

THE SOUTHERN

PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW,

CONDUCTED BY

AN ASSOCIATION OF MINISTERS

IN

COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA.

VOLUME XXI.

1870

COLUMBIA, S. C.

PRINTED AT THE PRESBYTERIAN PUBLISHING HOUSE.

1870.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Prayer Consistent with the Uniform Operation of Natural Law,	1
The Word of God,	24
Some Thoughts and some Facts concerning Domestic Missions in our Presbyteries,	37
Southern Views and Principles Not "Extinguished" by the War. By the Rev. Dr. A. W. MILLER, Charlotte, N. C.,	61
Church Property Litigation in Kentucky and Missouri,	89
Ministers' Widows and Orphans,	153
The Intermediate State. By the Rev. JAMES A. WALLACE, Clayton, Ala.,	173
Correspondence touching the Christians, between the Proconsul Pliny and the Emperor Trajan,	195
The Church and her Presbyters,	211
Editorial Comments on the Preceding Article,	226
Christ and the State. By the Rev. A. W. MILLER, D. D., Charlotte, N. C.,	233
The Literature of the South. By the Rev. THOS. B. BALCH, Prince William Co., Va.,	273
The Living Writers of the South. By Prof. M. LABORDE, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S. C.,	282
The History of Baptism. By the Rev. S. J. BAIRD, D. D., Waynesboro, Va.,	303
What is a Call to the Gospel Ministry? By the Rev. J. A. QUARLES, Lexington, Mo.,	338
Providence and Prayer,	348
A Memorial of the Rev. David Humphreys. By the Rev. JOHN MCLEES, Greenwood, S. C.,	365

The Nature of the Atonement—Why it is necessarily Vicarious. By W. L. SCOTT, Esq., Memphis, Tenn.,	381
The Life of Joseph Addison Alexander. By the Rev. Jos. R. WILSON, D. D.,	389
The General Assembly of 1870,	411
The Providence of God as Related to the Work of Redemption. By the Rev. T. D. WITHERSPOON, D. D.,	487
Giving, an Essential Part of True Piety. By the Rev. C. A. STILLMAN, D. D.,	505
The Reign of Law. By the Rev. A. F. DICKSON, New Orleans, La.,	520
Autobiography. By the Rev. THOS. B. BALCH, Prince William Co., Va.,	541
The New Church,	553
Natural Theology. By the Rev. L. G. BARBOUR, Danville, Ky.,	572

Critical Notices :

Credo, 135. Hood's Lamps, Pitchers, and Trumpets, 140. Plumer's Earnest Hours, 142. Smith's Student's Scripture History. The Old Testament History from the Creation to the return of the Jews from Captivity, 143. Guizot's Great Christians of France: St. Louis and Calvin, 144. Dale's Inquiry into the usage of ΒΑΠΤΙΣΜΑ, and the nature of Judaic Baptism, as shown by the Jewish and Patristic Writings, 294. Reynolds's New Pictorial Reader's, 300. DePressense's Religion and Reign of Terror, 459. Washburn's Reminiscences of the Indians, 470. Innes's Laws of Creeds in Scotland; and Moncreiff's Creeds and Churches in Scotland, 473. Inglis's Bible Text Cyclopaedia, 475. Reid's Sorrow, 476. Stephens's Constitutional View of the Late War, Vol. II., 479. D'Aubigne's History of the Reformation in Europe in the Time of Calvin, 593. Broadus's Treatise on the Preparation and Delivery of Sermons, 614. Goulbourn's Pursuit of Holiness: A Sequel to the "Thoughts on Personal Religion," intended to carry the reader somewhat further onward in the spiritual life, 615.

THE SOUTHERN
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXI.—NO. 1.

JANUARY, MDCCCLXX.

ARTICLE I.

PRAYER CONSISTENT WITH THE UNIFORM OPER-
ATION OF NATURAL LAW.

Since the occurrence of the disasters, which, in recent years, have befallen us as a people, there are not a few who have been tempted to scepticism in regard to the salutary offices which the Scriptures ascribe to prayer. Many earnest and united petitions have apparently failed to meet a favorable response, and to produce any results for good. Confident expectations, which appeared to have divine guarantees of fulfilment, have been blasted. Cherished hopes, which were founded on what seemed to be the promises of God, have been bitterly disappointed. In place of blessing, we have woe; and instead of emerging into the anticipated light of morning, we are like men who walk in the valley of the shadow of death. The pleadings of prayer, so far from having been converted into shouts of praise, have deepened into funereal lamentations, and given way to the wailings of despair. In this state of affairs, the temptation with certain minds has been a strong one, to refer the whole course of events

VOL. XXI., NO. 4—1.

to the rigid reign of natural law, to distrust the fact of a special providence, and to abandon all faith in the beneficial effects of prayer.

We propose, in this article, to consider a specious objection, professing to be based upon philosophical principles, which is but too frequently urged against the utility, the efficacy, and even the possibility, of prayer. It is contended that the world is governed by general laws which are fixed and uniform in their operation; and that therefore it is idle, if not absurd, to suppose that the petitions which may be dictated by our desires can exercise any influence upon the undeviating course of nature. No favor can be expected to be shown to individuals. Whether they pray or not, events will be the same. They must be content to have their lot assigned them under the general and impartial system of law. This objection to prayer has been forcibly and ingeniously expressed by Pope in his *Essay on Man* :

“Think we, like some weak prince, the Eternal Cause,
 Prone for his favourites to reverse his laws?
 Shall burning Etna, if a sage requires,
 Forget to thunder, and recall her fires;
 On air, or sea, new motions be imprest,
 O blameless Bethel, to relieve thy breast;
 When the loose mountain trembles from on high,
 Shall gravitation cease, if you go by?”

This is the difficulty which we purpose to examine; and it must be admitted that it possesses an apparent justification in the discoveries of science, which gives it a certain sort of weight with minds not thoroughly imbued with the doctrines of Scripture, or not convinced by their own actual experience of the incontestible benefits of prayer. We venture, however, to express the hope that an inquiry into the theory upon which the objection is founded will show, that it lacks the support even from reason which at first view it may appear to receive; that the inner testimony of God in human consciousness, and his outer testimony in his word, are not at variance with each other in regard to the necessity of prayer.

I. Let it now, in the first place, for the sake of argument, be

assumed—what, however, we are not willing to concede as a fact—that the world of nature is governed simply and purely by general laws. The first question, in the way of definition, which would arise for settlement, is, What is nature? What does it include? What is that which is stated to be the subject of this government of law? Evidently, there are comprehended in the term both departments of what is called nature—the material and the spiritual; or if that phraseology be objected to, matter and mind. In the position that the world is controlled by general laws, it must be meant that the world of matter and the world of mind are alike under the operation of this system of rule. If it be contended that mind is but matter of a finer texture and a more ethereal mould, then it is admitted that it forms no exception to the statement that nature is governed by law. If, on the other hand, it be urged that mind constitutes an exception to this enunciation, on the ground that it is essentially different from matter, and is controlled by influences which are peculiar to itself, then the position is clearly abandoned that the world is governed by *general* laws; for mind is obviously a part of the world, or of the system of nature, and those laws cannot be said to be general which do not apply to it. They would in that case be limited to a certain department of nature. They would be particular, not general. If it be granted, then, that mind, as well as matter, is a subject of this fixed and uniform government of general laws, we would call attention to the striking consideration, that man, in every age, condition, and clime, has been characterised by a conscious sense of dependence which instinctively impels him to pray. He has always been sensible of the fact that he is hemmed in and restrained by limitations of various sorts: limitations upon his faculties and powers arising from their native weakness; limitations springing from the influences exerted upon him by his fellow-men; and limitations imposed by natural circumstances which are beyond his control and which hedge him about on every hand. The conviction of weakness necessarily induces the consciousness of dependence—a consciousness sometimes manifesting itself in relation to other men, sometimes to external nature, and, most

frequently, to a power which is felt to be above men, and above nature itself. This universal sense of dependence has led very naturally to a universal disposition on the part of men to seek for help from a superior power; and we are accordingly met by the fact, that mankind in every age and country have been inclined to pray. Whatever may be the differences between them in civilisation, refinement, and learning, they are all characterised by a natural propensity to worship. Whether their religion has been of one sort or another, whether it enthrones this or that divinity, it invariably embodies the element of prayer. The Hottentot and the South-Sea Islander, as well as the Englishman and the German, offer prayer. Here, then, we are confronted by a fact of universal, or at least of well-nigh universal, existence. The completer the induction induced by observation, the stronger grows the conclusion of the universality of the phenomenon. We are therefore irresistibly impelled to the position, that if human beings are controlled by any law, they are governed by the law of conscious dependence constraining them to pray. If we are warranted in inferring the existence of a law from a wide induction of facts characterised by identity, we are justified in concluding that there is a law of prayer; for the induction upon which it is based is as extensive as the human race. We stand, then, face to face with a general law which necessitates the offering of prayer; and it devolves upon those who maintain the objection to prayer, that it is inconsistent with the operation of the general laws of nature, to explain the curious anomaly that it is rendered necessary by one of those very laws themselves. But if the fact that men pray is one of general existence, it would seem that there must be some provision made in the system of the world for meeting this fact, or human nature is a gigantic lie, and the scheme by which the world is governed is irreconcilable with itself. The latter supposition would destroy the foundation of the objection to prayer which we are considering, inasmuch as it would concede that the world is under the control of laws which are out of harmony with each other, and wanting in that relative adaptation which a general system must necessarily involve. The

hypothesis of the existence of a scheme of general laws would have to be relinquished. Even granting, then, that the world is simply governed by general laws, we are obliged to admit that the propensity to pray is the result of these laws themselves. It is not for us who maintain another theory to explain the fact, but for those who contend that prayer is inconsistent with the reign of law to adjust it to their views. It is commended to their consideration. Their attention is asked to what Professor Mansel calls "the sure instinct of prayer."

We are not unaware that it may be said, in reply to this line of argument, that the induction upon which the law of prayer is professedly founded is not as complete as it has been represented to be; that it is "ignorance" which "is the mother of devotion;" and that as men advance in the knowledge of the laws which science reveals as controlling the scheme of nature, they see the inutility and the absurdity of prayer. It must strike an impartial mind, that the spirit in which this exception is conceived is an unfair, if not an arrogant one, as it leaves out of account the fact, that some of the most illustrious expounders of scientific laws have been distinguished by habits of devotion. It will hardly be maintained with seriousness, that the prayers of such men as Newton, Locke, Bacon, Leibnitz, Pascal, and Hamilton, originated in their ignorance. Nor will it be denied that, in many cases in which men have neglected the practice, or have even opposed and ridiculed the theory of prayer, the appalling exigencies of life, and the dreadful solemnities of death, have converted neglect into petition, and sneers into supplication. It is in such circumstances that the truth comes out, that the weakness of our nature is confessed, and the conscious need of help springs instinctively to the lips in the language of earnest entreaty. Such was the case with the dying infidel who cried, "O God, if there be a God, have mercy on my soul, if I have a soul!" Speculate and theorize as we may, it is natural for men to pray for the supply of their wants and the relief of their pains. They may not always pray aright, but it is a law of their being to pray. Prayer, therefore, is not inconsistent with the laws by which the world is governed, unless it be supposed

that law is dashed against law, and nature engaged in destroying itself.

II. In the second place, it is pertinent to inquire, What *are* the laws in accordance with which the world is governed? We say, in accordance with which the world is governed; for, obviously, it may be one thing to hold that it is governed *in accordance with* law, and quite a different thing, that it is governed *by* law. In the one instance it may be intended to affirm, that the governing power is law; in the other, that the governing power is above law while it acts through it. The question being, then, what are the laws of nature?—it is but fair to admit that there is a distinction, demanded by the discussion, which is to be noticed as existing between moral and natural law. A moral law may be defined to be a rule of duty. It supposes a lawgiver of whose will it is a formal expression, binding the moral agent, as a subject of moral government, to a course of moral obedience. Now, as our nature, according to the testimony of consciousness, is partly moral, and as the laws by which it is controlled must also be in part correspondingly moral, it might fairly be insisted that a full treatment of the question would involve a consideration of moral law. In that case, as it is absurd to suppose moral rules without also supposing a lawgiver, whose will they express, and without whose power to clothe them with executive sanctions they would be mere advice, it might justly be argued that the admission of the existence of such laws embraces the acknowledgment of power lying back of them, and imparting to them all their significance. Let it, however, be conceded that this is not the aspect of law in which it enters into the present discussion; and the question recurs, what are the laws of nature? All are agreed as to the process by which we arrive at the conception of a natural law. When by a careful observation and collection of a sufficient number of particular facts which closely resemble each other, we have grouped them into unity, we denominate the generalised statement thus attained a law, and we say that the individual facts took place in obedience to this law. But is it not manifest that this is not a complete account of the occurrence of the facts? The question

at once arises, what produced the facts?—for facts are things done. What is that by which they are accomplished? It will not do to reply that they were produced by law, for law is only a generalisation of the facts. That would be equivalent to saying that the facts produced themselves. The true answer is, that they were produced by power operating in an orderly and regular manner. Natural, or physical, law is but the fixed and uniform mode in which power works to the production of results. We are, for example, accustomed to say that the solar system is governed by the law of gravitation, that many of its magnificent phenomena are produced by that law. But when we proceed to analyse the conception couched in this condensed phraseology, we are driven to the conclusion that it is not a mere abstraction, called by us the law of gravitation, which binds together the parts of that splendid system. The grand notion of power in energetic operation at once emerges. There is the force of attraction which draws worlds to worlds, and like a mighty hand holds the flying orbs to their appointed pathways through the glittering fields of space. The same thing is true of all natural laws, of animal and vegetable growth, of chemical affinity, electricity, magnetism, and others which science discloses as operating in the complicated machinery of nature. They are but the plans through which physical forces act, the moulds in which they fashion their curious and admirable results. When, therefore, it is said that the world is governed by certain laws, the meaning to be intelligible is, that it is controlled by power, which operates in regular and uniform modes in producing the facts of nature. And here, it may be remarked, as a thing deserving notice, that a discussion which has for some time been in progress in the philosophical circles of Europe, has developed the theory, which is ably sustained, that all the forces of nature are but different modifications of the same original and central force. The attraction of gravitation and chemical affinity, for instance, are but diverse manifestations of the same great force acting in different relations, and under dissimilar circumstances and conditions. This is not mentioned as affording a ground of faith, but only as indicating the interesting fact that the researches of

science tend to corroborate the doctrines of Scripture; that the utterances of nature in regard to subjects upon which she is competent to speak are not out of harmony with the oracles of revelation. God's works and God's word are the complements of each other. They constitute but one great text-book, with natural and supernatural departments, written by the same hand, and illuminated with a common glory. And he who rashly attempts to separate them into discordant volumes, will find, in the end, that he has vainly endeavored to sunder what God hath joined together by bands which no touch of man can dissolve. Deep calleth unto deep, voice answers to voice; the hymns of nature and the psalms of inspiration blend in a sublime doxology to God.

III. The inquiry now, in the third place, arises, What is this great power which produces the facts of nature? Were this a merely philosophical argument, the issue, at this stage, would have to be joined with the atheist upon the question, whether this power be that of God, or one which is inherent in nature itself. We do not feel called upon now to enter those lists. But it merits attention that it is not inconsistent with their purpose for those who urge the objection to prayer that it is rendered useless by the operation of general laws, to hold that those laws are but manifestations of a power which is divine. This is the position of the Pantheistic school. They confess the all-pervading power of God; but concede to them their doctrine of his impersonality, and you admit the impossibility of prayer. For, to all intents and purposes, God is law, and law is God; and it is the absurdest of all absurdities to suppose that prayer may be rationally offered to law. There must be a personal being who reigns, in order that prayer may be conceived as intelligible or possible; and it is alike the deliverance of reason and of Scripture, that the power which governs the world is that of an intelligent and personal God. The argument, did our limits permit, might be expanded, by which even reason establishes this fundamental principle of religion; but we must be content with a brief intimation of a single line of proof which appeals to the experience of every human being. It is derived from the testi-

mony of our own consciousness. It is true that our knowledge of the infinite God is exceedingly small, even though he has been pleased to reveal himself to us in his written word. But he has given us faculties by which we are able to apprehend somewhat of his existence and his attributes; otherwise, the idea of God would be an impossibility, and his name an unmeaning cipher. Man was originally made in the image of God, and we are able to rise to some conception of his nature and perfections from the imperfect but real analogies of our own consciousness. Were we not possessed of moral attributes, it would be impossible for us to conceive of his moral excellencies; had we no intellect, we could not apprehend him as an intelligent being; and had we no will and no conscience, we could not acknowledge him as the Almighty Ruler of the world. From our possession of these faculties, it is competent for us to infer their existence in him, although in an infinitely higher degree of perfection. In the same way, it is a legitimate process by which we infer, from our consciousness of personality, the fact of the personality of God. It is not intended to affirm that our consciousness of personality is direct and immediate. Possibly it is not. All that it is necessary to show, is, that we have a consciousness of the possession of attributes which necessitates the conviction of the fact that we are personal beings. It will not be denied that we are conscious of our individuality, of that characteristic which discriminates us from all other beings; that we are conscious of possessing intelligence, will, and conscience; in short, that we are conscious of qualities inhering in us from which the inference of our personality is necessary and immediate. This leads us to the conviction of God's personality. Although we may not be directly conscious of the fact, any more than we are directly conscious of the existence of God, we are irresistibly led to infer the divine personality, just as we are necessarily impelled, by the constitution of our minds, the admirable organism of our bodies, and the glorious order of external nature, to the inference of the divine existence. Every human being is conscious that he is different from every thing else; that what is himself, is not anything else; and that nothing else is himself. And the in-

ference is clear, that as God is a person, he is different from all other beings; that God is not the universe, and the universe is not God. All things were created by him; and "in him they live and move and have their being;" but they are not he, and he is not they. This must be so, or we are greater than God. It is the fact of our endowment with the noble attribute of personality which lifts us, poor and insignificant as we are, immeasurably above the brute creation, and the sublimest features of the natural world. Every intelligent, personal, human spirit has a glory which transcends that which shines in the exquisite garniture of the earth, and blazes on the face of the starry heavens. And shall we deny to God an excellence which distinguishes us? The Pantheist is confronted by the dilemma: either we are *not* persons, and then our nature is a lie; or we *are* persons, and, then, as according to his hypothesis, we are God, and God is we, he is a person, and the whole Pantheistic theory is overthrown.

The conviction of the divine personality is indestructibly imbedded in the heart of the human race. Wherever we find man, in whatsoever age or clime, we are met by "oracles, altars, and priests," as attestations of the belief that a personal Deity exists, that men may worship him, and that he may receive the worship of men. And this great truth, so loudly and unmistakably proclaimed by human consciousness, is, of course, the fundamental idea in which revelation is grounded. There must be a personal God, or it is impossible to conceive that he could communicate to intelligent beings the knowledge of himself, and invite them to the exalted privilege of holding communion with him. The fact of the divine personality is stamped upon the records of nature, and flames in letters of light in the awful pages of a written revelation. To strike it from the inmost convictions of our minds, is to dash out the lights upon the altars of our souls, and to render religion itself a mockery and a cheat. To blot it out from the tablets of Scripture, is to quench the rising dawn of immortal hopes, and to consign the idea of a Bible and a scheme of redemption to the region of impossibilities.

When, therefore, we affirm that the world is not simply governed by law, and that there is a power which lies back of law, and operates through it to the production of the facts of nature, we do not convey the impression that this is a blind and impersonal power. It is the sublime and active energy of an infinite personal God, whose reign is above law, while it is administered through it. Let this be conceded, and we reach the doctrine of the possibility of prayer. We cannot pray to law, but we can pray to the God who made law, and who uses it as a plan upon which he creates, develops, and controls, a system of transcendent order and beauty.

IV. But, in the fourth place, admitting the personality of God, and the consequent possibility of prayer, it will still be urged that the difficulty has only been shifted, not removed. For if God governs the world by general laws, the same objection exists to the utility and efficacy of prayer. The system of government, though administered by a personal Being, is fixed and uniform, and determines beforehand the destiny of the individual. Where, then, is the room for prayer? To this the answer is obvious. There is no impossibility, even on rational grounds, of conceiving that God has in the ordination of the plan of law, by which he administers the government of the world, made provision for prayer as itself an element in the scheme. He may have established between it and the results which are sought by it the relation of means to ends; and then prayer, so far from being inconsistent with the fixed procedures of law, is involved in their development and rendered certainly successful by their operation. It would be divested of contingency, and possess, when offered in sincerity, and in conformity to the divine will, the guarantee and assurance of success. We cannot do better than by quoting, on this point, the words of an able living writer who combines the faith of the Christian with the acuteness of the philosopher. They will more clearly convey the ideas we are endeavoring to enforce than any which we could employ. Says Dr. McCosh: "Dr. Chalmers supposes that prayer may be answered in one or other of two ways in perfect accordance with the ordinary procedure of God. He supposes that prayer and

its answer may be connected together as cause and effect, that they may form a sequence of a very subtle kind, more subtle than any of the sequences of the most latent physical substances, and not therefore observable except by those who have that nice spiritual discernment which is communicated by faith. Or, he supposes that God may interpose among the physical agents beyond that limit to which human sagacity can trace the operation of law. * * * He might, for instance, change the laws which regulate the weather, and send a storm or a calm at any given place or time, or he might modify the laws by which the living functions of the human body are regulated, and send health or disease, and no man be able to say whether there has been an interposition or not. But is it necessary," remarks Dr. McCosh, "to resort to either of these ingenious theories? Is there not a more obvious means by which God can answer the prayer of faith? It is not necessary to suppose that prayer and its answer form a separate law of nature; for the answer may come as the result of other laws arranged for this very purpose. Nor is it needful to suppose that God interposes to change his own laws. The analogy of his method of operation in other matters would rather incline us to believe that he has so arranged these laws that by their agency he may answer prayer without at all interfering with them. * * * His agents were at first ordained and marshalled by him for the accomplishment of all the wise designs of his government; and among other ends they may bring the blessings for which faith is expected to supplicate. He sends an answer to prayer in precisely the same way as he compasses all his other moral designs, as he conveys blessings and inflicts judgments. He does not require to interfere with his own arrangements, for there is an answer provided in the arrangement made by him from all eternity. How is it that God sends us the bounties of his providence? How is it that he supplies the many wants of his creatures? How is it that he encourages industry? How is it that he arrests the plots of wickedness? How is it that he punishes in this life notorious offenders against his law? The answer is, by the skilful prearrangement of his providence, whereby the needful events fall out at the very time

and in the way required. When the question is asked, How does God answer prayer? We give the very same reply,—it is by a preordained appointment when God settled the constitution of the world, and set all its parts in order.”

These views, so far as they go, we believe to be as just as they are forcibly expressed; and they are the more striking, as they do not indicate a method of answering prayer that is inconsistent with the fact, which every fresh discovery of science tends to confirm, that God *ordinarily* controls the world through the medium of natural laws. But it must be confessed, that if this statement of the mode by which God answers prayer were intended to embrace the whole truth in regard to it—which, however, we have no reason to believe is the case on the part of the writer quoted,—it would fail to present one aspect of the subject which is inexpressibly dear to the heart of the Christian, and with which he could not for an instant consent to part. That view is, that God is personally present, always and every where, in the working of the scheme of his providence, carrying into execution the laws of his own ordination, and bestowing blessings in answer to prayer by his immediate personal act. He is not, in accordance with the ancient philosophical idea, though admitted to be personal, simply the first cause of all things, who constructed the world as a vast machine, impressed upon it its laws, and withdrew from any subsequent interposition in its affairs. He does not, so to speak, operate at the remote end of the series of second causes. His power immediately pervades the whole series in its minutest details, circumstances, and relations. He is perpetually present with every part of it, and as his personality can no more be divided than his essence, he is personally present to guide, to manage, and to energize the entire system in all its parts. Nor, conceiving the world, as some do, to be a great living organism, can we for a moment consent to the supposition that God is present with it as a mere principle of development, of which its life is the general result, and its parts the special modifications. That would be to deny his personality, and to make him substantially identical with the world, and the world with him. He is, indeed, the principle of

life and the source of power; but he is a person who imparts life, a person who infuses power. He giveth to all life and breath and all things; but he is different from the world while he is *with* it, and the world is different from him while it is *in* him. Let us take this view into connexion with the other, and we can see how, without infringing the established order of natural law, God may provide for our wants, hearken to our petitions, and bestow answers to our prayers by his own personal and immediate agency. This is the precious doctrine of a special providence so clearly taught us by the Scriptures, without which the world would be but a cold and dreary realm under the sway of an iron system of law, with no God to whom we could draw near in sweet personal communion, and from whom we could derive a present help amid the stormy vicissitudes of life. No, we are not under the rigid reign of naked and absolute law. We are not doomed by the stern necessities of our being to pray to mere abstractions, to cry to no purpose, with the idolatrous priests of old, "O Baal, hear us! O Baal, hear us!" We are under the special providence of a personal God, who clothes the lilies, feeds the ravens, notices the death of the sparrow, and bows down a listening ear to the faintest breathings of true desire from the humble and broken hearts of his creatures.

V. The consideration of this subject would be incomplete, were it not added, that this personal God, who administers the laws of the world, has been pleased in his word to reveal himself to us under the relations of a father, a saviour, and a friend, and graciously invites us to pray to him as he is made known to us in these lovely and endearing characters. It is with a feeling of relief that we emerge from the thickets of a tangled abstract discussion into the open fields and the cheering sunlight of God's blessed word. Here the plainest and most unlettered believer in Jesus may take his stand, and invincibly maintain his ground against the most insidious approaches and the most determined onsets of philosophy and science "falsely so-called." God his Father speaks to him, and assures him that he hears his prayers. It is enough. He accepts the divine testimony, relies upon it though a world should pronounce it false, and unhesitatingly

stakes upon it his temporal interests and his eternal hopes. And what the word of God declares to him finds a response in his own experience, which the jeers of scepticism can not silence, or the storms of infidelity beat down. The great Being who created the world, stamps his laws upon it, and manages its affairs by his infinite wisdom and almighty providence; the God who thunders from the skies, and shakes the heavens and the earth, proclaims himself to us worthless sinners as our Father in Christ Jesus his beloved Son. We are taught to address him as "our Father in heaven." He thus tenderly expostulates with us amidst the waywardness of early life: "Wilt thou not from this time say, My Father, thou art the guide of my youth?" How movingly does he appeal to our own instinctive emotions, and derive from them exhortations to us to confide in his paternal love in all our weaknesses and distresses! "Like as a father pitieth his children; so the Lord pitieth them that fear him; for he knoweth our frame, he remembereth that we are dust." "Can a woman forget her sucking child that she should not have compassion on the son of her womb? Yea, she may forget, yet will I remember thee. For a small moment I have forsaken thee, but with everlasting mercies will I have compassion on thee." Further: "If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask him?"

And is this so? Then if he be indeed our Father, tender, pitiful, and loving, surely as his children we may come to him, and make known to him our requests. Poor, needy, blind, naked, miserable, sick, dying, we may come to him and tell him all our wants. And can a Father's heart be steeled against the entreaties of his children, who cry to him from the depth of such afflictions? Tell us not he governs the world by general laws and cannot listen to the prayers of individuals. And shall a Father's laws imprison the outgoings of a Father's heart? Who would ever dream that the more perfectly an earthly parent administers the government of his household, and the more thoroughly he manages its affairs by wise rules and systematic arrangements, the less likely he would be to hear the requests of

his needy, sick, and dying children? And why should God be prevented by the laws which He administers from answering the prayers of his children? Of what avail is it that he is our Father, and we are his children, if we cannot make bold to come into his presence, to cling to his knees, and supplicate his paternal benediction? Let men of science sneer as they may at the fancied inefficacy and absurdity of prayer, God is our Father, and we can come to him, and he will hear our voice. Yes, verily, God hears prayer. Under the pressure of conscious guilt, the lashings of conscience and the fears of death, in seasons of fierce temptation and bitter conflict, in periods of weakness, perplexity, and gloom, in times of anxiety, affliction, and despair, we have called upon him and he has heard our prayers. "I love the Lord, because he hath heard my voice and my supplications. Because he hath inclined his ear unto me, therefore will I call upon him as long as I live. The sorrows of death compassed me, and the pains of hell gat hold upon me: I found trouble and sorrow. Then called I upon the name of the Lord: O Lord, I beseech thee, deliver my soul. Gracious is the Lord and righteous; yea, our God is merciful; for thou hast delivered my soul from death, mine eyes from tears, and my feet from falling."

But that which, above all, gives us assurance of the efficacy of our prayers, is the fact that the procedures of providence are instituted, and the laws of the world are administered, by one who is at once a Saviour, a Brother, and a Friend. "All power," said the Lord Jesus in his parting words to his disciples, "all power is given unto me in heaven and in earth." All things are put in subjection under his feet, and nothing is excepted from his sway save him who did put all things under him. The hands that were pierced with the nails of Calvary wield the sceptre of limitless dominion. The sacred head that was lacerated and dishonored by the coronet of thorns is graced with many crowns, and blazes with diadems that symbolize a manifold and universal rule. Cherubim and seraphim, angels of all ranks, and ten thousand times ten thousand glorified saints, prostrate themselves before that face down which three sorrowful and shameful cur-

rents ran—the current of human tears, the current of human blood, and the current of human spittle. Into the grasp of Jesus are gathered up the reins of three great sovereignties—those of heaven, earth, and hell. There is not an element of nature, not a force of nature, not a living being of nature, which he does not hold in his power, and use at his will. The fulness of the world is his. The fish of the sea, the birds of the air, and the beasts of the field, are his. He gathereth the winds in his fists, rides upon the wings of the whirlwind, and treads tempestuous oceans beneath his feet. He speaks, and the mountains tremble; he utters his voice, and heaven and earth give ear. He calls, and the invisible empire of death attends, departed spirits return, and the mouldering dead arise. He purchased the control of this world by the price of his blood. Its peoples and governments and dynasties are his. He presides over the counsels of senates and restrains the thoughts of kings. And when the angry nations dash themselves against each other, he rules the stormy elements and directs the billowy masses at his will. It deserves to be remembered, too, as a source of unspeakable comfort, that this administration of providence, this control of the laws by which the world is governed, is committed to the hands of the Lord Jesus for the benefit and salvation of his people. “All things,” says the apostle, “are yours; whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or *the world*, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come; all are yours; and ye are Christ’s; and Christ is God’s.” Jesus is “Head over all things to his Church.” And can we believe that the laws of nature, which Christ himself administers, and through which he displays his power, shall ever be barriers betwixt his heart and the prayers of his people? Never, never! The Saviour who died for us, the Brother who passed through the flaming furnace of affliction that he might know how to sympathise with us, will tolerate no impediment to the communication of his love to his people, or the passage of his people’s prayers to him.

There is a great mistake which even Christian people make in regard to this whole matter. They appear to think that the scheme of providence and that of redemption are separately ad-

ministered; that they constitute two independent kingdoms. The truth is, that the cross of Christ has discharged, in more than one respect, the office of a great reconciler. It has closed up the chasm between God and man, and healed the breach between men and men. And now, under the rule of the great Mediator who is enthroned in Zion, providence and redemption have been brought together into a sublime and glorious harmony. They meet at the cross of Christ and kiss each other there. The processes of nature pass under the moulding influence of the principle of grace. Providence, sprinkled with the blood of atonement, takes on a redemptive type. The Sovereign of grace is the Monarch of nature. The King of saints is the King of nations; and, ere long, attended by angelic armies, and heralded by the trump of God, he shall come to earth with a name written on his thigh—King of kings and Lord of lords. Science and religion are destined to become joint worshippers; and, coming hand in hand, will together bring their gifts of gold, frankincense, and myrrh, and lay them reverently at Jesus' feet. The discordant tribes of the human race, linked together by the bond of one mediation and one hope of redemption, shall repair to the throne of Zion's King, with the united confession bursting from their lips: "O thou that hearest prayer, unto thee shall all flesh come!"

This, then, is our consolation in all our disappointments, afflictions, and griefs. We rest in providence, for providence is Christ's, and Christ is ours. To believe that the laws of nature are administered through the hands of the great Mediator, is to be assured that they cannot conflict with the validity of his people's petitions. To know Christ as the ruler of the world, is to know the efficacy of prayer.

We have thus endeavored, as fully as the limits of this article would permit, to meet the objection to prayer that it is inconsistent with the uniform operation of natural laws. Essentially infidel in its nature, its tendency is to subvert the foundations of religion, and to dry up the spring of every noble virtue. And yet, as it professes to be grounded in philosophical principles, it presents itself in a subtle and attractive guise especially to the

votaries of science. The marvel, however, is that it should, at least in the form of a temptation, have taken hold upon the minds of many Christian men, and have been allowed to entangle them in doubts respecting the utility and efficacy of their prayers. We beg leave, before closing these remarks, to indicate one of the principal causes of the disposition on the part of many of our people, in passing through the extraordinary trials which have befallen them, to entertain this sceptical objection to a primary institute of religion.

It is to be feared that there is an insufficient recognition of the sovereignty, wisdom, and mercy of God in the administration of those promises in which he engages to hear and answer prayer, and a rash and unwarranted interpretation of his will as it is disclosed in the procedures of his providence. It seems to be strangely taken for granted, that there is no limitation upon these promises except such as may be impressed upon their very face; that every qualification of them must be explicit, none can be implicit; and that every petition, provided only it possesses the element of sincerity, is entitled to success by virtue of a divine guarantee. In the event, therefore, of a failure on the part of a petitioner to secure the particular blessing which he has sought, he is tempted, in his disappointment, to discredit the promises which assure answers to prayer, to conceive himself defrauded of covenanted rights, and to throw himself upon the ordinary operation of laws by which all things happen alike to all, and no provision is made for individual wants or special emergencies. But it should never be forgotten, that one of the essential elements of successful prayer is, that it be offered for those things which are agreeable to the divine will. It would manifestly be inconsistent with his perfections for God to grant answers to petition which would involve a contradiction of his will; nor can he be conceived as having pledged himself to a course of action which would issue in such a result. Now, there are two aspects in which the will of God may be considered: First, as it is revealed or preceptive; and, secondly, as it is secret or decretive. In the first of these forms, it is embodied in the Scriptures; and in the second, it can only be gathered

from the decisions of his providence. It is clear that, so far as it goes, the revealed will of God as contained in the Bible is an unerring directory of prayer. Whatever petitions it authorises, it is legitimate for us to present; it can never be right to offer those which it forbids. To expect favorable answers, therefore, to prayers which are not sanctioned by this authority, is to abuse the divine promises, and to disregard the limitations which have been expressly imposed upon them. God cannot gainsay himself. The case, however, is not so clear in reference to those temporal benefits concerning which the Scriptures, as God's preceptive will, give us no positive directions. In regard to the expediency of our receiving the answers to petitions of that sort, which we conceive to be desirable, we cannot, from the nature of the case, be competent judges. We are bound to submit ourselves to that will by which the Almighty Ruler governs the universe, and which, whether it is or is not providentially made known, exacts from angels as well as sinners the profoundest deference of which they are capable. That will is the measure of eternal rectitude, the expression of infinite holiness, wisdom, and mercy; and to quarrel with its decisions, when they are made known in the course of providence, is to proclaim at once our impiety and our folly. All our prayers, for what we suppose to be temporal blessings, should ever be qualified by the condition—Thy will be done! We should remember that he whom we address is a sovereign, and doeth his pleasure in the armies of heaven and amongst the inhabitants of the earth; that he is all-wise, and therefore can make no mistake in the dispensations of his providence which contemplate his glory or our good; that he is infinitely merciful, and therefore denies us such answers to petition as he knows to be opposed to our best and highest welfare. God promises to deliver his people when they call upon him in the day of trouble; but the deliverance will be afforded in such a manner and at such a time as will most promote his glory and their good. It is often accomplished in accordance with the great law that discipline is in order to goodness, sorrow in order to joy, and death in order to life. The martyr is authorised to pray for deliverance from the fire and

the stake, so long as the final event is uncertain; but God may call him to testify to his truth, and to prove his own faith and love by dying in his cause; and, in that case, he is bound to acquiesce and to go obediently to his tragic end. His prayer seems to be unanswered, and he dies in bodily torture under the sentence of ecclesiastical excommunication; but the glory of God is highly promoted by the testimony which he delivers in blood; his disembodied spirit is rapt as in a chariot of fire to the gate of heaven to receive the plaudits of angels, the welcome of saints, and an amaranthine crown; while his heroic fortitude animates his surviving brethren to steadfast constancy and unflinching courage in their adherence to the truth. Our blessed Lord and Saviour himself, as an infirm and dying human being, staggering under the curse due to the sins of the world, prayed in agony that he might, if it were possible, be delivered from drinking the bitter cup of his last dreadful sufferings, but meekly referred the decision to his heavenly Father's will. The prayer seemed to be unanswered, and he drank that fearful cup to its dregs. But so far as we can see, had the petition been granted, and had he not died precisely as he did, the last hope of salvation for our lost and ruined race would have been blotted out in the blackness of eternal night. God promises to uphold truth and right; but he has not pledged himself, in every particular conflict in which truth grapples with error, and right with wrong, to render truth and right for the present triumphant. He may suffer them, for wise purposes, to undergo temporary defeat, and to be exposed to a tempest of oppression and scorn. In these cases, it is our duty to sustain ourselves by the consideration that God does his will, and that the Judge of all the earth will do right. And to those who, baffled in their hopes, and tempted to scepticism, yet honor God by an uncomplaining submission due from sinful shortsighted creatures to infinite wisdom and absolute sovereignty, it will in time be made to appear—as clearly as the flash of a sunbeam through the fissures of a dissolving cloud—that benefits were withheld for the bestowal of greater; that short-lived suffering is but the prelude to permanent blessing; and that truth and right go down, like the evening sun, beneath a horizon of

darkness and an ocean of storms, to reappear in the morning glory of an unclouded day. We have, then, no reason to despair because our prayers for certain blessings, however apparently great, have for a time been unanswered. Where is our faith? Where our allegiance to our almighty, all-wise, all-merciful Sovereign? Let us collect ourselves; put on the whole armor of God, and stand against these troops of doubts that would dislodge us from the citadel of our faith. God, our redeemer and deliverer, reigns. His will is omnipotence, his realm the universe, and justice and equity are the pillars of his rule. He sits, the high and lofty One, upon a throne of glory; and suns and starry systems are but the flying squadrons that wheel with flaming standards through the plains of space at his command. Legions of powerful spirits, prompt to obey and swift to move, minister before his feet. His eye rests upon his afflicted people, and his arm is lifted for their deliverance. When he bows the heavens and comes down to vindicate them, the whole earth is exhorted to make a joyful noise, the sea to roar with the fulness thereof, the floods to clap their hands, the hills to rejoice, and all the inhabitants of the world to shout before him. Zion hears the thundering acclaim and is glad, and all the daughters of Judah rejoice; for he cometh, he cometh to judge the earth; he shall judge the world with righteousness, and the people with his truth.

We cannot, if we would, strike out from our souls the supreme necessity of prayer, which is stamped by a divine hand upon the very structure of their being. Indeed, so far from its being inconsistent with the laws by which the world is governed, it is impressed upon the whole framework of nature and redemption. It is shadowed forth in dim, though not unmeaning, forms, in the dependence of all creatures inanimate and animate upon the providence of a benignant God. The flower lifts its cup at dawn as if entreating a supply of morning dew. The thirsty earth, cracked into fissures, opens her many mouths as though pleading for the descending shower. The brutes in their distresses utter their moans to him who made and can relieve them. The voices of afflicted nature are raised, as in supplication, to nature's God.

The whole creation groaneth and travaileth together in pain, crying for deliverance from the curse which oppresses it. From our sinful and dejected humanity, in all its departments, there rises upward a mournful chorus of prayers which needs only to be interpreted, to mean—Give us a Saviour, who can deliver us from going down to the pit! Give us a Saviour, who can bring holiness out of sin, joy out of sorrow, and life out of death! The work of redemption is one grand and perpetual prayer. Our great High-Priest, when in the outer courts of this world he rendered worship for us by the sacrifice of himself, offered up the sublimest prayer which had ever risen to the Majesty on high. And now that he has ascended into the heavens, he appears in the holiest of all as the minister of public worship for his Church, presenting his atoning blood, and urging his unceasing intercessions before his Father's throne.

There is no room to doubt the efficacy of prayer. With such grounds for its acceptable discharge as are furnished in the gospel; with such a Saviour, who has, by his blood, consecrated for us a new and living way into the heavenly sanctuary; with such an High-Priest over the house of God, who receives our imperfect supplications into his sacerdotal hands, and seconds them with his own powerful advocacy: with such grounds for prayer as these, we are entitled to "draw near with true hearts in full assurance of faith." The examples of the saints of all ages—the noble, the great, the good of earth—attest the value of prayer, and as with ten thousand voices summon us to its discharge. Compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, we shall, as by their common verdict, be convicted of infidelity and folly, if we come not "boldly to the throne of grace that we may obtain mercy and find grace to help in time of need."

ARTICLE II.

THE WORD OF GOD.

Admitting the existence of a Creator, nothing could be more inherently probable than the gift of a revelation to the creature. That man's chief end should be to glorify God, seems to be a self-evident proposition; because no higher motive for the exercise of creative power can be imagined. That God should have included the other and subordinate object—namely, that the creature should enjoy him forever—is the real mystery; because there is no antecedent probability of such an addendum to the original object. Again, there must needs be the revelation of a rule to direct the creature how he may glorify the Creator. So these two propositions, with which Presbyterian standards begin, lie at the foundation of all the creeds and confessions of Protestant Christendom, and therefore the fool hath said in his heart, "No God."

The announcement of this rule of faith and practice is majestic in its simplicity: "The word of God, which is contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments." Nothing more and nothing less. The obligation to believe and obey cannot be strengthened, if the proposition is true. The present purpose, therefore, is to investigate this statement, and to inquire whether or not these Scriptures are, in very deed, the word of God. And in conducting this inquiry, it is not designed to go over the ground upon which the Church has stood in her conflicts with infidels of all ages, or to collate the arguments and testimony of her best instructed sons; but rather to treat the subject from a more popular point of view, and to present such considerations as might be naturally suggested to the humblest and most unlettered lover of God's wonderful revelation.

One proof of the authenticity of this book, which is in the possession or within the reach of every man, woman, and child, whose eyes may meet these pages, is the utter failure of all the

infidel assaults that have been made upon it. It is true that this first argument is only a negative form of proof; but when it is remembered that the utmost ingenuity of profound thinkers has been given to this profitless warfare, the fact of failure is far from insignificant. There are many sceptics in the world who have not joined the army of positive unbelievers. These have not denied—they have only doubted. But there have also been many professed atheists and infidels, who have devoted all their powers to the overthrow of all forms of religion. It is a grand mistake to underrate the ability of these enemies of truth. Some of them have won a deathless renown in the republic of letters, when their contributions to the world's literature have been upon some other topic. The unbelievers of a past age, such as Hume, Voltaire, and Paine, were men of no ordinary capacity. The deists and free-thinkers of the present age, such as Renan, Strauss, and perhaps Humboldt, have brought no ordinary abilities to aid in their assaults upon revelation. Were it possible for a man, with an immortal soul, to divest himself of all personal interest in this curious warfare, he could not fail to be impressed with the variety and diversity of the weapons formed against Zion. Not one of the six champions above named is at agreement with any other; and this lack of unity amongst the motley crew of doubters and deniers has formed the staple of Henry Rogers's work, "The Eclipse of Faith," and given opportunity for the display of his most brilliant and pungent satire. It is a solemn matter to make the subject of a joke, yet the forlorn efforts of the very best of infidels are in point of fact both ludicrous and ridiculous. Compared with the truth which they assail, standing in majestic sublimity far above their reach, their most violent assaults are but shattered waves, impotently chafing at the base of the rock of ages.

The poor dead brute who wrote the "Age of Reason," "The Rights of Man," and "Common Sense," was perhaps at once the most earnest and the most feeble among the haters of God and of revelation. His works have gone with him into oblivion, and were never popular in enlightened communities. His life was a succession of failures. A feeble attempt to revarnish the

memory of Paine was put forth some years ago by a writer in the *Atlantic Monthly*, but the decayed bones could not be shaped into a decent skeleton; and the unhappy reader of the article shrank back appalled from the ghastly object thrust upon his attention. It is very remarkable that such an article should have been written and printed in a Christian land. It is more remarkable that an intelligent man should attempt to derive instructive lessons from the life of Paine, and extol his efforts in the cause of human progress. And it is safe to assert that no other spot than Boston can be found on the surface of this planet where such writing and printing could be done; where such a compound of cool effrontery and devilish blasphemy could be boldly thrust upon an educated community. There is one other locality in the universe, and only one, where, if the inhabitants indulge in periodical literature, the *Atlantic Monthly* is probably popular. It is only charitable to hope that this is the case, as the Boston theologians, when they finally quit the Hub, may there find a literature to their liking.

The other infidel writers above-named have a better record than Paine, though none of them can compare with him in the earnestness and persistence of their attacks upon truth. One might almost believe that Paine really fancied that his labors were to benefit the race. In the cases of the others, one looks in vain for anything indicative of brotherly affections. They seem to place all the rest of creation in a posture of antagonism, and to regard all civilised races as the victims of superstition, only less silly than Fetichism, and only less harmless than the idolatry of the Thugs. Yet they hold no common principle, and all of their artillery is of varying calibre. They abolish all creeds and confessions, and give nothing as a substitute. They do not assault each other, though atheists, deists, pantheists, and the like, alternate in their slender ranks. They do not see God, therefore there is no God. They see God in all things, therefore all things are God. There is positively nothing more nor less than one of these conclusions in all of their philosophy. Is there no argument for revelation here?

But the absolute and indispensable necessity for divine

revelation is written upon the nature of man, and is constantly manifested in all of the methods by which this nature is distinguished. To track the unbeliever through the desolate regions of doubt, were very profitless labor. It is a sterile waste at best, while human consciousness offers rich and attractive fields for investigation.

Look, then, at the universality and power of the principle called hope, the possession of which distinguishes man from the brutes that perish. The old myth of the heathen, dimly recognising the grand truth of man's heavenly origin, more clearly reveals the indispensable necessity of this attribute, in the fable of Pandora. The Christian knows better; he knows that nobler divinities remain, even after hope has fled; but the power of hope, manifested in the endurance and resistance of human ills, the heathen had discovered. It is the common instinct of humanity, and the want of it transforms man into a monster. Now compare the hopes which animate mankind, the legitimate offspring of desire and anticipation, but deriving no life from the oracles of God, with the hopes of believers. And here, the appeal must needs be to the experience of individuals. In the one case, it is a reliance upon the idol-god of the world—the divinity, chance—and is mingled with distressing doubts and fears. There are multitudes of chances; why may they not be favorable? And so man hopes for success in his enterprises, until he attains to some measure of it, or is involved in remediless failure. In the other case, the hope founded on the word and promise of God, is an anchor to the soul, just as secure and absolute when fixed upon earthly good, as when it rises to the heavenly beatitudes. The instinctive hope of good in the future, is certainly a token of God's great goodness to his creatures, as he has implanted the principle in the very depths of their nature. But the doubter or denier of revelation journeys through the devious paths of the world, as often misled as safely directed by his hopes. The light they furnish is the spark of the glow-worm, intermittent and uncertain, or the *ignis-fatuus* born in the swamps, fitful and bewildering. The better hope, resting upon the word, is a ray of light from the Sun of righteousness.

