of our Lord himself. It was mainly designed to prepare him for his approaching sufferings." P. 174. That he who was now an alien from heavenly glory should have a retaste of its felicity, even in his humiliation, need not appear to us strange. But there is no evidence in the narrative of any such design. It does not appear that even on this single occasion our Lord deviated from the principle of his life—that he came not to be ministered to, but to minister to others. It may have been, it doubtless was, consoling to the "man of sorrows" to hold converse in glory with saints from heaven; but we cannot explain some important circumstances of the narrative on the hypothesis that the personal consolation of our Lord was the leading design of the transfiguration.

Others see in it the good of the disciples. "He now purposed," says Kitto, "to encourage them, to strengthen their faith, and to advance their views of his character and office, by affording them a glimpse of that glory which essentially belonged to him." With this view before our minds, we ask in vain such questions as these: Why were only three of the disciples allowed to share these benefits? Why were Moses and Elias especially chosen from the redeemed in heaven? Why was his decease the topic of conversation? Why was all hushed till after the resurrection?

Barnes cuts the Gordian knot thus: "The *sole* design of this transfiguration was to convince them that he was the Christ; that he was greater than the greatest of the prophets; that he was the Son of God." We may ask again: Why convince only three of the apostles of this important fact, and not allow them to tell it even to their fellow-apostles, when the same announcement—that he was the Son of God—was publicly made at his baptism?

The most prominent lesson of this scene, according to Macduff, is, "that the legal and prophetic dispensations were superseded by the gospel." A view so restricted as this would give

significance to only one single event of the transaction—the passing away of Moses and Elias from the scene, leaving Jesus only. Why, then, all this display of glory which they shared with him? And why, when he stands alone, representing, according to this view, the new dispensation, has all the glory departed?

Adam Clarke furnishes us with variety of design, sufficient to satisfy the most voracious. He says: “The whole of this emblematic transaction appears to me to be intended to prove: First. The reality of the world of spirits and the immortality of the soul. Secondly. The resurrection of the body and the doctrine of future rewards and punishments. Thirdly. The abolition of the Mosaic institutions, and the fulfilment of the predictions of the prophets relative to the person, nature, sufferings, death, and resurrection of Christ, and the glory that should follow. Fourthly. The establishment of the mild, light-bringing, and life-giving gospel of the Son of God. And fifthly. That as the old Jewish covenant and mediatorship had ended, Jesus was now to be considered as the sole teacher, the only availing offering for sin, and the grand Mediator between God and man.” Surely we need not wish to show that all divine truth was revealed on the mount of transfiguration.

David Brown, in his excellent brief Commentary on the Gospels, connects this event, as we should do in interpreting it, with the “sayings” that precede it in all three of the narratives with regard to his death and resurrection, “at which Peter and all the twelve were so startled and scandalized;” and he remarks: “This scene was designed to show to the eyes as well as the heart how *glorious* that death was in the view of heaven.” That this approaches more nearly what we regard as the true import of this event than any of the other views advanced, will appear as we proceed. And yet the writer does not, in his interpretation, adhere strictly to his own statement. Nor does his statement convey fully the idea of the transfiguration.

Alford says: “This weighty event forms the solemn installation of our Lord to his sufferings and their result.” “The two who appeared were the representatives of the *law* and the *prophets*.” “And now they come endowed with glorified bodies

before the rest of the dead, to hold converse with the Lord on that sublime event which had been the great central subject of all their teaching, and solemnly to consign into his hands, once and for all, in a symbolic and glorious representation, their delegated and expiring power."

Lange calls the transfiguration "another direct testimony" to the Messiah's life of Jesus, "granted this time to the apostles, as the representatives of the *ἐκκλησία*. "The disciples were now taught that the sufferings and death of Messiah did not sever the connexion between him and the Old Testament—more especially between him and the lawgiver who condemned blasphemers to death and the zealous prophet who called down fire from heaven. * * * Again, as at Jordan, did the representatives of the two covenants meet." "Before the disciples could with safety descend to the depths of temptation connected with the cross of Christ, they were, so to speak, fastened to heaven by the cords of this vision."

A reference to other writers would give us other views or a modification of these. Let those cited suffice. Now, where there is such great diversity of opinion, it is less presumptuous to advocate another view of this portion of Scripture, than if Christian interpreters were generally agreed in opinion. We therefore ask the reader's attention to what we regard as the true view of this event in our Lord's life.

The transfiguration should, we think, be interpreted as a typical transaction. The New Testament history does not abound in types and symbols, as did the Old; and yet it is not altogether devoid of them. The two miraculous drafts of fishes—the one at the beginning and the other at the close of our Lord's ministry—were typical. The rending of the veil of the temple and the opening of the graves of the saints were typical events. We need not, therefore, be surprised if we find so peculiar a transaction as that upon the holy mount a typical event, setting forth spiritual truth. All its mysterious attendant circumstances would seem to point to this as its proper position in the history. The best argument in support of its typical character is a correct explanation of its typical import.

We now state the truth which we think is set forth in this typical transaction, namely :

*The glory that Christ secured for himself and the redeemed by his death and triumphant resurrection.**

It is the doctrine of Scripture that the death of Christ purchased our redemption, and that his resurrection was an attestation that the sacrifice was accepted in our behalf. "He was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification." The resurrection completed the design of his death. It is a part of a business transaction to pay the money that cancels a debt; it is a completion of that transaction to obtain a receipt acknowledging the payment and the cancelling of the debt. It is a part of a business transaction to pay the purchase money for a piece of property; but the act is completed only when a deed is obtained conveying the title to the purchaser. In the one case, the payment of money may cancel the debt—in the other, it may purchase the property; but in either case evidence of the payment must be given to complete the transaction. So Christ's death pays the penalty of sin, and, together with his obedience, purchases immortal life for the sinner; but simple death was not enough. Had Christ died and remained under the power of death, what evidence would we have had, what evidence would have been laid before the universe, that God had

* Wordsworth confirms the writer's view thus: "The transfiguration was a type and glimpse and earnest of the future glory of the risen *bodies* of Christ's members." "He was transfigured in order to give them a glimpse of his future glory." "Thus he prepared *them* also for suffering, having seen in his glory a glimpse of their own, if they remained true to him." "Another purpose of this manifestation was to show that Jesus was not Elias, nor one of the old prophets, but superior to them all."

Kurtz likewise, in his *Manual of Sacred History*, hints at the same view, thus: "The baptism of the Redeemer introduced the first division of the labors belonging to his office; the second was introduced by the transfiguration." "As the transfiguration glances retrospectively at the commencement of his work, so, too, it glances prospectively at its completion—namely, the resurrection." "As the transfiguration or glorification of Christ was still incomplete, and could not be understood until it was completed, he charged the disciples to tell no man of it until his resurrection had occurred."—EDS. S. P. REVIEW.

accepted the vicarious offering? Nothing would appear but death—no life, no glory. The sinner would have nothing on which to base a plea for acceptance with God. Christ must not only die for our sins; he must be raised for our justification. There must be the receipt for the payment; there must be given the evidence of the purchase. Such is the relation of Christ's resurrection to his death and to the redemption of his people.

Now, we regard the transaction upon the mount as setting forth the result of Christ's work in behalf of his redeemed people. It is a display in type of the glory secured by his death and resurrection. Prominence is rather given to the idea conveyed by the resurrection—a completing and sealing of the glory purchased. And yet this does not appear as separated from his death, but in its necessary relation to it. That which is here portrayed is the completed result of his death. We have the glorious triumph of the Redeemer, through death, for himself and his people.

Let us now see if the circumstances of the narrative will not more readily harmonize with this view than with any of the numerous others that have had their respective advocates.

1. The connexion in which the transfiguration occurs in all the narratives may readily be accounted for, if we adopt this view of its design. Jesus had just now, for the first time, disclosed to the disciples that he must suffer death and be raised again. It was a week after this disclosure and the instructions connected with it that the transfiguration occurred; but each of the historians passes over this interval, that the scene upon the mount may follow in immediate connexion with "these sayings." If, now, this scene was designed to portray, as we maintain it was, the glorious results of his death and resurrection, then the reason for connecting in the history the transfiguration and those teachings is obvious enough. But if a different view of it be taken, it will be difficult to account for this marked connexion in all the narratives.

2. In a typical scene, we expect to find representative characters; and in the transfiguration, if it pictures that in which the Church has a share, we may look for representatives of the

Church. These we have in this scene. Our Lord took with him Peter, James, and John; and they met with Moses and Elias. Now, what better representatives of the Church, under the Old Testament dispensation, than Moses and Elijah? Moses was the lawgiver of Israel, the founder, under God, of that dispensation. Elijah was a prominent prophet—perhaps the most prominent after Moses; at least, he was so conspicuous as to be made the type of the forerunner of the Messiah, who came in the spirit and power of Elias. And who could more fitly represent the Church, under the Christian dispensation, than these three intimate associates of our Lord, who were soon to be as foundation-stones in the spiritual structure?

Or take another view of these representative characters. Here was Moses, the giver of the law that was broken, but which was to be made honorable by the redemption whose results were here set forth. Here was Elijah, the "Prophet of Fire," who sternly threatened vengeance for the breaking of that law, and who called the people of a most degenerate age to repentance, like his antitype, who came to prepare the way of the Lord before him, preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins. And here were those who should soon go and preach the gospel of salvation through an atoning Saviour. The representative characters were the lawgiver, the preacher of repentance, and the ministers of gospel mercy. Thus was the Church, the people of God, represented in a scene portraying the glory in which the Church should share.

3. There was, moreover, something in the circumstances of these individuals peculiarly fitting them to be participants in a scene displaying the results of that work of redemption of which the resurrection was the consummation.

The heavenly participants were Moses and Elias. The latter of these two had not tasted death, but had passed in a triumphal chariot to heaven. He was thus, as it were, a risen saint. Although Christ himself was raised as the first fruits of them that slept, yet here was one who, not having tasted death, stood forth figuratively as one risen from the dead. As to the other glorious personage, there was also something peculiar in his rela-

tion to death. He had died, it is true, and he was buried; but no man was witness of his death. God buried him amid the solitudes of the mountains in a valley of Moab over against Beth-Peor; but no man ever knew of his sepulchre. So far as the eye of man was witness, so far as his testimony could go, there was no death nor burial. He, too, was therefore a fit participant in this transaction, typical of the glory secured by a risen Redeemer.*

The three apostles, Peter, James, and John, separated from the others on this occasion, were in like manner separated from the rest on two other most important occasions: first, when he raised to life the daughter of Jairus; and afterwards, when he suffered in the garden.

On the former occasion, he excluded the noisy multitude, and admitted only these three disciples, with the parents of the child; and in their presence he called back the spirit of the departed. This was the first miracle of raising the dead, and therefore specially important in its class. The miracles of Christ seem to have been designed, not simply for the good of those immediately concerned in them, nor simply to attest the divine mission of our Lord, though this was perhaps their chief end; but he made them a means of conveying spiritual truth. This they did, perhaps, more as classes than in their individual circumstances. His healing the sick conveyed to men the idea that he came as the great spiritual Physician for sinning, suffering man. The raising of the dead taught that he would give new life, a triumph over spiritual death, a resurrection to those dead in trespasses and sins. In its symbolical meaning, the raising of the daughter of Jairus was the most important of the miracles of raising the dead, because it was the first. And to this, an earnest of a better and spiritual resurrection to the dead soul, only these

* In his admirable sermon on the Death of Moses, Melvill (the great preacher of the Established Church of England) argues cogently from Scripture to prove that Moses' body was actually raised to grace this transfiguration scene. He makes use of the strange words of Jude, verse 9. That whole sermon is original and striking in a high degree.—EDS. S. P. REVIEW.

three of the apostles were admitted. And when he had restored the maiden to life, he charged them to tell no man. Let it be clothed in mystery for the present at least. The prohibition could not have been perpetual, or the record of the miracle would not have been made. The limit to the charge may have been the same as to that given upon the mount, "till the Son of man be risen from the dead." But let us not anticipate.

Again, only these three were with him in the garden. Here they beheld his agony, and were eye-witnesses of his "strong crying and tears." This was the beginning of "his decease which he should accomplish at Jerusalem." Here it was that he had the severe conflict with the evil one. Here did he begin to "make his soul an offering for sin," when that "soul was exceeding sorrowful even unto death." He was there purchasing that glory in which the redeemed would share.

Those, therefore, whom he took with him to the mount, had been witnesses of that first raising from the dead, the earnest of a better resurrection; and afterwards they were to have the most intimate admission granted to man into the secret chambers of his soul, when he was in the agonies of death. These, then, were the proper participants in a scene emblematic of the glory to which the perfect redemption of Christ, through his death and resurrection, admits the believer.

4. The topic of conversation between our Lord and these visitants from another world is striking. Heavenly beings come to talk of *death*, and that with the *Prince of Life*. They did not speak of heavenly scenes. They did not tell, as they talked with the Son of God, what they had learned of the glory which he had with the Father before the world was. They did not lay before him the bliss they enjoyed in the kingdom of glory. They did not bring down to him the adoring praises of saints and angels in heaven. Such converse would have been consoling to him amid the sufferings and sorrows of earth, had this been the object of their mission. They talked not of these things. "They spake of his decease which he should accomplish at Jerusalem." And yet this topic, strange for a scene of glory, is in beautiful harmony with the view we have taken of the transfigu-

ration. In that death was the foundation of all his glory as Mediator, and that of his people. By that death was he to purchase his glorious mediatorial kingdom. All the glory displayed in this scene, which the Church shared with him through their representatives, was based upon that death. Until he had suffered it, until he had finished the work assigned him,—and that was a work of death,—he could not be again glorified with the Father, nor bring his people to glory. Only with the blood that he would then shed could he enter into the holy of holies.

That death he was to accomplish or “fulfil” (*πληροῦν*). He was not only to suffer death, but to complete all the demands of death, to fill out the requirements of the curse, and hence to accomplish a perfect triumph over death. It was that death which was to end in a glorious triumph of which they spoke.

And this is the grand theme of heavenly converse, in the glorified Church, represented by these prophets upon the holy mount. They who have entered with their Lord into glory ascribe all their blessedness to the Lamb that was slain. Their robes are made white in his blood. Could we listen to their heavenly communings, we would hear them talking, as did the two of their number who appeared in glory upon the mount, “of the decease he accomplished at Jerusalem” in their behalf, and of his glorious triumph over death. This is the source of all their heavenly blessedness. They look back to Calvary and the opening tomb, as Moses and Elias looked forward to them when they were yet in the future. There is nothing of heaven for the redeemed but that which Jesus purchased.

Thus does the topic of conversation in the transfiguration connect this scene of glory with the redeeming work of Christ.

5. When the wonderful scene had passed away, and Jesus and the disciples were about to come down from the mount, he straightly charged them to tell the vision to no man till after the Son of man was risen from the dead. This very peculiar charge, whilst it shuts out other explanations of this event, supports the view we have taken of the transfiguration. It was not to be made known till after the Son of man was risen from the dead, because the scene portrayed the results of that work which

would be completed in the resurrection. When the Son of man should be risen from the dead, then would he have the testimony of heaven to the completeness of his work of redemption. Then would this significant act, raising him from the dead, proclaim that the sacrifice was accepted, and that the blessed results of his work portrayed on the mount were his by right. The transfiguration scene was based upon such a consummation. Without it, it was unmeaning. He did not therefore choose to make it public until it could have its full import. He would display to the world in type his glory and that of the redeemed only when he could accompany it with the evidence of its reality. But for this connexion between the transfiguration and the resurrection, we can see no reason for the charge of secrecy.

This charge to the disciples perhaps throws some light upon another important transaction, about which but little is said in Scripture—the meeting with the disciples on a mountain in Galilee after the resurrection. Dr. Moore, in his charming little volume, “*The Last Days of Jesus*,” regards this appearance on the mountain in Galilee as identical with that mentioned by Paul in 1 Cor. xv. 6: “After that he was seen of above five hundred brethren at once.” And he also connects this with the transfiguration scene, which he supposes was then reënacted upon the same mountain in presence of the great body of believers, when the charge of secrecy was removed, and the former event made public. His whole chapter on this subject is worthy of thoughtful perusal, and is most refreshing to the pious heart. The views there presented would of course be modified by the different view which we have taken of the design of the transfiguration. But, as this latter event rather receives light from the former than casts light upon it, we need not here pursue this investigation.

6. When we come to look upon the scene of the transfiguration itself, there is every thing to impress us with the idea of “*excellent glory*.” Whatever be its connexion or design, the whole is radiant with glory. The countenance of our Lord was changed so that his face shone as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light. It appears that his was not a borrowed splendor; but the brilliancy of his glorious face lighted up the

scene upon the mount of transfiguration. We are carried in thought to the heavenly mounts in that better country, that need no light of sun or moon, for the Lamb is the light thereof. His spotless raiment, white as the drifted snow upon the mountain tops, is an emblem of the spotless purity of his own accepted righteousness, accepted as the risen and triumphant Redeemer; and we connect it with his glorious attire in the heavenly city, and are reminded, too, of the robes of the saints that he has made white in his own blood. The heavenly personages that meet him also appear in glory. They come in their heavenly state, bringing that much of what belongs to the upper kingdom to meet below the Lord of that kingdom. To picture the law-giver and the prophet as they appeared in this scene, we must be able to picture heavenly beings. How they appear, we do not, we cannot, know. But this we know, that when we shall see our Lord, we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is. And we suppose that in this scene Moses and Elias were like our Lord, reflecting his glory. The bright cloud that overshadowed them was doubtless the Shekinah, the symbol of the divine presence. When the first tabernacle was dedicated, "a cloud covered the tent of the congregation, and the glory of the Lord filled the tabernacle." And so now the glory of the Lord enveloped and filled the scene of the transfiguration. And from the "excellent glory," as Peter terms it, there came a voice: "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." Such is the typical display of the glory purchased by our Lord.

The chief figure of this glorious scene was the Lord himself. And his own glory was the chief end of his redeeming work. All things were made by him and for him. He came to purchase, by his sufferings and death, a mediatorial kingdom over which he should reign for ever and ever. And we are taught to look forward to his coming in power and glory, as the Supreme Ruler of that kingdom. It is in connexion with this that Peter mentions the transfiguration in his Second Epistle. This is his language: "We have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eye-witnesses of his majesty. For

he received from God the Father honor and glory, when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. And this voice which came from heaven we heard, when we were with him in the holy mount." Peter had before made known to those to whom his epistle is addressed the power and coming of our Lord. This, we suppose, was his future appearing in glory, that consummation of his mediatorial work to which the Church still looks forward. In making this known to them, he now avers he had not followed cunningly devised fables, for he was himself an eyewitness of his majesty, and heard the voice from the excellent glory, when he was with the Lord in the holy mount. He refers to the transfiguration scene to confirm his declaration of the power and coming of the Lord. And so we have maintained that this scene portrays that glory for himself and the redeemed, of which his final coming will be the glorious consummation. It looks forward to that coming in power when he shall gather all the blessed fruits of his redeeming work; when "he shall see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied;" when "the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him," and "shall sit upon the throne of his glory."

One feature of the glory of this typical transaction, referred to by Peter, was the voice that came from "the excellent glory:" "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." Thus the glorified Redeemer "received from God the Father honor and glory." And when would we expect the Father to express his approbation of his well-beloved Son more than in the midst of this scene which was displaying the glorious results of his perfected work of redeeming love?

Our Lord's glory, as the result of his work of redemption, is chief in design and first in excellence; yet all the redeemed share that glory with him. In the typical scene on the mount, the representative characters shared the glory with him; and yet they did not participate alike in it. The lawgiver and the prophet appeared in glory as they talked with Jesus; whilst the apostles only beheld the glory. The former had already entered into their glorious inheritance: they represented those whose

redemption was complete. The latter were of the Church militant: they were not yet glorified. They beheld that of which they should afterwards partake. And so all the redeemed, like their representatives from heaven, shall be glorified with their Lord. When the Lord Jesus was pleading with the Father for the very glory here portrayed, based upon his finished work, he said of his disciples: "The glory which thou gavest me I have given them." And again: "Father, I will that they also, whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am; that they may behold my glory, which thou hast given me." Jesus has taught us, that when he shall sit upon his mediatorial throne, we shall also sit upon thrones with him; that when he shall be crowned King of kings and Lord of lords, we also shall wear the crowns of life which he, the Lord of life, shall give us; that whilst he only is equal with the Father, we shall be kings and priests unto God; that when he shall be glorified, we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is; and "we all, with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord."

The earthly representatives in the transfiguration were not prepared for such glory. "They were heavy with sleep" on this occasion, as they were afterwards when witnesses of the agony in Gethsemane. They were full of fears and perplexities; they understood not what was passing before their eyes. And yet, though not themselves appearing in glory, like the visitants from heaven, they beheld the glory. Yea, they were entranced with it. They found it good to be there; and had it been lawful, they would have lingered long upon the mount, unfitted as they were by their drowsiness, and their fears, and their imperfect knowledge, for that scene of excellent glory.

Like our representatives on the mount, we cannot, whilst on earth, "appear in glory;" and yet we have an interest in the transfiguration. We may at least look upon the glorious redemption that God has revealed to us in his word; we may behold the glory that shines forth in bright and beautiful similitudes from the mount, and by faith appropriate it as ours. Yea, more: we may have foretastes of that glory. We have not yet entered

upon our "inheritance incorruptible and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven;" but we have at least "an earnest of our inheritance." We have here something of the glorious redemption purchased by our Lord. We are justified, adopted, regenerated, sanctified. We have peace with God; we have joy in the Holy Ghost. Ours even here is a blessed portion. "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him. But God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit." "They are spiritually discerned." The more nearly we are drawn into communion with our Lord, the more do we behold and share his glory. We may in our heavenly communings, under the influence of the Holy Spirit, realise the presence of our blessed Lord with us; and though "we now see through a glass darkly," yet we may have such views of the great work of redemption and of the glory of our Redeemer, in which we share, that we will be constrained to say, with the bewildered but delighted apostle, "It is good to be here." By reason of the spiritual drowsiness of our souls, we may not be aware how blessed is our portion; but when we shall be awakened, we will behold the glory; and although not yet glorified, we shall enter into those glorious scenes, where our Lord is the object of adoring love.

In the words of a writer already referred to: "It is enough for us to know that there is a mount of ordinances where we, too, may meet Jesus and see him in his glory by the eye of faith. As we retire from the world and ascend that mount, in the quiet of solitary prayer, or in the communings of the great congregation, we, too, may have precious glimpses of him whom our souls love."

ARTICLE V.

AN EFFICIENT MINISTRY.

The entire consecration of time and energy and talent to the work of the ministry, is one of the necessary conditions of success in this holy calling. One great want of the Church, which ever has been felt more or less distinctly, is a body of ministers earnest and devoted, bending every power, physical and spiritual, to the duties and labors of their high office. The Bible gives great prominence to this whole-souled consecration to the ministerial work. Even apostles, when resigning the less spiritual work of the Church into other hands, say, "We will give ourselves continually to prayer, and to the ministry of the word." In this simple expression is found much to explain their amazing success. Even the supernatural endowments conferred upon them did not relieve them from the necessity of giving themselves continually to their work. Again we quote the words of inspiration: "Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine." "But watch thou in all things, endure afflictions, do the work of an evangelist, make full proof of thy ministry." "Meditate on these things, give thyself wholly to them, that thy profiting may appear to all." He who gave himself for the Church and gave his ministers to the Church, can require and expect nothing less than that they give themselves to it. A pastor should have nothing at heart but the glory of God and the salvation of souls. This should be his delight, his meat, his life. This is his work, his business, his calling; and to this all other things must be subordinated. For this work God has called him, and separated him, and endowed him, and fitted him, and laid upon his soul those mighty responsibilities which, but for divine help, would crush the highest angel. A plain path is set before him, and he must walk in it. His work is all laid out so that he cannot mistake it; and woe to the laggard, woe to

the man who deals with a slack hand. In the true spirit of our work, we should let others serve tables; let others mind earthly things; let the potsherd of the earth strive against the potsherd of the earth; yea, let the dead bury their dead; but let nothing whatever detain us from the present and imperative duty, "Go thou and preach of the kingdom of God." The pastor must say to all lower demands, with Nehemiah, "I am doing a great work, so that I cannot come down;" he may not, he dare not, he must not come down.

There is an ample field in the pastoral work for the largest endowments and the most exalted powers. Every energy of the physical or intellectual or moral nature may be taxed to the utmost tension, and then much will be left undone. Passion, and feeling, and reason, and imagination may here exert themselves to the utmost. No topics within the wide range over which the human mind expatiates can be compared to those with which the minister has to do. The most intense agitation of the emotional nature ever brought to bear upon the truth of God, falls below the commanding theme. Whatever is vivid in conception, lucid in statement, powerful in argument—in short, all that is forcible and discriminating as well as discursive, which the preacher can command, may be employed and exhausted, and yet fall immeasurably below the all-important and varied subjects which he handles. There is no vigor of thought, no exercise of feeling, however tender or elevating, which does not find here its appropriate field. Every good passion of the human soul may be expressed here, and in every degree, from the most calm and tranquil to the most agitated. If you have tears of compassion and sympathy, here you may weep them; if you have emotions of joy and triumph, you may here give them vent; if you have righteous indignation burning like a volcano in your soul, here you may pour it out like the seething red-hot lava. It is not possible to feel too much, or too long, or too deeply, or too intensely upon such themes as engage the attention of the minister. The shining of Moses' face when he came down from the mount; what Paul felt when he was taken up into the third heavens; the burning kindled in the hearts of the two disciples by the

Saviour's talk—are examples of the state of mind which the truth of God is capable of producing, even in creatures whose foundation is in the dust. Angels desire to look into these things; their mighty minds cannot fully grasp them; they are amazed and confounded before them, and in contemplating them they cover their faces with their wings. There is nothing like them in mere human knowledge. That is a power in the soul and a power in the earth; but in its influence it is infinitely below divine truth. Error has no such power even in the fitful, sporadic efforts of the sincere devotee or crazy fanatic; it may blaze up with a great heat, but soon dies away, to be forgotten and felt no more. The intense solicitude which the mind sometimes experiences when the kingdom of God is brought to bear upon and fully possesses it, made Welch say, "Stay thy hand, O Lord; thy servant is a clay vessel and can hold no more." It has crushed a few into premature graves. It is a blessed arrangement that the full impression which divine things are fitted to make upon us is not experienced in this world. They come to us shaded and tempered, and they do not strike directly upon our minds in all their tremendous force; yet it were well to be more deeply imbued with this feeling. It will not be felt in its power till this mortal shall put on immortality, but we may well long to feel it more. We would do well to know more of the power of divine truth to produce this solicitude, and its fitness to command and absorb our every energy; and well to be baptized with this baptism of fire.

The men of the world are absorbed in their several pursuits: the worshippers of Mammon in their thirst for gain; the ambitious in their reaching after power; the giddy, fevered crowd in their search for pleasure; and the literary in their efforts to secure the plaudits of fame. All these are immersed in their objects almost to madness, and their burning zeal attracts every thing around them to feed its flame. All who succeed in any worldly business are enthusiasts. Their schemes and projects are never absent from their minds. Working or thinking, or both together, day and night, in company or alone, awake or

asleep, their pursuits possess their souls and exercise all their powers, occupy their time, and absorb them entirely. It is this engagedness, this absorbing interest, this full enlistment of all a man's powers, that the pulpit needs to make it effective.

It would be easy to analyse that entire devotion to the pastoral work which is needed; to single out its elements and hold them up to notice. There is nothing difficult or mysterious about such an analysis. There is a vivid apprehension of the knowledge of God which is unto salvation, and a sense of the overtowering importance of divine truth, its preciousness and its adaptedness to man's moral wants. Then there is a desire, sincere and strong, to glorify God by making known this truth; and a sense of obligation, deep and ever-present, of indebtedness to that Saviour by whose grace and sacrifice alone we can be saved; and a sympathy with and compassion for the lost and perishing of earth. These are the constituents, which, compounded together in a man, fill him with zeal and power, and make him worthy to be the gift of the ascending Saviour to the flock he purchased with his blood.

This is the matter stated in words, yet who can understand it? It passeth knowledge. Our dwarfed and contracted minds cannot rise to the importance, the unmeasured vastness, of our work; we cannot reach its mountain heights; we cannot take in its mighty proportions. It is higher than heaven, deeper than hell. We are children gathering shells upon the shore, while the great ocean lies beyond, unfathomed and uncrossed. We are pigmies standing beside some Mt. Blanc, which rears its summit beyond the clouds. We may well fall upon our faces and ask, "Who is sufficient for these things?" Is such a work to be performed in fractions of time or moments of leisure redeemed from other engagements, or with energies that have flagged and been well-nigh exhausted in other pursuits? The thought is an impertinence; it is disloyalty to the Church's King; it is blasphemy against his holy-name.

The history of the Church furnishes two great examples of full consecration to the work of the ministry, which ought to be carefully pondered. The Saviour's whole soul was in his work—

intent upon it, subordinating relative obligations, personal convenience, and even present necessity, to the main business. No moment was wasted upon trifles. What unwearied activity! Never was an opportunity of usefulness lost. Even the common courtesies of life on public occasions were improved as vehicles of the most important instruction. The thought of relinquishing his work was intolerable to him: "I must be about my Father's business." Even Peter, who was admitted to his most intimate friendship, received the severest rebuke when he attempted to dissuade him from his work. The labors of a single day were unprecedented in ministerial records. What scores could not have done in a life-time, was compressed by him into the narrow space of three years. With the spirit of entire consecration to the work of the ministry, the apostle of the Gentiles followed this blessed example. He was a burning flame of earnestness and zeal and activity. He had a heart and tongue to speak where there was an ear to hear, "even at Rome." His own account of one of his courses of labor is a wonder. He commenced his work the very first day he came into Asia—publicly, from house to house, declaring the whole counsel of God; keeping back nothing that was profitable; warning every man night and day, for three years; outwardly exposed to the malice of his enemies, and inwardly pressed in his spirit by a tender fervor and compassion, which could find no vent but in tears. Thus could he testify, "God is my witness, whom I serve in the gospel of his Son." Think of him laboring more abundantly than all the other apostles; of his imprisonment and bitter persecutions and scourgings; of his perils by robbers and false brethren; of his shipwrecks and his wearisome travels. In the immense success of his preaching and in the whole life of Paul, there is a study which the Church of earth will not exhaust. The secret of his achievements was not the learning or the supernatural endowments which he sometimes exercised; but in his devotion, his being swallowed up in the work of him from whom "he obtained mercy." The same grace that made him what he was, is within our reach.

It is this self-oblivion that makes the efficient pastor. This is

the grand requisite; all other things are subsidiary. Learning, eloquence, natural gifts, important as they all are, must take a lower seat. They can effect but little without the former; but associated with it, they constitute a man thoroughly furnished and making full proof of his ministry. Such a man will be blessed in his labors. They cannot be in vain. The Master will look down upon him with his sweetest smiles. If heaven has blessings to bestow, they will come upon such a man. If there is a place on this earth that draws to it, more than any other, the interested attention of heavenly beings, it is the field in which such a man labors. He has meat to eat of which the world knows not; he is fed with the hidden manna, and it will be his to wear a crown and obtain rewards and share a bliss which others will not reach. Such men are the useful and successful men in the ministry. They may be destitute of much that is highly esteemed among men; they may have no rare gifts; their attainments in all human knowledge may be very moderate; they may know but little of systematic theology or the rules of homiletics, and much else that we gather from libraries and seminaries; but they can do this—they can preach the gospel acceptably and successfully. Put a man in any community, with every conceivable disadvantage around him, and let him have the spirit of his Master and of Paul, and results will be brought about which eternity only will disclose, but much of which will be seen and felt even by the blindest and dullest. The truth will be seen to be effective in the edification of saints and the conversion of precious souls, and the most profound respect will be extorted from an unbelieving world. If it is a delusion to believe that such a man could not continue for long in an unblest ministry, it is a delusion from which we hope never to be delivered. Such a ministry will be blessed, if there is truth in God's word, if there is truthfulness in the Head of the Church.

We would ever listen more respectfully to the man who has done a thing himself successfully than to what even a Butler or a Bacon might say who had not done it. We ask attention now to what a plain, ordinary minister of the gospel once said, who,

by a single sermon, was once the instrument of converting about five hundred souls: "Earnest faith and prayer, a single aim at the glory of God and the good of the people, a sanctified heart and carriage, shall avail much for right preaching. There is sometimes somewhat in preaching that cannot be ascribed to the matter or expression, and cannot be described what it is or from whence it came; but with a sweet violence it pierceth into the heart and affections, and comes immediately from the Lord." He says further: "I never preached but two sermons that I would desire to see in print, and both of these times I had spent the whole night before in conference and prayer with some Christian brethren, without any more than ordinary preparation. Otherwise my gifts were rather suited to simple, common people, than to learned, judicious auditors."

Brainerd's devotion to the missionary work is finely described by Robert Hall as "such an absorption of the whole soul in zeal for the divine glory and the salvation of men, as had scarcely been paralleled since the age of the apostles."

The great want of the Church is a ministry baptized with this spirit of entire consecration. Without this, she will ever be cursed with an inefficient ministry. Our Presbyterian Church, in common with others, lies under this blighting, withering, blasting curse. We have men of learning, and men of eloquence, and men of great commanding powers; but we have not, as a whole, nor, it is to be feared, as to the larger part, men who give themselves wholly to the ministry of the word. Many on whom the hands of the presbytery have been placed, and who go through a restricted routine of what they call pastoral work, have never entered into the spirit of the preacher's mission, or felt its awful responsibilities, or performed its duties. An inefficient ministry is a greater evil to the Church than one morally corrupt or grossly erroneous. These last, by their glaring unfitness, prepare the way for their own remedy. But an orthodox, moral, inefficient ministry, is Satan's grand device to cripple activities, blight spirituality, and bring deadness upon a Church. Give us men of ordinary capacity who are eaten up with zeal for the Master's glory and whose hearts melt in com-

passion over dying sinners, and the cause of God will go on in the world. Books and periodicals teem with directions about how to make sermons and how to deliver them when made; but let us have devoted men in our pulpits, and they will make sermons and preach them, too, in a way that God will bless to the good of souls. They may not have the primness and rhetorical polish with which moderatism once flourished in Scotland, or the "decent gentility" under which all that is vital and precious in the English Establishment has been drained away; but they will have the power of God.

Whatever interposes to prevent us giving ourselves continually to prayer and the ministry of the word, helps to promote an inefficient ministry and retard the cause of God. We had intended to notice at length some of these hindrances, but we must pass over them rapidly, as this article is intended to be suggestive rather than exhaustive.

The first of these hindrances we would mention is a *want of real grace*. If Scott and Chalmers, and many others of whom we know, could preach the gospel for years without experiencing its power, is it uncharitable to suppose that such instances occur now? Deception, indeed, is an easier thing in the pulpit than in the pew. The constant handling of sacred things, when not sanctified, tends greatly to blind the mind and harden the heart. The most hopeless cases of unconversion in the Church are found in the ministry. Such are rarely awakened. They have resisted the Spirit and are left without hope. Where such cases exist, whether many or few, and whatever may be the proportion they bear to the whole, this want of grace, whatever may be their other qualifications, utterly precludes their entering fully into the ministerial work. We must believe, and *therefore* speak. We must experience the power and preciousness of God's grace and the faithfulness of his word; we must experience faith in and love to the Saviour; we must experience the influences of the Spirit, before we can exhibit aright these things to others. A sermon, to be effective, must be first preached to ourselves. It is the felt experience of the virtue of divine truth that gives a glow and unction to preaching, which no arts of the orator or

adventitious circumstances of any sort can impart to it. The minister who does not profit himself by his study and preaching, can never edify a people. Baxter says, with that peculiar solemnity and pungency for which he is so remarkable: "Verily, it is the common danger and calamity of the Church to have unregenerate and inexperienced pastors, and to have so many men become preachers before they are Christians; to be sanctified by dedication to the altar as God's priests before they are sanctified by dedication to Christ as his disciples; and so to worship an unknown God, and to preach an unknown Christ, an unknown Spirit, an unknown state of holiness and communion with God and glory, that is unknown and likely to be unknown forever. He is likely to be a heartless preacher that hath not the Christ and grace that he preacheth in his heart."

The *want of self-denial* is another hindrance. Of all men, the pastor is to deny himself; not to please the flesh; to give up his ease and convenience, and even necessary food and sleep, when they interfere with duty. It was an apostle who said: "I keep under my body and bring it into subjection, lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a castaway." Eliot said to a ministerial brother what needs to be said to all who hold the office: "Study mortification, brother—study mortification." "I have always considered," said Johnson, "a clergyman as the father of a larger family than he is able to maintain. I do not envy a clergyman's life as an easy one; nor do I envy the clergyman who makes it an easy life." The preacher, of course, needs his seasons of relaxation; neither the physical nor mental powers must be kept on the stretch too long. Perhaps Cecil did wrong in cutting the strings of his violin and throwing away his painter's brush. But proper recreation is greatly removed from a life of indolence. To be a Christian requires great self-denial; to be a minister, in the right sense, requires this grace in much higher exercise. He must condescend to men of low estate; he must be all things to all men; he must bear with the ignorance and prejudices and doubts and infirmities of others; he must often give up his tastes and preferences, and must do many things irksome to the

flesh. In his studies and manner of life and intercourse with others, there will be daily draughts upon his self-denial. In trivial matters, great watchfulness is called for, from the fact that danger is not here suspected. If we could attend the *post mortem* examination of many a minister, we would find that he died of taking his ease, of being over-fed, of the cultivation of morbid appetites, of the excessive use of tobacco or opium, not to speak of other stimulants. Without a readiness to give up our preferences, without ordinary temperance, it is not possible to consecrate ourselves entirely to the duties of the ministerial office.

The *love of money* in the ministry helps greatly to retard its efficiency and make the Church a reproach to the world. Judas and Demas have had their successors in every age. The deceitfulness of riches has ready access to a minister's heart, and often finds there a genial soil. The terrible warnings against this evil which abound throughout the Bible are needed by him; he is not above them or beyond their reach. The frequency with which the Scriptures connect this selfish principle with the sacred office is itself a fearful truth, and fitted to warn the servant of God against this most dangerous and most prevalent temptation. This evil is not confined to religious establishments; nor are we to look for examples of it only in the dark ages. The present advanced state of religion has not left it among the fossils. It deserves to be considered whether the constant thought and talk about "more interesting fields of labor," which are somehow generally associated with larger salaries, and the prominence given to "ministerial support" in our periodicals and church courts, does not indicate the stronghold that filthy lucre has upon our hearts. Make your ministers what they ought to be, and they will not lack for adequate support.

Another hindrance, which always has had influence in the Church and at this moment exists as an alarming evil, is the *engagement of ministers in secular pursuits*. That a man can make full proof of his ministry and at the same time run a farm, or teach a school, or be a professor in a college, is an utter

impossibility. The attempt to defend such a course argues a very low conception of the sacred office. We believe it is Cecil who made the remark—at least, a true one, whoever was its author—that “the devil does not care how a minister is employed, so it is not in his proper work.” That employment may be honorable and honest and useful in itself, whether it be in trade, or literature, or science, or politics; it matters not, he is not giving himself fully to his work as a minister. The utter incompatibility of any secular pursuit, except what will afford necessary relaxation, with pastoral work, must be admitted by every one who has ordinary intelligence. A merchant, or farmer, or editor, or teacher, through the week, and a preacher on the Sabbath! Is any thing more preposterous? Is the preacher’s office to be put on and off as a man would put on and off a black coat? That English clergymen of the literary class have made invaluable contributions to the cause of learning, classical, scientific, literary, we are free to admit; and we admit, too, that such ministers in this country have done good service as teachers and authors; but have they done the work to which God called them when he put them into the ministry? We would utter no harsh judgment; but faithfulness compels us to say, that notwithstanding the good claimed for such labors, infinite mischief to the cause of religion is traceable to a secularized ministry. The excuses generally relied on for engaging in worldly pursuits are not satisfactory to any enlightened conscience, and will not bear the scrutiny of the last day. Ministers may fail of other things; they may somehow get along on what are called inadequate salaries; but if they would secure the approval and blessing of their Master, they must not entangle themselves with the affairs of this life.

Another impediment in the way of entire consecration to pastoral work is *spiritual pride*. “This,” says Edwards, who looked far deeper into the human heart than others, “offers to Satan his main advantage over the Christian.” To no class of Christians is this remark more applicable than to ministers: He is honored of God and acceptable to those to whom he preaches the word of the kingdom; they are almost ready to do sacrifice

to him. How easy is it for him to think more highly of himself than he ought to think! How hard is it for him to walk humbly with God! What large supplies of grace does such a man need! Few pastors are proof against the temptation of enlarged success. There are those who can bear poverty or reproach or the bitterest persecution, but who could not bear to be successful in their work. This would turn their heads, inflate their hearts with vanity, and bring down upon them the curses of heaven. There are ministers who take but little interest in the conversion of sinners, except through their own instrumentality. They wish for eminence rather than usefulness. They want to stand alone. They cannot admire superior talents when consecrated to their own Master. With them God's glory is a matter subordinated to their own glory. Old Cotton Mather called pride "the besetting sin of young ministers." When we first saw this years ago, we thought it the judgment of an old man in his dotage, and who had lost his sympathy with the young; but our experience and observation since has abundantly confirmed its truth. Many young ministers seem to be well qualified for their work, excepting a woful deficiency of humility; this is the fly that gives the stinking savor to their ointment. "I did," or "I do;" "I said," or "I say;" "I thought," or "I think;" and, above all, "I preached;" it's *I* and *me* and *mine*. The insufferably disgusting stuff oozes from every pore till their presence becomes a nuisance. Alas! how many fish for compliments; they preach and labor for the praise of men; the end they seek is the good opinion of others. They sacrifice to their net and burn incense to their drag. Ministers, old as well as young, ought to be reminded that they serve one who will not give his glory to another. And their own experience should teach them that the ministrations which brought them the most honor from men have often been most scantily furnished with tokens of the Master's presence and power. It is never so well with us as when we are content, with Paul, to be fools for Christ's sake; weak and despised and ready to glory in our infirmities that the power of Christ may rest upon us.

We present, as a last hindrance to an efficient ministry, the

want of Presbyterian control. That the Presbytery should exercise a most tender but watchful oversight towards all its churches and all its ministers, cannot be questioned for a moment. This spiritual care is, we apprehend, the main purpose of the Presbytery. We doubt very much if it can legitimately do any thing else. To license, ordain, and instal a pastor, and then turn him loose amongst his people without any presbyterial supervision, has always seemed to us the entire prostitution of its work and authority. We believe that, in our day and country, as long as a man shall refrain from conduct grossly immoral, or as long as he shall not preach glaring heresy, he may speculate in cotton or operate in stocks, and do a hundred other things inconsistent with the duties of his holy calling, and never be arraigned at the bar of his Presbytery for a violation of ministerial names. Until our courts are brought to know and to perform their proper work, we have but little hope of the Church.

We have pointed out in the foregoing pages what we see clearly to be one of the main causes of our slow progress as a Church. It is because the highest and most influential office in the Church is filled with men, who, notwithstanding their orthodoxy and talents, are but dry and empty cisterns. This is the corrupt fountain that pours its polluting waters over the whole Church. And we seldom see this subject discussed in our periodicals or judicatories. By some tacit but criminal truce, we have agreed for the most part to let it alone. And yet it is one of those evils that does not work its own remedy; it is never sloughed off and left behind. Every hour that it is undisturbed, it gathers strength; and even now, if that action was applied which the case clearly demands, it would shake our Church in its every timber. As a denomination, the Presbyterian Church in the South, is, in some respects, lagging behind some of her sisters, and unless we bestir ourselves we may soon be left in the distance. One hope left us is in laying the hand of presbyterial power upon every inefficient man and binding him in the harness; and if he proves refractory, casting him out of the ministry. If we cannot arouse the courage of our courts to do this, we must, as a Church, sink lower and lower. One working man, sur-

charged with the spirit of his calling, is of more worth than dozens who hold the office, but do not the work of the true minister.

If the ministry has been slandered in this article, none will rejoice at the discovery more heartily than we shall. We have not sought to spare ourselves. With others, we would lie in the dust before God and confess in deepest contrition past sins of commission and omission; and implore anew those endowments of grace and that baptism of the Holy Ghost which we all need for our responsible and holy work.

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF 1869.

ORGANISATION, ETC.

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, which met in the city of Mobile on the 20th of May, 1869, was the ninth in succession. The attendance of commissioners was larger than ever before. The fifty-four Presbyteries composing the immediate constituency of this body are entitled to an aggregate of one hundred and sixteen representatives. Of these one hundred and six were present—fifty-seven ministers and forty-nine ruling elders. Had there been one more minister and nine additional ruling elders, the roll would not have had a single blank. The only Presbytery which was unrepresented is that of "Indian," in the Synod of Arkansas. The Synod of Kentucky, with its seven Presbyteries, gave fourteen commissioners to this Assembly, which none of its predecessors could claim. But the Augusta Assembly only was larger (by one) than this would have been had the Presbyteries then represented been exclusively represented now. We regard this full attendance as a healthful indication. It exhibits a church conscience alive to the importance of giving impressiveness and efficiency to our highest ecclesiastical court. It well displays,

too, the unity of the body, and the interest that is attached to making this unity fully visible. It reveals, likewise, an aroused concern touching all those grave and great questions which routine brings up for annual discussion, but of which the Church is resolved that routine shall not dully dispose. We trust that our Presbyteries shall never permit themselves to become remiss in the duty of sending commissioners to the General Assemblies yet to convene in the better and brighter future that seems to await our beloved Church, nor fail in selecting such men as shall have wisdom and grace to transact, with conspicuous fidelity, the Church's common business on this, one of the "high-places of the field."

We have mentioned the Synod of Kentucky. It may not be unfitting to say that the representatives from the different Presbyteries within the bounds of this great Synod, although they could not be received into the Assembly by any demonstrations of public welcome, were nevertheless greeted on all hands by the members from the other Presbyteries in a manner that was at once graceful and expressive. The only method by which the body as a whole was allowed to exhibit the cordiality of a friendly salutation towards the delegation whose presence gave so much sincere pleasure, was promptly adopted. One of its seven ministers was chosen, and unanimously chosen, Moderator. This choice, however, had for its special object a man, who, independently of his connexion with a Synod which it was an intention of all to honor, was himself eminently entitled to the high distinction to which he was called. The Rev. Dr. STUART ROBINSON was selected; and the manner in which he presided over the deliberations of the Assembly served to add to the great fame which in so many other and different ways he had achieved.

Previously to this election, the opening sermon had been preached by the Rev. Dr. JNO. N. WADDEL, the Moderator of the preceding Assembly. It is quite proper to say that never was there a discourse delivered on any similar occasion which had more of the elements that are thought to contribute to perfection in this limited department of pulpit oratory. We hope that it has been generally read throughout the Church, and we are

sure that it will be filed away by all who have read it among their best pamphlet treasures. Those who heard it delivered cannot soon forget the impression it made with equal force upon their minds and their hearts. We cannot refrain from quoting the following sentences, which occurred towards the close of this discourse :

“Let me not be charged with uttering language of vain self-complacency, when I assert that the Southern Presbyterian Church is called in the providence of God to occupy a position second in interest and importance to none in all the earth. Feeble and sorely broken by the desolations of war, maligned and accused falsely by those who persistently refuse to understand her position, embarrassed in her means by the drying up of the pecuniary resources of the country, nevertheless it cannot be hid from our eyes that God has called us to occupy all the great fields of Christian enterprise, as though our organisation were old and long settled, and not as it in truth is, in its very infancy. China calls us, and the red man of our western wilds look to us, and the South American empires are demanding our zeal and our labors, and Italy is turning to us in her priest-ridden condition; and into all these places this infant branch of Christ's Church has already sent forth at the command of her Lord laborers to reap the white harvest. All over this land, even in its desolation and sorrow, the cry comes to us from many a darkened region, ‘Come and help us;’ ‘our beautiful temples are burned, our brethren are scattered, we are without any one to feed the lambs of the flock; send us the man of God to break to us the bread of life.’ The young men of the Church, ardently desirous of entering into the Lord's vineyard, tell us they would go forward and be content to take the lowest place in the ranks of God's servants could they but get the material help they need. Two hundred and fifty such youths throughout this broad land stand in readiness to put on the whole armor of God and go forth to fight the battle of the Lord, whenever in his providence he shall lead the Church to put forth her helping hand and furnish the means for their training.

“Lastly, while we behold on every side fanaticism and political influence invading the churches in other regions, while we behold the former champions of the truth inviting and receiving back into the very bosom of their communion error once denounced and never yet forsaken, we see that this persecuted but unfor-saken Church of ours presents to the view of the world the only

representative on this continent of the true principles of our faith and order in their unity, peace, and harmony. And while we stand on this ground and challenge denial, we humbly acknowledge, with gratitude, that for this truly honorable position we are indebted to God's free grace and sovereign mercy. 'Not unto us, O Lord, not unto us, but unto thy name give glory, for thy mercy and for thy truth's sake.'

"It follows, then, from these facts, that God has called us with a voice of no uncertain sound to stand in our lot and to do our duty. He has not given us a true creed but to propagate that truth all over the earth. He has not given us such a field of labor but that we should occupy it. He has not given us a desolate land, burnt sanctuaries, scattered churches, but that from the very ashes of their desolation we should feel called upon to 'arise and build.' He has not put it into the hearts of so many of the sons of the Church to preach the gospel at a time when the ministry of the word as a profession offers fewer secular attractions than ever before, but that the great heart of the Church should be stirred to its profoundest chambers by this astonishing fact of providence, and that the members of Christ's Body should take these young brethren by the hand, and say: 'You shall be trained; no man shall be sent empty away; but we will find the material aid that is needed to fit you for the work to which God is calling you.' He has not taken away our worldly goods and brought us into deep poverty, and humbled us under his mighty hand, and thus purified us in the fires of affliction, but that we should cherish in our own communion that pure faith once delivered to us by our fathers, and earnestly contend for it when assailed and keep it unspotted from the contamination of erroneous doctrine, and from the control of those who would enter in and mar its beauty and purity. Let us realise our position, not for vain glory, but as a stimulus to that fidelity which shall commend us to God and to the Spirit of his Son, whereby we may stand acquitted in the great day of accounts."

In reviewing the proceedings of this Assembly, we shall call attention to the several subjects considered and acted upon, not in the order of their presentation, but of their apparent importance. Among those four organs which are vital to the Church's prosperity as a thoroughly equipped church organisation,—Sustentation, Foreign Missions, Publication, and Education,—it is indeed difficult to discriminate. Each of these is, in its own

place, indispensable. But there is one of them which stands pre-eminent above all the others, as essential to our Church's very existence. We allude to the great fundamental cause of

SUSTENTATION.