It penetrates the secret recesses of the believer's soul, irradiating all its chambers when clouds and darkness most beset his pathway, and gilds his very fears. There are few men in the world who have entertained both of these different hopes, whose experience will not corroborate this statement. No reference is here intended to those higher expectations of the saint, which are fastened upon the things unseen and eternal, but merely to those hopes which terminate within the limits of the present life. The word hath the promise of *both* lives; and the believer who fails to seek in it the assurance of temporal prosperity, cheats his soul of most substantial comfort. Look, O brother, how accurately God provides for every conceivable contingency in your life! No evil can threaten, no calamity befall you, against which you may not oppose a weapon, drawn from this armory, to dash aside the impending danger. Or should the threatened evil grow into a present reality, you may still present the front of a man provided for all emergencies; because the promise overlaps the calamity, and reaches to the very verge of Jordan.

The argument suggested by this comparison is patent. For six thousand years the world has been collecting maxims, wherewith its inhabitants have hedged about all their multitudinous interests. Many of them are intended to encourage and sustain the hopes of humanity; and the most of them that have a positive value, are dilutions of the proverbs of Holy Writ. Men adopt these postulates insensibly, and apply them to their individual circumstances as emergencies arise in their history. In times of disaster, they say that the darkest hour is ever that which immediately precedes the dawn; or that in this variable life, a long continued course of misfortune is itself a promise of better times in the proximate future. It is the teaching of human experience, and most of the crests borne by the world's warriors have the same motto: *Spero meliora*. Indeed, as God has constituted humanity, it is not possible that it should be otherwise. No system of philosophy could exist among men that forbade indulgence in the illusions of hope; and this, by the beneficent decree of the Creator, though a thankless world knows it not, or acknowledges it not. But human experience teaches other and far different lessons

also. Sometimes the dark hours are followed by no sunlight. Sometimes the prolonged course of misfortune culminates in overwhelming disaster, and thus the "expectation of the wicked perishes." Therefore the wise weigh the balance of probabilities, and lean with caution upon the maxims of the hopeful. Their best and brightest anticipations are always clouded by doubts, and always hung upon a shaking chain of contingencies.

Not so with the hope that rests upon the divine promise. Here are no contingencies. In temporal things there cannot be a sure fulfilment, because the infinite will shapes all the ends of all men; but the promise includes all that is good. The grand old saint who was selected to write the final words of promise states the case with wonderful accuracy. The believers confidence, he says, is this: "If we ask anything according to his will, he heareth us: and if we know that he hear us, whatsoever we ask, we know that we have the petitions that we desired of him." This is not the announcement of a doctrine: it is the assertion of a fact, endorsed by the accumulated testimony of eighteen centuries.

It is not possible that men should have been cheated, throughout these long ages, by such fair sounding words. You cannot produce any similar words, though you sift all the productions of human philosophy to the bottom. And if you could, it would still be impossible to obtain the credence of humanity. How is it then, that in this late day, when the world is ablaze with the light of this tremendous nineteenth century, you can find the learned and the ignorant, the practised thinker, the acute reasoner, and the simple-minded child, all ranks, all classes, all conditions of men, and vast multitudes of them, uniting in the belief that these fair words are *true*, and clinging to them, as for the very life of their souls? There is but one conceivable answer. They are the words of God Almighty, and a secure stronghold for these prisoners of hope!

One step further brings into view another exercise of humanity—prayer. It is so universal an exercise, in some form, that very few people have paused to inquire into its origin. The doctrine of Scripture and the common sense of mankind agree in

teaching the existence of God, and in teaching that the fact of his existence is known independently of written revelation. He is manifested in the works by which his power and Godhead are made known. In this world, and probably in all other worlds, positive atheists are in a sorry minority. The untutored savage has a god of some sort, and he prays in some fashion. There are no exceptions to the rule. The most beastly tribes, earthly, sensual, and devilish, have still some dim perception of existent divinity, to be propitiated and petitioned. And so man is distinguished from other animals in that he alone is a praying animal. How this comes to pass does not matter. It is enough to know that all men pray.

It may be said here, that the Bible, if it were a merely human composition, would be certain to recognise and expatiate upon this universal habit. This is true, supposing the book to be either a delusion or a sham. But it is not credible that the product of human superstition, or of human fraud, would treat the subject as the Bible treats it.

By common consent, the prayer known as the Lord's Prayer, is regarded throughout Christendom as the one model which God has revealed. It is learned by rote, all over the world, and lisped by infant lips long before the infant mind apprehends the naked idea of petition. The memory retains the form of words with unfailing tenacity; and wherever the English tongue is vernacular, this wonderful collection of pure Saxon words ascends to the throne of grace and enters into the ears of the Lord God of Sabaoth.

It is not at all difficult to show that this brief form of prayer actually meets, expressly or impliedly, every conceivable condition of humanity. The wisdom that compressed all the possible wants of man into these six petitions was not created wisdom, and the book that contains them must needs be the word of God. But the same word plainly teaches that this matchless catholic form of petition does not exclude special supplication for special wants; but, on the contrary, it encourages the believer to present his plea for particular blessings as emergencies arise in his history: "After this manner, pray ye;" but use not vain

repetitions. And as the Bible abounds in examples of prayer, all over the revelation, from the first book to the last, which ends with a prayer, only two out of this multitude will be instanced for more minute examination.

The first of these is known all over the world as the prayer of the publican. It occurs in one of those matchless compositions of the Gospels, called parables, uttered by one who spake as never man spake before or since. This particular prayer is the more remarkable, because it is set in the parable in striking contrast with the address of the Pharisee, and the antithesis is perfect in all parts of the narrative. To avoid digression, the structure of the story here recounted, wholly different from any known human composition, will not now be discussed, albeit in this very point lies an indisputable argument for the authenticity of divine revelation. But confining attention to the petition and its recorded contrast, let it be noticed, first, that there is a wonderful repetition of the old story of the first two men that were born into the world. The sons of Adam are represented as coming before God in the attitude of worshippers. The elder brings his thank-offering, complete in the panoply of his own righteousness. The other comes with the blood of atonement and finds the favor of his Creator. It is by no means an after-thought of theologians, to make this distinction between the worship of Cain and Abel, as some shallow free-thinker has asserted; but this distinguishing doctrine of propitiation is plainly announced by God himself in his expostulation with Cain. "If," says God, "thy righteousness is perfect, thy acceptance is certain; and if it is faulty, behold a sin-offering coucheth at thy door!" Thus on the very threshold of the world's history, the line is drawn separating the race of Adam; and from that day to the present, there have been no subdivisions. On the one side stand the Pharisees of all ages, approaching the great throne with complacent trust in their own merits; their entire worship compressed into a brief sentence: "God, I thank thee that I am worthy!" And on the other, the stricken sinners of all ages, beating upon their breasts and supplicating mercy through atoning blood!

The common version of the Bible is so excellent, that scholars generally have deprecated all suggestions of formal emendation. Yet it is undoubtedly true that the English words do not always give the full meaning of the original. And while the prayer of the publican, as it stands in the English version, challenges the admiration of all men, it is marvellously enlarged in its scope and teaching by more accurate rendering. The word translated, "be merciful," occurs one other time in the New Testament, namely, in the second chapter of the Hebrews, where the merciful and faithful High Priest of the New Dispensation is said to "make reconciliation"; and the concurrent testimony of the best commentators and schoolmen is, that the word includes the idea of expiation, propitiation, atonement. "God be merciful, through atoning blood." This criticism is presented merely for the sake of revealing the peculiar orthodoxy of this short petition, so wonderfully comprehensive, and so appropriate in the mouths of all the sinners of Adam's race.

But the other mistranslation deprives the prayer of its startling emphasis. In calling himself a sinner, the publican uses the definite article: it is "THE sinner" that he proclaims himself. As if, in the countless multitudes of transgressors, he found none to compare with himself. Nay, as if he alone, of all the guilty race, were entitled to the name of sinner. If it had been a human invention, this "justified" worshipper would never have been so represented. It is not conceivable that any mere man would have invested the hero of his drama with this bad preëminence. It precisely accords with the profession of the great apostle, who styles himself the "chief of sinners," when he urges the faithfulness of the Redeemer and the fulness of redemption.

Here again, the appeal is made to the secret consciousness of every Christian reader. To him, this emphatic confession of ill desert, is not hyperbolic. It is the exact experience of each subject of the new birth, the inevitable pang in the travail preceding the joy of deliverance. It is more. It is the ever present and ever increasing conviction of the renewed man, attending him through all his pilgrimage, growing daily deeper

as day by day the grace and glory of the matchless Saviour are more clearly revealed. He loves much who is much forgiven. The poverty of the moralist, who finds no stains in his life, is the more ghastly, by comparison with rich experience. You have herein an argument for divine revelation always sufficient and satisfactory. No living intelligence but the Maker of your soul, could have invented the publican's prayer.

The other example is the prayer of David, as recorded in the fifty-first Psalm. In it is included all that the publican's petition contains, and something more. The circumstances under which this prayer was uttered, are a part of the record, and one familiar to all Bible readers. The man had been guilty of sins of peculiar atrocity and was now suffering the legitimate penalty. God's arrows rankled in his wounded soul. Knowing the story, you can appreciate his evident agony; and you will search in vain, for similar utterances, in all the world's literature. A formal exposition of the Psalm would not be appropriate to the present argument; but it is in order to call attention to the deep contrition of the sinner, his clear recognition of the distinguishing doctrines of grace, and the single fact that he specially charges himself with sin against God. "Against thee, thee only, have I sinned!" It is not credible that human imagination or human ingenuity could invent this conclusion to the story of the Hittite. No romancer has ever produced a similar story, which is told in few words, with the sobriety peculiar to Bible narratives, and infinitely touching in all its details. The innate nobleness of the warrior's character, so sharply defined by contrast with the meanness of the royal murderer, is like "a jewel flashing upon dingy serge-cloth." And none of the acts of the other mighties of David's hosts invest their histories with equal interest. He closed his career in the forefront of the hottest battle, with deeds of knightly prowess, and died the death of a hero.

While therefore, we might expect some token of remorse from the king, and in some measure appreciate the keenness of his anguish as he prayed, "Deliver me from blood," it is not possible that the enormity of his offence as against *God* would have

occurred to any uninspired writer. But this is not a controversy with unbelievers or doubters, and once again the appeal is addressed to the secret experience of the Christian. Have there been no times, in your history, when the words of this Psalm appeared to be the exact words you needed, more accurately meeting the emergencies of your case than any other words of Holy Writ? If not, there are depths you have not sounded, there are nooks in the dark valley you have not yet explored. But if this experience has been yours, rely upon it that no created intelligence could have placed it upon record, and made it applicable to millions of cases where the stains of the Psalmist's sins could not be found.

Advance one step further, and scrutinise the world's experience upon another point, or rather upon this same point in its universal application. Most, if not all, the forms of religion the earth has ever known, recognise the existence of guilt, and its sequence of penalty. It is probable that some of this experience is due to the traditional story of the lapse of humanity, in the person of its head and founder. It is certainly true that the internal conviction of guilt is universal, by the declared decree of God; but arguing outside of the revelation, the methods of expiation, diverse and numerous, prove the universality of this uncomfortable conviction. Now the first effect of this "conscience of sin" is anxiety for deliverance from the penalty, and the brotherhood of the race is demonstrated by the uniformity of this experience. Looking backward, along the track of ages, it is not possible to separate true progress of civilisation from the light and influence of God's blessed gospel; yet the modes of expiation invented by the heathen are usually hideous and revolting, considered independently of God's law and grace. Nothing could be more inherently improbable, than that these modes could be sufficient—the best of them. The sacrifices of the old dispensation availed nothing to the purification of the conscience; yet they are explicable by the clearer light of the new, and availed only as administrations of the antitype. Bereft of their spiritual and typical significance, all the parts of the Mosaic ritual are simply horrible, albeit estab-

lished by the authority of the Creator. How much more repulsive are the numberless inventions sought out by the sinners of heathendom!

Compare the Bible story of expiation, with all the other methods known to man, and notice how precisely the revealed plan meets every exigency in the case of every separate sinner. It states explicitly, first, that the progenitor of the race entailed an inheritance—sin and its penalty, death. No statement of the word has met with fiercer opposition. No human author would have built his story on such a foundation. What! shall I be held responsible in theory, or suffer in fact, because a man sinned six thousand years ago? But the Bible says more. Because of this inherited proclivity, constant, actual transgressions are added to the original guilt, so that all the children of this accursed race are “slaves” sold under sin. This, if possible, is more offensive than the former statement. What! shall I, who am conscious of so many generous emotions, whose life has been so comparatively innocent, be herded with the base and vile—included in the same category with the murderer and the thief? No mortal founder of a system of religion would begin with so unpopular a doctrine as this. But this is only the beginning of difficulties. Alongside of these disparaging statements there is a law given. It is a wonderful law, so extensive and general in its application, that it meets its subjects at every step of their pilgrimage—every one of them; and so accurate, that it touches the thoughts and intents of their hearts. No system of morals formed independently of this record will compare with it, the moralists of the world themselves being judges. It is summarily comprehended in ten commands, or in nine prohibitions, and one command with a promise annexed. As expounded in the gospel, it is reduced to two commandments, and these are not only more wide and general in their application, but also more exact and searching. Heart, soul, mind, and strength, all engaged in obedience to the first; and, in the second, the whole race of Adam brought into close brotherhood, and cast upon the kindly charities of each individual. It will not be denied that God’s law is full and ample enough.

But this word does not stop here. With remorseless iteration, it declares from first to last, that no lower obedience than perfect obedience will suffice; that the slightest violation of the smallest precept involves the penalty—damnation! And with this terrible announcement, it couples the assertion, that no man can possibly keep this law! Here is the culmination. The wise sceptics of this age pronounce these three, illogical, impossible, contradictory doctrines; yet since the days of Paul, multitudes of the wisest and best of earth's children have clung to these so-called absurdities with a tenacity that is only explicable by the universal consciousness of guilt.

Because, in Christ, the difficulties all disappear. The doctrine of substitution, as revealed in the word, is double. The spotless life of Christ illustrated the law in precept, and is given to the believer for righteousness. The death of the same Christ illustrated the law in penalty, and is called the believer's death. And, unlike all human inventions, this life and this death were not mere illustrations, but were awful realities. None but the God-man could obey the precept; none but he could exhaust the penalty. So the triple chain is stricken from the limbs of the freed sinner: guilt in its bondage; guilt in its pollution; and guilt in its curse. O learned sceptic! what have you to offer in substitution, when you take away from the guilt-burdened sinner this sublime "superstition?" For the combined genius of all the sons of men, has never yet presented a scheme like it, though the consciousness of guilt is the common heritage of the race. And of the victims of this "superstition," countless multitudes have died, saying: "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?" But among the deniers of God's revelation, there is yet to be found a solitary champion who has died with similar songs upon his lips.

The argument thus far, may be more coherently stated as follows. Three classes of evidences are herein suggested, and for the sake of orderly arrangement, let these propositions be kept in mind. First, merely logical:

1. Infidel assaults upon the truth of God have been failures, universally.

2. It is not possible that any human imposture could exist, and gain such universal credence among the most cultivated classes for forty centuries.

Next, internal:

1. The purity of Bible ethics.
2. The importance of the subjects treated, and the universal applicability of doctrine, precept, and promise, to all the conditions of all men.

Finally, the appeal to individual consciousness, the *argumentum ad hominem*. And although, in contests with unbelievers, this form of demonstration would count for nothing, yet it is far more potent than the best logic of the schools, when addressed to the Christian.

It may be said that these hints, vague as they are, are trite and commonplace, and that no new form of proof has been presented. But in this very fact lies another argument. Nothing that God does can be improved or amplified by human effort. His announcements are complete and final. His truth is the same, yesterday, to-day, and forever.

ARTICLE III.

SOME THOUGHTS AND SOME FACTS CONCERNING DOMESTIC MISSIONS IN OUR PRESBYTERIES.

The Reformed, or Presbyterian, system of Church government, it is alleged by some, is weaker and less efficient than Prelacy. One of the illustrations which may be employed in making good this statement, is this: Each session can very well watch over the interests of its own immediate parish, and so all the churches of a whole Presbytery enjoy faithful and diligent care, and supervision. But there are waste places in the bounds of every Presbytery which no particular church session claims or can cultivate. These, of course, it is for the Presbytery to look after; and yet the Presbytery cannot give any due degree of attention to them. The body meets ordinarily but twice a year, and it can-

not ordinarily meet oftener. Its other business necessarily occupies all its attention during these semi-annual meetings. The consequence is that those waste places, where churches might be gathered, must needs be neglected under such a system. The system is inherently weak and inefficient; a central power which is always in active operation is manifestly requisite. Let there be one man to rule over the whole Diocese; to take care for all its destitute portions; to seek out new stations for missionary preaching, and cause them to be efficiently occupied; to pass through, and overlook, and take care of, all the field.

Now, human wisdom has frequently approved, but divine wisdom condemns, this one-man-power in the Church. We find in the Scriptures, which are the sole, and also the sufficient, rule of faith and practice, that in all the apostolic churches there was a plurality of elders ruling and governing; and also, that whenever the business of the Church required, the apostles and elders would come together to consider of the matter, and to act according to their deliberate counsel. Inspired, these apostles, severally, were to write the Scriptures of the New Testament. Extraordinary powers they undoubtedly wielded as the first and the inspired organisers of the Christian Church; as indeed every modern evangelist also must carry with him extraordinary powers into "the regions beyond." But, nevertheless, we find them in Jerusalem meeting in council with ordinary office-bearers, and determining every thing, not severally, but jointly; not as being individually inspired, but collectively authorised to settle the order of the Church.

The system revealed in the New Testament for the government of the Church is the representative system—a government by chosen rulers—the very same which prevailed also in the Jewish Church from the beginning. Our Form of Government says, that it is agreeable to Scripture that the Church be governed by *assemblies* of rulers. (Chap. viii. 1.) Calvin insists (Inst. Book IV., Ch. xi., Sec. 1,) that the nature of church jurisdiction at the beginning, was the authority of spiritual tribunals to inspect morals and hold the keys of discipline; and he describes these tribunals as composed of two kinds of elders—

the teaching and the ruling. He adds, that preaching is "not so much power as ministry." He insists (Sections 5 and 6) that jurisdiction "did not belong to an individual who could exercise it as he pleased, but belonged to the consistory of elders." "The common and usual method of exercising this jurisdiction was by the council of presbyters, of whom, as I said, there were two classes." Hence the famous distinction of *several and joint* power which Andrew Melville in the Second Book of Discipline employs. As the celebrated Gillespie expresses it, speaking of the ordinary and settled state of the Church, and not, of course, of her aggressive operations in the outside field, (see his Assertion of the Government of the Church of Scotland, Chap. ii.,) "We boldly maintain, that there is no part of ecclesiastical jurisdiction in the power of one man, but of many met together in the name of Christ." Teaching or preaching is a several power, committed to individual ministers who are responsible, severally, to the Church and to the Lord, for the manner in which they discharge this highest of all spiritual functions; so that ministers of the word are immeasurably superior as such to all other church officers. And accordingly, they are to be held responsible always, most of all, for every existing evil or imperfection amongst us, since it is theirs to expound the word and apply it to the revival and edification and progress of the Church. But, on the other hand, ruling is a joint power, committed to courts of ruling elders, in which ministers take their seats by virtue of their being also rulers, and where all are equal as rulers. There were elders or presbyters ordained by the apostles over every church and in every city, so that parochial Presbyteries existed from the beginning. From an early period there must also have existed classical Presbyteries.

A very noteworthy fact it is also, that these assemblies* of

*The Free Church of Scotland in its *Act and Declaration*, May 31, 1851, made one of the only two "peculiar and essential features" of Presbyterianism to be "the government of the Church by Presbyters alone." The other feature was "the headship of Christ, and his word our only rule." The former is indeed the feature which gives us our present distinctive name—our Church is the *Presbyterian*, because governed by *Presbyters*.

presbyters or ruling elders should constitute the central and most important bulwark of the Church polity revealed in the Scriptures against Prelacy; which may justly be styled a semi-Popery. Separate entirely from the people a man whom you shall call by that popish misnomer—"a clergyman;" commit your spiritual affairs to him alone; conceive of him as discharging in any sense whatever, different from that which shall apply to all believers, the priestly function; commit to him and his class the power to rule the church; and you shall have taken one step, and that a long step, towards a prelatie order. It is quite easy to trace the history of Popery, which sprang directly out of Prelacy, of which the manifest root was clerical ambition. But one of the influences of this spirit was to cause ruling elders and deacons, too, to aspire all to be teachers, whilst the teachers aspired each to be the greatest. Thus the ruling elder early vanishes quite out of sight in Church history, except as a master-hand like Calvin's can trace him in the order of canons of the middle ages. "The institution," says Calvin, (Book IV., Ch. xi., Sec. 6,) "gradually degenerated from its primitive form, so that in the time of Ambrose, the clergy alone had cognisance of ecclesiastical causes." Contrary to what was right and lawful, the bishop, Calvin says, had "appropriated to himself" what was given to the church, that is, the consistory, "just as if the consul had expelled the Senate and usurped the whole empire." For, he continues, as he is superior in rank to others, so is there more authority in the consistory itself than "in one man." And he proceeds to denounce as a gross iniquity "the transfer by one man to himself" of a power that was designed to be "common." Then a succeeding step was, that bishops "disdaining the jurisdiction as a thing unworthy of their care, devolved it on others," that is, on their creatures. (See also Chap. v., Sec. 10.) Thus church power passes entirely into the hands of "clergymen." And then, by another curious perversion, it happens that the first and chiefest of these "clergymen" is transformed into a ruling elder—an exaggerated one indeed, governing, not jointly, but severally, not one church, but many—for Prelacy confers upon its bishops the rule and government of a

whole diocese of churches, ministers, members and all. We submit that, considering the origin and the results of Prelacy in the Church of Christ, Calvin is guilty of no extravagance when he speaks of its "pestiferous nature." (Chap. xi., Sec. 8.) But so long as church power is in assemblies, and these composed of two kinds of ruling elders—one of them kept free from all worldly cares, and avocations; and the other conversant daily with all the affairs of busy life, men of the people—so long, there is no danger of a priestly caste usurping the control of the Church, and one main inlet of Prelacy is closed. It ought not, therefore, to be supposed that our system demands simply the assertion of the parity of all ministers of the word, for that is but half the truth as against Prelacy; but the true Presbyterian position is the parity of all presbyters as rulers. It is conceivable that there might possibly be contrived by the Evil One a scheme of ranks and orders amongst our *ministers*, without absolutely overturning Presbyterian Church government; for the ruling power belongs not to ministers as such. But it is the denial of the parity of all presbyters, which is the mortal blow to the system of Presbytery. The stronghold, which must be held at all hazards: the central and the chief bulwark is the parity of all presbyters.

But the objection to Presbyterianism that it is weak and inefficient is specious and without any foundation. Any and all its courts can act by commission, and so perpetuate their own active existence. A commission, as any good English dictionary will show, differs from a committee, in that the latter is appointed to examine and report; but the former can inquire into and conclude. It has power conferred upon it to act, and therefore, amongst us, it is made to consist of, at the least, a quorum of the body, and is in fact the body itself. It is in this very way the Presbytery is able to look after its own waste places; and, perhaps, there is hardly a Presbytery in one Church which is not attending to its own domestic missionary interests by means of such a commission. Many of our Presbyteries also employ an evangelist. Sometimes he is connected directly with the committee, which we have described as a commission, and is either a member of it, or its chairman and executive officer. Sometimes

again he has no direct share in its operations, but is employed by them, or under their direction in simply preaching to vacant churches and missionary stations.

This brings us to a question which appears to us both timely and important: What is the true idea of our Presbyterian evangelists' office and sphere?

The Rev. GEORGE COOPER GREGG, who was taken from amongst us in the vigor of his manhood and the noon-tide of his usefulness, published some eleven years ago in this journal a very admirable article on *The True Theory of the Conduct and Management of our Domestic Missions*. He made the following points, which he sustained with convincing force:

1. That is the duty of each Presbytery to take charge of the territory embraced within its bounds.

2. To search out the waste places within its territory, ascertain favorable locations for mission stations, cherish feeble churches by pecuniary aid, and disburse funds raised for this purpose.

3. To employ one or more missionaries to visit vacant churches and mission stations, and minister the word and receive their contributions for benevolence.

4. To attend to the work of church extension as a coördinate branch of Domestic Missions.

5. To correspond with licentiates and ministers without charge, and bring them in contact with vacant churches and mission stations.

So much for the Presbytery. At the same time he insisted on "a central agency employed only in maintaining a pecuniary equilibrium," receiving the contributions of the strong, and distributing them according to the necessities of the weak. Thus his scheme answers perfectly to that upon which our Church is operating. We have reason, indeed, to rejoice in our having been delivered from the old Board, with its cumbrous and inefficient and really irresponsible membership of sixty ministers and thirty-six laymen, its absolute control over missionaries to the damaging of Presbyterian independence, and its interruption

of the direct connexion of the Church with her own work. That Board had power unrestricted by the powers or rights of any inferior court. The Presbyteries were mere advisory committees of that Board. They were its "*auxiliaries.*" It constituted a new kind of church court. The real power of it lay in its wheel within the wheel: its executive committee, which it appointed and which reported to it, and then it reported to the Assembly. But at the centre of this central wheel stood the Secretary of the Board, between whom and each one of several hundred missionaries there intervened no other power; whose bread depended largely on his favor; who constituted an army of ministers disposed and arranged through all the field according to his pleasure. Here, indeed, there was a mighty one-man power! Here was, in fact, a prelate of the very widest and mightiest influence and authority! This anti-Presbyterian arrangement (supposing Calvin, and Melville, and Gillespie, to know what is Presbyterian,) still prevails in the great "Presbyterian Church of the United States of America," now neither Old School nor New School, *especially* not now Old School. We have reason to rejoice that we have got rid of all this machinery, and that the whole direction and control of our missionaries in the domestic field is with the Presbyteries, where it ought to be; while our simple central committee of eleven members is purely executive in its functions, disbursing among the Presbyteries, through their own committees or commissions, the common funds.

Mr. Gregg said that to carry into execution this scheme of Domestic Missions, "Presbytery must have two agents—a Committee on Domestic Missions, and a Treasurer." Evidently he contemplated this Committee as charged by Presbytery with all the powers needful to carry on its work. The Committee was to be the Presbytery—in other words, it was the Presbytery's commission to inquire and act. They were to search out the waste places, and the mission stations; to cherish feeble churches, and to employ missionaries for preaching. But the Committee of Domestic Missions in that Presbytery had enjoyed the services of the Rev. J. C. Coit, of Cheraw, as its chairman—a man of

extraordinary energy and enterprise, and of first-rate executive abilities. Mr. Gregg, who had been Mr. Coit's colleague in the Committee, succeeded him in the post of chairman. Those were halcyon days in Harmony Presbytery. Coit and Gregg were both extraordinary men, and accomplished great things in connexion with the missionary committee, though in charge of congregations of their own. The Presbytery was felt through all its bounds, stimulating, encouraging, cheering, nourishing little feeble flocks of Presbyterians into strength and vigor; and causing mission stations to grow first into mission churches, and then into self-sustaining ones. With a few hundred dollars given from the Presbytery's treasury, they could draw forth from those whom they aided, all which it was in their power to give; thus doubling or trebling the means of support for the work. Thus was inaugurated a system of missions, the result of which was the building up of a number of churches able to take care of themselves.

Now, it appears to us that all this was an exemplification of the force and influence of the *power of rule* in our system. The preaching of the missionaries employed, did, of course, under God, accomplish the work that was done. But the ruling power of the court, through its commission, lay back of that preaching. The Committee managed the support of those missionaries, after looking them up and setting them at work in their several spheres. All these labors, and all their fruits, came out of the missionary zeal of the Presbytery met as rulers to look after the interests of the body. To carry the influence of the Presbytery all through its bounds, helping the weak, and stimulating the slothful or faint-hearted—that was the object aimed at. The idea was to bring the supervision and control, the power and the rule of the Presbytery, into every corner of its field; and wherever a poor little church was found, either trying to creep along, or else lying quite still in the mire of discouragement and sadness, to put all the power and influence of the Presbytery, and its charity too, as a lever, a mighty lever, under the poor little church, and raise it up at once to life, and hope, and action. This is what that Committee did; and they did it not by virtue

of the several, but of the joint power; not as preachers, but rulers in the house of God.

We come then to this, that what we want in our Presbyterian missionary work, is not a minister to preach a little to one feeble church, and a little to another; not two or three ministers to go and carry free preaching to all our waste places and mission stations; but the strong and steady arm of the Presbytery put forth in the systematic, and earnest, and vigorous, and persevering cultivation of its field—in other words, it is not a preacher's, but an evangelist's, functions which must be now employed. What the case demands, is just what Paul sent to Crete, because his own visit and labors there had been too hurried to bring the work to completion—and that was a man to “set in order things that are wanting.” We want an *evangelist*—you may call him chairman of a committee, if you will; but whatever called, he must, in conjunction with two or three other rulers of the church, constitute an impersonation of the Presbytery's governing powers. The more he can preach to the feeble churches, and at the mission stations, the better, of course; but it is not his own preaching labors that can constitute his peculiar usefulness. He must go out upon another errand than preaching, all glorious and excellent as that work always is. How much *could* any one man do towards supplying, by his own preaching, the wants of a whole Presbyterian mission field? This man's business is to be a stirring up, a regulating and a setting in order things that are wanting; and all this by setting others to work, rather than by his own individual labors.

The answer which we would give, therefore, to the question under consideration is, that the Presbyterian evangelist among us is the chairman of the Committee of Domestic Missions. Such was really the case when Coit and Gregg acted. Such is the case now in some of our Presbyteries. Such, it appears to us, ought ordinarily to be the rule and practice, for that idea is fundamental in our system and operations. You may have missionaries employed, and you may assist in supporting the pastors of feeble churches; but the work of superintendency, of stirring up, of encouraging and nourishing, of setting in order things

that are wanting, is the work which Presbytery seeks to accomplish, and that is evangelistic work in distinction from simple preaching; and for that work the body must look to the commission, and its executive officer or chairman.

What has been said leads to another question, which we are persuaded it is of vital importance for each Presbytery to consider: What should we aim at, as concerns our feeble churches?

If the evangelist amongst us is to be simply a missionary, whose work it is to go and supply one or all of our feeble churches with preaching, then it would seem to be our end and object concerning those churches to get them supplied with the ministrations of the word, without considering very carefully at whose charges the work is to be done. Naturally, it would be considered a high duty, and a great privilege to furnish these little companies of our believing brethren with the gospel freely preached; and to this end, of course, collections must be taken up in all our churches, so as to create a fund out of which the missionary doing this blessed work of charity should be supported. But if the evangelist's work is the work of the commission of Presbytery through its chairman, then a very different idea of the thing to be aimed at immediately becomes the natural and most prominent idea. The end to be aimed at, then, is to educate the feeble churches to do all they can to supply themselves with the preaching of the word, by encouraging their own efforts with the Presbytery's aid.

We are deeply impressed with the conviction, that there is a vast difference theoretically, and still more, practically considered, between these two conceptions. And very strong is our persuasion that the latter is the only true one. *Self-help*, it deserves to be engraven upon each feeble church's mind and heart with a diamond's sharpness and power—*Self-help is the first help amongst men for us*. And as it is of vital consequence for every particular church which is feeble to understand and feel this, so is it also, on the one hand, for every individual man and woman; and, on the other, for every Presbytery in the Church. There are young men willing to be assisted in getting an education to preach, but not willing to exert themselves sufficiently

in obtaining that education. There are impoverished families amongst us, whose members, male and female, are ready to throw themselves for support on others, and eloquent in soliciting the support of others, but not willing to work hard for their own support. There are little churches accustomed to being supplied with preaching by their Presbytery, and, thus trained, to be conscientiously persuaded that they can not and ought not to provide for themselves and children the bread of life. There are whole Presbyteries, and some of them the richest in our Church, willing to depend on the treasury of the Assembly for the means of carrying on their domestic missionary work—actually receiving, from year to year, more out of the common fund than they put in, and yet richer than the most of their sisters! When Dr. C. C. Jones was put in charge of the Philadelphia Board of Domestic Missions, he found a great number of these feeble infants amongst the churches which, to use his own vigorous expression, had been *sucking away* at the paps of the Church for twenty and thirty years; which liked so well their diet, as they lay reclining on the broad bosom of their mother, or were dandled on her knees, that they were unwilling to think of ever being any thing but infants. Our brother made a prodigious stir amongst all these chubby darlings, when he put forth the idea that the Assembly should at once proceed to wean her babies. By individuals and by families, by churches and by Presbyteries, it ought to be felt to be, as Jesus said it is, more blessed to give than to receive. It should be a point of honor with every Presbytery in our Church to comply with the Assembly's rule, if possible, and put into the common treasury more, much more than it draws out. And it is a high duty which each Presbytery owes to every one of its little churches, to train them to self-help; and we do not believe this can be otherwise done, than upon some such plan of operations as has been already described.

Another thought springs out of what has been said of self-help by the little churches, viz., that the evangelist and his committee should cultivate amongst all our churches, especially in the country, the desire for a full and constant supply of preach-

ing. Many of our strongest country churches are content with public services upon two Sundays in a month. They began with such a supply thirty or forty years ago when they were young and weakly. They have lived upon it, and, compared with those who get less instruction, they may be considered strong. But what an advantage it would be to them, and to the community where their candlestick is set, if they could have preaching every Lord's day! It is precisely by such an agency as our evangelist and his commission that the Presbytery can set in order what is wanting in these cases.

And there is still another thought we would briefly present, which arises out of a consideration of this subject. There ought to be a sincere and earnest effort by the Presbytery to secure a more liberal support for its ministers by their churches. And this, like the other points we have been urging, does not necessarily or naturally fall within the compass of any missionary's efforts; nor yet, on the other hand, can a body which meets but twice a year, adequately enforce any of these upon the mind and head of the churches. It is only the Presbytery *ad interim*, that is, the commission of the Presbytery, charged with the care of all its common interests in the line of aggressiveness and progress, which can press upon the churches the duty of self-help or of obtaining a fuller supply of preachers, or of affording them a better support. There is no single evil amongst us now for the abatement of which there needs to be louder or more earnest outcry than the evil of a secularized ministry. The scarcity of ministers is appalling to any man who earnestly desires to see the earth full of the knowledge of God. And yet scores of ministers are secularized in one way or other, because their support is inadequate. Many a faithful laborer worthy of his hire, many a good soldier of the cross who ought not to be forced to carry on the war at his own charges, is eating up the little patrimony he inherited and which ought to descend to his children, or he is rolling up a debt which will crush him; or he is harassed and oppressed with unavailing efforts to clothe himself and family, and get food for them out of a scanty income. And if some of this sort of men should resort to tent-making of one

kind or another (alas! there are some tent-making ministers amongst us of another sort and from other motives) in order to continue in the ministry, there is surely a fault lying at somebody's door; but just as surely it does not lie at their door.*

These thoughts about Domestic Missions have not been the fruit of mere abstract reflection, but the result of practical observation and some experience. And we propose in the remainder of this article to give some details of the history of Domestic Missions in one of our Presbyteries, by way of illustrating and enforcing the views expressed.

The Presbytery we speak of employed an evangelist for a number of years before the war, whose duties were to supply vacant churches and plant new ones. This work was suspended during the war, but was resumed again in the fall of 1865. One year later, viz., in the fall of 1866, a new feature was given to the plan, and it was made the chief business of the Committee to strive to supersede the prevalent system of stated supplies with the pastoral relation in all the churches. Moreover it was the

*It may be interesting and useful to condense from Mr. Gregg's paper a statement of the different phases which the work of Domestic Missions assumed in the earlier times of our Church in this country. From 1707 to 1722, aid was rendered to feeble churches, or rather to their pastors, but upon their attaining strength, further assistance was withheld. Down to this time the system of itinerating had not been introduced, but in this year we find missionaries sent to destitute places and frontier settlements. These were pastors taken from their respective charges for a few weeks or months. The compensation given was so much added to their income. This itinerating system continued from 1722 to 1825, when the Assembly added a new feature to the Board of Missions. Assistance now began to be given to pastors as such, and the old plan came back into use again. Now itinerancy languished and nearly ceased to be known. The care of existing churches occupied attention rather than the exploration of new districts. In 1839 the Assembly again called for itinerancy, and some pastors were released from their charges for short periods to attend to it. Another feature of the history is, that Presbyteries, Synods, and Assemblies, all claimed and exercised the right of laying an injunction at their pleasure upon any pastor, and sending him forth to do missionary labor. The consent of either party to the pastoral relation seems never to have been sought.

judgment of the Presbytery that ordinarily, no pastor should be connected with more than two congregations. At the same time the evangelist was made the chairman of the Committee of Missions, and they were instructed to aim at the ends above specified. It was estimated that for the support of the evangelist, whose whole time was to be given to this work, and also to give needful aid to the smaller churches in supporting their pastors, there would be required not less than four thousand dollars (\$4000) annually. But the Presbytery was large, and it was said that one dollar from each church member belonging to it would secure the necessary sum.

The experience of the first three months seemed to show that there was no probability of the required amount being secured upon the old system of occasional collections in the churches. Hence, on the 1st January, 1867, the Committee instructed its chairman to visit, as rapidly as possible, every church in the Presbytery, and endeavor to get introduced the system of weekly collections. The work was at once entered on and diligently prosecuted. The Presbytery at its meeting in April, 1867, gave its sanction to the movement, and by the middle of the following September, that is, in eight and a half months, all the fifty-three churches of the Presbytery had been visited. The success of the effort was remarkable, and nearly every church agreed at once to adopt the plan. The very small number which at first declined, soon yielded; and at the end of twelve months, the revolution might have been said to be complete. There were, indeed, some subsequent fluctuations; some few churches gave up the plan for special reasons, but returned to it again. But at last, four-fifths of the whole held steadily on, and in July, 1869, the plan was almost of universal adoption in the churches.

But this surprising success was not achieved without opposition. The prejudices of a whole life with many had to be overcome. False teaching in some cases, and in many more no teaching at all, caused the plan to be denounced as a "new fangled notion." A large presentation of Bible truth alone, tore down these prejudices. Even yet, not a few individuals refuse to contribute weekly, and some few oppose. But there is noth-

ing in all this which was not to have been expected by those who know the Presbyterian people. They are not to be driven about by every wind of doetime, and they cannot be coaxed or "blarneyed." They must be convinced. Hence, whenever right, they are gloriously right; even as when wrong, they are apt to be stubbornly wrong.

We must be allowed to dwell a little upon the greatness of the change of feeling and practice which has now been mentioned. In many of our churches, a public collection on the Lord's day for any purpose, even once or twice a year, would, before the war, scarcely be tolerated. If, in some emergency, funds were indispensably necessary to be collected, the elders and deacons would retire into the session-house, or get behind the church, out of sight, as though engaged in some questionable business; and they would themselves make up the necessary amount, if possible, rather than have any public call upon the congregation. Religion and money were regarded as holding something like the same relation to each other as light and darkness. Take the following incident in proof: At a certain meeting of this Presbytery, in 1858, after the body adjourned, a ruling elder, universally respected as a godly man, lifted both hands to heaven and thanked God that he had been permitted to attend one meeting of the Presbytery at which the word *money* had not been once uttered!

For twenty or twenty-five years, there labored, long since, in this Presbytery, one of the most gifted, earnest, acceptable, and influential ministers, who was absolutely opposed to saying anything whatever about money from the pulpit. He was opposed also, to all public collections in the church. Moreover, he always refused to accept any reward for his preaching labors. In 1849, he removed to the West; and before he left, saw and acknowledged his mistake. But his acknowledgment of error has not been very much heeded, whilst his former teachings and example are, in some neighborhoods, well remembered and often quoted. In justice to this excellent and much respected brother, who is no longer amongst the dwellers upon the earth, it ought to be stated that he had been an eminent lawyer and a conspicu-

ous member of society before his conversion; immediately upon which event he commenced to preach the gospel with fervor and unction and power. He said he had often heard it remarked amongst his comrades, before his conversion: "Take away the money, and you shall soon see how much preaching there will be left." Remembering this reproach and not looking at the subject in its other bearings, he resolved that it never should be said he was preaching for money. He carried this so far, that once when some money was left for him at his own house by some one who believed our Lord's saying, that "the laborer is worthy of his hire," and who respected our Lord's ordinance that "they who preach the gospel should live of the gospel," our single-hearted brother sent the money back to the giver. It should be further stated that he possessed at the outset of his ministerial career an ample fortune, but spent it all before he died; impoverishing his family to preach the gospel without charge to people who were able to sustain him. Many of these exhibit the effects of this doctrine and practice of their minister down to this day, and so illustrate the evils that may flow out of the mistakes of the best of men from the best of motives.

The position taken by this eminent servant of God was on the one extreme. Other ministers associated with him did not perhaps refuse what was offered them, but they did not teach the people the duty of supporting the ministry, nor yet of worshipping God in any other way with their worldly substance. Rather than plainly preach that pastors must be set free from worldly cares by a competent support furnished, these brethren preferred to go to the school, the farm, and in some peculiar cases even behind the counter, that they might preach the gospel freely and without charge. And what would naturally be the result of such a proceeding in all ordinary cases? That the half-paid minister gets rich in worldly goods, but the church grows spiritually poor. He gets two or three hundred dollars per annum for simply talking a while in the pulpit on Sundays, after having spent his strength the whole week in worldly work. Commonly he is a man as capable of managing secular affairs as the mass of his people; he knows how to plant and when to

plough as well as they do; he is as good a judge of the points of a horse or a cow or a hog as any of them, and can decide as well as any man how much to take when he sells, or how much to give when he buys. Does it not appear very manifest that the two hundred dollars is just so much start given to the secularized preacher in the race for riches betwixt him and his flock? It was divine wisdom in our Lord, which ordained that they who preach the gospel should live of the gospel, and be set free from worldly cares and avocations. It is a sad and a dreadful mistake which any church makes, when she contravenes that heavenly arrangement and starves herself in starving the preacher.

Under these difficulties the attempt has been making for now three years to have weekly collections in all our churches, and to secure from them a proper support of their ministers. Progress has been certainly made, and yet the standard is far too low, nor can we boast at all for our Presbytery, that we have yet "attained"; but we are "reaching forth unto those things which are before."

To return. It has been said the object of Presbytery in the fall of 1866, was to establish in every one of its churches the pastoral relation, each pastor not serving more than two churches; and to raise \$4000 to aid in effecting these objects. Now, in fact, not one-third of this sum has been raised, and yet there is positive and marked progress towards the goal; for the churches are better supplied with preaching and the ministers are better supported. Our impression is very strong that there is something here well worthy of the reader's particular notice. We are persuaded that a new idea, and the right one, has dawned upon our churches; God's providence and the necessities of their case have brought light to their eyes. When the Presbytery's scheme was first set forward, churches and ministers began to make application for assistance. But the necessary funds were not at command. The case with many grew desperate; ministers could not remain with their churches for the pittance they were affording to them. Then dawned the first ray of the new light spoken of just now. The evangelist visited

the churches and explained the case, and they began to see after a new fashion that they must *help themselves* or do without preaching. Some churches took prompt action, and the people were themselves astonished to see what they could do under pressure. Others delayed action until they lost their ministers; when discovering that really the alternative was closed churches or more self-denying and liberal giving, they chose the latter. Thus a better result has been attained than if the \$4000 could have been secured to be distributed, for in that case this mighty and excellent spirit of self-help would not have been evoked. As it is, in three years time these evangelistic efforts have raised the average salary of all the ministers in the Presbytery up to the sum of \$588, which is 78 per cent. more than the average salary in the year 1860. The total increase of contributions in the Presbytery for the support of the ministry (including what is paid to the evangelist) is about \$7000, which is nearly double the amount which the Presbytery set out to raise in the fall of 1866. We are persuaded all will admit that that must be an excellent plan of domestic missionary policy, which results in rousing the slumbering churches to deny themselves for the support of the gospel at home, rather than encouraging the belief that they are unable to maintain their preacher and cherishing in them a detestable eleemosynary spirit.

Whatever may tend to shed light on the problem of how to develop best the resources of the Church, will of necessity be interesting and profitable to our readers. And we do not hesitate, therefore, to proceed in this line of narrative and observation, and to give some instances in detail of the working of this evangelistic scheme. We shall speak—

1. Of the B. church, which formerly enjoyed the ministrations of the excellent brother whom we described as opposed to receiving any reward for preaching. Naturally it followed after a short time that the people did not trouble him much in that way. After his departure they paid about \$100 for the services of a preacher once a month. Such was their practice until the fall of 1866, when the evangelist first visited them on the subject of weekly collections. The proposition met with the most decided

hostility, except from two of the male members of the church. Upon his second visitation, the opposition had decreased. Very soon after this they began to pay their minister \$200 for one-fourth of his time, and their other contributions were far larger than they had been before. In January, 1869, they were offering to pay \$320 if they could secure the half of their minister's services, and they have since raised the offer to \$400. Thus they both desire more preaching than contented them before, and also are willing to pay much for it, which is, of course, the true practical test of their sense of its value. Supposing the original wishes of the Presbytery could have been fulfilled and they had been supplied with \$4000 to spend upon their weak churches, is it natural to think that B. church would now occupy her present honorable position? It should be stated that B. church is very small.

2. Of the S. church, which is also a little one. In 1867, it had preaching but once a month and promised to pay \$150, but came short of it. For some months S. found herself without preaching, and then under pressure of necessity made what everybody considered a noble effort, and pledged and paid at the rate of \$300 per annum for one-half of a licentiate's time. If the Committee had been in possession of the funds requisite, it would cheerfully have assisted this feeble flock in raising this sum; but as the case stood, they raised it themselves. Which was the better result? The licentiate left them at the close of his Seminary vacation to go and finish his course of study. Again they were left without preaching for a time, but have since secured half the time of a preacher at \$450. The other church which is associated with them, being still feebler than themselves, S. church, through the abundance of their joy, and their deep poverty abounding unto the riches of their liberality, was willing to pledge \$50 more than their share in this partnership in order to secure the end.

3. Of the N. church, partner to the one just mentioned and still feebler than it. This congregation thought they were making a very liberal offer, when they agreed at first to pay \$250 for the half of his time; and so indeed they were, con-

sidering what other and stronger churches are paying for the same. But to secure the arrangement spoken of with S. church, they were obliged to come up to \$350, and they have done it. Now, had the Committee been in possession of the funds, assistance would no doubt have willingly been afforded by them. As the case stood, the little church had recourse to *self-help*, and that mighty power did not fail them.

4. Of the M. church. This is a church numerically and pecuniarily quite weak. For a number of years it had preaching twice a month, for which it paid scarcely \$100 per annum, and its minister sustained himself by teaching. In January, 1868, this brother removed, and the little church was left vacant. For a supply of once a month they then paid less than \$150, but more than they had previously paid for preaching twice a month. Now they are anxiously offering \$300 to have the services of some minister twice a month. Here again, it was simply no prospect of outside help which brought about this result. In this church, a majority of the members hold that each church member is bound to give the tenth of his income to the Lord.

5. Of the F. church. This is a large church, which for years has employed a stated supply for twice a month, at \$200. Of course there was no thought of giving assistance to such a church; rather, the Committee looked for aid to it. But they seemed to think they were doing well to raise \$200 for preaching, and they made strong opposition to any innovations in the matter of collections. Of the evangelist's first visit, the only apparent effect was no little anger that such an unreasonable thing as the proper support of a minister for all his time, should be expected and desired of them by Presbytery. This was in 1867. Now they avow the determination to secure a pastor as soon as possible, on a salary of \$1000. The evangelist visited this church three times, and the avowal just mentioned was made after the third visit.

6. Of the W. church. This church was long ago supplied stately for years by a very eminent minister and celebrated classical teacher. Between his school and his farm, he was independent of any salary, and, of course, according to the notion of

those times, would have ruined himself as a preacher if he had asked or accepted any reward for preaching. At length their minister was removed, and there came a struggle to support the gospel amongst them. Finally, some two years since, they were found having a stated supply for one-half of the time, with a sort of indefinite idea that they ought to pay him about \$200, but this amount was not all subscribed, and only part of what was subscribed was actually paid. The Committee sent the evangelist to rouse them from this state. The leaven of truth worked, but not rapidly. They persisted in maintaining that they were not able to do more. In the spring of 1869, they were visited again. Their stated supply declined to serve them any longer on the old terms. They were left entirely vacant. The alternative came to be a much greater effort than they had ever made before, or to have their church vacant for a longer time. On their part it was felt to be necessary either that they get a minister who would work on half pay, or else that they be furnished with assistance from the Presbytery in paying the full value of his labors; but neither of these things was possible. Three days were devoted to persuading this people to make the needful effort. At the close of the first, they remained at \$200; at the close of the second, they had advanced to \$400, and supposed any further progress absolutely impossible. But they were assured that this amount was wholly insufficient, and that they must give at least \$600 per annum or be without a preacher. At the close of the third day they came up to this point, and solemnly pledged the requisite amount, and shortly a licentiate was found who preached for them four months at that rate. The prospect is now good that they will ere long be furnished with a pastor and find themselves able to give him a competent support.

7. The case of the C. church may be referred to as illustrating the general fact that there is to some extent on the part of the churches a wish to secure for themselves more preaching. This church had enjoyed one-half of the ministrations of its pastor. At the last meeting of the Presbytery, it secured the whole of them. Some of the larger churches are still content with preaching twice a month; yet even in some of these, the

desire begins to be felt for a fuller supply of the word publicly ministered in their own place of worship.

It may be added that in the spring meeting of this Presbytery, it was ordered that vacant churches desiring supplies, should make application to the Committee of Domestic Missions, and that Committee was ordered to procure supplies for them on the following conditions: (1.) That no minister should be called upon more than twice from one meeting of Presbytery to another for his services in this line. (2.) That the church supplied should pay to the minister, at the time of his visit, not less than \$10. (3.) That the supplying minister should report to the Committee of Domestic Missions, whether he had fulfilled the appointment made for him, and whether he had received the reward of his labors.

This rule led to some criticism of the Presbytery as being deficient in the true spirit of Christian benevolence, which required them to give without asking anything in return. But it has been said on the other hand, with great force and truth, that the gratuitous supply of vacant churches by the Presbytery only encourages them to inaction. It is unreasonable to expect a minister to supply any vacant church at his own charges, in any case; and especially in the case where such church is paying nothing for a regular supply.

It may also be *repeated* that no little opposition has been manifested, at times and in places, to all this evangelistic movement. Some who have been long sleeping and are enjoying their repose do not like to be roused up; and some have lived so long in the neglect of their duty without being waked up to a sense of it, that they seem to have actually persuaded themselves that the neglect is duty. But the leaven of truth may be trusted to leaven the whole mass wherever it is put in, although it must have time.

About fifty years ago the universal salary for ministers, where any was paid, in the bounds of this Presbytery, was \$400. No advance on this sum, or but little, was made in any or in very few churches, until about twenty years ago. At the present time, some object to *casting reflections on their honored ancestry*

by increasing ministerial salaries. It is a good thing to track the footsteps of our fathers wherein they were right; but their principles must be carried out, and we must not follow our fathers merely in the dead letter. Our fathers paid their ministers well enough when they gave them \$400. Thirty or forty years ago corn was worth, in the bounds of the Presbytery we refer to, from twenty-five to thirty-five cents per bushel. Flour was worth from two dollars to two dollars and a half per hundred. Meat was worth from one and a half to two and a half cents per pound. The clothing worn then was jeans and homespuns. Buggies and carriages were then almost unknown. Coffee was a Sunday beverage, not tasted during the week. Taking into account the price of provisions and the style of living half a century ago, one dollar was fully equal then to four or five dollars now, and ministerial support far better then than in any of our country churches now.

The facts which have been presented in this article, evince four positive results springing out of a Presbytery's evangelistic work. These four results are of the highest value and most cheering promise. Here is the system of weekly collections made nearly universal in the Presbytery's fifty-three churches; a marked advance in the support of ministers over what had of late years been common in its bounds; the desire for a fuller supply of preaching awakened to some extent generally, and to a large extent in particular cases; and the mighty idea of self-help roused in a number of cases, which do speak volumes of instruction to us all regarding both the resources of our weak churches and the true way of calling them forth. The eleemosynary spirit, whether in persons or in bodies amongst us, must be frowned down. It must be felt all through our Church, that to give is blessed rather than to receive. It ought to be a point of honor with every church to support its minister in comfort, and that without asking help outside the congregation. It ought to be a point of honor with every Presbytery to give much more into the treasury of the Assembly than it draws out. A person, a church, a Presbytery, that really cannot live without aid, ought not to be ashamed to accept it. We are all

brethren, and we have one Father and one Lord, and the strong must help the weak. But let us all try *self-help* to the utmost, before we ask for any help from others. If it is the Christian law to put your own shoulder to the wheel when you ask the Lord to help, surely it is meet to do your utmost before you appeal for help to other people. The resources we possess are, in a sense, boundless. No Christian man or woman, no church, no Presbytery, is doing the utmost possible. Let faith be stronger; love more active and tender and deep; zeal more earnest and fiery; the sweetness of giving to the Lord and his Church better understood—and wonders can be done by us all, in every portion of the field. We are poor now, comparatively, like the Macedonian Christians; but if the grace of God be only bestowed on us, then in a great trial of afflictions even, the abundance of our joy and our deep poverty will surely abound to the riches of our liberality. We must have *the abundance of the joy*, however, to make us liberal in our poverty. It must be sweet to us to give to Jesus and his people. We must be zealous for Christ and his Church. We must love sinners and the Saviour. We must believe in the unseen and eternal which is nigh. All these graces may God give to us all, and to all his people every where.

ARTICLE IV.

SOUTHERN VIEWS AND PRINCIPLES NOT "EXTINGUISHED" BY THE WAR.

[Prepared for Publication in November, 1865.]

"The enjoyment of liberty, and even its support and preservation, consists in every man's being allowed to speak his thoughts, and lay open his sentiments."—*Montesquieu*.

It has been asserted by Northern papers so often as to produce general belief, that the people of the South, in "accepting the situation," have also abandoned their former distinctive views and principles. We enter our decided protest against such inference. The people of the South do, in one sense, "accept the situation." The providence of God has sorely smitten them, and humbled them, and they desire to bow in submission to his holy will. But it does not follow that the providence of God has decided against the justice of their cause. The cause of the Jews, as against the neighboring nations, was *always* just, for it was the cause of God. But yet, how often were God's own people defeated in battle, and even subjugated, by the more wicked heathen around them! Their cause continued just under defeat and subjugation, and ultimately prevailed. In all contests between nations, God is the principal with whom either party has chiefly to do. Providence, for wise ends, may permit an ungodly nation to prosper for a time; but loyalty to Christ, the head of all power, is the indispensable condition of a nation's permanent prosperity and renown. A cause must not only be righteous, but must also be supported by a righteous people; else a righteous God may justly punish them, by suffering it to fail. With the multitude, success, or the want of it, is the sole test of the justice or injustice of a cause. The principle on which they proceed, is this: What God permits, is necessarily right; what he frustrates, is necessarily wrong. A most erroneous and destructive principle. God permits evil, but does not sanction it. And God frustrates a righteous cause on account of the sins of

those who espoused it. The word of God is the infallible standard of truth and duty. The providence of God appears sometimes to contradict the word, but does not, and never fails ultimately to vindicate the teachings of the word and the eternal principles of truth and justice. The people of the South, whilst submitting humbly to the terrible rebukes of a holy God for their sins, do not thereby surrender their well-established views and principles, political and moral: the first, supported by the Constitution of the country; the last, protected by the Scriptures of eternal truth. They have *not* been "converted by the sword to Northern ideas." The sword cannot "conquer" a creed. Force may confine the body, but cannot reach the immortal mind. Had the Southern people acknowledged and maintained aright their relations to Christ, the great Head of the State, "the Governor among the nations," Southern principles would have been crowned with speedy victory. But they refused to acknowledge him, in profession and in practice; and he refused to acknowledge them. As usual, in his dealings with nations, his judgments began with the less guilty people. And if they have been so fearful with us, what will they be with those whose cup of iniquity is greater than our own? The heavy blow that has prostrated us, will yet make the North stagger and fall. Before the tribunal of God, the South lays her hand upon her mouth, her mouth in the dust, acknowledges her guilt, and cries, "God be merciful to me a sinner!" Before the tribunal of nations, the South proclaims the justice of her cause; and to the jeers of a scoffing world, calmly responds:

"Truth crushed to earth, shall rise again!"

I. The South adheres to her former testimony in behalf of

STATE SOVEREIGNTY AND THE RIGHT OF SECESSION.

Truth cannot be put down by force of arms. It is our duty to give it our testimony, when we can give it nothing else. All the power of the United States Government cannot alter the following facts, taken principally from Judge Yates's Secret Proceedings and Debates of the Federal Convention, the Federalist, and Elliot's Debates. At the close of the Revolution of '76,

rebel colonies became free and independent states. As *States*, independent of herself, and of each other, they were recognised by Great Britain, each, name by name. As such, they formed a Confederacy: "The style of this *Confederacy* shall be 'The *United States* of America;'" the members of which were still recognised as "*sovereign and independent*" by the Articles of Confederation—those very articles which proposed to make the union "perpetual." "Each State retains its sovereignty, freedom, and independence." Thus they continued for thirteen years as equals, each State being entitled to one vote. When, in 1787, they formed the Constitution of the United States, they did it, State by State, as equal sovereignties. Such a political body as the people of the United States, as distinct from the States themselves, never existed. Had there been such a body, then a minority of the larger States, comprising, however, a majority of the people, could, and would have imposed the Constitution upon the people of the remaining States. But this was not the case. Each State ratified the Constitution for itself—no two at the same time—and thus, and thus only, did it become the Constitution of the States United. And so we find that the only "citizens" known to the Constitution, are "the citizens of each *State*," "citizens of different *States*," (Art. 3, Sec. 2; Art. 4, Sec. 2,) showing that *the State only has citizens*. If sovereignty is not in the States, then they are united Provinces or Counties, not united States; and so no better off than when subject to the British Crown. The Revolution was a failure; and the Declaration of Independence, which proclaimed them "free and independent States," was a farce. But the Constitution itself shows the supremacy of the States, when it shows that it was "established" "*between*"—not over—"the *States ratifying the same*;" and when it shows that amendments are effected, not by any one three-fourths, but by any three-fourths of the *States*; proving thus that sovereignty is in each of the States. The old Confederation was ratified by State *Governments* acting through delegates; the present Constitution by the people of the States in Convention assembled. The former, a union of State Governments; the latter, a union of States themselves. The

former, a union of agents exercising the powers of sovereignty; the latter, a union of sovereigns themselves. Both were unions of political bodies, as distinct from a union of the people individually. Both, *Confederacies*. But the present, in a higher and purer sense than the former; just as the act of a sovereign is higher and more perfect than that of his agent. Thus was "a more perfect union formed," as the preamble to the Constitution states; a consolidation of the Union, but not a consolidation of the States. This common Constitution is, for certain ends, the Constitution of each State, as much as its particular Constitution is for other ends. The General Government was now raised to the same level with State Governments, (instead of being their creature, as at first,)—through both of which, sovereign States exercised their sovereign powers, respectively; through the one, a conjoint, through the other, a separate exercise of sovereign powers. The States are united to the extent of the powers delegated, and separate beyond that limit. To speak of "distributed sovereignty," "divided sovereignty," "delegated sovereignty," is absurd. Sovereignty is a unit, indivisible; but the exercise of sovereign powers is divisible. And sovereign States have divided the exercise of their powers between the State and the Federal Governments. Sovereignty is the very life and soul of a State. "Powers" do not constitute it; for all possible "powers" of government may be delegated, and yet sovereignty remain intact. The Constitution shows that the Federal Government has only "powers," and therefore it cannot have sovereignty. Sovereignty is an essential characteristic, and is neither the subject nor the result of any acknowledgment, agreement, or reservation. The Constitution may recognise it, but cannot confer it. What are termed by loose writers "exceptions to sovereignty," are in reality simply the powers owned by the States, and delegated to their common agent, the Federal Government. To "delegate" is not to "transfer," "relinquish," or "surrender." The ownership of delegated powers is as unimpaired as is that of reserved powers; and the Government that administers the former, no less than those that administer the latter, is the property of the State. For though it be a govern-

ment, with all the rights belonging to it within the orbit of its powers, it is yet a Government emanating from a compact between sovereigns, who, through it, exercise their sovereign powers, conjointly, upon certain objects of external concern, of equal interest to each—such as war, peace, commerce, etc. But other objects of civil government are without its orbit. Upon all such the States exercise their sovereignty separately. It belongs to each State to determine for itself the extent of the obligation it contracted. Not the State, but the Constitution itself, annuls an unconstitutional act. Such an act is, of itself, void and of no effect. But the State declares the extent of its obligation; and such declaration is binding on its citizens.

The Federal Government, through all its departments—judicial, as well as others—is administered by delegated agents. And therefore, the power which controls, ultimately, the judicial, as well as all other departments, is not in the agents, but in those who appoint them. They who quote so confidently the 3rd Article of the Constitution, in support of the doctrine that the Supreme Court is therein made the umpire between the States and the Federal Government, to determine the political relations between them, may find their confidence rebuked by pondering the following words of that eminent authority, Chief Justice Marshall: "By extending the judicial power to all cases in law and equity, the Constitution had never been understood to confer on that department any political power whatever. To come within this department, (*i. e.* of a case in law or equity), a question must assume a legal form for forensic litigation and judicial decision. There must be parties to come into court who can be reached by its process and bound by its power; whose rights admit of ultimate decision by a tribunal to which they are bound to submit. A case proper for judicial decision may arise, when the rights of individuals are to be asserted, or defended, in court. The judicial power cannot extend to political compacts." In confirmation of the correctness of the decision of this illustrious judge, is the fact, that in the Convention which framed the Constitution, the advocates of a National Government proposed to make the Federal Government supreme, by giving it, in certain

cases, a negative on the acts of the State Legislatures. They insisted on this, after the judiciary, or third, Article of the Constitution was agreed to; which proves that said Article was considered by them as not constituting the Supreme Court the arbiter to decide conflicting claims of sovereignty between the States and the Federal Government.

So great was the fear that the Federal Government, under the Constitution, might, instead of the agent, become the sovereign, that the Constitution narrowly escaped defeat: Massachusetts adopting it by a majority of 19, in a convention of 355 members; New Hampshire, by a majority of 11 in 103 members; New York, by a majority of 3 in 57; Virginia, by a majority of 10 in 168; while North Carolina and Rhode Island rejected it, at first, by overwhelming majorities. As the Constitution was ratified by the States in Conventions assembled, its true character, and that of the Government it created, can only be determined, when called in question, by the construction of the framers, the States themselves.

First, let Massachusetts speak. Samuel Adams, one of the noblest of her sons and leaders, had, with many others, gone into her Convention with the determination to defeat the Constitution. His views of it he had given previously in a letter to Richard Henry Lee: "I stumble at the threshold. I meet with a National Government, instead of a Federal union of sovereign States. If the several States are to become one entire nation, under one legislature; its powers to extend to all legislation, and its laws to be supreme, and control the whole; the idea of sovereignty in these States must be lost." When it was evident in the Convention, that the Constitution would be defeated by an overwhelming majority, Governor Hancock introduced certain amendments—among them the famous tenth—to be proposed by Massachusetts to her sister States for their adoption, in order to conciliate the opponents of the instrument. With these, the great opposition leader, Samuel Adams, expressed himself satisfied, saying to Governor Hancock: "Your Excellency's first proposition is, 'that it be explicitly declared that all powers not expressly delegated to Congress are reserved to the several

States, to be by them exercised.' This appears to my mind to be a summary of a bill of rights, which gentlemen are anxious to obtain. It is consonant with the 2d Article in the present Confederation, that each State retains its sovereignty and every power which is not expressly delegated to the United States in Congress assembled." The same distinguished patriot thus wrote again to Mr. Lee: "The good people may clearly see the distinction—for there is a distinction—between the Federal powers vested in Congress, and the sovereign authority belonging to the several States, which is the palladium of the private and personal rights of the citizens."

In a letter to Elbridge Gerry, (1789,) he says that the leading Federalists "wish to see drawn, as clearly as may be, a line between the Federal powers vested in Congress, and the distinct sovereignty of the several States, upon which the private and personal rights of the citizens depend. Without such distinction, there will be danger of the Constitution issuing imperceptibly and gradually into a consolidated government over all the States, which, though it may be wished for by some, was reprobated in the idea by the highest advocates of the Constitution. The people under one consolidated Government cannot long remain free." And writing the same year, on the same subject, to Richard Henry Lee, he says: "Such a Government, pervading and legislating through all the States, not for Federal purposes only, but in all cases whatsoever, would soon annihilate the sovereignty of the several States—so necessary to the support of the confederated commonwealths—and sink both in despotism."

Mr. Shurtleff, in the Massachusetts Convention, made objection to the following statement contained in a letter of General Washington to Congress, Sept. 17, 1787, reporting the proceedings of the Federal Convention: "In all our deliberations on this subject, we kept steadily in our view the consolidation of our Union." Chief Justice Parsons replied to the objection: "There is a distinction between a consolidation of the States, and a consolidation of the Union." Mr. Jones said: "The word consolidation had different ideas. Different metals melted into

one mass, illustrated one; and several twigs tied into one bundle, the other. Mr. Deuch thought "the words, 'we, the people,' in the first clause ordaining the Constitution would produce a consolidation of the States; and the moment it begins, a dissolution of the State Governments commences." Colonel Varnum said the purpose of the Constitution "was only a consolidation of strength. It is the interest of the whole to confederate against a foreign enemy." Governor Bowdoin described the system as "a Confederacy, which would give security and permanency to the several States." Judge Sumner argued that there was no danger, "as the General Government depended upon the State legislatures for its very existence." Mr. Sedgwick said that "if he thought this Constitution consolidated the union of the States, he should be the last man to vote for it." Fisher Ames, one of the most brilliant names of the Revolution, statesman and orator, said: "No argument against the new plan has made a deeper impression than this: that it will produce a consolidation of the States. This is an effect which all good men deprecate. The Senators represent the sovereignty of the States. A consolidation of the States would subvert the Constitution. Too much provision cannot be made against consolidation. State Governments afford shelter against the abuse of Federal power. The system would be in practice, as in theory, a Federal Republic." Judge Parsons said: "The Senate was designed to preserve the sovereignty of the States." Christopher Gore said: "The Senate represents the sovereignty of the States." Governor Bowdoin said: "The States are distinct sovereignties;" "whether such power (of imposing taxes) be given by the proposed Constitution, it is left with the Conventions of the several States, and with us, who compose one of them, to determine."

The preamble to the Constitution of Massachusetts states: "We, the people of Massachusetts . . . do agree upon, ordain, and establish the following . . . frame of Government as the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts;" "the people of this Commonwealth have the sole and exclusive right of governing themselves, as a free, sovereign, and independent State, and forever after shall exercise and enjoy every power, jurisdiction, and

right which is not . . . by them expressly delegated to the United States in Congress assembled." Her Convention ratified the Federal Constitution, thus: "The Convention . . . do, in the name, and in behalf, of the people of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, assent to and ratify the said Constitution for the United States of America." Not in the name and behalf "of the people of the United States in the aggregate," or of a portion of them; but "in the name and behalf of the people of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts," of "a free, sovereign, and independent State," did Massachusetts ratify the Constitution—showing thus what she understood by the phrase, in the preamble to the Federal Constitution, "we, the people of the United States!" Notwithstanding all these explanations, Massachusetts barely ratified the Constitution by a majority of 19 in 355 members! Who doubts then, that, if the Websterian construction of a "National Government, by which State sovereignty was effectually controlled," were the just one, the insulting proposition would have been scouted and spurned, and Massachusetts have indignantly kicked the Constitution out of doors?

Let us next hear the voice of Connecticut. Chief Justice Ellsworth, in the Federal Convention, moved to expunge the word "national" from the Constitution, and substitute the words, "Government of the United States," which was unanimously agreed to. In the ratifying Convention of Connecticut, he characterised the Union as a "Confederation," and said he looked "for the preservation of his rights to the State Governments. His happiness depended on their existence, as much as did a new-born infant on its mother for nourishment." He also said "the Constitution does not attempt to coerce sovereign bodies—States in their political capacity." Roger Sherman wrote thus to John Adams, July 20, 1789: "It is optional with the people of a State to establish any form of government they please, to vest the powers in one, a few, or many, and for a limited or unlimited time;" and "they may alter their frame of Government when they please, any former act of theirs, however explicit, to the contrary notwithstanding." In the Convention of Connecticut, he said: "The Government of the United States

being Federal, and instituted by a number of sovereign States for the better security of their rights and the advancement of their interests, they may be considered as so many pillars to support it." Senator Wolcott said in the Convention: "The Constitution effectually secures the States in their several rights. It must secure them for its own sake; for they are the pillars which uphold the general system." Chief Justice Law compared the Federal Government to "a vast and magnificent bridge, built upon thirteen strong and stately pillars. Now, the rulers who occupy the bridge, cannot be so beside themselves, as to knock away the pillars which support the whole fabric." The Convention adopted the Constitution by a majority of 88 in 168 members, in these words: "In the name of the people of the State of Connecticut, we, the delegates of the people of the said State . . . do assent to and ratify and adopt the Constitution for the United States of America." This shows what Connecticut understood by the phrase in the preamble to the Constitution—"We, the people of the United States."

In like manner did New Hampshire, in Convention assembled, ratify the Constitution: "The Convention . . . do, in the name, and behalf of the people of the State of New Hampshire, assent to and ratify the said Constitution for the United States of America." But it was by a meagre majority of 11 in 103 votes. General Washington, writing to General Pinckney, speaks of "New Hampshire having acceded to the New Confederacy, by a majority of eleven voices." Her ratification, being the ninth, completed the number necessary for the establishment of the Constitution, agreeably to the recommendation of the Federal Convention, "that as soon as the Conventions of nine States shall have ratified this Constitution, the United States, in Congress assembled, should fix a day on which electors should be appointed by the States which shall have ratified the same." The ratification of eight States only, would have accomplished nothing. The ratification of nine established the compact. The *Massachusetts Sentinel* of June 25, 1788, exhibits the view entertained in that day: "We felicitate our readers on the accession to the Confederation, of the State of New Hampshire, not only because

it completes the number of States necessary for the establishment of the Constitution, etc." That New Hampshire did not surrender her sovereignty, by entering the Union, is evident from the following declaration of her present Constitution: "The people of this State have the sole and exclusive right of governing themselves as a free, sovereign, and independent State; and do and forever hereafter shall exercise and enjoy every power which is not, and may not hereafter be, by them, expressly delegated to the United States in Congress assembled." If the people of New Hampshire "have the sole and exclusive right of governing themselves," then they are not governed by "the people of the United States."

New York ratified the Constitution by a still more meagre majority of 3 in 57, after a contest long and severe. Chief Justice Yates and Chancellor Lansing, her delegates to the Federal Convention, had left it because they were persuaded that the system proposed for adoption was destructive of State sovereignty and State rights. Many members of the New York Convention entertained the same view. The advocates for the Constitution supported it, only on the ground that this view was erroneous. Alexander Hamilton, in the *Federalist*, said: "If the new plan be adopted, the Union will still be, in fact and in theory, an association of States, or a Confederacy." "Every Constitution for the United States must inevitably consist of a great variety of particulars, in which thirteen independent States are to be accommodated in their interests, or opinions of interest. . . . Hence the necessity of making such a system as will satisfy all the parties to the compact." In the Convention of New York, he characterised the new system as "a Confederacy of States, in which the Supreme Legislature has only general powers; and the civil and domestic concerns of the people are regulated by the laws of the several States." "While the Constitution continues to be read, and its principles known, the States must, by every rational man, be considered as essential component parts of the Union." "It may safely be received as an axiom in our political system, that the State Governments will, in all possible contingencies, afford complete security against invasions of the

public liberty by national authority. In a Confederacy, the people, without exaggeration, may be said to be entirely masters of their own fate." Chancellor Livingston said: "A republic may very properly be formed by a league of States; but the laws of the general legislature must act and be enforced upon individuals. I am contending for this species of government." Notwithstanding these and similar distinct and satisfactory explanations, such was the jealous watch of this State over her rights, that she set forth a number of articles, declaring her understanding of the Constitution, in her act of ratification, which was in the usual style; "We, the delegates of the people of the State of New York, . . . in the name, and behalf the people of the State of New York, do, by these presents, assent to and ratify the said Constitution." In her new Constitution, adopted November 3rd, 1846, she declares, that "the people of this State, in their right of sovereignty, are deemed to possess the original and ultimate property in and to all lands within the jurisdiction of the State." "The United States are to retain such use and jurisdiction (of the soil of navy yard, arsenal, etc.,) so long as said tract shall be applied to the defence and safety of the said State, and no longer." "No authority can, on any pretence whatsoever, be exercised over the citizens of this State, but such as is, or shall be, derived from, and granted by, the people of this State." "It shall be the duty of the Governor, and of all the subordinate officers of the State, to maintain and defend its sovereignty and jurisdiction." Surely, New York does not believe that her "State sovereignty is effectually controlled by the General Government!"

New Jersey ratified the Constitution by a unanimous vote, as follows: "We, the delegates of the State of New Jersey, . . . do hereby, for and on behalf the people of the said State of New Jersey, agree to ratify and confirm the same and every part thereof." William Patterson, one of her statesmen, well said in the Federal Convention: "The idea of a National Government, as contradistinguished from a Federal one, never entered into the mind of any of the States; and to the public mind we must accommodate ourselves." "We are met here as deputies of thir-

teen independent sovereign States, for Federal purposes. Can we consolidate their sovereignty, and form one nation, and annihilate the sovereignty of our States, who have sent us here for other purposes? . . . But it is said, that this National Government is to act on individuals, not on States; and cannot a Federal Government be so formed, as to operate in the same way? It surely may. I therefore declare that I never will consent to the present system, and I shall make all the interest against it, in the State that I represent, that I can." Here we find a bold affirmation made in the Federal Convention by this statesman—an affirmation, which was not, and could not be disputed—that not a single State dreamed of constituting a National, as distinct from a Federal Government! He avows his determination to oppose, with all his might, the adoption by his State of such a system. But the Federal Convention saw the impossibility of the adoption by the States of such a system; and therefore proposed to the States the establishment of a Federal, and not a National Government. And thus it was that New Jersey ratified the Constitution by a unanimous vote.

The views of Pennsylvania were represented in the following utterances of two of her distinguished representatives. Gouverneur Morris said: "The Constitution was a compact, not between individuals, but between political societies, each enjoying sovereign power, and, of course, equal rights." Tench Coxe said: "Had the Federal Convention meant to exclude the idea of the union of several and separate sovereignties joining in a Confederacy, they would have said, 'We, the people of America;' for union necessarily involves the idea of competent States, which complete consolidation excludes. But the severalty of the States is frequently recognised in the most distinct manner in the course of the Constitution."

The sentiments of Delaware were expressed in those of her worthy son and representative, John Dickinson, who characterised the new political system, as "a Confederacy of Republics;" and spoke of the independent sovereignty of the respective States, as "that justly darling object of American affections:" a sentiment that received the approval of Washington.

Virginia ratified the Constitution, after an exciting contest in her Convention, by a slender majority of 10 in 168 votes. Strenuous opposition was made to it by Patrick Henry, George Mason, and others, on the ground of its consolidation tendencies. Patrick Henry indignantly demanded: "What right had the framers of the Constitution to say, 'We, the people,' instead of 'We, the States'?" States are the characteristic and soul of a Confederacy. If the States be not the agents of the compact, it must be one great, consolidated, National Government of the people of all the States." Mr. Madison replied: "Who are the parties to the Government? The people; but not the people as composing one great body; but the people as composing thirteen sovereignties." Again he said: "The Constitution will not be a national, but a federal act. That it will be the act of the people, as forming so many independent States, not as forming one aggregate nation, is obvious from this single consideration: that it is the result neither of the decision of a majority of the people of the Union, nor that of a majority of the States. It must result from the unanimous assent of the several States that are parties to it." Were the people regarded in the transaction as forming one nation, the will of the majority of the whole people of the United States would bind the minority. Each State, in ratifying the Constitution, is considered as a sovereign body, independent of all others, and only to be bound by its own voluntary act." In like manner spoke Henry Lee: "If this were a consolidated Government, ought it not to be ratified by a majority of the people, as individuals, and not as States? Suppose Virginia, Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Pennsylvania, had ratified it; these four States being a majority of the people of America, would, by their adoption, have made it binding on all the States, had this been a consolidated Government. But this is only the Government of those seven States who have adopted it. If the honorable gentleman (Mr. Henry) will attend to this, we shall hear no more of consolidation." Chief Justice Marshall, referring to the objection made by Henry, that "a State might be called at the bar of the Federal Court," said: "It is not rational to suppose that the sovereign power should be

dragged before a court." Referring to the right of the State to resume the powers she delegated, he said: "It is a maxim that those who give, may take away." So said Jefferson: "States can wholly withdraw their delegated powers." "To the compact each State acceded as a State, and is an integral party; the Government created by this compact, was not made the exclusive or final judge of the extent of the powers delegated to itself, since that would have made its discretion, and not the Constitution, the measure of its powers; but that, as in all cases of compact among powers having no common judge, each State has an equal right to judge for itself, as well of infractions, as of the mode and measure of redress." So said Madison: "The States, being the parties to the constitutional compact, and in their sovereign capacity, it follows, of necessity, that there can be no tribunal above their authority to decide, in the last resort, whether the compact made by them be violated; and consequently, that as the parties to it, they must themselves decide, in the last resort, such questions as may be of sufficient magnitude to require their interposition." "A compact between independent sovereigns, founded on acts of legislative authority, can pretend to no higher validity than a league or treaty between the parties. It is an established doctrine on the subject of treaties, that all the articles are mutually conditions of each other; that a breach of any one article is a breach of the whole treaty; and that a breach committed by either of the parties absolves the others, and authorises them, if they please, to pronounce the compact violated and void. Where resort can be had to no tribunal superior to the authority of the parties, the parties themselves must be the judges, in the last resort, whether the bargain made has been pursued or violated."

The remaining States, after much discussion, agreed to ratify the Constitution, which they did in the usual style. North Carolina and Rhode Island at first rejected it, but subsequently adopted it; the former, after an interval of over a year, the latter, of over two years, and by a majority of only two votes. Not a single State adopted it with the remotest idea that in so doing, State sovereignty was "surrendered," or "effectually con-

trolled." Were there just ground for such suspicion even, the Constitution would have been unanimously and indignantly rejected. The sentiment of one of the noblest patriots who voted for it, the illustrious John Rutledge of South Carolina, in reference to a proposed article, which was an invasion of State rights,—was the sentiment of every State: "If nothing else, this alone would damn, and ought to damn, the Constitution. Will any State ever agree to be bound hand and foot in this manner?"

Even Mr. Webster was led, in his latter years, to abandon his former consolidation-theory, and to recognise the sovereignty of the States. He said: "The States are united, confederated, not 'chaos-like, together crushed and bruised.'" "I am not prepared to say that the States have not national sovereignty. The Constitution declares all the powers that are granted to the United States, and all the rest are reserved to the States. The States of this Union, as States, are subject to all the voluntary and customary laws of nations." (13 Peters' Reports.) In his letter to the Barings, he says: "Every State is an independent, sovereign, political community, except in so far as certain powers, which it might otherwise have exercised, have been conferred on a general government." In his speech at Capon Springs, Va., 1851, he said: "How absurd it is to suppose, that when different parties enter into a compact for certain purposes, either can disregard any one provision, and expect, nevertheless, the other to observe the rest." "I repeat, that if the Northern States refuse, wilfully and deliberately, to carry into effect that part of the Constitution which respects the restoration of fugitive slaves, and Congress provide no remedy, the South would no longer be bound by the compact. A bargain cannot be broken on one side, and still bind on the other side."

We have now seen that all the States ratified the Constitution with the understanding that the sovereignty of each was unimpaired thereby. It follows therefore, that the oath which binds each President to "preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution," binds him to "preserve, protect, and defend" the sovereignty of each State, which that Constitution recognises.

The President, then, who uses an army to attack a State, is a perjured rebel and traitor.

When the Constitution was on its passage through the Convention, the proposition was made to delegate to the Federal Government the power to coerce a State. The proposition was immediately and unanimously rejected. The proposition was subsequently made a second time, and a second time unanimously rejected. And it was never brought before the Convention again. Even Alexander Hamilton said: "How can force be exerted on the States collectively? It is impossible. It amounts to a war between the parties." "To coerce the States, is one of the maddest projects that was ever devised." Mr. Madison said: "The more he reflected on the use of force, the more he doubted the practicability, justice, and the efficacy of it, when applied to people collectively and not individually. A Union of States containing such an ingredient, seemed to provide for its own destruction. It would probably be considered by the party attacked, as a dissolution of all previous compacts by which it might be bound." Here, we have the unanimous refusal, both of the Convention, and of the States, to delegate to the Federal Government the power to coerce a State. "They who give, may take away." The States, as States, gave, separately, powers to the Federal Government, and the States, as States, may, separately, take them away. The people of Massachusetts did not give, in behalf of the people of South Carolina, powers to the Federal Government, nor did the people of South Carolina give any, in behalf of the people of Massachusetts. And neither can take from the other, the right to take away. The Declaration of Independence, which declared them "free and independent States," had distinctly proclaimed "that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends," (the security of their rights,)—the people, of course, being the judges—"it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it, and to institute a new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organising its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness." To affirm then, that the Federal Government, the creature of the States, has power to

compel the States to adhere to it, is to affirm that it has a power which the Declaration of Independence declares cannot be possessed by any government whatever! If the Declaration is right, the recent war was unjust; if the war was right, the Declaration is a lie. If, according to the Declaration, the war by Great Britain on her subject colonies was unjust, then the war by the Federal Government on sovereign States was doubly unjust. The right of secession is an inseparable right of sovereignty. And so have the Northern States declared again and again. Judge Rawle, of Pennsylvania, a devoted Unionist, asserts, in his work on the Constitution, that the right of secession is inherent in the Federal system. "This right," says he, "must be considered an ingredient in the original composition of the General Government, which, though not expressed, was mutually understood." There was no need of expressing in the Constitution an essential right of the States, lacking which, they were not States. Again, he says: "It depends on the State itself to retain or abolish the principle of representation, because it depends on itself whether it will continue a member of the Union. To deny this right would be inconsistent with the principle on which all our political systems are founded; which is, that the people have, in all cases, a right to determine how they will be governed. The secession of a State from the Union depends upon the will of the people of such State." That this right was formerly acknowledged, universally, is proved by the fact, that in the early debates of Congress, under the existing Constitution, the threat of seceding was made, more than once, and the right was never questioned. Massachusetts at a very early day advocated secession. Her representatives in Congress in 1789 threatened to break up the Union that had just been formed, if the Federal Capital were located on the Potomac. Again, in 1803, her Legislature actually passed a resolution to "dissolve" her connexion with the other States, in the event of the Senate's confirming the treaty with France relative to the Louisiana territory. In 1808, there was a secret plot in Massachusetts, in connexion with the other New England States, to withdraw from the Union, in consequence of the embargo on all foreign com-

merce, an offset by Congress to the Berlin and Milan decrees of Napoleon and orders in Council of England. In order to preserve the Union, the Embargo Act was repealed, and a non-intercourse act substituted, which permitted trade with all countries other than those of the belligerents. Massachusetts, through her legislature, avowed in 1814 the same principles, in the following language: "The sovereignty of the States was reserved to protect the citizens from acts of violence by the United States, as well as for purposes of domestic regulation. We spurn the idea, that the free, sovereign, and independent State of Massachusetts is reduced to a mere municipal corporation, without power to protect its people, or to defend them from oppression from whatever quarter it comes. Whenever the national compact is violated, and the citizens of this State oppressed by cruel and unauthorised enactments, this Legislature is bound to interpose its power, and to wrest from the oppressor his victim. This is the spirit of our Union."

In December, 1814, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Rhode Island, assembled in Convention at Hartford, and after reciting various grievances against Congress, declared: "In cases of deliberate, dangerous, and palpable infractions of the Constitution, affecting the sovereignty of a State and the liberties of the people, it was not only the right, but the duty also, of the State to interpose its authority for their protection. When emergencies occur, either beyond the reach of the judicial tribunals, or too pressing to admit of the delay incident to their forms, States which have no common umpire must be their own judges, and execute their own decisions."

In 1839, John Quincy Adams, one of her "representative men," in his address before the Historical Society of New York, uttered the following sentiments: "To the people alone is reserved, as well the dissolving, as the constituent power; and that power can be exercised by them only under the tie of conscience, binding them to the retributive justice of heaven. With these qualifications, we may admit the same right to be vested in the people of every State in the Union, with reference to the General Government, which was exercised by the people of the United

Colonies with reference to the supreme head of the British empire, of which they formed a part; and under these limitations have the people in each State of the Union a right to secede from the Confederated Union itself. Thus stands the right. But the indissoluble link of union between the people of the several States of this confederated nation, is, after all, not in the right, but in the heart. If the day should ever come (may Heaven avert it!) when the affections of the people of these States shall be alienated from each other—when the fraternal spirit shall give way to cold indifference, or collisions of interest shall fester into hatred—the bands of political association will not long hold together parties no longer attracted by the magnetism of conciliated interests and kindly sympathies; and far better will it be for the people of the disunited States to part in friendship from each other, than to be held together by constraint. Then will be the time for reverting to the precedent which occurred at the formation and adoption of the Constitution, to form a more perfect Union, by dissolving that which could no longer bind, and to leave the separated parts to be reunited by the law of political gravitation to the centre.”

On the 25th of May, 1859, a convention was held at Cleveland, Ohio, presided over by Joshua R. Giddings, styled the “Convention of the Sons of Liberty.” Resolutions were adopted, asserting the right of secession. They were warmly endorsed by Chief Justice Chase, then Governor of Ohio, who said: “We have rights which the Federal Government must not invade; rights superior to its power, on which our sovereignty depends; and we mean to assert these rights against all tyrannical assumptions of authority.” Does any one wonder why this man dared not to try President Davis?

The right of secession being inseparable from sovereignty is therefore not a derived right, and so could not be conferred by the Constitution. Still, it is recognised by the Constitution. The 10th amendment, proposed by Massachusetts, says: “The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.” Two inferences are just and

obvious: 1. The power of coercing a State, not being delegated to the Federal Government by the Constitution, is therefore denied it. Treason is against—not the Federal Government, which, as the agent of the States, only inflicts the punishment, but—the States themselves. It is plainly impossible, then, for a State to be guilty of rebellion or treason. Such an assertion is ridiculous, for a State cannot commit treason against itself. 2. If "the powers not prohibited by the Constitution to the States are reserved to the States respectively," then the right of secession, not being prohibited by the Constitution to the States, is reserved to the States respectively—not collectively, but respectively! So that to oppose the right of secession, is doubly to violate the Constitution.

In the exercise of this right, then, the South was vindicated by the Constitution. War, on her part, was defensive, not offensive. She withdrew from the Union, because the Constitution had been violated, and her rights and liberties were endangered. For this, war was waged against her, in renewed violation and defiance of the Constitution. It is simply ridiculous to affirm, that it was not a war upon States, but only putting down bands of insurgents by force! Does it belong to the Federal Government, or to the States themselves, to determine what are States, and what are mobs? If they that *acceded* to the Union were States, were not they that *seceded* from the Union also States? What greater evidence was there for the former, than for the latter? Did not the people, in both instances, send their representatives to the Conventions? Were they not Conventions of States? If the ordinance of ratification was the act of States, was not also the ordinance of nullification, of secession, the act of States? If not, then, not the people, but the Federal Government may determine what is, and what is not, a State! Convened for purposes sanctioned by its master, the Federal Government, it is a State and convened for purposes not sanctioned by its master, it is not a State! Statehood is extinct, and despotism reigns unquestioned!

It is also an idle plea, that the Northern States were justified in their war upon the Southern States, by the *Jus Gentium*.

This implies that the Southern States were out of the Union, and became foreign nations, which is a position the Northern States did not admit,—although as we have seen, they affirmed, time and again, the same right of secession for themselves, whenever it suited them. But the plea by any of the *jus gentium* cannot avail. For the *jus gentium* was, in this case, “effectually controlled” by the Constitution, which did not allow, but forbade coercion. The Federal Government pretended to derive from the Constitution the right of coercion,—a “right” which was unanimously denied, formerly, by the States United—Northern, as well as Southern. War was allowed by the Constitution, but not coercion. War respected foreign nations; coercion, the States. The former was of course allowed, the latter was prohibited. If it was war that was waged by the North, then secession was admitted, and the Southern States became foreign nations. But this the North denied. If it was coercion, which they contended it was, then that recognised them as States within the Union. We have seen how ridiculous it is, to consider them as individuals, not States. Now, the coercion of States is a violation of the Constitution. But the sovereignty of States, and the right of secession are recognised by the Constitution. The *jus gentium*, therefore, could not justify the Northern States in opposing the exercise by the Southern States of an original, undivided right, and one also recognised by the Constitution. It cannot confer the right to make war on account of the exercise of rights which are claimed by the North as well as by the South. Had the Southern States no just cause for seceding, they would have been responsible to God only, not to the North. Moral obligation alone, self-imposed, not the want of sovereignty, may restrain a State from withdrawing the powers it delegated to its agent, the Federal Government. Sovereigns are not responsible for revoking delegated power; united sovereigns are not responsible for resuming their original position of separate sovereigns. The *jus gentium* would have warranted the North in making war upon the South as separate nations, were the rights of the former sacrificed by the separation; but the opposite of this was the case. Not only the rights of the Southern States,

but their existence even, was in jeopardy, by remaining in the Union. The compact had already been violated by the North, and therefore broken; and hence it would be absurd for any to uphold the North in this war, by falling back upon the *jus gentium*. "A compact broken on one side, is broken on all sides," said Daniel Webster. The Hon. Edmund Burke, of New Hampshire, truly said, in 1858: "They are conditions in the compact"—referring to the constitutional provisions respecting slavery—"without the adoption of which, the Constitution would never have been formed, and the Union would never have existed. Now, if they shall be broken and repudiated by the people of the North, does it not absolve the slaveholding States from all obligation, legal or moral, to abide by the Constitution and remain in the Union? Can compacts be broken by one of the contracting parties, and be held binding upon the other? The proposition needs but to be stated, to demonstrate its absurdity. And if, after the conditions on which the Union was formed, shall have been broken by the Free States, or by the general governmental agency, which all the States have jointly established, the slaveholding States shall remain in the Union, will it not be from their own free choice, rather than from any legal or moral obligation binding on them to remain? The answer is palpable to every just and right-minded man."

And yet for the exercise of an incontestable right, the South was attacked. The elements of republicanism had long ago died out at the North. This was evident from her exalting the Federal Government over the States,—over all, but her own—and also from her making war on sovereign States, simply for the exercise of their sovereignty. The South took up arms to defend her rights, doubly invaded, and to put down this double Northern rebellion against right and justice. The North, by the aid of foreign mercenaries; triumphed,—and triumphed, not only over the South, but over herself, over the Constitution, over liberty, honor, interest, truth, justice, right! The spirit of republicanism is extinct, and the spirit of despotism reigns in its stead.

Andrew Johnson but uttered the truth, when he said in his

“Address to the People of the United States”: “By unconstitutional and oppressive enactments, the people of ten States of the Union have been reduced to a condition more intolerable than that from which the patriots of the revolution rebelled. Millions of American citizens can now say of their oppressors, with more truth than our fathers did of British tyrants, that “they have forbidden the governors to pass laws of immediate and pressing importance, unless suspended until their assent should be obtained;” that they have “refused to pass other laws for the accommodation of large districts of people, unless those people would relinquish the right of representation in the legislature,—a right inestimable to them, and formidable to tyrants only;—that they have made judges dependent upon their will alone for the tenure of their offices, and the amount and payment of their salaries;” that they have “erected a multitude of new offices, and sent hither a swarm of officers to harass our people, and eat out their substance;” that they have “affected to render the military independent of, and superior to, the civil power;” “combined with others to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our Constitution, and unacknowledged by our laws;” “quartered large bodies of armed troops among us, protected them by a mock trial from punishment for any murders which they should commit on the inhabitants of these States;” “imposed taxes upon us without our consent;” “deprived us in many cases of the benefit of trial by jury, taken away our charters, excited domestic insurrection among us, abolished our most valuable laws, altered fundamentally the forms of our government, suspended our own legislatures, and declared themselves invested with power to legislate for us in all cases whatsoever.” The Philadelphia Convention of 1866, declared that the “General Government has absolute supremacy, to which the allegiance of the States is due!” If this was the effect of the war, to destroy sovereignty in the States, and invest it in the General Government, then it must be so expressed in the Constitution; otherwise it is not law.

The effect of the overthrow of the Constitution by the Federal Government, through the 14th amendment, was long ago—

1826—foreshadowed by Mr. Calhoun, thus: "The blacks and the profligate whites that might unite with them, would become the principal recipients of the Federal offices and patronage, and would, in consequence, be raised above the whites of the South in the political and social scale. We would, in a word, change conditions with them—a degradation greater than has yet fallen to the lot of a free and enlightened people, and one from which we could not escape, should emancipation take place, (which it certainly will, if not prevented,) but by fleeing the homes of our ancestors, and by abandoning our country to our former slaves, to become the permanent abode of disorder, anarchy, poverty, misery, and wretchedness."