It is not three years since this great scheme was inaugurated, but it is now as firmly established in the policy of our Church as it is in the affections of the mass of its membership. Its success has equalled the most sanguine expectations. At the close of the war, our condition as a Church was one of prostration on the verge of helplessness. Many of our ministers were likely to be driven from their sacred calling for lack of support. Hundreds of our church buildings were in ashes. Nine-tenths of our entire membership were impoverished. To the eye of man, the gloom was like that of the borders of death. There was no remedy save in a universal awakening, throughout the Presbyterian congregations of the South, to the necessity of a united effort to sustain the existence of what life was still left in the body, and to provide means for extending a healthful vitality to the remotest and most paralysed members; uniting the whole into one close, compact brotherhood, full of the spirit of mutual help. What was comparatively strong should come to the aid of the comparatively weak. A general treasury was to be opened, into which should flow contributions from all sides, and from which they only should be permitted to draw whose wants were the most pressing. A great missionary fund was to act the part of a heart whose throbs were to be the sympathies of all for the encouragement of the needy and the desponding—sympathies that should flow out in streams of substantial assistance, accompanied, as these were sure to be, by prayer and goodwill. Well, what has been the result? A firmly coherent, united Church, with signs of vigorous life in every part—a Church, which, no longer bemoaning herself in the dust of prostration, but, conscious of a new existence, fairly upon her feet and prepared for the work of enlargement. She is yet poor, but no longer painfully feels her poverty. She is still wanting in some of the elements of full development; but what vigor she

has she realises as enough to enable her to strengthen more and more what remains, and to go forward in aggressive enterprises into the desolations that continue around and beyond her. It is not alone the money that has been collected and disbursed by means of our scheme of Sustentation that has contributed so largely to this result, but also the manner in which the scheme has worked with reference to the point of bringing all the Presbyteries (each of which is by a committee of its own an integral member of the central Committee) into mutual and hearty coöperation for the accomplishment of a common purpose—a coöperation this, which, first completely produced upon the field of Sustentation, has extended itself into those other great fields of the Church's enterprise which are represented in the Executive Committees of Foreign Missions, of Publication, and of Education.

This Assembly was thoroughly awake to the cause upon which so much has depended and yet depends. It listened with intense interest to the reading of the able report presented by the Rev. Dr. J. Leighton Wilson, and then discussed the resolutions brought in by the Standing Committee, with a degree of heartiness and of encouraged determination to push onward in the direction of a still larger success, which gave token of a blessed future for this branch of our operations. One of those resolutions, in deploring the fact that so many of the churches were still in the bad catalogue of non-contributors, goes on to decree thus: "The Assembly hereby enjoins on all the Presbyteries to exercise care in selecting only wise and efficient men for the chairs of the Presbyterial Committees, and that each Presbytery shall hold responsible to its proper censures every church session which neglects to coöperate in a work so important to the life of the Church and the permanence and spread of the gospel." It is herein implied that the principal blame of the delinquencies complained of ought to fall upon those Presbyterial Committees, and especially upon their principal members, the chairmen, whose duty it is to keep the churches informed of the wants of the Assembly's Committee, and to arouse them to a sense of their obligations in the premises. It is also set forth here that

church sessions are subject to disciplinary censure when they shall fail to present the object of Sustentation to their respective churches. Undoubtedly the principal burden of this great work falls upon pastors and sessions, and it is shared onerously by the Presbyterial Committees. Were these parties all to discharge their whole obligation in the matter of obtaining suitable collections from the masses of our widespread membership, there would be no lack of means for carrying forward this noble enterprise to the point where wonders could be performed in the way of grandly building up every where our Church, leaving almost nothing to be desired in this direction. As it is, however, the collections have rapidly augmented from year to year. Whereas in 1867, the Committee reported \$18,256.77 contributed by the churches, in 1868, they report \$14,751.95 for the *six months* that intervened between the Assemblies of 1867 and 1868; and in 1869, report \$26,948.02. A still greater effort may be reasonably expected to be made during the present ecclesiastical year, and we are authorised to hope for a general contribution of at least \$45,000. If this hope should be realised, the Executive Committee could raise the minimum of ministerial salary throughout our bounds to the \$750 authorised by the Assembly—a sum which, although so small in itself, would serve to lift many a worthy pastor above actual want.

Another of these resolutions discourages, we are glad to notice, all appeals to Christian charity abroad in terms of emphatic meaning. We quote it:

“3. That we cannot guard too carefully against the introduction and prevalence of an eleemosynary dependence among our people, and that the Assembly discountenances all appeals made abroad for the reëstablishment of institutions of learning, for the erection or repairs of costly church edifices, and other objects of a kindred nature, beyond the essential and pressing necessities of the present time.”

The period has arrived when, not upon others but upon ourselves, we must depend for the support of our various institutions and the upbuilding of our stricken churches. We ought not, indeed, to decline whatever contributions may be made from

time to time, by friends at the North and elsewhere, in aid of our different enterprises; but to place ourselves in the attitude of a begging Church is at once a needless humiliation, and serves to chill the warmth and check the flow of our own benevolence. The spirit of self-dependence is not the spirit of pride, but of manly self-respect, and is calculated to impart to us a strength which no amount of charities from without, apart from our own regularly sustained efforts, could be expected to furnish.

In connexion with this, it ought to be recorded that the Assembly exhorts "every Presbytery to call the attention of each church in its bounds to the importance of having a *Manse* provided for its pastor;" adding, that "the comfort and usefulness of ministers will be greatly promoted by this measure, and the cords of affection and confidence between pastor and people be greatly strengthened. This is true; and the exhortation might be further urged upon the ground that the provision of a manse is the provision of a considerable addition to the pastor's salary, and thereby the helping on, by so much, of the common cause of Sustentation. We trust that practical heed will be given to this entreaty of the Assembly, for the sake of the good effects that would be so certain to follow.

FOREIGN MISSIONS.

It is highly gratifying to be able to state that this arm of the Assembly's benevolence has gradually increased both in strength and length, since the close of the war. During the first years of our existence as a separate Church organisation, all missionary operations beyond the limits of the purely home work were necessarily confined to the Indian territory—for to this alone could our missionaries find access. But so soon as the termination of the war allowed our people to look upon the world outside, the resolution was formed to bear a part in extending the triumphs of the gospel among the distant nations of the earth. This resolve soon took the shape of money-contributions, and, whilst these were coming in, the further form of men-contributions. The report of the Executive Committee of Foreign Missions, presented at this Assembly by the Secretary, furnishes

the Church with an admirable résumé of what has thus far been accomplished, and opens up the future as still more hopeful than the past. It states that "the receipts from all sources during the eleven months ending the 31st March, 1869, (including \$2,523.99 contributed by Sabbath-schools,) amount to \$18,555.16. If we add to this, \$2,000.00 (about the value of the outfit furnished to the missionaries by the ladies of Richmond, Petersburg, New Orleans, and other places,) the aggregate receipts will be over \$20,000.00." In the preceding eleven months the receipts were only \$12,515.54, so that there has been an advance of sixty per cent. in the same period just closed. This is surely encouraging. The Committee during the last year made efforts to secure as generally as possible the coöperation of the Sabbath-schools in this great work, and these efforts, it is seen from the sum reported above as gathered in these nurseries of the Church, were measurably successful—105 schools having contributed over \$2,500.00, or about \$24.00 to each school. "If," says the report, "proper pains were taken to enlist our Sabbath-schools generally in the work, the above mentioned sum might very easily be trebled if not quadrupled." We think that the Committee are entitled to the thanks of the Church for thus drawing out her children in acts of practical benevolence, if for no other reason than because they have thus commenced to lay the foundations for the grace of giving in the tender minds of the youth, on which these youth, when they shall have reached mature years, will assuredly build, greatly to their own increase of Christian comfort and to the steady enlargement of the treasury of God's house. The habit of giving early formed will be likely to continue in lively exercise throughout subsequent life. As to the number of missionaries who are to be supported the present year, the report says:

"When the four missionaries who are now on their way or soon to leave, together with one missionary brother who will probably go to the Choctaws during the summer or autumn, have all reached their respective stations, the whole missionary force will consist of seventeen regularly ordained missionaries, one licentiate, four female assistant missionaries, and eight native helpers—making in all thirty missionary laborers. This is a

large and weighty responsibility to be assumed by a Church that is just emerging from a condition of extraordinary prostration and impoverishment; but he who has called her to this great honor and laid upon her this heavy responsibility will no doubt impart all the grace necessary to make her walk humbly in the midst of her honors, and bear the full burden of responsibility that has been laid upon her shoulders."

The support of these thirty laborers will require not a small outlay of money, and success in their work not a feeble exercise of the grace of prayer on the part of the Church. But may we not believe that God, who has put it into the hearts of his people to send forth so many laborers into the foreign field, will furnish those hearts with such a growing feeling of interest in this great cause as shall enable them to devise yet more liberal things for the ample maintenance of these laborers and of others who are to follow, and to exhibit a still greater earnestness of supplication for the Master's blessing upon what shall thus be done in obedience to his own command? We may, too, be permitted to express the hope that the members of our Church every where will cease to feel, as too many of them have felt, that the work of missions is to be mainly confined to the field within our own borders, and that they are not called upon to exert themselves in behalf of the outside world with any degree of sustained vigor until our home population shall have been effectually provided with the means of grace. The field is one, and it is all the earth; and the marching order of the Captain of our salvation is: "Go preach the gospel to every creature."

PUBLICATION.

The Secretary of Publication, the Rev. Dr. Baird, presented an unusually able and very exhaustive report upon this subject, from which it appears that the cash receipts during the past ecclesiastical year were largely in excess of those of any previous year; that the indebtedness of the Committee has been reduced to the inconsiderable sum of \$1,069.85; that grants of books and the amounts expended in colportage exceed those of the last three years combined; and that the general management of this branch of the Church's enterprise is altogether satisfac-

tory. This Assembly again urges upon the churches the importance of completing the capital endowment of the Committee, by making still further efforts to raise the sum of \$50,000, as determined upon by the Assembly at Memphis. The amount still to be raised is \$19,677.90. Says the report: "If this endowment was fully secured, the Committee, under the blessing of God, would need no further aid of that kind, but would be able to devote all the contributions of the churches to the promotion of its benevolent work."

When this subject was under consideration, the Rev. Dr. Stuart Robinson uttered the following sentiments, which are calculated to awaken increased attention to the operations of this important Committee:

"When I look at the history of this Committee, I am more surprised than even at the results reported by your Committee on Sustentation, because it does not, in the popular estimation, come so directly home to the heart of the churches. They don't know what labor and anxiety and money have to be expended in this department. I remember that the old Board, after fifteen or sixteen years, did not do as much as you have done, though wasted and enfeebled by the trials and calamities through which you have passed. But here you report a book establishment, with assets of \$35,000. And whence have they been derived? From a people over whom a terrible tempest of war and financial ruin has swept. To my mind, a people who can do this much, when thus smitten by God, give assurance that it is one destined to abide and prosper in the land. * * * * *

"But great as the work already effected may be, let it not be thought that all has been done that ought to be. I regard this enterprise of Publication as essential to the best welfare of the Southern Church. It is a great means to prevent your testimony for the truth of God from dropping out of the minds of men. The only way to prevent poisonous publications from falling around you thick as leaves in Vallambrosa's shade, is to scatter abroad leaves from the tree of life. Never have the efforts been so persistent to keep back and pervert the truth of God.

"The conflict for the last twenty years is really a war for civilisation. Our only chance of protection is to have this channel for truth open. Southern Christians have stood up for the truth—the truth as it was held in the Church by our fathers

in the days of its purity and power. And now, when journals of civilisation (many of which are journals of barbarism)—when these journals, pamphlets, and books, full of deadly evil, are spread over the land, let us cherish this Committee in its noble efforts to publish the truth of God.

“Many even of our religious books are mere frivolous stories, and suited to make a wrong impression. The land is flooded with them, and you can no more drive them out of the land than you could have expelled the frogs of Egypt. The only way open to you is to give them the precious truth. It is too late to try to carry on the gospel without the press. It has been an error in the Southern Church that while our brethren were men of eloquent speech, they have not been as ready with the pen. We must write as well as speak.

“Look back, for a moment, upon the past. In the midst of your poverty, you have had the faith to come as the poor widow in the gospel, and in the midst of your want you have cast in your mite into the treasury of the Lord. Now, brethren, just go on in this spirit, and, depend upon it, the blessing of God will rest upon you, and your work will prosper. A publishing house in New York would hardly undertake any considerable operation with a capital less than \$500,000. But while you need more than you have, God has so smiled upon you that it fills the whole Church with wonder and with gratification. Let us go home and stand by this Committee of Publication, and next year we shall have still greater cause to say: ‘The Lord hath done great things for us, whereof we are glad.’”

This subject of Publication ought to be well considered by our Church. The best methods for conducting an enterprise so full of practical difficulties have long furnished matter for discussion amongst Presbyterians, and room for much honest difference of opinion. We are truly glad to find that the Secretary and Executive Committee have succeeded so well in advancing towards complete success the work intrusted to their wisdom and fidelity. To show how small were the beginnings of this enterprise, and how nobly some of the churches (all that were specially appealed to) responded to the call of the Rev. Dr. Baird, who had just been placed at its head, we will further detain our readers by quoting what he said on this point to the Assembly:

“Three years and a half ago, the General Assembly, met at

Macon, found all our Church interests bankrupt. Our Missionary Committee was bankrupt; our Publication office was in ruins. That Assembly laid hands on me, and appointed me its Secretary of Publication. I found the treasury bankrupt, and no money in it even to pay my travelling expenses.

"My first efforts to put this cause in motion were here in the Southwest. I went to New Orleans. I met with men who did not know what they actually had left from the war. We held a meeting in the First Presbyterian church. Dr. Palmer said to me, 'This is a test meeting. As soon as you have accomplished what you can, I shall make an effort to raise \$80,000 to pay off the debts of our city churches.' I replied, 'Tell them about it to-night. Don't let them say that I obtained money by keeping them in ignorance of their own local liabilities.' It proved to be a rainy night; there were but thirty-five present. I told them what the Assembly wanted; and he told them of this heavy debt, which had to be met. That meeting subscribed more than \$1,800.

"Thence I went to Mobile, and conferred with your pastor and the other pastors of the city. They thought that possibly they might raise \$500. We called the people together in this church, and had a full house. I addressed them on the position, the prospects, and the mission of our Church. The result was, these pastors sent me to Richmond over \$3,100.

"I started for Memphis. There I met the great commercial crash; but I got \$800. From Jackson, Louisiana, an intelligent and liberal member of our Church sent on ahead of me \$3,000. Thus, with some smaller gifts, I went on to Richmond, from my Mississippi home, to assume my duties. I had \$9,000, received from the Southwestern cities, with which to commence my operations. The receipts of that first year were only a little over \$11,000, the rest of the Church contributing about \$2,000.

"I am glad to be able to say to this people that their money is there still. We have had \$44,000 contributed, and have given away about \$9,500, which would leave a balance of about \$34,000. Notwithstanding the heavy expenses of our collecting agents, we have now \$36,000 invested. It has been built up by hard work. We want still more funds. It is a large business and needs a large capital. We are conducting a publishing house, with both a wholesale and retail business, and we are issuing every month 23,500 copies of the *Children's Friend*. I shall not detain the Assembly by presenting other considerations."

EDUCATION.

This subject elicited an interest in the mind of the Assembly, due not to its intrinsic importance alone, but to the remarkable fact brought out in the report of the Executive Committee that not less than *two hundred and fifty* young men are at the present time seeking the gospel ministry within the bounds of our Southern Church. This is a number equal to nearly one-third of our entire ministry; and all felt that there was abundant cause in this animating statement for exciting special thanksgiving to God who has turned the hearts of so many of our youth to the self-denying labors of the sacred office. The question, How can they be supported? produced but little anxious concern, seeing that he who has laid upon the Church a burden so heavy is able and willing to enable her to bear it. Her resources will be made equal to her responsibilities. If there has been so large a consecration of men, there will, it is believed, be a corresponding consecration of means. It will unquestionably be found that the appeals which shall during this current year be made by the Executive Committee of Education to the churches for a liberality augmented in proportion to the enlarged demand for contributions, will meet with a generous response. The spirit with which the Assembly approached this subject will be manifest from the following remarks of two of the speakers who discussed it. The Rev. Dr. McPhail said:

“This is a subject on which I cannot forbear to speak—a subject of great and essential interest to the world. It is a mark of the presence of the great Head of the Church when young men rise and consecrate themselves to this work. It is a cause of gratitude to God. But a year ago I was sitting in Presbytery when five young men appeared before it as candidates. A venerable father sat by, his eyes glistening with tears as they were questioned. At last he asked, ‘Are you aware what a life of poverty it is? that you are throwing aside all hopes of honor and of wealth?’ They answered that they were. The fact of young men of talents coming to give their wealth, coming to give their lives to poverty and self-denial, is proof of Christ’s presence and approbation. * * *

“This is a question which has produced more solicitude in our

own organisation than any other. At the first our hearts trembled as we asked, Whence the supply for our pulpits? But now nothing is before us but thanksgiving. We cannot calculate the good to be accomplished. And so far from exaggeration in our estimates of the numbers looking to the ministry, I think it is far short of the fact.

“We have more in our desolation than in our palmiest days. God is making us glad according to the years in which he has afflicted us. The affliction is only to prepare us for the blessing. ‘Whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth.’ Have we not reason to thank God, take courage, and press forward? Our fathers held that education was necessary to the upbuilding of the Church. It is no less so in the present.”

The Rev. Dr. Palmer remarked :

“Two or three years ago the dispersion of our people and disorganisation of our Church was our great trouble, but we knew that this would right itself. Then the poverty, of which we have perhaps said too much, that produced almost an entire paralysis of exertion. We felt that we could not take hold of Christ. Then came the years of the worm and caterpillar, and out of deep poverty we did not know how the Church could emerge. These dark clouds did not discourage my labors. He who created the sun and made it a pledge that seed-time and harvest should not cease, gave hope for the future. But my great discouragement was this: Whence our future ministry? Our old men were dying off. We were shut off from the sympathy of the world. The children of Israel at the Red Sea, with mountains on the right and on the left, were not more isolated than our Church at the close of the war.

“There is not one branch of the Church in England or America that has lifted the hand of cordiality. I feel that there is something grand in conception in this position of isolation. We must place before us the figures in order to appreciate its grandeur. From two students to eighteen, forty-three, eighty-three, two hundred and fifty—nearly one-third of the ministry of the whole Church. We are not going to die. I have no doubts for the future. If God will secure to us a living ministry, we can see in it God’s own pledge that he has called us to a career of honor and increasing prosperity. Then put with this the other fact that just now, when the Church has spread forth her hands to receive Christ’s ascension gifts, some fifteen or twenty have asked to be sent to the foreign work. It is like God’s command to Israel to go forward across the Red

Sea. Here is the material—young men who shall come forth as our future laborers. We can afford, amid the marks of war, to stand alone under the blessing of him who smiles upon us.

“Let me add one remark: If the ministry comes immediately from Christ, then lay this truth on the heart of the Church, and let it prompt fathers to consecrate their children in infancy to this service. There are large churches which for half a century have not contributed a man to the ministry. They are constantly using up but not helping the supply. They have no right to act thus; they must replace the men whom they are using up.”

SYSTEMATIC BENEVOLENCE.

The Committee which examined the Presbyterian reports sent up on this subject, complained that only one-half of the Presbyteries had discharged their duty in forwarding to the Assembly information with reference to the action of the churches within their bounds touching the matter of regular collections. “Notwithstanding this delinquency, however,” the Committee go on to say, “there has been an encouraging increase of the number of churches adopting the Assembly’s scheme, and in the amounts they have contributed. A punctual and regular operation of the system must necessarily be the result of an educational process, and, in the cases of many churches, of slow development. It cannot be expected that much can be accomplished by the mere force of recommendations, resolutions, or authoritative injunctions, but by patient, persevering, and persistent prosecution of the proposed plan by our Presbyteries and sessions to bring the churches gradually up to the apostolic standard.” “In most instances, we believe that the failure of churches to take up regular collections is due to the neglect of the ministers to declare the whole counsel of God upon this subject, rather than a lack of genuine love for the cause of Christ, or to a wilful omission of known duty.” There can be no doubt of the truth here stated, that the meagreness of contributions, or no contributions at all, in a given church, is in all ordinary cases *mainly* due to a want of fidelity on the part of the man who serves to the people the word of life; or if not to his own want of fidelity, to his distrustfulness of the members of Christ’s

Body. Many ministers are disposed to think that believers will complain if they are asked for money in the Lord's name. A few such murmurers there may be whose piety has become well-nigh extinct, but we are assured that the masses of Christians *desire* the opportunity which will permit them to give something out of their substance for advancing the cause of that Redeemer to whom they owe all. At least, if this desire be in any instance wanting, the minister of the word can easily awaken it by a timely and judicious presentation of the truth; or where it exists feebly, it can thus be enlarged and strengthened. People cannot be scolded into the spirit of benevolence, but they can be instructed into it.

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES.

The Assembly was cheered by the annual reports from the Directors of the Seminaries at Columbia, S. C., and in Prince Edward County, Va. These two important institutions have been enabled to pass through another year without being materially embarrassed by pecuniary shortcomings. Their endowments are creeping slowly forward towards the point from which they fell off by reason of the destructive influence of the war upon all Southern securities. Meanwhile, they are, to a considerable extent, dependent for their income upon the benevolence of God's people. It is somewhat remarkable that exactly the same number of students (twenty-six) has been in attendance upon each during the past year.

A long and elaborate memorial from the Rev. Dr. R. L. Dabney, one of the professors in Union Seminary, on the subject of theological education, was presented to the Assembly and referred to the appropriate Standing Committee. This memorial is well deserving of consideration, in view of certain suggested alterations in the mode of imparting instruction from the different chairs, as well as some radical changes in the character of the instruction itself, as also its propositions affecting the relations that ought to subsist between the Seminaries and the General Assembly. Were the principles and policy stated and argued in this memorial to be sanctioned by the Assembly, a necessity

would arise for remodelling the whole plan of these institutions. For the reason that the subjects therein presented "have not been under general consideration in the Church, and because their importance forbids at the sessions of the present Assembly that matured judgment which they deserve," the memorial was referred to the Faculty and Directors of each Seminary respectively, with the request that "they report to the next Assembly the results of their deliberations." This was, in our opinion, the proper disposition to be made of the matter; and meanwhile it is to be hoped that thinking men throughout the Church will bring to bear upon the remarkable contents of Dr. Dabney's paper their best thoughts in the way of examination and public discussion. That there may be improvements made in the practical workings of our seminaries, we have no doubt; but whether the changes suggested by the respected author of this document are such as can command the cordial approbation of the Church, admits of serious question. We are not prepared at present to argue the subject with the fulness and the care it demands, but must defer the presentation of our views for some more fitting opportunity.

EVANGELIZATION OF THE BLACKS.

With reference to this vexed matter, a special Committee was appointed, of which, as was eminently becoming, the Rev. Dr. J. L. Girardeau was appointed chairman. The presentation of their report gave rise to considerable discussion, which indicated quite a diversity of opinion, not as to the propriety and necessity of the thing itself, but with respect to the best modes for imparting efficiency and success to the measures proposed, and as to the question, how shall uniformity throughout the Church be secured in practically dealing with the subject? It may be well to place on record in these pages the views and propositions of the majority of the Committee, as they were presented in the following able paper of Dr. Girardeau:

"Our Church, through her General Assemblies, since the year 1866, has expressed her kindly feelings for the freed people, and deprecated their alienation from her fold. The developments of providence, however, have not hitherto appeared to be

sufficiently clear to warrant the adoption of any definite scheme of operations among them designed to be uniform and general in its application. The time would seem to have arrived for pronouncing such a policy. Your Committee concur in the opinion of the petitioners, that it is highly desirable that some such action be taken by this Assembly as is suggested by the overture. The want of a recognised and general plan is tending to the adoption of variant and incongruous lines of policy in different parts of our Church. The result will be, that our relations to the colored race and our schemes of labor among them will become needlessly complicated and confused. The prominent view which has impressed itself on the minds of the Committee, and which they respectfully propose for the consideration of the Assembly, is, that the colored people who adhere to us be allowed a formative organisation, a sort of gradually maturing process, to be arrested at a certain point, until, under proper training, it is prepared to pass on towards completion. To be more explicit: what they need is, for the present, separate, particular churches, with their own deacons and elders, and at the same time instruction by an educated white ministry, until they can prove their ability to produce a competent ministry of their own. To combine these requirements into a practical scheme would, in the judgment of the Committee, go far towards solving the vexed problem of our relations to them and our operations among them. In this way, moreover, may alone be realised, if at all, the hope that from their number men may arise who would carry the gospel to their benighted kinsmen in Africa. In conformity to this leading idea, the Committee would, with great deference, submit to the Assembly the following plan for its consideration, and if the way be deemed clear, for its adoption:

“1. That separate colored churches may be established, the same to be united with adjacent white churches under a common pastorate; to be allowed to elect deacons and ruling elders; and to be represented in the upper courts by the pastors in charge of them, and by the ruling elders of the white churches with which they would thus be associated, until they are sufficiently educated to warrant their becoming independent: *Provided*, That the colored people themselves do not oppose a change in their existing relations, and that they consent to the foregoing arrangement.

“2. That where no white churches are accessible, evangelists may establish colored missionary churches, and preside over their sessions in admitting members and exercising discipline.

“3. That churches in cities with which colored churches

would, on this plan, be united, may secure, if practicable, two pastors each, in order to compass the work contemplated.

"4. That a committee (say of two ministers and one ruling elder) may be appointed by each Synod, to carry, in coöperation with pastors and presbyterial evangelists, this scheme into effect, as far as practicable, in its bounds; one member of each committee to act as evangelist among the colored people, and to receive his support, in part, from the Assembly's Committee of Sustentation.

"5. That suitable colored men may be employed to speak the word of exhortation to their people, under the direction of pastors or evangelists.

"6. That when colored candidates for the ministry are able to stand the usual examination, Presbyteries may proceed to license them; and in the event of these licentiates being qualified and desired to take charge of colored churches, Presbyteries may either ordain and install them over such churches still holding their connexion with us, or ordain and install them over such churches, with the understanding that they shall thenceforward be ecclesiastically separated from us.

"7. That such of our ministers as are willing to discharge that office are encouraged to assist trustworthy colored men who seek the gospel ministry in their preparations for the same.

"8. That our people be encouraged to give the colored people instruction in Sabbath-schools.

"9. That the Assembly recommends the adoption of the foregoing plan of operations among the colored people of Synods, Presbyteries, and churches, so far as it is practicable."

For this paper, in its original form, (wherein it made imperative what was finally made only optional,) a brief substitute was offered by Mr. George D. Gray, a member of the Committee from the Presbytery of Chesapeake. This substitute says, in substance, "that the obligations of our Church to the colored people are neither increased nor diminished by political events; that this Assembly sees no reason for changing its plan of operations; and that the Assembly urges its ministers to renewed diligence in efforts for their moral improvement." During the discussion that ensued, and which, though warm and earnest, was conducted throughout in a spirit entirely fraternal, Dr. Girardeau made substantially the following remarks:

"I speak to this question with diffidence, and profess no supe-

rior knowledge on this subject, though I have spent many years in labors among the colored people; but I have a strong conviction of the necessity of adopting a policy by which we may feel authorized in acting. This is no pet question of mine. I feel that there are others of greater importance—such as the examination of the Constitution of the Church. I am not disposed to lionize the negro. But I feel that he has an immortal soul, and the importance of that soul no man can exaggerate.

“The great John Howe, when he was in high position at a worldly court, thought of his country church, where there was a deep feeling of piety, and he returned from the court to his quiet country charge, with the remark, that, ‘if I can only save one soul, I shall not have lived in vain.’

Now, the question recurs to us whether we shall, in a kindly spirit, try to retain this people, or turn them off. With a due regard to their interests, or to our duty to God or ourselves, we cannot abandon them.

“As regards their interests, we cannot let them go without sending them to the vast sea of ruin. I live upon the coast among large masses of them, whose numbers are being increased by those retreating to the coast before the increasing tide of immigration into the upland country. I could reveal facts which would astonish the Assembly, concerning the tendencies of these people when left to themselves. The father of the Rev. Dr. Palmer has told me of their orgies. They fill a table with candles, and dance around it, saying that they are the angels of God around the throne. I know of a certain preacher among them who calls the gospel the gospel of Julius. He does not even know the name of the Saviour of the souls to whom he preaches. In some of their meetings, they are adopting the Romish system of penance. In some instances, they break brick into fragments, and then compel the penitents to walk over these on their bare knees. Shall we turn them off, alienate them from us, and increase the antipathy between the races?

“When I returned from a Northern prison, some of the blacks asked me to preach to them. I agreed to meet a few of their leading men, but found a whole congregation gathered to meet me. I asked them what had brought them thus together. Nothing but the love of Jesus. They wept, and I wept with them. Let us cultivate that bond, the bond of the love of Jesus, and some of the roughnesses and asperities of our present relations to them may be healed.

“If we retain them, what policy shall we adopt towards them? I urge giving them a formative organisation. Not to erect a

barrier, and say you shall not take any part in the government of your churches; and usurp the prerogative of God in saying, 'You have not been called to preach the gospel.'

"I would not be rash, but I would make a present policy, and then, in the future, recede from it or maintain it, according to its practical workings.

"Shall we, then, provide for them in our own churches, or give them a separate organisation? Dr. Thornwell urged the latter. The style of instruction given to the whites is above the capacity of the blacks.

"Say what you will about simplicity of preaching, we must conform our preaching to the capacity of our hearers. We do not address the same language to children in Sabbath-school and to adults in church.

"Then, too, arises the question of property. The sooner we separate the blacks and give them a distinct service, the sooner shall we be free from fears of the loss of our church buildings. As to the special plan upon which we shall operate, there is great difficulty; and we entertain no disposition to be dogmatic upon the subject.

"We propose to keep them under a capable white ministry for the present. There are yet none of them qualified to perform the delicate duties of a pastor. It will take years, and years of *enlightened* instruction, to fit them for it. The second point is to give them ruling elders. I see the constitutional difficulties of the matter. I respect the Constitution, and would not needlessly break over it. But on missionary ground we cannot demand the same amount of knowledge as a qualification for the office of ruling elder. And further, the instruction of the Spirit of God is the best preparation for holding office; and some of them have the ability to make prayers that we would gladly learn to make. So much as to their qualifications. And as to their performance of the duties of ruling elders, they have for years and years been virtually and practically elders, doing the work, visiting the sick, and ministering to the dying. Why not now make them formally so?

"The real constitutional difficulty is the introduction of a distinction of color. But the Constitution was not framed with a view to the present position of the South. It has always been the case that we have repressed the Presbyterian rights of these people; we have not suffered them to be elected to the eldership. If we were *then* justified in departing so widely, why not now depart less widely? It will be said that we are setting a dangerous precedent; but the case is so peculiar that I have little

out of any injury from it. Suppose we do refuse a ruling elder the privilege of a seat in Presbytery and he consents to it, we do him no violent wrong, and refuse him one privilege only because of peculiar difficulties.

“The whole question turns on this first resolution. If we do not adopt that, then I abandon the rest of the scheme. But I should go home with a heavy heart. For without some plan of this sort, I can see no prospect of retaining our influence over them for good.

“I sincerely trust our Church will throw her skirts over these our poor kinsmen. Let us not set them adrift upon the sea of ignorance, superstition, and fanaticism.”

Dr. Girardeau was followed by Mr. Gray, who said :

“I had not desired to say any thing, but my brethren say I ought to give my reasons for the substitute. It seems to me the proposed plan involves a violation of our Constitution and Form of Government. And I was surprised to hear the brother say that the first resolution necessitates the open violation of our Form of Government. It convinced me that my views and the views of my Presbytery are right, that we had better not legislate on the subject. I deny that we have been in the habit of violating our Constitution. Never has a colored elder or deacon applied for a seat in the Presbytery. But this plan, according to the admission of the Chairman, does violate their rights. It leaves the Presbytery to say, ‘We will not admit you to a seat, and if you insist on your right, we will set you adrift.’ I trust the Assembly will hesitate long before they endorse such a violation as this. Dr. Girardeau has said we must either adopt this or turn them off. I deny it. All through our land, we have had Sabbath-schools taught by white elders, and we ought to have the same now. It is not wise to change our plan of operations toward them. Let us go and labor among them as before. The only relief is to get them to abandon their rights to a seat in Presbytery and not claim these rights. But will they do this? They are very sensitive and more inclined to demand their rights than we ourselves. And if *they* had not such a disposition, there are designing men who will urge them to do it.”

REV. EDWARD MARTIN.—“I desire to say one word. I agree fully with the feelings of Dr. Girardeau and his sympathy for the race. But a plan adopted for the whole Church must be a plan suited to the whole Church. The plan which would suit the Presbytery of Charleston would not suit us. I believe that the General Assembly had better remit this to the Presbyteries.

But when you have these two plans before you, and I am obliged to choose between them, I prefer the minority report. We are not prepared for this thing. We cannot adopt it in all parts of the Church, and we should have different practices in different places. I think the Presbytery may well form and use such a plan. I agree with Dr. Girardeau that the book of government was made for man, not man for the book. But do not let them ask the Assembly to send a plan down to Presbyteries which is impracticable, with all the *moral* weight of an injunction. In Winchester Presbytery, it is impossible to carry it out. It is a question for the Presbyteries to manage.

"I have a warm personal interest in them. I have faithfully preached to them. But do not let the Assembly hamper us in our efforts, by limiting or committing us to this or any one line of action."

MR. BAXTER.—"I think it is a question which must be met and decided. The old ties of the two races are such as will not allow us to cast them off. We must decide independently of public opinion, even of the opinions of our own section.

"Opinions and the necessities of the case vary in different places. In some places, the blacks prefer to use the galleries, in other places to have separate services. Now, can we not secure a plan which will unite our pastors in effort for the blacks—allowing them liberty of detail, but unity of end? The chairman of the Committee has had great experience, and his advice is valuable on the point. I am not quite satisfied with the report; it has one weak point—that of withholding representation from ordained church officers. I give notice, therefore, of an amendment to make the first resolution read:

"1. That separate colored churches may be established, the same to be united with adjacent white churches under a common pastor, the pastor to be assisted by such persons as the session may select, * * * until they are sufficiently educated to warrant their becoming independent, to which independence this arrangement is intended to look in the future."

DR. BRIGHT.—"I wish to vote for the minority report. I think it is the only one which we can adopt. The political changes have not in the least weakened our obligation to the negro. To show that the moral relations of the two races are not changed, let us ask what we were formerly doing for that people. We had Sabbath-schools and personal labors. Remember the labors of Dr. Jones. Then, as now, we were bound to do all that we could for them. If we adopt this plan, I think it will be the entering wedge to the admission of colored people to

our church courts. Now, our social condition is not and cannot be one of equality. All that we can do is to preach to them. This we are doing, and we can do no more.

“The first speaker would have conveyed the impression that unless we do this, we are lacking in sympathy with them. But do we not show them the same sympathy, or greater, by our present care? Would not the proposed organisation place them in a position more readily to be drawn from us in a body? Are we prepared for such changes as this is proposed to be? The minority report urges the ministers to go to the churches and labor faithfully. You cannot do more. Do not let us repudiate our notions of duty as given to that people before.”

The motion to adopt the minority report was withdrawn.

The report of the Committee was amended by making it optional instead of imperative on the Presbyteries, and thus adopted.

It is probable that this subject has now been disposed of in a manner that will forbid its further agitation in the Assembly for some years. As to any coöperation with the Northern Presbyterian Assembly in efforts to evangelize the colored people amongst us, the Assembly declared that no practicable plan had been offered by that body in the semi-official correspondence between our Secretary of Sustentation and the Secretary of the Freedmen's Committee at Pittsburgh, and that we have none to propose. If that Committee shall, therefore, continue to intrude upon our field of work in the fretting ways to which the past bears such sad witness, we cannot help it; but shall do our part to the best of our ability, leaving the responsibility due to the entangling interference of the Northern Church to be answered for by them at the court of public opinion and finally before the judgment seat of the last day.

THE REVISED BOOK OF ORDER AND DISCIPLINE.

Among the acts of this Assembly none was more important than its determination to revise, by a Committee of its own, what is now known as the “New Book,” in the light of the objections and suggestions of the Presbyteries made two years ago, with the further resolve to remit the same, thus again revised and improved, for the consideration of the Presbyteries

during the present year. This matter was introduced through a memorial signed by a large number of ministers and elders present at Mobile. We prefer laying before our readers this memorial itself, as the better plan for setting the whole matter before their minds. It is as follows:

"The undersigned, ministers and ruling elders, respectfully ask the attention of the General Assembly to the following facts and suggestions touching the importance of prosecuting and completing the work of revising our Form of Government and Discipline. Our present Form of Government and Book of Discipline, framed unquestionably as it was for the use of a small body of churches in a narrow territory on the Atlantic coast, and at a time, when, in their conscious feelings, our fathers naturally inclined to alliance with the Congregationalism contiguous to them in the east (as evinced in the Plan of Union of 1801), has long been felt to be insufficient for the government of so large a body as ours, scattered over a territory so wide and diversified. This is manifest from the fact that so far back as 1857, and before our separation, the work of revising the Discipline was committed to Drs. Thornwell, Breckinridge, Hodge, McGill, and others, and has been prosecuted in both branches since the severance, until, after an elaborate revision of the Committee's labors, the Assembly at Memphis, in 1866, submitted a new Book of Order and Canons of Discipline to the Presbyteries. Owing, however, to the then unsettled state of things in our Church, and largely because of a desire on the part of the Presbyteries to delay the work until our brethren in Kentucky, and others, might, if they desired, have a voice in the case, as well as on account of diversities of view about certain points of interest in the Book, these overtures were declined by the Presbyteries, though a general desire was expressed for the preservation of what had been done, with the intention of continuing the work at a more auspicious time. The undersigned are impressed with the conviction that the auspicious time has now come. Our affairs are now settled, our agencies for carrying on the Church's work are established and operating successfully, our brethren of Kentucky are in organic union with us, and there is no longer anything to embarrass the Presbyteries, or to interfere with the calm and patient investigation so needful to the matter in question.

"The positive reasons for an early and earnest attention to this indispensable work are in our judgment urgent:

"1. The great Head of the Church has been and is now favor-

ing us with much unanimity among ourselves, and before possible troubles, agitations, and divisions arise from questions to which we are manifestly liable under our present defective Book, we are in a far better condition to construct a Book of Order and Discipline than we would be if torn again by controversies.

"2. At a time when the spirit of revolution and the tendencies to a latitudinarian Presbyterianism are so generally prevalent among Presbyterian bodies in America and Britain; our people are more exposed than ever to be led aside from the great principles on which our system of government rests, and need to have them brought out more clearly in the practical administration of our government and discipline.

"3. As we are now emerging from a period of suffering for our witness for great truths, it becomes us to endeavor to give these principles a more permanent and more prominent form in our government and discipline, especially inasmuch as many of our troubles have either arisen from or been aggravated by imperfections in our existing Form of Government and Book of Discipline, under which it has been most difficult to prevent the introduction of questions ministering to strife rather than to godly edifying.

"4. The large number of overtures, annually increasing, asking for an interpretation by the Assembly of points connected with our government and discipline, renders manifest the practical need of a more definite statement of the principles on which our Church order rests.

"Even though the work of revision should not at once succeed as to its final end, yet the general discussion of these principles will do good, as we believe it has already been useful. With proper deference to the superior wisdom of the Assembly, the undersigned respectfully suggest that a committee be appointed to revise the Book of Order and Canons of Discipline in the light of the objections and suggestions sent up by the Presbyteries to the Assembly, so that, if approved, the Assembly may send down the revised Book to the Presbyteries with a request that they express their assent to such portions thereof as may meet their approval; and send up also to the next Assembly objections to any portions they may disapprove of, and with a request that the portions disapproved of be revised by that Assembly and sent down for the action of Presbyteries, with a view to final action by the Assembly of 1871."

The prayer of the memorialists was unanimously granted by the Assembly; the committee requested was appointed; the work

of revision laboriously performed by it; this work reviewed by the Assembly itself; and the whole amended Book sent down for the action of the Presbyteries, in the manner and for the objects proposed in the closing words of the above paper. There can, we think, be but little doubt as to the eminent expediency of this action; and as little, that, on a candid and careful examination of the revised Book, it will meet the approval of the whole Church. There may be additional changes of phraseology proposed by some of the Presbyteries, but we feel sure that in the main the Book will be sanctioned by the entire body of the ministers, the elders, and the people.

It is germane to this subject to call attention to the section which treats of the office of Deacon. We particularly mention this point, because, our readers will remember, an *ad interim* Committee was appointed by the Assembly of 1868, whose express duty it was made to investigate the whole subject of the relation of the deacon's office to those of the eldership and the trustees. Of this Committee, the Rev. Dr. Dabney was chairman; whose report, sanctioned by a majority of its members, was submitted to the Assembly and referred to the special Committee on Revision. The mind of the Assembly was expressed in the following propositions reported by the Revision Committee as a part of the amended Book:

SECTION IV.—OF THE OFFICE OF THE DEACON.

“I. The office of deacon is ordinary and perpetual in the Church of Christ.

“II. The duties of this office specially relate to the care of the poor, and to the collection and proper distribution of the offerings of the people for pious uses. To the deacons may also be properly committed the management of the temporal goods of the congregation.

“III. To this office should be chosen men of honest repute and approved piety, who are esteemed for their prudence and sound judgment, whose conversation becometh the gospel and whose lives are exemplary; seeing that those duties to which all Christians are called by the law of charity are especially incumbent on the deacon, as an officer in Christ's house.

“IV. The pastor of the congregation is *ex officio* moderator of

the board of deacons. A complete account of all collections and distributions, and a full record of all proceedings should be kept, and submitted to the session for examination and approval at least once a year.

“V. In congregations where it is impossible to secure the appointment of a sufficient number of deacons, the elders may act as deacons until the deficiency can be supplied.

“VI. Where it shall appear needful, the church session may select and appoint godly women for the care of the sick, of prisoners, of poor widows and orphans, and in general for the relief of distress.”

MUTUAL RELIEF FUND.

Early in the session of the Assembly, a memorial was presented by the Rev. Dr. J. Leighton Wilson, urging the propriety of inaugurating a scheme (the main features of which this paper elaborated) by whose operation the families of ministers of the Church might at their death become possessed of at least one thousand dollars. The committee to whom this interesting and delicate matter was referred, recommended, after giving it a great deal of patient study, that the scheme proposed be “immediately adopted,” and submitted certain general features for its organisation and operation. The object being to secure to the families of deceased ministers the payment of \$1000.00 or its multiple, (up to \$5,000.00 as a maximum,) this result, it was thought, could be accomplished by the annual payment, on the part of those whose relicts should be benefited, or by the churches for them, of \$30.00 or its multiple—the scheme to go into practical operation whenever one hundred subscriptions shall have been made and paid. The subscription by a church to be for the benefit of the family of a minister who may be at the time of his death its pastor or stated supply, and not of the family of him who was pastor or stated supply at the time of subscribing, should his relation as such be dissolved otherwise than by his decease; *provided*, that any church may make a special subscription in the case of a minister retiring from said relation because of impaired health. Such are the main features of a plan that is at least marvellous for the ease with which it can be understood, whatever may be said on the question of its feasi-

bility—a question we do not feel competent intelligently to discuss. So great, however, is our confidence in the practical wisdom of the distinguished Secretary, some of whose thoughts have been given to this subject, that we are tempted, without further investigation, to give the scheme our endorsement. At any rate we are at liberty to direct the attention of our readers to Dr. Wilson's Memorial, wherein the reasons are given at length which go far to sustain his belief in the practicability of a plan which staggers faith by its simplicity. The whole matter excited much interest and brought out a good deal of debating talent in the Assembly. It was opposed mainly on the ground that the Church is bound to provide for her ministers without resorting to a scheme like this, and partly on the further ground that it carries with it the principal objections which tender consciences feel with reference to ordinary "life insurance" as being a kind of concealed lottery. Dr. Waddell moved to refer the whole subject to the Executive Committee of Sustentation, with a view to perfecting the plan in its details and of reporting the result of its labors to the next Assembly. After discussion, this motion was adopted.

THE CASE OF JACKSONVILLE CHURCH.

The Rev. T. L. DeVeaux, the excellent pastor of this church, presented various papers touching the troubles into which it had fallen, owing to the violent action of persons from the North, countenanced by the Central Presbytery of Philadelphia. Two-thirds of the members have been ousted from their rights in the church property, and compelled to worship in a hall rented for the purpose. The history of this case is a mournful one, as exhibiting a spirit of meanness and rapacity on the part of the Northern Assembly minority, (who still retain possession of the property,) which is almost unexampled. Redress could not be had by appeal to the law, and the Presbytery of Florida memorialized the Assembly with reference to what they had done in the premises, and asking counsel as to how they should further proceed. To this memorial the following answer was returned:

Resolved, 1. That the members of this Assembly receive with profound regret and surprise information of the wrongs and injuries suffered by the members of the church of Jacksonville, in the bounds and under the care of the Presbytery of Florida, and do hereby convey to them assurances of our most sincere personal sympathy in their sufferings.

2. That in the judgment of this Assembly the Presbytery of Florida should direct its Stated Clerk to lay before the Central Presbytery of Philadelphia, through its Stated Clerk, the full statement of this case, accompanied by an appeal to the sense of justice of that Presbytery, and a demand for a restoration of their church property.

3. That this Assembly approves the effort made by the church of Jacksonville to recover their rights through the civil tribunals of the country."

We have no extended comments to make touching a matter which is calculated to provoke from our pen harsher language of rebuke as towards our Northern "brethren" than we care to employ. It is somewhat remarkable that this Central Presbytery of Philadelphia was the first to overture the Assembly with which it is connected, for the purpose of urging upon that body the propriety of opening up a correspondence with the Southern Assembly with a view to organic union, at the same time that it was acting in a manner so hostile to one of our churches, and thus exhibiting a temper utterly at war with the whole idea of such union!

OVERTURES.

Overtures to the number of thirteen were placed in the hands of the very able Committee of which the Rev. Dr. Waddel was the wise and industrious chairman. The reports upon these had been so carefully considered, and were presented in such a form from time to time, as to call for very slight comment or amendment. Several of these papers are of importance considerable enough to justify special mention in this review of the proceedings of the Assembly. We invite attention, accordingly, to overture No. 1:

"Can a call for a pastor be considered regular by a Presby-

tery which does not pledge the congregation calling to provide an adequate support for a pastor?"

Answer. "That such calls as the overture contemplates are not strictly regular, but that in cases in which churches are not able to pledge the competent support of pastors, the expediency of constituting the pastoral relation be left to the judgment of Presbyteries."

We could have hoped that the answer to this overture had gone to the length of declaring that Presbyteries have no right to constitute a pastoral relation unless the full amount of salary required be actually pledged by the calling church, and not left it discretionary. The effect might have been to awaken Presbyteries to the necessity of more carefully investigating the conditions of each "call" upon which they are to act, and more minutely examining the ability of churches seeking pastors to support them when installed. It is certain that many churches, accustomed to regard themselves as "feeble," are abundantly able to sustain the ministrations of the gospel, if only they were made to understand that they are absolutely required to do so, instead of relying (which is so convenient) upon help from the Sustentation treasury. A judicious discrimination ought surely to be made between the really weak congregations and the really strong, so as to lift all above the benevolence of the body at large which *can* be so elevated. And further, where churches are too feeble to justify their calling pastors, they should be compelled, if possible, to unite with other churches around them in a common pastoral charge which as a whole can easily sustain a minister. This, moreover, would serve to break up the "stated supply" system, which has come to be an evil so wide-spread in our Church.

Overture No. 8, asking the Assembly to require every licentiate to spend two years in itinerant missionary labor before his settlement as a pastor. The answer is guarded, but sufficiently explicit:

"Resolved, That while the Assembly believes that the employment of competent *evangelists* is the most effectual means of supplying the destitutions in our bounds, yet in view of the fact that so few of that class can now be secured, it recommends to

Presbyteries to throw their licentiates, as far as practicable, into the destitute fields around them."

"We trust that by common consent the Presbyteries will be induced to comply with this wise recommendation.

Overture No. 9 asks :

"Is it an infraction of our standards for one of our ministers to baptize the infant child of a parent, or the ward of a guardian standing *in loco parentis*, who has not professed personal faith in Christ, but who was baptized in infancy?"

"The Committee respectfully recommend that the overture be answered in the affirmative, and that the Assembly would refer to the following portions of our standards as reasons for this answer :

"1st. Ch. 28, sec. 4, Confession of Faith.

"2d. The answer to the 166th Question of our Larger Catechism.

"3d. The answer to the 95th Question of our Shorter Catechism."

This answer may serve to put a quietus upon the controversy carried on by some of our ministers who are of the opinion that a "believer" may be viewed as one who simply gives his intellectual assent to the doctrines of grace, but has made no public profession of his personal trust in Christ.

Overture No. 13, from ministers of the Presbytery of South Alabama, requests the Assembly "to adopt some plan whereby Presbyteries may be authorized to license as lay preachers or exhorters such persons as may be found qualified in mind and heart to instruct and edify the churches, without requiring of them that course of literary and theological education which is required for our regular ministry." The Committee recommended the following answer :

"That the Assembly expresses its approbation of Presbyteries granting permission to persons of suitable gifts to hold meetings and speak the word of exhortation in churches in their respective bounds, with the consent of the sessions where such exist, and also in destitute neighborhoods; such persons being required to abstain from assuming the proper functions of the ministry, and being held subject to the control of Presbytery in this matter."

The report was adopted, no one dissenting. It might have been expected that a measure like this, which may lead to very important results, would not have been adopted without full discussion. We shall watch with interest the workings of the scheme.

CONCLUSION.

The Mobile Assembly may justly be regarded as equal in wisdom to any which has preceded it. Such questions as were discussed and disposed of, some of them difficult of settlement, (such as that connected with the freedmen,) were considered with great dignity and impartiality, and adjusted in a manner that ought to command the approbation of the Church. We hope that its Minutes will be widely called for by pastors, sessions, and private members, and receive as careful a perusal as an extensive circulation.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

The Life of Samuel Miller, D. D., LL.D., Second Professor in the Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church at Princeton, New Jersey. By SAMUEL MILLER. Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen & Haffelfinger. 1869. 2 vols., 12 mo., pp. 880, 562.

It has been with no ordinary measure of interest and delight we have read these volumes. For him whose life and character and works they commemorate, we cherished the profoundest veneration as a man and as a minister, and the most grateful and affectionate regard as a teacher. Not many men in this or any age and country have lived such long and useful, happy and honored lives, or died so peacefully and sweetly. For half a century, he was one of the most prominent and trusted ministers of the Presbyterian Church in America. His career of usefulness began in New York city, when that great metropolis was, as it were, but a village, where he was a pastor for twenty-one years. Then he was removed to Princeton Seminary, and taught church history and polity for thirty-six years more. So many classes of theological students he faithfully and successfully instructed in the revealed doctrines of church order, and in the history of the Church, both revealed and human. Scores of Presbyterian ministers all over the land revere him as their father. He was a voluminous and useful writer; not original or profound, but solid, clear, safe, scriptural. Many of his published works were controversial, especially on the subject of prelacy; and in these he was distinguished not only for sound learning and solid reasoning, but also for preëminent courtesy to some very discourteous opponents. Indeed, Dr. Miller was always and every where a gentleman. As a preacher, he was not gifted with the highest powers of oratory, yet he was instructive, earnest, simple, tender, pathetic, and orthodox; and

he spoke always with unction. He loved to preach and people loved to hear him preach, for he seemed to tell what he knew and felt. He excelled in social and public prayer, was given much to prayer in secret; and some of the tenderest scenes which many living men can recall to mind were prayers offered by Dr. Miller in his interviews with pupils and with brethren at his study. He was a holy man. The graces of the Spirit of God were visible in all his life and character. So much unaffected, sincere goodness, kindness, gentleness, beneficence; so much humility, industry, charity, zeal; so much love to man, to the Church, and to God, were not natural, but supernatural—the effects and fruits of heavenly influence.

It was fit and proper that such a man's life should be written. His biographer, who is his son, the Rev. Samuel Miller, D. D., of Mount Holly, New Jersey, has, in our judgment, well discharged his office. It is a delicate task for a son to depict the life and character of his father and also of his mother. We have been much impressed with the candor and impartiality, the good taste and refinement of feeling, which have throughout guided the biographer's pen. In this respect, we may take it on us to say the father seems to be reproduced in the son. His task has been executed skilfully throughout. He gives us just a *picture* of his father at home in his family, in his study, in the seminary, in the pulpit, in the church courts, and in his public controversies. That benignant face, lighted up with the glow of love for those to whom he might be speaking and with fervid enthusiasm for the truth he might be expressing, is clearly brought before us. We have, in the perusal of these volumes, lived over again our four years at Princeton. We think we now see the professor, at the very minute appointed, coming forth from his own gate, habited as always with punctilious neatness. With the polish of a gentleman of the old school, he bows to those acquaintances who pass by in that carriage, and then, with the cordiality of a true friend, he greets his neighbor who meets him on the sidewalk. We see him walking erect and briskly up to the seminary building, and he enters the old oratory where he used to meet his class. There we now seem to hear the bland

and silvery tones in which the dear old man used to address his "young friends." Six and thirty years have flown since the last time we thus saw and heard our old preceptor; but these charming volumes have brought all back to us as if it was but of yesterday.

We regard the portions of this work devoted to the history of Mrs. Miller and her remarkable religious experience as amongst the most valuable which it contains. She was no ordinary woman.

The inside views of the case of Mr. Barnes, and in general the history furnished of the Old and New School controversy and the separation, are also of great interest and value. We agree with the biographer, that while Princeton did not take the leading part which was justly expected in that crisis, it was no doubt wisely ordered in divine providence that she should somewhat moderate and temper the zeal of the real leaders until the whole body of the Old School were prepared to act together as they did in 1837. And all we have to offer by way of comment on this part of the work, is our regret that it was not published two or three years sooner, that it might have done something at least to retard the present reactionary movement, which is carrying the Old School over into the arms of the New.

Respecting the ordination of ruling elders, Dr. Miller, over fifty years ago, took ground that Scripture called for the imposition of hands in this service. His reasons, as stated by his biographer, were these: First, the rite seemed to be "as appropriate in their case as in any other; and secondly, it seemed to be according to Bible example to ordain all strictly ecclesiastical officers in this way. If deacons were so ordained, why not elders?" (Vol. I., p. 274.) On the same page, Dr. M. is quoted as saying that this "practice has been gradually gaining ground, and seems now likely to obtain general prevalence in our Church."

Upon this point, we would observe that it certainly is no less plain in Scripture that ruling elders were ordained with imposition of hands than that deacons were; which of course settles the matter for all true Presbyterians, since we get our order as well as doctrine from the Scriptures. It is very true, that since

the Reformation, the practice in ordination, even amongst Presbyterians, has not generally been regulated according to the Scripture. But this only shows how hard it is to reform a corrupt practice, even after a corrupt doctrine has been reformed. What is ordination but the setting apart by proper authority of a person to a work, according to custom in the Old Testament Church? Now, why is imposition of hands denied to ruling elders by some Presbyterians? And why is it so strenuously insisted on by others? Simply because the former class do not, but the latter do, regard the ruling elder as a true and proper presbyter. As for the Reformers, they were not all Presbyterian. But take John Calvin for guide, and it will be seen plainly enough (say in his *Inst.*, Book IV., chap. iii., sections 10-16) how the Scriptures teach that this is the right way of admission to every office in the Church.

It is evident that the biographer has failed, as his venerable father did before him, to carry out logically the scripture principle when the question of the ordination of ministers comes up. He states his father's idea to be that the New Testament employs the term elder for two distinct orders of officers; to the preaching elder belong "all the functions of the ruling elder, and in addition to these the preaching of the word and the ordination of other ministers—functions not belonging to the mere ruler." But his father certainly taught, in his book on the *Ruling Elder*, (p. 68, edition of 1831,) that the ruling elder is a scriptural bishop or a true and proper presbyter. And if this be so, how can the ruling elder's right to take part in this part of the Presbytery's work be denied? It is the Presbytery which imposes hands, and he is a member of the body. The act is an act of government, and he is one of the governors.

The biographer says: "There have been later discussions of the subject in this country, which have to some extent grown out of the publications already noticed. Dr. R. J. Breckinridge, Dr. Thornwell, and Dr. Adger, have insisted that preaching and ruling elders are one in order and essential functions; the preaching of the word by the call and gift of God and the call of the people being an unessential addition of duty in certain

cases." (Vol. II., p. 174.) But this is by no means a correct statement of the opinions of these parties. What they have maintained is, that there is one order of presbyters or bishops, but two classes—the ruling and teaching, and the merely ruling. Ruling elders are rulers as much as teaching elders, and take equal part with them in all acts of rule, such as ordination. But teaching is an immeasurably higher function than ruling, and belongs only to the one class.

There is one feature of this book which somewhat diminishes our respect for the writer. He seems, like so many other authors of the day at the North, to feel that he must have a fling at slavery and slaveholders. Speaking of Dr. Miller's mother, who was a slaveholder in Delaware, he says: "Her kindness towards such dependants seems greatly to have exceeded that which is commemorated so indiscriminately upon the tombstones of slaveholders under certain stereotype forms—'a kind master,' 'a humane mistress.' But 'the institution' at that earlier day was doubtless commonly more 'patriarchal' than at a later date. In the Delaware pastor's house, at any rate, the servants were evidently considered and treated as a part of the family, falling just below the children as objects of Christian regard and attention." (Vol. I., p. 27.)

Now, what right has this author to seek to rob poor dead slaveholders of the honor their surviving friends gave to them for being kind and humane to their slaves? And if it be so that this praise is "so indiscriminately" found on slaveholders' tombstones, is not that a tolerably good proof that in fact the South paid honor to all humane masters? It is certainly a mistake which the author makes to suppose that slavery at an earlier was milder than at a later day. We bought our slaves from Northern slave ships when downright savages, and our discipline was necessarily severe. But slavery gradually elevated them, and so their treatment softened with their improvement. We can tell this writer that thousands of Southern slaveholders regarded their slaves just as he declares his grandparents did.

Elsewhere the writer labors to establish for his father a claim to abolitionist views "three-quarters of a century ago," long

before the Garrison school was founded. (See Vol. I., pp. 90-94.) He quotes from a discourse by his father, in 1797, some eulogy of the statement that "all men are born free and equal." Well, no doubt that absurd statement was received at that day by his father and by all our fathers, too. Perhaps the whole American people at that day, South as well as North, held that error. But that unscriptural and utterly unfounded doctrine was repudiated afterwards by all the best people of the South and by multitudes of good men at the North, (his father, we suppose, amongst them,) and it came to be understood that "all men have not equal rights to equal things." Wild radical ideas are in the ascendant now; but Dr. Miller, of Princeton, had not one drop of blood in him that was radical. He had no sympathy whatever with Mr. Jefferson, except before he understood him. The son is doing his father nothing but dishonor in laboring to identify him in any degree with the present prevailing tendencies of the popular mind. He will live to see the day, we hope, when he must regret these representations of his venerable sire.

We close with the statement that there are errors of the press, some of them trifling, but some serious, in Vol. I., on pages 192, 309, 325, 335, 354, 372; and in Vol. II., on pages 18, 22, 45, 73, 79, 119, 257, 269.

Annals of the American Pulpit; or, Commemorative Notices of Distinguished American Clergymen of various Denominations, from the early settlement of the country to the close of the year eighteen hundred and fifty-five. With Historical Introductions. By WILLIAM B. SPRAGUE, D. D. Volume IX. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1869.

This ninth volume of Dr. Sprague's valuable work is interesting to us who are Presbyterians, as embracing notices of the most prominent clergymen of some of the branches of the Church which are most nearly allied to us. Our household has divided off, and is now known under various names. The first in this volume is the Lutheran Church, which is hardly a branch of ours; for the two great Reformers, Luther and Calvin, acted independently of each other, and could not agree on some points,

which, notwithstanding strenuous efforts at union made by the latter, still kept them and their disciples apart. The Lutheran Church observes the festivals of Christmas, Good Friday, Easter, the Ascension, and Whit Sunday, which we do not. It holds to the rite of confirmation. But it agrees with us in the parity of ministers, and has also the ruling elder. It more nearly agrees with us than it did at first in the sacrament of the supper. The first two hundred and nineteen pages of this volume are devoted to this Church.

Next follows the Reformed Dutch Church, which claims to be the oldest body of Presbyterians in America, and is descended immediately from the Church of Holland. Its first minister was settled in New York in 1628. It was at first dependent on the Classis of Amsterdam, and became independent only after the war of the Revolution. Its government is strictly according to the Presbyterian model. There are two hundred and fifty-four pages devoted to this branch of the Presbyterian family. The Associate Church, which derives its origin from the Anti-burgher Associate Synod of Scotland, comes next. It has been opposed from the beginning to the holding of slaves. In 1832, it attempted to discipline one of its ministers in Virginia and one in South Carolina for an infraction of its rules in this respect; and in 1840, took such measures as obliterated every vestige of their body in the slaveholding States, except two churches in East Tennessee. There are one hundred and forty-five pages devoted to this branch. The next one hundred and eighty-four pages are occupied by the Church of the Associate Reformed, which arose in 1782 by a union of the Associate Presbytery of New York and a part of the Associate Presbytery of Pennsylvania with the Reformed Presbytery. This occupies one hundred and eighty-four pages. The Associate Reformed Synod of the South has eight presbyteries and sixty-five ministers. The one hundred pages which remain are devoted to the Reformed Presbyterian Church. It is descended from the Reformed Presbytery of Scotland, which was composed of dissentients from the "Revolutionary Settlement," by which, in 1688-'89, the Presbyterian Church was again recognised as the Established

Church of Scotland. It once had two or three churches in South Carolina, which, we believe, are now extinct. This Church has been opposed to slaveholding, to an uninspired psalmody, to open communion, (in which two last particulars it agrees with the two preceding branches of the Presbyterian family,) and holds that public social covenanting is an ordinance of God, from which their name, "Covenanters," is derived.

The volume is especially interesting to those who desire to obtain a complete knowledge of the various divisions of the Presbyterian Church as they are represented in this country, and contains the biographies of many men whose influence has been widely felt in years past.

A Defence of Presbyterian Baptism; being the substance of two addresses on the Subjects and Mode of Baptism, delivered in the Presbyterian church of Hillsboro', N. C. By Rev. H. B. PRATT. Richmond: 1869.

We have rarely met with the argument for infant baptism treated more popularly and satisfactorily than in this pamphlet of eighty pages. It consists of the substance of two addresses delivered in the Presbyterian church at Hillsboro', N. C., called forth by a public statement by Dr. Pritchard, of Raleigh, of the views of the Baptist Church, in their most exclusive and odious form, in presence of a mixed audience, many of whom were Pædobaptists. This led to a discussion between Dr. Pritchard and himself on the evenings of the 26th, 27th, 28th, and 30th of November, in which Mr. Pratt took the initiative, the argument for infant baptism occupying the first night, to which Dr. Pritchard replied on the second night; then followed Mr. Pratt's argument on the mode of baptism upon the third night, and Dr. Pritchard's reply on the fourth. We have in this pamphlet only our own side of the argument. Mr. Pratt bears testimony to the elevated Christian courtesy, rare self-command, and gentlemanly bearing of his opponent, and to the kind, courteous, and frank manner in which the discussion was conducted. The unanswerable argument on the Pædobaptist side is felicitously set forth by Mr. Pratt in the free and lively style of oral debate, and

is now left behind him as he goes abroad to his foreign missionary work (which was interrupted by the war) as a permanent Presbyterian document, to confirm the minds of those who waver on the subject of baptism, and to defend our Presbyterian faith and practice in this matter. It is to be hoped that when another edition is called for, the typographical errors which blemish the pages of this will be corrected. We commend the argument to the attentive perusal of those seeking information as to these topics, and who have not the leisure to master the contents of larger and more elaborate works.

Hades and Heaven ; or, What does Scripture reveal of the Estate and Employment of the Blessed Dead and of the Risen Saints? By the Rev. E. H. BICKERSTETH, M. A., Author of "Yesterday, To-day, and Forever." New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1869. Pp. 128, 24mo.

It is the common sentiment of all sober Christian minds that what the Author of Revelation has seen fit to conceal from us, man should not presumptuously seek to unveil. This is no subject on which to dogmatize. We know comparatively little respecting the condition of the dead either before or after the resurrection, and we shall know comparatively little "until the awful curtains of mortality are drawn aside."

But we do not consider Mr. Bickersteth amenable to the charge of dogmatism, albeit we cannot accept his interpretations of Scripture on this subject. The work before us is the product of a devout and humble spirit, inquiring what has God said. And God has said something, although he has not said much, concerning the blessed dead, nor very much concerning the risen saints. But what we know not now we shall know hereafter, and we can patiently wait for future revelations concerning these things.

The points which the author considers that he can make out from the Scriptures concerning the blessed dead are these: That there is a state of rest; a state of consciously living to God; a state of being with Christ; a state of paradisiacal bliss; a state

of mutual recognition and of holy fellowship; a state of victory and of assurance of reward; a state of earnest expectation.

Now, we accept all of these statements as scriptural, although we are not able to accept them all precisely in the sense in which Mr. B. puts them forth. That the blessed dead rest, but are alive to God and are with Christ in bliss, and recognise and have fellowship with each other, and have got the victory, while yet their state is imperfect *personally* because their bodies are in the grave, and imperfect *socially* because so many of their brethren are yet on the earth—all this is certainly scriptural. True, it does not go quite so far as the standards of our Church, which set forth the additional items of scripture revelation that the souls of believers are “then made perfect in holiness, and received into the highest heavens, where they behold the face of God in light and glory; waiting for the full redemption of their bodies, which even in death continue united to Christ, and rest in their graves as in their beds, till at the last day they be again united to their souls.” (Larger Catechism.) All these additional items, we believe, can be made out from Scripture just as clearly as can those which Mr. B. accepts in common with us. Our objection to his view of the matter, therefore, considered as a statement of the scripture doctrine, is, that it is less full and positive than revelation distinctly warrants.

We have another objection. It was briefly expressed in our critical notice of his poem in the last number of this REVIEW. He holds his whole doctrine concerning the blessed dead in the sense accepted by many in his own Church and amongst the Lutherans, of a paradise for disembodied spirits separate from heaven, and a place of confinement for the damned different from hell. The negative idea, to which we adverted above, and this positive idea, seem to be all that is peculiar in Mr. Bickersteth's theory. But to this there seems to us as good ground for objecting as to that. Mr. Bickersteth appears to feel that this view of the matter lacks force and strength. He puts it forth as if he was conscious of its weakness. One page and a half of his little book is all he devotes to it. And the passages of Scripture he refers to neither bear his construction of them

nor are referred to by him as if he had any confidence in their support.

The truth is, as we suppose, that both Anglican and Lutheran opinions on this subject are liable to the objection that they constitute a return to the comparative undevelopment of the Jewish theology. Both make of *Hades* just what the Jews did—"one common receptacle (to use Mr. B.'s expression) of the dead." Jewish theology had only vague ideas of *sheol*. Sometimes the term was used for the grave simply; sometimes it was employed to signify a vast hollow subterranean pit, a cavernous realm in the centre of the earth, having gates and bars, where all the dead dwell; sometimes it involved more definitely the idea of a place of punishment; and very commonly it set forth just *the unseen world*. It came at last to be understood as consisting of two parts—one where the blessed dwelt, the other the abode of the lost.

Now, the Anglican and Lutheran error, as we consider it, is the going backwards on the track of revealed truth to adopt this old Jewish view of the unseen world, and the constructing out of it an *intermediate state* between death and the resurrection, divided into two parts. Our Lord in the parable does speak of *Hades*, but not necessarily in the sense of a *fixed place of two chambers*. Dives and Lazarus both die and go into the unseen world—but one to the place of torment and the other of bliss. There is betwixt these two places a wide and impassable gulf. So that, although they are represented as seeing, knowing, and speaking to one another from afar off, yet a great advance is made in the parable by our Lord upon the developments of Jewish theology. Subsequently, Christ teaches more distinctly that his disciples all have a place prepared for them by him, and that he will come in their dying hours and receive them to himself; so that where he is at the right hand of the Father, they shall be with him. It was there he prayed for them to be: "*with me where I am*, that they may behold my glory." And it was there that dying Stephen, looking up steadfastly into heaven and being full of the Holy Ghost, saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God; and to Jesus he

cried, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." Saying this, he fell asleep indeed, but that was his body only; for his spirit doubtless passed immediately into glory to be forever with the Lord.

The inspired apostles still more clearly develop the doctrine of the blessed dead being one with Christ and abiding in one place with him, and coming with him when he shall descend from heaven.

Another view brought forward by the author, in his account of the blessed dead, is, that "when Jesus Christ died upon the cross, his human spirit being separated from his human flesh, acquired new life, gained new powers of motion, and travelled (*ἔπορεύθη*) on a blessed mission to the region of departed spirits." He claims the authority of the Church of England for this idea of 1 Peter iii. 18, 19: "His spirit, which he gave up, was with the spirits which are detained in prison or in hell, and preached to them." We know of no warrant in Scripture for this belief. It is impossible to establish, on the authority of an obscure and doubtful text, such as that in Peter, a doctrine so little in harmony with the general drift of Scripture. The antediluvians had the word of God and rejected it. Is the theory of Christ's going and preaching to their spirits to throw doubt upon this plain and certain truth of the Bible? Or is it to cast doubt upon the doctrine which that very passage in Peter refers to, that God's longsuffering and patience with men is limited to this mortal life, and that death always seals up the destinies of eternity, for then "the door is shut." With respect to the alleged effect of death upon the human spirit of Jesus, "giving it new powers of motion, so that it might travel" the road to Hades, is not this really trifling, and indeed almost profane? What! was the soul of Jesus separated by death from his divinity? Could death do more on him than on his followers? It works no other effect on them than merely the separation of their spirit from their body, whilst neither is separated from him. And could it do upon him any other than the corresponding work of separating his human nature into its two components of body and spirit, while both remained, as before, perfectly united to his divinity?

Here let us refer to what Calvin says of "the subterraneous cavern to which they gave the name of *Limbus*. Though this fable has the countenance of great authors, (Justin, Ambrose, Jerome,) and is now also seriously defended by many as truth, it is nothing but a fable. To conclude from it that the souls of the dead are in prison is childish. And what occasion was there that the soul of Christ should go down thither to set them at liberty?"

We have no special criticism to offer upon the second part of this volume—that relating to the risen saints. Let us simply state that the author holds to the opinion that we "shall actually eat and drink in the kingdom of God, in such wise as befits the spiritual and incorruptible body. Why should we not take our Lord's words literally, 'I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom?' (Matt. xxvi. 29.) And again, 'I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me, that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.' (Luke xxii. 29, 30.) Why should we from these words expect a visible and palpable authorisation, but an invisible and unpalpable feast? It seems to me that we gain nothing—nay, that we lose much—by trying to etherealize or explain away those scriptures which give solid and substantial reality to our conceptions of the world to come. I doubt not that all things there will have a sacramental character; they will be outward and visible signs of inward and spiritual truths. But as the elements of bread and wine in the Lord's Supper do not exclude the spiritual meaning, but are a great help to us to apprehend it, so in heaven that which is spiritual will not exclude the actual and material, but will give the greater zest to our enjoyment of it." Pp. 83, 84.

For our part, we cannot see why any thing in heaven should be of a *sacramental* character, nor why the perfected saints should any longer require outward and visible *signs* of inward and spiritual truths. A sacrament is that which seals and confirms a *promise*; but in heaven the promises will be all fulfilled. And visible signs are for the confirmation of men in respect to

that which is invisible. But in heaven we shall see not darkly, but face to face, eternal things, and will have no more need of signs or sacraments.

On page 33, the author says "Moses *disembodied*, but Elijah embodied," appeared to Christ at his transfiguration. We prefer Melvill's idea, that Moses' body was raised to grace that occasion. In the gospel, we read that two *men* talked with our Lord. And there is a curious passage in Jude which appears to refer to a struggle of Satan, whose empire the grave was, with Michael and his angels about Moses' body, which they were sent to raise.

The Christian Sabbath Vindicated: and the Sabbath in its Political Aspect. By IGNORUS. Philadelphia: 1869. Pp. 249. 12 mo.

In our view, the unknown author would have accomplished his object more certainly and satisfactorily to his readers if his method had been less circuitous. The reader is too long detained in his efforts to discover the opinions and ultimate scope of the writer; and the smoothness and finish of style is a poor compensation for the delay to which he is subjected. By the political aspect of the Sabbath, the author means its relations to the state or civil polity. When the Almighty entered into his rest on the seventh day, he solemnly inaugurated his kingdom upon the earth over which he presided in visible form and in a fixed place. The observance of this Sabbath was the creature's acknowledgment of his allegiance to the Creator, and rests as a matter of obligation upon the entire race, securing the favor of God and the perpetuity of the political condition under which man was placed. The author now follows the history of the Church through the old dispensation down to the times of Christ. The Sabbath reappears in the Mosaic economy in the midst of the moral precepts which Christian nations recognise as essential to their perfection while they regard the Sabbath as of minor importance. His twentieth chapter is on what the author calls the political import of baptism. As in the nation of Israel when God determined to separate them to himself as a peculiar

people and to endow them with certain privileges not common to the rest of mankind, he ordained circumcision as the preliminary rite, and so every one who submitted to it was entitled to its privileges, and these privileges descended as a birthright to their children; so our Lord, about to organise his kingdom over which he designed in the end should embrace all the human race, ordained the initiatory rite of baptism. The author maintains that all the baptized are entitled to all the privileges of the kingdom, and that no other evidence of their title ought to be required. No other condition, therefore, than their own baptism, ought to be required from parents in order that their children may be baptized. None other should be demanded for admission to the Lord's table, even as none but circumcision was demanded for admission to the Jewish passover.

This certainly involves a broad-churchism, equally contrary to our Presbyterian standards and to the spiritual character of the Redeemer's kingdom. The Christian Church is not coincident with the nation as the Jewish was; and it is fatal to the purity of the Church to make the one parallel throughout with the other.

The author argues that as the kingdom of Christ is universal, so the Christian Sabbath is of universal obligation, and the recognition of Christ as King and the duty of observing his Sabbath should be embodied by the nations in their constitutions of government. God, he says, never made any distinction of Church and State in his government over men. It is not a necessary result of their union that the influence of the state should be antagonistic to religion. It has not been so, the writer contends, in England. It would be difficult, he says, to find more numerous and illustrious examples of Christianity, "pure and undefiled," than within the pale of the Established Church. It presents, he thinks, as near an approach, though *longo intervallo*, to that which we are allowed to hope for, where our Lord shall be recognised as the ruler of the earth, as any establishment of mere human device is likely to afford.

"Through the Church," he says, "the State, in an official form and with no hesitating accents, acknowledges the royal authority

of Jesus Christ, and honors his Sabbath; and as long as this is the case, I believe the government of England to be absolutely indestructible."

"The occasions have been rare upon which the Congress has been called upon to declare the ideas in relation to state interference in matters of religion with which the framers of the Constitution were impressed; but such an occasion did at one time present itself, and was eagerly seized upon for this purpose. I allude to the celebrated Sunday Mail report. The Senate of the United States, the most august legislative body known to the country, deliberately resolved that this Government, in its public and official character, recognised neither God nor a Sabbath day."

"What a melancholy conclusion! and more melancholy still, the people, with rare exceptions, ratified it!

"In that hour, Jesus Christ, the Lord of the Sabbath, was deliberately pushed from his throne by the Senate of the United States, and a blank and cheerless atheism inaugurated in his stead.

"In that solemn hour, methinks, angelic eyes might have seen a hand come forth and write upon the walls of that proud Senate chamber, 'Mene, God hath numbered thy kingdom and finished it.'

"In that hour the few in the land who comprehended far better than any member of that Senate the true import of the Sabbath, were filled with the most gloomy forebodings as they looked forward into the future history of this Government, and remembered that God is jealous of his name, and that he will not give his glory to another, nor his praise to the work of men's hands.

"A generation has since passed away, and whether or not their forebodings have been fulfilled in the late frightful civil war, is not for me to say.

"I love to remember that although justice and judgment are the establishment of God's throne, yet mercy and truth go before his face; but when I see this nation apparently rushing down to Hades, with the suddenness and impetuosity of an Alpine avalanche, when I witness its desolated fields and deserted homes, and the awful carnage of its own children, I cannot avoid the belief that their worst fears are more than fulfilled.

"And my belief is further strengthened, when in looking into the causes of this war, I can see no violation of vested rights, no contest between rival houses, as in the civil wars of England, where a crown was by common consent to be the prize of the conqueror. All I can see is a difference of construction as to

the powers conferred on the general government by the Constitution on the one hand, and the rights of the separate States on the other; and regarding it in this light, whatever others may think, I am profoundly convinced that our blessed Lord, in his righteous displeasure, is pouring contempt upon a constitution which has dishonored him, and is vindicating his own supremacy in the eyes of the world by showing that no political combination, however well adjusted, no form of government, however exalted in pretension, however well it may protect the rights of its citizens at home and abroad, however successfully it may promote the physical comfort and the material interests of the nation, can have any long duration, if the recognition of his authority and a reverence for his Sabbath do not constitute its glory and defence. The sentence has already been written, 'The wicked shall be turned into hell: the nations that forget God.'

And yet the author regards all laws compelling the observance of the Sabbath as wholly impertinent, as being based upon a capricious moral sentiment, and contrary to the teachings of the Redeemer. The principle carried out would justify persecution, and the great reforming principle of the gospel is not force, but love. He holds, too, that Christians should not go to law before unbelievers, but before the saints. For in resorting to a code which disowns the precepts of the gospel, it puts dishonor on Christ.

Such are the views of this unknown author. In our origin and by our education we are a Christian people, who have left the Old World, whose soil has often been reddened with the blood of martyrs, and whose air has been pierced with the shrieks of persecuted victims, and on these shores have set up our tabernacle. The civil law, as modified by Christianity, and the common law of England which acknowledges it, have never yet been banished from our tribunals of justice. There have come to dwell among us the Jew, the heathen, the Mormon—who is the Mohammedan of the West—the denier of the divinity of Christ our Saviour, and of the final judgment. We are trying to work out the great problem Christ and the apostles were engaged in, of the propagation and upholding of Christianity apart from the State. A century has not yet passed over us, nor is it yet plain

what our system will bring forth. The fruit of this vine may be bitter to the taste, but it is not yet ripe. We must wait for it to mature. There are fearful omens in the sky, that often blaze suddenly upon us and fill us with dread. But far above these shine the sun and the moon and the stars, serene and unshaken, and we do not yet despair. But let the Church shine forth in *her* beauty, and every man and woman that is named a Christian be *truly* such, work and stand up for Christ, sow beside all waters, and hide the leaven of the gospel in all the neighborhoods where men dwell, and wait for the result.

Ecce Cælum; or, Parish Astronomy, in Six Lectures. By a Connecticut Pastor. Boston: Nichols & Noyes. 1869. Pp. 198.

This is a remarkable book. It has the ring of the true metal, and is full of marrow. We have not only been entertained by it, but positively delighted. We have been more deeply interested in its pages than the school-girl usually is over the most sensational novel. It brings up fresh in the mind all the knowledge we ever had of astronomy, and adds a great deal that we never had before. It ought to be read by young and old, and deserves an immense success. There is in these pages a happy combination of scientific accuracy, a pleasing style,—rising often to the highest eloquence,—and rich devotional sentiment. It is at once attractive and edifying. The sublime wonders of the “noblest of the sciences” are here exhibited in a manner that cannot fail to produce the most wholesome results. It fills the mind with the grandest conceptions, and makes the most favorable impressions upon the heart.

Here is a volume of less than two hundred pages, which we read at almost a single sitting, and which contains all that people generally need to know about astronomy. Without the technical terms and the mathematical calculations, which the professionally scientific man must master, this unpretending volume contains all that the general reader could desire. If botany, geology, zoology, ethnology, and the whole range of the sciences, were treated in the same way by a hand equally skilled,

the road to the acquisition of scientific knowledge would be made plain and easy, and many more would travel in it. People would not have to resort to fiction, and especially the vapid perverting fiction now so much in vogue, for entertainment, if such books were within their reach.

It is not an easy matter to popularise a science and bring it down to the comprehension of the common reader. Such efforts have generally resulted in evaporating the substance and leaving in its place only a dry husk. But our author's success in this difficult undertaking is complete. He presents to us the whole field of astronomical facts up to the latest discoveries. Every fact in his hands has a charm about it that fascinates the reader. And the whole book is instinct with light and life and God. The Author of nature is not excluded from his own works, but the last lecture gathers up the varied reflexions of the divine character from the "heavens," and they are made in a masterly manner to "declare the glory of God."

The First Lecture gives a definition and brief history of the "Natural Bible," describes the instruments used in making discoveries and observations, and explains the use of the differential and integral calculus, by which mathematics has contributed so much to this science.

The Second Lecture discusses the sky, or what we suppose Owen would call the "Aspectable Heavens," exhibiting its nature, contents, and arrangement.

The Third unfolds to our view the satellite systems, with their revolutions, distance, size, shape, densities, etc.

The Fourth speaks of the planet systems.

The Fifth, of higher systems.

The Sixth, of the Author of Nature.

We have not one word of disparaging criticism to utter about this book. Though written in New England, and, we suppose, by a New Englander, its language is pure simple English; and what has surprised us more than all, it has not one word about slavery or the freedmen or the South!

We marked many passages which deserve to be quoted, but

we will give only one, assuring our readers that there are many others equally good :

“Now, suppose our thoughts to be chariots, and let us travel off towards the sun. At the distance of Mercury, the sun would appear six times larger and brighter than it did on the earth, and must be that number of times hotter—other things being equal. What a summer, 2 o'clock in the afternoon, the Mercenaries must have! If the supposed planet Vulcan were real, the sun from it would appear fifty times as large and bright as it does at the earth; and the mean heat at the most exposed parts of the planet would be more than 3000° . What a long thermometer, not to say incombustible, must the Vulcanians require! Going on still, as we near the surface of the sun, it expands so as to fill a half-heaven with its disc, and the heat is now three hundred thousand times what we have been accustomed to on the earth. Had we not had the prudence to provide ourselves with a jerkin of the very best asbestos, were not our thought-chariot itself a salamander safe of the very best quality, our travelling would now be forever ended. But, as it is, we are able to pass around the sun; and then, speeding outward as only thought-chariots, fancy-driven, can, past belted Jupiter, past Saturn with its three wondrous rings, we stop not till we reach Neptune. Looking back, we see the sun dwindled to the size of Venus—nine hundred times less than we saw it from the earth, and nine hundred times as dim and cold, and yet giving as much light as six hundred of our moons. And if our courage does not fail us on these dim frontiers, and with the thermometer already standing some $50,000^{\circ}$ below zero; if it is not too much of a transition even for us, thought-pavilioned as we are, to pass, all in a single minute, from the immeasurable furnace of the sun to the immeasurable refrigerator of the very pole of our planetary system—let us keep on one stage further to where the sun appears a star of inappreciable diameter, and where, in the heart of eternal night and of infinite congelation multiplied by two hundred and fifty-six, cruises the last known picket of our planetary system, the comet of 1680. We cannot deny that, if worlds thus situated are peopled, it must be with beings very differently constituted from ourselves. And what of that? We will not be guilty of the unphilosophy of assuming that the Infinite Creator has made but one pattern of living creatures, or that the patterns are not as various as the circumstances of the spheres which his almighty hand has shaped and sent whirling through the void.” Pp. 110, 111.

Baptism versus Immersion. A Review of the New Testament of the Immersionists. By GEORGE B. JEWETT. Reprinted from the *Congregational Review* for September, 1868. Published by request of the "Essex South Association." Third edition. Salem: 1869.

A Letter to the Bible Union in answer to a recent pamphlet entitled "*Essex South Association and the Revised Testament*;" covering also Dr. Conant's "*Letter to the Examiner and Chronicle, December 3, 1868.*" By GEORGE B. JEWETT. Salem: 1869.

These two pamphlets exhibit the controversy which has arisen between some of our Congregational brethren of Massachusetts and the *Immersionists*, concerning the Revised New Testament of the American Bible Union. The authors, inventors, and promoters of this "revision" have hitherto rejoiced in the appellation of Baptists—a name of large assumption, as if no others but themselves baptized, but which is so familiar that we forget its scope and import. They have earned, by their zeal and exclusiveness, the name "*Immersionists*," followers, they claim, of "John the Immerser," and which is but the synonym of an earlier name—the "*Dippers*."

The objections of Mr. Jewett arrange themselves under three classes. He objects to the revised New Testament as an English work, as a translation from the Greek, and as an instrument of denominational propagandism. In reference to the first, he objects that while aiming to modernise the language of the common version, it retains many of its obsolescent forms; that it has many unintelligible renderings, as "a hundred denaries" for "a hundred pence;" that it appears to have no law for the use of English relatives, auxiliaries, tenses, or the subjunctive and potential moods. In reference to the second, he objects to it as a translation from the Greek that its renderings are often ambiguous; that they are often *servile*, sacrificing the English idiom to the Greek when it was neither necessary nor tolerable; that its renderings are often intensely *weak*, as "chosen" instead of "elect," "he is risen from the dead and therefore do these

power work in him," "through the *bathing* of regeneration," "no one puts new wine into old skins;" that other renderings are manifestly incorrect. The third objection is a more forcible one, "that it is evidently intended to be *an instrument of denominational propagandism*." It is enough to state explicitly that "baptism" is supplemented by "immersion," "baptist" by "immerser," "baptize" by "immerse," and that this change is universal. *And this is the only characteristic feature of the version—the only change from the common version which is carried persistently through.*

"Their sole aim seems to be to expunge from the New Testament the very *idea of baptism*, and substitute *immersion*; thus foreclosing all discussion, and preoccupying the mind of every reader with a conviction so strong and irresistible of what the Bible teaches respecting this one doctrine and ordinance, as to preclude forever all room for doubt or question. They wish to be able to say to every inquirer: 'He that believes and is *immersed* shall be saved' (Mark xvi. 16). They wish to silence every objector by a thus-saith-the-Lord: 'Arise, *be immersed*, and wash away thy sins' (Acts xxii. 16). They would teach every child, they would declare to every person unskilled in the original languages of the Bible: There is not a single instance in the New Testament of the use of any word descriptive of what was once called 'baptism' except *immersion*; search and see for yourselves. Those who have learned the pass-word, they would welcome to the kingdom of heaven; those who 'cannot frame to pronounce it,' they would consign to the uncovenanted mercies of persistent *baptists*. Thus they would convert the Bible into one grand engine of proselytism.

"To effect all this, they must, of course, begin at the foundation. They must undermine the old version, and, if possible, utterly destroy the confidence hitherto reposed in it. They must make it appear as a thing of the past—as good as could be expected from the ignorant and prejudiced men who produced it, but quite inadequate to the present exigencies of the Church, and quite unworthy of the approval of the 'most competent scholars of the present day.' When this work is accomplished, they have opened the way for their new version; they have prepared for themselves an open field in which to roam at will, without fear of remonstrance or rebuke from one of those to whom their labors are addressed—the masses of the people. It is enough for most people to be told, *in scripture phrase*, that

'in those days comes John the immerser' (Matt. iii. 1); and that the people 'were immersed by him in the Jordan' (iii. 6). It is enough for them to read: 'Then Jesus comes from Galilee to the Jordan, to John, to be immersed by him;' and that, 'having been immersed, Jesus went up immediately from the water' (iii. 13, 16); and especially that the commission of the disciples was in these words: 'Go, therefore, and disciple all the nations, immersing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit' (Matt. xxviii. 19). What more is needed? Does not the Bible teach, that, in order to follow the example of Christ, and to obey his precepts, every man must be *immersed*? Could any thing be clearer? Could any duty be plainer or more obligatory?

"And could any other method of enforcing this obligation and silencing objection possibly be devised, so simple, so direct, so authoritative and effectual as this—to be able to show to every reader the word, 'IMMERSION,' emblazoned on every page of the gospel?

"And yet one thing more was found to be essential. An air of plausibility must be given to this daring innovation, by introducing enough other changes and professed improvements to serve as a foil or screen for this—a sort of veil to hide the nakedness of the statue. Hence the necessity of a general revision, rather than a specific alteration merely. Hence, too, the animus of the whole undertaking—the motive power of all the machinery. Under cover of zeal for the purity of the Scriptures and their wider dissemination, is thus introduced a more stupendous enterprise for converting the world to a single dogma, than ever entered into the thoughts of the most zealous disciple of the Society of Jesus.

"Accordingly, all the other changes from the common version are made in subserviency to this single dogma. Every rendering is shaped and shaded in such a manner as to give plausibility to this central doctrine. To undergo immersion, people must go down *into* (*eis*) the water; hence, as often as possible, must *eis* be rendered 'into,' though it involve the absurdity of walking *into mountains*. After immersion, the novitiate must come up *out of* the water; hence, *ek* must be translated, on every possible occasion, *out of*, even though the rendering involve the impossibility of rolling a stone *out of a door within which it had never been placed*. Immersion must be performed *in* some appropriate element; hence, *en* must be rendered *in*, even though it imposed the necessity of saying, 'Ye shall be immersed in the Holy Spirit not many days hence' (Acts i. 5);

and although the fulfilment of this prediction stands recorded in these words, 'They were all *filled with the Holy Spirit*' (ii. 4); and yet again, although the act implied is described in the 17th verse, in this significant form of expression, 'I will *pour out* of my Spirit *upon* all flesh.' From which it is evident that this 'immersion *in* the Holy Spirit' was, in reality, a baptism *by or with* the Holy Spirit; not a filling, but a being filled with the Spirit; not a plunging into, but a reception of, the Spirit *poured upon* the recipient from above.

"The word baptism must be supplanted by 'immersion,' though it be the occasion of *immersing the couches* of the Jews before they could be considered fit for occupancy—a custom which, in these days, would be regarded as more honored in the breach than in the observance; and though it involve the gratuitous assumption implied in the passage: 'And coming from the market, except they immerse themselves, they do not eat' (Mark vii. 4); and the preposterous translation: 'And the Pharisee, seeing it, wondered that he did not first immerse himself (aor. pass.) before dinner' (Luke xi. 38). We say 'preposterous,' because the probabilities of the case justify a term of reprobation as strong as this; and because one of the evangelists has taken the precaution to forestall so absurd a rendering by stating expressly: 'For the Pharisees, and all the Jews, except they carefully wash their *hands*, do not eat, holding the tradition of the elders' (Mark vii. 3, 4); and also because the Master himself said: 'He that is washed needeth not save to wash his *feet*, but is clean every whit' (John xiii. 10)."

The second pamphlet, whose title we have given, is a letter addressed to William H. Wyckoff, LL. D., Corresponding Secretary of the American Bible Union, in reply to Dr. Conant's answer to the first pamphlet of Mr. Jewett. There may be an occasional hypercriticism in Mr. Jewett's strictures, but they are exceedingly damaging to the new version, which claims to be "the work of the most competent scholars of the day," who, however, are often caught napping by the acute critic, wearied perhaps by their labors in constructing this new railway into the Immersionist Church. Many of our Baptist brethren, we know, have an intense dislike to the new version. We have some of our sincerest friends among them, and delight to walk with them on the broad fields of our common Christianity. We are only sorry that they do not allow their fellow-Christians to be

members of the visible Church of Christ, and for themselves that they so exalt the outward *form* of a sacrament of the Church above its spiritual import; which must be attended with evil consequences to their own Church as well as to others, and especially to the ignorant and unreflecting souls who are so apt to make religion to consist wholly in outward rites.

Calvin: His Life, his Labors, and his Writings. Translated from the French of FELIX BUNGENER, Author of History of the Council of Trent. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street. 1863. Pp. 349, 8vo.

The fact, referred to before in this department of our work, that the war cut us off completely from the current literature of Europe, must be our apology, if any is needed, for introducing this book at so late a day to the notice of our readers. But the interest of the subject and the value of this treatise, we think, will quiet all demands for such apology. The Rev. Felix Bungenner is the well known author not only of a "History of the Council of Trent," but of a number of other works—as "The Priest and the Huguenot," "The Court and the Desert," in three volumes, "France before the Revolution," in two volumes, "Voltaire and his Times," "Julian, or the Close of an Era," in two volumes, "Rome and the Bible," "Rome and the Human Heart," "Christ and the Age." We give the titles as translated into English, and the number of volumes as published in our language.

The present work we judge to be translated well, notwithstanding that a very few sentences have the outlandish air which it is so difficult to avoid in translations. There is no good excuse, however, for a translator who uses bad English, as this one does when he employs (p. 97) the word *ignore* in the sense of not *acknowledging*. This is one of many illustrations of the influence in these days of American books upon the people of the mother country. *Ignore*, we suppose, is New England English, like *locate* and *donate*; but Old England sometimes unwittingly borrows these inventions. A living author in London was amazed when we pointed to the word *reliable* in his

book as something imported by him from America, and boldly appealed to his Johnson as authority for its use, only to be still more amazed to find no such word there. We may add, that there are some errors of the press to be found in this book, as on pages 82 and 222.

Our author, though a great admirer of Calvin, is nevertheless very free and independent in his judgment of the Reformer. Here is what he says of the severity of Calvin's spirit and language: "When he refutes, there is always a little anger, a little contempt, and sometimes a great deal; always that assurance which will not allow him to admit it possible for one to differ from him without being a dolt, a dunce, or a traitor." (P. 40.) "All the impatience and all the indignation which can be inspired by a false idea, Calvin thinks himself entitled to pour out upon all who teach or even accept that idea. * * * You ask yourself how he came not to understand that, in default of charity, the very interest and dignity of his cause forbade him to defend it thus." (P. 55.) But he very properly and justly adds: "Calvin wrote for his own age, not for ours. He was to blame, it is true, for a great author ought to write for every age; but he was writing for his own; and if he was absolved by it, or rather if it did not even occur to it that absolution was needed, so natural then did harsh polemics appear—why, we must either absolve him, or keep our reproaches for those who absolved, approved, encouraged, and admired him. * * * Let us regret them, [these blemishes,] but on our own account; to visit upon Calvin all the annoyance which they inflict upon us, would be to be guilty of injustice to him like that for which we blame him; for we also should then magnify into serious faults what are such only from our point of view and according to our impressions." (P. 56.) Elsewhere he speaks of the severities exercised upon the Protestants at Paris, as young Jacques Pavanne and the poor hermit of Livry, both of whom he may have seen burned: "It was by the light of those flames that he resolutely entered upon the path in which at every step such fires might be kindled for him. When we judge the man, let us not forget the terrible and pitiless education which the age had given him." (P. 12.)

M. Bungener furnishes on many points details which we do not remember to have found elsewhere. Take, for example, his history of Calvin's childhood and youth, and you get a clearer idea than Henry gives of his relations to the Romish priesthood and of the facts in reference to that clerical appointment which he held when a mere boy. So in reference to the causes which led to his banishment from Geneva; and so in reference to the circumstances of his return; and so in reference to his correspondence with Sadolet; and so in reference to the Spiritual Libertines. Henry gives one a clear idea neither of the relations of these men to the Anabaptists on the one hand, nor to the political Libertines on the other. Bungener sets before us distinctly what was their object, viz., "the accommodation of materialism and the gospel. For this, it was necessary either to materialize the gospel, or to spiritualize materialism. They had chosen the latter, and hence the name of *spiritual* assumed by them." "They did but give to Anabaptism a more philosophical form, endeavoring at the same time to reconnect it better with the gospel, but a gospel philosophized with this intention." "God is every where, therefore God is all; such is the starting point of the system." (P. 205.) This is the account given of the Spirituists, or rather of their leaders, Coppin, Quintin, Perceval, and Pocque. Then come the Libertines of Geneva—the political ones who "seize as a matter of tactics upon a doctrine which sanctioned their disorderly practices," and who, for nine years, are all the time on the point of crushing Calvin, during which period he guides "Geneva as a vessel on fire, which burns the captain's feet and yet obeys him."

We set a very high value upon Henry's *Life and Times of Calvin*; but in a work of not half the size of it, our author gives a clearer statement of many points. It is just the difference between German and French writing.

Let us, however, separate Bungener's treatment of the question of Calvin and Servetus from this general commendation. That affair our author narrates very well and very satisfactorily; but we looked for some fresh light, and were disappointed. He tells us nothing which the *Memoir of M. Rilliet de Candolle*

(Geneva, 1844,) had not told us before, and it appears to us that his account of it lacks our author's accustomed spirit and point.

Let us also observe that Bungener's book wants the advantage of a copious index, with which Henry's furnishes the reader. Nor do we admire his plan of four books divided into twenty or twenty-five sections each, with nothing at the head of each page to guide the reader as he seeks to compare one passage with another.

Amongst the points on which Bungener sheds new light is the motive of Calvin in publishing his Commentary upon the *De Clementia* of Seneca. Some of his historians have said it was to obtain from Francis I. more indulgence towards the Protestants. Our author gives several reasons for not accepting this view, and then adds: "In fact, the idea attributed to him does not belong to his age, and is one from which no man was further than he. To ask *clemency* of a king for the friends of the Reformed faith would, in his eyes, have been to ask clemency and compassion for truth,—for the gospel,—and to ascribe to that king authority over God himself. The men of the sixteenth century never asked for *toleration*, in the more modern sense of the word—a fact too much forgotten when they are so loudly accused of not having granted it themselves while the power was in their hands." (P. 24.) The nineteenth century is very fine—it is far in advance of the sixteenth in point of civilisation; but the sixteenth was very sturdy, and sturdiness always deserves respect.

M. Bungener's remarks on Calvin's "tremendous doctrine" of predestination and reprobation appear to us to be very weak. In the first place, (and he acknowledges it very fully,) that doctrine is not Calvin's doctrine any more than it is Augustine's; nor is it the invention of either, for they both get it from Paul the inspired apostle, and the other Scripture writers. In the next place, it is not correct that Calvin admits the foundation of the doctrine to be "in a logical deduction," for he derives it directly and expressly from the Bible. But, in the third place, our author ought not to sneer at logical deductions from the

express words of Scripture, nor identify such a basis of doctrine with what infidels and Romanists accept or maintain. It is not a fact that infidels and Romanists build their structures on logical deductions from the express words of Scripture. Our author ought not to forget that what is written down in the Bible is no more truly the teaching of the Spirit than what is deducible therefrom by good and necessary consequence. If logic is human, so is reading and writing human. If we must not confide in our reason, so we must not confide in our eye or ear. We must not confide in either; but the word of God in which we are to confide is no more addressed to our eye and ear than to our reason, and whatever we read we are required to understand—not of course the *quomodo*, but certainly the *quid*.

We do not accept for a moment, therefore, our author's statement, that to Calvin, "as to his disciples," the doctrine of predestination "remained a dead letter," because "there is not a trace, either in his theology, his ethics, or his life, of that practical fatalism which ought logically to result from the terrible dogma he taught." (P. 53.) Indeed, he himself contradicts this statement on the same page, where he says: "Instead of destroying activity, courage, morality, and hope, it seems, on the contrary, to have given the soul a more vigorous temper, and to have made it face more boldly the severest duties and trials. All the martyrs who went to the stake, encouraged and comforted by some pious epistle from him who had taught them, believed in predestination." On the same page, we also read what we transcribe with slightly qualified pleasure: "A writer who certainly is no Calvinist, nor unhappily even a believer, is struck like ourselves by this moral, heroic aspect of the question. 'Geneva,' says Michelet, 'endured by its moral strength. It had no territory, no army—nothing for space, time, or matter; it was the city of the mind, *built of Stoicism on the rock of predestination*. Against the immense and gloomy net into which, when abandoned by France, Europe fell, nothing less was necessary than that heroic seminary. To every people in peril, Sparta for an army sent a Spartan. It was thus with Geneva; * * * and now the combat commences! Below, let Loyola

excavate his mines; above, let the gold of Spain and the sword of the Guises dazzle or pervert! In that narrow enclosure, the gloomy garden of God, blood-red roses bloom under Calvin's hand for the preservation of the liberties of the soul. If in any part of Europe blood and tortures are required, a man to be burnt or to be broken on the wheel, that man is at Geneva, ready to depart, giving thanks to God and singing psalms to him."

Upon Calvin's "Antidote to the Council of Trent," which was held in his day, our author makes the following observations, derived from Calvin: "Opened, after long delays, in 1545, the Council of Trent dragged itself miserably along with a very small number of prelates—twenty-five at first, but afterwards a few more, nearly all Italians, and visibly embarrassed by the grand name of General or Œcumenical, with which the Council had been decorated. The Romish Church has succeeded so well in forgetting those clay-feet of the colossus and in causing them to be forgotten, that it is curious to see what a well-informed contemporary was able to say of it without fear of being contradicted. Calvin asks these few bishops, dressed up with the name of General Council, if there be amongst them at least some well-known name, some theologian of any weight. Though unknown in their respective dioceses, 'a change of air' has sufficed for them to become the light of the world! Their decrees, moreover, are not drawn up by themselves; the true Council of Trent is composed of sundry monks, whom the bishops have brought to make them transact the business. And even were the Council composed of a thousand bishops, the rights which it arrogates to itself would be no better founded on sound doctrine and history. Who ever saw the first Councils ascribing to themselves infallibility? * * * Calvin was mistaken, therefore, in one thing only. He thought—what all Romanists then thought with him, including the members of the Council—that this Council was a failure." The Council of Trent having been prorogued, and it being doubtful whether it ever would be re-assembled, which it was not for fourteen years, there appears Charles V.'s famous *Interim*, to decide what Protestants and

Romanists were provisionally to believe till a good and true Council should make them agree. Whereupon Calvin puts forth his two treatises *Touching reformation and the true means of determining differences*. Bungenier's observations on this subject apply to more questions and more parties in the present day than one. What he says of "half-way men," "men of accommodations and compromises" "beginning to yield," and then yielding more, and "willing to live in peace at any price," "framers of a factitious concord," "the plan of which is but a tissue of equivocations," whereas "one means only is good, and that is frankness;" and what he says of "the interest of the cause," as "a human thought which Calvin despises and rejects," who "knows nothing but the interests of truth,"—all this it would be profitable to have read and pondered by various parties in our age and country. But let us quote his concluding remarks on this point. "If you wish to conquer by the Bible,—and by what else would you dream of conquering?—you must not begin by agreeing at its expense, even upon secondary things, with those who have abandoned or burlesqued it. Do not forget, moreover, that it is by secondary things, by forms, practices, and usages, that Rome established and still maintains her empire. The little which you would yield her would become a great deal in her hands: you would have furnished her the means to reconquer, if not you, your children. This is what Calvin had comprehended. Is the danger of acting otherwise less now? So some think. It seems to them that a position marked out by a straggle of three centuries cannot be compromised by allowing it to be encroached upon in a few unimportant points. Such is not our opinion; and we think that the greater part of Calvin's reflections on the 'Interim' are altogether as just now as they were in 1549."