And now, compare with this prediction, the grave asseverations of a Northern man, held in universal honor by Northern men, George Ticknor Curtis, Esq.: "Without scruple, straight to its object, and directly athwart the sovereign rights of those peoples, the Radical Congress moved in a solid phalanx to the accomplishment of its purpose, and crushed out beneath the heel of military power the very political sovereignty which it should have respected as constituting the State, and forcibly substituted in its place another people on whom it could confer no lawful title whatever. The partition of Poland is the older crime, but, judged in the light of truth and reason and law, it is not a greater one." "The temptation to use the emancipated blacks as an element of political power, overcame all past professions, all expediency, and all constitutional limitations, until it has carried the Congress of the United States into the most absurd and outrageous project ever attempted by lawless and despotic power—that of making an inferior race predominant over a superior one, and undertaking to make this condition permanent and irreversible." "The whole reconstruction scheme has been so devised and carried out, as to empower the colored population to hold a majority of the whites in a condition of disfranchisement just so long as they please; for the constitutions have been so framed, that a full political equality can never be enjoyed by the whites, until they can affirm the absurd and impossible dogma of political equality for all races and all colors. When they have qualified

themselves for political privileges by the profession of this belief, the whites will find themselves, in many of the States, in a numerical minority, if the past relative proportions of the two races are not greatly changed by a rapid diminution of the blacks. Surely, no such condition of society was ever before deliberately created by men affecting to be statesmen. It proclaims its purpose on its face. It shows itself to be a scheme for the exercise and perpetuation of party domination." "The 14th amendment breaks down *all* the characteristic principles of the constitutional system. It tears up by the roots the proportionate equality of the States; for although in terms it applies to all of them, in practical operation it bears very unequally." "The alternative, if they do not succeed in throwing off universal negro suffrage, will be that in most of them, the domination of the blacks will be supreme." "If the power that has been exercised by Congress over the States and people of the South is affirmed by the result of this Presidential election," (this was written by Mr. Curtis in August, 1868,) "it will be a rightful inference hereafter, that in the judgment of the majority of this nation, Congress does possess a power, from some source or other, to make and unmake the sovereign people of a State, whenever, in the opinion of Congress, any political expediency requires such action." Said we not truly, that the North "had triumphed over herself?" Corresponding with the sentiments of Mr. Curtis, are those of another distinguished Northern man, George Lunt, Esq., of Boston, member of the Massachusetts Legislature, as follows; "Whether negro slavery actually exist or not, the country can be neither free nor safe, until this matter becomes again the individual concern of the several States alone, without subjection to any interference whatever by the general government." "We may say, that the South deserved to lose its slaves by its revolt; but the important point is, whether in their particular loss, suffered otherwise than as a passing incident of war, the whole body of States, and hence the country at large, does not thereby lose its own constitutional immunities. For, national legislation to such an end, or executive dictation producing such a result, is revolution, not restoration; without

which, the States cannot be equal, and consequently, neither they nor the country, of which they are constituent parts, can be free. For such a revolution changes the principle and practice of our republican system, abrogates the constitution on which we should rest, and gives us, practically, a consolidated, instead of a popular frame of government."

The venerable Madison, in the Legislature of Virginia, in 1798, predicted the present state of affairs with painful and fearful exactness, drawing a picture of the catastrophe in these words: "If measures can mould governments; and if an uncontrolled power of construction is surrendered to those who administer them, their progress may be easily foreseen, and their end easily foretold. A lover of monarchy, who opens the treasures of corruption, by distributing emoluments among devoted partisans, may at the same time be approaching his object, and deluding the people with professions of republicanism. He may confound monarchy and republicanism by the art of definition. He may varnish over the dexterity which ambition never fails to display with the pliancy of language, the seduction of expediency, or the prejudices of the times. And he may come at length to avow, that so extensive a territory as that of the United States can only be governed by the energies of monarchy; that it cannot be defended except by standing armies; and that it cannot be united except by consolidation. Measures have already been adopted which may lead to these consequences. They consist in fiscal systems and arrangements, which keep a host of commercial and wealthy individuals embodied and obedient to the mandates of the treasury; in armies and navies, which will, on the one hand, enlist the tendency of man to pay homage to his fellow-creatures who can feed or honor him, and on the other, employ the principle of fear, by punishing imaginary insurrections under the pretext of preventive justice; in swarms of officers, civil and military, who can inculcate political tenets tending to consolidation and monarchy, both by indulgencies and severities, and can act as spies over the free exercise of human reason; in restraining the freedom of the press, and investing the executive with legislative, executive, and judicial

powers over a numerous body of men—and that we may shorten the catalogue, in establishing by successive precedents such a mode of construing the Constitution as will rapidly remove every restraint upon Federal power. Let history be consulted; let the man of experience reflect; nay, let the artificers of monarchy be asked, what further materials they can need for building up their favorite system?" To this question asked in 1798, let the answer be given in the words of Mr. Curtis, in 1868: "What strides have been made toward a National Imperialism!"

Well did Mr. Calhoun remark to Mr. Webster: "I would further tell the Senator, that if the right of judging finally and conclusively of their respective powers be withheld from the States; if this restraining influence by which the General Government is coerced to its proper sphere be withdrawn; then that department of the Government from which he has withheld the right of judging of its own powers (the executive) will, so far from being excluded, become the sole interpreter of the powers of the Government. It is the armed interpreter with powers to execute its own construction, and without the aid of which the construction of the other departments will be impotent."

We have lived to see the beginning of the fulfilment of this prophecy—and the end is not distant. Augustus, observes Gibbon, established "an absolute monarchy, disguised by the forms of a commonwealth. His successors for a while observed his constitutional fictions; but the republic insensibly vanished." Imperialism may be at first "disguised by the forms of a commonwealth," but the disguise will sooner or later be laid aside.

The Revolution is not ended—it has just begun.

ARTICLE V.

CHURCH PROPERTY LITIGATION IN KENTUCKY
AND MISSOURI.

Few persons seem to comprehend the magnitude of the issues involved in the present litigations of church property in Kentucky and Missouri—indeed, so few, even of those most immediately concerned, that it is said to be difficult to raise the funds needful to the vigorous prosecution of the cases in the courts of final resort. It may therefore prove a timely service to the Church at large, to exhibit the germinal facts in these cases as they come before the courts, on the one hand; and the germinal principles of the law pertaining to church property as it must present itself to the minds of the judges, on the other. From such a view, it will appear that the Kentucky and Missouri litigation is likely to mark an era in the history of church property litigation in the United States; and—if these issues shall finally reach a decision in the Supreme Court at Washington—to settle the question whether Protestant churches, maintaining at once the obligation of the Church of Christ to “hold fast the form of sound words” in doctrine and constitutional order, and at the same time maintaining liberty of conscience against “synods and councils that err and become synagogues of Satan,” shall any longer be protected under the civil law of America, in the enjoyment of endowments and property devoted to the support and propagation of an orthodox faith. Though the statement now proposed be *ex parte*, it may still be impartial.

There are several novel features in this litigation which of themselves should fix upon it the attention of men that think. First of all may be noted the seemingly grasping spirit which has prompted the assault upon the property rights of the excluded Synods of Kentucky and Missouri, which is in singular contrast with the spirit which has animated Presbyterianism heretofore. The contrast between the Act of the General Assembly in 1869, and the Act, under similar circumstances, in 1839, evinces the

sad effect of the general degeneracy of public morals upon the views of Christian ethics within the enclosures of the Church. In 1869, the General Assembly resolves to divert from its sacred funds, dedicated to the circulation of religious tracts and books, \$5,000 to the purpose of encouraging and supporting the law-suits of its adherents in Kentucky growing out of the recent disruption; whereas in 1839, in reference to the disruption of 1838, and after the civil courts had decided in our favor, the Old School General Assembly gave the following truly Christian advice to its adherents, (Minutes, 1839, p. 153):

“Be it resolved by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church,

“That this body considers itself and the Church at large bound, as both have been not only willing, but desirous, to adjust all claims against the corporate property of the Church, whether legal or equitable, in the most prompt, fair, and liberal manner.

“With reference to all institutions, corporations, congregations, or other public persons or bodies in connection with us, but holding property for ecclesiastical purposes, or for religious and benevolent uses, which property is not subject to the control of the Assembly, although the said persons, institutions, or congregations may be—in all such cases where difficulties in relation to property have arisen or shall arise in consequence of the long and painful divisions in our Church, we advise all our members and friends to act upon the general principles heretofore laid down, and with the spirit of candor, forbearance, and equity which has dictated this act.”

Nor was there probably a single law-suit between Old and New School adherents concerning local church property throughout the United States. We remember how, when in the Assembly of 1843, an attempt was made to authorize and encourage a suit for the recovery of Lane Seminary, on the ground that the lands of the Seminary had been donated by an Old School man, the proposition scarce met with a second in the house. The Presbyterians of those days thought it not lawful to “serve God with that which cost them nought;” much less to serve God with other people’s property.

The issues involved in these cases are also novel in many respects, and such as have never hitherto been made by Presby-

terians before either British or American civil courts. For as the facts will show, the questions here presented to the courts, divested of all minor details, are simply these: Does the exclusion of a portion of the Presbyterian Church, recognised as such, by order of the supreme tribunal, without even *charge* of heterodoxy in doctrine or immorality in practice, much less judicial trial, operate, in the view of the civil tribunals, a forfeiture of their church property; not only their general public property, but also the local congregational properties? And are the civil courts precluded by the decision of the Assembly from inquiring whether the exclusion, so far as it affects civil rights of property, was in accordance with the constitution and laws of the Church? Or must Protestant churches who deny the infallibility of councils stand before the civil courts on the same platform with Roman Catholics, who accept the infallibility of councils as a part of their constitutional compact, and have therefore no right to call decisions of the Church in question? Such an issue as this, as we have said, has never hitherto been made by Presbyterians before the civil courts. There have been cases wherein they have claimed that the palpable apostasy of congregations from the truth forfeits the church property dedicated to maintain the truth. Such were the English cases (the Attorney General *vs.* Pearson, 7 Sim., 290,) in 1835, and the cases (Attorney General *vs.* Shore, 7 Sim., 309; and Shore *vs.* Wilson, Clark and Finelly's P. R., 355,) in 1842, wherein Presbyterians demanded and obtained from British courts of final resort the protection of funds dedicated to the support of Presbyterianism, in 1701 and 1707, by Lady Hewley and others, from perversion to the support of Unitarianism. But, in the present instance, there is no charge of heterodoxy, or even of material departure from Presbyterian order against the excluded Synods. On the contrary, the leaders of the party seeking to oust them from their church property, proclaim them to be orthodox, and now in communion "with the purest body of Presbyterians in the world." Nay, they have during the whole struggle proclaimed their full sympathy with the principles of the excluded Synods against the Assembly.

So, again, cases have been brought before the civil courts, involving the question of forfeiture of property by a congregation in voluntarily changing its ecclesiastical relation from one secession Synod of Scotland to another; and the change was declared by the civil court to involve no forfeiture, because the court could discover no change of fundamental doctrines implied in the change of Synods. Such was the famous case of *Craigdallie vs. Aikman*, in 1813, giving occasion for Lord Eldon's celebrated opinion, overturning the previous doctrines of the Scotch courts, who, in cases of division, at first gave the property to the majority in interest of the congregation, and subsequently to the representatives of the majority of the whole denomination—refusing to go into the inquiry as to which party represented the doctrines and principles, for the support of which the trust had been created. But in the present case, it is not the voluntary withdrawal of the Synods and their congregations assuming voluntarily the risk of forfeiture of property; but their forcible exclusion from the denomination by the party that is now demanding also the forfeiture of their property.

Cases have been made also before the civil courts, involving the question whether a congregation forfeits its right to church property by employing a minister who has been deposed, after trial, by the Presbytery, and the sentence affirmed by the Synod to which the congregation belongs. Such was the case of *Robertson vs. Bullions*, in 1850, (9 Barb. 64,) which gave occasion for the opinion of Chief Justice Hand, the most learned and elaborate, though not the most logical and consistent, opinion yet delivered in any American court on these ecclesiastical questions; and to the decision, that the employment of a deposed minister by an Associate Reformed congregation is inconsistent with the constitution and order of that body, and forfeits the right to property given for the express purpose of supporting a congregation "in adherence to the Associate Reformed Church." And the same principle is illustrated in the case of *Diffendorf vs. The Reformed Calvinistic Church*, (20 John. 12,) wherein the Synod reversed the Presbytery's sentence of deposition. But in the present case, there was neither trial nor judicial deposition

of the ministers whose congregations are charged with having forfeited their rights of property.

In the case of *Com. vs. Green*, (Wharton, 531,) known among us as "the Presbyterian Church case" in 1838, instituted to determine the question of succession between the New and Old School Assemblies, the issue was chiefly whether the Old School Assembly had destroyed itself and forfeited its right to the vested funds, by pronouncing the New York and Western Reserve Synods, grown up under the "Plan of Union" with Congregationalists in 1801, to be no part of the Presbyterian Church; and the civil court decided that the "plan of union" being no part of the constitution, but merely a legislative act of Assembly for temporary missionary purposes, the power that enacted it was competent to repeal it; and that the Synods which, with full knowledge of its temporary character, had constituted under it, must fall with it. But in the present case, there was no question at all as to the excluded Synods being constitutionally a part of the body which presumed to exclude them. And the grand peculiarity of the issues before the civil courts, which renders them novelties in the history of either British or American jurisprudence, consists in the fact, that the question for the civil courts is simply whether they are to take as conclusive the decree of the General Assembly, irrespective of its conformity to the constitutional compacts under which the church property has been dedicated, and pronounce the property of the excluded churches forfeited.

As the spirit which prompts this litigation and the issues involved are novelties, so also are the proceedings in the cases so far. Instead of paying respect to the State courts, which had already taken jurisdiction, and which, therefore, according not only to immemorial chancery usage, but also to the special Act of Congress of 1793, reënacting that usage as law, should not be interfered with by the Federal courts; nay, instead of respecting even the decisions of the court of last resort in Kentucky, the Assembly's adherents have, by means of the most discreditable strategy—revolting even to the more honorable and intelligent of their own leaders—dragged both the cases and the courts of

the State before the Federal courts, and rendered it needful to have a decision of matters, upon which obviously the State courts only can decide properly, from the Supreme Court of the United States. The prospect, as the year 1869 closes, is, that in the Walnut Street church case, which has been decided finally by the Court of Appeals of Kentucky, there is to be a direct conflict between the Supreme Court of the State and the Federal Circuit Court, as to whose mandate is to be obeyed—in other words, the Walnut Street church case has become the representative of the dignity and sovereignty of Kentucky as against the attempt of a foreign power to coerce the State into submission to a consolidated sovereignty at Washington.

It might be added, as illustrative of the novelty of this litigation, that so far as concerns the decrees of the Radical judges in Kentucky, and also in Missouri, they indicate a return to the doctrines, substantially, of the ecclesiastical supremacy over the civil courts, which must receive without question all ecclesiastical decisions—the very doctrine against which Huss and his followers testified to the death four hundred years ago.

We are very free to admit, at the outset, that the Evangelical Protestant Churches of this country, who maintain the unity of the Church as one great body of which the several congregations are but fractions, and who yet maintain the doctrine of the liberty of conscience and the right of private judgment as against the decrees of “synods and councils that may err and become synagogues of Satan,” are not likely to be favorites before the tribunals of Cæsar. The theories of Romanism of infallibility of the Church, and consequently the obligation to obey the decisions of its priests and councils without question, are more likely to find favor with secular courts, because they relieve the secular courts of the trouble of inquiring into church creeds and constitutions in order to determine the purpose of the trust for “pious uses.” And not less are the theories of the *non-churchly* and creedless religious bodies apt to find favor, because they relieve the judges of the necessity of inquiring beyond the question of the will of the majority of “the society.” But the Presbyterian Church, which recognises at the same time

the obligation of the Church, as the one body of Christ, to witness for the truth, and also the liberty of conscience, which must testify against erring synods and councils, and which makes every minister such a witness by his ordination vows, must ever expect to be a disagreeable suitor in Cæsar's courts. For its very demand that Cæsar's official shall protect property which has been given to support "the faith once delivered to the saints," involves the trouble of examining into creeds and church constitutions—not indeed to judge of their truth, but to ascertain what was the purpose of the trust, and who is executing that trust. It is only surprising that men calling themselves Presbyterians should not see that in the decisions which give them a temporary triumph—the decision implying that the vote of General Assembly, and not the Constitution, is conclusive upon the civil courts in questions of property and civil rights—is but a Haman's gallows which they are preparing for themselves, unless it is their purpose to abjure the doctrine that the Church should be a witness for the faith and order of Christ's house. Or may it not be that divine Providence is suffering this "blindness to happen in part to Israel," and will give them success in their blind efforts with a view to break up, among his true people, the whole system of endowments and other anticipatory provisions for the support of the gospel, and the holding of rich and costly properties by congregations of his people, and thus bring them back to the simplicity and daily dependence of the Apostolic Church?

• If these preliminary observations seem unduly protracted, their direct force and application will be perceived when we proceed now to recite the facts concerning the litigations in Kentucky and Missouri, and to give some account of the law which bears upon these cases.

The public may be presumed to be familiar with the following general facts: That the second disruption of the Old School Assembly, (1866–1867)—which, as is now manifest, like the first disruption of 1861, was effected by reckless leaders with a view to put out of their way all effective opposition to their project of reunion with the New School radicalism, "sloughed off"

in 1837—excluded about three-fourths of the Synod of Kentucky, and probably as large a fraction of the Synod of Missouri, by mere resolution, declaring them no longer a part of the Presbyterian Church. This estimate of the portion excluded in Kentucky, is based upon a comparison of the last official report of the Presbyteries of the entire original Synod to the Assembly of 1866, with the first official reports of the Presbyteries of the excluded Synod to the Mobile Assembly of 1869. In 1866, the entire original Synod reported 108 ministers—37 of them pastors and 31 stated supplies—with 163 churches containing 11,250 communicants. This had been the report substantially for the five years previous. In 1869, the same Presbyteries reported to the Mobile Assembly 75 ministers—31 of them pastors and 26 stated supplies—with 137 churches, of which 70, about one-half, reported 4,600 communicants. There was no report of communicants from Transylvania, nor from more than five churches from Ebenezer—and these, generally the smaller churches—nor from some of the larger churches in Louisville Presbytery. So that it would be a reasonable estimate to put down the whole number of communicants at 9200. Thus there would be left, including several ministers and churches which had not yet decided, 33 ministers—6 of them pastors and 5 stated supplies—with some 2000 communicants. It may be doubted whether the whole number of communicants positively adhering to the Northern General Assembly amounts to more than 12 to 1500, and whether those interested in this litigation, amount to 500. The large proportion of “loose ministers” in the secession from the Synod, is readily enough accounted for by the fact that the Northern Assembly had several places to fill in Kentucky; and the further fact that it was commonly understood that the Board of Missions would aid to the extent of \$600 any minister who could succeed in leading off a secession from any congregation.

Such is the relative strength of the two parties to this litigation in Kentucky. It is probable that about the same statement would apply to the relative strength of the parties in Missouri. It will be seen that if the equity of the case should depend upon

the majority in numbers or interest, it is with the excluded Synods.

The amount of property in Kentucky involved, and liable to be involved, in this litigation, may be moderately estimated at a million to a million and a half of dollars. For it must be remembered that it is one of the peculiarities of this litigation that the claim of forfeiture covers the house of worship and local property of every congregation, as well as the synodical investment of some \$300,000 at Danville. The amount involved in Missouri cannot be less than a million. Some half dozen or more of the congregations in Kentucky, in which divisions have occurred, avoided litigation, at least for the present, by allowing the seceding Radicals a lion's share of the church property. The Louisville Orphan's Home property, valued at perhaps \$120,000, was divided by compromise in this way.

But in other cases, suits have been brought—in every instance, we believe, by the Radical party—and no doubt will continue to be brought, should this party succeed in establishing the new principle, that the decision of the General Assembly, and not the Constitution of the Church, is conclusive upon the civil courts in determining property rights.

In some five instances in Kentucky, so far, and in two instances in Missouri, suits are now either pending in more or less advanced stages, or already decided by the State courts. It may throw light on the character of this litigation, to present a brief history and description of their present status.

The oldest of them is the Walnut Street church case, which originated even before the beginning of the disruption of 1866, in one of the many instances of carelessness on the part of the Synod of Kentucky at that period. A difficulty having arisen in the congregation, and, in consequence, a complaint, then pending before the Presbytery of Louisville, the parties attempting to ignore the Presbytery, applied to the Synod of 1865 for a redress of grievances, and after a deliverance by Synod to the effect that the matter could not be entertained in the higher court until the Presbytery had issued it, the large mass of the Conservative members of Synod culpably hurried off, leaving

the body in session, in the hands of Dr. R. J. Breckinridge and his friends, who appointed a synodical committee to visit the Walnut Street church, call a meeting of the congregation to elect elders, etc., etc. A synodical committee of visitation was a novelty. The elders and trustees of the church declined to receive this committee, and refused to open the house. Three of the committee, notwithstanding the protest and appeal to Synod of the other two—Dr. Wilson and Mr. Garvin—proceeded to hold the meeting in the street; new elders were chosen—they being persons at the time under suspension by the old session—and were ordained by the chairman of the committee, who, under the instructions of the meeting, immediately brought suit for possession of the church building. This suit was pending in May, 1866, when to aid its friends in their suit, the General Assembly, without the case being before it save by a letter of one of the new elders, in contempt alike of the Synod, whose committee had not yet reported, as it was ordered to do, and of the Presbytery in which the whole case was pending, and which was to hold an adjourned meeting within three weeks, to consider the case; and in utter contempt, also, of the right of the people to say who shall be elders in the Walnut Street church—declared that these new elders—known as “the lamp post elders,” from the place of their election—“*are to be recognised and acknowledged as ruling elders in said church.*” It is worth while to note in passing as an illustrative comment on the doctrine that the decree of the spiritual tribunals are conclusive upon the civil courts, that the theory of Chancellor Pirtle, who sympathised, politically, with the General Assembly, and who first enunciated this doctrine, made the declaration of the conclusiveness of all decrees of Assembly upon the civil courts directly in view of this specimen of Assembly orders officially filed in evidence in the case before him. It shows that the faith of this class of jurists, once they adopt a dogma, is not easily staggered.

Contrary to all precedent, Chancellor Pirtle took the property out of possession of the old elders and trustees while the case was pending, and put it, practically, in possession of their opponents. The case was subsequently decided by Chancellor Pirtle, in

favor of the adherents of the General Assembly, on the extraordinary ground, that under its general powers of "deciding controversies, superintending, etc., and suppressing schismatical contentions," the Assembly is unrestricted by any constitutional limits. Says Chancellor Pirtle, after citing the Form of Government, Chap. 12, Sec. 5:

"Now, to what forms or to what deeds, what methods, what judgments, what cases or instances, can a temporal court confine the acts of *this great national tribunal, clothed with sacred injunctions not to be set down in words?*" * * * "What may not this tribunal do *sua sponte*? Surely it is not for any civil court to decide. I think that the action of the General Assembly at St. Louis, on the 30th May, 1866, is conclusive on the subject of the appointment of these elders.

"I have a proper deference for the Presbytery; but I think the other court had jurisdiction, just as if there had been nothing before the Presbytery; and the Presbytery has now no jurisdiction in the case. Of course I cannot expect that they will take any action except to obey with dutiful respect, the General Assembly."

We cite so fully from this preliminary decision in the case, by way of illustrating from Chancellor Pirtle the sort of idea entertained of Presbyterianism by the Radical jurists and ecclesiastics. He states, artlessly, the extraordinary dogmas which Judge Ballard and others of that school have had the art to keep in the back ground. Manifestly, if this is law, then no Protestant church, holding the right of private judgment, can long retain property in Kentucky and Missouri, except by mere sufferance. Yet this is the specific decision which the General Assembly of 1869 voted \$5000 from its book and tract fund to maintain! Is this the sort of religious literature those funds were contributed to spread? It adds to the extraordinary incongruity of this misapplication of funds that the Southern churches were mainly instrumental in founding and supporting the Board of Publication in its earlier days.

The decision of Chancellor Pirtle was carried to the Court of Appeals of Kentucky, and there argued by Messrs. Caldwell and Bullitt, by one of the most unanswerable briefs we have ever

read. Mr. Caldwell had been selected by Walnut Street church. Mr. Thos. W. Bullitt, a young Presbyterian, was selected by the Presbytery of Louisville, to look after this case, in conjunction with Mr. Caldwell, and any others that might occur within its bounds. Mr. Bullitt made the subject a speciality, and thus, though yet a young lawyer, is now probably better versed in the whole subject of the law pertaining to church property than any lawyer in Kentucky.

The Court of Appeals, Judge Hardin delivering the opinion, reversed the decision of Chancellor Pirtle; and in an argument singularly clear and conclusive, controverts Judge Pirtle's assumptions as to the unlimited powers of the General Assembly, denying that the Presbyterian Constitution will bear the construction which confers on the Assembly other than appellate powers, and especially any power to undertake the management of the affairs of a congregation or *appoint* elders. On the general question of the duty of the civil courts to hold the decisions of a majority of the General Assembly conclusive upon them, without respect to the Constitution of the Church, Judge Hardin makes the following unanswerable argument :

“While we recognise the principles as firmly and correctly established, that civil courts cannot, and ought not, to rejudge the judgments of spiritual tribunals as to matters within their jurisdiction, whether justly or unjustly decided, we cannot accept as correct the principle contended for in the argument for the appellees, that whether the Synod had jurisdiction and power over the subject on which it acted under the presbyterial system, is a question purely ecclesiastical, to be settled by the Synod itself and the General Assembly. Such a construction of the powers of church tribunals would, in our opinion, subject all individual and property rights, confided or dedicated to the use of religious organisations, to the arbitrary will of those who may constitute their judicatories and representative bodies, without regard to any of the regulations or constitutional restraints by which, according to the principles and objects of such organisations, it was intended that said individual and property rights should be protected.

“Especially is this so with reference to the powers of the higher courts of the Presbyterian Church. Those powers are not only

defined, but limited, by the constitution. But if it be true, as insisted for the appellees, that the inferior courts and people of the Church are bound to accept as final and conclusive the Assembly's own construction of its powers, and submit to its edicts as obligatory, without inquiring whether they transcend the barriers of the constitution or not, the will of the Assembly, and not the constitution, becomes the fundamental law of the Church.

“But the constitution having been adopted as the supreme law of the Church, must be supreme alike over the Assembly and people. If it is not, and only binding on the latter, the supreme judicatory is at once a government of despotic and unlimited powers.

“But we hold that the Assembly, like other courts, is limited in its authority by the law under which it acts; and when rights of property, which are secured to congregations and individuals by the organic law of the Church, are violated by unconstitutional acts of the higher courts, the parties thus aggrieved are entitled to relief in the civil courts, as in ordinary cases of injury resulting from the violation of a contract or the fundamental law of a voluntary association.”

Having cited the opinion of Judge Hardin, representing the Court of Appeals in the Walnut Street church case, we may cite in connexion with it the deliverance of the same court, through the venerable Judge Robertson, in the “Bethel Union” case, subsequently brought before the Court of Appeals, as further illustrative of the views of the Conservative jurists of Kentucky, on the general issues. Says Judge Robertson:

“In revising the case, this court in the logical and necessary order of consideration must first dispose of the controverted question of jurisdiction by the civil power of the State, and which both parties acknowledged by invoking its intervention.

“A church, like every other organised body of citizens, must be consolidated by an organic law, and under and according to the Constitution of the United States. The organic law of the Presbyterian Church is a fundamental compact, voluntarily made between all the members of the unincorporated association for the guidance and protection of each constituent church and member, and necessarily inviolable by any delegated power of the aggregate Church.

“Its supremacy over all representative organs deriving their authority from it, and therefore subordinate to it, was the great

end, and must be the necessary consequence of its adoption. But the organic law of the Church, like that of the State, being a contract between all the parties to it, and the members of the Church being entitled, as citizens, to the protection of the paramount Constitution of the State against all wrongful breaches of their contracts, the civil tribunals must have some rightful jurisdiction over the Constitution of the Church, as a contract not less obligatory than any other contract between competent parties; and those tribunals must have jurisdiction also to protect a member of the Church against unconstitutional invasion of his fundamental right to personal liberty and security, whenever attempted by his ecclesiastical government inconsistently with either its own constitution or that of the political government. A contrary assumption would magnify the General Assembly beyond the sphere of its own organic law, and install it as an arbitrary, infallible, and final power over all constitutional restraint; and would thus exile members of the Church from the guardianship of the civil and only supreme human power, which is bound to protect them as well as all other citizens in their property and personal liberty. But, as they joined the Church with a knowledge of its defined powers, and as the civil power cannot interfere in matters of conscience, faith, or discipline, they must submit to rebuke or excommunication, however unjust, by their adopted spiritual advisers and ecclesiastical rulers.

“So far the jurisdiction of the General Assembly is exclusive and final. But it has no such jurisdiction over property, nor any authority to imprison a member of the Church, whose locomotive liberty as a citizen must be protected by the civil power against all ecclesiastic or other usurpation.

“We will not debate so plain a question. The inevitable conclusion is that the General Assembly itself forced the dismemberment of the Presbyterian Church by acts which are void for want of higher authority. And consequently, even if the appellants held their interest in the church property by the tenure of adherence of the Assembly, a severance of that connexion by the unauthorised acts of the Assembly cannot affect the title to the property. They are still in every essential element of identity the same ‘Bethel Union church’ as always hitherto.”

In accordance with the opinion of Judge Hardin just cited, the mandate of the Court of Appeals came down to Chancellor Pirtle, directing the restoration of the church property to the charge of the old trustees and elders. But, on the motion, before

the Chancellor, of the Radical counsel—by the strategies which may be practised so easily before a court to secure ends which the court desires to be accomplished—obedience to the mandate was put off, and the parties were compelled to return to the Court of Appeals for a special mandate upon the Chancellor, which was obtained.

But meanwhile the Radical parties had been preparing a non-residence for one Jones and wife, members received from the Methodist Church by the Assembly's session, and sent across the Ohio to reside in New Albany on a pension from the poor fund of the church. And now that Chancellor Pirtle had given place to Chancellor Cochrane, who would enforce the mandate of the Court of Appeals, suit was brought in the Circuit Court of the United States for the district of Kentucky, in the name of Jones and wife against the whole Walnut Street concern, old elders and new, complaining of their neglect to protect properly her newly and oddly acquired interests of Jones and wife in the Walnut Street church property. Judge Ballard lent a willing ear to the complaint, and treated the Court of Appeals as the General Assembly had treated the Presbytery and Synod; that is, ignored its jurisdiction in fact, though in form pretending to recognise it, under plea that the Court of Appeals had not taken jurisdiction over certain points, which were therefore within the jurisdiction of the Federal Court. The odd result followed, however, that in every material point he reversed the decision without interfering with the court's jurisdiction. In the course of his opinion, he fully endorsed Judge Pirtle's extraordinary view of the conclusiveness of the decrees of the Assembly upon the civil courts in these terms: "It seems further to the court, that this order, made by the General Assembly in May, 1867, (the order excluding the Synods and Presbyteries of Kentucky and Missouri,) has reference wholly to a purely ecclesiastical matter, and was thus within the proper sphere of the authority of the Assembly, and that as such this court and all civil courts are bound to *respect it as furnishing the conclusive uncontrollable evidence*, respecting the matter therein declared."

An appeal was taken to the Supreme Court of the United

States; and the motion for enforcing the mandate of the State court was also pressed, and a special chancellor, A. Barnett, Esq., was appointed to hear the case—the regular Chancellor being disqualified to act. It is worthy of note, that he was selected on the nomination of the Radical counsel themselves. The question to be tried now was, whether the decision of Judge Ballard of the Federal Court was not null and void for want of jurisdiction; and whether the mandate of the Court of Appeals should not therefore be enforced. The special Chancellor declared the decree of the United States Court null and void for want of jurisdiction, and ordered the enforcement of the mandate of the Court of Appeals. To gain time (as Chancellor Pirtle had contrary to all usage and right put them in possession of the Church) the Radical party again appealed from this decision to the Court of Appeals, where the case is now pending, and of course can be decided only one way. But though the question of jurisdiction was the particular issue before special Chancellor Barnett, he was obliged incidentally to notice the extraordinary doctrine of Judge Ballard, and of Chancellor Pirtle before him, touching the conclusiveness of the decrees of the Assembly upon the civil court, and also the character of the decrees. We have space for only a few extracts. Says Chancellor Barnett:

“The Constitution and laws of the State of Kentucky vest the judicial powers of the sovereignty in her courts, and every article of property within her territorial limits, to which is attached a money value, is subject to the jurisdiction of her courts whenever the title or possession or use of such property becomes the matter of dispute; and the courts of the country have no right to shun the responsibility of deciding such questions because they affect a church, or to refer the adjudication of such questions to any foreign tribunal unknown alike to the Constitution and laws of the State or nation.”

And again in reference to the acts of Assembly:

“It is alleged in the proceedings, and relied on in argument, that Watson and the others whom this action seeks to have put in possession of the church edifice and property, under the order of September, 1868, have seceded from, and quit their connex-

ion with, the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, and that they now belong to another church. And it is shown, in support of this, that, by resisting the deliverances of the superior court and tribunal of the church, they have come under the excising power of a kind of self-acting knife of excision, which first cut them off from that church, and, being so cut off, they voluntarily united with another organisation, and, per consequence, now have no right in the property in dispute.

“This matter has been substantially passed upon by the Court of Appeals in the Bethel Union church case, so far as to indicate what will be the judgment of that court when the question is made directly. This court concurs in the conclusions announced in that case. The power of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, to make deliverances, establishing new doctrines and tests of membership, is freely admitted, so far as the spiritual aspect of the question is concerned. But the power of the General Assembly under the form of church government, to raise up these new tests, and then to enforce them by a wholesale exclusion of those who do not, and cannot, agree with them, presents another question, when that inability to believe in the new tests is made the pretext for stripping the great body of the members of the Church in this State of all their rights of property in church edifices and other church property.

“This court assumes to adjudge nothing as to the *spiritual* aspect of the matter; it only asserts its convictions as to what is the law of the State as to the questions of property involved. The civil tribunals of this State, organised by and under the Constitution and laws of the State, have no right to hand over these property questions into the keeping and jurisdiction of a non-resident tribunal not supposed to be learned in the laws of the State, but are bound to dispose of such questions themselves according to the law of the State. The deed from Humphrey and wife to Watson and others for the lot on which the church edifice stands, makes no mention of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, but conveys it to them as trustees of the Third Presbyterian church of the city of Louisville and State of Kentucky. New tests and articles of faith may be inserted in the church creed; but when a church body seeks to strip people of property rights upon such new tests of membership as the deliverances of the General Assembly upon the subjects of loyalty, slavery, and States rights, the historian and the dispassionate lawyer will be very slow in assenting to the proposition.”

This opinion of special Chancellor Barnett, both from its clear and succinct history of this unprecedented case, and its very remarkable ability, well merits the distinction conferred upon it by A. Davidson & Co., in publishing it in pamphlet form for general circulation, and at the merely nominal price of \$1 per dozen copies. We advise all who take an interest either in the question of the church property, or in the question whether there are any longer State courts as distinguished from Federal courts, to procure this valuable document.

Leaving the Walnut Street church case thus pending at the same time in the Supreme Court of the United States and the Supreme Court of Kentucky, we notice in a few words the "Bethel Union" case decided against the Radicals by the Court of Appeals, as will be seen by the opinion of Judge Robertson already largely cited from. This case, after the decision by the court of last resort, is brought before Judge Ballard of the United States Court, in a manner even more extraordinary than through the Joneses boarded at New Albany to make them non-residents. The "Bethel Union" church, and with it the Court of Appeals, is brought to answer in the Federal Court, under the "Civil Rights Bill," through an old negro woman, fallen from grace years ago, but rising again at the call of her Radical friends, and bringing her husband with her into the church, in order to institute complaint, and demand protection for her rights in the Bethel Union church property! Thus the case stands, unheard as yet by Judge Ballard.

A third case is that of the Shelbyville church, which, after the defeat of the Radicals in the Circuit Court, was brought before Judge Ballard, instead of before the State Court of Appeals, by means of a non-resident somebody who used to belong to the Shelbyville church—so long ago as to have been dropped from the roll. This case has not yet been heard in the United States Court.

A fourth case is that from Richmond, Kentucky; remarkable from the fact, that, after the Radicals had been allowed the use of the church part of the time, and they, for want of a minister, had given it up, a suit is now brought in the Federal Court

by the wife of a peripatetic minister, Todd, who made an utter failure as temporary supply, and went to West Virginia. While in Richmond, she had been known only as a Baptist! But now she prays Judge Ballard, under some very remarkable swearing, to protect her rights in the Richmond church property! To these four cases involving the local church property of congregations, must be added the fifth and largest case, involving the question of the Centre College property and franchises.

While a suit was yet pending in the Circuit Court at Danville between the trustees of the excluded and the Radical Synods, perceiving that the views on this general subject held by the Court of Appeals were against them, the Radical Synod be-thought itself of the strategy of electing non-resident trustees, and through these trustees suit was brought in the Federal Court against the ministers of the excluded Synod to enjoin them from electing trustees of Centre College. The decision in this case, after being argued and submitted in the State Court, is strangely postponed from term to term. In the Federal Court, it is only in its first stages.

Such are the phases of this remarkable litigation in Kentucky. These five cases are but representatives of fifty others, which will be made if the Radical party are finally successful in these. It will be perceived, also, that in the providence of God, the Presbyterian Church of Kentucky has been thrust into the front of the conflict between the Federal and State Courts; and important as are the temporal issues to Presbyterians, still more important are the issues involved to the citizens of the State. And yet, strange to say, such is the apathy both of Presbyterians and citizens, that a mere handful of men are left to stagger under the vast load of the expense of these suits.

The excluded Presbyterians of Missouri are in a worse case than their brethren in Kentucky, in that they have no State courts to protect their rights. Under a constitution concocted by such a lawgiver as the man Drake, now burlesquing the title of United States Senator, in his most blood-thirsty temper toward the non-loyal, and under the rulings of a judiciary created by such a constitution, and judges elected by the people who

adopted such a constitution, it would naturally be supposed that the decrees of the Assemblies of 1866 and 1867 would be enforced by the civil courts with great vigor. One is prepared to receive, with little allowance for exaggeration, the recent remark of a Missouri Presbyterian: "If a Radical were to steal my watch, and plead that he did it by command of the General Assembly, our Supreme Court would sanction the theft." And, indeed, why not sanction it—provided the theft were for purely spiritual purposes—as Judge Ballard would say—such, for instance, as to send loyal Missionaries to the South, or to add to the \$5,000 from the Board of Publication to sustain the lawsuits in Kentucky? For as Judges Pirtle and Ballard ask: "What may not this great national tribunal do *sua sponte*?" And, as Judge Bullard says: "Having reference to a purely ecclesiastical matter, all civil courts are bound to respect its decree as furnishing conclusive, and uncontrollable evidence respecting the matter therein declared!"

But two cases of litigation, as yet, have been reported from Missouri: one, the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of the Lindenwood College at St. Charles; the other, the case of the church property of the Presbyterian congregation at St. Charles; just decided in the State Circuit Court of that district, under the lead of the Supreme Court's decision.

The opinions rendered in these cases evince, by their singular want of logical self-consistency, and the propensity to garble and pervert authorities, rather the spirit of an unscrupulous advocate at the bar, than that of the honest judge. The Supreme Court of Missouri expressly declares:

"But the General Assembly has adjudicated upon that subject. *That judgment is conclusive upon us. We will not undertake to penetrate the veil of this church power.*"

And the Circuit Judge, Edwards, expressly states the first question in the case before him to be, "Is the act of the General Assembly conclusive upon this court?" and answers in the affirmative. Yet in both opinions, as if afraid to let this dogma stand in its naked deformity before the Protestant public, these judges do "undertake to penetrate the veil of this Church

power," and to determine the ecclesiastical question touching the powers of the General Assembly; and still worse, to pervert the Constitution and decide the question wrong. Nay, the Circuit Judge proceeds to calumniate the whole Church as it was from 1849 to 1864, charging it with suppressing the truth in the presence of Baal, and hypocritically teaching the world a lie, as will be seen from his account of the origin of the St. Charles church controversy in the following paragraphs of his opinion:

"The troubles in the church of St. Charles, which have finally culminated in this suit, are *directly traceable to a conflict of opinion on the subject of African slavery as it existed in this country*, when viewed from an ecclesiastical or Presbyterian stand-point.

"The Church denounced slavery as a sin at an early period of her existence. Through her highest judicatory she has repeatedly uttered her testimony and raised her voice against human bondage, as being a sin against God and man, from the earliest history of the Church in this country down to a period subsequent to the great political agitation on that subject, when her voice began to grow weak, and finally ceased to be heard. The General Assembly of this Church, for a long time before the late civil war, had little or nothing to say on the subject of slavery. The question, as a political question, had obtruded itself into the Church, and threatened temporal disaster, and, in order to avoid this, the Church became silent in the presence of Baal! Not only had the Church ceased to raise its voice against 'the sum of all villainies,' but it had so compromised and temporized, in order to preserve its ecclesiastical unity, that that which was once deemed as a sin against God and man, became popular and of good repute within the Church, and was believed by many of its members to be divinely sanctioned. The Church remained silent on the subject from 1849 till after the commencement of the late civil war—and during that time slavery ceased to be a sin, was found out to be divinely sanctioned, and became an element of great strength and power in the Church. Hence it was that when the Church again undertook to raise its voice against slavery, as it did during the recent war, the opinions of its members, formed during the years of silence, were heard protesting against the right of the Church, as a church organisation, to make binding declarations upon that subject; and in this originated the suit now before the court.

“The General Assembly of the Old School Presbyterian Church, by what is known as a ‘general deliverance,’ declared that the Church was opposed to both rebellion and slavery. This gave rise to a paper known as the Declaration and Testimony. The contest between these two parties in the Church led to the adoption, on the part of the General Assembly, in the spring of 1866, of the Gurley order above referred to.

“The Declaration and Testimony party, treating this action of the General Assembly as a nullity, proceeded in entire disregard of it, and continue to do so.”

The same thing substantially, without the ribaldry, had just been said by the Supreme Court of Missouri in the Lindenwood College case :

“The difficulty and dissension grew out of the action of the General Assembly of the Old School Presbyterian Church in issuing its deliverances on the subject of loyalty and slavery during the progress of the civil war through which the country has just passed. These deliverances inculcated loyalty, took strong ground in favor of the General Government in the struggle then going on, and pronounced emphatically against slavery.”

It will be observed that here is a full admission that the Old School General Assembly, in setting up the anti-slavery test in 1865 as a term of communion, made an entire change in the terms of communion—even so great a change as from alliance with Baal to witnessing for the true Jehovah, and from holding slaves to be no sin to confessing slavery to be a “sin against God and man.” And still more noteworthy is the fact that the General Assembly recently met in Pittsburgh, itself declares substantially the same thing in adopting the report of Mr. Drake—the same Senator Drake, author of the Missouri Constitution; the reputed author of the Rosecrans oath test, as a qualification for sitting in a church court; and now with singular consistency, author of the bill to gag the Supreme Court of the United States—the report of the settlement of the difficulties in the Chicago Seminary and with Mr. Cyrus McCormick. For in that report it is distinctly stated as the ground on which Mr. McCormick was released from the payment of the remaining \$25,000 of the \$100,000 originally pledged by him, that, subsequent to the giving of that pledge, *the views and policy of the*

Church had undergone an entire change from the views and policy prevailing when Mr. McCormick gave the pledge; and to maintain and support which, he gave the money. And the substance of the settlement is, that if Mr. McCormick will let them continue to pervert the \$75,000, he shall be let off from the other \$25,000. The ethical idea of the settlement seems to have been borrowed from the current rule of police detectives with their embezzling or thieving subjects—"Give up what you have left, and no questions asked about what you have spent;" or rather, perhaps, from the method in which the government, after the war, in salutary dread of restored civil law in the border States, settled the account with the victims of the previous robberies and plunderings by its military satraps—"Take back that which we can no longer keep, on condition of no questions raised in the civil courts, touching the robberies."

It is thus admitted both by the Missouri judges and the recent Assembly at Pittsburgh, that the orders of Assembly in 1865, which gave rise to the Declaration and Testimony, involved a great change. According to Judge Edwards, this change was so fundamental as the adoption of the infidel doctrine, that slavery is "a sin against God and man," in place of the Assembly's doctrine of 1845, that "we cannot denounce the holding of slaves as necessarily a heinous and scandalous sin, *without charging the Apostles of Christ with conniving at sin, introducing such sinners into the Church,*" etc. Thus, while in effect admitting that so fundamental a change of doctrine, and of the terms of communion, was involved in the deliverance of 1864 on slavery, and the orders of 1865 making that deliverance a term of communion, as the practical denial of the inspiration of the apostles, yet these Missouri judges declare the decree was "both constitutional and conclusive upon the civil courts." And those that refuse to accept the germinal infidelity must give up their property!

The Kentucky Radical jurists had been sharp enough to stop with the simple declaration of the conclusiveness of the Assembly's decrees, without having any thing to say as to the merits of these decrees, beyond simply that they were authorised by the gene-

ral powers given in Chap. XII., Sec. 5. And we have been not a little amused to find lawyers, accustomed to construe instruments, here seeking shelter behind the constitutional expositions of the ecclesiastics of the General Assembly, who have been shedding forth, "as the fig-tree sheddeth her untimely leaves," their special pleadings, evasions, rhetorical flourishes, and shallow metaphysical prosings, for years past—as if the instinct of the lawyer in these judges shrank at the idea of leaving their theory of the Assembly, and its impenetrable veil, standing out in its naked deformity; and hence they seek for fig leaves to hide its nakedness.

Conspicuous among these shelters is the disquisition on the Constitution in the Assembly of 1867, of our quondam acquaintance, Professor Matthews, which seems to justify his title at Centre College as "Professor *Paddy* Matthews." Misled by the endorsement of Moderator Gurley and others, calling for a pamphlet edition of the speech, these lawyers seem to have taken as authoritative this truly Hibernian exposition of Presbyterianism. The distinguishing feature of Professor Matthews' theory, is that the word "*also*" at the opening of Sec. 5th of Chap. XII., "to the General Assembly *also* belongs," etc., denotes that besides the things in Sec. 4, which the General Assembly "shall do," under the rules and limits of the Constitution, there are "*also*" these things enumerated in Sec. 5, (such as the power of deciding controversies, suppressing schisms, etc.,) which it has "the power to do," *independent of any constitutional limitations* as to mode of trial, appeal, etc! Until this "very Daniel came to judgment," we presume the whole Presbyterian world thought that Section 4th enumerated certain regular routine duties of the Assembly, to be done under the forms prescribed by the Constitution; and that Section 5th recited certain other extraordinary, or rather, less ordinary, duties which, as occasion may arise, it has "*also*" the power to do under the same forms and limits of the Constitution. Under Professor Matthews' view, the General Assembly shall indeed do routine duty within the enclosures of the Constitution; but this "*also*" is a gate, or rather open gap, through which, on any unusual occasion and

excitement, the Assembly may run out into the common, and there perform any and every sort of ecclesiastical "ground and lofty tumbling," free from all constitutional forms, in the exuberant consciousness that

"No pent up Utica confines *our powers*—
But a whole boundless continent is ours."

And yet this ludicrous logical Hibernicism was solemnly endorsed by the grave doctors of 1867, and has been repeated by learned jurists of the party in one form or other ever since. This fact evinces clearly enough the consciousness of the great straits into which both the ecclesiastics and the jurists are driven to screen their theory from the disgust of the people and the indignation of honest and honorable men.

Not unlike this is Professor Matthews' remarkable inference from some scrap which he had picked up, of the ancient Scotch dispute, whether the ecclesiastical power is from "*above*," or from "*below*"—that is, whether the power is primarily in the General Assembly, and descends to Synods, Presbyteries, and church sessions, as its departments; or, whether the power is in the congregation and Presbytery, and ascends upward by delegation to the Assembly. Professor Matthews had evidently heard some one speaking of this dispute, and not comprehending the point, becomes very learned in the Assembly, and very ridiculous. The Supreme Court of Missouri, very naturally taken with Professor M's. consolidation theory, follows suit, and makes Presbyterian Church government merely another form of Papal government, with a polyheaded Pope!

So far as we have followed these Missouri judges in their citations of legal authorities, we find them perverting and garbling these not less than the Constitution of the Church, to make them assert dogmas precisely the reverse of what the authorities meant to utter. We make room for but two specimens of the whole.