Dr. Cunningham has said that Calvin yielded in the sacraments too much to Luther, and endeavors in this way to weaken the force of the Genevan doctrine upon that subject. M. Bungenier's may be set over against Dr. Cunningham's authority on this point. (See pages 153, 296-7.) We have long been satisfied that this is an error of Cunningham's.

What Calvin did for the French language is another point upon which our author may be consulted with advantage. (See pages 14, 56, 57, 64.)

One interesting item is thus set forth by our author: "He always preached *extempore*." (P. 328.) Another is thus expressed: "In fact, never was marriage holier and more indissoluble than at Geneva under the ordinances of Calvin." (P. 186.) But we take occasion to record, to the honor of our maligned and hated South Carolina, that there never was a case of divorce amongst her white population until this year, when such an event has occurred under the present government, administered by freedmen and foreigners. As to our former slaves, we hold, with Dr. Thornwell, that, for the most part, they were incompetent to make or observe any such alliance. Marriage is an institute of revealed religion, and barbarians and semi-barbarians are not capable of its duties or obligations.

Another item of some interest is the following: "Another day it is a dentist whose art is new, for hitherto men had only been drawers of teeth, but he announces himself as taking care of and repairing them. He is sent to M. Calvin, and Calvin receives him, puts himself into his skilful hands, and recommends him to the magistrates." (P. 330.) Another is this: "Farel is nearly eighty years and Calvin is going to die." Farel writes that he is coming. His friend replies in writing, and begs him to avoid so much fatigue. "But Farel was already on his way; dusty and exhausted, for he had come from Neuchâtel on foot, Calvin saw him enter his chamber." (Pp. 345-6.) And still another is the following: "He also refused, during his last illness, the quarter's salary which was brought to him. He had not earned it, he said, how could he accept it? * * * This is the characteristic which even the Pope, Pius IV., on hearing of his death, pointed out in him: 'That which made the strength of that heretic,' said he, 'was that money was nothing to him.' Calvin's strength had a very different cause assuredly, and one of which his indifference to money was only a consequence; but it is pleasant to prove to the end the perfect unity of his life." (P. 340.)

We shall close with one more reference: "On the 19th November (1563) was fought the battle of Dreux." It had most important results; for the Protestants were thereby prevented from marching into Paris, which would have been the signal for the definite triumph of the Reformed religion in France. One thousand men would have sufficed to change the aspect of that battle, and the aspect, too, of France for centuries. "God did not then will the triumph of the Reformation in France. Why did he not will it? Away with our questions! His ways are not our ways; let us submit and be silent." "This is what Calvin had more than once to preach, after the battle of Dreux, to all those hearts which were less cast down by defeat than painfully astonished at seeing God abandon the cause." (Pp. 324-5.) The people of the late Southern Confederacy, whose sad privilege is to mourn a good cause lost just about three centuries subsequent to the battle of Dreux, can understand the meaning of our author's words concerning those champions of right in France who were less cast down by defeat than *painfully astonished at seeing God abandon the cause*. It is comforting to know that ours was not the first righteous cause which the Judge of the whole earth has seen fit, for reasons which satisfy him, to abandon. It is indeed *our* only comfort to recognise defeat in this case as coming, not from man, but from God. That which God our Father chooses for us, we know through his grace how to accept. "God hath given us," said Calvin, "a heavy blow; let us remain cast down till he lift us up. Since God wills to afflict us, let us keep quiet." "*To keep quiet* with Calvin and his disciples, could only be to humble themselves before God—to be steadfast before men—to hope and to pray. The counsel is as good now as it was in 1563." (P. 325.)

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. XX.

OCTOBER, MDCCCLXIX.

No. 4.

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

1869.

CONTENTS.

ARTICLE	PAGE
I. Unification,	458
II. The Amended Form of Government. By the Rev. J. A. SMYLLIE, Milford, Texas,	477
III. Christian Unity. By the Rev. B. W. MOSELEY, Oakley, Va.,	492
IV. What is a Call to the Gospel Ministry?	508
V. Bannerman's Church of Christ,	520
VI. Foreign Missions,	555
VII. Card of Rev. Dr. F. A. Ross.	572
VIII. Critical Notices,	575
1. Tischendorf's New Testament, 575. 2. Campbell's Theory of the Eldership, 578. 3. Schele De Vere's Studies in English, 582. 4. Conybeare and Howson's Life and Epis- tles of St. Paul, 586. 5. Power's Pivot Words of Scripture, 588. 6. Gibson's Public Worship of God, 592. 7. Barnes's Notes on the Psalms, 596. 8. DeFonvielle's Thunder and Lightning. 9. Marion's Wonders of Optics, 600.	

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XX.—NO. 4.

OCTOBER, MDCCCLXIX.

ARTICLE I.

UNIFICATION.

1. *The South.* An Address delivered by W. L. Trenholm, Esq., on the Third Anniversary of the Charleston Board of Trade. April 7, 1869. Charleston, S. C.: Walker, Evans & Cogswell.
2. *A Continental Empire, from the Polar Sea to the Isthmus of Panama, including all contiguous Islands.* *New York Herald*, May 1 to 31, 1869, inclusive.
3. *Proceedings of the Old and New School Assemblies in New York.* *New York Observer*, May 27 and June 3, 1869.

Many years ago, one of the monthly magazines published a humorous article, in which the writer affected to describe the condition of humanity in the middle of the twentieth century. The capital of the planet was located in the island of Borneo—a city of remarkable magnificence, the residence of the magnates in “The Republic of United Interests.” The central idea of the essay was the unification of the race; and the drapery of the story, ingeniously constructed and dexterously applied, exhibited this idea in all the relations of life. The great old

VOL. XX., NO. 4—1.

centres of power, wealth, and influence—Paris, London, and New York—were crumbling ruins, visited only by antiquaries in search of the records of extinct tribes and nationalities. It is now fifteen or twenty years since this publication appeared, and it would seem that the drift of the civilised world towards unification was even then already apparent. In the present day, this tendency is the characteristic of the time. The publications noted at the head of the present article will indicate the treatment of the topic now under examination, and it is proposed to investigate this apparent tendency, first in its application to material interests—both industrial and political—and secondly, in its ecclesiastical aspects.

I. An extended review of Mr. Trenholm's eloquent address, delivered six months ago, before the Charleston Board of Trade, is not the present purpose. It is a good omen for this stricken land, and a rich promise for her proximate future, to have these brave and hopeful words spoken at such a time and under such circumstances. With a clear and candid recognition of the peculiar difficulties of the case, the orator earnestly and forcibly points out the mode of egress, and invites his countrymen to unite in the task of building a magnificent empire upon these smouldering ruins. The first grand lesson of the time is to accept the situation; the second and grander lesson is to grapple with the apparent discouragements and hindrances which the providence of God has heaped in our pathway, and with manly courage and resistless energy, transform these very obstacles into instruments of material progress. Constantly recognising the drift of the age towards consolidation, Mr. Trenholm urges his hearers not only to yield to the current, but to seize the helm and thus keep control of the vessel. It is not possible to beat back the waves, or to stem the tide of progress; but it may be possible for the statesmen and jurists of this latitude to occupy the foremost places, as their fathers did, availing themselves of opportunities as they are presented, and compelling the success they desire. This apparently untoward drift will then become the tide in their affairs that leads to fortune. What a grand spectacle would thus be presented, challenging the admi-

ration of the civilised world! To behold the very men who but yesterday were prostrate, stunned, and bleeding amid the wreck of all their hopes and all their material interests—their entire social system disorganised, their hearthstones desolated, their liberties a mockery, their capital dissipated into thin air; to see these men to-day, with patient courage, gathering up these shattered fragments and shaping them into implements for warfare in a new field, where there are no defeats,—this were indeed a spectacle worthy of their record, which is no mean part of their country's history.

So many illustrations of this unifying tendency are presented in all the great achievements of the present day, that the difficulty is to select examples. The completion of the great highway from the Atlantic coast to the shores of the Pacific, and the successful operation of ocean telegraphs, have annihilated time and space. All parts of Christendom are drawing nearer together, and the rival interests of distant nationalities are yielding to the pressure of this new principle, called into active exercise by the requirements of commerce. In New York, there are multitudes of houses with branches in old world cities; and it is probable that every centre of trade in the civilised world has one or more representatives in the American *entrepot*. Twenty years ago, London, Paris, Bremen, Hamburg, and Naples, had branch houses in the United States. To-day, while these subordinate establishments still continue, New York has branch houses in every great market on every continent. That the "progress of the age" is noticeable in the fields of science, art, and literature, is undoubtedly true. But the steadfast march of trade, moving with the stride of a giant to possess the world, overshadows all other forms of progress; and if it were not for the constant recurrence or constant threat of wars, no created agencies would avail even to retard this stately progress. The unification of the race in all its industrial interests would be an established fact before the close of the present century.

There are some examples of recent combinations in large enterprises, which are not so universally known throughout the Southern States. Since the beginning of the Pacific Road, the

various great corporations on the Atlantic coast have been struggling to secure the control of the eastern terminus; and to accomplish this object, they have consolidated their lines in many instances. This plan of consolidation has long been in practice, and one familiar illustration of its working is furnished in the through ticket system, extending over many independent lines. More recently, however, the eastern lines, which control rolling stock of fabulous value, have been gradually absorbing smaller corporations, and making their connexions perfect from the Atlantic seaboard to the great western river. It will be seen that rival interests have thus been swallowed up in these acts of consolidation. The management of the long lines thus united is in the hands of few men, and so far the public have undoubtedly been benefited by this example of unification. The time tables are far more accurate; freights for distant cities are delivered with more regularity and despatch; passengers travel the length or breadth of the populous part of the continent with no care of luggage, and with very few changes of cars; while all this improved service is rendered at less expense than formerly. All of this indicates substantial progress, and all of it is due to unification.

There are still rival interests at work, producing competition and keeping prices at a low standard. Referring to the example already presented, it will be remembered that five or six points on the shores of the Atlantic are already connected by long lines of railways with the interior. Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Charleston, and Savannah, have each established connexions with western roads or rivers, and the vast volume of freight and passenger traffic is partitioned among them. But the time is approaching when these various outlets will either be under one management, or when some combined system will be adopted by which rivalry will give place to coöperation. The same remark will apply to the numerous telegraph lines, covering as with a net-work the entire surface of the continent. Recent events seem to indicate that these private enterprises will come eventually under Government control, and be included in the postal system of the country; which would involve a loss of revenue

to private stockholders, but secure an enormous gain to the public.

One other example of the tendency to combination in material enterprises, is a comparatively recent union of stock boards in New York. It is not very easy to explain the constitution of these establishments to those who are far removed from their influence; nor is this the publication in which a formal defence of the system would be in place. It is, perhaps, sufficient to say, that the popular idea that Wall Street is a mere nest of gamblers, thinly disguised, is a popular delusion. The truth is, that the operations in certificates of values in that locality actually regulate the quotations all over the civilised world. It is positive *values* that are there bought and sold; and while it is true that large transactions for mere speculation daily occur, it is also true that an enormous amount of business is there done on a purely legitimate basis. Until very recently, there were several of these organisations. First the "Regular Board," which was divided into "Government" and "Miscellaneous" combinations. The former dealt in United States securities alone, and was, and is, powerful enough to manipulate the stock operations in London and Frankfort. The latter, dealing in railway, mining, and other stocks, has also ramifications extending to European capitals. Besides these, there was the "Open Board of Brokers," kept for years out in the cold by the exclusive "Regulars," and growing richer year by year. Within a few months, all of these have been combined—forming a monster organisation, with specific departments, but all under one direction. It now appears probable that the "Gold Board" will, sooner or later, be included in the same corporation; in which event, the "Wall Street operators" will form the most powerful financial agency in Christendom, and New York will regulate the exchanges of the world.

Let not the South be jealous of this growing influence, for the prosperity of the entire country is included in its onward march. As before hinted, the material development of American resources is dependent upon commercial operations. Your trader is always a man of peace, and the terrible waste of values in all

wars is the telling argument in all peace congresses. Eventually, if the earth abide, wars will be simply impossible, because all races are gradually but surely unifying under the operation of trade and under the pressure of its simple laws. The untold and unimagined wealth which lies hidden in the bowels of these mountains, that gladdens the eye in the fertile valleys, that sparkles on the surface of all these majestic water-courses, calls aloud to the traders of the world to come and take possession. And these busy men are drawing together for this very purpose. Hitherto their progress has been hindered by the operations of another body of manipulators, who trade upon the passions and prejudices of mankind—the politicians. But their days are numbered.

II. To introduce the second branch of this discussion, it is worth while to look back a little at this unifying drift in the political world. How short is the time since the power of the petty sovereignties of the Italian peninsula disappeared! Less than twenty years ago, this fair land, which has nurtured glorious nationalities, was subdivided into contemptible principalities, the most powerful of which groaned under the tyranny of the brute of Naples—Ferdinand. King Bomba, as he was nicknamed by “Punch” years before his downfall, will be remembered while the world lasts—only to be execrated. If a momentary digression may be pardoned here, it is curious to recall the fact that the lineal progenitor of the present King of Italy, Emmanuel Philibert, the valiant Duke of Savoy, spared the handful of persecuted saints in the Piedmontese valleys, when they were in the very grasp of his gauntlet, and when their total annihilation would have secured to him the highest honors the Church could confer. The unification of the peninsular dukedoms, however, could not have been predicted in the sixteenth century.

Nearer to the present date, the absorption of petty German States by the kingdom of Prussia, and the apparent growth of a real Germanic empire, furnishes a notable example of the drift of the age. The old taunt of the first Napoleon, who recognised nothing like German nationality in these disjointed fragments, is partly met, and the consolidation of the empire is

a sore trial to his successor. Coincidentally, the vast empire of the Cossack threatens to sweep round the southern coast of the Black Sea, and fulfilling the dream of a line of Czars, secure the Levantine seaports, and obliterate the effete dominion of the Crescent. This is perhaps the most certain result of another European war. In all of these changes the accretion of atoms goes on, and none of the recent changes in the map of the world have given birth to new nationalities.

It will hardly be denied that the *New York Herald* is the most untrustworthy publication that is printed in English—or indeed any other language. Any modern Diogenes might search the land throughout, without finding a solitary believer in the honesty or truthfulness of this sheet. Of all known examples of cold-blooded effrontery and shameless mendacity, it is the best. That portion of its utterances which is more formal and didactic is usually puerile and flimsy, and always vulgar. Owing to its well-earned reputation for instability, and the known want of principle in its conductors, it exerts no influence whatever upon the opinions of men. It takes sides on all questions without note of warning, and forsakes its ground abruptly, without explanation or apology. Parties or enterprises that seek its advocacy (which has a price affixed) do so in order to escape its assaults, and for no other reason. It is probably at once the most contemptible and the most universally read paper printed in the English tongue.

A pertinent enquiry is here suggested. If this is the true character of the *Herald*, why are its issues for an entire calendar month made the text for an important part of this discussion? The answer is, that no paper can compare with it in enterprise. It furnishes daily intelligence from all accessible localities. Its enormous circulation and its advertising patronage produce an immense revenue, and this is expended with liberality in procuring news for its numberless readers. So that any man who will patiently wade through its triple and quadruple sheets day after day will keep abreast of the world, in a superficial knowledge of its progress at least. Wherever man can obtain a foothold, the *Herald* has a correspondent—from Alaska to Halifax.

from the Northern lakes to the Gulf. And so far as this correspondence indicates the drift of opinion, it is tolerably accurate and trustworthy.

One of the later forms of unification in its political aspect, is the consolidation of the English possessions on our northern border. In spite of resistance, the new Dominion is steadily unifying, and by the power of trade combinations, with telegraphs and railways, and with restless Yankee enterprise all at work, drawing and binding diverse interests together, all of this territory will eventually be absorbed into the American Union, if political craft do not scatter that Union into fragments in the meantime. At the same time the course of events at the South and the South-west tends to the same result. The Cuban insurrection may very possibly determine in annexation, and Mexico's chronic condition of semi-anarchy may very possibly end in the substitution of United States authority and the enforcement of Anglo-Saxon law. That the abolishment of Iberian domination on this continent would be a great advance in material prosperity, no educated man can doubt. That the consolidation of the entire North American continent under one government might make the most powerful empire on the planet, seems equally plain. Indeed, if one may read the signs of the times, this *must* be the result of recent changes, or chaos must come again. The statesmanship wherewith the country has been cursed through ten weary years, is as contemptible as it is vicious, and is utterly short of the necessities of the age. And if God has any purposes of mercy to be brought out by human instrumentality in America, it is indubitably certain that the man for the emergency has not yet risen to the surface.

So much has been spoken and written and printed upon this general topic, that very little remains to be said. According to Mr. Stephens, the drift of the Government is towards centralisation; and centralisation means consolidation, and consolidation means despotism. The only apparent barrier is what is left of the time-honored doctrine of State Rights, and this will go down before the advancing flood. In point of fact, the theory of State Rights is dead under the sword. In point of fact, con-

solidation, where the English tongue is vernacular, does not mean despotism, but it does mean empire. The stuff of which despots are made does not enter into the constitution of any of the foremost men now occupying places of power. Try to imagine either the great man of the Senate or the great man of the House assuming the role of despot! One of them lacking the ordinary characteristics of manhood; the other famous for nothing but his failures and the effrontery that survives them. It is an imminent breach wherein the first autocrat must stand in this land, and if *all* the worthies now prominent in our political world should essay to occupy it, they would crumble into dust under the shout of derision their very appearance would evoke. The empire *may* come, but the royal purple can never be shrunken to fit any of these ungainly forms!

Once more. If the doctrine of State Sovereignty is really dead—and who can doubt it?—then our form of government is dying. Democratic institutions are not possible in any other form. The history of the world demonstrates this fact. For the sake of the argument, admit this fact—and then, divesting yourself of all personal interest in the result, consider the alternative—Imperialism.

What is there in the term that is so utterly hateful? Is the thought of Imperialism baneful because it annihilates self-government? Alas! this theory has been a myth—the memory of a pleasant dream—throughout this Southland for four or five years. Is Imperialism less conservative or more hideous than Radicalism? And if not, would not the substitution of the former be an unspeakable blessing to all classes of Southern society? Your attachment to Democracy is only your abhorrence of Radical misrule, because *Democracy to-day is far different from Democracy ten years ago*. It has degenerated into agrarianism; and in its very best aspects, it essays to make the educated, the moral, and the pious, the slaves of an illiterate, vicious, and wicked majority. No form of unified despotism can be so atrocious as this.

But consider the probabilities in the case. History repeats itself—with variations. It is not possible for a Napoleon to seiz

the reins of empire on this continent. A *coup d'etat* in America would terminate in what is popularly called a fizzle. Because a race like that which peoples this land cannot be caught with tinsel; cannot be deluded by high sounding titles; cannot be snubbed into silence by the parade of illegal authority. If the disturbed elements of American nationality harden into the empire, it will be by and with the agency and approval of the wisest and best of the population.

Finally, upon this point: No form of government, excepting a pure theocracy, and excepting a pure autocracy, is so much as hinted at in God's revelation. And the theocracy was and is God's government of his Church, so that humanity is shut up to the one example of absolute rule as applied to interests that terminate with the present life. Israel verily sinned in demanding a king at the time and in the spirit in which they made the demand; but the *gravamen* of the offence was the rejection of their divine King who was all along ruling them by delegated authority. It was clearly the divine plan that in God's time they should have a king, for it had been written by Moses in the Book of Deuteronomy. So also it must have been, in order that there should be kingly as well as priestly and prophetic types of the true King and only Potentate, the High Priest and Prophet of Israel—the Lord Christ.

Again: The constitution of society, throughout the Bible narration, accords with royal forms, with gradations of rank, and with all the appliances of monarchical institutions. The exhortations of the gospel touching obedience and honor due to rulers, apply only to government in its most absolute form. There is not a solitary example of executive authority conferred by suffrage. And even in those cases in which the people selected judicial officers as umpires in contested matters, these were "heads of families" or tribes, and men who were already ennobled by birthright. This leads to the third observation on this head, to wit: the right of primogeniture is one of the most securely guarded rights of the Jewish economy. It is not an invention of man, and it is an open question whether or not the abolition of the distinction by modern races has tended to abase

rather than exalt the tone of society. It will hardly be denied that gradations in rank, positive orders of nobility, obtain in the heavenly host: thrones, dominions, principalities, and powers. And while the sacramental host of God's elect shall be composed of a royal priesthood, even there one star shall differ from another star in dominion and glory. It does not seem probable that democratic institutions could be an improvement upon this model.

In these brief hints, all that is intended may be thus summed up: The tendency of the age is to unify—in politics as well as other things. And it has long been an axiom in this country that the safety of republican institutions depended upon the division of voters into at least two great parties, and upon their clearly defined antagonisms. Unification obliterates these divisions; and then comes empire, by conspiracy and usurpation, or by the deliberate choice of the nation. The latter is the better alternative. It may be true that our lost forms of government, that prospered under the shield of constitutional law, were better; but the battle is over, and the shield is shivered. Accept the situation, and make the next best thing out of the materials that are left.

The second suggestion is that an American empire would be necessarily unlike and superior to all other imperial forms. There is no other land where intellect and cultivation are so uniformly self-asserting and dominant, and there is no other land where brains and morality are so generally combined in the individual. It may even be asserted that where intelligence and morality are found, there is also piety in most cases. And if you have rulers—and eventually the brains *would* rule—who are moral and religious, fearing God and regarding the rights of man, you need not distress yourself about the title of your government. There was something quite respectable in the name of a free Roman citizen, even under the empire; and Paul's haughty assertion of his citizenship has nothing democratic in its tone.

The third suggestion is that the wisest statesmen in the country are now and again uttering solemn warnings, proclaiming

the imminent dangers that threaten American liberty. We stand between two perils. On the one side is an irresponsible oligarchy whose arrogant usurpations are rapidly growing more and more intolerable. It does not hesitate to deride the authority of the organic law of the nation—if these States may be called a nation. And there is no other law that affixes a positive status to their separate commonwealths. We have tried to establish our identity as States, and we have failed, and to-day the charter under whose provisions we made our supreme effort is trampled under foot. On the other side, we are threatened with a form of tyranny infinitely more intolerable, in the rule of an illiterate mob; and the dead certainty that they will rend their leaders is but slight consolation if they rend us also. The only apparent mode of egress is by consolidation. Under an empire, the State lines potentially obliterated by the footprints of Sherman's army may be restored and form the boundaries of principalities. This is the least evil of the three.

The final suggestion is, that *nothing* can atone for the destruction of American liberty. God forbid that one word in approbation of so horrible a wickedness should appear in these pages! God forbid that one word of rejoicing over so dire a calamity should be spoken by any who fear his name! If this terrible tide of evil might be stayed, it were better to face it with naked breasts and unarmed hands and perish beneath the advancing floods, if thereby we might transmit to our children the glorious heritage we received from our fathers. But if it be indeed true that all resistance is vain, then it better becomes our manhood to go with the torrent than to waste our strength in futile struggles. If, as many assert, we are in the throes of dissolution, this is no time for vain repining, but rather the very time for energetic action. It may be possible to give shape and direction to the drift; and in any case, better the empire than anarchy.

III. One Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, one body and one Spirit, one calling and one hope—the Church militant and the Church triumphant is one Church, the one body of him who filleth all in all. Much has been written upon “the idea of the Church;” but this is God's idea, dis-

tinctly revealed. All schisms are sins, *per se*. "Ye are yet carnal" is the judgment of Paul, and this is the only evidence of carnality that he quotes. The case is too plain for argumentation.

Nevertheless, the world is full of sects, and Protestant Christianity is divided and subdivided. At the beginning of this branch of the discussion, it may be proper to state definitely two or three propositions, as taken for granted.

The first is, that there is no Christianity excepting Protestant Christianity; and in this statement is included the excommunication of all sects who deny the doctrines of the Apostles' Creed, or any one of them.

The second is, that the Calvinistic creed is the only true creed in Christendom; all departures from it are errors and heresies, more or less harmful in proportion as they diverge from this line.

The third is, that the Presbyterian Church, in doctrine and order, if not the exact Church organised on the day of Pentecost, more nearly approaches that model than any other organisation on earth. If there be any room for improvement in her doctrine and order, that improvement must be secured only by lessening the interval which separates her from that model. She can never have any other standard.

Proceeding, then, upon this foundation, it may be said that the unification of the Church is not possible, except by the universal adoption of Presbyterian doctrine and order. The charity that embraces all creeds and confessions, that only frowns upon the pretensions of dead orthodoxy, needs very little extension to embrace in its loving arms Buddhism and Thuggee. Indeed, the former style of piety has peculiar claims upon the haters of sectarian prejudices, inasmuch as its professors include about a third of the earth's population. It must therefore be with them a pretty good sort of religion. In the present day, the demonstration of the truth of a religious system is in the number of its votaries. But this is not God's testimony. For, while from the beginning God has always had a Church in the world, yet has it ever been but a remnant according to the election of grace.

Leaving all other Christians, therefore, to study out the problem of the unification of the Church in its wider aspects, believers in the divine right of Presbyterian doctrine and order may be permitted to take a hurried glance at the question of Presbyterian unification.

In the year 1847, the Secession and the Relief Churches in Scotland, after twelve years of negotiation, became one, and are now known as the United Presbyterian Synod. Between this body and the English Presbyterian Synod, there is now going on a movement towards union. Moreover, between the United Presbyterian Synod and the Free Church of Scotland, and also at the same time the Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, (which is, strictly speaking, the Church of the Covenanters,) a similar movement is still in progress, and has been in progress for more than six years. It is, naturally, as between the two largest bodies that the question of unification has most widely and profoundly excited the public interest. On both sides, there appears to be a deep sense of the importance of union, if it can be effected without a sacrifice of any principle. Both Churches seem to be impressed with the idea which Dr. Buchanan dwelt on in the Free Church Assembly of 1867, that "to aim therefore at union among the Churches, at bringing together branches of the Church which even in the same land have been living for generations in separation and estrangement from one another, is a great duty lying upon God's people at all times. * * * If there be any thing to which the signs of the times point more clearly than to another, it is to the imperative and hourly increasing necessity that lies on all churches which hold the Head, and which know and love the truth as it is in Jesus, to draw closer together." And it appears to be acknowledged that the main point of difference between these bodies of Presbyterians regards simply the question of the relation of the State to the support of gospel institutions. The Free Church holds that the State may support the Church and the Church receive that support. The United Presbyterian denies both these positions. But both are agreed, as Dr. Rainy expressed it in 1867, "in regard to the great principle of the

Headship of Christ over the nations: that nations and their rulers are bound to obey Christ."

On that same occasion, the Chairman of the Free Church Union Committee said: "After sifting for four years the whole question 'as with a sieve,' the *residuum* of difference that remains is neither more nor less than this, that we think there are circumstances and conditions under which it might be lawful for the State to set up and support with the national resources a civil establishment of religion, and that there are circumstances and conditions under which the Church may lawfully accept such a position; whereas our United Presbyterian friends hold an opposite opinion."

Others, however, take a somewhat different view of the facts, alleging some incongruities of opinion relative to the atonement and to the use of organs in public worship.

At the last meeting of the Free Church Assembly, it was urged by a small minority, headed by the retiring Moderator, Mr. Nixon, that "there are serious differences of opinion whether the result arrived at in the negotiations for union conserved the doctrines of Scripture; also, that there should be no further steps taken in the movement until negotiations could be renewed with due regard to scriptural principles and the peace of the Church." A very large majority, however, (429 to 89,) resolved that the report on union should lie on the table till next year, and that the same Committee be reappointed, with the former instructions.

The Reformed Synod and the United Presbyterian Synod, at their late annual meetings, both unanimously agreed to send down the report on union to the Presbyteries and Sessions for their information, and, if they please, for their opinion.

It is clear that there is a powerful tendency to ecclesiastical unification amongst the Presbyterians of Scotland, and also of England; and many are expressing the belief that it must eventually include all the six sections of the Scotch Church—the Established Church itself not excepted. Indeed, the Rev. J. R. McAlister, a prominent minister of the Irish Presbyterian Church, lately uttered at Manchester what is no doubt in many

hearts on the other side of the water—that he did not “despair of seeing a grand Presbyterian Church for the three kingdoms.”

Now, looking across the Atlantic at this movement, two observations must strongly impress every mind. The first is the great deliberation with which Presbyterians in the old country seem to move in this matter; and the second is the comparatively unimportant character of the differences which separate them. Perhaps these differences would seem greater, were their precise nature better understood; but to imperfectly informed and far-off observers, they do not seem to be fundamental or vital; nor does it appear that any of these negotiating bodies have erred in any direction beyond the reasonable limits of the duty of mutual forbearance and charity. Scotch Presbyterians the world over have commonly been tenacious of the old theology, and the same may certainly be said of the Irish, if not of the English, Presbyterians. It belongs to another shore than the British, and to another ecclesiastical quarter than the Presbyterian, to practise clerical diplomacy; to be men of expediency, and profess creeds without honestly believing them, and then seek to corrupt and overthrow them; to be juggling tricksters, “paltering with us in a double sense,” joining a Church and solemnly accepting its symbols purely for purposes and ends of ambition, or even gain.

In America also, there is a tendency among Presbyterians towards unification. The Presbyterian Church in the United States, some years ago, received the United Synod into union with itself. There have also been negotiations between it and the Associate Reformed Synod of the South, and also with the Cumberland Presbyterian Church. In the former case, it may be said justly that the difficulties were not at all on its side. In the latter case, the difficulties were mutual and very serious. It seems to be very certain that neither the Cumberland Presbyterian brethren nor their brethren of the other Church are at all prepared for ecclesiastical unification.

The movement towards union between the Old and the New School Churches of the North has been completely successful, so far as their Assemblies are concerned: and there can not be

any doubt that a large majority even of the Old School Presbyteries will give it their hearty sanction.

Looking at this movement more intelligently, because more nearly, than at the trans-Atlantic one, every person amongst us must be impressed with the idea of the superior *fastness* of the American bodies. Considering the character of the differences which separated these two communions, and especially the circumstances under which they parted, it must be acknowledged that the terrible wounds which severed them into two have been healed with a remarkably speedy healing. The commencement of this process of healing certainly dates subsequent to the Assembly of 1861, when the South began not to appear in the councils of Northern Presbyterians. At that time, such a thought as union with the New School entered, we presume, no Old School mind. All this love and concord has sprung up since the separation of Southern Presbyterians from them. One is led naturally to inquire how this speedy healing of dreadful wounds was brought about. The prophets and priests of Israel were rebuked for healing slightly the hurt of the daughter of Zion, and their loud cries of "Peace, peace," were held to be a grievous fault. How is it, and how will it be in the case of this healing of hurts and these cries of peace? And what powerful influences have so suddenly operated to bring it about? Two very great enemies once became friends out of their common hatred to one who deserved no such treatment at their hands. Can it be possible that the hatred which they felt in common for their poor Southern brethren had any thing to do with this newborn mutual love between Old and New School? Or can it be that, reduced in numbers and extent of territory, the Old School are seeking to regain their former *status* of strength and power? Or, dismissing both these hypotheses, were there really, after all, no differences of a serious character in the theology of the respective parties in 1837, and has that been found out in these days of superior light? Or has there been a change of doctrines in one or both parties? These are questions which Northern Presbyterians of both the branches will be ready to admit are more easily asked than answered.

VOL. XX., NO. 4—2.

It will strike the mind of many a Southern Presbyterian that this is evidently a *popular* movement at the North ; that is to say, it is a movement of the people rather than of the office-bearers ; and being such, the popularity of ministers has naturally more or less influenced their action in the premises. There have not been, and there are not going to be, any martyrs to the testimony given for the union. Dr. Musgrave was very proud to claim the paternity of the movement, and boasts that it was "on my motion at the Assembly in Columbus, Ohio, seven years ago, that this correspondence was begun." It is the sentiment of the popular heart that has brought these two Churches together. Dr. Spring said to the Old School Assembly which met in his church : "I believe that every one in the large congregation of spectators expects you to do this thing *now*." "If you postpone, you fly in the face of the prayers of God's people. I have never heard such fervent prayers as have been offered lately by God's people in this city upon this subject, and you contend against them if you postpone this matter." Just so the Rev. Dr. Nelson, of the Free Church of Scotland, said of the union of his Church and the United Presbyterian : "The sooner it is taken out of the hands of ministers and Synods, the better. When the people make this *their* question, there is no doubt what the decision must be." Now, just in so far as this is a movement of the mere populace, in so far it is not worthy of the respect of any Presbyterian. It is the *collective wisdom* of the Church, not her mere impulses, that command respect. Ecclesiastical unification may be the spirit of the age or the demand of the popular voice, without being the will of God. He does not promise to speak to his people through any such oracles.

There is another observation which deserves to be uttered, and by none better than by the men of that Church which is now separate from the Old School of the North, but who were one with them in the great and glorious days of 1837. It is that the unification now under consideration involves the clear going over of the Old School to the New. Let us see how this was revealed in the unconstrained and outspoken expressions which found utterance in both Assemblies. The leader of the Old

School Assembly this year and the leader of this movement there for union, confessedly, was Dr. Musgrave. Now, every body knows how much the trial of Mr. Barnes for heresy, of which he was undoubtedly guilty, had to do in bringing on the division of the year 1837. But Dr. Musgrave told the New School Assembly in New York, last May, (being sent to them as a delegate from the Old School,) in reference to that trial: "I want to forget it. I wish it could be blotted out forever." He also said: "I don't expect to be an Old School man after June 1st, 1870, but a minister of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America." To the Old School Assembly, he says: "It would not be proper for me to state *how* I became satisfied, but I *am* satisfied, that these brethren are substantially sound, and that there is no material difference between us. The points of difference that existed thirty years ago have passed away, and we shall not be troubled with them again."

- Such are the expressed views of the leader of the last Old School Assembly. Accordingly, when the Rev. Mr. Laurie (a Scotch Presbyterian, by the way,) undertook to deny that the New School are a sound orthodox body, and in order to substantiate his position, read from Mr. Barnes's writings concerning imputation, the atonement, and kindred topics, he was continually interrupted in the most insulting manner by members of the Assembly, and even by the Moderator, who asked "if he would never get through." It was, as Mr. Laurie well said, "unpalatable and intolerable" to them to hear any thing said of Old School difference with New School heresy. One of the members objected to hearing any thing brought forward from Duffield's writings, on the ground that "he is dead." Another refused to let extracts be given from the books of either Barnes, who is living, or Duffield, who is dead, on the ground that "their books are dead." This was no other than our excellent friend, Robert Carter, the publisher, who explained that there is no demand for these books, but they lie dead on booksellers' shelves! "At this point, there was great confusion, and several members were on their feet with motions and protests," says the (Philadelphia) *Presbyterian*, of the 12th of June. Then

comes forward the leader of the Assembly again, and points out that it was not the orthodoxy of *individuals*, but of the *body*, that was to be considered; which the Moderator declared was a point of order well taken, and that Mr. Laurie must confine himself to proofs of the unsoundness of the body!

This is evidence enough from the Old School side that this union is a clear going over on their part to the New School. Dr. Musgrave is ashamed of the trial of Mr. Barnes for heresy, and wishes it could be forever blotted out! And this venerable leader, who, of course, was always acknowledged by all to be a thoroughly-read theologian himself and a high authority in such matters, then asseverates his entire satisfaction that the New School are all substantially sound. Moreover, with his usual sagacity, he points out, in the very nick of time, the important fact that Mr. Barnes's errors are not those of the Church which defended and followed and still honors and follows him! And, in fine, that the old immortal points of difference between truth and error have passed away, and will give no more trouble—*dead*, like Dr. Duffield and like Mr. Barnes's books, which have long been circulating by the hundred thousand.

And now, what was incidentally dropped on this point in the New School Assembly?

Dr. Heacock, of Buffalo, said he had been slow in favoring the union, but had been brought to it by the expectation of "a greater spirit of Christian charity." He hoped for "a broad mantle to cover all varieties of opinion." "This union is to be cemented in the spirit of charity and not uniformity." It is to be "the beginning of a more liberal and catholic Calvinism." The brethren of the Old School were "to receive into their history the names of such honored men as Albert Barnes and others."

Dr. Patterson, of Chicago, "had been at great pains to inform himself as to whether the majority of the Old School Church would admit any, even such as Albert Barnes, of the New School to perfect equality; and he had become perfectly satisfied that this was their full intention and disposition. There was, moreover, a most important and gratifying acknowledgment of the orthodoxy of the New School in this new basis."

Dr. Herrick Johnson, of Philadelphia, a colleague of Mr. Barnes, said: "There are differences between the two Schools, but there is to be a liberty in the two Churches, consistent with sound Calvinism, regarding these differences. God forbid the union forever rather than with a denial of the conservation of this liberty. The basis itself distinctly says, 'The Confession shall *continue* to be sincerely received,' etc.; this is an admission that we have been orthodox. This basis would not receive a half-dozen votes here if this were not the case. Liberty and orthodoxy meet together and kiss each other—that is all in this union. He deprecated a union that should exclude Rev. Albert Barnes, the honored and beloved servant of Christ, or such as hold with him."

Dr. Henry Darling, of Albany, said: "If it were to be understood that Mr. Barnes's views were not to be allowed in the united Church, very few would vote for reunion. If there be any doctrinal symbol of the New School, it is the 'Auburn Declaration;' yet, at their last meeting, the Old School General Assembly endorsed that symbol. A man elected by the Old School General Assembly itself to a chair in one of their theological seminaries has set himself distinctly in opposition to Princeton (Old School) Theology. These examples show that New School Theology is not denied as orthodox in the Old School."

There are volumes of meaning in these expressions. Dr. Adams, of New York, a delegate sent from the New School Assembly, told the Old School body it might consider itself "the conservator of *orthodoxy*," but his Church was to be the "special advocate and representative of liberty." And Dr. Crosby, of the New School, referring to these words of Dr. Adams, said there would be "such an orthodox liberty and such a liberal orthodoxy as the world had never seen." A liberal orthodoxy!—that is the idea. A broad mantle of charity to cover all varieties of opinion! Albert Barnes, once publicly rebuked for heresy, to be now received, none of his heresies recanted, with honor into the history of the Old School Church! And Dr. Musgrave and his Church to be ashamed of that trial, and to wish the memory of it and what followed it blotted out

forever! The New School acknowledged to be orthodox, with their "Auburn Declaration" and their "opposition to Princeton (Old School) Theology!" This is what they said in the New School Assembly, whilst the Old School body flutters with agitation and alarm when one earnest voice is lifted for the old testimony, and would point out the true nature of the step about to be taken.

And here arises a question which must be acknowledged to be pertinent. The Old School Assembly having thus gone clear over to the New School ground and "liberal orthodoxy," first introduced amongst Presbyterians from New England by Absalom Peters, Nathan S. S. Beman, and Lyman Beecher, being to be henceforward the standard of true doctrine amongst the Presbyterians of the North,—what becomes of the reputation of the Old School leaders of 1837? They are, of course, now to be reckoned very ignorant, narrow-minded, prejudiced, contentious, and wicked misleaders of the flock. And the testimony given for Old School Presbyterianism at that period is no longer to be held in honor, but in shame, and the memory of it to be, if possible, "blotted out forever." Principles never change, though men do. What is worthy to be repudiated and forgotten in 1869 must have been really very bad thirty-two years ago, although evil disposed and foolish men led the Church then to think it right and good. Will the Old School Assembly, ere it ceases to be a separate body, have the manly sincerity and the Christian humility to appoint a day of fasting, humiliation, and prayer, to ask forgiveness of God for their sin in excising the New School? If it were a sin of ignorance, passion, and prejudice, it was nevertheless a sin, and ought to be frankly and humbly acknowledged as such before the whole world, and especially to their New School brethren, as well as to God. The movement in 1837 will never be forgotten; nor will this one of 1869, and the anticipated one of 1870, ever fade from the knowledge of men. One of the two must be right and the other wrong. There remains in their adjourned meeting at Pittsburg but a single opportunity for the Old School to evince a magnanimous simplicity of soul. Does anybody imagine their present leaders to be capable of any such greatness?

Unquestionably, this is the day of great churches as well as great nations and great coöperative undertakings generally. Unification, industrial, political, and ecclesiastical—this is the tendency of our age—a good or a bad tendency, according to circumstances. Surely, surely, it is not for the Church of Christ blindly to follow what has been well called an “unreasoning enthusiasm.” Surely, surely, her pillar of cloud by day and of fire by night is not any such mere impulse of a self-complacent and self-confident age. The Church is set to bear witness to the truth—she is its pillar and ground in the earth. No union can be blessed of God which sacrifices what he has given into her charge to keep. It behoves her to look well to any covenants into which she may be tempted to enter. And all the more if the proposition be such as chimes in with the popular enthusiasm of the hour, and if it be such as promises advantages of wealth and power and greatness.

It is not improbable that to the Presbyterian Church in the South there will come proposals for unification with the two Northern bodies whose prospects have now been under consideration. It is hardly to be expected that they will be altogether insensible to the application which the age's magnificent and aspiring spirit and tendency might be capable of as regards even so small a body as this. Indeed, there cannot be the shadow of a doubt that already the leaders in this grand movement have the Southern Church down in their programme. So great, so rich, so numerous and strong as they must be after the consummation of this union, it will be simply intolerable to them to be any thing less or any thing else than the one Presbyterian Church of this mighty country. Every great and good thing now is and must needs be *national*, and there must therefore be a Presbyterian Church which can be properly called by that imposing name. That they should cast their eyes towards this Southland and behold another Presbyterian organisation at work here; that they should see it have its seminaries of theological learning, its committees of evangelistic operation, its newspapers and review, and every other needed agency in active and healthful employment, and be enjoying the confidence, affection, and support of all the

Presbyterians who are of Saxon blood, or who possess education and refinement—whilst *they* are represented here only by a few congregations of our colored brethren; that, in a word, they should discover that, with all their wealth and strength, they must still be viewed as the Church only of a section: this will be just a thing which they *will* not endure. Southern Presbyterians may be sure they will come at them—first, with kind and sweet words, and with offers of every species of advantage which they can confer; but, if these should fail to effect their end, words and deeds, too, of a different description, will not be wanting. The South must make up her mind to be treated as the anaconda treats its victim; but that swallowing will be the end of it, if they can get their way, whether she submits gracefully to the preliminary process or not. There are many in the Old School Church at the North, and no doubt in the New School also, who are too true and noble to stoop to meanness and wrong. But there are some of a different character in both organisations. It cannot be questioned that the aim of such will be (and the idea was actually expressed in distinct terms at the last Old School Assembly) to *divide* this Southern Church. Such is the ordeal through which this Church must pass. That it will be passed without any loss, would be too much to expect; but it is not too much to expect that the loss will, by God's grace and blessing, prove unreal and insignificant.

With perfectly clear and strong convictions that this issue must shortly be presented to the Southern Church, who could hesitate here and now to express a deliberate judgment respecting it? In the interest of Presbyterian doctrine and order throughout the whole land, plainly it is of the greatest importance that this Church should not entertain any proposition for relinquishing its independent attitude. Had the Old School resisted the temptation to give up the testimony of 1837, it might have proved possible, after the softening influence of time had done its work, for the Southern Church to have been reunited with them again. Had this been their temper and disposition in respect to the grand old doctrines for which they contended side by side with their Southern brethren two and

thirty years ago, there would have been ground of hope that some day they would recede from the false position into which they have fallen respecting the Church's loyalty to Cæsar, and respecting the so-called "sin of slavery." And then there might have remained no justifying reason for a separate organisation by Southern Presbyterians. But called to stand in their lot hitherto and bear witness for Christ's truth on these two points, much more clearly and imperatively will they be called hereafter to maintain this witness-bearing position when the Old School at the North shall have superadded to their other denials of fundamental truth, this fresh denial of the glorious testimony given in 1837 to the precious doctrines of grace. And never let us fear that He whose truth we are maintaining will suffer us to fall or perish.

ARTICLE II.

THE AMENDED FORM OF GOVERNMENT.

It was well to defer action on the new Form of Government till the Kentucky brethren had consummated organic union with us—especially in view of the fact that the action of the Presbyteries developed great dissatisfaction with the draft of the Form of Government sent down from the Memphis Assembly. The General Rules of Order and the Canons of Discipline contain decided improvements on the old rules; and in some respects the amended Form of Government contains improvements. But it is not likely that, without further improvements, it will meet the views of the whole Church. As the Mobile Assembly has brought the subject up again for action, it should not be regarded as out of place to discuss the subject in the public prints.

We desire to suggest that an addition be made to Chap. V., Sec. 2, under the heading, "*Of the Jurisdiction of Church*

Courts." The addition would be something like the following, viz. : "Deliverances of church judicatories are to be regarded in the nature of advice to the churches and people under their care. They are to have no other force than that which inherently belongs to them from the force of the reasonings contained therein, and from their being a solemn judgment of a court of Christ's Church. But all judicial decisions, in cases coming up by regular appeal, or complaint, or reference from a lower court, or in which the court has original jurisdiction, and all decisions made in the exercise of the 'power of review and control,' are to be regarded as authoritative expositions of the Constitution, and having the binding force of law; as also all enactments made in pursuance of existing law."

The reasons on which the above suggestion is based can be easily made apparent. It has been the case in the past that deliverances were regarded as having the force of law. The "Spring resolutions" on the state of the country were to some extent so regarded. Had it not been for this, the Southern Church would not so forcibly have felt the necessity of withdrawing from the Northern Church. Nor would the Northern part of the Church have felt so fully that the enactments of their majority were binding, whether constitutional or not. The old Form of Government, in Chap. XII., Sec. 6, declares that "regulations," in the nature of "*constitutional rules*," shall not be obligatory, unless sent down to the Presbyteries; and the above statement presents in more explicit form the principle contained in this section.

In the next place, we give our hearty approbation to Chap. V., Sec. 7, on the subject of "*Ecclesiastical Commissions*." This is regarded as a great improvement on the old Form of Government.

Once more: it is well enough to leave out Chap. I., Book I, it being not of the nature of constitutional enactment, and is rather, as the Committee well observed, of the nature of an apology to the world for being Presbyterians.

With these suggestions of approval, we now pass to the consideration of some things not approved.

I. In Chap. VI., Sec. 4, none but communicating members, in regular standing, are allowed to vote in the calling of a pastor. And yet it is proposed, after the election has been decided, to take the vote of non-communicating members. It is apt to be the case that non-communicating members will feel no interest in casting a vote which will have no influence in deciding the election. We apprehend they will regard it as in the nature of a farce to be voting in such a case.

What possible harm can result if non-communicating members, who contribute their just proportion in defraying the expenses of the congregation, are allowed to vote equally with communicating members? By giving them this privilege, they bring themselves under obligations and engagements to support their pastors; and this is something gained. The Presbytery still hold in their hands the decision of the question whether the pastor so elected shall be placed over the church. None but such as are approved by the Presbytery can be placed as pastor in authority over a church. It is believed that non-communicating members should be induced to feel that the pastor of the church is their pastor as well as the pastor of other members. In consequence of so feeling, it is human nature to take more interest in the pastor. Nor would they be so much disposed to regard themselves as outsiders, in the same category with other worldly persons; nor would the church itself and pastor be so much disposed to treat them as outsiders, as has too generally been done heretofore.

II. It is very important that we should have some constitutional enactments on the subject of almsgiving. There must be something lacking in our Church, or else from the start it had, both in Europe and America, it ought to have been a great deal stronger than it is. Why are some other denominations both stronger and more numerous than ours, when we had so much the advantage of them after the Reformation had begun?

The defect would seem to be in the management of our matters of finance. Our system is an organism with but one arm; for the two arms of government are the purse and the sword. No civil government destitute of either one of these arms can

sustain itself, and must soon fall to pieces. In the Church, we want no other sword but the *sword of the Spirit*. But this is only one arm. Where is the other? Our system lacks one that is efficient. If our financial arrangements are defective, our government is without strength to sustain itself. Can not a more efficient system be devised? And do not the Scriptures authorise and point out wherein? There are some things which the Church must do—some things which she is required to do; and which she cannot do successfully without an efficient system of finance. She must sustain the gospel at home, and she must send the gospel to the regions beyond. Let her means of doing this be crippled or deficient, and her operations must necessarily be retarded in proportion. All governments must have power to carry out their own laws. Even voluntary societies, that would efficiently accomplish the objects proposed, must have an efficient financial system. Masonry does not hesitate to put its hands in the pockets of its members, if needs be, to carry out its objects. So of Odd Fellowship. This must be a feature of any sort of government that would be efficient. We regard the matter of giving to the cause of Christ as an act of worship and means of grace; and it is therefore to be voluntary. At the same time, it ought to be the case that sums voluntarily promised or lawfully required ought to be paid, on pain of exclusion from church privileges; the sums "*lawfully required*" being necessary expenses, required under the operation of laws voluntarily established. If it is the *duty* of church members to support the gospel at home and abroad, the Church has power to require its members to perform their duty. The power to require this implies the power to inflict penalty. Penalties in the Church can only be "*ministerial and declarative*;" but this may reach to the exclusion from church privileges. The deacons might be, and should be, empowered in certain cases to assess the sums due or lawfully required upon the church members *pro rata*, according to each one's list of taxable property. As the government is representative, it is therefore, theoretically, the church voluntarily taxing itself, by its own authority. For the want of some such system as this, church debts very often remain unpaid.

Unpaid balances accumulate from year to year, in the pastor's salary, or the incidental expenses fall entirely upon two, three, or a few members. Repudiation at last is the consequence. The reputation of the Church and of religion is at stake. All this might be avoided by the plan above suggested—a plan which would carry out the principle that we should give as God has prospered us.

It is not intended to indicate that this plan would supersede voluntary offerings in the house of God from Sabbath to Sabbath. These also should be kept up as acts of worship and means of grace.

In order to remove every objection from the plan above hinted at, there must be in the judicatories a proper system of representation. Taxation without a proper system of representation is exceedingly objectionable. It would be improper, then, to have church courts filled up with members who represent no persons but themselves. No one has a right, by Scripture warrant, to vote in the church courts except as the representative of some church; but of this point, more at length in the sequel. At present, we observe that, by the plan above marked out, a remedy may be found for an evil which has long been felt in the church, viz., the paucity in the number of ruling elders who attend the judicatories above the church session. Let the arm of government be *felt* by its subjects, and the result is, that those subjects are no longer indifferent as to whether they participate in the actings and doings of that government. Legislatures and congresses do not find it necessary to be passing resolutions from time to time, urging the counties or states to send up representatives. There is no doubt, however, that counties and states would manifest great indifference as to sending up representatives, if the actings and doings of the legislatures and congresses might be disregarded and no penalty suffered.

III. The next suggestion herewith submitted is as to the propriety of abolishing synodical courts altogether. This suggestion may at first strike a good many with surprise. The writer believes there is no particular need for the synodical court. All

the requisitions of the Scriptures are fully met by three courts, viz., the church session, the presbytery, and the highest court—whether that highest court be called the *General Synod* or the *General Assembly*. The three courts make a more simple machinery. It is apprehended that three courts would be a machinery equally as efficient. If this be so, it follows that it is an unnecessary waste of time and money to have the fourth court. It is no little expense, as well as loss of time from the pastoral work, to attend the synodical court. To an individual without a family, it is a pleasant recreation and recess from arduous labor to attend the Synod, with his expenses paid; but to one with a family charge, it is not unfrequently felt to be a hardship. Not unfrequently, he is unable to reach home after the fall meeting of the Presbytery, but must start immediately for the meeting of Synod. In this case, he may be from home for nearly a month. The item of expense may be pursued a little further. Suppose a Synod have in attendance a hundred members. They will probably have to travel from ten to three hundred miles; let the average be one hundred and fifty miles. At an average of five cents a mile—which is less than many railroads charge—and conceding that they obtain return tickets free, the travelling expenses alone would be seven hundred and fifty dollars. If to this be added hotel bills and porter's charges, the whole amount would be little short, if any, of a thousand dollars. This amount generally comes out of the pockets of the members, many of whom are not able to pay it. Is it to be wondered at that scarcely half of those who are entitled to seats in Synod are in attendance? Such is the actual fact, especially in the extreme Southwest. The Synods, then, actually fail of accomplishing the objects had in view. "*The review and control*" of the Presbyteries is less than half accomplished. Now, if our machinery can be simplified, the expense and other inconveniences of attending church courts be reduced, without diminishing aught from their efficiency, ought it not to be done? Let efficiency be the controlling consideration, and the matter of expense and inconvenience to individuals be secondary. But it is believed that the Assembly could accomplish all the ends had

in view by the synodical courts, without the necessity of sitting very much longer.

IV. There is one more suggestion herewith submitted. The proposed new Form of Government assumes that, by Scripture warrant, there are three distinct *classes* or *orders* or *ranks* of permanent church officers. This assumption is not to be admitted. We believe the proof conclusive that there are but two, viz., first, presbyters, who are also called bishops; and second, deacons. The terms presbyters and bishops are used as convertible terms in the New Testament—Acts xx. 17, 28. 17th verse: "And from Miletus he (Paul) sent to Ephesus, and called together the presbyters (*πρεσβυτέρους*) of the church." The apostle having assembled these presbyters, proceeds to give them his farewell address. In that address, he tells them (28th verse): "Take heed therefore to yourselves and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you bishops" (*ἐπισκόπους*). Having thus indiscriminately styled these presbyters bishops, he then exhorts them to perform the pastoral work—"to feed the Church of God." The word here translated "to feed" is *ποιμαίνειν*. This is the same word used by the Saviour at the Sea of Tiberias, when he said to Peter, "Feed my lambs," "Feed my sheep." It is the word which, both from its derivative meaning and its use in the Scriptures, is expressive of the pastoral work. All these presbyters were alike then properly entitled bishops, and all were alike expected and required to perform the pastoral work. 1 Peter v. 1, 2: "The presbyters which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ." * * * "Feed (*ποιμάνατε*) the flock (*ποίμνιον*) which is among you, (*ἐπισκοποῦντες*) *exercising the office of a bishop.*" Here the same persons are called presbyters and have also in their hands the office of bishop, and are exhorted to perform the pastoral work. Admitting that the distinction is proper between presbyters who rule only and those who both rule and "labor in word and doctrine," (1 Thess. v. 17,) and that it was customary for both kinds to be appointed in every church, then both kinds are addressed by the title of bishop, both kinds are expected to perform the pastoral work. Titus i. 5-7: "For

this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain *presbyters* in every city. * * * If any be blameless, the husband of one wife, having faithful children, not accused of riot or unruly; for a bishop must be blameless as the steward of God." Here, again, both appellations are applied to the same persons. It follows that all *presbyters* are *bishops* and all *bishops* are *presbyters*, and these are convertible terms. Whatever distinction, therefore, may exist among these *presbyters*, must be a distinction as to function, and not a distinction as to the rank which they hold. It is not supposable that the church of Ephesus was not equipped according to the apostolic model of establishing the church. Nor is it supposable that the churches "scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia," to whom the Epistle of Peter was addressed, were not so equipped. Titus, acting under the instruction of Paul, would certainly establish the churches in Crete after the apostolical model; all these churches must have had the proper officers appointed in them. It must be a gratuitous assumption that the *presbyters* in all these churches were only of the sort who labored in word and doctrine, in contradistinction from *presbyters* who ruled only. We must either take the ground that all *presbyters* have the function of *laboring in the word*, and the fact that there were any who *ruled only* was an accidental circumstance; or we must admit that all *presbyters*, whether of the sort who *rule only* or otherwise, are rightly called *bishops*—rightly have in their hands the pastoral work, and therefore hold the same rank.

This position may be made further apparent from the following scriptures, viz.: Phil. i. 1: "Paul and Timotheus, the servants of Jesus Christ, to all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the *bishops* and *deacons*." If all *elders* are not *bishops*, it is unaccountable that a part of the officers should have been left out in this address.

1 Tim. iii. In this chapter, Paul is giving to Timothy general instructions as to the establishment of the church. He mentions the officers in the church, *bishops* and *deacons*. If *ruling elders* held a different office or rank, it is unaccountable that they, too, were not mentioned.

The view here maintained was admitted by Calvin (Calvin's Institutes, Book IV., chap. iii., sec. 8): "In calling those who preside over the churches by the appellations of 'bishops,' 'elders,' and 'pastors,' without any distinction, I have followed the usage of Scripture, which applies all these terms to express the same meaning."

Hilary says: "The presbyters were at first called bishops." Theodoret admits the same. He says: "Of old, they called the same men both bishops and presbyters." Jerome, as quoted by Calvin, gives the same testimony (Institutes, Book IV., chap. iv., sec. 2): "A presbyter is the same as a bishop; and before dissensions in religion were introduced, by the instigation of the devil, and one said, I am of Paul, another, I am of Cephas, the churches were governed by a common council of presbyters. Afterwards, in order to destroy the seeds of dissensions, the whole charge was committed to one. Therefore, as the presbyters know that, according to the custom of the church, they are subject to the bishops who preside over them, so let the bishops know that their superiority to the presbyters is more from custom than the appointment of the Lord, and they ought to unite together in the government of the church."

Further, it is admitted that the Christian Church was modelled after the Jewish synagogue, and the elders or rulers of the synagogue were of the same official rank. Rulers in the synagogue "had all an equal rank in the church. Rabbi Nissim and Maimonides agree with Jarchi as to their equality of rank." (Brown's Antiquities of the Jews, p. 533.)

The New Testament speaks of the *chief ruler* in the synagogue; but the person so designated was only the presiding officer of the bench of elders, and this no more gave to him a higher rank than it does to confer upon one of the presbyters of our church courts the functions of moderator.

Three orders or ranks of permanent church officers is unscriptural and contrary to what was practised in the primitive Church. The very first step made towards three orders, and therefore towards prelacy first, and afterwards towards foisting in papal forms, was to appropriate the term bishop to one particular pres-

byter of the congregation, who gradually claimed superior rank, and which was gradually conceded to him. To maintain that the presbyter *who ministers in the word* holds a higher rank than other presbyters, is to advocate a low form of prelacy.

It is not surprising that the fathers of the Reformation were not able to throw off at once the influence of old prejudices. Luther held mistaken notions in reference to the eucharist. For a long time, all Protestants held that the state should enforce uniformity in religion. The Westminster Assembly itself had the same old prejudices in favor of three orders. They regarded "*ministers of the word*" as belonging to a higher order than other presbyters. The majority, composed in part of Independents and largely of English Presbyterians, prelatically educated, carried the principle, against the views of the Scotch delegation, that "ordination shall be with the laying on of the hands of *those preaching presbyters to whom it doth belong.*" For the sake of uniformity, the Scotch Kirk agreed to accept this form; but the Second Book of Discipline of the Scotch contained the sounder formulary, in these words: "Ordinatione is the separatione and sanctifying of the person appointit, to God and his Kirk, efter he be weill tryit and fund qualifiet. The ceremonies of ordinatione are fasting, prayer, and imposition of hands of the eldership. Elderships and Assemblies are commonlie constitute of pastors, doctors, and sic as we commonlie call elders, that labor not in word and doctrine."

Our fathers in 1787 went back again to the ground of the Second Book of Discipline, and adopted the language that ordination should be "*by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery.*" But still the Form of Government which they adopted, and which has been in force among us since then, as well as the form sent down to the presbyteries from Memphis, and recently from Mobile, makes two orders or ranks of presbyters. The one holding that office which is styled "*first in the church both for usefulness,*" and to which may be given the titles *bishop, pastor, minister, presbyter, angel of the church, evangelist, ambassador, missionary, preacher, doctor or teacher, and steward of the mysteries of God*; the other rank to be called *ruling elders, and*

are declared to be the "immediate" or "proper" *representatives of the people*. It has been already shown above that all presbyters are indiscriminately called by the titles "bishop," "pastor." They are all, with the deacons, ministers—that is, *servants of the churches*; and the fact that some "labor in word and doctrine," and others do not, and the former may therefore be called *ministers of the word*, teachers, preachers, doctors, does not necessarily imply a difference of rank, but only a difference of function. That the ruling elder should be styled *specially* the "representative of the people," has no foundation in fact or in Scripture. The other presbyters are, in fact, just as well qualified to represent the churches which they serve.

Then, again, to make the preaching elder the *ex officio* moderator of the session, or to make him a permanent member of presbytery and synod, is not treating him as officially equal in rank with other elders, but as being superior. Besides, it may be well to look at the effects of this in its practical out-workings. The result is, that not a few voters in presbytery and synod are representatives of no one but themselves. They have no pastoral charge, are not unfrequently involved in secular business, give their thoughts specially to secular business, rather than to the interests of the Church. Yet they may, and often do, exert a controlling influence in the meetings of these judicatories. That influence is not always for good. As an example in point, for illustration, it may be mentioned that the only three pastors in a certain presbytery, in the State of Kentucky, were "*ipso-factoed*" out of the presbytery and out of the Church, under the operation of the "Gurley resolutions." If we pretend to have a representative government, let it be so in fact, and let no one vote in the judicatories unless he represents some church. In that case, if the arm of government is made to be felt; if taxes are imposed; if orders are issued in accordance with constitutional law—there could be no proper ground of objection to these acts of government. This plan would give efficiency—enable the Church to carry on and sustain itself, and the churches would have a substantial reason not to be unrepresented in the judicatories. That the ruling elders are to be

regarded as *specially* "the representatives of the people," seems to be founded on the idea that ministers of the word constitute an estate in the Church, against whom the ruling elders are to be for a protection to the churches; just as the idea has been in civil matters, that senates or parliaments were introduced as a means of acting as a check on consuls and kings, to prevent them from misgoverning.

The theory running through our old Form of Government is, that ministers of the word are presbyters only in the sense that the greater includes the less; that holding a higher office in the church, that higher office includes in it all the functions of the lower office; and while it is declared that *as rulers* all presbyters are officially equal, yet, very inconsistently with this declaration, one class of presbyters are made permanent members of presbytery and synod and *ex officio* moderators of session, and no quorum of a judicatory can be formed without the presence of a certain number of them.

It is alleged that ministers of the word must hold a different and higher rank from that of the ruling elder, for the reason that the call to these respective offices is different. But, in our judgment, the call in both cases is essentially the same. The call in both cases consists in the election of a church, together with an intelligent apprehension in the mind of the person that it is his duty to serve God in the capacity indicated. In the case of an evangelist or missionary, the call of the presbytery to this work may be construed as taking the place of a call from a church in the other case.

Will it be objected that if all presbyters hold the same official rank, then it follows that they may each minister in the word, if they judge themselves qualified? We answer, that this is no more the case than it follows that, because as rulers they are all equal, this authorises any one of them to assume to perform the functions of moderator or clerk, without being expressly called to the exercise of these functions by his peers. In reference to the point here brought to view, we would not abate one tittle from the requisitions made of young men who are preparing to preach the gospel. We have no fault to find on this point with

the regulations of the present Form of Government. But, at the same time, there are not a few ruling elders who, on account of their intelligence and religious experience, are well qualified to talk to the people to edification. We may not close the mouths of such and say they must not talk to the people, because the function of laboring in the word and doctrine has not been conferred upon them. On the contrary, let them be encouraged to go forward and exercise their gifts in this respect, *under* the authority of the session. We might just as well close the mouths of all Sunday-school superintendents, and say they shall not talk to the children, as to say these ruling elders shall not talk to the people. Our book already makes it the duty of the session to conduct worship in the church, in the absence of the preacher, by singing, prayer, reading the Scriptures and the sermons of approved divines. In some instances, the members of session go further than this, and exhort the people. Let them be encouraged in this work; but let the work be done under the direction of session. The session would be good judges as to whether any could talk to edification. Nay, further: let such ruling elders as, in the judgment of session, can talk to edification, be encouraged to collect the people together in destitute neighborhoods near by, and conduct religious services for them.

This thing is done, and will be done, and would vastly better be done by authority and under the regulations of authority, than against authority. How much efficiency could be given to the ruling eldership by encouraging them into this work; and the result, in many instances, might be that not a few of them would be in time inducted into the regular ministry of the word. This plan would furnish a remedy, and the best remedy that could be devised, for a felt want of our Church. The South Alabama Presbytery had an overture before the last Assembly, asking that some plan might be adopted by which to "*license lay preachers or exhorters*;" and the General Assembly gave the presbyteries permission to do so. How much more scriptural for the Church to lead her ruling elders into this work. Indeed, this is what ought to be considered a part of their regular work.

If they are qualified to rule, they have the requisite intelligence to talk to the people. Having adopted the Confession of Faith, we could trust them as to their orthodoxy; and when acting under the direction of the session, the work of overtaking many destitutions around us would be done, and well done.

The details of a Form of Government, wrought out in accordance with these suggestions, would require all presbyters to be ordained by the provincial presbytery or its commission; would give the presbyteries original jurisdiction over all presbyters; and while all presbyters being present might deliberate in presbytery, none could vote except those recently appointed by the sessions to represent them in presbytery. It would make a quorum of presbytery to consist of a given number, without any distinction as to whether they were ruling elders or those who both ruled and ministered in the word; and in like manner the quorum of session or the General Assembly. As it is now, a ruling elder, having once been ordained, never ceases to be a ruling elder but by deposition; but he may cease to be an *acting* elder, and until again reinstalled over a church, does not actually exercise the power of rule. So let it be with the presbyter who ministers in the word—when not actually installed over a church, he ceases to vote in presbytery, unless a vacant church should choose to commission him to represent them in presbytery; and it might be desirable that evangelists, acting as such, be so commissioned by vacant churches. It might also be that a quorum of a judicatory having assembled, all members, without distinction, should be held equally eligible to the moderator's seat as well as to the appointment of clerk. This would be consistently carrying out the principle that all presbyters holding the same office have the same rank. Indeed, the principle that *as rulers* all presbyters are equal, has been asserted in the old Form of Government as well as in the amended Form; and this principle, legitimately carried out, would require most of the details here above mentioned.

Is there any positive proof from Scripture that the elder who ministers in the word holds an office of different and higher rank from the elder who rules only? The writer can find none. On

the contrary, the fact that the same official titles are given to both is the positive proof that they hold the same rank. In matters of worship and church regulation, "*what is not commanded is forbidden.*" This is the injunction running throughout the Scriptures, in various forms of expression. One passage expresses it in this form: "*Thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish aught therefrom.*" Only some "circumstantial details" are left to our discretion; as, for example, the time and place of meeting of a judicatory, what should constitute a quorum, or how a judicatory should be authoritatively convened. In all other things, the word of God is sufficient for a guide, and we are not at liberty to fall short or go beyond, except as it respects these necessary details. To take any other ground than this, is to open the door for any or all the ritualistic mummeries of Prelacy or Popery. The question whether, by Christ's appointment, there are to be one or two ranks of presbyters in the Church, is not in the nature of "circumstantial detail," but a radical principle underlying the very structure of the Church. It behoves us, therefore, to see to it that on such a subject, we are on a scripture basis. Error on this as well as on other subjects always did, and always will, carry damage in its wake. Just as soon as the primitive Church departed from the scripture basis and initiated the practice of giving a priority to a presbyter of each church, the practice necessarily arose of having distinctive titles for the two ranks of presbyters. Hence the title bishop was exclusively applied to the one having that priority. Had the Apostolic Church had the two ranks, there would of necessity have been the two sets of distinctive titles; nor could both ranks be called by the same titles without great confusion. When the first step was made towards Prelacy, it was easy to make the next step. The distinction was introduced between bishops and rural bishops or suburbans. Innovations went on and brought in the titles *primate, patriarch, metropolitan*; these titles still indicating different ranks, till at last the usurpations culminated in the establishment of Popery. Here was the mischief resulting from a departure from scripture warrant. So it must be in all such cases of departure. The Scrip-

tures being our sufficient guide, let us take heed to go by them, and by them alone.

May not persons holding the same official rank yet possess different functions? The moderator of our church courts possesses powers not belonging to the other members, but his rank is not changed by possessing these powers. The same remark may be made of members appointed to act as clerks or committee men. So, when power is conferred upon a presbyter to preach the gospel and administer the ordinances, we do not necessarily change his rank.

ARTICLE III.

CHRISTIAN UNITY.

Moderate Episcopacy not inconsistent with Presbyterian Principles. By ROBERT LEIGHTON, Bishop of Dumblane. Republished from the Edition of 1662, with Notes and an Introduction. New York. 1868.

A tract with the above title was recently received by us through the mail. The authorship is attributed to Bishop Leighton, professing to be a reprint of a little tract of his published in 1662, as "A Modest Defence of Moderate Episcopacy, as established in Scotland at the restoration of King Charles II.,"—a title which is truly very modest, and doubtless justified to the mind of the republisher a change to that which it bears upon the title page, and the accompanying introduction and notes, which form really the body of the tract as now issued. The party by whom this production is gotten up and disseminated is unknown, and therefore it is not designed in this article to attribute its positions to any special party. It is thrown upon the public, however, without evidence of its origin, and certainly can claim no special regard upon the ground of its paternity.

The mission of this tract is to promote "Christian unity,"—that is, the visible, organic union of evangelical Protestant churches. "It is the opinion of many," says the Introduction, "that the claims of Christian unity are beginning to predominate over the feelings of party and sect, and that the way is preparing for some grand movement, in which the Reformation will be renewed and completed on primitive principles. The present condition of the orthodox reformed must be regarded as merely provisional. To revert to common truths and so begin anew, is the only way to insure our ultimate triumph." The more particular design is "to revive among Presbyterians their own historical position in respect to Episcopacy;" "to meet Presbyterians on their own grounds, and incite them *in their own way* to organic unity with historical Christianity;" "to realise the idea of their founders and settle at once the painful disputes between them and their Christian brethren called 'Episcopalians;' thus establishing a mutual recognition, and opening the way, in God's good time, for a more complete unity." (Pages 3, 6, and 15—Introduction.) "This," continues our author, "is certainly called for by the commands of Christ, and not less by the wants of the world and by the condition of our own dear country, in view of the awful inroads of Romish superstition, and of that which always attends it—scepticism and infidelity." (Introduction—p. 7.)

The object of this publication, then, from its own showing, is to induce Presbyterians to return to organic unity with "historical Christianity,"—or, in other words, with Episcopacy,—upon the ground that such unions are in accordance with the command of Christ, and made necessary by the wants of the world and the prevalence of Romish superstition, scepticism, and infidelity in our own country; and this with the ultimate design of securing "the reunion of Christendom and the fulfilment of our Redeemer's prayer that all his followers might be one." (P. 9—Introduction.)

This publication deserves notice only as it presents the subject of Christian unity. As to its specific purpose of establishing the consistency of moderate Episcopacy and Presbyterian princi-

ples, and thus seeking the organisation of Presbyterians under an Episcopal form of government, it is one of the most superficial, illogical, and presumptuous productions we have ever perused. It is an insult to the intelligence and convictions of Presbyterians, and is certainly inconsistent with the known teachings of Episcopalians. A few isolated extracts and mere simple affirmations relative to the teachings of Calvin, Beza, Baxter, Lightfoot, and others, with this tract of ten pages from Bishop Leighton, forms the appeal made to Presbyterians to become Episcopalians. For, whatever this tract professes, or its publisher may design, the practical effect of such secret missiles is to unsettle the minds of Presbyterians who may not be familiar with the principles involved, and thus are inimical to the spirit of Christian harmony and concord.

The tract, as it came from the hand of Bishop Leighton, was designed to promote conformity to an Episcopal hierarchy, and thus to evade the pains and penalties inflicted upon non-conformists. It doubtless expresses the views under which the author himself left the Presbyterian party and received Episcopal ordination and preferment. It was written to allay the spirit of resistance and indignation awakened among the Scotch Presbyterians by the forcible establishment of Episcopacy under Charles II. But it was wholly unequal to the strong convictions and undaunted courage of the Scottish Covenanters. Now it is reproduced to induce and justify a conformity of Presbyterians to Episcopal order, to promote organic unity, and to make head against Romish superstition—certainly a wide difference from its original purpose.

The only matter to be considered in proposals for external Christian unity, it would seem from this effort to establish an agreement between moderate Episcopacy and Presbyterian principles, is that of church government—ignoring other and even more weighty matters. And in marking the ecclesiastical lines within which we are invited, human authority—and that very limited in amount and unsatisfactory in character—is the only source of appeal. It does not seem to occur to this writer that this generation of Presbyterians have what they at least esteem scriptural evidence for their distinguishing belief.

The sentiments, however, which this writer advances upon the general subject of Christian unity, deserve special consideration. As a representative of this type of opinion, it raises a question of extended consequence and of great practical import. The general truth maintained upon this subject by this class of Christians, and from which this special effort to promote agreement between Episcopalians and Presbyterians has its origin, is, that the visible organic unity of the Christian churches is necessary to the manifestation of its spiritual and real unity, and essential to the ultimate triumph of Christianity. Therefore, some basis of doctrine and church polity must be perfected and promulgated, upon which all the people of God can stand in visible, organic, and active union. To secure this end, we are invited "to revert to common truths and begin anew," as the present condition of the orthodox reformed must be regarded as merely provisional. In other words, we are summoned to ignore, to eliminate, and to conjoin the distinctive principles of different churches, till some residuum is attained palatable to all. Such is the scheme which is here presented to Presbyterians, who, this writer says, "have sadly lost sight of their position in this matter." Such is the scheme which finds numerous advocates among the Christian churches. In it we are all interested, and it is eminently wise we should all seek to be informed and established in our minds concerning it. The principles involved cover the whole question of union, whether of any two or of all the separate ecclesiastical organisations of the Christian Church.

The grounds upon which the external organic unity of the Christian Church is advocated, and which give it favor with many, are believed to be embraced in the following:

1. That it realises what our Saviour taught—the oneness of all believers.

2. That it is essential to the complete triumph of Christianity: "the body must be fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, that it may make increase and edify itself in love." Let us endeavor to examine the validity and practical worth of these propositions as affecting this question.

1. That there is a real union between Christ and his people, and a union thus between them; none will question. "We being many are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another" (Rom. xii. 5); and gifts are bestowed upon his people as such for the edification and increase of the Church. But that this necessitates, or even makes advisable at all times, external and organic union, certainly will not be affirmed by the least considerate advocate of such a union. It cannot mean that organic is essential to real union among the disciples of Christ. For, if so, the existence of the visible Church under different external organisations involves the dismemberment of believers from Christ and the eternal destruction of each. External unity, therefore, can not be necessary to the real and spiritual union of the people of God. All that is or can be meant by those who advocate, upon this ground, the organic unity of Christians, is, that Christian unity is only fully attained by its external manifestation. And this we admit, provided we attach to visible unity its scriptural meaning and encompass it with scriptural limitations.

A visible unity of Christians we do not understand to be synonymous with organic unity—that is, a union which implies the identically same standards of doctrine and government under one ecclesiastical administration. This,—which seems to be assumed by this class of Christian unionists,—if admitted in theory, would be utterly impossible in practice. The diversity of races, the difficulty of intercommunication, and the impracticability of embracing the entire Church of God under the same ecclesiastical jurisdiction, are barriers that cannot be overcome to such an extent as to secure active and efficient unity. We have been accustomed to regard every association of professed believers, who recognise the headship of Christ, who possess the ministry, oracles, and ordinances of God, and who enjoy to a greater or less degree the presence and witness of the Holy Spirit, as a part of the visible Church; and these, taken unitedly, to constitute the visible Church catholic, the one Church and kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ. Such an organisation of believers is fully equipped for the work the great Head

of the Church has committed to his saints. Such is the great agency by which Jesus gathers his disciples from all flesh, edifies them and prepares them for the invisible and glorified Church on high. In this all Protestants agree, except, possibly, a few extremists who are "greater zealots for party difference than matters more substantial." Not only spiritual but visible unity, therefore, may consist with denominational difference and separate organisation.

All those, then, whom this movement would unite organically are already by profession constituent members of the same body of which Christ is the living Head, partakers of the same Spirit, engaged in the same great work, and anticipate a communion in the same heavenly inheritance. They are, however, imperfect in knowledge and sanctification. They see through a glass darkly and know only in part, and hence their views of divine truth differ to a greater or less extent. Hence differences, either in a negative or positive form, in other words, a lack of perfect agreement, is not only a fact, but one which is essentially consistent with a church imperfect in knowledge and sanctification. To expect a unity which ignores this, is chimerical, and can never be realised on earth. To seek a union of Christians irrespective of it, is fanatical. To effect a union regardless of it, is a practical and pernicious error. All schemes, therefore, for organic union among parts or the whole of the Christian Church, that ignore this general truth, which underlies the very nature of the visible Church, or that disregard the particular differences of those proposed to be united, we cannot but regard as evil, and only evil.

Such propositions do not emanate, as is sometimes supposed, from the highest degree of the spirit of Christian unity. They spring from a low estimate of the sanctity of conscientious convictions, or from a very imperfect knowledge of the nature and history of the Church visible, or sometimes, even worse, from the unsanctified opinion that in external greatness there is real efficiency. External unity is an accidental and not an essential element of Christian unity. It may or may not exist, without affecting the catholicity of the Church. If this be not so, then

we find ourselves in a labyrinth of practical difficulties, from which there is no exit. What is the visible catholic Church? By what part or parts of those who profess the true religion has its identity and unity been preserved? Who shall claim the promises God has made to his professed people? Whom are we justified in recognising as his Church, and to whom shall we look for the oracles and ordinances of God and for the fulfilment of the covenants? From these and such difficulties there is no escape, if we adopt the dogma that the visible unity of God's people, as taught in his word, cannot consist with different ecclesiastical organisations. And if our convictions of divine truth must abdicate in favor of organic union, what is the result? It does not extract the root of discord. It does not, in truth, enhance real unity, for external unity without agreement and harmony of sentiment is a mockery. It is forced by some external pressure, and must be worse than fruitless. If the matter of difference justifies before the conscience separate ecclesiastical organisation, then to fetter the parties by the forged bonds of organic union enslaves the conscience and is sin. "For whatever is not of faith is sin." The supremacy of conscience has a divine approval,—“Let every one be persuaded in his own mind,”—and our convictions in matters of religion are sacred. The apostle strikes the chord of practical wisdom as well as speaks the word of inspiration, when he says: “Whereto we have already attained, let us walk by the same rule, let us mind the same thing.” “And if in any thing,” continues he, “ye be otherwise (differently) minded, God shall reveal even this unto you.” Agreement is the condition of external union: “how can two walk together except they be agreed?” But in matters of difference, the rule is a waiting for the clearer revelation of God. This he may afford on earth, or may defer for the clear light of eternity. These differences, which rise to such importance as to justify to the minds of those who entertain them separate church organisations, cannot be sacrificed upon the altar of organic unity. It is the sacrifice of a principle of guidance in such matters that is divine, and contravenes the strongest convictions of common sense.

The union of believers, therefore, as taught by our Lord, we do not think is embodied in such proposals for organic Christian unity. The spiritual unity of believers consists in their common union with Christ as one body, the inhabiting of the self-same Spirit, and consequently their being animated with one heart and mind, and bringing forth fruit unto holiness. This is visibly (though not perfectly) manifested by their professed recognition of one Head, Jesus Christ, in the visible possession of the ministry, oracles, and ordinances which he hath appointed, with the indwelling and quickening power of the Holy Spirit. We say not perfectly manifested; and yet as perfectly as the known imperfection of knowledge and sanctification which pertains to the saints whilst on earth justifies us in expecting, and more perfectly than by an organic unity which encompasses many differences and not a few elements of danger and discord. Now, the Church universal and visible, as thus defined, is associated and conjoined, though under separate and somewhat differing organisations, for the same great end—the edifying of the Church and increase of itself in love, the ingathering to itself from the world of the elect people of God, and to be a witness unto the nations for the truth.

The external organic unity of the Church, then, is not a command of Christ, as such parties would have us believe. As affecting the entire visible Church on earth, it is utterly and wholly impracticable; nor is it made a command by being restricted in its application to a more limited territory. To exist at all under the sanction of his word, it must be the outward manifestation of unity of mind and heart. This presupposes a degree of knowledge and piety which he has not yet bestowed upon his Church.

The practical duty of Christians in this matter is to preserve and cultivate a spirit of love and concord, which is the spirit of unity, and to prosecute with harmony and unity of action the great work in which all agree; and thus exemplify the unity of believers. And if, under increased knowledge and sanctification, the differences of any parts of the visible Church disappear, and all the conditions of a harmonious and effective coöpe-

ration aggregate in their history, then will they be ready, we think, as led by the Spirit, for organic union. If there are any movements, however, made in this direction, or any unions effected, regardless of the differences that have produced or justified separation, and may still yield discord and dissension, they deflect from the line of providential guidance, and must result in evil. Let all engaged in such schemes look well for the clear light of God's truth and providence, and weigh well the teachings of God in this matter in the past history of the Church; especially let not our people be perplexed or unduly influenced in this matter by conventions whose actions are without authority, or by publications whose paternity is unknown. Unto a praying and believing people, who desire to know and do the will of God in all things, who are faithful in his service, and who guard their minds against unholy motives, God will reveal in his time their duty in this and all other matters, and make manifest the path by which it is to be attained. But may we be saved the prevalence of the grievous error that the organic unity of Christians is a command of God, or that it is a condition so important to the triumph of Christianity that it would be justified at almost any sacrifice!

2. Let us, then, investigate the other ground upon which the organic unity of Christians is advocated, viz., *that it is essential to the ultimate triumph of Christianity.*

It is said "that much of the time and strength of the different denominations of the Christian Church is wasted in opposing each other," and that it is high time "that some more systematic efforts should be made to bring into Christian fellowship the different portions of the household of faith." It would be difficult, we apprehend, to prove that all the attrition of controverted truth has been worthless, and that the amount of time and strength that has been wasted in useless controversy would have been redeemed for effective use by bringing the contending parties into closer antagonism, through the bonds of external unity. Such unity is not the remedy by which the Church is to be restored to the highest degree of healthful efficiency.

It is, moreover, assuming much to affirm that the organic

union of all the Protestant Churches after the Reformation, and of those that have arisen since, would have insured a more rapid and at the same time real growth of Christianity, than that attained under the providence of God as actually developed. This proceeds from a narrow and incomplete survey of the subject, with a considerable admixture of unholy presumption. What has occurred was God's plan certainly. As such, it was as certainly the best by which, upon a perfect knowledge of the whole matter, to attain his own end—the glory of his name and the redemption of his chosen people. Doubtless, if the Church from its infancy had been endowed with perfect knowledge and sanctification, its growth would have been more rapid and in a spirit of perfect harmony. This assumption, however, involves not less than an entire change of God's method in instituting and perfecting his Church. In the visible Church on earth, the living stones to be erected on high into the spiritual and eternal temple of the living God are gathered and prepared; hence we hear the sound of the hammer, the axe, and the tools of iron in its workmanship. And that God attains the redemption of his people through weak and defective agencies, and these resisted by the rulers of the darkness of this world and by spiritual wickedness in high places, does not prove that his plan needs revising, but that the excellency of the power is of God, and that according as it is written, "He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord."

If, however, we admit that organic unity is essential to the ultimate triumph of Christianity, it will not follow that we should immediately inaugurate measures to attain it, regardless of those causes that have occasioned and prolonged such separations. There are many conditions, doubtless, which must be fulfilled ere Christianity is completely triumphant, and conditions that may be necessary to bring it about; yet this does not necessitate or justify steps to compel the realisation of such conditions in the present history of the Church. There are connected and prerequisite events upon which the wisdom, the efficiency, and even the very existence of such conditions, are necessarily dependent. Let us not endeavor, in any movement of the Church, to

anticipate the development of God's purpose; for "his judgments are unsearchable and his ways past finding out."

But is the organic union of Christians necessary to the triumph of Christianity? It may be true in the history of certain parts of the visible Church, that union may result in increased efficiency and usefulness. It is true in the history of those in whom the Spirit and providence of God have realised the conditions of a harmonious and effective unity. This is very different, however, from presenting organic unity to the mind of the Christian Church as essential to the triumph of Christianity, and awakening in the minds of Christian people a feverish expectation of "some grand movement, predominating over the feelings of party and sect, in which the Reformation will be renewed and completed on primitive principles." And that there may also be some external recognition among all evangelical churches of the doctrine of Christian unity, we think not improbable. But that it is essential to the success of Christianity in any specified territory, or in the world, that all Christian churches should be externally united under one ecclesiastical administration, we do not for a moment believe.

When it is asserted that such a union is essential to the triumph of Christianity, it may be well to accompany such an affirmation with a clear definition of what is meant by a triumph of Christianity. It is by no means clear to the minds of all what is to be the last and triumphant period of the Church's history. And until this is settled, it would be indeed difficult to decide what means are necessary to attain it. We can perceive that the maintenance of the fundamental truths of the gospel, the proclamation of salvation through a crucified Redeemer as a common and commanding truth, the indwelling of the self-same Spirit and a recognition of our Lord, will yield unity and harmony of spirit in prosecuting the work committed to the Church. This will receive the approbation and blessing of the great Head of the Church, and insure success and ultimate triumph. Yet this organic external unity will not secure, nor will separate ecclesiastical organisations destroy. More of the knowledge and spirit of Christ will attain the desired end, we know. It will

lead all parts of the visible Church to give the essential truths of salvation their first and due place; it will beget forbearance and mutual respect for the convictions of each other in matters of difference; it will remove bigotry and asperity, and thus manifest the doctrine of Christian unity, and render the Church edifying to itself and triumphant over its enemies. The aggregate of influence and power thus exercised would be reduced but little by separate church organisations. This Christian unity, which is real and effective, is far different, however, from that which is sought by the agitators who resort to some grand external movement as the medium and surety of the triumph of Christianity.

The opinion here advanced, that organic unity is a condition of the complete success of the Christian religion, when stripped for inspection, stands upon this assumption, that an external organisation of Christians, grand and imposing, a unit in numbers, harmonious in action, and combining all the external elements of effective strength, could withstand all opposition, triumph over all enemies, and soon gain the world for God. This underlies much that is said and written in these United States upon Christian unity. That significant statement of our Saviour made to Pharisees, "The kingdom of heaven cometh not with observation," is forgotten. It is attended with the least external display and pomp, but a kingdom of power, whose foundations are everlasting, and whose dominion endureth forever. It is in the world, but not of the world. Not organised upon the same plan, nor sustained by force, but by the power of God's truth and Spirit. So far, therefore, as this opinion obtains in efforts for external unity, it is one of grave import. It is nothing less than supplanting Christ as Head of his Church and the source of its power, and displacing the Spirit of all grace. It is to secure success to this Church by some grand external movement, combining the whole of its external strength. It is this, rather than the mighty but hidden work of the spirit of Christ. This is the spirit of antichrist. It is Urijah removing, at the command of Ahaz, the altar of the living God, and placing in its stead one after the pattern of that at Damascus.

It is the pattern of the idolatrous altar reared by a boastful, self-confident people to what it regards the achievements, the strength, and the grandeur of a national union. It is this national pride and vanity, we fear, that has generated in the hearts of some of the professed people of God a desire to conform his Church to this earthly and unchristian pattern. So far as this spirit prevails and attains its end, it must result in the subversion of the kingdom of Christ, and not in its triumph. It is doubtless true that some fall into the ranks of this army, whose banner is *Christian unity*, that are deceived by the assumed spirit of Christ, and it may be that some think that they are even doing God service; but to us it appears dangerous, and will only pillage our separate church organisations of the covenant and crown rights of Jesus. It was the same spirit that culminated in the unity of Roman Catholicism—a claim gradually established that the Church was one in external organisation, that this one Church was that of Rome, and as a consequence all others were antichristian, and to be required to acknowledge their heresy and compelled to return to the mother Church. And for this end, her bloody inquisitions were established, and their bloody edicts executed till the blood of the saints cried to heaven for the avenging judgment of God. The same spirit prevailed in England during that period so celebrated in English history for bitter controversy, discord, persecution, and civil war. And, as Neal observes, the measures to effect external uniformity were “the occasion of all the mischief that befel the Church in England for above eighty years” (Sixteenth century.) And now, though clad in a different garb, it preserves its identity. The pains and penalties of the civil authority, or of the authority of force in the hands of ecclesiastics, was then used to bring recusants, heretics, and non-conformists to the one Church. The conscientious convictions of men were threatened with extirpation by temporal pains and penalties inflicted by the minions of civil and ecclesiastical tribunals. Certainly, in such historical developments of the spirit of external unity, we have little confirmation of the assertion that it is essential to the triumph of Christianity. Nor is it certain that to help in this

“grand movement” now inaugurated to secure organic unity, the civil power may not be again invoked. Have we not already heard intimations that Christians must unite in securing a chief magistrate whom they may approve, and alterations in the civil constitution which they may deem needful? Have we not, in the periods of passion and excitement through which we have passed, heard the voice of this demon of a politico-religious unity? It is already the custom of some among the religious denominations in the United States to give out in no inaudible tones the expression of their preference for men and measures in the State. And they use their influence, not in their legitimate sphere as citizens, but as churches, in the political canvasses and legislation of the land. If this be done in the green tree, what shall be done in the dry? Is there any prophet needed to foresee that soon, from this “grand movement,” there would emerge a grand politico-religious organisation, resulting in incalculable detriment to the religion of our Lord and Redeemer? It would inaugurate another period of religious persecution. Whether the same precisely in the nature of its penalties, it is not a matter of moment to inquire; but if not, none the less inimical to the peace and rights of God’s people. Not only, then, do we deny that the organic unity of the Christian churches is essential to the triumph of Christianity, but, on the contrary, as we have every reason to believe, it would be fraught with great danger to its peace and purity. In the periods of external strength and prosperity, the power of antichrist has effected its greatest victories in the Church. God, on the contrary, has revealed his power and manifold wisdom in the Church, by the triumphs of his truth and grace through weak instrumentalities, and that without the external conditions of success. He does not act according to the dictates of human wisdom in his great purpose of redemption. He chooses the foolish things of the world to confound the wise, and weak things to confound the mighty, and even things that are not to bring to nought things that are, that no flesh should glory in his presence. Christ Jesus is made of God unto us wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption, that, according as it is written, he that glorieth

let him glory in the Lord. The success of the Church of God is attained by him, through Jesus Christ, in a way that will confound the wisdom and device of man, and will redound in glory to his own name. The mysteries of that plan none can solve—its conditions none can anticipate. His judgments are unsearchable and his ways past finding out. The presence and blessing of Jesus, the Head of the Church, upon the preaching of the pure gospel and administration of the sacraments, will secure through his believing people the success and triumph of his Church; but by such means and in such a way as will confound all human wisdom and conditions of success, and yield glory in the highest to him that sitteth upon the throne and to the Lamb forever and ever. Let us not, then, prescribe to God the nature or conditions of the Church's triumph; but in the maintenance of the truth, in dependence upon his Spirit, and in faithful discharge of the duties presented in his providence, let the Church await the coming of the Lord and the glory of his power.

In closing this article, we wish to say that it is not as against all unions, consummated or contemplated, that we write. A spirit of unity should pervade all branches of the visible Church, and will in proportion as Christ dwells in them by faith. And if with this there is among any parts thereof essential agreement in the standards of doctrine and church order, with all the outward conditions of an effective and fraternal union, then it is their duty to effect what God in his providence so clearly counsels. But all prominence given to this matter of external and organic Christian unity, which exalts it unduly before the mind of the people of God, which claims for it the position of "a command of Christ," or an essential condition to the triumph of the Christian religion,—we say all such proposals of Christian unity are founded in error, pernicious in their results, and should be reprobated by all that love that unity and peace which come from above. And to whatever extent such a spirit may prevail, any manifestation of which we lament, we earnestly hope that it may never pervade our own Church, now established in the reception of its standards and inhabited by a spirit of peace and

concord—the manifestation, as we would hope, of the indwelling of the spirit of truth and love.

We cannot better close this article than with the following passage, written in regard to the Act of Uniformity passed by the British Parliament in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. It is equally applicable to the present subject: “Among the innumerable follies to which men have been addicted, none is more egregious or absurd than is exhibited in the end which is proposed in this statute” (uniformity in Christian faith and worship). “To whatever extent it has been accomplished by human legislation, it has involved the corruption of Christianity and a most unnatural and pernicious imprisonment of the human mind. Were it attained, it would be unworthy of pursuit, for it is wholly apart from religion; and if compassed, it might exist with the greatest security where the spirit of religion was not found. * * * But the folly of attempting to secure religious uniformity is apparent in its hopelessness. It has not, it will not, it cannot succeed. So long as religious principle endures, or the human mind retains the power of thought and the faculty of research, all enactments of this kind must be futile. They constitute an unnatural coercion of man’s intellect; and if they appear to succeed for a season, their ultimate defeat is thereby rendered more signal. Uniformity in the modes of religion has usually been sought at the expense of its living spirit. They have been mistaken for religion itself; and the energy and zeal which ought to have been expended in the conversion of an apostate world have consequently been employed in the establishment of that with which religion has little if any connection.” (Robinson’s *Eccl. Researches*.)

ARTICLE IV.

WHAT IS A CALL TO THE GOSPEL MINISTRY?

This is one of those troublesome questions in casuistry which it seems impossible to settle. It springs up periodically, to be discussed afresh, always with earnestness. This is due to the fact that it is not a question about abstract theory only, but a question about personal duty. Every man who turns his thoughts to the work of the ministry in our Church meets it at the threshold, and must settle it for himself before he can advance a step. That the popular theory of our Church in regard to it exerts a powerful influence on the question of the supply of ministers, cannot be doubted. And under this conviction, notwithstanding the fact that the question has been so frequently and so ably discussed, we propose to reëxamine the evidence on which it rests.

This theory, as is well known, is, that God designates those who are to preach the gospel by a supernatural divine call to their work. Dr. Dabney, in his able pamphlet, says: "The Church has always held that none should preach the gospel but those who are called of God." A writer in the *Princeton Review* (1842) says: "It is a first principle not to be invaded, that a call to the gospel ministry is from God. Where this doctrine is denied by any community, it may be safely concluded it has ceased to be a branch of the Church of Jesus Christ." Dr. Thornwell says: "That a supernatural conviction of duty, wrought by the immediate agency of the Holy Ghost, is an essential element in the evidence of a vocation to the ministry, seems to us to be the clear and authoritative teaching of the Scriptures." (S. P. REVIEW, 1847.) This is a statement of the theory in language quoted from the very highest authority. If this theory be true, the conclusion seems to us irresistible that ministers are, *quoad hoc*, inspired, since they receive a knowledge of their duty immediately from God, instead of learning it from his word.

Our practice, on the other hand, seems to be without reference to this theory. When any one presents himself as a candidate for the ministry, our presbyteries proceed at once to inquire into his fitness for the work. Their examination is close and particular, taking a wide range, including his good name, piety, learning, aptness to teach, and whatever might affect his prospects of usefulness in the ministry. If satisfied with the results of this examination, they license him to go forth and exercise his gifts before the people. If he pleases the people, and some church, having ground to hope from experience that his ministrations in the gospel will be profitable to their spiritual interests, gives him a call, presbytery ordains him, and thus he becomes a minister. Up to this moment, he is on trial and the matter in suspense: the presbytery is waiting to be satisfied by actual experiment that he is qualified for the work of the ministry; and it is understood from the first that if, as the issue of all these trials, they fail to be satisfied, they will refuse to ordain him. This is the course pursued by our presbyteries in the matter, with unvarying uniformity.

This is our practice. And it would be difficult to imagine any thing more simple, plain, and matter-of-fact, more free from suspicion of mystery or the supernatural, or more in accordance with the dictates of common sense, than are the requirements of our Book and the practice of our presbyteries in the matter of inducting men into the gospel ministry. The only question raised is, Has the candidate the character and qualifications which fit him for the work? But in the effort to satisfy themselves on this point, there is not a step in the whole process which would suggest the thought of a supernatural call, nor one which, it seems to us, is compatible with it. In every instance where God has given men a supernatural call to any work, he has with it given them supernatural credentials of such call. Moses received such a call, and Samuel, and Elijah; so did the apostles of our Lord, and they relied on the supernatural credentials furnished by him who called them, and never sat to be examined by a presbytery. Such a call would place a man above the authority of the presbytery, and there would be as

little fitness in his appearing before a presbytery to be examined as there would be in the king's ambassador submitting his credentials to the inspection of a precinct magistrate's court. The royal seal accredits him.

Here, then, we confront the popular theory and the uniform practice of our Church. Their antagonism, it seems to us, is obvious. Which is right? Our practice is in accordance with the requirements of our Book. We proceed step by step with the Book open before us. We are required by it to be rigidly strict in our examination of candidates—almost timidly cautious in admitting men to the office of the ministry. Either the theory of the direct supernatural call is wrong, or else our practice is wrong. For if there be such a call, it is unquestionably paramount and decisive, and to overlook it would be unpardonable. But then, if our practice is wrong, our Book is wrong; for we go by its requirements. We must, it seems to us, choose between the two.

While, therefore, we venerate the names of many of those who hold or have held and advocated the theory in question, for their wisdom and piety, and for their labors of inestimable value to the Church; admire with enthusiasm their genius, their learning, their great abilities, their manly earnestness and passionate love of the truth; yet we feel constrained—though with diffidence, still with unhesitating decision—to dissent from it; and for the following reasons, among others:

1. The theory is unauthorised by our standards. This has been made apparent already, but we wish to make some further use of it. When our Confession of Faith and Form of Government were drawn up, the nature of the ministry and its relation to the Church were among the most prominent and exciting topics of the day. If the framers of these documents had held this theory, they would doubtless have distinctly announced it. And yet there is not a sentence which asserts it, nor a word which suggests it; but instead, they have given a definition of the Church which excludes it. All that is to be found in our standards on the question is contained in the directions to Presbyteries how they shall proceed in licensing and ordaining men

to the ministry; and he must have sharp optics who can see it there. It is unnecessary, however, to press this argument, as none of the advocates of the theory have ever appealed to our standards in its support.

2. We object, further, that it is incompatible with our theory of the Bible. According to our Confession of Faith, Chap. I., Sec. 6, "the whole counsel of God, concerning all things necessary for his own glory, man's salvation, faith, and life, is either expressly set down in Scripture, or by good and necessary consequence may be deduced from Scripture: unto which nothing at any time is to be added, whether by new revelation of the Spirit or traditions of men." But how can this be true, if a very large class of men cannot learn from it their duty in one of the most important acts of their lives, and in a matter deeply affecting the glory of God and the salvation of men? It will not be denied that when a man decides whether or not he shall preach the gospel, he decides a question of duty; and that he must decide it in accordance with some standard or rule which is authoritative, from which he can learn what is his duty. And if he is taught this duty by a divine supernatural conviction, wrought by the immediate agency of the Holy Ghost, he surely does not learn it from the Bible. And how can he go forth and teach the people that every thing necessary for the glory of God, man's salvation, faith, and life, is set down in their Bibles, while at the same time he tells them that in choosing his calling for life, he was guided, not by the Bible, but by a supernatural conviction of duty, wrought by the immediate agency of the Holy Ghost. And to be consistent, he must say to them, "Every thing necessary for faith and life is to be learned from your Bibles, unless it should be the duty of some of you to preach the gospel, in which case you cannot find it out from your Bibles, but must wait to be taught it by a supernatural conviction wrought by the immediate agency of the Holy Ghost. Unless it is distinctly set down in the Bible that a call to the ministry is an excepted case, so that, while men are to learn their duty from their Bible in all other instances, in this they must be taught by a different method, how can we make the distinction? Is there, then, scriptural authority for it?"

The advocates of the popular theory leave us in the dark on this point. Dr. Thornwell, in stating it, says such "appears to us to be the clear and authoritative teaching of the Holy Scriptures." But he mentions no text or passage where he supposes it to be taught. Dr. Dabney says: "The solid proof of this is not to be sought in those places of the Scripture where a special divine call was given to Old Testament prophets and priests." "The true proof that none should preach but those called of God is rather to be found in such texts as Acts xx. 28, ('Take heed to all the flock over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers,') 1 Cor. xii. 28, etc.; and in the obvious reason that the minister is God's ambassador, and the Sovereign alone can appoint such an agent." On these texts doubtless rests the whole weight of the theory. If there were others in the Bible which might seem to lend it support, they would not have escaped the eye of Dr. Dabney. Let us, then, in candor and fairness, examine the bearing of these texts on the question at issue.

In regard to Acts xx. 28—"Take heed therefore to yourselves and to all the flock over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the flock of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood"—if these words were addressed to preachers as distinguished from ruling elders, they were addressed to them as pastors of particular churches, and the meaning would be that the Holy Ghost had appointed them over these particular churches; which, though true in an important sense, is not our theory of the settlement of pastors, who are chosen by the churches themselves. If these words were addressed to ruling elders as well as preachers,—as some suppose was the fact,—then they would teach that ruling elders as well as ministers have a supernatural call to their office. In either case, the text would prove too much.