Thus the Supreme Court of Missouri has the effrontery to cite "as a case entirely analogous" to the *ipso facto* orders, the excision of the New York Synods in 1837, and to quote Judge Gibson as asserting the principle that the Assembly may excise Synods, Presbyteries, and ministers belonging to the body, with-

out trial. Whereas Judge Gibson, in the context of the very place cited, said: "It (the Plan of Union) was obviously a missionary arrangement from the first, and they who built up Presbyteries and Synods on the basis of it, had no reason to expect that their structure would survive it. . . . They embraced it with all its defeasible properties plainly put before them, and the power which constituted it might fairly repeal it, and dissolve the bodies which grew out of it, whenever the good of the Church should seem to require it." And yet here a Supreme Court has the effrontery to say that the repeal of a mere act of Assembly by a subsequent Assembly is "entirely analogous" to the excision of Synods and Presbyteries and ministers acknowledged to be component parts of the Church, without any reference to the lower courts, or to the form of trial specifically required by the Constitution. And besides, the Supreme Court of Missouri forgot for the moment, very conveniently, that Judge Gibson had no scruples about lifting the "sacred veil," and inquiring whether the Assembly had acted in accordance with its constitution and covenants.

The same garbling of cases might be illustrated from the citation of *Robertson vs. Bullions*, and others. The most remarkable citation, however, is that, in Judge Edwards' opinion, of Lord Eldon's great opinion in 1813, which overthrew the previous narrow and bigoted views of the Scottish courts, and established the principle—recognised ever since by all jurists except our Radical judges—that the courts should treat church property trusts as any other trusts, and compel the execution of them for the benefit of those who maintain the doctrines and order of the Church in accordance with the purpose of the donor; that the church property follows the doctrines, independent of the question of adherence to the church tribunals, and not the majority either of the local congregation or of the general body. And yet the only point seen in the decision by this Missouri judge, is, that after inquiring as to which party held the ancient doctrines, the court could not find any material difference, and of course gave the property to the majority, which happened to be the adhering party. And yet this is the authority on which

rests this case of resistance to an admitted change in the faith and order of the Church touching the fundamental doctrine of the relation of the Church to Cæsar's kingdom, and to the organisation of labor in Cæsar's kingdom, and the proof that those who resist this setting up of a new article of faith and term of communion ought to be despoiled of their church property.

Unfortunately for themselves, the excluded churches in Missouri, by their choice of a battle-ground in the conflict with the Assembly, have furnished their adversaries with the most plausible (if not the most substantial) of all their justifications for despoiling them of their property. The Missouri brethren have insisted on still asserting that they are part of the Northern Church, and, therefore, have declined connexion with the Southern General Assembly. And this position was selected for the very reason that, as they were advised, it would better protect their property rights. The Kentucky brethren—especially those who urged a connexion with the South—contended from the first, that the surest protection for their property, as well as the spiritual interests of the people, would be found in an immediate union with the Southern Synods (who had been excluded for the same reason) in the constitution of a General Assembly which should claim to be the true Old School Assembly against the other as apostate, and thus force the civil courts to examine the constitutional question, and determine whether the Constitution or the will of a majority is the supreme law of the Church. They warned their brethren of the danger of coming into the civil courts as an isolated body organised in defiance of the Assembly, and yet claiming to be a part of it; and confessedly with a practically mutilated Constitution, since they had no General Assembly to represent their unity in faith and order with the Presbyterian Church in the United States. That these warnings were timely will appear from the following, which is the only very plausible plea in Judge Edwards' opinion:

“The status of the parties is such as to preclude the consideration of the third question, viz., Is it necessary to establish ecclesiastical connexion in order to hold as beneficiaries under

the deeds? If there had been an entire separation and withdrawal of these defendants as a part and parcel of the Old School Presbyterian Church on an honest difference of opinion as to some question of doctrine, or, perhaps, of church government, as in this case; the question as to a sale and division of proceeds might arise on proper proceedings for that purpose, on the ground that they were still beneficiaries under the deed, notwithstanding the separation. But in the opinion of the court, the present status of the defendants will not permit the consideration of any such question.

“It will be observed that the position of the defendants, both from the pleading and the testimony and the argument in the case, is not that of a separate and independent church organisation, resulting from difference of opinion on church government, or the constitutionality of these acts, or the slavery question; but the position is one of direct antagonism to the church authorities while claiming to be a part of the church. The salient point of defence, and almost the entire force of the argument, is as to the unconstitutionality of the acts of church government which place the defendants out of ecclesiastical connexion.

“The defendants occupy then the position of church members, or a part of the Presbyterian congregation, dissatisfied with the action of the church judicatories, and refusing to be bound by them, at the same time using and claiming the right to use the church temporalities. In this aspect of the case, have the defendants any right to seek to control the affairs of the church by using her temporalities for the very purpose of building up and increasing the opposition to her judgments and decrees? It would seem not. And right here seems to be the insuperable difficulty with which the Declaration and Testimony party are met. So long as they claim to be members, they must be in subordination to the ecclesiastical government of which they are citizens. There certainly can be no such thing as lawful rebellion against constituted and acknowledged authority, either in a secular or in an ecclesiastical sense.”

Now it must be admitted, that, even if this argument is not genuine, it is a far more ingenious counterfeit than is to be found in all the decisions of Radical judges in Kentucky and Missouri; and should convince the Missouri Presbyterians that, even on the question of expediency, those advised the true policy who from the first urged a bold and decisive movement for the immediate reconstruction of a true Old School General Assembly, and

to set up a claim for not only our congregational property, but at least a share also of the public property of the Church. This difference between the status of the excluded churches in Kentucky, and that of those in Missouri, should be noted in this controversy.

We have spoken of the attempts of these jurists to shelter their dogmas under the absurd views of the constitution pretended to be set up by ecclesiastics in defence of the Assembly. The Missouri judges reproduce also, as a plea, the absurdly anti-Protestant doctrine of Dr. Hodge in 1862: that when a decree of Assembly contrary to the standards is laid upon the churches, all are bound to submit until the decree is repealed; just as all good citizens must submit to the unlawful decrees of the civil government till repealed. This monstrous dogma, it will be seen, overlooks the wide difference between the obedience of overt act to a civil government, and the obedience of conscience to the spiritual government; and utterly ignores also the obligation of all church courts, ministers, and people, to be witnesses for the truth of Christ against the apostasy from the faith and order of Christ's house. As reasserted by these judges from a civil point of view, the dogma becomes monstrous, and an offence to every Protestant. For the sum and substance of these decisions, is, that, if men, and even whole bodies of men, dare to denounce and protest against the introduction of germinal infidelity into the Presbyterian Church, they must do it at the forfeiture of their church property—even of their local congregational property—since the civil courts cannot go behind the "sacred veil" of a church tribunal's decision, no matter what deeds of darkness, faithlessness to covenants, or other devil's work, have been done behind the veil.

Now, this result of these decisions of Radical courts is what makes the question one of the gravest importance to every thoughtful Protestant in the land. These decisions virtually put all Protestant churches into the same category with the Roman Catholics, who hold the infallibility of the councils, and, therefore, have no right, according to their creed, to ask the civil courts to set aside an infallible decision. But every

Protestant body holds substantially the right of private judgment as set forth in the Presbyterian standards—"God alone is Lord of the conscience, and hath left it free from the commandments of men. Synods and councils may err—have erred; yea, have degenerated into synagogues of Satan." How preposterous, therefore, to say that men who contribute their money on the faith of the covenants implied in these standards, shall not be allowed protection, as citizens, for their civil rights against the machinations of a "synagogue of Satan," because the civil courts dare not "penetrate the veil!" What Protestant, not a fool by nature, or made a fool of by his partisan credulity, would give his money or property to maintain and propagate Protestant principles of religion with no guarantee of protection for his donation from perversion by the error of synods and councils if they degenerate into synagogues of Satan? The common sense of every intelligent Protestant revolts against such decisions as these in Missouri, and would not receive them as law (for law is common sense) if all the judges in Missouri swore it. This affectation of delicate reverence which forbids to "penetrate the veil" of the decisions of church tribunals, is but the affectation of the crafty libertine, who ever affects a prudish reverence for female purity beyond all other men. The fundamental point of their argument, is, that no matter what a church tribunal decides in matters affecting civil rights, the civil courts must accept their conclusions without question; that a Presbyterian Assembly, Episcopal Convention, or Methodist Conference, may decide that Jesus is not the Son of God, save in the sense of Renan or Emerson, and then cut off any minority for resisting that decision, and then take their property and use it to propagate infidelity; and for all this there is no remedy, save the kind permission of the Supreme Court of Missouri—to leave the Church, having first delivered up your pocket-book, and go—where, the court does not say.

All this is too monstrous to be accepted as law; the native instincts of any honest man who has the least conception of the Protestant first principle of the right of private judgment and the fallibility of counsels, revolt at it. Nor will men, however

little they know of law, ever be made to believe that, in reference to religious trusts, the civil courts of Protestant countries stand just where they did before the great Reformation, listening with awe to the oracle behind the "sacred veil," and subserviently executing its edicts of persecution and plunder. It is no extreme case to suppose that the oracle may become infidel and demand the use of the property of Christ's people to persecute Christ's cause. According to these Missouri judges, the great point in these cases is that the General Assembly adopted the infidel view of slavery—a view which necessarily leads to the denial of the infallible wisdom of Jesus and his apostles; and, because of their resistance to the apostasy, they must give up the property in St. Charles, donated by men and women not one of whom but would have gone to the stake rather than receive the Assembly's doctrine.

It has been found impossible to execute the first division of the work proposed in this article—to exhibit the facts of this litigation as they come before the civil courts—within the compass at first deemed ample. It will be possible, therefore, to present only in the most summary way the second thing proposed—the law pertaining to such cases as it must present itself to the judges in view of the facts.

First of all, then, it should be borne in mind that there are four somewhat different views of the relations of church property and franchises to the civil law, under which British and American jurists utter the opinions which are cited as authorities governing the decision of these cases in Kentucky and Missouri. Thus, in Great Britain, the dissenting bodies of all names do not hold their church properties by incorporated trustees, as in this country, but simply by trusts committed to parties named and those appointed to succeed them. And the courts in determining church property questions, are controlled by the Statute of Charitable Uses, (43 Elizabeth. c. 4). In the United States, there are three very distinct methods of managing the question of church property under the separation of Church and State.

The first method may be called the New England method, though no longer confined to the New England States. This

method incorporates "religious societies," and confers upon the society thus incorporated all the powers of a municipality or "township" for the election of trustees, so called, though in fact not trustees at all, but a board of managers, for the assessment of a church tax or pew tax, and for the compulsory collection of it from all who recognise themselves as members of the society.

The second method is to incorporate the trustees, properly so called, of a church to hold such property and funds as may be committed to their charge by the voluntary offerings of the people. In this case, the church, as such, is what the lawyers call the *cestui que trust*—that is the party for whose benefit the right and title is held by the trustees. This is the general method in all States who have not adopted the New England method, and yet have made provision by statute for the holding of church property.

The third method, in States which give no charters of incorporation to religious bodies—for in some States it is even forbidden—is to protect church property in the hands of unincorporated trustees simply by the common law of trusts for charitable uses. The chief difference between this method and that of the British for dissenting churches, is, that in Britain the courts act under the special statute of Elizabeth, while in such States of America, the courts act under the common law of charitable uses, which has generally been adopted from the British law by the several States of the Union.

The intelligent reader of these church property controversies will therefore bear in mind these very important diversities of the law of church property, as the opinions of the various jurists are cited; and interpret them in the light of the local law under which the view of the judge is taken and the opinion given. It is because of disregard of this diversity of the local law that the decisions of judges are so frequently misunderstood. Thus the recent decision of Judge Jameson of Chicago, while in exact accordance with the opinion of the Kentucky judges as to the general principle that the civil court is bound to "penetrate the veil" of the ecclesiastical council, yet seems to Kentucky or

Virginia Presbyterians to go very far in the application of the doctrine to the case of a minister under trial. This is simply because the judge contemplates the case from the stand-point of the New England scheme of supporting the minister by compulsory tax on the members of the society, thus vesting in the preacher a valuable right. On the other hand, it at first sight shocks the Kentucky or Virginia Presbyterian to find it stated in the New York case of *Robertson vs. Bullions*, "that the trustees of a church cannot take a trust *limited to the support of a particular faith or a particular class of doctrines.*" Or when they find it stated, as in the case of *Burrel vs. The Associate Reformed Church of Seneca*, (44 Barb. 282,) that "should a *religious society* think proper to separate from the church with which it has been previously connected, and form a connexion with another denomination, the trustees have the power to employ such minister as they see fit." Or when they find it stated, as in the New York case of *Petty vs. Tooker*, that "the legal character of the corporation is not affected by the existence or non-existence of ecclesiastical connexion, doctrines, rites, or modes of government of a church or churches formed by the incorporators." Or as they find, in the same case, that the "trustees of a religious society can determine by their control of the corporate property, who shall conduct the religious exercises in the house of worship of the society; and make such regulations in respect to the renting and occupation of the pews, as to exclude persons of obnoxious opinions from becoming attendants upon worship, and thereby obtaining a right to vote."

All these things arise out of the gentilism of the theory of incorporating "religious societies" in New England, New York, and elsewhere. The churchly instincts of the Episcopal, Dutch Reformed, and Associate Reformed churches, have been strong enough to secure in New York and all the New England States, special laws of incorporation for those churches severally. And the very fact that a professedly Presbyterian Church can exist at all under such laws incorporating "religious societies," is *prima facie* evidence that their Presbyterianism is of a very loose order. But it is no doubt the case even in the States

which have provided for the incorporation of religious societies, that the greater portion of the Presbyterian churches exist either under old charters or special charters. Doubtless the general acts for the incorporation of "religious societies," are simply a device to avoid the necessity of special legislation. And so far as concerns the Presbyterian Church, it may be presumed that they are practically administered under the third method specified—of trustees, in the true sense, holding property in trust for pious and charitable uses. Hence the principle enunciated in *The People vs. Steele* (2 Barb. 397) may be taken as universal, that "when a religious society is organised as part of an established denomination, and becomes endowed with property given on the faith of its being so, the trustees, at a given time, will not be permitted to employ such property in maintaining doctrine and discipline at variance with that of the denomination, even though they might be sustained by a majority of the corporators; and in such a case the intention of the donors is the criterion by which to determine the purpose to which the property of the church has been dedicated."

This is the simple principle upon which the defence of the church property of the excluded Synods in Kentucky and Missouri rests against the claimants under the Assembly. They plead before the civil courts that their property has been donated to the maintenance of the Presbyterianism of the Confession of Faith and the Form of Government, not a Presbyterianism that varies its terms of communion according to the will of the majority in church courts. And while adherence to the General Assembly is indeed an element in the question of their right to enjoy the use of Presbyterian property, it is not the only or even the chief element. When the action of the church court is revolutionary, and directly in the face of the Constitution, then adherence to the standards and church order of Presbyterianism, is the test whether the property is used according to the intention of the donors, who gave it under the covenants of the standards and church order. And the singularity of the case, is, that the parties seeking to oust them admit that they are standing fast to the standards and order to main-

tain which the property was dedicated; nay, they even profess to agree with them fully as against the decrees of Assembly accepting, and making a new test of communion, the infidel views of slavery as against the Apostles—and yet they claim that exclusion by the Assembly for refusal to depart from the standards, forfeits the property! The State courts in Kentucky affirm their own competency to inquire which party are maintaining the doctrine and discipline to maintain which the property was dedicated; while the Federal Court of Kentucky and the courts of Missouri deny the competency of any civil court “to penetrate the veil of power,” and inquire beyond it, what has the ecclesiastical tribunal decreed?

The hue and cry against interference with religious doctrines and discipline by the civil courts, and the citation of the dicta of jurists against such interference, is, in this case, demagoguery pure and simple. Nobody ever claimed that civil judges shall decide upon doctrines as true, or discipline as scriptural and wise; or that civil judges shall interfere either to enforce or annul ecclesiastical penalties. And it is but absurd demagoguery to pretend that civil judges cannot construe a church creed or discipline just as they must construe a will or a conveyance, to find out the intention of parties in conveying property or contributing funds, and whether those intrusted with the execution of the trust are effecting the intention of the donor. As the judges do not examine a will to determine whether it is a wise one, or a deed to determine whether the bargain was a good one, so neither do they examine church constitutions to determine their merits as good or bad, but simply to find out their meaning as a covenant between those who gave and those who received certain property which it is the business of the court to maintain the rightful owners in possession of.

Now, in regard to the fundamental issues in the Kentucky and Missouri litigation of church property—both the right of the civil courts to “penetrate the veil” of ecclesiastical decrees involving civil rights, and inquire into doctrines and discipline as matters of fact in determining the intention of donors and the duties of trustees, and also the duty of the civil courts to enforce the use

of such property to those who adhere to and maintain the doctrines and principles of the donors notwithstanding their non-adherence to the ecclesiastical tribunals, when that adherence must be at the sacrifice of the doctrines and principles—the whole tenor of judicial decisions, to which, in the nature of the case, we must look chiefly for the law in such matters, is so entirely in confirmation of the views of the Kentucky Court of Appeals, that only by such perversions and garbling as we have already noticed, can the contrary view be made even plausible.

Premising that in both Kentucky and Missouri Presbyterian Church property is held by incorporated trustees, strictly so called, we proceed in conclusion to cite the law bearing on the case from the decisions of courts of the highest authority, beginning with the British decisions in reference to unincorporated churches under the law of trusts. Limited, as this citation must be, to a few specimens of the whole, those relating to Presbyterian Churches will chiefly be selected.

Innes, in his remarkably able volume on the Law of Creeds in Scotland, gives us the following general view of the tone of the British courts in reference to litigations of church property:

“While the general desire of courts at law is to avoid ecclesiastical or spiritual questions, they find it impossible wholly to do so. * * * If a body of men have wrongful possession of a church, or a sum of money—on the pretence, for example, that they are the religious body to which the money or the building was destined—their opponents have no way of redressing the wrong and vindicating their own rights, except by appealing to the civil tribunals of the country. And these civil tribunals have no means of doing justice, except by investigating into the differences—of doctrine, discipline, or practice—which to the litigants may be religious differences, *but to the judges are mere matters of fact bearing upon a question of civil right.*” P. 322.

“We have already seen that the courts of Scotland in the last century declined, as much as possible, though on various grounds, to meddle with the matters of dissenting churches. * * Down to 1813, the universal principle of our court was, when any such question arose, to abandon the decision of it to the church itself. The only difference was, that in some cases the bench left it to the congregation—*i. e.* to the majority of the congregation; in other cases to the whole church, that is, to the

majority of the whole church or body. This course of conduct had, as we have seen in parallel cases of jurisdiction, a twofold origin—a feeling on the one hand that dissenting bodies ought to be ignored by the law, and on the other a feeling that bodies which sacrificed so much for the sake of separation and independence ought to have their independence respected. The desire to ignore such bodies rather tended to make the courts leave questions of property to be decided by the local majority—the majority of the congregation more immediately concerned; the other principle led (though later) to their leaving it to the decision of the Presbytery, Synod, or other judicatory of the general body. . . This ancient principle was upset by one decision in the House of Lords in 1813.” Pp. 326, 327.

In the Scotch case, which gave occasion to Lord Eldon’s opinion here referred to, when appealed to the House of Lords in 1813, Sir Islay Campbell, delivering the opinion in the lower court, had asserted precisely the dogma of the Missouri courts, in giving the property to the majority of the congregation :

“The sole question is, Who are the majority of this body of individuals, and who are the trustees named by them? The judge cannot listen to the peculiar doctrines either of ecclesiastical discipline or of moral and political systems adopted by voluntary associations.” P. 329.

When the case came up again the next year, (1804), the judges meantime having been changed, Lord Hope took an opposite view in favor of giving the property to the body adhering to the Synod, instead of to the majority of the congregation. And on this ground: “This congregation did not mean to become Independents. They meant to continue Presbyterians. I have no access to know who are the real Burgher Seceders, but the judicatories themselves.” This it will be perceived is Judge Ballard’s doctrine precisely.

But both these views were upset, as Innes tells us, when the case went by appeal to the House of Lords; and never since thus upset in 1813, unless it might be in Lord Meadowbank’s opinion in 1837, has this doctrine been heard of until revived by the Kentucky and Missouri Radical judges.

“I do apprehend,” said Lord Eldon, “that there is no case that we have had which would authorise me to say, that if per-

sons had subscribed to a meeting-house for religious worship, and if those persons afterwards disagreed in opinion, you would compel the execution of the trust for the purpose of carrying on the religious worship of those who *had changed their opinion*, instead of executing that trust for the benefit of those *who had adhered to their religious opinions*. * * When I speak of religious opinions in such a case, I would state that the court here would examine what were the religious opinions merely *as a matter of fact*, in order to get at the intent and purpose with which the property was purchased." Pp. 337, 338.

When Lord Meadowbank, who had been counsel for the Synod party in the case, afterward attempted to expound the opinion of Lord Eldon in a sense that adherence to the Synod is the true test of holding the original doctrines, Lord Hope, in the Kirkintilloch case in 1850, declares that such a view "is precisely the error in the Craigdallie case, (1813), again brought out and in more absolute terms." That error "consisted in *taking as decisive* what was only one element in the case, and it might be *an element of no importance*, in the inquiry what was the original trust, and which party maintained *the principles*." P. 346.

Says Innes: "Lord Meadowbank's doctrine of *probatio probata* is the point emphatically repudiated by the court in this case, and *ever since*. Whatever weight may be attached to the fact of Presbyterian subordination, *it is not to be assumed as conclusive*. All are agreed that the Craigdallie principle is, that *the property follows not the central judicatories, but the original principles of the congregation*."

"And to Lord Meadowbank's rejoinder, 'But submission to the judicatories may be one of these original principles,' the answer of his successor on the bench is: "*Then you must prove that*; it is not *probatio probata*. It is not even a presumption of law. *The presumption is the other way*.'" P. 346.

It is almost incredible that a judge should dare quote this Craigdallie case as authority for the principle that adherence to the Assembly is conclusive upon the courts, merely because it happened that the court could not find the difference of principle between the two parties, and therefore left the property with the

Synod party; yet this is the use made of the case by the Missouri judges. What makes the effrontery greater, is, that Lord Eldon himself, in the case of *Folgin vs. Wontner*, declared: "I take it to be now *settled* by a case in the House of Lords, on appeal from Scotland, that the chapel must remain devoted to the *doctrines* originally agreed upon." (2 Jacob and Walker, 247.) And to settle still further a settled thing, Lord Justice-Clerk Hope declares broadly: "The truth is, that if the original principles of the congregation are established, *adherence to them and not to the Synod* (the supreme tribunal) is the rule fixed by the case of *Craigdallie*; so that separation from the Synod is really in that case immaterial." P. 347.

It would be impossible within these limits to cite the multitude of British decisions all to the same effect. Nor is it needful. For the decision here cited has controlled all British decisions for near sixty years, and has been a controlling authority in American courts also; and of course there can be no decisions fairly quoted which militate against its general principles. And, indisputably, this great authority is precisely to every point in the Kentucky issues, and "upsets" the whole theory of the Radical jurists, as it upset their intolerant Scotch predecessors. Those who may wish to examine the question in more detail, will find the whole subject elaborately set out in "Innes' Law of Creeds in Scotland."

In regard to the decisions in American courts, there is great uniformity on these points and perfect conformity to them, in every case where the courts find occasion to touch upon them. And this is the more remarkable, because, as Chief Justice Hand, of New York, among the most learned of them all in this branch, says: "In consequence of the diversity of legislation on the subject, very little aid can be obtained from the decisions of courts of sister States; and the contrariety of opinion in our own courts unfortunately leaves the matter in some perplexity." One may form some conception of the variety of opinion growing out of the peculiar legislation of New York, with its general incorporation of "religious societies," and its special incorporations of the Episcopal, and Dutch Reformed, and other *churches*,

from the case of *Miller vs. Gable*. A German Reformed church withdrew from the Dutch Reformed, and employed a Lutheran pastor without consent of the *Classis*. The court went thoroughly into the differences of doctrine between the Lutheran, the German Reformed, and the Dutch Reformed Synod of Dort. Vice-Chancellor Hoffman dismissed the bill of the Dutch Reformed party, no doubt deciding under the "Religious Society" act, that the "society" could do as it pleased about denominational connexion. Chancellor Walworth reversed the decision, on the ground that the call of a pastor not of the Dutch Reformed *Classis* was a perversion and misapplication of the corporate funds. The case was taken up and reversed again in the Court of Errors, 14 to 4, (*Miller vs. Gable*, 2 Denio, 492,) but scarce two of the reversing senators agreed in the grounds of their reversal. Gardiner, president, did not sympathise with the doubt whether the trustees are not independent of all control with reference to doctrines and modes of worship; while Senator Beers thought the trustees had nothing to do with selecting the minister, and no right to determine his orthodoxy. Senator Barlow thought a majority of the church, or of the society, or of the trustees, at liberty to deviate from the doctrine at the time the donation was made, unless there is explicit declaration that it is to be held for the support of a particular doctrine.

Chancellor Walworth makes the suggestion in one case, that the English Lords in deciding *Pearson vs. Shore*—the case of Presbyterians against Unitarians—Lady Hewley's charity—was under the limitations of the law of England in 1701, making it penal to deny the doctrine of the Trinity. But it is difficult to see how that can affect the authority of Lord Eldon's opinion in 1813; for that was a decision as between two bodies of Presbyterians equally orthodox. Indeed, the decisions of Chancellor Walworth on all these points concerning church property seem to be exceedingly changeable and inconsistent, probably because of deciding now in the light of one system of legislation, and now in the light of another. In the case of the Baptist church, *Hartford vs. Wetherell*, he decided that the association recognising the minority of the church, though owning two-thirds of the

pews, could not remove the minister without consent of a majority of the "society," which is the corporation. Yet in the case of *Lawyer vs. Clipperly*, in 1838, (7 Paige, 281,) he decides that a Lutheran minister, nominated by the church council, and elected by a majority of the male members of the congregation, was justly excluded by the trustees from preaching in the church-building, because irregularly elected, and for having departed from the Augsburg Confession. Theologically, the trustees were doubtless right; but what becomes of the New York principle, that the "society" may call a minister of any faith they please? It is a somewhat remarkable fact that the General Assembly of 1863, at Peoria—probably the weakest body that had ever assembled under the constitution—should have repudiated so explicitly the New York and New England theory of trustees. As though "God had chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise," we find, as one of the dying utterances of true Presbyterianism, this deliverance of that body:

"By the constitution of the church, the session is charged with the supervision of the spiritual interests of the congregation; and this includes the right to direct and control the use of the building for the purposes of worship, as required by the special usages of the congregation, or the Directory for Worship. This being the principal purpose of the trust, the trustees are bound to respect the wishes and action of the session as to the use and occupation of the house of worship. The session is the organ through whom the trustees are to be informed how and when the church is to be occupied; and the trustees have no right to refuse compliance with the action of the session in that regard."

It will be seen that this deliverance of the Assembly is an admission which at once relieves the Kentucky and Missouri litigation from all embarrassment from the questions that trouble New York courts, and narrows down the controversy to points mainly covered by the British decisions, which are generally accepted as authority in our courts. The only case we have met with suggesting doubt as to the application of Lord Eldon's principle, is the *dictum* of Chancellor Walworth, in the case of *Bap. Ch. vs. Wetherell*, that he was "not prepared to say that

it would be right to adopt the principle of Lord Eldon here where all religions are not only tolerated but entitled to equal protection. Upon Lord Eldon's principle, a society of infidels, who had erected a temple to the goddess of reason, could not, upon the conversion of nine-tenths of the society to Christianity, be permitted to hear the word of life in that place where infidelity had once been taught. * * And the Court of Equity in a neighboring State might find itself constrained to order some of the parishes to employ religious teachers who should inculcate the doctrine of witchcraft as it was taught in their churches at their first organisation."

Now, any thoughtful man must see that we must accept all the consequences of the toleration and protection of all opinions; and notwithstanding this attempt at a witty *reductio ad absurdum*, it is, and ought to be, American law, that even as a Christian minority should be protected against an infidel apostasy, so an infidel minority should be protected in the trust once created; and it would be much better evidence of the conversion of the nine-tenths that they leave what they had dedicated to infidelity as a monument of their folly to humble them, and go build and dedicate to God a new temple, than to rob the infidel minority of their property to serve God with. And so if any Church exists which ever asserted witchcraft as a fundamental article of its creed, and there be successors to that faith to claim the use of the trust property, any just minded American will say they are entitled to it.

Having thus noted the only doubt of Lord Eldon's doctrine of applying the trust property to the maintainance of the *principles* to which it is dedicated, notwithstanding non-adherence to the majority of the body, that is to be met with in American decisions, we may the more properly limit, as want of space compels, the citation of the numerous cases fully endorsing it to a few specimens. And first of all, we cite the opinion of Chief Justice Hand in *Robertson vs. Bullions*, which is specially applicable to the Centre College case, and generally applicable to all the cases, as a denial of the Radical idea of adherence to the church judicatory as essential to holding the property:

“The description of the grantees as trustees of a church in connexion with the Associate Presbytery of Pennsylvania, having Dr. Bullions for a pastor, does *not amount to a condition or limitation of the estate conveyed*. No doubt the grantor to a religious association may make a particular connexion a condition of the grant. And the corporate or denominational name may indicate the nature of the trust as to doctrines esteemed fundamental. But in these cases the clauses in the conveyances are merely *descriptive of the grantees*, and designate the denomination of the Church, and admitting it has a connexion with such a Presbytery or Synod at that time. *But no condition or limitation* in that respect attaches to the estate.” This, it will be observed, is substantially what Lord Eldon’s opinion declared—“If it were distinctly intended that the Synod should control the use of the property, that ought to have been matter of contract. But there must be evidence of such a contract.”

So the Pennsylvania court—Judge Gibson himself, who decided our church case in 1839—decided in case of the church at York, Pennsylvania, seceded from Carlisle Presbytery in 1838, that though subjection to a church judicatory might be made a fundamental condition in the trust, yet, that not having been done in this case, the church did not forfeit the trust property by secession from the Presbytery. Chief Justice Hand, though he is a little prone, like Chancellor Walworth, to *homilize* on the divisions which Paul labored in vain to keep out of the Apostolic Church, and also disposed nervously to ask with Pilate, “What is truth,” yet, as a trained lawyer, brings out the just conclusions of equity. “In this State,” says he, “*it all rests on contract*. The incorporation is a contract.” And this is the true principle on which, together with the law of trusts, all these cases rest. Every Presbyterian who gives a dollar toward a church property binds those in charge of the church by contract, under the terms of its creed and constitution.

In announcing the result of his reasoning in the case of Robertson *vs.* Bullions, Chief Justice Hand declares: “In the present case I do not think a secession from any particular Presbytery or Synod (the supreme tribunal) would be a palpable abuse.

The church or society lost no rights by connecting itself with the Associate Synod of North America. Nor do I see how it would do so by connecting itself with any other Presbytery or Synod of the same denomination, if any other exists."

Justice Cady, in the same case, while laying more stress on the question of connexion with the Synod, yet announces that the question is, "Who are *now seeking* that the \$13,000 shall be applied to the specific purpose for which *the donors originally intended it?* If that can be discovered, the court is bound to carry it into effect."

In New Jersey, the courts seem to have laid down the very doctrine of Lord Eldon. In the case of *Hendrickson vs Decow*, (Sat. Ch. R. 577,) after stating that the courts inquire into religious opinions as matters of fact, the court declares:

"If the majority of an ecclesiastical assembly withdraw, however sufficient their reasons may be, that will not deprive those who remain of their ancient name, rights, and privileges, *if they retain their ancient faith and doctrines and adhere to their ancient standards.*" But we are obliged to forbear citations.

We have had nothing to say of the extraordinary partisan manœuvre whereby the Kentucky litigation, having been brought into the Federal courts, is now brought before the Supreme Court of the United States. If the lawyers, jurists, and citizens, can remain silent under this insult to the majesty and sovereignty of the State, it is not for the Church to make an ado about it. And we have learned, some time since, never to fight for those who will not fight for themselves. Whether properly or improperly before it, the Supreme Court at Washington is to be called upon to determine these issues—stated a little more in detail than in the opening of this article:

First. Do the civil courts of the United States recognise any church courts, as such, with jurisdiction in any other sense, so far as concerns civil rights, than the jurisdiction, if properly so-called, of any voluntary association—bank, railroad, farmer's club, base-ball club, or any other, in administering the bye-laws of the association?

Second. If so, then is the decree of a Protestant ecclesiastical

council affecting rights of property and franchises, conclusive upon the civil court, as "uncontrollable evidence" establishing the proper direction of funds for religious uses in the body?

Third. If either not recognised at all or not conclusive, then does the use of the church property—especially of local congregational property—follow the adherence to the constitution, doctrine, and worship of the Church, or follow the adherence to the majority of the body as represented in its supreme council?

Fourth. If it follow adherence to the Constitution and standards, then does not the attempt to add to the terms of communion by the Assembly of 1865, certain political dogmas—as of loyalty, which many sincerely believe to be "a usurpation of the prerogatives of the Divine Master;" or concerning the sinfulness of slavery, which many sincerely believe to involve the infidel heresy of the peccability of Christ, and a denial of the inspiration of his apostles who tolerated slavery in the Church—so subvert the doctrines and principles of Presbyterianism as to justify protest, resistance, and refusal to submit to such dogmas, that those who hold fast to the ancient doctrines and principles are entitled to hold the church property in their hands dedicated to the maintenance of these doctrines and principles?

Fifth. Even if not, then, was it competent to the General Assembly, under its general power to "suppress schismatic contentions," etc., to exclude from the Presbyterian Church ministers and ruling elders confessedly in constitutional connexion heretofore, and admitted to be in good standing by leaving them in charge of churches and church sessions, without any form of trial or hearing as provided for in the Constitution; and to dissolve Presbyteries and Synods who failed to execute this order upon members in good standing with them; and finally to follow this exclusion from the body with a forfeiture of all their church property?

It is needless to suggest that the decision of the question whether the Supreme Court of the United States will entertain such questions after their decision by the State Court, must be looked forward to with great interest by every intelligent States rights man in the nation; and that the decision of these ques-

tions, if entertained, must be looked forward to with intense interest by every Protestant in the nation as settling the question whether sacred trusts, created for maintaining the orthodox creeds of the Reformation, and at the same time the great Protestant principle that "God alone is Lord of the conscience," and that "synods and councils may err, and have erred and become synagogues of Satan," can any longer be protected in this country.

And should the decision be in accordance with that of the Radical judges in Kentucky and Missouri, will not our Northern brethren soon find that the \$5000 given to erect a gallows for the Declaration and Testimony men, has turned out to be a Haman's gallows, as we have before suggested?

CRITICAL NOTICES.

Credo. Boston: Lee & Shepherd. 1869. Pp. 444, 12mo.

The author of this anonymous work, in his preface of six lines, devotes it to the "enquiries which now agitate the thinking world." Accordingly he discusses these four points: *Supernatural Book*; *Supernatural Beings*; *Supernatural Life*; *Supernatural Destiny*. The particular topics treated under these heads are sixteen in number, and are such as these: Prophecy, Geology, the Resurrection of Christ, the Three-One, Satan, Spiritualism, Regeneration, Memory, the Conflagration of this Earth preparatory to a New Earth.

It is evident that the writer is a New Englander and a Republican, and of the "trooly loil;" and therefore naturally he indulges occasionally in the pleasure of a fling at the "rebellion" and the "traitors" of the "cotton oligarchy." But, we can overlook this; for, of course, in New England his views would meet no favor, nor indeed anywhere amongst the masses at the North, without a little of this favorite and fashionable seasoning. And as we are glad to have such views as this author generally holds held up to Northern eyes, we can tolerate his occasional harshness towards the South.

The book is a Boston book about the Supernatural—a region generally supposed in New England to lie quite contiguous to that metropolis, and in fact to be given over to its scholars and thinkers for a peculiar if not an everlasting possession. And yet there is no pretentious philosophy and no heresy in the volume. Marvellous to relate, it is a Boston book on the Supernatural, which appears to be sound to the core. Its title is the great word *Credo*, and it does no dishonor to its title. Holding fast to the inspired word as the only and sufficient rule of faith and practice; faithful found amongst many faithless; wielding unusual powers of argument and eloquence; and subsidizing

various learning to the defence of truth, our highest instincts and our sympathies attract us to him as to a brother; and not knowing who he is, we would travel a hundred miles to find him out and take him by the hand, if he would let us. It gives us real and strong delight to hear from any New Englander in these days the sentiment that "The inspired word will live for ever;" or "During the past eighteen hundred years the world has not advanced one step in the actual revelation of supernatural truth," (pp. 18, 19). No matter what may be the errors of opinion concerning great questions of political philosophy in which he has been reared; no matter what may be the narrow and ignorant prejudices regarding his Southern brethren which have been a part of his education, we must and we do honor him as a defender of the truth.

And yet it is a sad thing, indeed, that we should have to be so much delighted now with the mere general orthodoxy of any New England production. This author defends the outposts well and valiantly against infidels—that is all. We do not know what he may be in the more inside controversies. Alas! we are charmed when New England says what is not very bad; thankful, we find ourselves to be, for small favors. New England has her good and sound men—we do not dispute it. But the glory is departed, the old orthodoxy which pervaded her churches is gone. We expect but little sound doctrine from that quarter and it takes but little to gratify us.

In his chapters on *Supernatural Beings*, the author shows that he is no modern Sadducee like the Unitarians, saying "there is no resurrection, neither angel, nor spirit." He believes, because the Bible reveals, that there is a personal devil with his angels, many, mighty, crafty, cruel, having permission given them to tempt and destroy the human race. He also believes, because the Bible reveals, a close connexion, manifold, between the spiritual world and this present world; and that we can, and do, and ought to feel in many lawful and necessary ways the powers of the world to come. And further, he believes, on the same authority, that there are influences from the spirit world which are prohibited to men. Clairvoyance, mesmerism, and

animal magnetism, have nothing to do with Medium Spiritualism. Psychological science is yet in an undeveloped condition, and modern Spiritists have seized upon its facts for purposes of delusion. Nor do they scruple to employ direct and intentional deceit. Many things which they do are done by sleight of hand. Japanese jugglers could pass for splendid mediums. He classifies the medium spiritists as (1) good men, bereaved and over-anxious to communicate with the departed; (2) inquisitive men, eager after the secrets of the unknown world, and ready to listen to any voice and obey any command but that of revelation; these are your superstitious infidels, your credulous incredulous; (3) spiritualistic philosophers with cool heads and steady hands—many of them, however, as might be expected by any Christian, the most pitiable dupes; (4) men seeking pecuniary advantage in business relations; (5) sensual and devilish men using the excellent opportunities they enjoy to make victims and indulge their passions.

The author charges that Spiritualism aspires to the grandest political designs. They aim to control or crush this Government. They seek to introduce a new social order. They hold that the claims of the State are superseded by spiritualism: society and law being nothing, and spiritual communication every thing.

He charges that they are atheists; hold that belief in God is degrading, a horrible phantom, a soul-crushing superstition; justify blasphemy, and practise it in their public assemblies.

He charges that they justify any act of immorality which is prompted by the lusts of a depraved heart; denounce all matrimony except what is temporary or terminable at pleasure; publicly advocate and privately practise free love; and constantly seek to sap the heart of all virtue, generating in it the elements of impiety, falsehood, and shamelessness.

And finally, he maintains that it is not unreasonable to believe that of all these abominations, Satan himself is "the skilful leader in the back-ground."

Dr. Bond, in a very lively article on this subject of Spiritism in the December No. of the *New Eclectic*, confirms our

author's statements generally. He says: "The rapidity of the spread of spiritism since it was spawned twenty years ago, when the Fox girls began to play their stupid little tricks, is simply marvellous. There is no record of so rapid and permanent a delusion in Christendom." He quotes Bacon, who says "in all superstitions wise men follow fools." "The Fox girls are followed by philosophers, statesmen, heads of nations, literary men, and *proh pudor!* Christian divines." All these, says Dr. Bond, believe in ghosts revealing the highest truths and supplanting the religion of Almighty God! And such wretched ghosts, worse "peepers and mutterers" than Isaiah's wizards! Muttering is oratory, mumbo-jumbo lucidity, to their communications with men. Even dogs (he says) make more intelligible signs with their tails, than these interpreters of the mysteries of eternity! The highest physical achievement claimed for them is a rap on the table, or an empty head with a tambourine. Their sole religious revelations are broken echoes of Theodore Parker, and fins and tails of vulgar Yankee infidelity. Yet for these, thousands abandon (what they never had, however, Dr. Bond!) God and the glorious gospel of his Son. The emancipated pulpit of the North; the pulpit of great moral ideas, and of a refined and decorous salvation; the pulpit of that new messiah—the New England conscience—is in open league (says Dr. Bond) with the Fox girls, and the highest culture of the New England mind is giving its sanction to spiritism. The long continued stimulation of the times (he says) has produced in feeble people a form of intellectual *delirium tremens*, in which the natural foolishness appears in phantasies, and all the latent stupidities become active. It is with many such persons now, as with frogs in oxygen—they frisk themselves to death. The most absurd, unnatural, feeble, contemptible thing, Spiritism is also the most formidable of anti-christian developments. Many of the rulers of the earth it claims as patrons. Queen Victoria communes with ghosts; Louis Napoleon condescends to *seances*; ducal houses in Scotland, noble families in England and Ireland, it claims amongst its adherents. Of course, we presume it can lie respecting such matters sometimes, as well as concerning

other things. But it claims "the preëminent intellects and characters of the age," as William Howitt expresses it, who then proceeds to name first of them all Abraham Lincoln—the "shrewd and honest Abraham Lincoln was a devoted spiritualist;" so also Garrison, and Greeley, and Longfellow, Victor Hugo, and Garibaldi, and even Guizot. They publish and sustain many newspapers and other periodicals; issue hundreds of volumes; have lyceums all over the country; establish Sunday-schools; dispense with churches and a regularly employed ministry, but support hundreds of the cleverest lecturers. The indignant French *gourmand* (as Dr. Bond reminds us) shook off American dust from his feet, denouncing the people "who had fifty religions, and only one gravy;" but we think with him, that "the smartest nation in all creation" has since Talleyrand's day produced some incomparable new religions. "Mormonism and ghostism only are enough to establish our superiority, even without the evangelical patriotism, that

" ' Whilst one hand was red
With murder, feigned to stretch the other out
In brotherhood and peace.' "

You of the South are behind the age—that is, the New England age. Wendell Phillips says, and does not he know?—that you are "a people sunk in brutish ignorance"—"eight millions of dunces led into rebellion by a few hundred thousand knaves." Think of that and weep, as Paddy says. There is comfort for you! It is like what the wise and good Sherman said when he was burning Columbia, (which he has since denied doing), and was applied to for a guard over the South Carolina College Library of 20,000 select volumes: "Certainly; I did not come here to burn *libraries*—I would rather give you a library." Think of that, O South! and love the great Sherman for the good he would have "rather" done you, but you compelled him to do you evil. Libraries were in his heart for you, but you forced him to set fire to your houses, after they were under his protection! The good General continued: "If you had had more libraries down South, you would never have rebelled." So then you must indeed be a benighted people! There is no "ad-

vanced thought" in you—especially none concerning religious matters. You have never made a new religion. Mormonism on the one hand and Free-love-spiritism on the other are a pair of twins the South *could* not equal. God be praised for that! And God, in his mercy, pity the North, and New England especially, so inventive in religion as in everything else without exception! She has thousands of true men and true Christians left, as we said before—the excellent of the earth. We believe the author of *Credo* to be one of them. It is our earnest prayer that grace may be given to all such to witness a good confession, and contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints.

Lamps, Pitchers, and Trumpets. Lectures on the Vocation of the Preacher. BY EDWIN PAXTON HOOD. New York: M. W. Dodd, 1869. Pp. 453.

There is something about the title of this book which awakens the fear that we are to find in it more pretension and affectation than solid worth. A book must not be condemned simply from its title; yet the fact must not be left out of view, that the impression which this makes upon the reader, is often of no little consequence. The author thus explains the name which he has seen fit to put upon the title page. "Words are lamps, are pitchers, and are trumpets. Preaching to the intellect, is as a lamp: it sheds light over truths, over processes of argument, over means of conviction; preaching to the conscience is as a trumpet: it calls up the soul from slumber, it makes it restless and unquiet; preaching to the experience is as a pitcher: it bears refreshment, it cools and calms the fever of the spirit, and it consoles and comforts the heart."

The work attempts an historical survey of the Christian pulpit, embracing the apostolic age, the early Church, mediæval, and post-mediæval preachers, and great preachers of the 17th and 18th centuries. The representative men of these different periods, whom the author endeavors to portray to his readers, are Paul, Chrysostom, St. Bernard, Puritan Adams, and Christmas Evans. He has also a lecture on wit, humor, and coarseness in the pulpit, and one on the formation of style for pulpit composition.

It would scarcely be possible for one to pass over such a wide field of discussion without bringing out much that would be entertaining and instructive. So the book is certainly a very readable one, while it contains much that we cannot commend. The style is neither plain, smooth, nor forcible; there is a constant straining after the strange and unusual and startling. When he narrates the simplest fact, he tries to be sensational, and there is a fondness for oddities and surprising antitheses which must be repulsive to the cultivated reader. The writer has all the faults of the Spurgeon school; and he has been more successful in imitating these than the merits of his master. For he has neither the versatility, the unction, nor glowing piety, which so eminently mark the London preacher.

The author has his fling at slaveholders, without which it would seem that no modern Christian book, whether English or American, is held to be complete.

In the great number of extracts which are brought forward from preachers of different ages, there is much valuable matter; but there are many of these that might have been spared and which appear to have been selected for no other reason than that they were not familiar. They have been unearthed from out of the very places where most of them might as well have remained. It does appear to us insufferable conceit, that the author should have presented his own sermons as models for the imitation of others. Speaking of the use and abuse of imagination, he brings forward two sketches of his own composition to show how to deal with sacred images (pp. 322-330.) This is a breach of good taste and a manifestation of vanity which we hope the author will live to be ashamed of.

Some of the illustrations of wit and humor which are presented here as new, have been repeatedly published in magazines and newspapers, and the world would not have lost much if they had not seen the light. There is doubtless a legitimate use to be made of wit and humor in the pulpit; but they should be used both sparingly and cautiously, for in unskilful hands they often bring sacred things into contempt.

There is one feature of this book which would have been sur-

prising twenty years ago, because never found then in books coming to us from across the Atlantic; namely, its frequent references to American writers. There are repeated quotations from Stevens, Milburn, Sprague, Alexander, Taylor, and others. The question is not now in England as it was then, "Who reads an American book?" This country is now strongly impressing itself—its peculiar forms of thought, and of language too, upon her mother. Especially is this true of New England, which is the chief manufactory of American books. She is teaching old England both to think and to speak in her ways, bad as well as good. The provincial English of that portion of our country is creeping into use amongst many writers in Great Britain; even American *slang* is continually quoted in English newspapers. There is a mighty work of *unification* going forward in this direction.

Mr. Hood is evangelical in his views, and is, no doubt, a well meaning, earnest preacher of the gospel. But we question very much his ability to lecture profitably to young ministers who would attain to high excellence in their holy calling. There is an absence of literary polish, and he seems incapable of a calm, thoughtful discussion of any subject. Still, with all this, there are scattered through the book precious thoughts and interesting incidents and anecdotes, which it may be of great service to ministers to read. The subject is one on which too much of what is good could not well be written. The pulpit is the greatest power in Christendom, and any work which can correct its faults or stimulate its occupants to more faithfulness and greater efficiency will be cheerfully welcomed from the press.