The same, it seems to us, may be said of 1 Cor. xii. 28. It includes too much. "Helps, governments," are mentioned as well as preachers, and what is true of one is true of all. Besides, we have been accustomed to the thought that the apostle in this place was speaking of the offices which God had ordained

n the church, rather than the officers; some of these, being extraordinary and temporary, were filled by men who were supernaturally called of God as were the apostles; others, ordinary and perpetual, and to be filled by the body itself, under instructions. In verse 27, he had gathered up the sum and drift of his discourse in the statement that the church is the body corporate, or corporation, of Jesus Christ. In verse 28, he describes the style and character of the corporation more particularly, by reciting the offices which God had ordained in it for its government and edification; and to our mind it has always appeared that his object was to teach that the offices in the church were ordained of God, without teaching how it should be determined who should fill them. If, however, it should still be contended that the doctrine of a divine supernatural call to the ministry is taught in this place, then, to be consistent, we must carry it straight through, and apply it to every officer known to the church.

What Dr. Dabney says of the office of ambassador is certainly true: the Sovereign alone is competent to appoint such an agent; and if the minister is, in the proper sense of the word, an ambassador to the church, that settles the question. He has only to show his credentials to command a hearing. But is the pastor an ambassador to the church over which he presides in the sense of this text? God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself, and hath committed to us the word of reconciliation. "Now, then, we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us; we pray you, in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God." Ambassadors sent to negotiate reconciliation and peace are supposed to be sent to a hostile power. Is the church a hostile power, which the pastor is sent to beseech, in Christ's stead, to be reconciled to God? Rather is it not already supposed to be reconciled and obedient to the faith, the cherished flock of God which the pastor is sent to feed? Whatever, therefore, may be the application of this text; whether Paul spake it of himself or of some other man; applied it to the college of the apostles, who were called of God to found the churches and set them in order, or to the Church itself as the corporation of

Jesus Christ intrusted with the oracles of God, containing "the word of reconciliation,"—one thing to our minds seems plain, namely, that the pastor, whose duties to the church (often and clearly defined elsewhere) are so entirely different from the functions of the ambassador, cannot with any propriety be called an ambassador to the church. It is a notorious fact that every church in our connexion, from the least to the greatest, chooses its own pastor; and the right to do so has been deemed by us so important and sacred that we have poured out our blood like water to maintain it.

There is one other text which in this connexion we wish to examine. It is 1 Cor. ix. 16—"Yea, woe is me if I preach not the gospel!" This utterance of Paul is perhaps more frequently quoted and more confidently relied on in support of the theory under consideration, than any other text in the Bible. The apostle, it is assumed, here states the cause which determined him to become a preacher of the gospel, namely, a conviction that it was his duty to be a preacher, so strong and clear that he felt that a curse would overtake him if he declined it; and it is assumed that a general principle is here laid down which must govern all who enter the ministry. No man may enter the ministry who is not impelled thereto by a conviction as clear and strong and terrible as was that of Paul.

But is this what Paul meant to teach? Did this question ever come before his mind to be discussed and settled as a question of duty, as it does to our minds? That question was settled for him by the Master, who appeared to him on his way to Damascus, and told him that he must go and preach the gospel. How, then, could he ever experience a doubt on this question? Such a doubt would have subverted the foundations of his faith. The conviction that Jesus was the Christ and that he must preach the gospel came together; they rested on the same foundation, and must stand or fall together. He could not have meant, therefore, in this exclamation, to assign his reason for becoming a minister or an apostle.

A glance at the passage in which this saying occurs shows that he was discussing another matter. The question which he

is treating of is the *privileges and rights of ministers as members of the spiritual corporation*. Among other things, he asserts their right to a support. As they devote themselves to the service of the corporation, by the rule of equity they should be supported at the expense of the corporation. This, he says, the Lord has ordained as the law of the Church—"They that preach the gospel shall live of the gospel." But Paul, as is well known, had waived this right in his own case, while preaching at Corinth. He preached the gospel to them free, and lived by the labor of his own hands and on the gifts of Christian friends abroad. (See Acts xx. 34, 1 Thess. ii. 9, 2 Thess. iii. 8, 2 Cor. xi. 8, 9.) And he is here telling why he adopted this course at Corinth and one or two other places: he did it that he might "cut off occasion from them which desire occasion," and stop the mouths of cavillers. The key to his whole statement is given in verse 15: "For it were better for me to die than that any man should make my glorying void." He is actuated by a high sense of personal honor. He is assailed by the calumnies of his enemies, false teachers, unprincipled men who were seeking to destroy his good name and his influence as an apostle. He determined at once to adopt a course which would refute their slanders, and of which he could boast over them. But how is this to be done? Not simply by preaching the gospel faithfully. That had been committed to him as a trust, and to neglect it would be dishonorable—assigned to him as his task, and when he had performed it well, he was but an unprofitable servant. If his preaching had been a matter purely voluntary, he could have gloried in it; but as it was not assumed, but imposed upon him by immediate revelation from God, it was a matter of specific duty, and if he failed to perform it to the best of his ability, he would incur the curse of the Master who employed him. What, then, must he do to have ground of boasting? Why this—that while he preached the gospel as commanded to do, he should "make the gospel of Christ without charge," which he was not commanded to do. This we take to be the sense of this passage; and we confess our inability to see what support it gives to the theory of a supernatural call to the ministry.

3. But we further object to this theory as inconsistent with our theory of the Church. We teach in our standards that the Church is a free corporation, composed of those who profess faith in Jesus Christ, together with their children. The foundation upon which it rests is a profession of faith in Jesus Christ (Mat. xvi. 16, 18); and whoever makes formal, solemn profession of this, is thereby qualified to become a member of this corporation, and upon application, receives baptism, which is the corporation seal.

The object of the corporation is stated to be "divine worship and godly living, agreeably to the Holy Scriptures." It is the house of God, where his children serve him and are trained for heaven. The corporation, it is true, is required to perpetuate itself, and by organising similar bodies wherever it can find the material, to spread itself until it covers the earth, and brings the whole race to bow to Christ as Lord. But all these numerous and wide-spread corporations are in all essentials alike—modified as to minor details by local circumstances; to understand one is to know all.

In a corporation, then, like this, resting securely on its divine charter, furnished with a code of laws which is complete and perfect, its offices all ordained—in a word, fully equipped and furnished for its work, and that work being nothing else but to cultivate the "worship of God and holy living, *agreeably to the Holy Scriptures,*"—the question is, what sort of a man does this corporation want for its minister, and how shall it obtain him? The obvious answer is, it wants a faithful man, who shall not corrupt the doctrine; one who shall bring to the office a good name, piety, prudence, gravity, diligence, good sense, and good manners. It wants a man as its leader, guide, and teacher, who understands its principles, is imbued with its spirit, and in his public and private walk illustrates and adorns its doctrines. As a free corporation, it will choose its own instructor, and will naturally seek those most in harmony with its own spirit. If the church is full of life and zeal, it will seek those who are such for its ministers; if cold and formal, it will desire such as are not spiritual. It will be as the word of God says, "Like

people, like priest." A church will not listen to a minister it does not like. A corrupt and worldly church will not endure the ministrations of a godly and faithful man. "The time will come when they will not bear sound doctrine, but after their own lusts will heap up to themselves teachers having itching ears."

In point of fact, the Church makes her own ministers. She takes of her own sons and sets them apart to this work. And she will select those who best represent her own spirit. Such as she is, such will they be. They partake of her organic life, and ordinarily cannot rise much above her standard of piety. The spiritual state of the church does not depend upon the minister alone. He is but the dispenser of what is provided—the steward of the household. His duties are such as to require no supernatural powers, gifts, or calling, to perform, any further than the humblest Christian needs the same for the performance of his humblest duties. "Moreover, it is required in stewards, that a man be found faithful." This is the prime quality in the character of the minister, as of every Christian. Let him be a faithful dispenser of the word. The Head of the Church has furnished her, in the written word, with a rule of faith and practice, which is simple, clear, authoritative, and unalterable; and she only requires to have this faithfully inculcated and applied. The Holy Spirit, which abides in her according to the promise, gives efficacy to the word and ordinances. But the minister's duty is to labor in word and doctrine. He that prophesies must prophesy according to the proportion of faith. He that preaches must preach the word. He who preaches another gospel than that which is written, is accursed. He who adds to or takes from the word, is accursed. The appeal is to the law and to the testimony. The Church must try the spirits to see if they are of God, and hearers must search the Scriptures to see whether these things are so. The Bible is the treasury where all that is necessary to be known, of the character, purpose, plan, and will of God, in order to his glory and our salvation, is stored; and all that the Church requires, so far as objective truth is concerned, is to have what is herein contained faithfully dispensed. The

unction which they have from the Holy One, will enable them to understand it and use it aright.

This view of the ministry is fully sustained by the history of the Church under the apostles. For a period of about sixty years, the churches were under the supervision of the apostles; and it is reasonable to suppose that every question which was likely to spring up under the practical working of the principles on which it was organised, would, within that time, spring up and be settled by them. Paul was actively engaged for a period of thirty-five years in preaching the gospel, establishing churches, and superintending their affairs. Hundreds of these corporations sprang up almost simultaneously among the Gentiles, ranging from Rome in the south to the northern part of Asia Minor on the north, and as far west as Spain. These were mainly under the direction of the Apostle Paul while he lived, and about the close of his ministry he wrote the three pastoral epistles for the direction of all that should come after him. In these he gives special instructions in reference to the work of the ministry—directing how they should be chosen and appointed, and explicitly stating what must be their qualifications. (See 1 Tim. iii. 1-7, Titus i. 6-9.) But there is not one word to be found in these three epistles which would suggest the thought that there was any thing supernatural or extraordinary in their call to this work. Assuming as a matter of course that those to be set apart by the Church to serve her in the ministry are men of faith and of piety, the apostle gives directions as to their social, intellectual, and moral qualities. If a supernatural call had been requisite, would not a prominence have been given it in these epistles? And as no mention is made of it, is not the inference that it does not obtain unavoidable?

The theory of a supernaturally appointed ministry belongs to the Prelatists—not to us. With them the Church is dependent upon the priesthood for an authoritative interpretation of the Scriptures, and for the efficacy of the sacraments. Hence a dignity and sanctity is claimed for the priesthood, which is not attributed to the laity. But it is not so with us. The Church as a whole—so far as true to their profession—are “a

chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation ;" he ministers, *members of the brotherhood detailed by the body to this specific service*, steward of the mysteries of God, earthen vessels containing the precious seed, clothed only with administrative power and authority, showing the sanctity of the body of which they are members. The Church is taught to understand the word savingly, not by the authoritative interpretation of the ministry, but by the unction of the Spirit, and receives the efficacy of the sacraments by the same influence. The Bible needs no authoritative interpretation. In all essential points, it is as clear and plain as it can be made. It is able to make us wise unto salvation through faith.

Let our Church rouse herself to look well into this matter. We languish for want of ministers. Our feeble churches grow more faint, and our waste places more dreary for want of them. There are, doubtless, scores of men in our churches who are fit to be pastors, and who ought to be set apart to that work ; and if the step were once taken, hundreds more would spring up, ready to enter the field. Our theory of the necessity of learning to the ministry may be carried too far. See what Methodism accomplished with an unlearned ministry. John Wesley followed the apostolic rule in finding a ministry for his churches, and the results were such, in no mean measure, as were witnessed in apostolic times. Under the combined influence of our popular theory of a supernatural call, and our rigid requirements as to learning, the supply of ministers in our Church falls far short of the demand.

ARTICLE V.

BANNERMAN'S CHURCH OF CHRIST.

The Church of Christ: A Treatise on the Nature, Power, Ordinances, Discipline, and Government of the Christian Church.
By the late JAMES BANNERMAN, D. D., Professor of Apologetics and Pastoral Theology, New College, Edinburgh; Author of "Inspiration: The Infallible Truth and Divine Authority of the Holy Scriptures." Edited by his Son. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 38 George street. London: Hamilton Adams & Co. Dublin: John Robertson & Co. 1868. 2 vols., 8vo., pp. 480, 468.

The author of this work was one of the literary executors of the late Principal Cunningham, and in conjunction with Dr. James Buchanan, (Professor of Divinity in the Theological College where they had been all three associated together,) edited his works in four volumes. Dr. Bannerman survived his friend and colleague but a few short years. These two volumes are made up of the lectures delivered by him during each winter session of the New College to the students of the fourth year; and his son and editor tells us that the manuscript was left by its author in a very perfect state, so that very little modification was necessary in preparing the work for the press.

The plan of the work is as follows: First is considered the Church; under what authority constituted; what its essential nature; what its peculiar characteristics; then, how it stands related to the State. In the next place, the nature of Church power and authority is considered; its source, its limits, and its ends; then in what members of the Church this power has its primary seat. In the third place, the principles so far established are applied to the different kinds of matters respecting which the Church exercises her powers; which matters come under the three heads of Doctrine, Ordinances, and Discipline. Upon the second head, ordinances or worship, the treatise is

especially full; and those peculiar institutions, the sacraments, receive large and detailed consideration. In the fourth and last place, the persons to whom the exercise of Church power ought to be committed come to be considered, and this leads to a discussion of the scriptural form of church government.

Professor Rainy, who is a reputable authority upon such questions, says it would not be easy to point to any one work treating so thoroughly and comprehensively this class of subjects. He ventures to compare Dr. Bannerman with Voetius. He gives him a decided superiority to modern German authors on the Church, and also to English Church writers. "It is," he says, "a fresh statement of our fundamental principles in their application to the whole range of questions," and being from the Presbyterian point of view, it has for us "of course a special interest and value." For our own part, we consider that we pay Dr. Bannerman a high compliment when we state that his work appears to us to compare well with Principal Cunningham's "Discussions of Church Principles." The range of Bannerman's treatise is wider than Cunningham's, and whether he be as profound or not, he is equally clear and candid, which is saying a great deal. Indeed, we cannot withhold the expression of our admiration for the learning and the industry displayed by several of the professors of the Scotch theological colleges in the recent publication by them of so many and such valuable and important works. There are the four magnificent volumes of Dr. Cunningham, and Dr. James Buchanan's *Doctrine of Justification*, (one of the Cunningham Lectures,) and the works of Professor Fairbairn, and Professor Smeaton's *Doctrine of the Atonement as taught by Christ himself*, and Dr. Bannerman's book on *Inspiration*, besides the volumes at present under review.

Passing now to a more close inspection of the merits of this work, we may quote Dr. Rainy's testimony that the "fundamental principles laid down" are those "commonly received among Scottish Presbyterians." And we may add to this testimony a kindred one by Principal Candlish in these words: "I can testify with the utmost confidence to his being competent, and admitted on all hands to be competent, to give a fair and

full representation of the theory of Church polity, all but unanimously adopted in Scotland at and after the Reformation—not under influences from without, such as regal supremacy or Papal dictation; but inwardly and directly from the study of the divine word and the honest application of its principles to the problems of divine Providence as they came up. For that is what we claim to be characteristic of our Scottish Reformation—that in all the departments of doctrine, worship, and government, it was * * * a reconstruction of the divine plan freshly based on the old foundation. For the exposition of the doctrine of the Church upon that footing and in that view, Dr. Bannerman was eminently qualified. He was a close and thorough biblical student; and he was an authority in ecclesiastical history and law.” We make these quotations because they will tend to convince our readers what are really Scotch Presbyterian Church doctrines. Of course, we never build our doctrine of the Church upon any mere human foundations, and are far from intimating that because a certain idea prevails amongst Scotch Presbyterians, it must therefore needs be correct. But inasmuch as it is rather common to appeal to the Scotch Church as our mother, and therefore our proper teacher, our desire in making these quotations is to hold up competent testimony to this fact that Dr. Bannerman’s views are those which represent truly Scotch Presbyterianism. We suppose, indeed, that upon some points, Presbyterians on this side of the water may be in advance of their Scotch brethren and enjoy a fuller and a juster development of scriptural Presbyterianism. But if we are to appeal at all to our mother for confirmation of what we understand the Scriptures to teach, let us be sure that we refer to authorities respecting her understanding of the Scriptures who are qualified to represent her.

Having said this, we acquaint the readers that our design in this article is chiefly to introduce Dr. Bannerman to their fellowship and confidence, and that in order thereto we propose to present them with large extracts from his discussion of sundry topics.

We present, in the first place, some paragraphs from our

author on the question of the existence of a divine and authoritative

FORM OF CHURCH POLITY.

“The theory which denies the existence of a divine and authoritative form of Church polity, and leaves the whole matter to be regulated by Christian expediency or merely human arrangement, is one which has found favor with Churchmen inclined either to latitudinarian or Erastian views of the Church ; although it has been held by others also. * * *

“There is another theory, however, very different from that first mentioned, which asserts that the form and arrangements of ecclesiastical government have not been left to be fixed by the wisdom of man, nor reduced to the level of a question of mere Christian expediency ; but have been determined by divine authority, and are sufficiently exhibited in Scripture. The advocates of this view believe that in respect of its government and organisation, as well as in respect of its doctrine and ordinances, the Church is of God, and not of man ; and that Scripture, rightly interpreted and understood, affords sufficient materials for determining what the constitution and order of the Christian society were intended by its divine Founder to be. * *

“The theory which denies a divine warrant for any system of church government, and hands over the question to be settled by considerations of human expediency, is contradicted by the fact, which can be clearly established from Scripture, that the Church of Christ, in its essential and peculiar character, is a positive institution of God.

“This principle is applicable to the Church in all its aspects : to its doctrine and its ordinances ; to its constitution and its faith ; to its inward life and its outward organisation ; to the spiritual grace which it imparts and the external form which it bears. All is equally and alike of positive appointment by God ; being, in the strict sense of the terms, a divine institution, not owing its origin or virtue to man, and not amenable to his views of expediency, or determined by his arrangements. Looking at the Church of Christ as an express and positive ordinance

of God, it is clear that man is neither warranted nor competent to judge of its organisation. * * * *

“The three marks laid down by George Gillespie, in the parallel case of church rites and ceremonies, may serve also to indicate what, in the matter of church government, is left to the determination of reason according to its views of Christian expediency. First, it must be a matter belonging not to the substance of ecclesiastical organisation, but only to the circumstances of it. Second, it must be a matter not determinable from Scripture. And third, it must be a matter to be decided in one way or other; and for the decisions of which in *this* particular manner, rather than in a different, a good reason can be assigned. With the help of these tests, it will not often be a difficult matter in practice to say what in the order and arrangements of the ecclesiastical society is or is not left free to be determined by human wisdom.” Vol. II., pp. 202, 211.

In the next place, let us hear this representative of the Free Church of Scotland make his statement of the Presbyterian doctrine of

TWO ORDERS OF OFFICE-BEARERS

in the Church as against the Prelatic theory of *three orders*:

“The two orders of presbyters and deacons, acknowledged by all the three parties, are held by Presbyterians and Independents to be the *only* ranks of standing office-bearers divinely instituted in the Church; while Episcopalians contend that, in addition to these, there is a *third* order, superior in place and authority to both, and forming part of the permanent arrangements of the ecclesiastical society. In addition to presbyters and deacons, the advocates of Prelacy assert, against the view both of Presbyterians and Independents, that there is an order of bishops or prelates distinct from the former two, and equally of standing authority in the Christian Church. * * *

“The distinctive peculiarity of the system of *Episcopacy*, as opposed to Presbyterianism, lies in the assertion by Episcopalians of the existence of a third order of office-bearers in the Church, possessed of powers appropriate to themselves, and

denied to the rest. These are the *potestas ordinationis*, or the right, denied to presbyters, of ordaining to office in the Church, and the *potestas jurisdictionis*, or the right, also denied to presbyters, of exercising government and dispensing discipline in the Church. According to the Prelatic theory, as explained by almost all who hold it, the power of ordination and the power of ruling are peculiar to bishops, and so characteristic of the office that they cannot be separated from it. Where the right to ordain or to rule can be proved to exist, as belonging to any one in the Church, there the office and presence of a bishop are to be recognised; and where these can be proved to be wanting in the case of any office-bearer, there the functions of a presbyter or deacon, but not of a bishop, are to be acknowledged. Now, this principle, necessarily implied in any system of Prelacy, properly so called, affords an easy and certain test to enable us to bring to the bar of Scripture the pretensions put forth by its adherents. Is the twofold right of ordination and of government in the Christian Church one which, according to Scripture, rightfully appertains to a distinct class of men, holding ordinary and permanent office in the Church and separate from presbyters; or does the right of ordination and government form one commonly and statedly exercised by presbyters?" (Vol. II., p. 260-1, 280-1.) "But this evidence is greatly strengthened by the consideration that, included in the general class of presbyter or elder, there is a special kind of presbyter or elder set apart more peculiarly to the exercise of the office of ruling in the Christian Church. The Scriptures seem to point to three sorts of office-bearers, all belonging to the one common order of the eldership, but distinguished from each other by the peculiar functions discharged by them respectively. First, there is the preaching elder, so often spoken of in Scripture under the name of 'pastor' and other titles, significant of his distinctive work of preaching the word and dispensing ordinances. Second, there is the teaching elder, spoken of under the name of 'teacher,' and apparently to be distinguished from the pastor in Scripture as more especially devoted to the duty of teaching or explaining and interpreting the truth of God. And third, there is the

ruling elder, to be discriminated from both by having it as his peculiar function to administer rule or government in the Church of Christ. Standing upon the same footing, as all belonging to the order of elder, there are these three varieties in the order to be distinguished in Scripture. * * * *

“But the decisive evidence for the office of ruling elder is to be found in the well known passage in the First Epistle to Timothy: ‘Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honor, especially they who labor in the word and doctrine.’ A vast deal of minute and labored criticism has been expended on this passage, in order to make it bear a meaning against its obvious sense. But the very explicit testimony which it bears to two classes of elders—the one of whom ruled exclusively, the other of whom, in addition to ruling, exercised also the ministry of the word—is so strong and conclusive that not a few, both among Episcopalians and Independents, have been led to acknowledge the force of it. Nothing but a very dangerous kind of wresting of the plain meaning of the text will suffice to get rid of such an interpretation of it as carries conclusive evidence in favor of the class of ruling, as separate from preaching and teaching elders. The strong fact, then, of the institution of a distinct class of presbyters for the express purpose of government in the Christian society, in addition to the general order of presbyters who both preach and rule, serves very greatly to confirm the evidence we have from Scripture against the Congregationalist principle of a distribution of the power of government between office-bearers and members in the Church.” Vol. II., pp. 305–307.

The next topic on which we propose to let Dr. Bannerman set before us the views current in the Free Church, is the measure and limits of the

DISCRETIONARY POWERS OF THE CHURCH IN RESPECT TO HER WORSHIP AND GOVERNMENT.

“There can be no mistake as to the doctrine held and inculcated by the authorised standards of our Church with respect to the exercise of Church power about the public worship of

God. In the twentieth chapter of the Westminster Confession, under the head of 'Christian Liberty and Liberty of Conscience,' the power of the Church, not only in regard to matters of faith, but also in regard to matters of worship, is expressly excluded as not binding on the conscience, in any thing beyond the limits of what is laid down in Scripture. 'God alone,' says the Confession of Faith, 'is Lord of the conscience, and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men which are in any thing contrary to his word, or beside it, in matters of faith and worship; so that to believe such doctrines or to obey such commandments out of conscience is to betray true liberty of conscience; and the requiring of an implicit faith, and an absolute and blind obedience, is to destroy liberty of conscience and reason also.' The direct object of the Confession in this passage is no doubt to assert the right and extent of liberty of conscience; but along with that, it very distinctly enunciates the doctrine that neither in regard to faith nor in regard to worship has the Church any authority beside or beyond what is laid down in the Bible; and that it has no right to decree and enforce new observances or institutions in the department of scriptural worship, any more than to teach and inculcate new truths in the department of scriptural faith. In entire accordance with this statement of the Confession is the doctrine announced in the Larger and Shorter Catechisms. In the Larger Catechism, the answer to the question, 'What are the sins forbidden in the second commandment?' tells us that 'the sins forbidden in the second commandment are all devising, counselling, commanding, using, and in any wise approving, any religious worship not instituted by God himself;' . . . 'all superstitious devices, corrupting the worship of God, adding to it, or taking from it, whether invented and taken up of ourselves, or received by tradition from others, though under the title of antiquity, custom, devotion, good intent, or any other pretence whatsoever.' In answer to a similar question, the Shorter Catechism declares that 'the second commandment forbiddeth the worshipping of God by images, or any other way not appointed in his word.' The doctrine, then, in regard to the

exercise of Church power in the worship of God held by our standards is sufficiently distinct. The Church has no authority in regulating the manner, appointing the form, or dictating the observances of worship, beside or beyond what the Scripture declares on these points—the Bible containing the only directory for determining these matters, and the Church having no discretion to add to or alter what is there fixed.

“The Church of Rome holds a doctrine in regard to the extent and limits of Church power in connection with the worship of God the very opposite of this. It assigns to ecclesiastical authority a right to regulate and enjoins to an unlimited extent the manner and the ordinances of Church worship—making what additions it deems fit to the institutions, the observances, the rules enjoined upon the worshippers, without regard to the intimations of Scripture on the subject. * * *

“There is a third theory upon this point, intermediate between the doctrine laid down in the Westminster Confession and the doctrine embodied in the pretensions of the Church of Rome. This third theory is held by the Church of England. It differs from the views of the Westminster standards, inasmuch as it ascribes to the Church the power to enact rites and observances in the public worship of God. But it differs also from the practice of the Church of Rome, inasmuch as it professedly limits and restricts the power of ordaining ceremonies to those matters which are not forbidden in the word of God. * * *

“There is a marked and obvious difference between this statement and the declaration of our Church's standards on the same subject. The doctrine of the Church of England is, that whatsoever is not forbidden expressly by the word of God, it is lawful for the Church to enact by her own authority, the only restriction upon that authority being that what it declares or enjoins in the worship of God shall not be contradictory to Scripture. Within the limitation thus laid upon the exercise of Church power in matters of worship, there remains a very wide field indeed open to the Church, in which it is competent to add to the ordinances and institutions of religious service. The doctrine of the Westminster standards and of our Church is.

that whatsoever is not expressly appointed in the word, or appointed by necessary inference from the word, it is not lawful for the Church in the exercise of its own authority to enjoin; the restriction upon that authority being that it shall announce and enforce nothing in the public worship of God, except what God himself has, in explicit terms or by implication, instituted. Under the limitation thus laid upon the exercise of Church power in matters of worship, there is no discretion or latitude left to the Church, except to administer and carry into effect the appointments of Scripture. In the case of the Church of England, its doctrine in regard to Church power in the worship of God is, that it has a right to decree every thing except what is forbidden in the word of God. In the case of our own Church, its doctrine in reference to Church power in the worship of God is, that it has a right to decree nothing, except what expressly or by implication is enjoined by the word of God." Vol. I., pp. 336, 340.

"The second concession to be made to those who deny that there is any thing laid down in Scripture sufficient to be a rule to the Church, in its government and discipline and administration generally, is this: that although there is not any discretion allowed to the Church itself in regard to its laws or its institutions, yet there is a discretion permitted to the Church in regard to matters simply of 'decency and order.'

"There is a distinction, in short, which all must acknowledge at one point or other, wherever the line may be drawn, between principles essential to the existence and administration of the Church, and points accidental to the existence and administration of the Church. With regard to the former, or what is essential to the existence and use of Church power, the Scripture contains a rule complete and sufficient for all the purposes contemplated, and expressed either in direct precepts, or by particular examples, or through the announcement of general principles all bearing on the subject. With regard to the latter, or the points accidental and not essential to the existence and administration of the Church, there is nothing expressed in Scripture directly: and something is to be left to the discretion

of the Church and its office-bearers. Where and how the line is to be drawn between these two kinds of things, marking on the one side what is fundamental and distinctive in the laws and administration of the Church, and therefore revealed; and what, on the other side, is accidental and not peculiar, and therefore not revealed; it may be sometimes difficult to determine. But that after the laws and institutions of the Church had been directly or indirectly revealed and appointed by Christ, there was some power left to the Church itself to fill in the details of arrangement and order and propriety, not essential but expedient to the former, there can, I think, be no doubt, both from the statements and the silence, the utterances and the reserve of Scripture on the subject. As to such matters of order or expediency, as, for example, the hour of public worship on the Sabbath, the order of the service, the number of the diets each Lord's day, the length of time appropriated to each, and such like,—all conducive more or less to the proper discharge of the duty connected with them, and all requiring to be fixed and arranged in one way or other,—there can be no doubt that a discretionary power in determining them has been left open to the Church. To have fixed by positive law such details, would have been contrary to the whole analogy of Scripture, which deals far more largely in general principles than in special regulations or precepts." Vol. I., pp. 215–217.

“It is plain, then, both from the nature of the rule itself and from the circumstances in which it was given, that the general canon for Church worship, ‘Let all things be done decently and in order,’ while it gives no authority to the Church in the matter of the rites and ceremonies and institutions of divine service, except to administer them, does give authority to the Church in the matter of the circumstances of divine service common to it with civil solemnities, in so far as is necessary for decency and to avoid disorder. There is a broad line of demarcation between these two things. In what belongs strictly to the institutions and ceremonies of worship, the Church has no authority, except to dispense them as Christ has prescribed. In what belongs to the circumstances of worship necessary to its being dispensed

with propriety, and so as to avoid confusion, the Church has authority to regulate them as nature and reason prescribe. On the one side of the line that separates these two provinces are what belong to Church worship, properly so called—the positive rites and ceremonies and institutions that enter as essential elements into it; and here the Church is merely Christ's servant to administer and to carry them into effect. On the other side of that line are what belong to the circumstances of worship as necessary to its decent and orderly administration—circumstances not peculiar to the solemnities of the Church, nor laid down in detail by Christ, but common to them with other civil solemnities, and left to be regulated by the dictates of reason and nature; and here the Church is the minister of nature and reason, and her actions must be determined by their declarations. In regard to, not the circumstances of worship, but its ceremonies, the Church has no discretion, but must take the law from the positive directory of Scripture. In regard again to, not the ceremonies, but the circumstances of worship, the Church has the discretion which nature and reason allow, and must be guided by the principles which they furnish as applicable to the particular case." Vol. I., p. 352.

"In the very acute and masterly treatise of George Gillespie, entitled '*A Dispute against the English Popish Ceremonies*,' he lays down three marks by which to distinguish these matters of decency and order, which it is necessary and lawful for the Church at the dictate of reason and nature to regulate, from those parts or elements of public worship in regard to which she has no authority but to administer them.

"'Three conditions,' he says, 'I find necessarily requisite in such a thing as the Church hath power to prescribe by her laws: First, it must be only a circumstance of divine worship and no substantial part of it—no sacred, significant, and efficacious ceremony.' There is plainly a wide and real difference between those matters that may be necessary or proper *about* church worship and those other matters that may be necessary and proper *in* worship; or, to adopt the old distinction, between matters *circa sacra* and matters *in sacris*. Church worship is itself

an express and positive appointment of God; and the various parts or elements of worship, including the rites and ceremonies that enter into it, are no less positive divine appointments. But there are circumstances connected with a divine solemnity no less than with human solemnities, that do not belong to its essence, and form no necessary part of it. There are circumstances of time and place and form, necessary for the order and decency of the service of the Church, as much as for the service or actions of any civil or voluntary society; and these, though connected with, are no portion of divine worship. *When* worship is to be performed on the Sabbath, for example,—*where* it is to be dispensed,—*how long* the service is to continue,—are points necessary to be regulated in regard to the action of the Church as much as in regard to the action of a mere private and human society; and yet they constitute no part of the worship of God. And they are to be regulated by the Church in the same way and upon the same principles as any other society would regulate these matters, namely, by regard to the dictates of natural reason, which have not been superseded, but rather expressly called into exercise in the Christian society for such purposes.

“‘Second. The circumstances left to the Church to determine by the dictate of natural reason, and according to the rule of decency and order, ‘must be such as are not determinable by Scripture.’ Of course, whatever in the worship of God is either appointed expressly by Scripture, or may be justly inferred from Scripture, cannot be left open to the jurisdiction of the Church, or to the determination of men’s reason. It is only beyond the express and positive institutions or regulations of Scripture that there is any field for the exercise of the Church’s authority and judgment. Within the limits of what strictly and properly belongs to public worship, the directory of Scripture is both sufficient and of exclusive authority; and the service of the Church is a matter of positive enactment, suited for and binding upon all times and all nations. But beyond the limits of what strictly and properly belongs to divine worship, there are circumstances which must vary with times and nations; and for

that very reason, they are circumstances not regulated by Scripture, but left to be ordered by the dictates of natural reason, such as would be sufficient to determine them in the case of any other society than the Church. In addition to the test of their being merely circumstances and not substantial of worship, they are also to be distinguished by the mark that from their very nature they are 'not determinable from Scripture.'

“‘Third. The circumstances left open to the judgment of the Church to regulate according to the rule of decency and order, must be those for the appointment of which she is ‘able to give a sufficient reason and warrant.’ This third mark is necessary, in order that the canon of Church order under consideration may not be interpreted so widely as to admit of the indefinite multiplication of rules and rubrics, even in matters that stand the two other tests already mentioned—that is to say, in matters merely circumstantial, and not determinable from Scripture. Even in the instance of such, there must be a sufficient reason, either in the necessity of the act or in the manifest Christian expediency of it, to justify the Church in adding to her canons of order, and limiting by these the Christian liberty of her members. There must be a sufficient reason, in the way of securing decency or preventing disorder, to warrant the Church in enacting regulations even in the circumstances of worship as contradistinguished from its ceremonies. Without some necessity laid upon it, and a sufficient reason to state for its procedure, the Church has no warrant to encroach upon the liberty of its members. And without this, moreover, there could be no satisfaction to give to the consciences of those members who might scruple as to the lawfulness of complying with its regulations. Even in matters lawful and indifferent, not belonging to divine worship itself, but to the circumstances of it, the Church is bound to show a necessity or a sufficient reason for its enactments.’

“All these three tests of George Gillespie's are combined in the singularly judicious and well-balanced statement of the Confession of Faith on this point. After laying down the fundamental position that ‘the whole counsel of God concerning

all things necessary for his own glory, man's salvation, faith, and life, is either expressly set down in Scripture, or by good and necessary consequence may be deduced from Scripture, unto which nothing at any time is to be added, whether by new revelations of the Spirit or traditions of men,' the Confession proceeds: 'Nevertheless, we acknowledge the inward illumination of the Spirit of God to be necessary for the saving understanding of such things as are revealed in the word; and that *there are some circumstances concerning the worship of God and government of the Church, common to human actions and societies, which are to be ordered by the light of nature and Christian prudence, according to the general rules of the word, which are always to be observed.*' Every word in this brief but pregnant sentence has been well weighed by its authors, and deserves careful consideration from us. The things in connexion with public worship which it is lawful for the Church to regulate must be '*circumstances,*' not *parts* of divine service; they must be '*concerning* the worship of God,' not elements *in* it; they must be '*common to human actions and societies,*' not *peculiar* to a *divine* institution; they must be things with which reason or '*the light of nature*' is competent to deal; they are 'to be ordered by *Christian prudence,*' which will beware of laying needless restraints upon the liberty of brethren in the faith; and they are to be regulated in accordance with '*the general rules of the word,*' such as the apostolic canons referred to in the proofs of the Confession: 'Let all things be done unto edification,' and 'Let all things be done decently and in order.'

"By such tests or marks as these, it is not a matter of much difficulty practically to determine what matters connected with the worship of God are and what are not within the apostolic canon, 'Let all things be done decently and in order.' They are the very things which reason is competent to regulate; which cannot be determined for all times and places by Scripture; which belong not to Church worship itself, but to the circumstances or accompaniments common to it with civil solemnities; and which must be ordered in the Church, as in any other society, so as to secure decency and to prevent confusion. The

power which the apostle gives to regulate such matters is no power to enter within the proper field of divine worship, and to add to or alter or regulate its rites and ceremonies and institutions. It has often indeed been argued as if the apostolic canon gave such authority. It has been maintained that the authority ascribed to the Church to regulate all things according to the law of decency and order, is an authority to deal with matters *in sacris*, and not merely *circa sacra*. But it is clear, both from the nature of the apostolic rule and also from the application made of it in respect of the scandals in the Church at Corinth, that no such peculiar authority to intermeddle with the provisions of worship set up by Christ in his Church was ever intended." Vol. I., pp. 354, 358.

"Such plainly is the limitation set to the exercise of Church power in worship by the authority of Christ. In the department of the rites and institutions of divine service, his authority is supreme and exclusive; and if it is to be kept entire and untouched, there is no room for the entrance into the same province of the Church's power at all. This principle plainly excludes and condemns every ecclesiastical addition to the worship of God, and every human invention in its observances. It shuts up the Church to the simplicity of the Scripture model, and forbids every arrangement within the sanctuary, and every appointment in holy things, of whatever nature it be, which does not find its precedent and warrant there. It condemns the impious and superstitious observances which the Church of Rome has unlawfully introduced into the worship of God: its spurious sacraments; its worship of the Virgin and the saints and the host; its fasts and penances and pilgrimages; and all the rest of its unwarranted and unscriptural impositions upon its members unknown to the word of God and opposed to it.

"But the principle now laid down does more than condemn the ceremonies in worship which Popery has imposed and which are often as revolting to all right Christian taste and feeling as they are superstitious and unscriptural. It condemns no less those rites and ceremonies introduced into worship by the Church of England, and considered by her to be not only innocent, but

subservient to its spiritual effect. Whether such rites and ceremonies may or may not conduce to the spiritual edification of those who make use of them in worship, is not the question to be determined—although a right answer to this question would not be difficult to find, and it would militate strongly against the expediency of their introduction. But the only proper question is, Have these rites and ceremonies been appointed or not by the authority of Christ ruling alone and exclusively in his house? If not, then they are all unlawful encroachments upon that authority. It cannot be pretended that they are made no part of the ordinary worship of the Church, but rather belong to those outward circumstances of administration which fall under the apostolic canon, and are necessary to the order and decency of its celebration. It cannot be pretended that the sign of the cross is necessary to avoid indecency or prevent confusion in the administration of the sacrament of baptism. It cannot be pretended that turning of the face towards the east is essential to the orderly and decent performance of any part of public prayer. It cannot be pretended that the use of a white surplice in some parts of divine service, and not in others, is necessary to the right discharge of the one or the other. It cannot be pretended that the consecration of buildings in which public worship is conducted, or of ground in which the burial of the dead is to take place, is a ceremony dictated by natural reason, and absolutely necessary to give effect to the apostolic canon. It cannot be pretended that the bowing of the head at the repetition of the name of Jesus, and not at the repetition of the name of God, is decent and orderly in the one instance and not in the other. These ceremonies and rites cannot be, and are not alleged to form, any part of the circumstances of decency and order necessary to the due discharge of divine worship, as they would be necessary to the due discharge of any civil solemnity in like circumstances. And if not, if they are not introduced into Church worship as essential to preserve decency or prevent disorder, then they must be introduced into Church worship as parts of it, considered to be necessary, or at least conducive, to its full or better effect. Viewed in this light, we are warranted to say in

regard to them, without at all requiring to enter on the question of whether they contribute to the edification of the worshipper and the better effect of the worship or not, that they are unwarranted by the authority of Christ as revealed in his word, and are therefore unlawful interferences with his power and rights as the only head of ordinances in his Church." Vol. I., pp. 365-367.

"In the department of worship, as well as in the department of doctrine, the Church has no latitude beyond the express warrant of Scripture, and is forbidden as much to administer a worship not there revealed as to preach a gospel not there revealed. The single fact that the rule of Church power in the worship of God is the rule of Scripture, is decisive of the whole controversy in regard to rites and ceremonies, and ties up the Church to the ministerial office of administering a directory made for it, instead of presumptuously attempting to make a new directory for itself. The worship not enjoined in the word of God is "will-worship," (*ἰθελ.σθησκεία*) and as such neither lawful nor blessed.

"There is no possibility of evading this argument, except by denying that the Scriptures are the only rule for worship, or by denying that they are a sufficient one. Neither of these denials can be reasonably made. The Scriptures are the only rule for worship as truly as they are the only rule for the Church in any other department of her duties. And the Scriptures are sufficient for that purpose, for they contain a directory for worship, either expressly inculcated or justly to be inferred from its statements, sufficient for the guidance of the Church in every necessary part of worship. There are, first, express precepts contained in Scripture, and designed to regulate the practice of divine worship in the Church as to ordinances and services; second, there are particular examples of worship in its various parts recorded in Scripture, and both fitted and intended to be binding and guiding models for subsequent ages; and third, when neither express precepts nor express examples are to be met with, there are general scripture principles applicable to public worship, enough to constitute a sufficient directory in the

subservient to its spiritual effect. Whether such rites and ceremonies may or may not conduce to the spiritual edification of those who make use of them in worship, is not the question to be determined—although a right answer to this question would not be difficult to find, and it would militate strongly against the expediency of their introduction. But the only proper question is, Have these rites and ceremonies been appointed or not by the authority of Christ ruling alone and exclusively in his house? If not, then they are all unlawful encroachments upon that authority. It cannot be pretended that they are made no part of the ordinary worship of the Church, but rather belong to those outward circumstances of administration which fall under the apostolic canon, and are necessary to the order and decency of its celebration. It cannot be pretended that the sign of the cross is necessary to avoid indecency or prevent confusion in the administration of the sacrament of baptism. It cannot be pretended that turning of the face towards the east is essential to the orderly and decent performance of any part of public prayer. It cannot be pretended that the use of a white surplice in some parts of divine service, and not in others, is necessary to the right discharge of the one or the other. It cannot be pretended that the consecration of buildings in which public worship is conducted, or of ground in which the burial of the dead is to take place, is a ceremony dictated by natural reason, and absolutely necessary to give effect to the apostolic canon. It cannot be pretended that the bowing of the head at the repetition of the name of Jesus, and not at the repetition of the name of God, is decent and orderly in the one instance and not in the other. These ceremonies and rites cannot be, and are not alleged to form, any part of the circumstances of decency and order necessary to the due discharge of divine worship, as they would be necessary to the due discharge of any civil solemnity in like circumstances. And if not, if they are not introduced into Church worship as essential to preserve decency or prevent disorder, then they must be introduced into Church worship as parts of it, considered to be necessary, or at least conducive, to its full or better effect. Viewed in this light, we are warranted to say in

regard to them, without at all requiring to enter on the question of whether they contribute to the edification of the worshipper and the better effect of the worship or not, that they are unwarranted by the authority of Christ as revealed in his word, and are therefore unlawful interferences with his power and rights as the only head of ordinances in his Church." Vol. I., pp. 365-367.

"In the department of worship, as well as in the department of doctrine, the Church has no latitude beyond the express warrant of Scripture, and is forbidden as much to administer a worship not there revealed as to preach a gospel not there revealed. The single fact that the rule of Church power in the worship of God is the rule of Scripture, is decisive of the whole controversy in regard to rites and ceremonies, and ties up the Church to the ministerial office of administering a directory made for it, instead of presumptuously attempting to make a new directory for itself. The worship not enjoined in the word of God is "will-worship," (*ἰθελοθρησκεία*) and as such neither lawful nor blessed.

"There is no possibility of evading this argument, except by denying that the Scriptures are the only rule for worship, or by denying that they are a sufficient one. Neither of these denials can be reasonably made. The Scriptures are the only rule for worship as truly as they are the only rule for the Church in any other department of her duties. And the Scriptures are sufficient for that purpose, for they contain a directory for worship, either expressly inculcated or justly to be inferred from its statements, sufficient for the guidance of the Church in every necessary part of worship. There are, first, express precepts contained in Scripture, and designed to regulate the practice of divine worship in the Church as to ordinances and services; second, there are particular examples of worship in its various parts recorded in Scripture, and both fitted and intended to be binding and guiding models for subsequent ages; and third, when neither express precepts nor express examples are to be met with, there are general scripture principles applicable to public worship, enough to constitute a sufficient directory in the

matter. Any thing beyond that directory in the celebration of worship is unwarranted and superstitious. And the danger of tampering with uncommanded rites and observances is not small. Let the evil of 'teaching for doctrines or duties the commandments and ordinances of men' be once introduced into the Church and a departure from the simplicity of Scripture worship once begun, and superstitions will strengthen and grow apace. In point of safety as well as in point of principle, it is the duty of the Church to adhere with undeviating strictness to the model of Scripture, and to shun the exercise of any power in Church worship beyond the limits of that directory expressly laid down in the word of God." Vol. I., pp. 365-367.

We apprehend that our readers will not fail to observe the complete identity of these principles with those enunciated in an article in our number for January of this year. The writer of that article we know had never seen this work, but both in ideas and in language there is a strong resemblance, greater even in some portions not quoted by us than in the extracts above given. It is but the one voice of truth speaking in two hemispheres.

We propose to let the reader now hear Dr. Bannerman on

THE DOCTRINE OF THE SACRAMENTS,

believing that there are some difficulties on the subject current amongst us, which he may be able, with the blessing from above, to remove. We shall offer no other remark here, except that Dr. Bannerman makes no qualification whatever in the praise he awards to Calvin as the one amongst Reformers who had most clearly and perfectly set forth the scripture doctrine on the subject of the sacraments. And yet, as one editor of Dr. Cunningham's works, he of course must have observed how that author discounts sensibly from Calvin's claim to put forth sound scriptural views upon this point. It is regarding the sacraments that Cunningham finds "the only blot on Calvin's fame as a public teacher" in his peculiar theory of the Lord's supper. It would seem that Dr. Bannerman must have differed from his friend and colleague.

“In exact accordance with the practice universal in one shape or other among men, and expressly sanctioned by the example of God himself in the Old Testament Church, we affirm that the sacraments of the New Testament are parts of a federal transaction between the believer and Christ; and visible and outward attestations or vouchers of the covenant entered into between them. In addition to being signs to represent the blessings of the covenant of grace, they are also seals to vouch and ratify and confirm its validity. * * * * *

“No doubt that [new] covenant in itself is sufficiently secure without any such confirmation, resting as it does on the word of God. That word alone, and without any further guarantee, is enough. But in condescension to the weakness of our faith, and adapting himself to the feelings and customs of men, God has done more than give a promise. He has also given a guarantee for the promise—has vouchsafed to bestow an outward confirmation of his word in the shape of a visible sign, appealing to our senses, and witnessing to the certainty and truth of the covenant. In the case of the sacraments, God has proceeded on the same principle as is announced by the Apostle Paul in reference to his oath: ‘God, willing more abundantly to show unto the heirs of promise the immutability of his counsel, confirmed it by an oath; that by two immutable things, in which it was impossible for God to lie, we might have a strong consolation, who have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before us.’ The word of promise was itself enough to warrant and demand the belief of God’s people. But more than enough was granted: he has not only said it, but also sworn it. By two immutable things—his word and his oath—is the faith of the believer confirmed. The oath is the guarantee for his word. And more than this still: in the visible seal of the sacraments, God would add another and a third witness—that at the mouth, not of two, but of three witnesses, his covenant may be established. He has not only given us the guarantee of his word, and confirmed that word by an oath, but also added to both the seal of visible ordinances. There is the word preached to declare the truth of the covenant to the unbelieving heart.

More than that—there is the oath sworn to guarantee it. More than that still—there is the sign administered in order to vouch for all. Christ in the word, unseen but heard, is ours, if we will receive that word with the hearing ear and the understanding heart. Over and above this, Christ, both seen and heard in the sacrament, is ours, if we will see with the eye or hear with the ear.* The sacraments are the outward and sensible testimony and seal of the covenant, added to the word that declares it. This is the grand peculiarity of sacramental ordinances, separating them by a very marked line from ordinances not sacramental. They are federal acts—scals and vouchers of the covenant between God and the believer. They presuppose and imply a covenant transaction between the man who partakes of them and God; and they are the attestations to and confirmations of that transaction, pledging God by a visible act to fulfil his share of the covenant, and engaging the individual by the same visible act to perform his part of it. Other ordinances, such as the preaching of the word, presuppose and attest no such personal engagement or federal transaction between the indi-

* ["What mister (need) is there that thir sacraiments and seals suld be annexed to the word? Seeing we get na new thing in the sacrament, but the same thing quhilk we gat in the simple word, quherefore is the sacrament appointed to be hung to the word? It is true certainly, we get na new thing in the sacrament, nor we get na other thing in the sacrament nor we gat in the word; for quhat mair walde thou crave nor to get the Son of God, gif thou get him weil? Thy heart cannot wish nor imagine a greater gift nor to have the Son of God, quha is King of heaven and earth. And therefore I say, quhat new thing walde thou have? For gif thou get him, thou gettest all things with him. Quherefore, then, is the sacrament appointed? Not to get thee a new thing. I say it is appointed to get thee that same thing *better* nor thou gat it in the word. The sacrament is appointed that we may get a better grip of Christ nor we gat in the simple word; that we may possess Christ in our hearts and minds mair fully and largely nor we did of before in the simple word; that Christ might have a larger space to make residence in our narrow hearts nor we could have by the hearing of the simple word. And to possess Christ mair fully it is a better thing; for suppose Christ be ae thing in himself, yet the better grip thou have of him thou art the surer of his promise." BRUCE, *Sermons on the Sacraments*, Wodrow Soc. Ed., Edin., 1843, p. 22.]

vidual and God. Christ in the word is preached to all, and all are called upon to receive him; but there is no personal act on the part of the hearer that singles him out as giving or receiving a voucher of his covenant with his Saviour. * * *

“It is carefully to be noted that they presuppose or imply the possession of grace in the case of those who partake of them; but they are also made the means of adding to that grace. They are seals of a covenant already made between the soul and Christ—attestations of a federal transaction before completed—confirmations, visible and outward, of engagement between the sinner and his Saviour previously entered into on both sides. They presuppose the existence of grace, else they could not be called seals to it. * * * But from the very peculiarity that attaches to their distinctive character as seals of a personal covenant between God and the believer, sacraments may reasonably be supposed to be more effectual than non-sacramental ordinances in imparting spiritual blessings. The spiritual virtue of sacraments is more and greater than other ordinances, just because, from their very nature, they imply more of a personal dealing between the sinner and his Saviour than non-sacramental ordinances necessarily involve. * * *

“What is the nature and extent of the supernatural grace imparted in the sacraments, in what manner they work so as to impart spiritual benefit to the soul, it is not possible for us to define. As visible seals of God's promises and covenant, we can understand how they are naturally fitted, in the same way as the vouchers of any human engagement or covenant are naturally fitted, to attest and confirm them. But beyond this, all is unknown. The blessing of Christ and the working of his Spirit in sacraments we cannot understand, any more than we can understand the operation of the same supernatural causes in respect of other ordinances. They have a virtue in them beyond what reason can discover in them, as naturally fitted to serve the purposes both of signs and seals of spiritual things.” Vol. II., pp. 10–14.