Earnest Hours. By WILLIAM S. PLUMER, D. D., LL.D., Professor of Didactic and Polemic Theology in the Theological Seminary at Columbia, S. C. Richmond: Presbyterian Committee of Publication. Pp. 332, 12mo.

This volume is written in Dr. Plumer's characteristic style, simple, pointed, practical, impressive; and the matter of it, like all the author's writings, is solid, scriptural, awakening, instructive, and full of unction. Dr. Plumer here, as in many of his

other works, abounds in pertinent and affecting illustrations, so that his book is also highly entertaining and attractive.

The subjects discussed are such as these: "Man a Proof of the Truths of Natural Religion;" "The Bible is the Word of God;" "Human Accountability;" "The Responsibilities of Educated Men;" "Sin is Horrible;" "The Saint Excels the Sinner;" "Thoughts on Noah, his Times, and his Ark;" "The Life and Character of the Apostle Peter;" "Lessons from the Life and Fall of Peter;" "Modern Missions."

The book contains twenty-five chapters on such topics as these; and with God's blessing it cannot fail of carrying light and life to many households.

The Student's Scripture History: The Old Testament History from the Creation to the return of the Jews from Captivity. Edited by WILLIAM SMITH, LL.D., Classical Examiner in the University of London. With maps and wood cuts. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, Franklin Square. 1869. Pp. 714, 12mo.

The editor of this work is the same Dr. Smith who edited the Dictionary of the Bible in three volumes, published during the war; and who also has edited a variety of Histories for the use of Students. The Appendices, Notes, and Illustrations, are all taken from that Dictionary of the Bible. There is a full index attached to the work. It is divided into six books, each presenting a portion of the whole period, but based upon no very special view of the subject. The first runs from Adam to Abraham; the second, from Abraham to Joseph; the third, from Moses to Joshua; the fourth, from Joshua to Saul; the fifth, presents the single monarchy under Saul, David, and then Solomon; the sixth, treats of the divided monarchy, the captivity, and the return.

We have not had the opportunity of thoroughly examining the work. The cursory examination we have given to it impresses us with the belief that it is not comparable with Kurtz's Manual of Sacred History.

Great Christians of France, St. Louis and Calvin. BY M. GUIZOT, Member of the Institute of France. J. B. Lippincott & Co. Philadelphia: 1869. Pp. 363, 12 mo.

M. Guizot holds that universality is the first principle and ultimate aim of Christianity, but diversity in secondary institutions and forms of worship is the inevitable result of differences of time, place, and degrees of civilisation. Catholics and Protestants he considers to be two branches from the same stem, and says they have at least learned that they can and ought to live together in peace.

More than one of these propositions we might dispute. But this is what the author says about the matter, and then he declares himself an honest Protestant, yet says he is able to recognise and revere those true Christians who are not members of his communion—to which we respond Amen! with all our hearts.

With these views, M. Guizot has been led to choose four of the most earnest and noble representatives of Catholicism and Protestantism, that, in them, Christian faith and piety may shine out, notwithstanding their profound divergence and their fierce controversies. Regarding the thirteenth and the seventeenth centuries as the fairest epochs of Catholicism, he selects St. Louis of the former, and St. Vincent de Paul of the latter time, as great and noble Christians of the one branch; and he selects for honorable representatives of the other branch, Calvin and Du Plessis Mornay, the sixteenth and beginning of the seventeenth centuries being the fairest epochs of the French Protestantism.

The intelligent Christian reader will anticipate a treat as he sits down to read this book, and will not be disappointed. Some things are put forth by the distinguished author which Presbyterians of our school can not accept; but we remember from what a different point of view Guizot looks at them, and we extend him charity and tolerance. For example, he is quite too ready to apologize for the idolatry of the Romish Church. Again he misconceives and misstates the doctrine of the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures as though it did not acknowledge

both the human and the divine element in the word of God, and he is led accordingly to express sentiments which have, for our ear, an infidel twang. And again he misapprehends Calvin on free-will and predestination, and so ventilates some theological speculations which we hold to be quite shallow and rather heretical. But of course we never should think of going to M. Guizot for theology. *Ne sutor, etc.* He is a statesman and a philosophic historian. *Non omnia possumus omnes.* We refer to these as blots on the otherwise fair face of the work before us.

M. Guizot describes St. Louis as not the wisest or most politic of kings, nor the greatest of generals, nor the mightiest and most brilliant of men intellectually considered; but his greatness was that although a monarch he contracted none of the royal vices, but displayed on his very throne, in a high degree, every human virtue, purified and ennobled by Christian faith. He gave no new or permanent impulse to his age, yet he was in full sympathy with the ideas of the thirteenth century and did honor to France, to royalty, to humanity, and to Christianity alike. But he took part in the two great errors of his time: a Christian, he did not recognise the rights of conscience; a king, he wasted his kingdom in a blind infatuation for the Crusades. Our author pronounces this movement to have sprung originally from a noble, disinterested, and moral impulse, worthy of the age which it so profoundly stirred, and allows that many of its results have been valuable. "It rather aided than impeded or changed European civilisation." But in the time of Louis IX., the Crusades had "lost that character of a spontaneous and general impulse, which had been at once their strength and their excuse;" and Louis, more than any other man of that period, is responsible for prolonging what was "more and more inexpedient and ill-timed because day by day it became less spontaneous and more incapable of success." (Pp. 141, 142.)

Upon the other subject Guizot pronounces Louis to have been quite as much in error, yet more excusable, because he was just obeying with sincere convictions the prevailing and emphatic belief of his time. Our author says well that "the war waged against religious liberty has been for many centuries the great

crime of Christian society ;” “the cause not only of most grievous wrongs, but the most formidable reactions. And he considers this most dangerous error to have culminated “in the thirteenth century, where it was enforced by legislation as well as upheld by the Church.” The statutes of St. Louis explicitly condemn all heretics to death, and command the civil governors to carry out the sentence of the bishops on this point ; and “St. Louis himself asked Pope Alexander IV. in 1255 to extend the Inquisition * * to the whole kingdom, and to place the power which it gave in the hands of the Franciscans and Dominicans. * * Indeed, with the feelings entertained by St. Louis on this subject, liberty, or to speak more correctly, the merest shadow of justice, had reason to hope for more from the Church than from the throne.” (P. 143.) That thirteenth century, let it be remembered, witnessed the beginnings of the horrible Inquisition and the crusade against the heretics of the south of France.

In his life of Calvin, although the great statesman disappoints our expectations, by not producing a work more worthy of his own fame, and more worthy of its exalted subject, we nevertheless find very much to interest and to instruct, and a good deal to admire. What impressed us most as we read the book, was the testimony which this production of the celebrated author assists in giving to our age’s growing comprehension and appreciation of the great Genevese. M. Guizot’s book, notwithstanding its occasional manifestations of his unfitness to handle such a theme in all its bearings, will help still further to disabuse the mind of the nineteenth century respecting the true character of Calvin and his principles. As Presbyterians and Calvinists, we confess to a high degree of satisfaction in the fact, that so many pens are at work in Europe in rescuing the fame of a man we revere so highly, from the contumely and reproach which the Papacy and its ally, Infidelity, have so long been heaping on Calvin’s name. We are indebted to M. Guizot for introducing to us several of these, of whom we knew nothing before. One is Stahelin, a German writer, said by our author to have written “a very intelligent history of Calvin,” published in 1850. Another is Emile Saisset, “a very distinguished philosopher of the

contemporary French school," writing in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* for 1848. Another is "a careful memoir by M. Amédée Roget, entitled '*L'Eglise et l'Etat à Geneve du Vivant de Calvin*,' published at Geneva, 1867." (See pages 240, 256, 292, 299.) Besides these, we may refer to *Kampschulte's Life of Calvin, including his Church and State at Geneva*, just issued in Germany. The book of Bungener, which we recently noticed, our author pronounces "a remarkable work," although he calls in question the certainty of its statements regarding the visit of Cardinal Sadolet to Calvin, (pp. 236-8).

Describing Calvin's early zeal, indefatigable activity, and wide spread influence whilst still a mere youth, Guizot gives him credit for remembering that not long previously he had himself been a Catholic, and showing consideration for the institutions and members of his ancient Church, and moderation both of judgment and language. He says, however, this "gave way only too soon to violence and invective." But he explains how the change was produced by the sufferings of his brethren, who were "persecuted, banished, imprisoned, and led to the stake." (Pp. 161, 162.) "So long as prudence was possible, Calvin was prudent and anxious to conciliate the established authorities." (P. 162.) He describes the Genevese "as the boldest, and, at the same time, the least revolutionary among the Reformers of the sixteenth century; he was devoid of fear, but he had great deference and consideration for authority even whilst he was openly opposing it." (P. 174.) Yet he charges Calvin with "speaking of the Catholic Church and of its dignitaries with brutal violence and insulting familiarity," in the dedication of his Institutes to Francis I. (P. 175.) But again, in reference to another matter, he suggests what is a very good apology for this violence, in addition to the one already referred to, the actual cruelties inflicted by these dignitaries. He says: "Surely, very few men in the sixteenth century—I do not speak of any other—were liberal and large-hearted enough to use such language concerning the death and the future state of their most formidable enemy." (P. 207.) This refers to Calvin's sentiments concerning the wicked and persecuting Duke of Guise.

We quote the following from the author's delineations of Calvin personally :

“His correspondence with the principal French reformers was a constant exhortation to prudence, patience, submission to the civil power, and religious independence. He desired to see neither aggression nor vengeance on the part of the Protestants. * * No doubt the precepts and practice of St. Paul were always present to his mind, and that he both preached and practised obedience to the powers that be in things that did not interfere with faith in Christ and the will of God. In all that concerned religion, no innovator was ever bolder than Calvin, [Guizot elsewhere gives the key to Calvin's course in this respect, when he says: “*In this circle—(that is, the necessity and authority of Scripture, and the dependence of the Church on Scripture)—the mind of Calvin moves,*”] and at the same time less revolutionary. None was ever more scrupulously indifferent to all other aims than the propagation of the gospel, the organisation of the evangelical Church, and the reformation of man's moral nature. I do not know how far his logical forethought was able to penetrate the future, or if, whilst he was prosecuting his work of religious emancipation, he foresaw that what he was doing would bring forth, as a natural consequence, such immense political and social changes. I am inclined to believe that he did not concern himself about it in any way; that his essentially judicious and practical mind was exclusively occupied by his mission and by the immediate present; and that he did not seek to penetrate the darkness of the future centuries, and the far-off designs of God.” (Pp. 340–341.)

“Calvin was one of those rare great men who are rich both in heart and intellect; who can no more look with indifference at the fate of an individual, than at that of a kingdom; and who feel for the joy and sorrow of the human heart, as well as for the storms which agitate a nation. He was as deeply interested in the faith and sorrows of one simple woman, as in those of all Christendom; and could apply himself as eagerly to the enlightenment of a single conscience, as to the moral reformation of a whole city,” (P. 344.)

“Moreover, he entertained great respect for the human intellect, and looked upon its full development as essential to the accomplishment of the destiny of man and the glory of God. Literature and social science, all great intellectual labor, and all large utterance of thought, had great value in his eyes, and attracted him powerfully.” (P. 349.)

In close connexion with these praises of the Reformer, let us put Guizot's censures of him for the part he had in the death of Servetus, together with some account of the facts as he represents them.

"I think that this visit bears equally strong proof of premeditated design. Precisely at this period, Calvin was engaged in the contest I have recently described with the Libertines. * * When Servetus entered Geneva, the Libertines had some reason to expect that they might triumph. * * But neither the Libertines, nor Servetus, knew the resolute adversary with whom they had to deal. From the moment that Calvin heard that Servetus was in Geneva, he did not hesitate for one instant, although he was already engaged in a fierce and perilous struggle. * * 'I do not deny' (wrote Calvin on the following 9th of September) 'that he was imprisoned at my instance,' * * * 'and I arranged so as to procure a prosecutor.' * * * At its commencement, [of the trial,] and for the first fourteen or fifteen days, Servetus showed no lack either of moderation or skill, although both attack and defence were sharp and keen. * * The trial was soon transformed into a theological controversy. * * 'I do not doubt' (answered Servetus) 'that this bench and this table, and every thing that we see, is essentially God.' Again, when it was objected, that according to his views, the devil must be a manifestation of God, he laughed, and answered boldly: 'Do you doubt it?' * * The Council was both shocked and embarrassed. There were warm partisans of Calvin in its ranks, and eager protectors of Servetus—among others, the principal Libertine leaders Ami Perrin and Berthelier; but there were also some impartial members who were sorry to see Calvin take such a prominent place in the prosecution, and who had no desire to become judges in a trial for heresy. Still they recognised the danger to Christianity of the Spaniard's pantheism, and refused at any cost to appear to sanction it. * * They adjourned the trial several times, and put off the final decision as if they dreaded to pronounce it. * * The crisis of the two struggles in which this small State was engaged had arrived. * * With the instinct of the man of action, Calvin felt this, and unhesitatingly adopted the most energetic measures in both cases. On the 27th August, 1553, he uttered the severest censures from the pulpit upon the conduct of Servetus; and on the 3rd of September following, * * * he solemnly refused to administer the communion to the leader of the Libertines, who—in spite of the decision of the Council of State—had been pronounced unworthy

of it by the Church. The trial of Servetus * * suddenly changed its whole character. All moderation, all prudence, were thrown aside by the prisoner; led away by the hope of overwhelming an enemy who was fiercely attacked and in danger elsewhere, Servetus became the vehement accuser of Calvin even unto death. * * * Servetus * * demanded that his adversary should be committed for trial, 'and that he shall be kept in prison as I am, until the trial shall be ended by the condemnation to death of one of us two, or by some other punishment.'" (Pp. 312-319.)

"During the whole course of the trial Calvin had never concealed his feeling as to what the sentence ought to be. On the 20th August, after it had commenced, he wrote to Farel: 'I hope that he will be condemned to death, but I trust that there may be some mitigation of the frightful torture of the penalty.' * * On the 26th October * * he wrote to Farel * * 'To-morrow he will be led to the stake. We made every effort to change the manner of his death; but in vain.'" (P. 323.)

"It was their tragical destiny to meet each other and to enter into mortal combat as the champions of two great causes. It is my profound conviction that Calvin's cause was the good one, that it was the cause of morality, of social order, and of civilisation. Servetus was the representative of a system false in itself, superficial under the pretence of science, and destructive alike of moral dignity in the individual and of moral order in human society. In their disastrous encounter, Calvin was conscientiously faithful to what he believed to be truth and duty; but he was hard, much more influenced by violent animosity than he imagined, and devoid alike of sympathy and generosity. Servetus was sincere and resolute in his conviction, and he was a frivolous, presumptuous, vain and envious man, capable in time of need of resorting both to artifice and untruth. In an age full of martyrs to religious liberty, Servetus obtained the honor of being one of the few martyrs to intellectual liberty; whilst Calvin, who was undoubtedly one of those who did most towards the establishment of religious liberty, had the misfortune to ignore his adversary's right to liberty of belief."

"I do not think that Calvin ever felt any hesitation or regret as to his own conduct during the trial of Servetus. He believed in his right and duty to suppress heresy in this manner as sincerely as Servetus believed in the truth of his opinions; and his most intimate friends, instead of trying to soften him, endeavored to confirm his severity. * * Even the most advanced advocates of liberty did not go so far as to say that honest error could not

be a crime. Servetus himself, when he was accused of saying that the soul was mortal, exclaimed, 'If ever I said that, and not only said it but published it and infected the whole world, I would condemn myself to death.' (Pp. 327, 328.)

"At length, to the honor of humanity and the promotion of its social and moral well-being, rays of divine light have shown us the right of the human conscience to liberty of belief. * * Assuredly, truth is the queen of the intellect; and whoever believes in truth, is a champion bound to promote the establishment of her reign. But man is so constituted that truth can and will consent to govern him only on condition of his own free adhesion to her rule. * * * Urge all around you to bow before truth and pay homage as to a queen. But if you cannot prevail with them * * remember that there are still two things, even in the most bitter enemy—a free conscience which ought to be respected, an erring brother who may be loved. * * Make every allowance for the spirit of the age, for the prevailing prejudices which not even a man of genius can altogether escape; make allowance for all the necessities of the time and the pressure of circumstances; make allowance for whatever you choose; but the fact still remains that the laws and measures by which Calvin endeavored to ensure unity of conviction in Geneva are a stain upon his memory, an element condemned beforehand in his work, upon which time ought to pass a just sentence.'" (Pp. 331, 332.)

These last observations are from M. le Pasteur Coulin, now of Geneva. We accept them heartily, excepting the sweeping condemnation they contain of Calvin "laws and measures" at Geneva in general. We accept them heartily as applied to the tragical case of Servetus; only we must insist that it shall be borne in mind that eight of the thirteen members of the Council which finally condemned Servetus were Calvin's enemies, and only five of them his friends; and also that had this been a Roman Catholic *auto da fe*, we never should have heard of it; and yet further, that while it is true that Calvin prosecuted Servetus for heresy, and that he was condemned and executed for heresy, it was not Calvin who either condemned or executed him, nor is he responsible for either act. It was the state at Geneva which did both these acts. There is abundant proof that infidelity and heresy were punished at Geneva as crimes against the state—nay, that even contempt of church censures was held to be and punished as being a crime against the state. But there is no

evidence that if even the blasphemies of Servetus could have been considered as mere *church offences*, they would have met with state punishment.

Passing from this topic, we must observe that M. Guizot's account of Presbyterian church government, as to the main principles of it held by Calvin, (see pp. 335, 336,) we cannot accept as correct. It is contradicted by the fourth book of the Institutes.

We commend to the reader the interesting details given in pages 218-231 and elsewhere, of the difficulties Calvin encountered in setting up again the apostolic church discipline; and also Guizot's denial that Calvin was supreme in Geneva and the government there a theocracy, with the proofs afforded. (See pp. 290, 292.) "There can be no doubt (as our author well says) that the power of the pastors was very great; but that of the civil magistrates was equally great, and they had no hesitation in using it"—and moreover, that "even Calvin himself was not beyond the reach" of their power.

Our author makes known to us the interesting fact that "several learned French and German editors, among them the eminent historian and Professor of Theology at Strasburg, M. Edouard Reuss, are preparing a new edition, published at Brunswick," of the works of Calvin.

We should like to give some extracts from M. Guizot's account of Calvin's academy or college, and still more of the manner of his calm and peaceful death; but space forbids.

We close with a paragraph expressing the great French statesman's idea of the true method of the historian:

"It is an easy and vulgar manner of writing history, to depict exclusively the most salient features of men and parties, and to describe only those views and violent passions which separate them most strongly. I have no taste for this superficial and crude method; truth demands that we should penetrate beyond the mere surface of minds and characters, that we should also show their inmost nature, and point out the larger views and and juster feelings which have sometimes led opponents to seek to understand and approach each other. This is what I have just done with regard to Sadolet and Calvin." (Pp. 235, 236.)

THE SOUTHERN
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXI.—NO. 2.

APRIL, MDCCCLXX.

ARTICLE I.

MINISTERS' WIDOWS AND ORPHANS.

At the last meeting of the General Assembly, a memorial looking to some positive and permanent provision for the families of deceased ministers, was presented by the Rev. Dr. J. Leighton Wilson. If his scheme, or any kindred scheme, should be got into successful operation, as the fruit of this initial effort, he may undoubtedly regard it as the crowning work of his useful life. Because the imperative need of such a provision presses upon the Church with accumulating weight year by year; because the manifest interest excited throughout her bounds since the earliest discussion of this topic demonstrates the fact that the Church is beginning to recognise this ponderous obligation; and because no enterprise that has engaged the attention of her worthiest sons is so environed with difficulties as this.

In the discussion at Mobile, two or three things were formally expressed or constantly implied. First, that the preaching of the gospel, from Presbyterian pulpits at least, seems to involve the necessity of poverty in the preacher. That is to say, the

work is not remunerative in dollars and cents. The exceptions to this rule are so few and far between as to prove its almost universality. Abject want, and the more distressing forms of poverty, are, by God's blessing, comparatively rare; but the minister of the word usually lives a life of self-denial and painful economy. The ravages of war impoverished a rich country, and the popular delusion, still current, is that minimum salaries only can be expected from the majority of congregations. It is to be hoped that this delusion will disappear as the country emerges from the ashes and scoria of the eruption. The saddest token of defeat which these States could suffer would be the establishment of the peculiar forms of thrift in favor among their conquerors. Nevertheless the fact abides, that the heralds of salvation are not enticed by the promise of emoluments. The most that is expected in any case is a "comfortable support," with no sort of provision for old age, failing health, or death.

Another idea constantly present was, that the minister of the word could not properly have any secondary occupation by which his monetary affairs might be improved. His work demands all his time and the employment of all his faculties. He cannot preach fifty-two days, and engage in secular business three hundred and thirteen. During the conflict, society and the Church were in an abnormal condition; and the soldiers of the cross enlisted for the nonce under other banners. The grain of comfort that remains to cheer them under defeat, is the reflection that this temporary service involved no treason to their Supreme King, albeit this precise charge is one count in the indictment presented by their enemies. The destruction of values all over the Southland made the customary support of the ministry next to impossible, and many were forced to win daily bread by secular occupations. But with the return of peace, the former habits of thought were restored, and the known sentiment of Christian men and women is manifestly against the secularization of the ministry. It were therefore a mere waste of time and space to discuss that question now and here.

Once more: It was consequently implied that the widows and orphans of ministers must needs be liable to that direst form of

affliction that can touch the children of God. It is not necessary to paint any imaginary picture to harrow up the soul: the terrible reality is appalling enough—a stricken household mourning the departure of its head and support, with the super-added horror of known destitution! In the black future nothing can be descried to temper its gloom, but the uncertain charity of kindred and friends. For these households are rarely self-sustaining, and the sort of labor possible to most of them is not remunerative enough to provide the commonest necessities. The bare idea of living upon eleemosynary aid, fitfully bestowed, is so intolerable that the quiet rest of the grave seems by comparison the next best thing to the Paradise of God.

Therefore, finally, it was implied that the formal enactment of a *law* to met these exigencies—to reach to the remotest hamlet in the land—and to provide a regular and OFFICIAL form of relief, instantly applicable to every case in the bounds of this Church, is the most urgent and imperative duty that can challenge her attention.

Within the ten years last past, it is probable that more has been said and written about the limits within which the Church may properly manifest her organic life, than in any other decade since the era of the Reformation. She is not *of* the world, but she is *in* the world, and must needs be interested in its progress. She may not assume the custody of the civil government, but she may exert her influence to evangelize the civil ruler, for whom she is instructed to offer her prayers. She may not engage in secular enterprises for the accumulation of capital, but she is bound to fulfil her contracts involving monetary interests.

She cannot assume control of the press; but she may have publications issued under her authority, and even a periodical literature that in some sense answers to the organs of other corporations. In the intervals between these acknowledged rights and these plain prohibitions, there are of course many points of debatable ground, and it may be that the matter now under discussion occupies one of them.

I. Therefore the primal question presenting itself is now in order: Is it the right and duty of the Church to make system-

atic and efficient provision for the families of her deceased ministers?

The one charter, under which all the works of this organisation must be performed, is the word of God. It is not enough to say that she may safely occupy fields that are not specifically forbidden—because that which may be right and proper for individual performance may be totally without the province of the Church. It is the glory of the Presbyterian creed, that all things ecclesiastical are made after the pattern shown on the mount. So any arrangement which may be made to banish poverty from the desolate households of God's departed servants, must be builded upon this secure foundation. It is not a scheme of private benevolence that is now under consideration. On the contrary, it is an official duty, as clearly incumbent upon the supreme court of the Church as the work of missions.

Under the old economy, the provision made for the Levites—who were undoubtedly the representatives of the gospel ministry—was full and ample. While that economy was in force, every member of the tribe was positively assured of the support of the Church to the latest generation. And this was not in the way of spontaneous liberality, but by express command of God. They were in the room and stead of all the first-born of all the other tribes, hallowed, when God inflicted the culminating curse upon Egypt; and the tithe was their *inheritance*, theirs by right of primogeniture. That their families were included in the provision is perfectly plain from the record. If there was ever a case in which the sustentation of the altar-servants might have been left to the voluntary liberality of the Church, this was such a case. The Church was a "close corporation," isolated from the rest of the human race, and her boundaries included an entire nationality. But divine wisdom ordained a formal and regular method of sustentation, and charges nothing less than robbery upon the withholder of tithes and offerings.

How much, or how little, of this old law has been abrogated, either by direct acts of repeal, or by the superior light of the gospel, may here be a pertinent question. It is tolerably certain that the regular assessment of tithes has not been entirely abol-

ished in all branches of the Christian Church, albeit the assessment and collection of them have required for their enforcement the sanctions of secular law. Perhaps the whole thing is an encroachment upon the liberty wherewith Christ makes his people free. But the author of the best paper upon systematic benevolence that has yet been presented to any Assembly, does not hesitate to build his argument upon God's old system of tithes—as fixing the proportion of temporal gains which the Giver of all reclaims. It will be remembered that the sum of the offerings to be systematized is divided and subdivided, and, except in isolated cases, no special fund has ever been devoted to relieve the wants of those in whose behalf the present discussion is offered. Dr. Wilson's memorial is based upon the fact that no such provision is common in the Church. The right and duty of the Church are, however, apparent from another view of the subject.

If it be admitted that the plain command of God secured the sustentation of his ministering servants and their families under the old dispensation, it is not credible that the gospel ministry was left in a worse position. It is not credible that the newer and fuller dispensation is inferior in any essential particular. All the analogies of the two Testaments show a vast gain to the last; as the comparison of circumcision with baptism, or the pass-over with the Lord's Supper, manifests past all contradiction. In the case of the ministry, the enlargement and dignity of the office, compared with the narrow sphere of Levitical services, cannot escape the notice of the most superficial student of the word. Is it credible that God would have left this most important interest of humanity without due provision?

While, therefore, the Christian Church is exhorted to stand fast in the liberty wherewith God has made her free, this liberty does not include deliverance from the obligation to sustain the watchmen on the walls of Zion. The requirements of the Decalogue have not been removed or lowered, even if the tithe has been abolished. So far from this, there has been in fact a new commandment added, which establishes the unity of the Church upon a basis stronger than the gates of hell. The old covenant

was glorious, but the new is "rather glorious;" and one of its plainest conditions is that the ministers of the gospel shall live of the gospel. Is it probable that the *families* of the ministers are excluded from the benefits of this provision? If so, then the first covenant was the better in this regard at least; and the argument in the 8th and 9th of Hebrews has no conceivable application.

In the inspired annals of the Christian Church, there is the account of special legislation providing for the systematic support of Christian widows and their families. There is no indication in the record that the widows of elders who labored in the word and doctrine were omitted in the stated distribution.

The object of this argumentation is to show that this business belongs to the Church in her corporate capacity. If the organic life is of any value, let us have its manifestation in this direction. For here is presented at once the most urgent necessity for action, and the most flagrant case of neglected duty to be found in her modern history.

II. Having thus reached the main point for examination, to wit, the *method* by which the Church shall meet this objection, the memorial of Dr. Wilson is first presented. And here it is proper to observe, that his scheme was received with considerable distrust at the very outset, simply because of some real or fancied resemblance in it to the ordinary system of life assurance. The general outlines of his plan are probably well known to all Presbyterians in the South; and his proposed method of accumulation would certainly be successful, if universally adopted. But the fatal objection in the minds of many godly men, is the bare fact that this plan is built upon a calculation of contingencies relating to the duration of life. There are to be many contributors and but few beneficiaries, and these few are dependent upon the occurrence of an event wholly beyond the reach of human knowledge or foresight. Hence, it is a lottery, an appeal to chance, an attempted barrier, like the Tower of Babel, to the irresistible march of God's providence, an attempted evasion of God's inflexible decrees. Each contributor to the fund makes his stated payment, with the implied confession that

he has some expectation of reaping the benefit eventually. Hence, it is an impious trading upon the chances of life and death, a profane attempt to thwart the purposes of God, who thus vainly essays to hide his purposes from the scrutiny of mankind.

Because God's purpose is not exhausted in the mere death of the husband and father. The sorrow of the bereaved household is part of his plan, and if you deny ingress to the gaunt wolf—poverty—you are so far hindering the effect of his purgatorial discipline, and making some other agonizing dispensation necessary. If these are not the logical results of the various forms of objections urged against life assurance, the objectors have failed to state their points plainly. And if these are the logical deductions from their statements, they perish from positive emptiness, as soon as the sunlight touches them. The priests of Baal cut themselves with knives and lancets to attract the notice or win the favor of their sluggish deity. But the beneficent God of the Bible does not feast upon the agonies of his worshippers. It is even possible that he may look upon a bereaved household sustained by the product of a life policy with complacency. He can sustain this household by miraculous interposition, as he did once in Sarepta, or he may allow it to live upon the spasmodic liberality of his children, as he does to-day; but his Church would do well to see whether or not he expects and demands of her, as an organic whole, some more regular and stable system of maintenance. And if Dr. Wilson's plan is not feasible, she would perhaps do better to find out one that is.

In its last analysis, the objection to life assurance that offends some consciences, is, that it proposes to give something for nothing; or, in other words, that the beneficiaries receive that for which they pay no equivalent. A minister aged forty, pays \$30, and dies, and his widow receives \$1,000. That is to say, she gets \$970 for nothing. But there are forty other clients of the same corporation who do *not* die, and they also pay \$30 each. This is the converse of the proposition. In this case, the corporation gets \$1,200 for nothing. Now, add the coöperative

principle, the system of mutuality, and the objection is answered. This is precisely Dr. Wilson's plan, and the figures, which are nearly accurate, are his. If it be said, that a greater or less proportion than two or three per cent. *may* die, the answer is, that all the tabular statements of all the life assurance companies in the world corroborate these figures.

The report of the Committee on Dr. Wilson's memorial is consequently very nearly right. There are some slight modifications to be suggested, the need of which will be apparent as soon as they are stated. Were it certain that the next Assembly would proceed to prompt legislative enactments upon the basis thus furnished, the discussion of the topic might terminate here. The defects in the scheme would reveal themselves in due time, and might be remedied as experience accumulated. There are, however, three special points which may be noticed—one in the memorial, one in the report of the Committee, and one in the subsequent discussion.

1. In the memorial—which Dr. Wilson says “is to provide a fund that is virtual life assurance”—he proposes to ignore the very foundation of all life assurance schemes. That is, he proposes to make no sort of discrimination in the character of the risks—to use a technicality belonging to the system—but to demand the same premium from all, without reference to age, or the state of health in any case. In the next place, he proposes to double the premium and the value of the policy in special cases, such as city charges, thus doubling isolated risks.

2. The Committee adopted these suggestions bodily, and even amended the memorial by recommending “the payment of \$1,000 *or its multiple* upon the payment (as premium) of \$30 *or its multiple* annually.”

3. Col. Wade, apparently seeing the defects of the plan, suggested that the annual premium should be raised to \$35, “because we admit men of all ages, and in all kinds of health.” This was in the discussion that followed the presentation of the report.

It will be seen from these brief extracts that the general idea of life assurance was at the base of the plan; while those who

participated in the debate seemed to keep it studiously concealed on one side, or to drag it constantly into view on the other. But on both sides of the debate, the fact that the commonest principles of life assurance were recklessly violated, was entirely overlooked. Indeed, it may be said that the plan as it stands is in exact contradiction to the fundamental principle of life assurance, which is built upon rigid discrimination in the matter of age, and positive exclusion in case of impaired health. So that Dr. Wilson's statement, "that the objectionable features of this system are omitted in his plan for mutual relief," is entirely true.

For just in this matter of discrimination lies the *gravamen* of all life assurance iniquity. It is not merely because it proposes to "give something for nothing;" but because it affects to decide which man in the multitude of its clients shall die, and which shall live. It probes to the hidden machinery of the body, examines into the condition of deep-seated organs, measures the respirations, and counts the pulses. The discovery of organic lesions prevents the issue of the policy; and even hereditary predispositions are taken into the account, and the causes of death in a past generation are carefully investigated and recorded. With all these precautions duly observed, the average estimate of the "value" of human life is about Dr. Wilson's figure—\$30 to \$1,000, taking forty as the average age of the insured. It is expected, however, that this rate of premium will yield a profit; and in mutual companies this profit is added to the policy at its maturity. It will now be seen that Col. Wade's suggestion to increase the annual premium to \$35, (or three and one-half per centum,) was conservative and wise; inasmuch as the security would thus be increased one-sixth, while the additional annual outlay would be very small.

Still arguing upon life assurance statistics—it may be observed, that while Dr. Wilson's plan does not "discriminate," it does about accord with the result of these tabular statements. Perhaps the *average* age of the proposed beneficiaries would be rather over than under forty. If this average shall be *much* over forty, the ratio of premium is too small, even with Col.

Wade's amendment. But the strong probability is, that the combination of five hundred congregations at \$30 each per annum would immediately provide a fund sufficient to secure \$1,000 to the families of all the ministers in this connexion who shall die from this date onward. But certain conditions are indispensable.

1. There must be concurrent action on the part of all, or nearly all, the Presbyterian churches in connexion with the General Assembly. The needful fund cannot be provided by isolated contributions. One hundred contributors would accumulate only three thousand dollars, and if the majority of these *happened* to be much over forty years of age, the ratio of mortality would more than exhaust the fund. That is, more than three of them would die. Those most eager to avail themselves of the relief fund, would naturally be those whose pastors were well stricken in years. A young minister in robust health would have a better apparent "chance of life," and the people of his charge would not be so eager to secure the benefit of the relief fund for his small family. In fact, the voluntary combination of congregations can hardly be expected, and the plan must fail, if the fundamental truth of the uncertainty of life is not universally recognised and acted upon. There are pastors in service who have reached the age of threescore and ten, who will outlive some of their brethren that are fifty years younger. But the probabilities are the other way, and men will infallibly be governed by apparent probabilities.

2. There must be uniformity in the annual premium, and in the promised benefit. There cannot be one premium of \$60 securing a benefit of \$2,000, and many premiums of \$30 securing half this benefit. Because the most aged and infirm would surely secure the larger sum, and the *equation* would be destroyed. In life assurance corporations, the aged pay in proportion to their age and the consequent risk involved. Here there is no discrimination, and therefore there can be no variation in premium or policy. So there must needs be uniformity of relief, as well as universality of subscription.

Supposing these two conditions met, the plan would probably

be efficient. To render its efficiency nearly certain, the suggestion of Col. Wade should be adopted, and \$35, at least, be fixed as the amount of the annual premium. The average membership in Presbyterian churches is large enough to make this annual outlay next to nothing in the case of each individual member.

One more suggestion will close the discussion under this head. The object now in hand is the relief of the families of deceased ministers, and nothing else. If it be desirable to make provision for others, there are multitudes of ways; and the complete operation of the present enterprise does not exhaust the charity or the energies of the Church. This case is urgent. Give it the needful attention, promptly, and the successful working of the system will open the way for many kindred schemes. There are multitudes of believers in the development of "the corporate life of the Church." If this be anything more than sounding brass, or anything better than individual beneficence, it will be able to secure substantial comfort to the widows and orphans of all her ministering servants.

All that has been said thus far, proceeds upon the supposition that Dr. Wilson's plan will be carried. It has also been taken for granted, that such needful precautions as those suggested above will be duly observed. The rules and rates of insurance corporations are certainly founded upon common sense and experience, as well as the stable logic of figures; and it were an evidence of great folly, or of sublime faith, to erect such a scheme upon opposite theories. Humanly speaking, the success of the enterprise depends upon two or three things, such as concurrent adoption of the plan by all the churches; rigid adherence to rules of equation, based upon mortuary tables; and the consequent *confidence* of the church membership in the practicability of the scheme itself—because this scheme in its entirety is based upon the voluntary contributions of the Church.

In anticipation of objections to the plan from the brethren who abhor life assurance and its congeners, and in anticipation of the lukewarmness or indifference of perhaps a larger number, it may not be wholly amiss to present, and briefly discuss, in these pages, a plan in substitution of Dr. Wilson's, or more accurate-

ly, an amendment to his proposition. Perhaps the amendment may be adopted, should the original motion fail.

III. In presenting a modification of the plan sketched in the memorial and enlarged in the Committee's report, it is proper to go back for a moment to the former argument, touching the imperative duty of the Church in the premises. Enough has perhaps been said to satisfy any candid Christian that the obligation to make the indicated provision verily rests upon the Church. And it may be suggested by objectors that Dr. Wilson's scheme will not work for two reasons. The first is, that it rests upon the *voluntary* offerings, imperfectly systematized, and liable to be discontinued. It is an open question, whether or not five hundred churches would coöperate. But it is *not* an open question whether or not the coöperation of fifty churches would result in failure. Because in small combinations the "risk" of death is in larger proportion than three per centum. In this view of the case, the voluntary system seems unsafe, as separate congregations could always throw off the separate obligation by pleading the duty of the Church in its organic capacity to do the work. Again, the defect in the voluntary arrangement appears in the certainty that the most prompt contributors to the fund would be those congregations whose pastors were aged.

The other probable objection is still more formidable. It is remarkable that it was not prominent in the debate of the Mobile Assembly. For while the obligation to care for the families of deceased pastors undoubtedly rests upon the Church, the *method* presented in the memorial is no where indicated in the only recognised rule of practice. It is called "virtual life assurance, bereft of its objectionable features." Whereas life assurance has no objectionable features in the estimation of many godly men; and if it have, the scheme of the memorial preserves the very head and front of its offence, in that the fund for the dying is provided by the contributions of the living. Because the plan is based upon the known fact that ninety-seven annual contributors at \$30 each will provide \$1,000 each for three in the hundred who will die. Now there are good men who see no evil in the work-

ing of this plan, as applied to individual cases, but who will oppose it as an ecclesiastical act, because no such pattern was shown in the mount. The theory is, that if God has really laid the work upon his Church, he has also prescribed the plan. It is somewhat difficult to answer an objection stated in this fashion.

So much being conceded, the next step in opposition will naturally be the demand to abandon the scheme or to show the authority for its working. It is not whether life assurance is or is not a system of questionable morality. One man eateth and giveth God thanks; another eateth not and giveth God thanks; and the prohibition is clear that the brother of larger liberty shall not judge the other. It would be an example of peculiar meanness for a majority to press such a system upon the consciences of a minority, whether they were weak consciences or strong; and a tender regard for the authority of Christ in his Church is a very good sort of weakness to cultivate. It would perhaps be better to err on this side than to incur the risk of erring on the other. It is the old question, therefore, "What hath God spoken?" And the answer is perfectly plain and sensible.

The propriety of, the necessity for, the apostles' fund and the community of goods in the infant Church, were clearly a propriety and a necessity growing out of the present distress. It was a temporary arrangement, which could not continue without destroying the entire structure of society. In fact, all the exhortations of the Epistles touching the duty of Christians in the arrangement of their worldly possessions, are meaningless, except upon the theory of individual ownership. But the authoritative command relative to the distribution of temporal possessions is as precise as the old command instituting the tithe. The Christian is plainly instructed to give, to give liberally, to give systematically—"as God hath prospered him"—to give on the first day of the week, and to give to the necessities of the saints. Under the old dispensation, a specified proportion of temporalities was set aside by divine command. Under the new, the tithe is not mentioned; but the commandment added to the

Decalogue, and enjoining a new manifestation of Christian love, covers the whole ground, and each contributor to the necessities of the saints is constituted the judge of the proportion of his gifts. Is it not plain that his self-assessment is to be made in the light of this new command? And if this be so; surely the instruction is full and ample.

By the same authority, the distribution of the collected fund, originally confided to the apostles, is now placed in charge of their successors, who assembled at Mobile last year, and who will assemble at Louisville in May, 1870. They alone can appropriate the money which is intrusted to the Church as a corporation, and only they can fix authoritatively the amounts to be expended in special cases, and in support of special enterprises. The disbursements of the Sustentation Committee, for example, are potentially the disbursements of the Assembly, and there is no conceivable reason why the Assembly should not immediately create and empower a committee to disburse the "collections for the saints"—for the widows and orphans of her ministerial servants.

In the vast majority of cases, the Sabbath collections, which are the only *commanded* collections, are taken up for no specific object. The special collections for special causes are not included in this observation. It is common to apply so much of the weekly gifts of the congregations as may be needed to defray current expenses, and even to eke out the pastor's salary. Sometimes the aggregate goes into the custody of the trustees; sometimes of the deacons (where there *are* deacons); and sometimes the session, acting deacons and acting trustees, take charge of receipt and disbursement. The system is loose and uncertain, and there does not seem to be any settled *law* that touches this matter at all. The drift of this argumentation therefore, thus far, is simply to suggest the enquiry—has the Assembly, as the ultimate authority, the right to make appropriations from this fund? And if this authority does reside in the highest judicatory of the Church, the plan of operation in the present interest may be unfolded by a plain and easily comprehended

statement. No lower court can do any good here, because the interest is wide as the boundaries of our Zion.

1. Let the General Assembly announce that it undertakes, in the name of Christ, and as the almoner of his people, to provide a definite sum for a definite time to sustain the families of his ministers, when they shall be impoverished by the translation of the laborer to the rest of the upper sanctuary. Keeping within the limits suggested by the Assembly's report—say four hundred dollars per annum for five years. To ascertain the extent of the annual outlay under this provision, it is only possible to argue upon what are called "probabilities;" and taking the outside figures suggested in the memorial of Dr. Wilson, say three per centum, and taking the aggregate of ministers with dependant families as five hundred, the annual mortality, so far as this fund is concerned, would be fifteen ministers out of the five hundred. It is violently "probable" that these figures are very excessive, but they will answer the purpose, and render the statement of results possible.

2. Now, coming to the exact amount of this annual obligation, the following table will state the case:

1st year,	15	beneficiaries	at	\$400	each,	-	-	-	\$ 6,000
2d	"	30	"	"	"	"	"	"	12,000
3rd	"	45	"	"	"	"	"	"	18,000
4th	"	60	"	"	"	"	"	"	24,000
5th	"	75	"	"	"	"	"	"	30,000
									\$90,000
						Total,	-	-	\$90,000

or an average of \$18,000 per annum. Beyond this point there can be no increase (by equation), as the beneficiaries of the first year cease after the fifth, and thereafter the annual claim upon the fund will be invariable—that is to say, \$30,000. As the Church lengthens her cords, she will also strengthen her stakes. If her ministry is doubled, her resources will be doubled also, and the proportion of contributions to the aggregate of members will remain the same.

3. The next point to consider is the ability of the Church to meet this annual demand.

In the Minutes of the last Assembly, the statistical reports of

Presbyteries—which are by no means full—reveal the fact that the givings of the Church amounted to \$750,000 to all objects. Two-thirds of this amount are found in the table of congregational collections, which of course include the stated support of the ministry. There is no doubt that the aggregate contributions in all the churches amounted to a full million last year. The tithe of this sum is one hundred thousand dollars; and the tithe of the tithe is ten thousand dollars. Is there any doubt that the Church can increase her gifts one cent in the dollar? It is positively certain, that an increase of one and a half per centum would provide a fund equal to the foregoing figures, and sufficient to supply the pressing needs of all the widows and orphans of all the Presbyterian ministers in the South who may die in straitened circumstances.

4. To show how a fund would grow, with interest accumulations, let it be supposed that five hundred congregations contribute by average ten dollars each on the fifth Sabbath of every month that has five Sabbath days, that is, four times in the year. The following tabular statement reveals the result:

500 congregations, \$10 each, 4 times, equal to,	-	-	-	\$20,000
Average interest, 3 per ct.,	-	-	-	600
				<hr/> 20,600
1st year—Deduct 15 beneficiaries, \$400 each.	-	-	-	6,000
				<hr/> 14,600
2d year—Contributions,	-	-	-	20,000
				<hr/> 34,600
Average interest, 5 per ct.,	-	-	-	1,730
				<hr/> 36,330
2d year—Deduct 30 beneficiaries, \$400 each,	-	-	-	12,000
				<hr/> 24,330
3rd year—Contributions,	-	-	-	20,000
Average interest, 5 per ct.,	-	-	-	2,220
				<hr/> 46,550
3rd year—Deduct 45 beneficiaries, \$400 each,	-	-	-	18,000
				<hr/> 28,550

4th year—Contributions,	-	-	-	-	-	20,000
Average interest, 5½ per ct.,	-	-	-	-	-	2,670
						<hr/> 51,220
4th year—Deduct 60 beneficiaries, \$400 each,	-	-	-	-	-	24,000
						<hr/> 27,220
5th year—Contributions,	-	-	-	-	-	20,000
Average interest, 5½ per ct.,	-	-	-	-	-	2,580
						<hr/> 49,800
5th year—Deduct 75 beneficiaries, \$400 each,	-	-	-	-	-	30,000
						<hr/> 19,800
6th year—Contributions,	-	-	-	-	-	20,000
Average interest, 5 per ct.,	-	-	-	-	-	2,000
						<hr/> 41,800
6th year—Deduct 75 beneficiaries, \$400 each,	-	-	-	-	-	30,000
						<hr/> 11,800
7th year—Contributions,	-	-	-	-	-	20,000
						<hr/> \$31,800
						Balance,

It will thus be seen that it requires seven years to exhaust this fund, even at the small rate of contributions suggested, and estimating the rate of mortality at the highest figures. A very small increase of contributions would provide a capital that would be inexhaustible. But taking more probable figures as a basis, that is, putting the ratio of mortality at two and a half per centum, instead of three, (which is excessive,) the following table exhibits a far different result:

1st year—Contributions and interest,	-	-	-	-	-	\$20,600
" " 12½ beneficiaries, at \$400,	-	-	-	-	-	5,000
						<hr/> 15,600
2d year—Contributions and interest,	-	-	-	-	-	21,780
						<hr/> 37,380
" " 25 beneficiaries, at \$400,	-	-	-	-	-	10,000
						<hr/> 27,380
3rd year—Contributions and interest,	-	-	-	-	-	22,370
						<hr/> 49,750

170	<i>Ministers' Widows and Orphans.</i>	[APRIL,
" "	37½ beneficiaries, at \$400,	- - - - 15,000
		<u>34,750</u>
4th year—	Contributions and interest,	- - - - 23,010
		<u>57,760</u>
" "	50 beneficiaries, at \$400,	- - - - 20,000
		<u>37,760</u>
5th year—	Contributions and interest,	- - - - 23,180
		<u>60,940</u>
" "	62½ beneficiaries, at \$400,	- - - - 25,000
		<u>35,940</u>
6th year—	Contributions and interest,	- - - - 23,070
		<u>59,010</u>
" "	62½ beneficiaries, at \$400,	- - - - 25,000
		<u>34,010</u>
7th year—	Contributions and interest,	- - - - 22,990
		<u>57,000</u>
" "	62½ beneficiaries, at \$400,	- - - - 25,000
		<u>32,000</u>
	Balance,	- - - - \$32,000

It is thus demonstrated that a steadily growing capital will be formed at the end of the seventh year, when the balance in the treasury will be equal to the total obligation for the ensuing year. The fund will then be, so to speak, out of debt, and all this accomplished by imperceptible steps and trifling donations.