“1. The sacraments of the New Testament are regarded by one party as signs, and no more than signs, of spiritual things—

symbolical actions fitted to represent and impress upon the minds of men gospel truths. The Socinian party have made this doctrine peculiarly their own. According to their views, a federal transaction between the believer and Christ, founded on his atonement, is no part of the gospel system at all; and hence the sacraments of the New Testament can be no seals appointed and designed to ratify such a covenant. The Socinian doctrine concerning the nature of the sacraments allows to them no more than a twofold object and design. They are not essentially distinct from other ordinances, as set apart by themselves to be the seals of the one great covenant between the believer and Christ, at his entrance into the Church at first, and from time to time afterwards, as occasion justifies or demands. But, in the first place, they are signs in which something external and material is used to express what is spiritual and invisible—the only virtue belonging to them being what they are naturally calculated to effect, as memorials, or illustrations, or exhibitions of the important facts and truths of the gospel; and in the second place, the sacraments are solemn pledges of discipleship on the part of those who receive them, discriminating them from other men, and forming a public profession of or testimony to their faith as Christians. These are the two grand objects, which, according to the Socinian view, the sacraments were intended to serve: and such, according to their theory, is the nature of the ordinance. * * * *

“The same system in the substance, making, as it does, sacraments entirely or essentially teaching and symbolical signs, has been adopted by many who disown the tenets of Socinianism in regard to the gospel system generally. The theory of the sacraments now described has been and is held by not a few in the Church of England of somewhat latitudinarian views—the representative of such, as a class, being Bishop Hoadly. It is avowed and advocated in the present day by a very large proportion of the Independent body, who count the sacraments to be no more than symbolical institutions, and who are ably represented by Dr. Halley in his work entitled *An Inquiry into the Nature of the Symbolic Institutions of the Christian Religion, usually called the Sacraments.* * * *

“Dr. Halley alleges that the sacraments, if they are considered as the cause or the means, or even the seals, of spiritual and saving grace, would be opposed to the great Protestant doctrine of justification by faith without works. Now, it is readily admitted that if sacraments are regarded as the causes or means of justification, they are utterly inconsistent with the Protestant doctrine of justification by faith alone; and in this point of view, the objection is true and unanswerable, when directed against some of those theories of the sacraments which we may be called upon to consider by and by. But it is denied that the objection is true when directed against the theory of the sacraments which maintains that they are not causes and not means of justification, but seals of it and of other blessings of the new covenant. The sacraments as seals, not causes of justification, cannot interfere with the doctrine of justification by faith, for this plain reason, that before the seal is added, the justification is completed. * * * * *

“II. The sacraments of the New Testament are regarded by another party as in themselves, and by reason of the virtue that belongs to them, and not through the instrumentality of the faith or the Spirit in the heart of the recipient, effectual to impart justifying and saving grace directly, in all cases where it is not resisted by an unworthy reception of the ordinance. This general opinion may be held under various modifications; but all of them are opposed to the doctrine I have already laid down, that the sacraments are seals of a justifying and saving grace already enjoyed by the recipient, and not intended for the conversion of sinners; and that they become means of grace only in so far as the Spirit of God, by the aid of the ordinance, calls forth the faith of the recipient, and no further.

“The doctrine of the efficacy of sacraments directly and immediately of themselves, and not indirectly and mediately through the faith of the receiver, and through the Spirit in the receiver, is advocated in its extreme and unmodified form by the Church of Rome. * * *

“This doctrine of the inherent power of sacraments in themselves to impart grace, held by the Church of Rome, is also the

system maintained, although with some important modifications, by another party beyond the pale of that Church, the representatives of which, at the present day, are to be found in the High Churchmen of the English Establishment. * *

“But they agree with the Romish Church in the grand and fundamental principle which belongs to its doctrine of the sacraments, namely, that they communicate grace from the sacramental virtue that resides in themselves,—or, as some prefer to put it, that invariably accompanies them by Christ’s appointment,—and by their own immediate influence on the soul, and not instrumentally by the operation of the Spirit of God on the worthy recipient and through the medium of his faith. This is the characteristic principle that is common both to the Popish and the High Church theories of sacraments. * *

“There are four different tests by which we may try the merits of this sacramental theory, whether held in its extreme form by Papists, or in its more modified form by High Churchmen of other communions.

“First. Tested by Scripture, which constitutes the rule for the exercise of Church power, there is no warrant for asserting that there is an inherent and independent virtue in sacraments to impart justifying or saving grace. * * *

“Second. The theory of an inherent power, physical or spiritual, in the sacraments, is inconsistent with the supreme authority of Christ, from whom all Church power is derived. * * *

“Third. The theory of the sacraments which ascribes to them an independent virtue or power, is inconsistent with the spiritual liberties of Christ’s people. * * *

“Fourth. The sacramental theory we have been considering is inconsistent with the spirituality of the Church, and of the power exercised by the Church for the spiritual good of men.” Vol. II., pp. 20–41.

There remains only to be considered what certainly is one of the most interesting, able, and important discussions of this whole treatise, viz., the Church in its relations to the State and the duty of the State towards religion. This is unquestionably

a very nice and difficult question, although by many who stand at both extremes of some of the issues involved, it seems to be supposed that there is no difficulty at all in the subject. Whatever faults any of our readers may have to find with Dr. Bannerman's opinions on these points, they may as well be reminded, just here, that there is a certain value and importance due to them, if on no other ground, because they are the opinions of the Free Church generally. In the negotiations for union now going on between that Church and the United Presbyterian Church, these very opinions form one of the main obstructions. They are maintained with zeal and with ability by many living ministers of the highest character in that Church, and they were earnestly contended for by both Chalmers and Cunningham during their life-time.

We begin by stating the opinions of our author relative to

THE ESSENTIAL DISTINCTION AND MUTUAL INDEPENDENCE OF
CHURCH AND STATE.

“First, the State and the Church are essentially different in regard to their origin.” Vol. I., p. 97.

Upon this point, our author explains that civil government originates with God as universal Sovereign and Ruler, but the Church with Christ as Mediator. Nor does he admit that this fundamental difference is cancelled by the fact of the civil governments of the earth being all subordinated to Christ as Redeemer for his own ends as such. This is a new character superinduced upon the original character, which does not at all affect or supersede it. The State now delegated to Christ is still as much the appointment of God, the God of nature, as the creation of God is still such, though it also is subordinated to Christ for the interests of his people.

“In the second place, the State and the Church are essentially distinct in regard to the primary objects for which they were instituted.” Vol. I., p. 98.

Here Dr. Bannerman explains that the one is ordained to promote, as its primary object, the outward order and good of society, whether in Christian or heathen lands; and without

civil government, human society could not exist at all; but the other was instituted to promote the work of grace upon the earth, and is limited to this as its primary object. Still he says both have secondary objects, which both are bound to subserve. "The State as the ordinance of God can never be absolved from its allegiance to him, and can never be exempted from the duty of seeking to advance his glory and to promote his purposes of grace on the earth." On the other hand, the Church is adapted to promote the mere temporal and social well-being of society. But still the grand distinction cannot be overlooked, that the two were instituted for widely different ends and must not be confounded.

"Thirdly, the State and the Church are essentially distinct and independent in regard to the power which is committed to them respectively by God." Vol. I., p. 99.

Here Dr. B. explains that the State has the power of the sword, while the Church has only spiritual weapons.

"Fourthly, the State and the Church are essentially distinct and independent in regard to the administration of their respective authorities." Vol. I., p. 100.

Here the author explains that God's word enjoins no particular form of government, and sanctions neither despotism nor democracy as such. But, on the contrary, the Church has a form of government laid down in the New Testament, and office-bearers with a divine sanction in the rightful discharge of the duties of their office. And his conclusion is that these two institutes of divine appointment have a separate existence, a distinct character, and an independent authority; and that it is impossible to identify them or make one dependent on the other. And these principles he applies, first, to expose the fallacy of Erastianism; and secondly, to expose the fallacy of Popery, which subordinates the civil power to the spiritual. (Vol. I., pp. 97-106.)

But our author, while insisting upon the essential distinctiveness and mutual independence of the two institutes, has no objection whatever to the idea of

A CONNECTION AND A FRIENDLY CO-OPERATION BETWIXT CHURCH
AND STATE ;

and he argues that there is a foundation for such alliance—

First, in the fact of the twofold character which Christ sustains of "Head of the Church," and also of "Head over all things to the Church." Originally separate and still essentially distinct, being jointly under Christ's dominion as Head over both, he considers that each may be made serviceable and advantageous to the other. Even if the State were to be identified with the world as ungodly, still Christ can use it as an instrument to benefit his Church. But the State is not to be identified with the world, which lieth in wickedness. It is an ordinance of God, good in itself and appointed for good. The very end for which it has been placed under Messiah is that it may be made instrumental to promote his kingdom of grace. "Church and State, because equally the servants of Christ, are helps made and meet for each other."

In the second place, he finds the same foundation in the fact of important ends in common. Besides the primary end of each, each has secondary ends, and these often meet and unite the two in one. None can deny that the duties of the second table of the law are the concern of the State as well as of the Church. The life of man, the ordinance of marriage, rights of property, the oath which is the cement of society, the obligations of honesty and justice between man and man,—all these are common concerns of State and Church. Here is common ground where they may—nay, *must*—meet.

In the third place, Dr. Bannerman argues that there is a foundation for friendly coöperation between the State and the Church, in that they may and do consist of the same individual persons.

In the fourth place, he urges the fact that the friendly alliance under consideration is actually exemplified in Scripture with the direct sanction and approbation of God himself. Under the Jewish dispensation, Church and State were not merged in one, but remained separate and independent, and yet there was a close and intimate union betwixt them. And here he insists that

we find warrant by God himself for "the alliance of things civil and sacred, for the connection and coöperation of the king and the priest, of the throne and the altar." There were peculiarities, he admits, in the case both of the Church and of the State among the Jews; but there was no peculiarity about the Jewish Church, such as to render it no Church at all; and there was no peculiarity about the Jewish State, such as to render it no State at all; and so the fact of the union of Church and State amongst them, with the divine approbation, can not be gotten rid of. (Vol. I., pp. 112-119.)

And here Dr. Bannerman encounters a theory maintained by Erastus, but denied by Beza; debated earnestly and long in the Westminster Assembly; Selden, Lightfoot, and others, maintaining the position of Erastus, but Gillespie and Rutherford conclusively answering them;—the theory that the distinction of Church and State was unknown before Christ, and that amongst the Jews the two were one and the same. Our author urges here five arguments: I. The Church and the State amongst the Jews were distinct in respect of their origin: for the State was a theocracy, and God, the ruler of all the nations, was in a special sense Ruler of the Jewish nation; but the Jewish Church, which is the same as the Christian Church, had the second Person of the Trinity for its founder and Head. II. The Church and the State among the Jews were distinct in respect of their objects and ends. This same distinction separates the two institutes now—the one had spiritual, the other temporal ends. III. The two were separated amongst the Jews, as they are now amongst us, by the nature of the power which they respectively exercised. True, a few individuals, as Moses, were commissioned to unite in their own persons civil and ecclesiastical functions. But these were wholly exceptional cases. The Jewish State wielded purely civil, and the Jewish Church purely ecclesiastical and spiritual powers. IV. The two were distinct in respect of the administration of the power. Rulers and judges were distinct altogether from priests and Levites. The elders of the city were not the elders of the synagogue. "The matters of the Lord" over which "Amariah the chief priest" was to

preside, were most undeniably separated from "the king's matters," over which, in the civil Sanhedrim, "Zebadiah, the son of Ishmael, the ruler of the house of Judah," was appointed. V. The two were distinct in respect of members. Then, as now, the nominal membership of the Church and State may at some periods have nearly coincided, but the conditions of membership of the two bodies were by no means identical. The uncircumcised, the temporarily unclean, the persons under synagogue censure, were excluded from membership of the Church while yet members of the State. On the other hand, "proselytes of righteousness" were members of the Jewish Church, but not of the State. (Vol. II., pp. 119-124.)

Let us pause here to remark that our author appears to us to trip in arguing that the temporarily unclean and the censured man were excluded from *membership* of the Church; but we shall not enlarge on this point.

Proceeding now to insist that it is not only lawful for Church and State to coöperate in the service of God, but endeavoring also to evince

THE DUTY OF THEIR CONNECTION,

our author finds it necessary to draw a most important distinction: "There is an important difference between the recognition of the Church by the State and the maintenance of the Church by the State. For the State to recognise the Church as a divine institution, to acknowledge its origin and claims to be from God, to confess that the doctrine which it teaches is the truth of God, and that the outward order and government of the Christian society are his appointment,—this is one thing; and it is, we believe, an incumbent duty on the part of a Christian State at all times. For the State to go beyond a public recognition and acknowledgment of the Church, and to lend its aid in the way of pecuniary support. * * * this is another thing, and a duty that may be incumbent on a Christian State or not, according to circumstances."

Carrying this important distinction along with him, our author urges the duty of friendly coöperation in the service of God betwixt the Church and the State, on the ground—

VOL. XX., NO. 4—7.

1. That both these are to be accounted moral parties, responsible to God. They both have a distinct moral personality. Duty can be predicated of them both. They are both directly accountable to God. There is a subtle misapprehension current on this subject. Whatever moral responsibility belongs to a man, considered as an individual merely, is added to, not diminished, when he becomes a citizen or church member. This character of citizen or church member augments his personal responsibility, and the body which he joins derives from its members a moral character in its corporate and collective capacity, and becomes itself responsible for all its actions. The members of such a society do not sink their individual responsibility in their membership; but, on the contrary, they impart that responsibility also to the society itself. There is an individual responsibility attaching to every man; there is a collective responsibility attaching to every society, as a society.

2. That, in consequence of this responsibility to God, both Church and State are bound to own and recognise his revealed word.

It is admitted that there is a material difference between the Church and the State in that the former was founded for the express purpose of being a witness for the truth of God, whereas the State was founded for other immediate objects. But the duty of the Church to profess the true religion, although more immediate and direct, rests ultimately on the same footing as the duty of the State in this regard. They are both moral and responsible creatures of God, and so bound to own his name and acknowledge his truth.

But it is affirmed that the State has nothing to do with religion, and must be neutral between the profession and the denial of Christianity. If this doctrine means any thing, it signifies that the State, as a corporate body, is not responsible to God at all. To say that the civil magistrate, as such, is not bound to receive and submit to God's will, is to say that he, alone of all moral creatures, is free from the law which binds all moral creatures to own and honor God in all they do. Admit the civil magistrate to be, in his official character, a moral and responsi-

ble agent, and he necessarily incurs obligations in reference to that official character, the same as belong to every other moral and responsible person and position. It cannot be alleged that the State or the magistrate, officially as such, is incompetent to own and recognise the revelation of God in the same sense that the irrational and irresponsible creatures are incompetent. On the contrary, there is involved, in the very idea of the moral responsibility which belongs to them, both understanding and will and conscience; and unless you deny altogether the responsibility of States to God, you must admit that the very first and chiefest act for which a State is responsible is the act of owning or rejecting the revelation God has given of his will. It is freely admitted by all that the State has a moral responsibility in reference to other States, in its tactics of war and peace; in its covenants fiscal and commercial; that it is capable of right and wrong-doing in its dealings with its own subjects or citizens, in its internal laws and regulations. Is it then only in relation to God and his revelation that the State is divested of its moral character and responsibility, having no duty and no accountability? Is the State, alone of all God's moral creatures, under no law to God and free to disown him?

3. That a proper regard to itself and to the other objects for which it exists, binds the State to recognise the true religion.

Religion forms the main and only foundation on which the authority of States can rest; the only sanction sufficient to enforce right and deter from wrong; the only force able to insure obedience and respect for law; the only bond that can unite the discordant elements of society. To assert, then, that the magistrate, as such, must have no care for religion, is to say that he must forego the chief stay of his own authority.

4. That a proper regard for the Church, as God's ordinance, binds the State to countenance it and advance its interests.

The magistrate finds from the revealed will of God that there is another society of divine appointment coördinate with the State, but different from it in its nature and its powers. And what remains but for him to ask how the State can properly assist this other society, its own co-servant of God? That there

are ways of aid proper to both, cannot be doubted. The State may give the Church the protection of law, and may embody its confession in the national statute book. It may recognise the Sabbath as a day sacred to worship, and throw round it the fence of law. It may endow the gospel ministry so far as the nation's resources and the true interests of the Church will allow.

5. That this duty of the State to recognise and it may be endow the Church, is undeniably countenanced by the whole tenor of Scripture.

It is a striking fact that the only form of civil polity ever framed by God himself was in close connection with his Church, which surely proves the lawfulness of such a connection. Nor does the New Testament repeal the Old Testament law on this subject; but contrariwise, when heathen magistrates in sundry cases gave countenance to the Church of God by pecuniary aid and otherwise, the deed was sanctioned by the approbation of God. And, moreover, the future millennial state of the Church is described as one in which the kings of the earth shall all bring their gold and other honors unto it, and become the great instruments of promoting its spiritual interests. (Vol. I., pp. 124-135.)

But our author proceeds a step further, and argues not only that coöperation, as the servants of one common Lord, is the DUTY of Church and State, but that there is absolutely

A NECESSITY FOR THIS CONNECTION.

His argument here is that the civil and the religious elements in society are so interwoven that they must necessarily tend either to establish or to destroy each other. There can be no such thing as neutrality betwixt them. The Church will be either the ally of the State for its good, or an aggressor encroaching on its rights and dangerous to its supreme authority. The State will be either the Church's friend and protector, or else its secret or avowed enemy. The fundamental maxim of the Voluntaries is: "The State, as the State, has nothing to do with religion." But the State, as the State, *must* have to do with religion—if not in the way of friendly coöperation, then in the way of hostility and opposition. Here Dr. Bannerman quotes

Dr. Wardlaw's celebrated saying relative to the province of the magistrate in regard to religion, that "*his true and legitimate province is to have no province at all.*" But he proceeds to point to several matters with which both the civil and the spiritual powers are so concerned as to demonstrate the error of Dr. Wardlaw.

The first of these is the oath, which is the bond and seal of human society. This is more than a civil engagement—it is a religious one superinduced upon the civil. It appeals to the central truth of religion—the existence of God to aid man in binding his fellow-man. Now, deny or disown the religious obligation of the oath, and you unloose the whole bonds of civilised society. And now, shall we say "the State has nothing to do with religion," or shall we not rather say she cannot disown religion without returning to the state of savage nature?

It will not do to say the oath is a matter not of revealed but natural religion—common to nature and not peculiar to Christianity. This is true. But the doctrines of natural religion, as much as of revealed, are upon the voluntary theory excluded from the office of the magistrate; and there are atheists in the world, as well as deists, who upon that theory are as much entitled to object against the recognition by the magistrate of the truths of natural religion as of the doctrines of revealed religion.

Nor will it do to allege that the oath is a mere civil transaction; for over and above the civil engagement, there is in it the solemn appeal to God, as present witness of the truth and as future avenger of the falsehood.

In the next place, Dr. B. refers to the right inherent in the Church of Christ to propagate the gospel in every nation under heaven. This is a right which cannot be recognised by any State constituted on the principle that it has nothing to do with religion. The right to take possession of this world in the name of Christ, to the exclusion of every other form of faith and worship, is what Christianity demands. How can any State concede this demand, so long as it maintains absolute neutrality; or how protect the Church in its exclusive claims, while strictly impartial and indifferent both to truth and falsehood? The truth is

not only exclusive, but aggressive. For three hundred years, Christianity was in perpetual collision with the State, because it was an exclusive and aggressive system. And history teaches that no State not Christian can grant the exclusive claims which Christianity sets up. So that, if the State be not a friend, it must be a foe—if not a protector, it must be an enemy and a persecutor. It cannot be neutral.

In the third place, the law of marriage illustrates the position that civil and religious elements are so bound up together in society that where they do not coöperate, they must injure one another. Marriage has its origin in nature, yet revelation deals with its rights and duties. The State cannot avoid legislating about it, and so does Christianity. Now, how is collision between them to be avoided—collision fraught with evil to the peace, if not the existence, of society? The family is the root of the State. It is the unit of combination for the whole body politic. But unless there be, on the part of the State, a distinct acknowledgment of the word of God as the law to which its marriage laws must conform,—unless the State be here at one with religion,—the difference must deeply injure, if not fundamentally damage, the one or the other.

A fourth illustration is the case of the Sabbath. By this law, God confers on every man the right to demand, at the hands of his fellow-man, the free and undisturbed use and enjoyment of the day. But it is well-nigh impossible for an individual to keep the Sabbath as it ought to be kept, without the aid and advantage of the State making the outward observance of the Sabbath a national thing. But a State acting on the principle of indifference alike to truth and error, to the religion of God and the falsehoods of men, must needs disown any such appointment as the Sabbath; and disowning it, illustrate the general position that when religion and civil government do not unite and coöperate, the separation must be fatal to the highest interests of the one or the other. (Vol. I., pp. 135–148.)

These extracts will suffice to acquaint our readers with this work. Dr. B.'s opinions, we must again be allowed to remark, are not those of an isolated or an unimportant individual, but of

a representative man—and a representative man in the Free Church of Scotland. And let not the reader forget, while he peruses the observations of the author upon the last topic especially, that the Free Church therein represented is not to be regarded as tinctured in the slightest degree with an Erastian spirit. Her noble exodus from all connexion with the State, rather than submit to its interference with her rightful powers as an independent spiritual commonwealth, must forever entitle her and her representative men to speak their views respecting all the relations of Church and State, without being liable to any suspicion of such tendencies. We may or we may not be able to accept her teachings on this difficult subject; but she has proved herself too honest and conscientious not to be heard patiently and respectfully by all who desire more light upon intricate questions.

ARTICLE VI.

FOREIGN MISSIONS.

Foreign Missions—Their Relations and Claims. By RUFUS ANDERSON, D. D., LL.D., late Foreign Secretary of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. Charles Scribner, New York.

We know of no volume that comprises in so short a compass as much solid and valuable information in relation to the great work of foreign missions as the one before us. It is the substance of a series of lectures delivered by the author to the students of a number of the Northern theological seminaries during the last winter, and is now published for more extended circulation. We give it a hearty welcome, and have no doubt that it will do a great deal to promote the cause of missions. We have long regarded Dr. Anderson as one of the greatest men of the age. Certainly no man living, either in this country or

Europe, on heathen ground or in the Christian world, has done more by his personal influence to promote the spirit of missions among the churches, or to spread the knowledge of the gospel among the unevangelised nations of the earth. For a period of more than forty years, he has devoted all the energies of a noble and earnest mind to the almost exclusive study of this one great subject. Had his early life been devoted to the study of theology, law, politics, or general literature, he would no doubt have attained to a high position in any of these departments. But his heart was early and deeply interested in the great work of evangelizing the heathen nations of the earth; and he rightly judged that this was an undertaking vast and important enough in itself to occupy all the energies of his noble and enthusiastic mind, and they were heartily and unreservedly consecrated to it. But not only did Dr. Anderson study the subject of missions, but he had peculiar advantages for making himself thoroughly acquainted with every department of the work, both in this country and in foreign lands. From his official position, he has not only been personally acquainted with all the missionaries sent out by the American Board, and been in constant and intimate correspondence with them for a period of forty years, but he has had the opportunity to visit, for personal inspection, a large number of the missions of that Board, as well as those of other missionary associations, especially those around the Mediterranean, in Western and Southern Asia, and the Sandwich Islands. His views and observations, therefore, cannot but be of the highest value to the Church at large. We regret somewhat that he did not institute a formal comparison between the workings of the various schemes of missions in the different countries which he visited. It would, perhaps, have appeared somewhat invidious, but it would have been a matter of great importance to the cause of missions nevertheless. There are some things in his book, especially in relation to church government, to the manner in which the gospel is to be propagated in Africa, as well as some allusions to the South, to which exception may be taken; but these are so few and slight that they fade away before the great facts and results that are brought to view. We

are glad to know that the venerable author is devoting the evening of his life to the preparation of a more extended volume on the same great subject. In the meantime, the volume before us affords ample material for thought and reflection, and we select a few leading topics for our present consideration.

Nothing connected with the present aspect of foreign missions is more remarkable than those wonderful interpositions of divine providence by which both the Christian Church and the heathen world have been prepared, the one to receive and the other to impart the blessings of the gospel. Persons whose memories extend back over a period of forty or fifty years have a very distinct impression of these wonderful changes. The great heathen nations of the earth, fifty years ago, appeared, almost without exception, to be entirely beyond the reach of the gospel. Africa, for example, in consequence of the insalubriousness of the climate, the rude and savage character of her people, the prevalence of piracy and the slave trade along all her borders, the want of lawful commerce with the civilised world, and other causes, seemed to be placed entirely beyond the reach of the gospel of Jesus Christ. India, to human appearances, seemed to be quite as inaccessible. There are those living who distinctly remember that the first efforts to establish American missions in that part of the world were entirely frustrated, though this was done more through the jealousy of the British East India Company than from any hostility of feeling on the part of the natives of the country. China, with its 400,000,000 of inhabitants, was more thoroughly locked against the influences of Christianity than either of the other two countries. Morrison and Milne, the pioneer missionaries to that land, were debarred from all intercourse with the people, except the few attendants upon the tea factories near Canton, and even with these their intercourse was very restricted. Nor was this exclusive policy ever relaxed during the lives of these holy men. All they ever effected in the way of missionary labor was to translate the word of God into the language, and throw a few handfuls of the good seed, in the form of religious tracts, over those dense walls which separated them from the millions within. Japan, as is

well known, not only excluded Christianity by legal enactments, but in order to guard more effectually against its entrance, she cut herself off from all intercourse with the civilised world for a period of more than three centuries. The teeming multitudes of the isles of the Pacific Ocean, fifty years ago, so far as they were known to the Christian world, were regarded as fiends in human form and as lying entirely beyond the reach of Christianity.

But what is the state of the case now in relation to these countries? Of what one of them can it be affirmed with truth that it is now out of the reach of the gospel? Piracy and the foreign slave trade have been superseded on all the seas and shores of Africa by lawful commerce; the savage and lawless character of her people has been greatly modified by the combined influence of Christian education and lawful commerce; the deleterious effects of malaria have been counteracted in a great measure by the discoveries and improvements in medical science; missionaries, by the blessing of God, have been enabled not only to acquire and maintain a firm footing at most of eligible points along her seaboard frontier, but they are gradually pushing their missionary operations toward the very heart of the country. At the same time, the outlet of one and the source of the other of the two great rivers of Africa—geographical problems that had baffled the researches of the civilised world for more than three thousand years—have been discovered, the results of which are, that one of them will furnish a highway to missionaries to the heart of Central Northern Africa; whilst the other will take them to the centre of the heretofore unexplored regions of Central Southern Africa. Nor have the changes in the outward condition of India been less marked. Not only has the opposition of former years passed away, but facilities are now enjoyed for traversing the country and preaching the gospel in that land, of which the early missionaries never dreamed. A system of railways is under construction, which, when completed, will be more than ten thousand miles long, and will bring the remotest portions of that great country into close contact with each other. More than five thousand miles of the whole has

already been completed and is now in full operation. One line of it extends along the valley of the Ganges from Calcutta to Delhi, a distance of something more than one thousand miles. Another extends from Allahabad, a point of intersection on the railway about half way from Calcutta to Delhi, to Bombay and from thence to Madras. A third runs from Calcutta in a north-easterly direction towards China, and will no doubt soon become the common medium of communication between these two great countries. When this whole system of railways is completed—and no doubt it will be in a very few years—missionaries will not only be enabled to visit all the more remote and inaccessible portions of the country, but they will do it in as many days as it formerly required months. Not only will the missionary be saved great expense and fatigue by this arrangement, but he will be enabled to contribute four times as much active missionary labor to the upbuilding of the Redeemer's kingdom in this far-off land.

But China is undergoing changes in her outward condition that may, in the providence of God, bring about even greater results. Not only have all her important seaports been thrown open to the influences of Christianity, but her roads, her canals, and her rivers, are all made tributary to the same great cause. More than this, three great railways are contemplated, which, when completed, will open up almost every portion of this vast empire for the spread of Christianity. One of these, projected by the French, will extend from Cochin China on the south, from south to north, through the whole length of the empire; a second, contemplated by the British Government, will extend from Burmah in a diagonal direction to the northeastern corner of the empire; and the third, contemplated by Russia, will extend directly across all her broad northern provinces. Now when all these are accomplished, they will not only exert a powerful influence upon the moral, social, and commercial, condition of China itself, but upon the world at large. What will be their ultimate effect upon the spread of the gospel in that empire, can be fully known only to Him under whose superintending providence they are brought about. So we might, if time and space

allowed, speak of the great changes that have been brought about in the condition of Japan, New Zealand, Madagascar, and the Polynesian islands, but we refrain.

Nor has the same period been characterised by less marked changes in the condition and circumstances of the Christian Church. If the heathen have been brought to our very doors by the providence of God, the Church has been equally prepared by his grace to impart to them the blessings of the gospel. This was by no means the case fifty years ago. At that time the Church felt very little interest in the conversion of the world. She neither understood her own true vocation, nor the claims of the heathen world. The command of the Saviour to preach the gospel to every creature was construed as having special application to apostolical times, and the Church strengthened herself in this position, by the assumption that the great heathen nations of the earth were entirely beyond her reach. At the same time her pecuniary resources, and her facilities of access to the heathen, were very limited. But now her circumstances are entirely changed. Providence has poured wealth into her lap without stint. Facilities of access, even to the remotest portions of the earth, are being multiplied every day; and the claims of a perishing world are now felt as they have never been since the days of the apostles.

Now, by what means have these great changes and coincidences been brought about? Different classes of men will account for them according to the various points of view from which they are contemplated. Scientific men will regard them simply as the natural results of the scientific discoveries of the age. The man of commerce will see in them nothing but the natural consequences of the commercial activity of the times. The man of humanitarian views will glory in them as the natural fruits of the progress of society. But the true Christian philosopher will recognise the hand of God behind and above all these subordinate agencies, and will regard them but as the pre-sages of those richer and more abundant spiritual blessings which God is about to shower down upon our miserable world.

The extent and results of missionary labor is another most

important feature in the progress of modern missions. On this particular point we fear there is very little correct information even among well informed Christians. The history of modern Protestant missions, with a few unimportant exceptions, is all comprised within this present century. Our author remembers the time when there were no Christian missionaries in Turkey, in China, in Burmah, in the Indian Archipelago, among the islands of the Pacific Ocean, very few in India, and none on the continent of Africa, except at Sierra Leone and the Cape of Good Hope. But how is it now? There are fourteen separate missionary associations in this country; twenty-one in Great Britain, not including several that are intended to operate exclusively upon the Jews; and thirteen on the continent of Europe—forty-eight in all, and all actively engaged in the great work of evangelising the heathen nations of the earth. The whole amount of funds raised and disbursed by these various associations during the year 1868, was \$5,355,698. The receipts of the Church Missionary Society, representing the evangelical portion of the English Church, was \$754,320; those of the Wesleyan Missionary, were \$584,260.00; of the London Missionary Society, representing the Congregationalists and the Independents of England, were \$526,445.00; the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, \$530,885.00; the Old School Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions, \$312,828.00; and the Methodist Episcopal Missionary Society, \$275,866.00. The whole number of foreign missionaries is about two thousand, whilst the number of native assistants of various classes, is upwards of three thousand. Missionary stations have been established and are maintained among all the principal Indian tribes in this country and British America; in different portions of Mexico and South America; in every considerable group of islands in the Pacific Ocean; in Western, Eastern, and Southern Africa; in the various islands and countries bordering upon the Mediterranean; in Eastern Europe: in Western, Central, and Eastern Turkey; in India, not only along the Ganges and the Indus, but along the whole of its southern and southeastern borders, including the island of Ceylon; in Burmah, Siam.

Assam, and Singapore; in almost every seaport of China, as well as in many of her inland town and cities; in Japan; in New Holland; in New Zealand, and in Madagascar. Not only have missions been established and maintained in all these countries, but in most of them there have been witnessed triumphs of divine grace that have no parallel since apostolical times. We can do little more than allude to some of these results. Sierra Leone, on the western coast of Africa, has been one of these favored scenes. That community, of eighty or one hundred thousand souls, is made up almost entirely of recaptured Africans, brought there from time to time in a condition of the most abject poverty, ignorance, and barbarism that can be conceived. Active missionary operations were commenced among them by agents of the Church Missionary Society about fifty years ago, the results of which are that a large number of Christian churches have been organised, over which native pastors preside, and into which more than twenty thousand hopeful converts have been gathered. All of the native pastors are supported by the people themselves; six separate missions are maintained by them among the neighboring native tribes; and the Church Missionary Society, by whose agency the work has heretofore been carried on, regard their work as completed in this particular place.

A still more remarkable state of things exists on the island of Madagascar. It is about fifty years since the London Missionary Society sent its first agents to this people. The well known Radama was the sovereign of the island at the time. Under his mild and benignant reign, the gospel made very considerable progress, and a goodly number of churches were organised. The missionaries reduced the language to writing, and translated the word of God and various other religious books into it. After the death of Radama, his widow, a wicked and cruel pagan woman, succeeded to the throne, and, for a period of thirty years, persecuted her Christian subjects with a degree of bitterness and cruelty that scarcely has any parallel since the days of Nero. Some were poisoned; some were hanged; some were speared; some were thrown over a fatal precipice; and

many were banished or sold into slavery. It is estimated that more than two thousand Christians perished in these various ways. But Christianity silently extended itself, notwithstanding all this opposition and persecution. For the last eight years, the throne has been filled by a Christian sovereign, and the progress of the gospel has been most wonderful. There are within and immediately around the capital ninety organised churches, upwards of one hundred native pastors, and more than five thousand native members. In the space of four years, the number of nominal Christians has been doubled, whilst the communicants have increased more than tenfold. Christianity, from present appearances, will soon become the prevailing religion of the island.

Every intelligent Christian is familiar with the history and results of missionary labor in the Sandwich Islands. It is not necessary to enter into any extended details. It is stated upon trustworthy authority that nearly one-third of the population are creditable members of the Church, of whom more than eight hundred were received during the year 1868. There are thirty large native churches, each one of which supports its own pastor. These same churches support thirteen native missionaries in the Marquesas and Micronesian Islands. Their contributions to the various causes of benevolence the last year were more than \$29,000 in gold, or about \$40,000 in our currency. Dr. Anderson remarks: "Having myself traversed all the Sandwich Islands, five years ago, I do not hesitate to declare the United States to be no more entitled, as a whole, to the appellation of Christian, than those islands."

The progress of Christianity in Central and Eastern Polynesia has not been less encouraging. Dr. Mullens, the honored Secretary of the London Missionary Society, remarks: "Sixty years ago, there was not a solitary native Christian in Polynesia; now it would be difficult to find a professed idolater in the islands of Eastern or Central Polynesia, where missionaries have been established. The hideous rites of their forefathers have ceased to be practised. Their heathen legends and war songs have been forgotten. Their cruel and desolating tribal wars, which

were rapidly destroying the population, appear to be at an end. They are gathered together in peaceful village communities. They live under recognised codes of laws. They are constructing roads, cultivating their rich lands, and engaging in commerce. On the return of the Sabbath, a very large proportion of the population attend the worship of God, and in some instances more than half the adult population are recognised members of the Christian churches. They educate their children, endeavoring to train them for usefulness in after life. They sustain their native ministers, and send their noblest sons as missionaries to the heathen lands which lie farther to the west. There may not be the culture, the wealth, the refinements of the older lands of Christendom. These things are the slow growth of ages. But these islands must no longer be regarded as a part of heathendom. In God's faithfulness and mercy, they have been won from the domains of heathendom, and have been added to the domains of Christendom."

But the most signal display of the power of the gospel over the heathen mind is to be found in connexion with the wonderful changes that have been effected in the condition of the Feejee Islands. Every school-boy is familiar with the fact that the very name of these islands was synonymous with all that is barbarous and cruel in the history of our fallen race. In former years, and not more than a score of years ago, sailors would perhaps have preferred to be swallowed up by the Maelstrom itself than to have been shipwrecked on the Feejee Islands. Savage warfare, polygamy, infanticide, and cannibalism, were the distinguishing characteristics of that people until a comparatively short period. About thirty years ago, a mission was commenced among them by the Wesleyan Missionary Society of England. In a comparatively short time, the Scriptures were translated into their language and placed in the hands of more than 100,000 of the people. It is estimated that not less than 90,000, including the children of the Sabbath-schools, were in the habit of attending public worship, of whom more than 22,000 were recognised members of the Church. There were more than six hundred Feejee preachers, of whom forty-eight had

received ordination, or were expecting to do so; whilst the teachers were about one thousand and the number of pupils about thirty-six thousand. An officer of the English navy, speaking of a recent visit to that people, says: "I was very much impressed with the scene before me. Only fifteen years before, every man I saw was a cannibal. Close to me sat the old chief, Bible in hand, and one of the most sanguinary and ferocious in this terrible land; and in twenty yards of me was the site of the fatal oven with the tree still standing, covered with the notches that marked each new victim."

Among the Karens, a field occupied mainly by American Baptists, the results of missionary labor, in some respects, transcend all that has as yet been adduced. A well known native preacher, by the name of Quala, was the honored instrument in the conversion of more than two thousand of his countrymen in the short space of three years. The Rev. Mr. Vinton, a well known American minister, in the course of six years,—between the years 1852 and 1858,—was instrumental in founding forty separate churches, of establishing thirty schools, and of gathering between eight and nine thousand converts, besides training during the same period one hundred native preachers and evangelists.

Among the Shanars, a community of devil-worshippers in Southern India, the Rev. Mr. Tucker, a representative of the Church Missionary Society, during a ministry of twenty years, was permitted to baptize more than three thousand of these people, whilst a hundred thousand, at least, have been brought in some measure under the influence of Christianity. But our space forbids the further multiplication of such illustrations. Enough has been stated to show that the gospel is making as great conquests in heathen as in Christian communities, if not greater.

But the progress of the gospel in heathen lands must not be estimated simply by the number of churches that have been organised or the number of converts that have been gathered into them, though this is undoubtedly the great and primary object of all Christian missions. Much has been effected in preparing the way for the more rapid spread of the gospel here-

after. Much missionary labor has necessarily been devoted to this preparatory work. The languages of most of these nations had to be studied out and reduced to writing; it was necessary that the Scriptures, as well as other religious books, should be translated into them and circulated among the people. Much time has also been spent in training teachers and preachers of the gospel; in demonstrating the folly and the sin of their various systems of idolatry; and in disseminating amongst the masses the great and cardinal principles of the Christian religion. The amount of labor performed in connexion with this necessary and preparatory work would scarcely seem credible to any except those who have had some experimental knowledge of the subject. Dr. Anderson states that the missionaries of the American Board alone had reduced twenty of these barbarous languages to writing. Within the last half century, the entire Bible has been translated into thirty-nine languages, outside of Christendom; the New Testament into thirty-five others; and portions of the Sacred Scriptures into forty-eight others—making one hundred and twenty-two languages in the great field of missions that have been enriched and ennobled by having portions of God's word translated into them. Something like ten millions of copies of the Sacred Scriptures have been circulated among these nations, which, our author forcibly remarks, "is a far greater number of copies than were in the hands of mankind through all the ages of the world from Moses to the Reformation." The number of other religious books that have been printed and circulated among these people, it is impossible to state. The missionaries of the American Board alone have published a greater or less number in forty-two of these languages, amounting in the aggregate to more than a thousand million of pages. The American Baptist Union have published in thirty languages, and to the amount of two hundred millions of pages. These two missionary societies together have published in sixty of the different languages of the unevangelized world, and the number of separate works does not fall far short of three thousand. Here is leaven enough, one might think, to leaven the whole lump of heathendom. Certainly seed enough has

been sowed to bring forth a richer harvest than the world has ever witnessed.

But the leading topic of the volume under review, and one undoubtedly of the most weighty importance, is the *proper mode* of conducting the work of foreign missions. Our author regards Paul as the great model missionary, and his plan of operation as the only wise and safe guide for the Christian Church at the present day. He regards Paul, apart from the exercise of his apostolical functions, simply as an evangelist, as that term is defined and understood in the New Testament Scriptures: that he never became the pastor of any of the numerous churches he founded, but appointed pastors and elders over them, and went on founding new ones, but retained the oversight of the whole, revisiting them from time to time for the purpose of confirming them in sound doctrine and aiding them in the administration of church government. He thinks that modern missionaries ought to act on these same general principles: that they should never become pastors of churches among the heathen, but should appoint pastors and elders from among themselves; go forward to form new churches, but maintain a general oversight over the whole, as Paul did, so long as there was any necessity for such oversight. He thinks, also, that the missionary ought to look to the churches at home for his personal support, whilst the native pastor should look to the church to which he ministers for his, and be content with such salary as the people may be able to give. He would apply the same principles to the teacher of the common or parochial school; but would have the missionary retain in his own hands the higher departments of education, especially the training of ministers, the translation and circulation of the Sacred Scriptures and other religious books, the expenses of all of which, for the time being, should be borne by the churches in Christian lands. He advocates this general plan in opposition to the one which has been pursued by almost all the great missionary associations, (the American Board, of which he has been the Secretary, among others,) and according to which the missionary has almost always become the pastor of the first church he might form. Very few native pastors were

brought into requisition even after the missionary work had been carried on for a period of thirty or forty years, and according to which the almost entire expense of the work continued to be sustained by the churches at home. The practical effect of this mode of operation was to dwarf these native churches, repress their energies and their benevolence, and keep them in a state of unnecessarily prolonged tutelage. At the same time, the gospel, under this system, made very little progress beyond the immediate confines of the missionary stations, and the question was constantly asked, when will the world be converted at this rate? Within the last fifteen or twenty years, however, all the older and more extended missionary associations, both in this country and in Europe, have adopted the course advocated by our author, and the most important and satisfactory results are rapidly developing themselves. Actual experiment shows that native Christians, when properly selected, are much more capable of discharging the solemn and responsible functions of the ministry than was supposed by even those who knew them best. Native churches are not only developing extraordinary energy and benevolence, but they are setting examples of humble, self-denying piety, that churches in Christian lands might do well to imitate; and the gospel, under this new *regime*, has made much greater progress in the last ten years than it did the previous forty years. No one has done more to bring about this change in the management of the missionary work than our author himself. He does not claim the credit of it; but, in our judgment, no man living has done as much to bring it about. We remember very distinctly the opposition that was raised, not only by intelligent Christian men in this country, but by many of the ablest and most experienced missionaries on heathen ground, when he first attempted to carry these principles into practical effect. But the plan is now regarded with very great favor, and, with the exception, perhaps, of the Scotch missionary societies, is very generally practised.

We have no doubt ourselves of the general correctness of these principles. It is a matter of the greatest moment that all newly formed churches, whether in Christian lands or in the

heathen world, should be thrown as soon as possible upon their own resources. In no other way can their energies and their benevolence be properly developed. They should be trained from the very outset, not only to maintain the preaching of the gospel for themselves, but to aid in extending its blessings to others. In no other way can they ever fulfil their destiny as churches of the Lord Jesus. Help, except where it is absolutely needed, or under extraordinary circumstances, is almost sure to generate an eleemosynary spirit, and cannot fail to paralyse the energies of all such churches. Much harm has been done in this way, we have no doubt, in connexion with our domestic missionary operations. Churches that might have risen to power and influence, if they had been trained to habits of benevolence and self-reliance in the earlier periods of their history, have sunk into inefficiency and insignificance by being helped after they were able to help themselves. A mean and contracted spirit is often generated by such treatment, and it is one of the most difficult things in the world to restore to a church the spirit of true Christian manliness that has been fed too long by the hand of charity. This same course has no doubt been pursued by foreign missionaries to a disastrous extent. They have not only preached the gospel to native churches, but, in the great majority of cases, without charge. Their object undoubtedly was to show the heathen that they were actuated by disinterested motives; but this was illustrating one Christian excellence at the expense of another. The general tendency of all such gratuitous services, especially in heathen communities, is not only to countenance and strengthen feelings of selfishness, but to make them undervalue the gospel itself. Nor is it less important that native churches should be trained to self-government. So long as the white missionary presides over them, they follow in his lead and abide by his decisions, without forming any independent opinions of their own or ever becoming fitted for self-government. It would be better for them to have the reins placed in their own hands at an early period, even if they would certainly make mistakes. The correcting of these mistakes would become an important means of discipline, and might lead

them to clearer views of proper church government than they could get in any other way.

Missionaries have erred also, without doubt, in being too slow to admit native Christians to the exercise of the ministerial office. In relation to the standard of ministerial qualification, particularly so far as literary attainments are concerned, they have been governed too much by the standard deemed necessary for civilised countries. Apart from the question of the general expediency and desirableness of adopting such a high standard for heathen lands, we question very much whether heathen youths have the *intellectual capacity* to go through the full curriculum of study prescribed by our colleges and theological seminaries. So far as our own observation goes, they either break down in the attempt, or are so completely exhausted before they get through, that they are good for very little in after life. Nor ought this to occasion surprise. It is unreasonable to suppose that men descended of heathen parentage, where the intellect has lain dormant for centuries, could at once rise to the intellectual stature of men of a cultivated race. No doubt the progress of the gospel has been greatly impeded by keeping native Christians out of the ministry altogether, or by attempting to put them through a course of study not suited to their capacity.

Still, however, while we admit the soundness of the views which we are considering, and anticipate the most important results from their practical working, we think, nevertheless, there is great danger of pushing these views too far and too rapidly. Whilst it is true that they bear the stamp of apostolic sanction, it is equally true that the very apostle who is regarded as the model missionary, guarded the purity of the churches he formed with the utmost care; and no one ever uttered stronger warnings against the admission of unsound men into the sacred office of the ministry. The great danger is that the work will be done imperfectly and superficially, and above all that poorly educated ministers—especially such as the apostle denounces as “novices”—will be likely to sow as much error as truth. Churches that are prematurely hurried into the exercise of self-government, and served by officers incompetent to the task, are very

apt to have a transient existence, or be swallowed altogether by the predominance of error. Too much care cannot be exercised in laying the foundation of the missionary work deep and broad. Missionaries are now building up Christian churches in the very places where the apostle reared his most flourishing churches. If he had had such facilities for giving permanency to his work—especially in printing and circulating the Sacred Scriptures, in diffusing religious intelligence among the people, and of thoroughly educating ministers—those churches would perhaps, with the blessing of God, have continued to live and flourish to the present day, and thus the necessity would have been superseded, of rebuilding on the same foundations. We see the practical working of this plan (perhaps we should say the true plan perverted and abused) among the colored people immediately around us. Ignorant and uncultivated men are hurriedly and almost indiscriminately introduced into the ministry; churches are constructed out of the most heterogeneous and incongruous materials; and the consequences are, that not only absurd and superstitious notions, but the most fatal heresies are fast taking hold of the minds of the people. How these superstitions and heresies are hereafter to be purged out of their minds it is not easy to foresee. Error mixed up with a little of the leaven of truth is sure to take a stronger hold upon the human mind, and is far more difficult to be eradicated, than when it stands in its own strength. The wiser course in all such enterprises is to make sure every acquisition, even if we must go the slower for it. To do the work hurriedly and imperfectly but implies the necessity for doing it over again. The first and great business of the Church is to sow the seed of divine truth far and wide over the face of the earth, leaving it for the Holy Ghost to fructify and give it external form in his own time and way. We would not have these words of caution construed as opposed to the plan of conducting missions advocated by Dr. Anderson, but simply to guard against the abuses of that plan. We think that he has done a most important service in bringing to the light and correcting many serious mistakes; and if his views are consistently carried out, they cannot, with the blessing of God, fail to bring about the happiest results.

CARD OF THE REV. DR. F. A. ROSS.

MR. EDITOR: Our articles on Right and Wrong, Nos. 1 and 2, are parts of a book we have been writing. It is objected, that we represent the Deity as deciding every thing in arbitrary will, without necessity of nature. We desire, in Christian duty, to correct this impression thus:

The common philosophical theory of the divine nature is, that ideas of truth, right, holiness, and all other, with their infinite conditions of combination, exist, from eternity, in the mind of Deity, *irrespective of his will*; that his NATURE is thus a rounded, completed whole of character, without personal voluntary agency.

We reject this notion, because the NATURE of spiritual, personal, intelligent beings, must exist in MOTION; and that motion is WILL *in diverse manner of action*. To deny, therefore, that the nature of God moves in such activity, is to reject the personality of the Godhead. Surely, for any imaginable *motion other than will*, if conceived to be the energy of the divine nature, is, and can be, nothing else than that *impersonal law* which the atheist holds to be eternally in the nature of all things. To say that such energy can exist only in Deity, is to beg the question; since the atheist finds no difficulty in conceiving such *unwilled activity*, while he rejects the idea of God. The theory, on the contrary, we affirm, teaches, that WILL is *essentially the motion of the divine nature*; that thus, from the NECESSITY of his nature, God freely, from eternity, generated all ideas, and their corresponding emotions. Hence, it is a contradiction and an absurdity to imagine he could conceive other thoughts and feelings than he always has had. This free conception, speaking in the order of nature, not of time, was the first movement of the divine existence. God, then, in self-determined pleasure, or in the counsel of his will, decided the combinations and conditions of these his perfect conceptions.

This *double process*, *i. e.*, the free generation of ideas, and the free self-determination among them, is the action of the human mind to our *absolute consciousness*. To rise, then, in modest analogy, from the finite image, to the infinite, is all the conception we can form of the nature of the Personal Jehovah.

The Bible sustains this theory; for it reveals every where that the ENERGY, as well as *the mere expression* of God's nature, is WILL. Hence the Scriptures impress upon us, that, if we fail to recognise that fact, we are not permitted to form any notion at all of his nature *lying back of that expression*, save only as mere POTENTIALITY *so to move*. In other words, the divine nature is *necessarily perfected in WILL*, and without it we would not have the consummated character of God, either intellectual or moral. And now, after this statement, can any one say we affirm God acts *arbitrarily, and not from necessity of nature*? Surely we do not; for, is he arbitrary, if from the *eternal necessity of his nature* he freely conceives all things, and then from the same freedom-giving nature, determines the combinations of his thoughts in the pleasure of his will? Is he arbitrary, if he changes the conditions of men, and the laws of their obedience in like counsel of his will, since such changes, whatever they may be, can only be from choices between holy motives already in the conception of his mind? Is it not then a delusion to imagine God could be arbitrary in any alterations he might make in the moral relations of mankind, inasmuch as the very idea is, that *will is the movement of his nature*, thus making it the wisdom and the goodness of his nature, whatever that will may be? Is this speculation presumptuous? Why so? Shall philosophers, for ages, give us the "*wisdom of the Greeks*" to explain the nature of God? and shall we be said to venture too far on mysterious ground, when we reject that "*wisdom,*" and seek to show what the Scriptures reveal, and what so many thinking men, not warped by such philosophy, see to be true in the analogy between God and his image in man? Yea, is it presumption to reach the result, that in God, as in man, *will is the VITALITY of his nature*? The questions, then, which sum up the whole subject are these: Is the ENERGY of the divine nature,

that which moves the heavenly bodies; or, *that* which crystallizes the stone; or, *that* in animal existence; or, *that* in the law of atheism; or, are divine ideas without origination at all, and therefore only *seen* by Deity, from eternity, as *fixed facts* in the firmament of his nature, just as, according to the olden astronomy, the stars were forever fastened, without a maker, in the crystalline sphere of perpetual motion; or, is the energy of God's nature THAT *of the free moral agent?* Yea; but, is *that* any thing else than WILL, *in spontaneous conception*, and then SELF-DETERMINED PLEASURE? Yea, we think THAT will be the ultimate verdict. And these questions thus settled will lead to great results; for then it will be acknowledged, that the Bible does decide, in highest sense, its own revelation, and does teach that all truth, and right, are made to be such in the will of God, from very necessity of his nature.

The all-important difference, then, between the two theories, is that the one imagines a Supreme Being acting in fatality; the other reveals God, freely generating his eternal thoughts, and then freely choosing among them in the wisdom of his pleasure.

We showed (Part II., p. 204, 5,) that Dr. Miller, of Princeton, agreeing with Stapfer, said, that the existence, from eternity, of the Son of God, while NECESSARY, was also VOLUNTARY; "*for God is independent, and therefore can do nothing unwillingly, or of compulsion, but always acts voluntarily—the GENERATION OF THE SON, THEN, WAS VOLUNTARY.*" This, too, is the Presbyterian Confession of Faith.

Surely, then, we may, without rebuke, teach, that every lower conception of the divine mind has always been generation, necessary, yet voluntary; and that, consequently, when we speak of the truth, right, holiness, of God, we mean that, *this*, HIS CHARACTER, is his self-determined pleasure, SO TO BE, *in the eternal and necessary motion of his nature.*

F. A. ROSS.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

The New Testament: The Authorised English Version. With Introduction and various Readings from the three most celebrated Manuscripts of the Original Greek Text. By CONSTANTINE TISCHENDORF. Tauchnitz Edition. Volume 1000. Leipzig: Bernard Tauchnitz. London: Sampson Low and Son and Marston. 1869.

The press of Tauchnitz, at Leipzig, has for a long series of years been occupied in publishing editions of the classics, both Latin and Greek, of the Fathers, and other works of value, and placing them at a very moderate price in the hands of scholars. The present representative of this family, the Baron Tauchnitz, is the noble originator of the "Tauchnitz Collection" of English authors, whose aim it is to place the glorious works which adorn the literature of England and America within reach of the readers of other countries. "In selecting the word of God as recorded by the apostles," says Tischendorf, "for the thousandth volume of the series, he has chosen the most appropriate crown for such a structure of human genius."

The English version of 1611, which was prepared at the command of James the First by a body of learned divines, was founded on the Greek text as accepted at that time by Protestants, was translated by the most competent scholars with scrupulous care, and has become an object of reverence and a treasure to the English-speaking nations of the earth. The German nation alone possesses a similar treasure in the New Testament of Luther.

Both these proceeded from a Greek text which Erasmus, in 1516, and Robert Stephens, in 1550, formed from manuscripts of later date than the tenth century. Other manuscripts have since been found of far higher antiquity. It is well known that books which are often transcribed will vary—mostly, however, in immaterial things—from each other. The process of transcrip-

tion is not the work of a mere machine, but of a pen guided by a mind not always equally attentive, and an eye that is liable to mistake. It is therefore natural to suppose that the oldest copies approach the original text more nearly than the later ones; and this general supposition, with some abatements which might be mentioned, will be generally concurred in.

Of the manuscripts of the New Testament, three take the precedence for antiquity of all others. The first which became known to Europe after the revival of learning is the *Vatican Codex*. Whence it was procured is unknown. It appears in the first catalogue of that collection in 1475.

The next is the *Alexandrine Codex*, presented to Charles the First in 1669, by Cyril Lucar, Patriarch of Constantinople, who had himself brought it from Alexandria.

The third is the *Sinaitic Codex*, which Tischendorf was so happy as to discover in 1844 and 1859, at the Convent of St. Catharine, on Mount Sinai, in which last year he brought it to Russia to the Emperor Alexander II., at whose expense and at whose suggestion his second journey to the East was undertaken.

The first place among these most celebrated manuscripts, both for antiquity and completeness, is held by the Sinaitic Codex, the second by the Vatican, the third by the Alexandrine.

The Sinaitic is believed to belong to the first half of the fourth century, and it is not improbable that it is one of the fifty copies which the Emperor Constantine, in the year 331, directed to be made for Byzantium, under the care of Eusebius of Casarea; and if so, it is not unnatural to suppose that it was sent to the monks of St. Catharine by the Emperor Justinian, the founder of the convent. The entire Codex, embracing the Old and New Testaments, with the Epistle of Barnabas and part of the Shepherd of Hermas, was published by the discoverer in a costly and magnificent way, at the expense of the Russian Emperor, in 1862, and the New Testament in a more portable form in 1863 and 1865.

It occurred to both Tischendorf and the Baron Tauchnitz that it would be to the interests of both piety and learning to issue an edition of "the Authorised English Version" of the

New Testament, which should exhibit its departures from these three oldest and most important manuscripts.

This has accordingly been done: the English text published as it stands, the variations placed in the margin and denoted by the letters S., V., and A., indicating thus the manuscripts in which these variations occur.

Its title page is preceded by a *fac simile* example of each manuscript, and is followed by the dedication—

“I dedicate this volume to my English and American Authors—as a token of esteem for the living and a tribute of remembrance to the dead.
TAUCHNITZ.

“LEIPZIG, January, 1869.”

So the noble publisher has chosen to phrase his votive tablet.

The English reader now has this whole matter before him. He will find that the Sinaitic and Vatican omit the doxology to the Lord's Prayer in the sixth of Matthew; that the Sinaitic and Vatican omit the first twelve verses in the eighth of John, containing the story of the woman taken in adultery; and that the three heavenly witnesses, 1 John, v. 7, are omitted by them all.

This does not *certainly* prove that these passages did not exist in copies written before these manuscripts—since manuscripts written later may have been copied from manuscripts written before these three. It does, however, confirm the doubts as to their genuineness which have before existed. But the English reader will perceive that all the precious doctrines remain intact and the word of God unshaken after all these researches. From the death of John the Apostle to A. D. 331 was a narrow time for Christianity to have arisen and its documents to have come into existence by any *human* device—a narrower breadth of time than from this hour back to the settlement of Virginia, or than to the landing of the pilgrims at Plymouth Rock, but little more, indeed, than to the first settlement of Charleston. But this is not the place to pursue this argument. This fact, however, of the early existence of the New Testament Scriptures. and the evidence this very manuscript exhibits that it was copied

from others, themselves also copies in all probability, is exceedingly damaging to the theories of Eichhorn, Strauss, and Renan, as to the origin of these writings, and of all those who prefer to live in the region of mist and cloud rather than in the clear sunlight, or who, like certain tenants of the deep, hide themselves in inky darkness from the eyes of their pursuers.

The Theory of the Eldership; or the Position of the Lay Ruler in the Reformed Churches Examined. By PETER COLIN CAMPBELL, D. D., Principal of the University of Aberdeen. William Blackwood & Sons, Edinburgh and London. 1866. Pp. 109, 12mo.

The author of this little work, we suppose, must be a minister of the Established Church of Scotland; but, strange to say, we cannot find his name on their list for 1860, which might seem to show that he is young in the profession. There is, however, no lack of assurance in Dr. Campbell. His book is pervaded throughout with dogmatism and self-confidence. Evidently misapprehending the doctrine which he opposes, he disparages its defenders in the most offensive terms. And he does not scruple to claim, over and over again, "all the learned" as on his side of the question.

What this writer's side of the question is will appear from a few quotations. Speaking of the ruling elders, he says: "We have no doubt that the presbyter theory of the lay assessorship, apart from the injury done by it in other respects to the cause of the Reformed polity, has hampered and paralysed the very institution which it might be supposed to strengthen." (P. 63.) "While styled presbyters, they are inconsistently but most happily viewed, by themselves and for the most part by others, as what they really are—laymen to all intents and purposes, identified with their brethren in the ordinary walks of life." (P. 66.) On page 69, he objects to calling it *ordination* when a ruling elder is inducted into office, because that term is inconsistent with "the true view of their position" as "representatives of the *unordained* members of the church as distinct from its professional functionaries;" yet he is willing to have them "admit-

ted to their important duties with public prayer," and graciously says "nothing could be more proper in every point of view." With regard to their "appointment to office," he maintains that the practice "usual in the Church of Scotland" is the right one. This is "coöptation,"—that is, "selection by the existing session" at their pleasure. Like a true and genuine Scotch *moderate*, Dr. Campbell argues stoutly against the people being allowed any share in electing the men to be placed in office over them. (Pp. 69–72.) Still, he declares that he does not wish to "weaken the position and influence of the lay element in the church." (P. 62.) The "association of the laity with the ministers of the word and sacraments in ecclesiastical councils is both just and expedient." "Lay councillors or rulers" is a "valuable institution." (Pp. 1, 2.) It is even found "in Scripture," according to Dr. Campbell, where "governments" are mentioned," and where "brethren" are expressly conjoined with the apostles (page 5); but 1 Tim. v. 17 must by no means be applied to them.

These extracts and statements sufficiently define the position of our author. The ruling elder is not a true and proper presbyter, but only a lay assessor. Presbyter is synonymous with *preacher*, and must not be applied to this "official." There is "a fallacy lurking in the designation *elder* and in the term *ordination*," as applied to them. (P. 108.) *Lay assessor* or *lay elder* is the right name, for he is purely and simply a layman admitted to the church courts as a matter of mere convenience or civility. These courts are not bodies of rulers, but *assemblies of clergymen*, where ruling elders have no seat by *right* of office.

There are multitudes in the Presbyterian bodies of the Northern States to whom the views of this writer would be altogether acceptable—Dr. Hodge, of Princeton, being one of them. There are some also in our own Church, men of eminent worth and great influence, who would not reject our author as the exponent of their views. The great majority of our ministers and elders, however, we are persuaded, consider the opinions of Dr. Campbell *semi-prelatic*—tending to set up a hierarchy of clergymen amongst us and to vacate entirely the ruling office in

the Church. They would tell our author to cease his vain endeavor throughout his little book to establish the government of the Church of Christ upon the basis of the authority of any names of men. They would tell him to go at once to the New Testament and find the Apostle Paul describing in full two office-bearers, and only two, viz., the presbyter (or bishop or elder) and the deacon; and then also find him afterwards, in the same Epistle to Timothy, dividing the order of presbyters into two classes—one ruling, the other ruling and also teaching. This is a short and a sufficient, though far from a full and complete, demonstration from Scripture of the ruling elder's authority and of Dr. Campbell's utter misconception of the Scripture doctrine on that subject.

It is very amusing to observe how differently writers are sometimes estimated in different hemispheres. Dr. Campbell ridicules Dr. Miller, of Princeton, for example, for his views on the ruling eldership, and in various forms sets forth his utter want of respect for the great Princeton teacher. "Dr. Miller, begging the question as he so often does, styles the session 'the parochial presbytery.'" (Page 80.) We have slightly inverted our author's language, but not altered the sense at all. "Miller views with great self-complacency his own picture of a primitive 'Church,' presided over by a bishop and a 'bench of ruling elders.'" (P. 76.) "Miller assumes in the most extraordinary manner," * * * and overlooks "the absurd consequences which must follow from his view." * * * "In this double begging of the question—unheard of, we believe, till his time—he has been followed by one or two popular writers." (P. 9.) "Miller, in the introduction to his singularly illogical essay," etc. (P. 51.) "Miller naïvely adds," etc. (P. 8.) We hardly can believe it is our own venerable father whom Dr. Campbell is thus disparaging. But then we remember that Dr. Miller taught that very "presbyter theory" of the eldership which our author first misunderstands and then rejects, and our amazement lessens. We turn back to Dr. Campbell's book and read (p. 52) that the publication of Dr. Miller's treatise led to others on the opposite side, and the author signalizes three of these in par-

ticular, calling them "the most eminent defenders of Presbyterianism who have appeared in America since that time." And whom does the reader expect now to hear named in terms of such high praise by this Scotch *moderate* professor? What opponents of Dr. Miller are these, whose treatises were written in consequence of the errors he promulgated? The first named is the able but eccentric and very *un*-Presbyterian Dr. J. P. Wilson, of Philadelphia. The second is Albert Barnes. The third is Dr. Smyth, of Charleston. *Risum teneatis, amici?*

It is also very significant that Dr. Campbell is a great admirer of Dr. George Hill, of St. Andrews, as a good Presbyterian authority, who was leader of the moderate party in the Established Church of Scotland just about one century ago; and also of Dr. Hill's contemporary and a predecessor of our author at Aberdeen, the celebrated Dr. George Campbell, who was also of the *moderates*, though less decidedly than many.

It is still further significant that our author much admires Grotius, the Erastian and Latitudinarian; also, that he insists upon the authority of the Westminster Form of Government as not only having been adopted by the Church of Scotland, (we all know that was under great pressure of public necessity, so called,) but as being in itself, *in all respects*, worthy of the highest consideration by Presbyterians; whereas it is well known that the only thorough-going Presbyterians in that venerable and theologically orthodox Assembly were the few commissioners from the Church of Scotland, and that the Formulary they united on was on some points a compromise of genuine Scripture doctrine with Prelacy and Independency both.

Yet further it signifies much respecting the real character of such views as our author maintains that he calls Beza and Melville "stiff dogmatists on church government" (p. 40); and Gillespie and James Guthrie, the martyr, "rigid theorists." P. 24. Nay, he insists that the Second Book of Discipline is of no weight in the Church of Scotland, (p. 39, note,) which certainly amounts to the confession that that Second Book is against his views, while some who hold his views amongst us have loudly and pertinaciously insisted that the Second Book was on

their side! But perhaps the most significant thing of all is his "deep regrets that the illustrious Calvin" maintained this doctrine, and used 1 Tim., v. 17, to support it. P. 4. And yet Dr. Campbell so far forgets himself afterwards as to make the astounding declaration that the doctrine he combats "originated" in the overstraining and misapplying Lord Chancellor King's and Dr. George Campbell's views! P. 81. How could King and Campbell's views, whether overstrained or not, have originated a doctrine which yet John Calvin had maintained before them, to say nothing of the inspired apostles?

Studies in English; or, Glimpses of the Inner Life of our Language. By M. SCHELE DE VERE, LL. D., Professor of Modern Languages in the University of Virginia. Second Edition. New York: Charles Scribner & Co., 654 Broadway. 1867.

No one at all acquainted with the University of Virginia, and its able corps of professors, needs to be told that Dr. Schele De Vere is one of the most competent teachers of the Modern Languages in the United States. Those who have had access to his study, (with its rare books and *proof-engravings*, and the delights of its fine, yet unobtrusive European aroma,) are further aware, that Professor Schele De Vere is a perfect adept in the use of our own and many other tongues, regarded as *spoken* dialects. It was to be expected, that such an expert as this, whose casual contributions to the magazines and other organs of ephemeral thought, had shown him to be capable of wielding a graceful pen, and had gained him an American reputation in the department of *belles lettres*, should give the world something valuable also in the department of philology. His former work on Comparative Grammar was too slight and tentative an effort to fulfil this expectation but in part; but in the treatise now under review, he has done more. He has given us the most popular, and not the least exact, of all the many books which have appeared lately on the subject of General Etymology and the Science of Language, or specifically on the English Language, and, at the same time, has enlarged and embellished our

store of permanent and agreeable fire-side reading. No recent work, touching however lightly on "the new science," the Indo-European group, and especially on the English—with the single exception, possibly, of Trench; not Marsh; not Whitney; not Max Müller—has produced so entertaining a volume, if estimated by the standard of the public tastes. It does not pretend to be wholly or chiefly original, but it is sufficiently copious and thorough-going; and it is as charmingly garrulous as a book of travels or anecdotes, and as merry withal as a marriage bell. It would be worth getting if it were only for the quotations, which are judiciously introduced from the best English authors, and the pleasant, gossipy way in which they are served up. One would never suspect that the author was a foreigner. Dr. Schele De Vere is a rare master of colloquial English; and one charm of this book is, that the style is not at all heavy or stilted. In one instance, and one only, we fancied we detected the idiom of the continent of Europe, but it was so immaterial a point that it has escaped us; and it was evident to us at the time we read it that it may have been a misprint. We cannot more fittingly close this notice, than by appending a few extracts from the interesting volume of Professor Schele De Vere. Before doing so, we would merely say, that the volume is one of Scribner's exquisite, creamy, crown octavos, and is comprised in 350 pages.

Here is a good story, well told. It will be found on p. 136 *et seq.*

"The Taylors, in the same way, are apt to become *Tayleurs*, of whom Mr. Lower tells the following good story: A Mr. Tayleur, who had been thus modified, asked a farmer somewhat haughtily the name of his dog. The answer was, 'Why, sir, his proper name is Towler, but since he's a consequential kind of a puppy we call him Towleure.' If Plato was right in recommending parents to give happy names to their children, because the minds, actions, and successes of men, depended not on their genius and fate only, but also on their names, then we can certainly not blame those who desire to rid themselves of an ill-omened name. They may remember what befel the unlucky princess of Spain, whose name cost her a throne. For when the good King Philip, of France, had determined to seat a queen by

his side, he sent ambassadors to his neighbor the King of Spain, and gave them license to choose one of his own daughters for their sovereign. They were struck with the beauty of the elder sister, and decided among themselves, that, both on account of her age and her charms, she should be a fit bride for their master. But of a sudden their opinion was changed. They had been informed that the beauty was called *Uracca*; whilst her younger and less attractive sister's name was *Blanca*. That name of *Uracca* destroyed all other charms; they gave up their own preference and led the younger princess back with them to rule over France. History has more than one such answer to the oft-quoted 'what's in a name?' Perhaps parents would be more guarded in naming their children, if they thought how much more pleasing *Mary*, *Anna*, and *Lucy* sound, even to the uneducated ear, than barbarous *Barbara*, the little bear *Ursula*, or the heathen *Apollonia*, to say nothing of American eccentricities.

"It is not too much to say, that men might possibly even guard their names more jealously from every stain and bad repute, if they gave more attention to their meaning and their history. But as we have, unfortunately, little to say when our names are given us, we ought at least be permitted to change them when they are too atrocious and prove intolerable burdens. First names can generally be hidden under mysterious initials, but the family name asserts its rights, and may prejudice all the world against the unfortunate owner.

"We cannot help sympathising, therefore, with poor Mr. *Death*, of Massachusetts, who petitioned the legislative body of his State to change his name to *Dickinson*, and we do so all the more because malicious fate would have it that the member who presented his petition was a Mr. *Graves*. A Mr. *Wormwood* supported his more ambitious desire to assume the name of *Washington*, by the argument that 'no member of taste would oppose his request,' and that 'the intense sufferings of so many years of wormwood existence, deserved the compensation of a great and glorious name.'"

The following is taken from p. 178 :

"It is more curious, however, to observe, that here the language has made a singular, which originally did not exist. The word was first *peas*, from the French '*pois*.' Spenser says, in his '*Shepherd's Calendar*' for the month of October. 'Nought worth a *peas*;' and Puttenham has,

'Set shallow brooks to surging seas.
An oriental pearl to a white *peas*.'

“Our singular *pea* is formed upon a misconception of *peas* being a plural; like the blunder of the good mayor of a town, who was so deeply impressed with his own dignity, that he always spoke of a ‘*claw* of Parliament;’ and the poet Holmes’s humorous expression of the ‘one-hoss *shay*.’ Many an ignorant countryman still uses *Chinee* as the singular of Chinese; and Milton, in his ‘*Paradise Lost*,’ (III. 437,) sins in the opposite direction, when he says :

‘But in his ways lights on the barren plains
Of Sericana, where Chineses drive
With sails and winds their cany wagons light.’”

The last words we shall extract are from the introductory remarks of the first chapter :

“Ἄρθρον ἀρακτὶν ἐκ λόγων ἡρωϊκῶν.—OLD COMEDY.

“The youngest of all European idioms, our great and noble language has yet spread farthest over the globe, and now rules the world without a rival. More than fifty millions of men, forming the most enterprising race upon earth, speak it as their native and only tongue. The elder cousin, staid, precise, and settled, uses it at home in his counting-room; the younger, bold and adventurous, carries it with him as he roves through the wide world. It has long since become the great instrument of European culture, superseding the Latin, which was once as general, though used mainly by the scholar and the churchman; and the French, the language of courts and the higher circles of the continent. Even in the early days of Queen Elizabeth, the gentle Daniel, the Atticus of his age, foresaw its future greatness, and sang :

‘Who knows whither we may vent
The treasure of our tongue? To what strange shores
This gain of our best glory may be sent
T’ enrich unknowing nations with our stores?
What worlds in the yet unformed Occident
May come refined with accents that are ours!’

“The prophecy has come true. And wherever on this wide earth man may meet, in the merchant’s busy marts, or on the prairies and pampas of America, amid the Nomadic tribes of Asia, or in the mysterious heart of the land of Ham, ice-bound in Polar regions or becalmed under the tropics—everywhere they may hear words familiar to their ear and dear to their heart. For our good English has become the language of the world; and strong with the colonist, cunning with the merchant, and bring-

ing the blessings of the gospel with the missionary, it promises soon to spread the benefits of civilisation, and the glory of God, over the whole earth."

The Life and Epistles of St. Paul. By the Rev. W. J. CONYBEARE, M. A., Late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and the Rev. J. S. HOWSON, M. A., Principal of the Collegiate Institute, Liverpool. The only complete and unabridged edition. Two volumes in one. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1869. One volume octavo, containing 547 pages.

The appearance of two abridged and incomplete editions of the original work, has occasioned the reissue, by an American house, of the unabridged *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*. The print is good, and the general air of the page is that of Kendrick's *Olshausen*. The entire text, and all the notes of the complete London edition, together with the maps and illustrations, many of which are omitted from the editions referred to, are said to be given in this volume. If this claim be indeed made out, Scribner's unabridged edition is manifestly superior even to Howson's own abridgment. It professes, moreover, to be the only complete and unabridged edition of the English work that has been published in this country.

Of the invaluable labors of Conybeare and Howson themselves, the chief of which have been upon the *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, we need not say one encomiastic word. The book has become one of our religious classics. The idea of writing the life of the Apostle of the Gentiles, on a large scale, and somewhat in the discursive and descriptive style of modern biography, was a most happy one, and has been on the whole successfully realised. Some of the chapters, especially some of the earlier ones by Howson, are worthy of the epithet magnificent. Other chapters do not flow so picturesquely and easily, but are able and profound in their historical and antiquarian discussions, and are greatly enriched by copious and learned notes, by diagrams, by maps, by multitudinous references, and by wood engravings. Nearly every chapter is permeated by the flavor of Roman or Greek literature, annals, and manners, and many a

one is adorned by the beauty of the Oriental or Mediterranean landscape. Some of the pictures in the splendid London edition of Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans, 1854, are enchantingly fine, and the result of the highest kind of work in stone or steel. The ordinary wood-cuts are exactly copied in the American edition, and we have the beautiful prints, under tissue paper, imitated as well as possible, and reproduced in this rich volume. The historico-biographical parts are not only good but masterly.

We have always preferred the chapters written by Howson. to those which proceeded from the pen of his colleague; though had there been no Howson, Conybeare would stand without a rival. We doubted moreover the feasibility of carrying out so complex a plan as that of a biography and commentary under the same covers; and have surmised that separate works by the two authors respectively would perhaps have been better. Samuel Johnson has spoken of the intrinsic difficulty of men clubbing together for purposes of authorship, and with intent to make the same book. If men do join for this object, certainly two authors are better than three, or more; and the history of literature affords several happy examples of that kind of writing. The names of Beaumont and Fletcher are notable instances; but others almost equally familiar will at once rise in the mind of the reader. There is something beautiful in the sight of these learned, or otherwise gifted pairs: moving through the literary firmament like double stars; as inseparable as the Siamese twins; and associated as indissolubly in the fancy and memory as Orestes and Pylades, Damon and Pythias, Palamon and Arcite, or even Pyramus and Thisbe. In such companionship are likely to live the names of Conybeare and Howson. We have said we like Howson's work best. It is but fair to add, that this may be due to the fact that Conybeare has had the more rugged parts of the field to till. Whatever may be thought of his comparative excellence in that field, the interpretation of Paul's doctrines and writings that is contained in this volume is by no means equal to the interpretation of Paul's life. The commentary furnished is, indeed, eminently

scholarlike and able, but too often superficial, fanciful, inadequate, or erroneous. The scholar is everywhere to be seen; the man of profound, nice, and varied erudition; the historian, the geographer, and even the poet; but not the exogete.

We sum up, however, by saying that the architecture of these two master-builders is noble, and will be enduring. Founded upon a basis of immoveable marble, the bright structure rises in columns of white, classic purity, that terminate in chapters of Corinthian luxuriance, and are surmounted by a faultless entablature—architrave, frieze, and cornice—of fine material and exquisite proportions. It is our deliberate judgment, that in the *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, not only has the Church received one of the most valuable contributions made in our time to her store of evangelical treasure and literary spoil; but the world at large has witnessed one of the most redoubtable achievements that has lately been attempted in one of the most hazardous and delicate departments of that branch of human effort, calling for knowledge, and perspicacity, for intellectual comprehension, for a vivid sense of truth and beauty, for balance of mind, taste, refinement, art, and skill. We heartily commend this book to our impoverished Southern ministers, as being not only pious, learned, brilliant, and elegant, and very useful, but also cheap. In cloth, it is only three dollars.

Pivot Words of Scripture. By the Rev. PHILIP BENNETT POWER, M. A., Author of the "I Wills" of the Psalms, "I Wills" of Christ, etc. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 530 Broadway, N. Y. 1869. Pp. 353.

There is a flavor of affectation about the title and the plan of this book, which puts it at a disadvantage. It sets the reader to looking for pretension and affectation in the treatment of the subjects; but he will not find it.

The "pivot words" are those small conjunctions and adverbs which not only complete but (under the circumstances) modify the sentence in which they occur. "And," "but," "ere," "whence," "yet," are taken as such words here, and in some cases at least have an unforced significance well worthy the time

and thought expended upon them. In others, the justness and relevancy are not so clear.

It is simple justice, however, to Mr. Power, emphatically to commend that habit of minute study of the word, of which he is here the example and advocate. Few are the *readers* of the Bible; and they are many who *skim* over it! To gather the vaguest general idea of the drift of the passage, is all that most attempt, or are in the habit of believing possible; whereas—knowing that God spake *all* these words, and that a God whose wonders are as great in the microscopic physical world as in the telescopic cannot have put his word together carelessly, and that the test of a builder is in his joinings—we ought diligently to scrutinize all parts and members of his gracious message, sure that there are treasures every where. It was Luther who taught us that “there is a certain vehemency in the pronouns;” but the lesson need not stop there.

We take pleasure in commending the simple good sense,—one of the rarest of gifts,—the familiarity with Scripture, the aptness of quotation, and the freshness, fitness, and wisdom of the lessons deduced. Occasionally there is an over-refinement—as in Section IV., on Psalm lxviii. 13: “Though ye have lien among the pots, yet shall ye be as the wings of a dove covered with silver, and her feathers with yellow gold.” Here the general contrast is well drawn between the disfiguration of the humbled and the beautiful joy of the delivered believer; but descending into details, Mr. P. makes the dove symbolize purity, acceptance, lowliness in self, helplessness in self; and then the wings of the dove are taxed to set forth “a combination of beauties,” “a combination of treasure and value,” “the power of dazzling reflexion,” (shining holiness,) “power of flight,” (*i. e.*, soaring upward out of worldliness,) and “enjoyment of a pure atmosphere.” Forcing too much out of a passage weakens the whole commentary.

This fault, however, we are careful to repeat, does by no means pervade the book, much of which is replete with valuable and suggestive remark. Many of the illustrative incidents are good in themselves and apt to the theme.

We subjoin two or three extracts, as fair examples of its interest and worth :

“Observe, all this must be a *willing service*. ‘Gird *thyself*’ are the words which God speaks to his people. And this opens out before us, in a moment, the great truth that it is a willing service that God requires. * * *

“There died, many years ago, in the small parish of St. L——, a little old man whose name was William W——. Poor old W—— was bent double; he walked on two sticks, and with his sharp nose and chin almost meeting, and his shovel hat, he presented an appearance not easily forgotten.

“In the little parish of St. L——, there was no place of worship, and the cripple, as well as many aged people, found it impossible to reach the neighboring church of All S——. At length, the preaching of the word came down to the little parish of St. L——. A curate, provided by the Pastoral Aid Society, came to preach there on Tuesday evenings, and commenced his ministry, for the want of a better place, in the tap-room of a public house! There he preached, and, blessed be God! the tap-room was full, and we wish that every tap-room could be turned to as good account. Those were happy evenings to minister and people; there was a warmth about them that was better than all the forms and ceremonies in the world; even now, though many years have passed, we can recall the earnest faces and the hearty singing of working men and women and girls, come from the factories just as they were—the tap-room congregation of St. L——.”

The work so prospered that it became necessary to build a church :

“That was a long and weary work; but, blessed be God, it was done at last, and the Lord crowned it with his blessing.

“Amongst those who earnestly watched the progress of the building was our poor crippled friend, William W——. Little had he to give; if he had had a purse as large as his heart, he would have built the place at his own expense. But he did what he could. He did what we want you, our poor readers, to do, viz., *what he could*. The old man’s heart was right; and ‘where there’s a will, there’s a way.’

“As the walls of the new building rose, the autumn came on, and the old tree shook its leaves into the inner space, round which they chased each other as they were driven by the blast of the bitter wind. The poor old man, who could not lift a hoe

or brick, could at least drive out these intruders; and there, in that roofless building, was he to be seen carrying away the decaying leaves in his old shovel hat. It was a touching sight to see that aged cripple at his humble work—humble in the sight of man, but acceptable and honorable in the sight of God; for it was *a work and labor of love.*”

Before the church was completed, in the triumphs of faith “the old man died; and there were produced from his well-worn shoes two little packets containing two pence each—his savings to lay on the plate at the opening of the new room.” Pp. 223–226.

We would especially commend the wisdom of the following extract:

“Another lesson we learn here, which is, *not to be afraid of setting before men the highest motives.* It might have been thought enough to have said to the reformed thief (Eph. iv. 28), ‘How much safer it is for you to earn honest bread than to lead a life of crime! * * * Moreover, consider what an uncertain provision you had; you never knew from one day to another where you could procure your daily bread. Think, also, how you must have been looked upon; how you could have no society but that of your criminal companions; and give up this bad, thieving life, and for your own sake become an honest man.’ All this is very true, and all these motives deserve to have their proper weight; * * * but we find something in advance of all this—something above self-interest; he is to get, not only to have, but to give; he is to be swayed by a law of Christian love higher than the law of self, which is the highest law that the carnal heart recognises and obeys.

“Surely, this is not only very wonderful, but also very suggestive. Does it not distinctly teach us the wisdom and the value of a high standard? Does it not say to us, ‘Do not be afraid to try and lift man out of himself; there are forces in the spiritual kingdom more potent than those of the natural kingdom; * * * use them, and look to God for success?’

“We may be persuaded that the higher the motive power we use, the less danger there will be of a relapse.” Pp. 245, 246.

A golden sentence, and one that bears profoundly upon the reformatory schemes and associations which characterise the ago.

We repeat our endorsement of the book as practical and val-

uable; sometimes a little carelessly written, but generally sound, forcible, and wholesome.

The Public Worship of God: its Authority and Modes, Hymns and Hymn Books. By JAMES GIBSON, A. M., D. D., Professor of Systematic Theology and Church History, Free Church College, Glasgow. London: James Nisbet & Son. Edinburgh: D. Grant. Glasgow: T. Murray & Son. 1869. Pp. 175, 12mo.

The author of this book is known to us as one of the most prominent opposers of the union now under negotiation betwixt the Free Church to which he belongs, and the United Presbyterian Church. A coadjutor of Dr. Begg, he has stood up very earnestly, though we do not think very ably, and not very successfully, against Drs. Buchanan, Rainy, and Candlish. His main object in the present work is to insist on the unlawfulness of using human compositions in the praise of God. We feel compelled to characterise his production as loose in argument as well as style. It is a very feeble exhibition of the subject, and not much calculated to aid the cause advocated. One great defect of it, is, that the writer gives us no solid scripture proof of his doctrine. His method is to attack the employers of hymns, and endeavor to demolish their position; but what we wanted was to hear him set forth strongly his own side. It is, we conceive, a positive and not a negative argument which becomes those who would deny our liberty to sing uninspired words to the praise of God. Let them tell us why it is not lawful to sing such songs of praise. But Dr. Gibson spends his time and strength in assailing the arguments of those opposed to him. And we must add, that his assault is made in the most scattering sort of way, and is languid in the extreme. There is a note C at the end of the volume, embracing only four and a half pages, and consisting of a condensed summary of answers to arguments for the use of hymns, taken from the "Rev. R. J. Dodd's Reply to Morton," which appears to us to be worth more for Dr. Gibson's side of the argument than the whole of his book.

I. With reference to the doctrine of this book, we are very

free to say that we heartily agree with the author in the principle, that every thing which can be used legitimately in the worship of God's house, must be a thing prescribed. But in the case under consideration, the thing prescribed is singing praise to him with the human voice according to what he has revealed to us regarding his perfections and his works. The thing prescribed is not singing only and always the Psalms of David. That is the point Dr. Gibson should have established on strong scriptural grounds, but did not. It can not be that the Psalms of David are prescribed to be our only book of praise, because,

1. Many of them are not suitable for use in the Christian Church, any more than many of the directions given in the book of Leviticus. There are not a few of the Psalms which call on us to worship God with bloody sacrifices, with cymbals and harps and dances, all which are abolished remnants of temple worship.

2. New Testament light must be allowed to shine for New Testament believers in psalmody, as well as in prayer and preaching. If the Psalms is "the best of prayer-books, as well as the best of hymn-books," which Dr. Gibson very properly maintains, then his argument should be as strong against free praying as free praising. But the idea is that prayer expresses only our wants which we are perfectly able to make known, while praise declares God's glory, which we are incompetent to set forth. Now we submit, that mankind are no more qualified without the teaching of the Spirit to pray than they are to praise. And in point of undeniable fact, we are taught to do both as well in the New Testament as in the Old. John and Paul may certainly be followed by us, both in the matter of prayer and of praising God, as well as David. It is, we apprehend, a narrow view which would insist that all the New Testament writings are to be of no use to us in the one duty, but only of use to us in the other. These are correlative duties always.

We think what Dr. Gibson approvingly quotes from Dean Stanley to set forth the reverence in which all churches ought to hold the Psalms, might have a bearing on his own position that would not be altogether complimentary. The Dean is quoted

thus: "In the most barbarous of churches, the Abyssinians treat the Psalter almost as an idol, and sing it through from end to end at every funeral." We can not reverence God's word too highly, but we may be said, perhaps, to make an idol of a portion of it, if we unduly exalt that over every other portion of the same divine volume.

3. Dr. Gibson and his brethren do not give us David's Psalms, but they give us Rouse. They no more sing the inspired Psalms, than we who make use of the version of Watts. Their argument admits not of degrees of conformity to the songs of the Spirit, but calls for those very songs themselves, which surely Rouse's are not.

And the reason why they like Rouse so much, while other Presbyterians do not like him, is simply use and non-use. Sir Walter Scott (quoted by Dr. Gibson) says well, after speaking of the homely and rude, but plain, forcible, intelligible, and majestic style of Rouse, which perhaps would be ill-exchanged for mere elegance, that their antiquity strikes the imagination and influences the feelings: "These are the very words and accents of our early Reformers, sung by them in woe and gratitude in the fields, in the churches, and on the scaffold. The parting with this very association of ideas is a serious loss to the cause of devotion, and scarce to be incurred without the certainty of corresponding advantage. But if these recollections are valuable to persons of education, they are almost indispensable to the edification of the lower ranks, whose prejudices do not permit them to consider as the words of inspired poetry the versions of living or modern poets, but persist, however absurdly, in identifying the original with the ancient translation." Here we have the secret of the whole matter. It is antiquity; it is imagination; it is association of ideas; it is the notion that Rouse is the original and divine, and all other versions human. We cannot like Rouse, for we have our most sacred and delightful associations all with Watts. But Dr. Gibson, for the like reasons, cannot abide any version but Rouse. And yet Watts and Rouse are both mere versions—mere human translations of the divine Psalms of David.

4. The Psalms do not give us "the sweet name of Jesus." But we will not enlarge on this important point. Dr. Gibson essays to meet this objection to his views, but fails, we think, very signally.

We cherish a warm regard and the highest respect for our brethren of the Associate Reformed Synod of the South, and we earnestly desire now, as heretofore, that our Church may be strengthened by a union with them. This question of an inspired psalmody is what divides them from us. But it is not this which originated their separation from the Established Church of Scotland. Nor was close communion the question upon which that separation occurred. Upon both those points the Church which they left was at one with them and they with her. If we do not greatly mistake, they left the establishment upon the question of *patronage*. This, then, is the basis upon which their separate church existence stands, and upon this basis we are altogether at one with them. And now cut off as they would be from all the Scotch Presbyterian Churches as thoroughly as we ourselves, because of our common views of slavery, it impresses us strongly as a matter much to be regretted that we should be practically unchurched by them, where there is so much to unite us, upon simply the question of our liberty to sing uninspired hymns. Unchurched and cut off by many of our brethren of the Presbyterian faith on both sides of the Atlantic, they and we seem to us to be called, in the providence of God, to consider afresh, whether there might not be a closer union betwixt our suffering communions. If we cannot accept their ideas respecting an inspired psalmody, can they not exercise forbearance with men so closely allied upon all the main points to themselves, and in common with themselves cut off from the sympathies of their and our brethren?

II. We agree very fully with Dr. Gibson in regard to the poverty and meanness of much of our modern current hymnology. The authorship of many of these hymns is enough to condemn their use. "In the Book of the General Association of Connecticut, hymns of Bryant, Pierpont, Bowring, Hemans. Martineau's collection, Pope. Sir Walter Scott. Tom Moore. are

all found. In the New School Presbyterian Assembly's Book, *Tom Moore holds an honorable place*, as he does in the book of the Old School General Assembly, and *Nettleton's Village Hymns.*" P. 86. "On the other hand, it cannot be denied that human hymns have been and still are largely made use of to promote the sectarian views of parties holding Arminian, Tractarian, and other heretical and unsound views. * * * But what is the proposed remedy? To substitute others of their own for whose superiority or soundness in the faith, there neither is, nor can be, any permanent security; and these again to be superseded when a new party springs up in the march of real or supposed progress," etc. P. 89. Dr. G. dwells on "the absurdity of expecting that any set of human hymns, selected by any party prevailing for the time being, can ever satisfy for any length of time any other party that springs up." P. 98. "Every denomination has its peculiar system of hymns. Every new schism produces some change in the songs sung in religious exercises. Every new phase of doctrine * * * * makes its appearance in the shape of new hymns." P. 140.

The author's object is to show "the utter hopelessness of making any collection of hymns for the public worship of God which will not bear the stamp of human weakness; of the peculiar prejudices, feelings," and even errors of the compilers; and to prove thus the necessity of our being confined to the book of inspired Psalmody. See pp. 157-8. We reject his inference, which might as well be made regarding our poor, miserable attempts at praying. We insist upon the liberty which we have in Christ. Yet we admit in full Dr. Gibson's allegations against hymns and hymn-books in general, and deplore their numerous faults and manifest imperfections.

Notes Critical and Explanatory on the Psalms. By ALBERT BARNES. In three volumes. Volumes II. and III. Harper & Brothers. 1869.

We noticed the first volume of this commentary in our April number. We simply chronicle the issue from the press of the two remaining volumes. Mr. Barnes's labors have been per-

formed in a different branch of the Presbyterian family from ours. But his life has been one of self-denying industry, and he has placed before the people at large, in a popular form, the labors of others digested through the alembic of his own mind.

“Here I close my exposition of this Book,” he says, “and with it all that I purpose or expect to prepare in attempting to furnish a commentary on the Holy Scriptures. The volumes which I have prepared have occupied me daily, almost without intermission, for nearly forty years of my life; and now, at sixty-eight years of age, and with the diminished power of vision with which it has pleased God to afflict me, I can hope to attempt no more. More than a generation has passed away while I have been engaged in these labors.”

“Mr. Gibbon has thought proper to record the precise day and hour in which he concluded his ‘Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire.’ ‘I have presumed,’ he says, ‘to mark the moment of conception: I shall now commemorate the hour of my final deliverance. It was on the day, or rather night, of the 27th of June, 1787, between the hours of eleven and twelve, that I wrote the last lines of the last page, in a summer-house in my garden. After laying down my pen, I took several turns in a *berceau* or covered walk of acacias, which commands a prospect of the country, the lake, and the mountains. The air was temperate, the sky was serene, the silver orb of the moon was reflected from the waters, and all nature was silent. I will not dissemble the first emotions of joy on the recovery of my freedom, and, perhaps, the establishment of my fame. But my pride was soon humbled, and a sober melancholy was spread over my mind, by the idea that I had taken an everlasting leave of an old and agreeable companion, and that whatever might be the future fate of my history, the life of the historian might be short and precarious.’ * * I am conscious of similar emotions, as I bring to a close this long series of works, designed to illustrate the Bible.”

“I cannot lay down my pen at the end of this long task without feeling that with me the work of life is nearly over. Yet I could close it at no better place than in finishing the exposition of *this* Book; and the language with which the Book of Psalms itself closes seems to me to be eminently appropriate to all that I have experienced. All that is past—all in the prospect of what is to come—call for a long, a joyful, a triumphant HALL-
LULIAH.”

Illustrated Library of Wonders. Thunder and Lightning.
By W. DE FONVIELLE: Translated from the French, and
Edited by T. L. PHIPSON, Ph. D., F. C. S., etc. Illustrated
with thirty-nine engravings on wood. New York: Charles
Scribner & Co. 1869. Red muslin with gilded back. Duo-
decimo. One volume. \$1.50.

This is one of the most entertaining and laughable books of the season. It is made up of two elements—*anecdotes* and what the University of Virginia has long since denominated “curling.” It is famous reading for a hot summer afternoon, and infuses so much scientific and jocular enthusiasm as to make one quite intrepid even in actual presence of “a cloud.” The alleged facts, many of them, resemble the accounts of Munchausen; but truth is stranger than fiction, and we repose the same implicit faith in them that we do in Gordon Cumming. But if the matter of the book is good and fresh, the manner is in the last degree sensational. This is partly owing to the Parisian vivacity of the author, and partly to the innumerable Gallicisms of the translator—who, however, can write very tolerable English of his own, and seems to be *au fait* on all the correlated forces. M. de Fonvielle’s writings are said to have attracted much notice on the continent of Europe. The work now under review is in great part a digest of that inexhaustible repository, Poggendorf’s *Annalen*. The redaction is fortunately in the “spread-eagle” style. M. de Fonvielle is a classical scholar, and touches upon the well-known passages in Lucan, Virgil, *et al.* He does full justice to Franklin, and honors Professor Henry; but is very grudging in his references to Faraday, whom Tyndall styles “the greatest experimental philosopher of the nineteenth century.”*

The reader will thank us for the chapter titles: “A Storm on the Pyramids; Lightning and Ancient Philosophy; The Neutral Fluid; The Two Common Reservoirs; Clouds and Electricity; The Fire of St. Elmo; Mysterious Aureola; Sheet Lightning; Sparkling Clouds; Globular Lightning; Electrical Will-o’-the-Wisp; Terrestrial Water-spouts; Lightning on the

* Life of Faraday.

Ocean; Lightning Spirals: The Lightning's Budget; Natural Lightning-conductors; Storms and Earthquakes; The Voice of the Thunder; Lightning and the Cholera; What it is that Lightning Finds in the Air; Motive Power of Lightning; Fossil Lightning; The 'Pharsalia' and Lightning; What Lightning can Melt; The Thunderbolt which Struck Antrasme Church; Is it Prudent to Throw Oneself in the Water to Avoid Lightning? Will the Discharge of Cannon Prevent a Storm? The Drama of Electricity; Effect of a Walking-stick on Lightning; Can Lightning Melt a Crystal Goblet without Breaking it? Lightning and Gunpowder; Storms are not Affected by Bells; The Fish of Jupiter; Lightning and a Ship's Compass; Magnetic Mountains and Lightning; Storms at Sea; Fulguration from the Bodies of Persons Struck by Lightning; Lightning and Emperors; Advantage of having Small Feet; Dangers of Riches and Coquetry; The Small Change of Lightning; False Jupiters; Lightning as a Photographer; Keraunography; Lightning at a Distance; Captive Lightning: Of Complementary Discharges; Lightning Underground; Volta's Pistol. Lightning and Railways; Anonymous Lightning; Lightning and Electric Telegraphs; Peculiar Cases of Death from Lightning; Curious Cases of Rigidity; Medical Effects of Lightning; Chemical Effects of Lightning on Living Beings; Lightning and the Microcosm; Frightful Effects of Lightning; How did the Bird get out of the Cage? Franklin and Frederick the Great; A Few Words on the History of Lightning-conductors."

The chapters on globular lightning, sheet lightning, etc., and those on water-spouts, etc.,—indeed, those comprising the first half of the volume,—are especially novel, suggestive, spasmodic; the remaining chapters are equally incredible, more practically instructive, and less rhetorically pyrotechnic. The wood-cuts are exceedingly good—the very thing for boys and girls. One of the most powerful of these engravings represents "a murderer struck by lightning." The author thus discourses upon it in the Banvard-Panorama style: "See here an assassin approaching his victim! He has chosen a dark, stormy night; he glides noiselessly between the trees of the forest. . . . He holds

his breath whilst he draws his murderous weapon and raises it to strike his fellow-creature. . . . At this moment, a brilliant flash of lightning illuminates the scene. An involuntary shriek escapes from the wretch, whose knife is snatched from his hand, whilst his inanimate corpse is rolled in the dust by an invincible and unseen power." P. 155. What will the attentive reader say when informed "that this is a scene of pure imagination; nevertheless, it is profoundly sensational (*sic*) because (?) such a circumstance might occur naturally(!) To bring out its probability, it would be wrong to neglect any of the circumstances which render it possible." This reminds us of the showman who exhibited the sword with which Balaam killed the ass; and when reminded that Balaam did not have a sword, or kill the ass, though he may have wished for a sword for that purpose. exclaimed, "I meant to say, this was the sword *he wished for!*"

The great faults of this book are the number and abruptness of its transitions, the absence of sufficient explanation, the straining after the marvellous, the frequent infelicity of the English idiom, and the fulgurating crackle and explosiveness of the diction. It is not unfair to mention also an occasional squint towards pantheism. Its chief merits are its readableness, its rich store of incidents, its presentation of late results, its picturesque popularity, its extraordinary conciseness, its exceptional, but real, brilliancy and eloquence, and its happy mingling of true science and pleasant quackery. The following is a specimen of our author's wit: "As a cure for paralysis, a thunderbolt seems to be a sovereign remedy; but the difficulty resides in knowing how to receive a proper dose, and not an exorbitant quantity."

The Wonders of Optics. By F. MARION. Translated from the French, and Edited by CHARLES W. QUIN, F. C. S. Illustrated with seventy engravings on wood, and a colored frontispiece. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1869. Pp. 276. Duodecimo.

This is a much more cautious and temperate discussion than the one entitled "The Wonders of Lightning." It is also

every way a better book ; though it may not excite the same sensational and jocose interest. The author, M. F. Marion, holds a high official place in Paris as a man of science, and is well regarded in Europe as a popular writer on subjects connected with physical philosophy. The work is ably and adequately translated. The English idiom almost invariably replaces the French. The topics are very attractive, and are admirably handled by one who may lay claim to the honor due a vigorous and lucid thinker and good writer. The first part treats of the phenomena of vision. The successive chapters discuss the eye ; its structure ; its errors ; optical illusions ; the appreciation of color ; illusions caused by light itself ; the influence of the imagination. The second part treats of the laws of light, and the chapters take up the following points : What is light ? the solar spectrum ; other causes of color ; luminous, calorific, chemical, and magnetic properties of the spectrum ; the laws of reflexion ; mirrors ; metallic burning mirrors ; lenses ; optical instruments ; the simple and compound microscope ; the solar and photo-electric microscope ; the telescopes of Galileo, Gregory, Newton, Herschel, Lord Rosse, and Foucault. The third part is occupied with natural magic. The chapter-headings read thus : The magic lantern ; the phantasmagoria ; other optical illusions ; the properties of mirrors ; Chinese shadows ; polyorama, dissolving views, diorama ; the stereoscope ; the camera obscura and camera lucida ; the spectroscope ; spectra. the ghost-illusion."

The single aim of both author and editor seems to be to make things sure and plain ; not to produce a stare of idiotic wonder. The dish offered us is at once meat for men and milk for babes. The chapters on light, the spectrum, and the spectroscope, have interested us intensely. The explanation of the method of spectrum analysis and the vindication of its principle are, we think, even clearer than the recent and happy attempts in *Chambers's Journal*. The whole subject, especially when considered in its connections with planetary and stellar astronomy, is one of surpassing interest. The cuts are excellent, and one of them is splendid with printed color ; but the picture of the ghost is an

enigma which is unriddled by the attempted solution in the text. This book is a good preparative for Sir John Herschel's fuller treatise, and for Prof. Tyndall's biographico-electro-magnetic sketch of Faraday's career as a discoverer. How Sir Isaac Newton would open his eyes, if he could but read some of the *memoirs* of the last ten years! The instruments of science are now bringing the most distant of the stellar bodies and the most impalpable of the celestial vapors before the notice and under the scrutiny of the most casual students of nature, and indeed the merest literary loafers. We shall make a single extract from this volume; but it gives a fair taste of the whole:

“ Although most philosophers consider that there are seven colors in the spectrum, there are others who do not admit it, but assert that there are really only three,—red, yellow, and blue,—which, by the superposition of their edges, produce the intermediate hues of green and orange. Perhaps it would be nearer to the truth to say that the spectrum is composed of an infinite number of colors of different hues. We have already stated that every one of these colors is indecomposable, and that there are certain worlds illuminated by a single color only, instead of possessing the infinite number of tints enjoyed by the inhabitants of the solar system. An idea of this effect can easily be gained in a very simple but surprising manner, by inserting panes of glass of different colors in the hole of the shutter of a dark room. If the light is yellow, you will find that those objects that are capable of reflecting yellow light are colored by it, while those which are bright red or blue become almost black by absorbing the only light present. If we could procure an object which was perfectly complementary in color to the yellow glass, it would appear perfectly black. The same experiment may be repeated with the other colors. After remaining in this colored light for some time, if you suddenly pass out into daylight, the complementary color will tinge every thing around you.”

The reader of this volume will be unable to conjecture how, in consistency with the doctrine of probabilities, the hypothesis (or rather theory) which attributes the origin of light to a cause producing waves in an invisible luminiferous ether, should not be the veritable account of the matter.

**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.