Comparing the plan thus imperfectly sketched, with the plan of Dr. Wilson's memorial, the most prominent point of difference is the total absence of any life assurance feature. It is not required of any minister to make or induce stated payments of premiums. It is only required that he shall die in poverty. The fund is for the relief of the widows and orphans of deceased ministers; and it makes no provision for those who need no aid. In the next place the substitute is based upon the Word. The fund is accumulated by the Sabbath collections, for an object as plainly endorsed by Holy Writ as the cause of missions; and, if feasible, is certainly liable to no objections on the score of con-

scientious scruples. No saint will say that his conscience forbids his contribution to a fund for the benefit of his pastor's widow. Again, it is a slight modification of the plan already inaugurated by the Assembly in ordering one special collection for this object. Indeed, it may be that this single annual collection will be sufficient; and it certainly will, if God will enlighten his people to see the inherent worthiness of the object, and the pressing urgency of the case.

Against the plan of the memorial, and against any plan in substitution, looking to the relief of impoverished widows and orphans, another objection may be urged. The notoriousness of the fact that ministers of the gospel are the most underpaid class of workers in the world, does not make the fact less a scandal and a shame. It may therefore be said that the root of the matter is just here. Let the Church, that is, the body of believers, be educated up to the proper standard, and there will be no ministers dying in poverty. Pay your pastors an adequate salary while they are alive and in active employment, and they will make due provision for their relicts just as other people do. This is very fine in theory. But this process of education is a slow process, and ministers die while the first lessons are being commenced. The prospect that the ministry will rank with the other learned professions in the matter of pecuniary reward is not flattering, and the reason is obvious: the preacher of the word is hunting for souls, while the lawyer and the physician are hunting for dollars. The pastor cannot engage in both searches. He will hold to the one and despise the other. Again, there are and always will be localities where congregations of worshippers may be gathered who are not able to pay the money value of their pastor's time and talents. Are such localities to be left without supplies? Or is the gospel to be made too expensive for their means, and thus placed beyond their reach? Or is the laborer in such fields to be forced into a life of celibacy, as well as a life of self-denial and hardship? The answer to all these questions is in the plan for the relief of the relicts of ministers who may die in their harness at any of these outposts.

In conclusion, and by way of summing up, look at the diffi-

culties in the way. First of all, and last of all, there is the apathy with which all new projects are received. Men will discuss the general subject with some slight show of interest and go away, forgetting straightway what manner of men they are themselves. For the very men who have the responsibility thrust upon them, are they who are most personally interested in the working of this or a kindred scheme. Yet so many things are doubtful. The readiness of the response of the membership of the Church and of all the regular attendants upon Presbyterian worship; the doubt as to the scope of the Assembly's powers in the premises; the ever-recurring doubt as to the accuracy of any tables relating to the average duration of human life; and the need for the invention of new appliances for the collection and disbursement of the fund—all of these and more, will occur as the subject is discussed. Nevertheless the plan is worthy of a trial. The Sustentation Committee could take charge of the work which falls in the line of their regular occupation. Every pastor in this Southland is *ex officio* an agent—always on the spot, and always within reach of precisely the right audience. Now and again, the wail that follows the husband and father as he is borne to his last resting-place is heard; and many times the inevitable grief of the survivors is deeper because the near future threatens poverty, the disruption of the household, and the doled-out charity that is more intolerable than destitution. And capping the climax, there remains the patent fact that this accumulation of horrors may be averted in every case, by the simple performance of a plain duty on the part of the Church; by the most natural manifestation of her corporate life, if she really *have* a corporate life.

What more can be said?

ARTICLE II.

THE INTERMEDIATE STATE.

- I. *A Sermon preached at Corinth, Miss.* By Rev. J. R. FREEMAN. Published by Request.
- II. *The Intermediate State; or, State of the Soul between Death and the Resurrection.* A Sermon in the Methodist Pulpit, South. By H. N. McTYEIRE, D. D.

In a debate which occurred some years since between a Presbyterian and a Universalist, the question was categorically put by the former, "What is the state of the soul between death and the resurrection? Is it happy? Is it miserable? Is it unconscious, or dead? Paul's asseveration had been quoted, "There shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and the unjust." And as it was beyond dispute that there will be two classes of men, the holy and the unholy, existing at the time of the resurrection, the Universalist was forced to assume the position, that as a part of the human race died unsanctified and condemned, they will be all justified and prepared for heaven in the act of rising from the dead. The question then came up, where then is the soul while the body is sleeping in the unconscious state of the dead? It must be either happy, or miserable, or unconscious. To these interrogatories the advocate of universal salvation could only reply, "The dust returns to dust as it was, and the soul to God who gave it; and that is all that I know about it."

But the condition of the soul, as soon as it leaves the body, is one that deeply interests every son and daughter of Adam. When these lips are sealed in death, these eyes sightless and glassy, this arm paralysed and stiff, and the entire mortal part disintegrated and mouldering in the grave, where and what is the condition of the soul that never dies? Without an appeal to revelation, we should never be able to come to a certain knowledge of the truth. The wisest and best of the Greek and

Roman sages were unable, by the most powerful efforts of human reason alone, to prove satisfactorily to themselves the naked doctrine of the soul's immortality, much less the condition of it when released from the body. Cicero said that while reading the arguments of Socrates, he felt convinced; but as soon as he laid down the parchment, the proofs of the so much desired truth evanished from his mind. It is only through revelation that life and immortality are clearly brought to light. The states and conditions of the souls of Abel, and Noah, and David, and all others good and bad, who have passed from time into eternity, must be obtained only from the book of God.

I. In the first place, there are those in the Christian Church who believe that the soul lies in a state of unconsciousness from death to the resurrection. This was the the view adopted by the Anabaptists of Germany during the Reformation, to whom Calvin replied with marked ability, in his tract entitled *Psychopannychia*. The same doctrine is resuscitated in the discourse first mentioned as the subject of review in this article. How far the numerous Church to which the author of this discourse belongs, sympathises with him, we are unable to form any conception. A body of Christians wielding such a vast influence, and to so great an extent orthodox, we would trust could not be largely contaminated by such a heresy: for by no milder term are we able to designate it. This view of the soul's condition in the disembodied state we must regard as a dangerous one—a doctrine leading to materialism, and manifestly of a licentious tendency. This was abundantly indicated in the advocates of it three centuries ago. For, although to the soul asleep, or in a state of quiescence, the flight of time is imperceptible, to the living man anticipating such a state, it is far otherwise. Grant to the crimes of men now a delay of judgment; put the gallows and the penitentiary off for twenty, forty, or sixty years, and crime will multiply to a frightful extent. What but this filled the old world with rapine and murder, and as a consequence brought the flood of waters on it? And hence it was that the Almighty shortened the life of man from almost a thousand years to less than a tenth part of that period. And if bold

offenders against God can obtain a respite of judgment for 1,000, or 2,000, or as some believe 365,000 years, it will appear an almost eternity. "Because sentence against an evil work is not executed speedily, therefore the heart of the sons of men is fully set in them to do evil."

Before leaving this part of our subject, it behoves us to notice the desperate straits to which our author from Corinth is driven to support a favorite theory. In order to evade the force of our Saviour's address to the thief on the cross, Luke xxiii. 43, he informs us that the Greek language is without punctuation, and charges the common version with misleading the readers, by inserting the comma *before*, instead of *after*, *σήμερον*, rendered "to day," and makes the adverb qualify, "I say unto thee." "I say unto thee this day, thou shalt be with me in paradise," (at a future time). In harmony with this singular specimen of exegesis, the thief did not die on that day, and was nailed to the cross again on the day after the Sabbath, his legs having been broken merely to prevent his running away! A pretty sure mode of proceeding on the part of Pilate, we should think, provided he had neither guards nor prisons to secure him. This absurd and forced construction of the passage would not be deemed worthy of a respectful notice, were it not that we are aware that thousands regard it as the true exposition of it. Whether the asseveration that the Greek is without points, is the result of ignorance, or a design to deceive, is not for us to determine. The discourse was heard and requested for publication, doubtless by those who concurred with its sentiments. Greek punctuation dates back more than 200 years before Christ. Its inventor was Aristophanes of Byzantium, librarian to Ptolemy Euergetes. And although it was not universally adopted for many centuries, and the original marks differ widely from those of the present day, a tolerably correct and uniform system of punctuation has been in use for more than 800 years. Then as to the correctness of the pointing in Luke xxiii. 43, that of the common version is the one adopted by Bloomfield, Scholz, Lachman, Knapp, Hahn, Alford, and Tischendorf in his Sinaitic Codex, and by the critical authorities generally. And to

make the adverb "to day" qualify the words "I say unto thee," must be regarded as meaningless, and destroys the force and emphasis of our Saviour's promise. The very passage quoted by our author to sustain his interpretation, goes the rather to overthrow it. Heb. iii. 15: "While it is said, To day, if ye will hear his voice," etc. To day, or now, the people are commanded to hear the voice of the Almighty, and harden not their hearts; and to day the penitent thief should be with Jesus in paradise. The pronoun of the first person is without gender, because the speaker is presumed to be always known. So the suffering malefactor on Calvary was aware that his Lord was speaking to him at the then present time, neither in the past nor future. Had Jesus said, "I told you before, and tell you now again, thou shalt be with me," etc., there would have been a propriety in the expression; but such was not the case. And we have in this forced exposition an instance of the miserable shifts to which men will resort, when reckless enough to torture the inspired word to support a favorite doctrine.

The breaking of the legs of the thief to prevent his escape, too, is an idea as silly as it is novel. Cicero says that the legs were broken, in cases where the officers of justice compassionated the offenders, in order to put an end to their sufferings by hastening their death. And Josephus tells us of some whom Titus had crucified, and released at his intercession, but who all died except one. Had the thief been taken down, after being suspended for six dreadful hours, by huge spikes driven through the quivering tendons of his hands and feet, there would have been no necessity for nailing him to the cross two days afterwards. But enough on this point for the present. The scripture proofs touching this scheme will be considered farther on.

II. And we shall now proceed to the examination of the views of an able living divine whose name and discourse stand second on our list. We are aware that there are many who concur with Dr. McTyeire in the belief that the disembodied soul occupies an intermediate *place*, which is neither heaven nor hell. Here is the moot point between us. Does the inspired word reveal to us, with satisfactory clearness, a locality for the

righteous which is outside of heaven? and a place for the souls of the unredeemed, apart from the fire prepared for the devil and his angels? It is admitted that the ancient Jews, and also some of the early Christian fathers, received the doctrine of a place of departed souls. This place is called *sheol* in the Hebrew Scriptures; and the Seventy rendered this word usually by *hades*, a word of similar meaning in the Greek. These words both signify *invisible*, or *unseen*. *Sheol* is from the verb *shaal* to ask, or inquire for, as for something whose locality is unknown. Taking the words together without their adjuncts or qualifying circumstances, they throw but little light upon the subject; they simply express the *invisible world*, the "undiscovered country" of Shakspeare, "from whose bourne no traveller returns." In many places in the Old Testament they signify the grave; and in 1 Corinthians xv., *hades* means the grave,—“O grave, where is thy victory?” But in the 9th Psalm, *sheol* must mean the place of future punishment. “The wicked shall be turned into hell, with all the nations that forget God.” Here, if the word implies nothing more than the grave, or even a receptacle of departed souls, the passage is stripped of its entire force as a threatening; for both righteous and wicked die and go to the grave and the state of the dead. It has the same force in Prov. xxiii. 14, Amos ix. 2, and some other places. So in the story of the rich man, it is said, in *hades* he lifted up his eyes, being in torments. Here the place of suffering is called *hades*; and the region of happiness, Abraham’s bosom.

The words of the apostle (1 Pet. iii. 19), “By which also he went and preached to the spirits in prison,” have been largely relied on in support of the doctrine of an intermediate place, or region of disembodied spirits. And this construction has been strengthened by the wording of the Creed, usually called the Apostles’ Creed, but which was written long after the days of the apostles, and is of no more authority than any other human composition. The phrase, “he descended into hell,” has been understood to mean, that the human soul of Christ, after his crucifixion, went to *hades*, the place of departed souls, and there preached the gospel to them. Hence the application of the ex-

pression, "he went and preached to the spirits in prison." And in this passage the Romanists find their principal Bible authority for the doctrine of purgatory, and prayers, and masses for the dead. But the construction of the words that views Christ as going in his human soul and preaching to the wicked who rejected the preaching of Noah and were drowned in the flood—a view adopted by many Protestants—requires more than they might be willing to concede. We must recognise a day of grace beyond the grave, a work of evangelisation—preaching, repentance, faith, and growth in grace—in eternity, as well as on earth, if we embrace this construction. But now *only* is the accepted time. And "there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in the grave whither thou goest." And why Christ should go and preach the gospel to the imprisoned antediluvians, either in the language of invitation, or warning, or imperious triumph over them, more than to the people of Sodom, and other heinous sinners, does not appear. The passage is not without its acknowledged difficulties. But the doctrine of purgatory, and all the other heresies that have taken their rise from it, are the results of glaring misconstruction. It is not on the inspired record that Christ preached in his human soul at all while his body was in the tomb; this is a wholly gratuitous assumption, without a shadow of inspired authority. In the preceding verse we read, that he was "put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit. By which (Spirit) he went and preached to the spirits in prison." The antecedent to the relative *which*, is *Spirit* in the verse preceding, (and some copies repeat the word, and read *ἐν ᾧ πνεύματι*); and it was by the Holy Spirit, or in his own divine nature, that he preached, as here stated, and not in his human soul. We know that he did preach by the mouth of Noah, and his Spirit did strive with those wicked people of old, and they are merely set forth as an instance of an incorrigible generation of sinners who hardened themselves in impenitence, and were damned in consequence. And they are held up as a warning to others, as Jude represents the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah, "suffering the vengeance of eternal fire." This is the exegesis adopted by Whitby, Scott, Bp. Pearson, Beza,

Macknight, Lightfoot, and many of the most able commentators of modern times. "Spirits in prison," or prisoners, is a common term in both the Old and New Testaments for unconverted persons; and it is thought by some to refer more particularly to the Gentile world as in Isaiah, for the reason that then the Jews had not been called. Speaking of the old prophets, Peter says, i. 11, "Searching what, or what manner of time, the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify." And we may understand the passage to mean, either that Christ preached by Noah and the Holy Spirit to the wicked then on earth, or that he preached in person himself, and by his disciples, to sinners such as were drowned in the flood. We use the expression, "our missionaries preach the gospel to the Indian tribes, who, in the days of Columbus, were naked savages." The persons to whom the gospel is preached are not the same that were naked savages in the days of Columbus, but they are of the race. Christ preached on the day of Pentecost, by Peter, and by the Spirit, to sinners who or such as mocked at Lot in Sodom, and at Noah while building the ark. Thus we see that either construction relieves us of the necessity of making the soul of Jesus, between his death and resurrection, go and preach to the old antediluvian rebels, "now reserved in chains under darkness, unto the judgment of the great day." He preached by Noah, and by the Spirit, to wicked men who are now in the prison of hell; and he preached himself to sinners like them during his earthly ministry, and by his apostles and ministers after his ascension into heaven.

In Ps. xvi. 10, David says, "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, *sheol, hades*; neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption." This prediction of the resurrection of Christ, Peter uses with great effectiveness, in his defence on the day of Pentecost. We know where the sacred body of Jesus lay, and that it came forth from Joseph's sepulchre without putrefaction. And where was his human soul during the period that the body lay under the power of death? Whatever difficulties may arise in the minds of others, to us it seems there can be but one reply. Hear his own words. To his Father he said, "Into thy hands I

commend my spirit;" and to the thief, "To day thou shalt be with me in paradise." Truly these expressions convey to our mind no semblance of a descent to the regions of the damned; but prove directly the reverse. Before the night had closed down on the scenes of that eventful day, he was in the presence of his Father in heaven, bearing with him, as a rich trophy of redeeming love, one of the most degraded of his kindred according to the flesh. But as this is a cardinal text with the advocates of an intermediate place, we cite a few authorities. Dr. A. Clarke says, "As to *leaving the soul in hell*, it can only mean, permitting the *life* of the Messiah to continue under the power of *death*; for *sheol* signifies a *pit*, a *ditch*, the *grave*, or *state* of the dead." Bp. Patrick regards it as simply a prediction of the resurrection. Whitby, Acts ii. 27, renders it, "*my life in the grave.*" Dr. J. A. Alexander says, "Hell is here to be taken in its old English sense—the invisible world, or state of the dead." Calvin gives the same construction. The location of paradise will claim our attention further on.

The reply of Jesus to Mary in the garden, "Touch me not, for I have not ascended to my Father," has been used to show that his soul had not been in heaven, but in paradise, a lower place. But he evidently alluded here to his final ascension into heaven, which took place forty days afterward.

The remark of Whitby on this truly affecting reply is suggestive: "Spend not now thy time in touching my body; for I shall not presently ascend to my Father; but go to my brethren," etc. The sense of the passage seems to be this: Mary had come at early dawn to the sepulchre to anoint the body of Jesus with the spices they had previously prepared. Their absorbing thought was care for the *body*, which they expected to find cold in death. What must have been the surprise then, when they saw it alive, and not needing their attention! And how fitting the words of Jesus, directing the thoughts of Mary to something more important! "Go tell my brethren that my ascension has not yet taken place; that I will remain with them for some time, and realise to them the promises I made to them before my death."

Referring again to the remark of Peter concerning David, "For David is not ascended into the heavens," it is clearly a statement as to his body, which was then sleeping in the sepulchres of the kings at Jerusalem. The expression of Jacob regarding Joseph, "I will go down into the grave unto my son mourning," has been supposed to indicate a separate place of departed souls; because being devoured by a wild beast, his flesh had not found a grave. But the grave and the dust are terms used to denote the resting-places of the bodies of men, wherever they may be. "All that are in their graves shall hear his voice, and come forth." "Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake." Here, if the terms *grave* and *dust of the earth* are to be limited to those who have been actually buried, a large portion of the human race, saints as well as sinners, will never enjoy a resurrection. Millions of bodies have never been buried in the earth. They have been devoured by wild beasts, and by cannibals of their own race; burned on the funeral pile, and lost under the billows of the ocean. And yet Jesus and David speak of them indiscriminately as being in their graves, and sleeping in the dust of the earth. In the same sense, sorrowing Jacob used the term, meaning death, the place or state of the dead, (Bp. Patrick *in loco*). In 2 Sam. xxii. 6, the Septuagint renders the word *thanatos*, death.

Phil. ii. 10, "That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things on earth, and things under the earth," has been cited also as descriptive of an intermediate place—that is, "under the earth." But comparing this with Rom. xiv. 10, 11, we find that this submission of the dead who are under the earth to Christ, will be at the day of judgment, when the intermediate place, if there be one, will have been deserted. The view of the passage taken by our opponents, would require them to prove that *hades* is located beneath the surface of the earth, which they will hardly pretend to do. Rev. xx. 14, "Death and hell (*hades*) were cast into the lake of fire." This also occurs after the resurrection and judgment. And it cannot be predicated of that portion of *hades* or the intermediate place where the saints are said to dwell, that it and they shall be cast

into the lake of fire. But it is true of the grave, for there will be no more use for it, and also of hell itself; for the place now used for the punishment of the wicked may yield up the souls of the damned to the judgment of the great day, and reclaim them again; as prisoners are brought out to trial in earthly courts, and when sentence is pronounced, returned to their cells again.

III. A third class of believers receive the doctrine that "the souls of believers are at their death made perfect in holiness, and do immediately pass into glory, and their bodies do rest in their graves till the resurrection." That the bodies of all men, good and bad, do sleep in unconsciousness till the resurrection, is generally admitted. That there will be a resurrection of all the bodies of men, is abundantly proved in both the Old and New Testaments. The wise among the Gentiles in Paul's day denied the doctrine; and when he preached it before the Athenian judges, "some mocked, and others said, We will hear thee again of this matter." The pious Jews believed it, as we learn from Martha's reply to Jesus at the tomb of Lazarus, "I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection of the last day." And it is to the resurrection of the body that the Saviour refers in several passages, which our author at Corinth lays under contribution to prove the sleep of the soul. "No man can come to me, except the Father which sent me, draw him; and I will raise him up at the last day"—John vi. 44; also 39, 40, and 54. The death, intermediate state, and resurrection of Christ, afford a graphic portraiture of the same scenes through which all the saints must pass. Die they must; their bodies will sleep for a time, and eventually triumph over death. He commended his soul into the hands of his Father, and it returned from heaven to reclaim its body from the sepulchre, and being reunited went back to enjoy the glory he had with the Father before the world was. The bodies of the saints will sleep longer; but not less surely will their glorified spirits return from the bosom of the Father to reanimate the bodies they left behind them in this world.

It is freely admitted that the glorification of the child of God

will be incomplete until the resurrection. The stigma of death will not be removed from the body, though the soul will be as happy as its capacities will admit. But there are lawful pleasures which the mortal part enjoys peculiar to itself. And the full and perfect gratification of those holy appetites, in connexion with the pure desires of the soul, will never be fully realised until after the reunion of the two in the resurrection. Their enjoyments and sufferings are often entirely independent of each other. The souls of the martyrs were filled with raptures, while devouring fire was consuming their flesh. On the other hand the sensualist indulges to the full all the baser passions of the carnal man, while a goading conscience robs him of all mental delights.

Our proposition is, that, after death, the soul of the believer passes immediately into glory; and the wicked lifts up his eyes, like Dives, in hell. And here we pause to notice the objection of Bishop McTycire. If, says he, the portions of the righteous and the wicked are determined immediately after death, there must be two judgments; and the second sitting of the court may reverse the decision of the first. "We read of a second death; never of a second judgment." But this same eloquent preacher admits that the state of the righteous is irreversibly fixed, and his ultimate admission to the glories of the highest heaven infallibly secured against all contingencies as soon as he dies. But he is only in the vestibule or antechamber of heaven, the happy part of *hades*, and not heaven itself. The difference between the learned bishop and ourselves, is merely a difference in locality. He places the saint in the porch of heaven; we place him in heaven itself. And is there not as much of a judgment in the one case as the other? If the happiness of a soul has been infallibly secured in *hades*, there must have been a decision of the Judge of quick and dead to effect that security; and just as full and complete a decree as there would be in placing the soul immediately in the presence of the throne. And as to any danger of a reversal of that decision in the day of general judgment, we are perfectly willing to trust the Judge of all the earth. "I am the Lord, I change not." The God-man is not ignorant

of facts so as to make an erroneous decision at first; nor will he ever repent and reverse it.

Having noticed the principal arguments in opposition to the doctrine of the immediate glorification of the soul after death, let us now consider the question affirmatively, and adduce some of those scripture proofs that seem to support this scheme. And

1. In 2 Kings ii. 1, it is said, "when the Lord would take up Elijah into heaven by a whirlwind," etc. The prophet's destination is not *sheol* or *hades*; no, it is heaven itself. The word used is *shamayim* in Hebrew, and *ouranos* in the Septuagint Greek, the words invariably used to express the highest heaven. In 1 Kings viii. 27, Ps. ii. 4, and lxxiii. 25, *shamayim* is the word used to denote the residence of God. "And Elijah went up by a whirlwind into heaven." Bp. Patrick, after noticing the silly conceit of Abarbinel, that he was carried up into the region of the air, and afterwards dropped in the garden of Eden; says he went up to live with the angels, his body being transformed in its passage. And from that heaven he came with Moses—neither of them asleep—to talk with Jesus on the Mount of Transfiguration. And with Moses and the other saints made perfect in glory, he is in heaven now.

2. A second argument in support of our proposition is, that the departed saints are with Christ. Wherever the God-man is, there are his ransomed ones. "Behold I and the children which thou hast given me." "In the midst of the Church will I sing praise unto thee." The place where his honor dwelleth, the home of our ascended Lord and Redeemer, cannot be mistaken. "Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, but into heaven itself," etc. "Who is set on the right hand of the throne of the majesty in the heavens. And his people who have left this world are there with him. For this he prayed, just before his crucifixion. "Father, I will that they whom thou has given me be with me where I am, that they may behold my glory." He has never prayed in vain. "I knew that thou hearest me always." And when he asked that his saints should be gathered with him before the throne to enjoy his glory, he knew that his intercessions would be successful. In

2 Cor. 5th chap., Paul teaches the same truth, "For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." "Therefore we are always confident, knowing that, whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord." "We are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord." The earthly house is the frail body of flesh; and when the soul is released from it, the transition to the eternal residence in heaven is immediate. Being in the body, walking by faith, is absence from the Lord. Absence from the body, which the soul leaves at death, is "presence with the Lord." Phil. i. 23: "For I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart and be with Christ." 1 Thess. v. 10: "Who died for us, that whether we wake or sleep, we should live together with him." Here the strait of which the apostle speaks, is, whether he should live and labor for Christ, or leave this world of toil and suffering to enjoy the glorious blessedness of his presence. There is no third place intimated. And suppose he had looked upon his departure from earth as a plunge into insensibility and inaction, a sleep of thousands of years, how could he have used this language? Could he who gloried only in the cross; who counted not his life dear to him if he might win souls by losing it; who had great sorrow and heaviness of heart for his brethren; and who was willing in some sort to be accursed for them; who regarded all his sore afflictions as light and but for a moment—could he lose all at once this intense interest in saving souls, and the glory of God, and prefer to lie down in a state of insensibility? No; it is from the light affliction, to the "exceeding and eternal weight of glory." In Eph. iii. 15, the same writer says, "Of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named." The whole body of believers, who have lived since time began, are in two places, and two only, heaven and earth. There are none of them in the upper *hades*, nor in an insensate condition. If, however, the views of either of our opponents are correct, much the larger portion of the Church is in neither heaven nor earth, but in *hades*, or a state of unconsciousness. In Heb. vi. 12, the saints are represented as

having already come into possession of the heavenly inheritance. "Be not slothful, but followers of them who through faith and patience inherit the promises." Whitby renders the word κληρονομήσαντων *inherited*; and Bloomfield says that most commentators regard it as an *aorist*, and explain, "who have come into the enjoyment of the promised blessing of salvation." *Ergo*, they are with the Author of salvation in heaven. And our Saviour, in reply to the Sadducees, who denied the soul's immortality, and sought to embarrass him by the case of the woman who had had seven husbands, represents the saints already before the resurrection, as "like unto the angels," and "equal to the angels," *ισάγγελοι*, *angel-mates*. And the angels are never described as sleeping or unconscious, but always actively engaged in executing the commands of God. "Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be the heirs of salvation?" And here we may appropriately bring to notice the case of the angel-saint seen by John on two occasions. Supposing him to be the same mighty Being before whom he fell as dead at a previous interview, the Son of God himself, he was about to fall down and worship him, when he heard the words, "See thou do it not; for I am of thy fellow-servants the prophets." There is no saint or angel worship in heaven; and besides this, we learn another important and pleasing truth: saints as well as angels are employed by their heavenly Father in errands of mercy to this world. In addition to the cases just mentioned, Moses and Elijah, after being in heaven many hundred years, were sent to earth, and conversed with Jesus about the death he was about to accomplish at Jerusalem. (See this thought more fully expanded by the late Dr. Woods, of Andover, in his sermon on the death of Mrs. Phœbe Farrar. Woods' Works, Vol. 5.) Heb. xii. 22-24: "But ye are come unto Mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and church of the firstborn, which are written in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant." Here we have presented a striking portraiture of

the heavenly world called Mount Sion, and the Jerusalem above, as contrasted with the places of the same name on earth. And in this glorious locality we find God himself the Judge and Father of all, and Jesus Christ the Mediator, the uncounted multitude of the angels who never sinned, and the souls of just men saved by grace and made perfect in holiness. There are no partition walls barring the ingress of redeemed souls into the divine presence; no separating barriers placed between holy souls and holy angels; and no ascending steps leading from the more humble abodes of the one to the more glorious of the other. They are all either angels, or like the angels, and all stand in the same blessed presence of God and the Lamb.

When the martyr Stephen was falling under the murderous blows of his persecutors, he looked up and saw the heavens opened, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God. And he cried, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." What must have been the belief of the holy man on this subject, but that he would be carried immediately into the presence of God? As Jesus had committed his soul to the hands of his Father, so Stephen commended his to the care of him that sat on his right hand.

The visions of the Apostle John in Revelation, all represent the saints as a component part of the heavenly world. In the 4th chapter, he saw the heavens opened, and the throne, and him that sat on it, the ever blessed Spirit, and the elders and living creatures offering divine adorations. There was also the God-man bearing the aspect of a lamb that had been slain. And the celestial assembly "sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof; for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation." These are the souls of the saints who sing this song; for Christ took not on him the nature of angels, but he was slain for and redeemed the seed of Abraham. But then the angelic host respond in an anthem of their own. "I heard the voice of many angels round the throne; and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands; saying with a loud voice, Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches,

and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing." In the 6th chapter, at the opening of the fifth seal, the souls of the martyrs are seen under the altar; and to every one of them were given white robes. And again in the 7th chapter, "I beheld, and, lo, a great multitude which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues, stood before the throne, and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands." These were gathered out of the Gentile world, as the 144,000 were from the Jewish nation. And they stood *before the throne, and before the Lamb.* The angels stood *round about* the throne, and about the elders, and the living creatures. The saints were closer up to the throne. They came out of great tribulation, which the angels did not; and therefore they are rewarded by being placed before the throne of God; and he that sitteth on the throne shall dwell among them. Here it would seem that nothing could be plainer, than that the redeemed souls of men are in the presence of God; and not only so, but in fuller fruition of his glorious presence than the angels. The angels are there, but they stand more remote on the outskirts of the celestial throng. Here John saw souls of every language, and color, and nation. The Asiatic, the African, the European, the far-off inhabitants of the isles of the sea, are there. There, no doubt, he beheld angel-faced Stephen; there the devoted Paul, whom Nero murdered; there his own brother James, whom Herod killed with the sword; there the intrepid Peter, saved from the same death by prayer, but crucified at last; there the rest of the apostles, and thousands of others whom he personally knew. And they see no longer through a glass darkly, but face to face. It is admitted that these visions of John were imperfect delineations of heaven—meagre outlines of the glorious place; for mortal man could endure no other, and we could have comprehended no other, had he seen and communicated them to us. But they were not deceptive nor fallacious. John did not, by the aid of the Holy Spirit, see saints in heaven while there were no saints there. And he was not made to hear their loud anthems of praise, as the sound of many waters, and loud as mighty thunders, while they were sleeping in unconscious-

ness, and their tongues mute in the grave. And it will not avail to say that these visions are only prophetic, and describe the scenes of heaven after the resurrection. The apostle saw only the *souls* under the altar. In chapter xx. he saw the *souls* of them that were beheaded for the name of Jesus. Their bodies were not there, as they will be after the day of judgment. Now all these visions were vouchsafed to the last of the apostles before the close of the first century; and these multitudes of souls were then in heaven, and have been ever since, and will remain there till the sounding of the resurrection trump.

And this brings us directly to the prophecy of Enoch, recorded by the Apostle Jude, "Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousand of his saints, to execute judgment upon all," etc. We know the construction of those who wish to evade the force of the term saints, by rendering it angels. But Calvin gives the true sense. The word *ἅγιος* is used as a noun sixty-two times in the New Testament, and in every instance it is translated *saint*, and cannot mean anything else than the people of God either on earth or in heaven. Here in the early age of the world, the seventh from Adam, Enoch, the holy man whom God translated as he did Elijah, utters the first prophecy of man on record; and it is that the Lord will come to judge the ungodly for all their ungodly deeds. And he will not come alone. The holy angels, and a vast multitude—a certain for an uncertain number—of the saints shall attend him down the sky. "Know ye not that ye shall judge angels?" "The saints shall judge the world." Holy men dwelling in heaven with Christ, Enoch himself being one of them, will come as a part of the grand retinue that will surround the throne, and they will sit with Christ as assessors in the grand assizes of the judgment day.

3. A third argument in defence of our proposition is found in the use of the term *paradise*. It is in the use of this word that the advocates of an intermediate place have usually drawn their strength from the passage, and not in the silly creations of the brain that found utterance at Corinth. "This day thou shalt be with me in paradise." In a few hours the Jewish day ended—at sunset—and the souls of Christ and the thief were in para-

dise. And now, is paradise *hades*, or is it heaven? Let us see. Paul in 2 Cor. xii. 2-4, says he was "caught up to the third heaven;" and almost with the same dash of the pen, he tells us "he was caught up into paradise, and heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter." Here there is no mention of two ascensions, one to the third heaven, the other to paradise. The vision was "fourteen years ago." And it was in paradise that he heard those unspeakable words, unlawful, or impossible, for man to utter. Hence the third heaven and paradise must be the same place. Lightfoot says, "Paradise and the third heaven are one and the same thing." Vol. II., p. 478, Ed. of 1784. But further, the only other place where the word is found in the New Testament is Rev. ii. 7, "To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the paradise of God." We find then where paradise is by the location of the tree of life: the tree of life is in the midst of it. And where is the tree of life? Turn to the 22d chapter and see: "And he showed me a pure river of water of life, clear as crystal, proceeding out of the throne of God and of the Lamb. In the midst of the street of it, and on either side of the river, was there the tree of life, which bare twelve manner of fruits, and yielded her fruit every month." Whether we regard the tree as one in the middle of the golden street, and the waters flowing on each side of it, or as many, and growing on each side of the river, is immaterial. We have found the exact location of this wonderful tree, and by it we prove what paradise is. The river of life flows out from the throne of God, and the immortal tree grows on its banks, and paradise surrounds it. The throne, the glory, the awful presence of the eternal God, is in paradise. And if there be any such place as heaven, we shall surely find it here. And thither it was, to the tree of life, to the throne of the Almighty, that the sinner and his Saviour, the thief and his Lord, went on the day of the crucifixion. And if the throne of God is not in heaven, there can be no such place.

4. Our last argument for the immediate glorification of the saints, is founded on the story of the rich man and Lazarus. And we shall not enter at length into a discussion of the ques-

tion, whether this portion of our Lord's teachings is a parable or a narrative of facts. If this be a parable, however, it differs very materially from all the others spoken by the Saviour. Singularly in this one he gives us the names of two persons who had lived on earth, Abraham and Lazarus; and on this ground Calvin and many other able expositors claim it as a portion of history. But admit it to be a parable, what do the advocates of this opinion gain by it, in the consideration of this subject? A parable is very different from a fable. The sower and his seed are not fabulous things; the profligacy of one son, and the obedience of another; the losing of a sheep or a piece of money; the pearl, the draw-net, says Drummond, are not fabulous things. On the contrary, the marriage of the king's son, and the wedding-garment, and the ten virgins, display to us most accurately the customs of the Orientals in our Saviour's time. And in all his parables, says Dean Trench, there is not one instance of transgressing the order of nature. They are all facts *such as* have actually occurred. There is no making of birds and beasts and trees talk like men, as in the fables of La Fontaine and Æsop. Facts of every day occurrence, and of the most familiar kind, are used to illustrate divine truth. The difficulty raised in this instance by Whitby, Kuinoel, and others, that the same story, or a similar one, is found in the Babylonian Gemara, will amount to but little when it is acknowledged that this work was committed to writing at least 200 years after Christ. And there is a far greater probability that a Jewish Rabbi copied it from the Gospels, than that the divine Teacher borrowed it from the traditions of the Jews. The horror evinced by a Universalist too, in the idea of placing hell in sight of heaven, where the saints in glory would witness the torments of their friends who are lost, may be obviated by the cases of Stephen and the Apostle John. One flash on the eye of the protomartyr, revealed the Son of God standing on the right hand of the Father, and the vision was closed. The visions of the last apostle, too, were temporary. So the view, and the conversation across the impassible gulf, we must suppose, were for only a brief period. Be this as it may, the saints before the

throne can never suffer any anguish on account of lost friends or anything else. Confirmed in glory, they are confirmed in happiness, and can suffer no pain on any account. It is at least probable, then, that our Lord seized upon a case known to his omniscient eye, (as he directed his hearers to a husbandman in sight of the sea of Galilee, committing his seed to the ground,) displaying the very doctrines which the Jews received of future rewards and punishments, to show the awful results of setting the heart on the things of this world. Lightfoot, regarding the passage as a parable, says it was spoken to exhibit the dreadful doom of the unbelieving Jews. Lazarus is Eliezer in a contracted form; and Eliezer of Damascus was the high steward of Abraham. There was hence a propriety in associating these names together, though another man, a lineal descendant of Abraham and a sick mendicant, is presented, instead of the Gentile of Damascus. This Lazarus had lately died, and so had the rich sensualist, whose name is withheld perhaps for the sake of living friends. The five brothers of the latter were living, while he was burning in *hades*; and he prayed that Lazarus might be sent to warn them of his fate. They both die; the one is carried into Abraham's bosom, the other awakes tormented in flames of fire. There is no delay; no sleep of the soul in either case. The one is happy, the other miserable, while the five brothers are still living.

We are aware that some of the ancient fathers used this portion of Scripture to illustrate the condition of the Jewish and Gentile nations, and that Universalists at the present day entertain the same view of it. But Paul uses many incidents in the journeyings of the children of Israel from Egypt to Canaan, as warnings, consolations, and instructions. And in making Lazarus represent the Gentiles, and Dives the Jews, the parallel will not hold throughout. The Jews and Gentiles will come together—and they are coming now; but the gulf between Lazarus and Dives can never be crossed. And further, if it was the design of Christ simply to show the present and coming states of these nations, he reverses the order of things entirely. In all his parables, he takes simple well known facts in nature to

illustrate spiritual and mysterious doctrines. But here there would be the appropriating of the most awful mysteries of the eternal world merely as a prophecy to foretell the casting off of the Jews, and the calling in of the Gentiles. From such fanciful and dangerous constructions, may the Lord deliver us!

But where did these two men go when they died? The one went to *hades*, the other to Abraham's bosom. We have seen that the word *hades* means simply *invisible* or *unseen*. It is compounded of *a* privative and *ideiv* to see, and implies *not seen*. We may not determine its locality, but we know its character. Into it a worldly sensualist plunges as soon as he leaves this world. From rolling in wealth, and feasting both body and soul, he awakes in all the torments of flame and thirst. The purple and fine linen are torn off, and naked, he burns like poorer sinners. And is there yet a more dreadful hell? and are there hotter flames yet to flare round and kindle a more furious thirst? Yes; that body that died, and was buried with funeral pomp, will awake to endure the same burnings, and add thus to the torments of the soul. What that fire is we know not, any more than we know what the gold and pearls of the New Jerusalem are; but we know that it is a fire prepared for the devil and his angels. And if there is a fire that can burn devils, it can also affect the souls of men.

But where is Abraham's bosom? and where is Lazarus? We answer, just where Abraham is. If the father of the faithful and the friend of God is in heaven, the beggar is there with him. Our Saviour said, "Many shall come from the east and from the west, and sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven." And in this passage (says Lightfoot) he spoke agreeably to the received opinion of the Jewish nation. From this learned author, it is evident that the Jewish Rabbis believed that Abraham was in heaven. He says: "They say that when Abraham died he went to paradise; and when Moses died he went to paradise; and again, they say he is under the throne of glory; and again, he is in heaven ministering before God." It is evident that Christ appropriated many of the phrases of the Jews, but attached to them a very different

meaning. "Thy kingdom come," was a prayer used by them, but only in that carnal sense in which they regarded their Messiah. "A new creature" was applied to proselytes to the Jewish faith; and when the ceremonies of ablution and circumcision were over, they were said to have had "a new birth," and were thus severed from all relationship with their natural kindred. But how differently did the God-man understand and apply these same expressions! So we must understand the term "Abraham's bosom," by the general teachings of inspiration, and not by the conceits of Jewish Rabbis, although in this instance they evidently approximate the truth. "Abraham's bosom" was a term used to denote the closest and most intimate union to the father of the nation, and would convey to the Jew the idea of the highest degree of happiness.

Having examined the Scripture authorities mainly relied on by those whose works are passing under review, in the light of many of the ablest critics of both the earlier and later ages of Christianity and the vast array of inspired proofs on our own side of the question, we come to the conclusion that the souls of the departed saints are with Christ in glory, perfectly happy, but not advanced to that degree of glorification which they will attain to at the resurrection of the just in the end of the world. There they await the full "adoption, to wit, the redemption of the body." Lost souls are in hell with Dives, awaiting with terrible foreboding the day of judgment, and reunion to those old bodies, in which, by indulgence in the fleshly lusts, they lost heaven, and gained an eternity of misery.

ARTICLE III.

THE CORRESPONDENCE TOUCHING THE CHRISTIANS, BETWEEN THE PROCONSUL PLINY AND THE EMPEROR TRAJAN.

It is supposed to have been seventy-five or eighty years after the crucifixion of Christ, when the younger Pliny became governor of Bithynia in Asia, under the Roman Emperor Trajan. The famous letters that passed, in the first years of the second century, between these two, touching the proper course of procedure in trials of the Christians, have long been, and are to this day, of surpassing interest. Accordingly, they have been discussed and commented on times without number—volumes and volumes perhaps written; yet such is their hold on the imagination, that when one generation grows weary and lays them by, another follows and finds them fresh and suggestive as ever; for they are among the plainest foot-marks that point to the beginning of a memorable struggle—perhaps belong to the most precious parts of the wreck that floated off when Paganism went down before victorious Christianity.

As to the facts of the case, nothing has been left unsaid. Two letters only compose the correspondence—the longer being Pliny's, and the Emperor's answer a few brief sentences; and both much in keeping with the accounts history gives of the men. We append to this article an English version of the Latin originals, from the best edition of Pliny's letters. The basis of our translation is Lardner's.

So ancient and curious are these writings that they must needs have been fully discussed and critically handled long ages ago, and chiefly, of course, touching their bearing on the story of Christianity in the earlier ages. But as they have long ceased to furnish matter of interest from that particular point of view, they find place at this day chiefly in writings on the entire body of the "Evidences." Still they seem so remarkable in them-

selves, and throw light on so many other things, that they cannot fail to repay one for special attention even now.

Through the spirit of a new time, old facts come to have new meaning. The world goes on changing; views of things alter, soften down, and sometimes come round to make the opposite impression from the first. Or it may be things counted wholly worthless or worse, grow into esteem in a new age, because of the light they reflect on things near by. Take, for instance, the latest view of the Apocryphal Gospels, or spurious lives of our Saviour, made up in early ages to suit the taste of the times, especially those that claim to give accounts of his childhood. These latter contain stories of miracles, which, instead of standing vouchers to his divinity, as in Scripture, and proof that the All-Good had been made flesh and dwelt among men, are there treated of as nothing other than preternatural gifts of a child, which were used like toys to gratify petty caprices and humors. In short, these spurious Gospels look so like a trifling with things held sacred, as must be shocking to the feelings of all persons with reverent minds. Yet, puerile as they appear, the writings, nevertheless, are valued at this day for the light they reflect on those dark centuries, showing the prevailing manner of seeing things then, the coarse, confused sentiments of the common mind in those early ages debased by idol worship and corrupted by the sway of a little restrained animal nature. Those earlier in date show too by the demand they created for like tales, how eagerly these poor fables were sought after; and this demand not failing to be supplied of course, the entire New Testament Apocrypha thus got pieced together.

Sometimes, too, though the facts in regard to events be not disputed, yet opinions concerning them and the characters that acted parts, are often altered and even reversed in after generations. Take, for instance, what might be called the most memorable deed in the profane history of the Ancient World: that of Brutus, the tyrannicide and homicide, who shed the blood of Cæsar, his friend, and foremost man of all the world, in order to restore the Republic. Martyr of Liberty, heroic self-slayer that he might bring back freedom to his country—thus was he.

applauded for long years after by the noblest minds. At this day, on the contrary, though the honesty of Brutus in the matter and noble-mindedness are no more open to doubt than then, yet few reflecting men will defend what he did. For who amongst mankind is clothed with authority to reach after the good of society, through breach of the laws that protect life from treachery and violence? Doubtless every one, however humble his condition, is in some measure chargeable with care of the common weal; for, in the large sense, the interest of one is that of all. But no man whatever can be so far answerable as that he may violate the first principles of order for the chance of some greater good to the people; for in such cases they must take the risks, many and great though they be, that their affairs will be made worse, and not better by the trial. In the case named, it looks as if, though mortal disease had attacked the life of the Republic, the lawless shedding of one man's blood could by no means have saved it. Now, nothing but the certainty of saving it—a thing impossible to be known—should gain any show of favor to such a deed.

Or, take the case of a name well known to modern times—Cromwell. With the main facts of this man's life undisputed, how has opinion changed in regard to the character, not only of the "monster of cruelty and oppression," such as he was named for eighty or a hundred years, but even of the "magnanimous usurper" of Hume. In our time, however, he is recognised as a man that dealt with the troubled world around him and the facts of his hard case, with a spirit so great as to rank him in history amongst those who have best discharged the trusts of power; not a small mark of the man being this—that he said nothing for himself, but left his motives to be judged, if indeed he was ever concerned about the matter, by what he did. Thoughts like these have had a share in causing attention to be invited to the subject of these pages; and the hope of making new again an interesting passage of ancient history, by trying to view it from the standing point of our own time.

After the Bible history closes, we read nothing certain about the Christians, except the short passage in Tacitus touching

Nero's cruelties against them, till they are brought forward in the correspondence here given. In it the master of the world and one of his first ministers come on the scene; and, strange to say, considering its low estate when the Bible history comes to an end, Christianity is the theme of their discourse, and is confessed by these great personages to be a perplexing phenomenon and hard to be dealt with.

From these celebrated Epistles we gather, that in the year of our Lord one hundred and seven, when or near which time they are supposed to have been written, the Christians were an obscure and despised sect. The Roman Empire stretched over the world, and had drawn together under one sovereignty all existing civilisations. But, whether Greek or Roman, Jew or Phœnician, all peoples despised the Christians, or else were utterly ignorant of them. And so every where, magistrates and people, priests and philosophers, scholars and men of the world, however apart in other things, were of one mind here; and this is made clear by the sort of mention they get in such scraps of heathen writing as have come down to us. Pliny's letter, however, is not the earliest account of the then new sect. We read of persecutions in Nero's and Domitian's reigns; yet so far as known, it was in Trajan's time that these obscure people were first brought distinctly within view of the philosophers and princes of the Roman world. It heightens the interest to remember that the Emperor and his Bithynian Governor were not only among the ablest men of their time, but high in all the culture of the age as they were in station.

Besides, it was a marked era, when the world had reached pagan perfection, an age which a great author pronounces "the human race to have been most happy and prosperous in," "when the vast extent of the Roman Empire was governed by absolute power under the guidance of wisdom and virtue"—in short, that of Trajan and the Antonines. Pliny the philosopher and man of letters, friend of the Emperor, of Tacitus the historian, and conversant with the most eminent men of his day, whom it would not be far wrong, perhaps, to point to as the noblest, most humane, and enlightened man of his generation, held the office:

of proprætor, with proconsular powers, in Pontus and Bithynia. Well, this was the man now brought face to face with the Christians in matters of life and death. They were arraigned on a capital charge, and he was their judge; and the letter to the Emperor now before us is what is left to show how the accused acted, and what their judge thought and felt. This is all. Nobody's letter tells their side of the story. All that remains we get from the other party; and he seems to have entered on the business with prepossessions against the prisoners.

It is now many hundred years since the Christians rose to the place of Pliny and Trajan, and became judges in turn. And most of their writers decide that, according to the account of the trial before us, the Bithynian prisoners were treated unjustly and cruelly. This seems the generally received opinion of after times. Yet so far as regards Pliny, it appears to be hardly a just or large way of thinking. For instance, the instructions asked of the Emperor were clearly prompted by humane tenderness and a genuine disrelish of cruelty and oppression. Let us remember that this proconsul was almost absolute here. Certainly he ran no risk of offending by severity; for the Christians had no friends at court or in the country. Yet he inquires, Are the young and tender to be dealt with like the full grown and robust? Shall not pardon be granted those that repent, and such as have ceased to be Christians? These questions read like a prayer for mercy—at least for leave to deal gently with the accused. But specially so, mingled with an enlightened sense of the office of penal laws, is the important question: "Should the Christians be punished for the name, though no crimes are shown, or for crimes connected with the name?" It seems to us that the idea started by this last question is not only in advance of that age, but one it took the Christians themselves many centuries to catch up with.

True we find that Pliny himself, in these same trials, took the guilt for granted on mere proof of the faith, and handed over the accused to punishment for nothing more than owning themselves Christians; but he seems to have followed the settled course, approved, as the sequel showed, by the Emperor, and

embodied in an edict to rule thenceforth. Yet even then this oft-censured magistrate warned the parties not to confess to a capital offence, and twice gave chance to retract. The "contumacy" and "inflexible stubbornness" of the letter were looked on doubtless as aggravations; but one may say, with confidence, could not have been the real offences the accused suffered for.

Now, after such scenes, do not Pliny's suspension of further proceedings, and letter praying new instructions, look like a sort of appeal against an indefensible law?

It also appears that during the trials, two poor women were put to the rack, in order to extort confessions; but thus it was that Bacon questioned Essex, in the reign of Elizabeth, when prisoner, prosecutor, and judge were all Christian. Let us say, therefore, his errors were of his generation; the humanity Pliny's. A Roman proconsul—synonymic with oppressor—seeks new powers, not to use for rapine and bloodshedding, but to shield the friendless from unjust laws.

But, dropping these things for the really important subject of this famous correspondence, does it not seem, as before suggested, that Pliny meant here to appeal to the Emperor against the law itself, or the construction put on it, by asking this question: "Ought a man be put to death for no other crime than his belief in matters of religion"? The Romans had ever been tolerant in this respect, as every nation was supposed to have gods of its own, and a suitable worship. Therefore, everything of the sort was looked on as an affair of nationality; and as a rule, the worship of subject countries was not interfered with. Now, when these things are kept in mind, the leading away of men to death, exile, and the like, for nothing more than adopting a new kind of faith, may well appear to have been repugnant to Pliny's gentle nature. What more likely, then, than that this familiar friend of the Emperor, his fellow philosopher and administrator of his laws, under cover of "doubts" and "ignorance," should contrive to put this grave matter squarely before him? Even a little appearance of flattery may be allowable wherewith to urge home truth on the great. It may be added

that if one accepts this as the true view of the affair, the other questions of the letter seem like mere pretexts. Certainly it never would have been doubtful what Trajan's answer to them would be.

Again, Pliny's professed ignorance touching the true matter to be inquired into, because "he had never attended any trials of Christians," could hardly have been real. Their being strange to him might have raised doubts as to the manner of the trials, but not of the object. Yet in this lies his difficulty: "What is the subject matter of punishment?" "Shall a name be punished, or crimes belonging to it?" The Christians were accused of the worst crimes, but denied them. Therefore, the proconsul inquires: Shall the accused be punished on suspicion and without proof of guilt? Is the principle of such a law defensible? Here is the point, and not ignorance of forms or other secondary matters.

These things sufficiently show that Pliny's actual difficulty was the law itself—its justice and humanity. There might, indeed, have been another signification in the words, "crimes belonging to the name," those, to wit, of endangering the established system of worship. Yet the governor's suspicions hardly reached so far as this, though doubtless the emperor's did. For his answer is decisive: "Grant any indulgence you will to the young and tender, dismiss all that repent, but punish such as are proven to be Christians. Do not place them at the mercy of spies and informers, nor hunt up accusations, but spare none convicted of that name."

It seems noticeable, too, that the new faith and the prosecutions on account of it, are referred to in the letter as things well understood by the emperor and taken for granted. Also, that the latter writes back in the same way, and sends the desired instructions. Of course, everything was well known before, both the parties and subject of the prosecutions. And as it was *his* to construe the law as he pleased, this reply to Pliny, or Trajan's rescript, as the name is which it is known by, governed all like cases during several following reigns.

Some writers maintain that there was no law against the

Christians at this time ; for Nero's and Domitian's edicts had been repealed by the Senate. This latter seems true ; yet there can hardly be a doubt that either positive statutes made to apply to the case of the Christians were in force, or else ancient usages, such as the common law of all nations is made up of. Pliny's letter proves that there had been like prosecutions prior to those he tried ; and the emperor's answer, that he too knew and gave countenance to them ; for, without a word of inquiry into the matter of suspicion, he orders death to all that profess the new faith. Of course, he was not in the dark ; could not have been, at least as to such of its doctrines as concerned the state or its ruler.

Most probably, then, the offence of the Christians was disbelief in the gods, such as Socrates was adjudged guilty of. For in a country where the popular worship was matter of state and upheld by all classes, avowed disbelief must needs have been held punishable as a public offence. So that before there were Christians or emperors, there must have been laws against those that fell away from the common faith ; and these could easily be made to reach votaries of a new worship, whom Pliny's contemporary, Tacitus, describes as haters of the human race.

Yet, as before observed, a merely foreign manner of worship was taken no account of among the Romans. Even the Jews that abhorred idolatry, paid worship to the one God, and held any other worship impious, went unmolested. In the Acts of the Apostles, for example, we find these people spread through all the eastern provinces of the empire, carrying their worship along with them ; for the Apostle of the Gentiles found as many as eight or ten synagogues in different cities outside Judea. But the Jews gave no offence ; since one chief comfort their religion gave the body of the people was, that no other peoples had any share in it. Of course, one of this faith was not molested ; for while he condemned all other kinds, he kept his own to himself, and did not desire to impart it.

Not so with the Christians. There was a dangerous infection in their doctrine, which, notwithstanding all the hatred stirred up against it, was spreading far and wide. It appears from the

letter before us that the secret fire which had smouldered seventy or eighty years since its kindling, had flamed out at last. "Great numbers of people" were suspected. Men and women, young and old, high and low, had seen the light—town and country were ablaze in the country of Mithridates. What could the emperor do but stamp out this flame?

The temples of the gods were forsaken, and sacred victims found no market. Trajan was himself a pontiff, and therefore knew pretty well what the gods were good for; and probably the worship lately sprung up, he no wise distinguishes from the impostures already familiar. And though as a magistrate he must have felt the importance of ranging religious worship on the side of government, yet the chances are that no notice would have been taken of the Christians, except for the disturbances that rose, and the necessity for putting them down and restoring quiet. These things give us a glimpse into the emperor's way of thinking in regard to what caused the disorders. He offers to offenders pardon or the sword. Pliny thought pardon would answer; the other sternly adds the sword to help.

Returning to Pliny's letter—one is tempted to conclude, after going over the whole and weighing what it reveals, that few more humane things are related of all antiquity than this appeal in behalf of the Bithynian Christians. What he thought of their belief can never be known, but there is no reason to suppose that he ever gave it a serious thought. In fact, we cannot doubt that this governor—philosopher as he was—disdained like his class *all* vulgar superstitions, among which stood Christianity, of course; while great value was set on the established forms of worship. Also, that he was instigated against the prisoners by informers, secret and open, and, as elsewhere, perhaps by popular clamor; that his power over their liberties, and even lives, was next to absolute; that he was disgusted and vexed at their stubborn refusal to renounce their faith for either threats or promises; yet that there was something so revolting in the way they were treated, that he stopped all proceedings, and sent a sort of protest to the emperor against the law they were tried by. The Christians had no friends; all that had influence with

their judge must have taken side with their enemies, and human life amongst subject peoples in distant provinces must have been taken small account of at Rome; yet Pliny's humanity and sense of right were good against all these. Now, when we gather up all the facts his letter brings out, some notion may be got of what made him pause and take counsel of his government before going any farther with the trials. As, for instance, that there were young and tender persons among the accused as well as the full grown and robust; that is, boys and girls in danger of suffering as well as men and women; that though the lives of these people were proved to be upright and innocent by others, yet we are not told that they set up any defence themselves, but that all their actions seem to have been a firm refusal of offers and inducements to deny their faith; that some suffered death for this, but others fell away; that it was those that forsook who testified to the integrity of those that stood fast to the faith; and that the judge took what these witnesses said for true, since in his petition to the emperor for clemency to the accused, he reports it without a contrary word.

This is what Pliny did according to his letter, and these the facts that decided his course of action. As regards the emperor, there is less light to go by. We learn from his letter that leave was given the governor to do as he saw best in all things else; but those convicted of Christianity, he orders peremptorily, shall be punished. Nothing but proof of that fact is needed. This is what the rescript imports; so it is clear Trajan knew the principles of the Christian doctrine and meant to suppress it.

Why is left us to conjecture; but it is easy to see how some of its teachings must needs have been offensive to the master of the world. For instance, it taught that the Romans were themselves the makers and not creatures of the gods they had sacrificed to for seven centuries; that before the true Creator, there was no difference between a Roman emperor and a Bithynian slave; that men's lives should be regulated by his laws, and not by the usages of other men; and that though the kingdom he claimed to form, concerned our immaterial nature only, and

took no account of force, still it commanded a higher obedience than any other.

But whatever the emperor's thoughts, it is not likely that he looked farther than the political bearings of the new faith. Doubtless it was classed in his mind with the popular superstitions the world was full of. For to such a mind, so trained and conversant with the Roman world, the idea of ruling nations on Christian principles must have appeared not only impracticable, but preposterous. Still there was room for uneasiness in the new spirit stirred up wherever the doctrine was taught; and if large numbers should continue to be drawn into such a way of thinking, there must needs have been risk of dangerously unsettling the popular mind.

Thoughts like these doubtless decided Trajan to stop the spread of Christianity by force. Hence the rescript and its stern command. Yet the full ground of his disquietude, that is, the extent of it, and the special quarters of the empire the new faith had spread in, it is hard, from all that remains of this ancient age, to make a plausible guess at. Bithynia was a remote province, many hundred miles off from Jerusalem. No special mentions seems made of it in the missions of the Apostles, nor of any early church planted there. True, it lay within Asia Minor, that famous peninsula throughout which the Greek tongue was now probably the prevailing speech. But there seems no reason for supposing that Christianity spread faster here than in other places—perhaps not so fast as in some. Yet see what Pliny's letter says of what was going on in Bithynia:

“The great number of persons in danger of prosecution—many of both sexes and of all ages and conditions are accused or liable to be—the contagion of this superstition has seized not only cities, but the villages and fields throughout the country.” Thus did the faith spread, and such the spirit it kindled on the far off shores of the Euxine, in the year one hundred and seven, or seventy odd years after the crucifixion. And so, as we may suppose, it was received with some favor wherever Greek was spoken. Perhaps it advanced more slowly where Latin was the language, and more gradually still in any province of the all

conquering empire where the vernacular speech held its ground still. Yet it was more than two hundred years after this before Christianity had risen from its low estate and spoke from Trajan's seat. It is even said that under Constantine, first Christian emperor, the great body of the Roman people had not become outward believers. This seems probable; yet even at the time the doctrine was rejected, it could hardly fail to root out polytheism by means of its new class of ideas, and the absurd look of the old beliefs when its light was let in on them; just as sunshine gives us to see things by reflected light, though men's backs be turned to the place it comes from. No doubt scepticism or indifferentism in large degree succeeded idolatry, so that when Christianity came to be protected by law, it may have been accepted less through conviction than indifference. Yet, as must be confessed, Trajan's early distrust of it was now fully vindicated. At last it had overthrown the religion of the state, and brought it to utter contempt. It *did* now command a higher obedience than any the state could enforce. It was found to regulate men's lives against all established usage, and to speak with equal authority to the monarch and the slave. But the empire was now hastening to its fall, and its ruins before long covered the earth. When this came to pass, it was seen that Christianity was not of like perishable nature, for its empire was over individuals rather than societies of men; so that after a thousand states, it might be the same still, if only men were unchanged.

And so we may feel sure that after long ages from *now*, Pliny's account of the early Bythinian converts will continue to fill men's minds with wonder and pity. Another seventeen hundred years, and the story will be read still: how they met before light in the morning, sang a hymn to Christ, and bound themselves by an oath to do no wickedness; how they then separated and met later in the day at the love feast, but gave that up when news came of its being against the law; how spies and informers hunted them down, and the judge tried the torture, and got nothing to find fault with, except a bad and excessive superstition. But the temples were nearly left empty

because of them, and there was no sale for victims. It seems likely that the classes interested, but chiefly the pagan priests, first summoned the Christians before the tribunals. There men and women, young and old, were tried, but found blameless in all things save this strange superstition. Yet this, on inquiry, proves to be the very root of the offences charged; and, oddly enough in that age, the accused, with death before their eyes, refused to give up their faith in it. A crowd of people, and of all sorts, had been informed against. Some are frightened by threats at the trial and disown the dangerous belief; others refuse to do so, and are led away to death. Who these latter were, what their number, age, sex, and condition, we shall never know in this world; nor anything else certainly, but that they held fast their integrity in this deadly trial. All else that can be made out with certainty or fair probability is, that among the condemned were youths of both sexes as well as men and women, and that these set up no defence themselves and uttered no complaint; but that there were others that did bear testimony to the virtuous lives of the Christians, whose society the witnesses themselves once belonged to, but now recanted their profession, and cleared themselves of it when brought to trial. Their evidence for those professing the faith of the accused seems the stronger, because the interest of the witnesses must now have lain on the other side. For having quitted the unpopular party, the way to regain their lost standing naturally was to blacken the others. Yet this course was not taken. They testified in such manner as appears to have convinced their judge that the accused led blameless and unoffending lives.

These are all the facts of our case. Neither evidence nor conjecture go any further. The one fixed and certain thing about it is, that in an age when the animal in man seemed to reign supreme on earth, and spiritual consciousness lay almost stifled beneath, these poor Bithynians held fast to their belief in spirit, and laid down life for it. Uncalendared martyrs, nameless immortals! Where they learned this lofty teaching no word of these famous letters tells, nor of the trust stronger than death those simple hearts gave to it.

It remains to be seen in what way the matters treated in these letters stand related to the New Testament history.

There had been a notable change since Paul the Apostle was sent in chains to Rome, which closes the Book of Acts, or the Bible account of the spread of Christianity forth from Jerusalem, its beginning point. The time of the Plinyian correspondence was perhaps forty-five or fifty years later. But the chronicle of Christianity during the interval is lost. We shall never know it. These letters bring us on traces of it again, though instead of learning what was happening from Christians themselves, we have to gather the facts now from parties that were viewing them with strange and unfriendly eyes. The proconsul's letter before us gives only a glimpse of their affairs; but, like a flash of lightning in the dark, it brings the whole scene vividly before the eye. The country is Bithynia, that lay on the southern shore of the Euxine Sea, and far off from any point the missionary to the Gentiles seems to have visited; yet away in this remote region, according to Pliny, the new faith was taking the country by storm. Young and old, rich and poor, town and country, were carried away with it.

Again, at the time Paul was sent to Rome for trial, the sect he belonged to was very obscure and despised. True, the governors Felix and Festus knew of it, and King Agrippa, rulers under Rome of Judea, and some adjacent provinces of small account in the great empire; but even these officers seem to have known it only because it had been a ground of disturbance within the sect of the Jews, and caused a petty trouble to the civil authorities. Now, emperor and proconsul are found in consultation over it. Instead of Festus, it was Pliny; Trajan for Agrippa. So that during the forty or fifty forgotten years, the obscure sect must have gone on gathering strength and importance. No longer, as in Paul's time, the cause of trifling tumult among the scorned Jews, it now disturbed the empire.

So it becomes clear that at the time of this correspondence, Christianity was fast spreading abroad in the country of the Bithynians, and by its spirit of opposition to the established order of things, had become a source of uneasiness to the Roman

proconsul, or chief officers in that part of the empire, and of solicitude and suspicion to the emperor himself.

And these letters are connected in yet another way with the sacred writings. Here we behold the beginning conflict between the kingdom reared without hands and the iron power of Rome, the coming of which had been made known seven hundred years before by Daniel, the captive Jew, to the king of Babylon. The Roman Empire, last of the four that were to rise and each in turn bring the chief nations of the earth under its sway—this latest and greatest of them had now begun to feel the presence of a new and wondrous power. And before this presence the prophetic kingdom of iron was foredoomed to go down, be broken in pieces, and become like chaff of the summer threshing-floor. These were the things foretold long ages ago, when the prophet interpreted Nebuchadnezzar's vision and showed to his astonished sense its hidden meaning—how that thereafter the generations of man should live under the dominion of four great empires, each rising from the destruction of that which went before, till the coming of a kingdom that never should be destroyed. The appearing of this last, and its establishment on earth, when in fulness of time these things came to pass in fact, are recorded in the Gospels. Yet the beginning of its resistance to the power of Rome—a conflict foreordained to end in the breaking to pieces and final consuming of that and all other human authority—this is to be found in the correspondence before us. Of all extant writings it is these that tell this story.

PLINY PROCONSUL TO THE EMPEROR TRAJAN, A. D. 107.

It is my custom, sir, to refer all things to you, touching which I doubt; for who can better guide my hesitation, or instruct my ignorance? I have never attended the trials of the Christians; so that I know not well what is the subject matter to be punished, or to be inquired into, nor how far to go with either the one or the other. And I have hesitated no little to decide: whether there may not be some difference in respect of age; whether the tender may not differ from the more robust; whether pardon should not be granted to penitence;

whether to one who only *was* a Christian, it may not help his case that he has ceased to be one; whether the name itself, even though it be free from the crimes imputed to it generally, ought to cause one to be punished? Meantime this manner of procedure has been followed in regard to those who have been brought before me as Christians. Confessing it, I questioned them again, and a third time, threatening them with death; those that persisted in the confession I ordered to be led away and dealt with. For I did not doubt that whatever might be thought of the offence charged, certainly unruliness and inflexible obstinacy deserved punishment. There were others of the like mad way of thinking, who, because they were Roman citizens, I have noted down to be sent to the city. Shortly the crime diffusing itself, as is customary when steps are taken to repress it, many kinds of these people fell in my way. An information from one who did not give his name was laid before me, containing the names of many who denied that they were Christians, or had been, who repeating after me invoked the gods, and supplicated with wine and frankincense to your image, which for this purpose I had brought with the statues of the gods. Besides they spoke evil of Christ; nothing of which, it is said, can they be forced to do who are really and truly Christians. Therefore I thought proper to dismiss these. Others named by an informer declared themselves Christians, and presently denied it; some said that they had been Christians, but were not now—some three years before, some longer, and a few as much even as twenty years before. All these worshipped your image and the statues of the gods; they also reviled Christ. But they affirmed that the height of their fault or error was this: to come together on a stated day before light and to sing among themselves in turn a hymn to Christ as a god, and to bind themselves by an oath not to do any wickedness, but to abstain from theft, robbery, and adultery, and not to break their word, nor deny a pledge when called on to restore it; which things being done, it was their custom to separate and come together again for partaking a meal, which was eaten together, but attended with no disorder; and even this, that they had forborne after my edict, in which by your orders I had forbidden assemblies.

After hearing this, I judged it the more necessary to examine even by torture two maid-servants who were called ministers; but I found out nothing from them except a bad and excessive superstition. And so putting off these trials for the present, I come to you for

advice. For it seems to me a matter for consultation, chiefly on account of the great number of persons in danger of suffering. Many of all ages and ranks, and of each sex also, are now or are liable to be accused. Because the contagion of this superstition has pervaded not only the cities, but the villages and fields. Yet it seems possible to arrest and correct it. Certain it is that the temples before almost deserted begin to be frequented again, and the sacred solemnities a long time suspended to be resumed. Victims are every where sold, which it was hard to find a buyer for heretofore. Whence it is easy to surmise what a crowd of people might be reclaimed if a place were left for repentance.

THE EMPEROR TRAJAN'S REPLY.

You have followed the right course, my Pliny, in disposing of the causes of those who were brought before you as Christians. For it is not possible to settle on a rule applicable to all cases. They are not to be inquired after; though if brought before you and found guilty, they must be punished. Yet, if any one denies that he is a Christian, and makes it manifest in fact—that is, by worshipping our gods—although suspected of having been one formerly, let him have pardon on repenting. But in no case of crime whatever ought an information to be received without a name signed to it; for that would be an example of the worst kind, and not in the spirit of our age.

ARTICLE IV.

THE CHURCH AND HER PRESBYTERS.

American Presbyterianism is now passing through an interesting and critical stage of its history. In one portion of the United States, the hazardous experiment of combining in one body two large and hitherto discordant organisations on the basis of mutual forbearance, creates anxiety in the minds of many of the friends of truth, whilst it flatters the hopes of others. In our own quarter, the spirit of reform has manifested itself in a strong movement for a revision of our standards of Order and

Discipline, the result of which remains to be determined. The extent to which the change may be carried was not at the first defined with very distinct limitations, and the Committee of Revision appointed by the Assembly entered upon its work with a large discretion and a corresponding weight of responsibility. The first report made by this Committee having been sent down to the Presbyteries for their examination was extensively considered, and subjected to the crucible of a rigid criticism. It was returned to the Assembly loaded down with numerous objections, many of which referred to certain changes in the statement of principles, which changes were condemned as violent and unnecessary. A second report, made with a view to these objections, and evidently designed to conciliate the approbation both of the Assembly and the Presbyteries, is now in the hands of these bodies for their final action.

The present aspect of the movement thus begun is deeply interesting, and of serious importance to our branch of the Presbyterian Church. For the question now recurs, in all its original force, how far it is desirable at this time to modify the forms under which we are organised. Shall the Church be satisfied with a simple emendation of a few defective portions of her system of government, leaving untouched and unimpugned her principles and her policy? Or shall she proceed so far as to review, alter, and improve her organism, in the light of experience, and under the direction of the word and Spirit of God? The inquiry is one that demands deliberation and mature counsel on the part of the Presbyteries. It cannot be answered by a course of abstract reasoning; but requires a comprehensive view of facts and obligations, of circumstances and duties, by which the Church must be governed in all her transactions. It is not our purpose in this article to push this preliminary inquiry to a solution. It may suffice in a few words to indicate some of the considerations which ought to influence our minds in our efforts to reach a wise conclusion.

We lay it down as a principle, that in all our investigations, the love of system, or rather our attachment to any one system, should be subordinate to the love of truth. In reference to pro-

posed reforms, it becomes the Church to occupy an humble attitude, conscious of her fallibility, suspecting her own consistency, and anxious to apply to her standards, as well as to her practice, the rigid rule of the word of God. The opposite spirit has had a deplorable influence in the past by stereotyping and rendering inveterate the errors of earlier times. It would seem to be one of the incidental benefits of the existing division of the Church, into different denominations, that these various branches may bear a mutual protest against prevailing errors. But this benefit cannot avail for the reformation of the whole body, without a candid and teachable spirit inclining us to mutual respect and attention. It will be a most encouraging sign for the advancement of the general cause, when each of our evangelical bodies shall manifest a disposition to hear the admonitions of the rest, and to receive those lessons of truth which they may be able to impart.

It is equally obvious on the other hand, that the reforms required by the Church should not be undertaken without great caution and deliberation. There ought to be clear proof and a general understanding that the changes proposed are according to truth. A restless spirit of innovation, having reference alone to considerations of temporary expediency, has often agitated the Church and rent it into rival factions to the great injury of religion; whilst the interests of truth and the demands of the Holy Scriptures have been to a great extent disregarded. Radical alterations in ancient and venerable ecclesiastical systems require much time and patience to ascertain their relations to the divine rule, and to prepare the mind of the Church for their cordial adoption. Whilst the ultimate decision of such questions is reserved to the judgment of our courts, it is both scriptural and expedient that the people shall have their attention called to them, and that the conscience and intelligence of the Church shall be exercised in their consideration.

But time and space cannot now be spared to discuss this important subject. Let us proceed to the more immediate purpose of this paper, to ascertain whether the report of the Committee of Revision, now before the Presbyteries, approximates to or recedes,

from the doctrine of Scripture. We confine ourselves to one leading feature of the Presbyterian system, the corner-stone of its distinctive organism. It is the *presbyter*, and not the *presbytery*, who in our judgment gives to the system its peculiar historical and organic form. And it is to the definition and functions of this office that our present inquiry refers. In the original report of the Committee, a marked change in the language of our standards had been proposed. The attempt was boldly made to expose certain inconsistencies in the law and practice of the Church. For example, in the judgment of some, no distinction could be made in the presbytery sitting as a court between the coëqual presbyters composing the court. And yet, in practice, some of the members are excluded from taking a part in the presbyterial act of ordination. And this distinction and pre-eminence of one class over another runs through the whole course of our ecclesiastical transactions, supported by the tenor of our Form of Government. The Committee sought to obliterate it to a considerable extent, by so defining the office of ruling elder as to indicate clearly their views of its original dignity. But this feature of the report was especially condemned and repudiated by the Presbyteries, and the second report comes to us with these changes expunged, and the new Book of Order continues like the old to preserve a wide distinction between the two classes of officers. Our own inquiry on this point is therefore limited to the question, whether it is a scriptural distinction to the extent exhibited in our Book of Order. A satisfactory solution may aid us in determining the subordinate question, whether the new Book shall be adopted or rejected.

The acceptance of the last report would commit the Church for many years longer to the present doctrine of the eldership, that it is distinct from, and inferior to, the *pastoral* or *episcopal* office. For it is clearly maintained that this latter office "is the first in the Church both for dignity and usefulness." And again, referring to the various designations applied to the ministerial order: "These titles do not indicate different grades of office, but all describe one and the same officer." It is indeed evident from the whole tenor of the Book, either in its old or its

amended form, that the ruling elder is regarded as inferior to the teaching elder in every thing but the single function of "*ruling*;" and this exercise of authority is so referred to as to convey the impression that it is a duty of subordinate importance. The present Form of Government declares that "the ordinary and perpetual officers in the Church are *bishops* or *pastors*, the representatives of the people usually styled *ruling elders*, and *deacons*." And the new Book holds substantially the same language: "As the whole polity of the Church consisteth in doctrine, discipline, and distribution; so the ordinary and perpetual officers in the church are teaching elders, who labor in the word and doctrine; ruling elders, who wait on government; and deacons, whose chief function is the distribution of the offerings of the faithful." The position of the Church is therefore positive, that there are *three* grades of office differing in dignity and importance, and *three* classes of officers whose rank accords with their duties. The number three, so much insisted upon in the Episcopal and some other churches, is, after all, a sacred number with ourselves; and the three distinct orders are still preserved with a tenacious veneration.

Two salient objections to this theory present themselves at the outset of our examination. The first is, that the exercise of ecclesiastical authority and discipline is *not* a subordinate function according to the Scriptures. The highest function of the ministry of Christ must, in the nature of things, be that of *organising and preserving* his Church. "The power of the keys" cannot be subordinate, because it is the fountain from which all authority flows. Upon it depends the validity of all the official acts performed in the Church by individuals or associations. The preaching of the gospel, the administration of the sacraments, the admission, government, and excommunication of members, are all exercised in virtue of this great commission. The fundamental theory of the Presbyterian Church regards this power as invested in her presbyters assembled in her courts, and jointly administering the authority committed to their hands. There is no appeal from their judgments; for the higher courts are composed of the same elements. The Synod and the As-

sembly are councils of presbyters, no less than the Presbytery and the Session. And in these councils no members can exercise authority in any other capacity than that of a ruling elder. For, during their sessions, the proper ministerial functions are not in operation. The ministerial class are not present in their capacity as teaching elders, but as ruling elders, on the same footing with the rest. By courtesy, they may conduct the devotional exercises and pronounce the benediction; but during the progress of the deliberations, or in the discharge of executive business, the body consists not of two classes, but of one, and each individual wields an equal amount of power. And yet these councils of elders are invested with the highest prerogatives known in the Church. Ministers and congregations, Presbyteries and Synods, are made and unmade by them. All the great operations of the entire Church are conducted under their authority, supervision, and control, and their transactions and decisions form a regular code for its future government. It is plain therefore that government in the Church is *not* a subordinate function, implying an inferior rank in those who exercise it.

It may, however, be urged that this supreme power is a *joint* power, lodged in the court, and that the individual members do not derive a proportionate dignity from its exercise; but that the dignity of an office depends upon the sacred character of those duties which are severally performed. While, therefore, the authority of a court may be superior to that of an individual, the immediate duties required by that authority of its several agents may be such as to impart to them a dignity which the members of the court do not possess. We admit the apparent force of this suggestion; but it is not substantial. We are not concerned about the actual impression made upon the minds of men, but for the intrinsic dignity belonging to a sacred office. And we maintain that there is no higher dignity in the Church than membership in its courts. For whatever importance appertains to the body is not subdivided among the individuals composing it, but belongs to them by virtue of the commission which, as presbyters, they derive from Christ. It is not membership, but *ordination*, that imparts the power and dignity of

office. And a presbytery or a session is important and venerable, from the sacred character and divinely authorised functions with which its members are invested. A false impression in regard to ecclesiastical transactions is often created by reference to the supposed analogy of political affairs. In civil government, a man may derive much personal importance from the fact that he belongs to a legislative body. But even here a striking exception appears in the British House of Lords, which is ennobled by the hereditary dignity of its members. And the same principle applies to our own ecclesiastical bodies. The presbyters are separately ordained, and invested for life with the most sacred powers; and the various courts in which they assemble for business are entitled to respect and obedience, for the very reason that they are thus constituted. The elder who represents his church in a presbytery or synod, is in no sense superior to his colleagues at home, for he exercises a trust derived from them, and is justly responsible to the session for his official acts. His appointment adds nothing to the sacredness of his office. He is a presbyter in his own congregation, and nothing more than a presbyter in any court of the Church.

The other objection to the prevailing opinion of the eldership, which suggests itself to us with much force, is the restriction of authority to associated acts. The power of "ruling" seems to be limited to the regular transactions of deliberative bodies. This limitation is just and necessary, if we confine the duties of ruling elders to the simple exercise of control over the household of God. But, in this sense, it applies with equal force to ministers of the gospel. By special provision of superior judicatories, the latter may be invested with extraordinary powers for extraordinary circumstances. And so might ruling elders derive additional authority from the same source. But in the ordinary administration of ecclesiastical affairs, neither of these classes of officers can properly exercise, as individuals, those functions which belong to the councils of the Church. But there seems to be some confusion, or want of discrimination, in the minds of those who have discussed this subject, in reference to the character of the duties that belong to the presbyterial

office. The impression seems to exist, that the English word *rule*, in its restricted sense, conveys a faithful representation of the original Greek. But we are not satisfied that this is a correct view. The Greek verb is *προίστημι*, which is used in various inflections, as *προεστῶτες*, *προϊστάμενοι*, *προστήναι*, to describe or illustrate the presbyterial office. It is true that the passages containing these words are usually appropriated, by a tacit assumption, to ministers exclusively. But even if this were true, the words themselves are, by general consent, regarded as referring to the "ruling" power in the Church, which belongs equally to both classes. And they certainly convey to us something more than the mere exercise of control. The composition of the verb implies guidance, direction, example, and influence. The apostle compares the relation of the presbyter to the Church to that of a father to his own family. And surely this paternal government embraces much more than formal commands and prohibitions, rewards and punishments. It includes *all* the legitimate means that may be employed in training a household to knowledge, virtue, and piety. The ruling function in the Church is, therefore, comprehensive enough to embrace all the elements of moral and spiritual power which the interests of religion require. And whatever it implies in one class of presbyters, it implies in the other; for, as rulers, they are admitted to be on the same footing.

These, then, are two very serious difficulties in the way of those who would maintain a wide difference of dignity and power between ministers and elders. They must prove that ruling is inferior to teaching, and that it implies greater authority in the hands of one class of elders than the other. But neither of these positions can be established on scriptural authority. The whole weight of the evidence is against them.

It is a significant fact, bearing directly upon this question, that ruling elders have no distinct scriptural designation; for the title we apply to them is admitted by all to belong to ministers of the gospel. It is difficult to explain this omission of a distinctive title consistently with the theory of our system. The text uniformly cited to prove the existence of two classes

stands alone in the New Testament. But this very passage fails to present them to the reader by a difference of terms. A periphrasis is employed, which proves that no nominal difference was recognised. "*Let the elders that rule well, be counted worthy of double honor, especially they who labor in the word and doctrine.*" (1 Tim. v. 17.) It seems reasonable to infer from this language, that no title was known to the apostle by which he could designate the class to whom double honor was especially due. For he would not have employed a circumlocution without necessity. But the absence of distinguishing terms renders it very improbable that any striking difference existed between the two classes. Such a difference as our system presents would have very early suggested the use of words expressive of the fact. So far, then, this negative evidence powerfully militates against the prevailing impression that ruling elders are an order of spiritual officers, inferior in dignity and subordinate in function to ministers of the gospel, who, by virtue of their office, are entitled to peculiar honor. For the usual interpretation assumes that two classes of elders, organically distinct, are recognised in the text. But this is by no means obvious. On the contrary, it appears to us absurd to require the rewards of eminent merit in one class to be paid to the members of another. The passage referred to may be more consistently interpreted in another manner. To "labor in the word and doctrine" may be regarded as the most satisfactory evidence of zeal and faithfulness in the discharge of those duties which the eldership required. And the apostle may have had no reference to the public discourses of regular pastors or evangelists. Much "labor in the word and doctrine" is assigned to the ruling elder of the present day, and he is expected to "rule well," not only by authoritative acts, but by exhortation and instruction addressed to individual members of the flock. It is not therefore a point to be hastily assumed, that two classes of elders are contemplated in this text, but most consistent with reason and fact to confine its application to that one class of elders who were ordained in every apostolic church as its spiritual guides.

We have further to consider those well-known passages in the

Epistles of Paul to Timothy and Titus, in which the characters and duties belonging to the offices of bishop and deacon are carefully detailed. Two alternatives are presented to us: we must either explain the fact that the apostle notices only *one* office distinct from the diaconate, or admit that a strange and inexplicable *omission* of an important class of officers occurs in his writings. How can it be explained? What plausible reason can be imagined for this minute instruction to the evangelists, in reference to ministers and deacons, whilst no mention is made of ruling elders? And how does it happen, that, in the opening of his Epistle to the Philippians, he addresses the "saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the *bishops* and *deacons*," without the least allusion to any other functionaries? We say with emphasis that this significant silence of St. Paul must be satisfactorily accounted for, or we must conclude that, in his view and intention, the two classes of elders were substantially the same. But, in our judgment, no such explanation can be given; for none that can be invented could meet the demands of the question. In our present system of church government, three distinct offices are recognised and treated of under different heads. Can anything be more irrational than to suppose that this system existed in the days of the apostles, and that St. Paul, in some of his Epistles, formally described the qualifications necessary for the first and the third classes, and made no reference to the intermediate one? In various passages, he labors to impress upon the Church some adequate conception of the duties and responsibilities of ministers, so that there is no failure on his part of a sufficient treatment of this sacred calling. But if we appropriate to ministers exclusively all that he has said in the Epistles to Timothy and Titus in reference to bishops or elders, we are compelled to encounter the astounding fact, that he *ignores* the ruling elder altogether as the subject of any formal consideration.

We are well aware that serious objections may be made to this course of argument, on the ground of a long established interpretation of the passages in question. So much weighty authority can be produced to show that the apostle had ministers

alone in view, that it may seem to many persons rash and inconsiderate to suggest the possibility of error. But this sentiment springs from the constant tendency of our nature to overestimate the *opinions of men*, and disregard the authority of *revelation*. The difficulty we have presented in the preceding discussion is a *stubborn fact*, which ought to be kept in view when we endeavor to investigate the portions of Scripture to which we refer. All that can be attempted in a single article like this, is to indicate some of the landmarks of the investigation; and we leave to abler hands the task of representing the apostle's instructions in a clear and satisfactory light.

Let it be observed, then, in the first place, that the language in which St. Paul describes the models of bishops and deacons is almost identical. In their essential features, the characters are the same, *except this one significant requisite*, that the bishop or elder must be "apt to teach." This therefore is the principal distinctive mark of the office, and the point to be ascertained is the *character* of the instruction which is here contemplated. If it is confined to the formal exercises of the pulpit, the fact is conclusively determined that ruling elders are *not* considered in this passage. But this cannot be conceded. It involves too great a difficulty, and unsettles the corner-stone of the Presbyterian system. And there is no necessity whatever to restrict the meaning of the apostle to such narrow limits. In his Epistle to Titus (ch. ii. v. 3), the "aged women" are required, among other godly exercises, to be "teachers of good things" (*καλοδιδασκάλους*), which cannot be supposed to warrant the employment of women in the ministerial office. We are not compelled therefore by the expression "apt to teach" (*διδακτικόν*), to infer its exclusive application to preachers of the gospel. Such language would indeed be superfluous, for it is required of candidates for the ministry that they shall be tested, prior to ordination, as to their qualifications to instruct and persuade others. We may very fairly and naturally give another direction to the apostle's meaning, and refer it especially to private personal efforts to enlighten and improve the ignorant and erring of our fellow men. To be qualified and disposed to this duty, is highly

useful and honorable in the Church; but we see no reason why it should imply an official dignity, or an exclusive occupation inconsistent with the duties of private life. And, besides, in the present day, when lay preaching has so many earnest advocates in various quarters of the Church, no sound objection can be produced why ruling elders may not be permitted to exercise their gifts in public speaking without reordination. But this is a question out of the line of our present inquiry. All that we now maintain is this, that aptness to teach is a quality eminently desirable in a ruling elder, whose acknowledged duty it is to visit, converse, and pray with the people, to administer wise counsel and spiritual admonition to ignorant and wandering members of the flock, and, in a variety of ways, to exercise an intelligent moral influence over the congregation in which they are appointed to rule.

When the apostle sent for the elders of the church of Ephesus to meet him at Miletus, he addressed them as *members and representatives* of that church: "I kept back nothing that was profitable unto you, but have showed you, and have taught you publicly, and from house to house, testifying both to the Jews, and also to the Greeks, repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ." This would have been strange language to be addressed to a body composed of ministers alone; but it is perfectly natural and intelligible when we regard it as intended for a party of elders, appearing in behalf of the church to which they belonged. Nor is this impression impaired by the exhortation that follows: "Take heed therefore to yourselves, and to all the flock over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood." These words are usually regarded as belonging to ministers of the gospel; but a little consideration may suffice to show that this restriction is unnecessary; for ruling elders are admitted to be "overseers" (*ἐπισκόποι*) in the Church, in fact, if not in name, by all of our authorities; and it is obviously their duty, as defined in our present Book of Government, to "feed" (*ποιμαίνειν*) their spiritual flock with spiritual food; or rather, in every sense, as faithful *shepherds*,

to watch over its welfare. The apostle, we presume, simply intended to impress upon the eldership of Ephesus a sense of their obligation to discharge with fidelity their ordination vows, and to persuade them, by a solemn and affectionate appeal, "to concert the best measures" and make their best exertions for the spiritual improvement of the people. The language he uses is general rather than specific, and conveys no precise suggestions as to the methods they were expected to adopt. This passage, therefore, when viewed without prejudice or bias, serves only to confirm our position, that St. Paul refers in his Epistles, under the names of presbyters, bishops, or elders, to all the *resident spiritual officers* of the churches for which they were designed.

As stated before, we regard this question as vital to the Presbyterian system. If the views we have expressed are erroneous, the difficulty of maintaining this system against Prelatists on the one hand and Congregationalists on the other, is vastly increased. If the distinctive existence of the office of ruling elder has no other scriptural foundation than the word "governments," as referred to in our Book of Order, and the slight allusion observed in the First Epistle to Timothy, to "elders that rule well, but do not labor in the word and doctrine," whilst those formal instructions in which the qualifications of elders or bishops are specified so carefully are regarded as exclusively applicable to ministers of the gospel, we may be challenged to show our warrant for such a class of officers, occupying so prominent a place in our organisation, and bearing the very same designations which the apostle applies to a superior order. It is fair to ask the question, *why* this title of "elder" is given to the representatives of the people, if it belongs with peculiar propriety to the ministry. If two distinct classes were included under this name, and only one was referred to by the apostle, the churches needed to be informed of the restriction, and saved by accompanying explanations from great doubt and embarrassment. And yet we discover no effort to prevent this confusion, and are left to mere conjecture in the pursuit of our inquiries.

A careful review of all the facts in the case, so far as they

are derived from the New Testament, would seem to justify the conclusion, that in every complete apostolic church, two classes of officers were ordained—the one to exercise *spiritual* supervision over the flock, and the other to attend to its *temporal* concerns. The former class, under the title of bishops or presbyters, embraced all those whose duty it was to rule and instruct the church, without restriction as to the method of such instruction, and regarding simply the great end to be accomplished in the enlightenment and sanctification of the disciples. In this normal school of the church were trained its future teachers, who were gradually distinguished above their brethren by their qualifications for the work, and were authorised, in the absence of apostles and evangelists, to discharge the more public and regular duties of a stated ministry. But although a certain degree of eminence was attributed to the regular teachers in the church in the days of the apostles, the same qualities and duties were required of all their fellow-laborers, the same designations were applied to them in the parlance and literature of the church, and the same authority was committed to them in its government.

If this is a correct representation of the ecclesiastical principles of the New Testament, it becomes the Presbyterian Church, in revising her Form of Government, to endeavor to conform its language more closely to the scriptural standard. As now constructed, three distinct orders are recognised and described in our constitution, in different chapters; and in the first, the various titles used by St. Paul in reference to elders, are appropriated to ministers of the gospel. The arrangement and phraseology necessarily impress upon the reader the idea of regular subordination, and the scriptural authorities for the office are referred to in such a doubtful tone, that a degree of *suspicion* is cast upon it as a questionable feature of the system. For the opinion of the reformers appears to be the principal support for its existence.

Two weighty reasons present themselves why we should conform our language more closely to the Scriptures. One is, that it is required by a just regard to the consistency of the Church.

In some parts of our standards, and in our ecclesiastical literature, we have long insisted upon the importance of preserving this institution as a necessary guarantee of the rights of the people. The ruling elders represent the congregations in our various judicatories, and by their influence guard the people against the encroachments of unconstitutional power. Why, then should the office be admitted only to a *doubtful* and *inferior* place in the scheme of the Church, and deprived of the support of those divine authorities upon which it depends for its dignity, its character, and its usefulness? But another powerful reason for reform is found in the false impression that is made upon the elders themselves. There is much complaint of their want of activity and zeal. This want, however, is, in a great measure, due to the belief so generally entertained, that their order constitutes a *lay element* in the government of the Church; whereas, in fact, the Scriptures represent it as a spiritual office, instituted for the edification of the body of Christ. It may be hoped, that when their proper place is assigned them in the house of God by the terms of our organisation, the incumbents of this sacred office will more fully realise their calling and responsibility. Who can measure the benefit the Church may derive from such a change? Instead of so many feeble congregations, now almost abandoned for want of spiritual culture, we might see new life and vigor springing up on every hand, under the fostering care of those spiritual officers who are appointed for the very purpose of cultivating the vineyard of the Lord.

These suggestions appear to us timely and important. The attention of the Church is humbly invited to them, in the hope that they may serve to guide us in a cautious and candid consideration of the defects in our present system. Let us be slow and deliberate in the adoption of changes, but at the same time resolved, that, when they are made, they shall bring us nearer to the principles and examples of the word of God.

ARTICLE V.

EDITORIAL COMMENTS ON THE PRECEDING ARTICLE.

We differ with our correspondent, the author of the foregoing article, but we also agree with him; and the points in respect to which we differ, though perhaps not fewer, may yet be of less consequence than those concerning which we agree.

In the first place, we differ with him as to his statement (p. 212,) that the first report of the Book of Church Order was returned to the Assembly loaded down with numerous objections, and condemned for its violent and unnecessary changes, and that this was the result of extensive consideration and rigid criticism. We are of opinion, on the contrary, that it was but little considered, and never loaded down with objections. The Church was preoccupied with the public calamities and distress, and never intended to pronounce the changes proposed to be violent and unnecessary, but was led to reject the Book mainly from being not in a condition to give them any adequate consideration. And should our Presbyteries be led again this spring to express dissatisfaction in general with the Book, it will be due, we apprehend, to the difficulty of having adequately considered them more than to any other cause. The truth is that the Form of Government and the Book of Discipline are weighty documents, and the revision proposed is very thorough and covers many points. And although what is proposed is simply a more logical and scientific development of our system, yet many of our brethren have not turned their attention to a consideration of them in time to come to a conclusion favorable to their adoption. To get fifty different bodies of men to agree to two long reports touching many different matters is not a task of easy accomplishment. We may add as helping to explain correctly the almost unanimous rejection of the first report by the Presbyteries, after the Memphis Assembly had with equal unanimity adopted it, that in the meanwhile it had become apparent that

our Kentucky brethren would shortly be united with us, and the general desire was not to make any alterations previous to their entry amongst us. In fact, we positively know that there were many who decidedly approved of the Book as sent down from Memphis, who yet for various reasons were disposed to have its adoption postponed for a while.

In the second place we might be inclined to differ from the statement (p. 214,) that it is the presbyter and not the presbytery which gives to our system its peculiar historical and organic form. We admit that our system is *called* the Presbyterian, because it is a government by presbyters or elders, and not by preachers; but we hold that no idea is more fundamental than that these presbyters or elders rule *in bodies*. The parity which all true Presbyterians insist on is the parity not of ministers *as such*, but of all presbyters or elders; and if that can be protected, the other is of little importance. It might be freely denied without fatal consequences to church government; for that does not belong to preachers as such. The official parity which belongs to all presbyters is in relation to the ruling office. It is in the courts of the Church that they are all on a par, class with class, and individual with individual. Now, this parity of all presbyters is one of the foundation-stones of our ecclesiastical edifice, and if it be taken away, the whole building is endangered. But another and perhaps a still more fundamental principle is that the presbyters or elders never govern singly, but always in assemblies. Both these ideas are plainly held forth in our present Form—the parity of all presbyters or elders in Chapter V., where it is said ruling elders are properly (that is *simply*) representatives chosen to exercise government in conjunction with ministers (who are representatives *and something more*, viz., teachers); and the necessity of the ruling by bodies, in Chapter VIII., where it is said that Scripture requires the Church to be governed by assemblies, parochial, presbyterial, and synodical.

In the third place, we can not agree with our correspondent in his opinion expressed (p. 214,) that the tenor of our present Form supports a wide distinction between the two classes of elders, and a preëminence of one over the other *considered as*

rulers. We will not call in question what he says of the *practice*, because that does vary in different sections of the Church; but we insist that our present Form holds up the parity, as in Chapter V. above quoted; and also in those places where it gives us courts composed of rulers; and also where it calls on *the presbytery* so composed to lay hands on ministers, and calls on *all the members* of the presbytery to give the newly ordained the right hand of fellowship. Of course it is altogether inconsistent with all this for our present Book to omit imposition of hands in the ordination of ruling elders. But it can not be admitted that the revised Form, as at first sent down, contained any different doctrine of the ruling elder from the Form in use amongst us. It was only more completely distinct and self-consistent. Neither can it be admitted that the revised Form as it comes now before the Presbyteries has expunged certain changes regarding this matter which the former report of it had made—much less that the Presbyteries had condemned and repudiated this feature of it. All these statements are made by our esteemed correspondent (p. 214); but we are forced to say that we think he makes them erroneously.

In the fourth place, our correspondent seems to us to be in error, when he states (p. 214,) that the present doctrine of the eldership makes it distinct from, and inferior to, the *pastoral* or *episcopal* office. Such is the theory of some individuals in our Church, and it may possibly be the prevalent theory in some particular districts. But we deny earnestly that our Church holds any such view, as we also deny that such is the doctrine of our present Form any more than of the revised Form. Our present Form of Government certainly answers to the Scriptures in regarding *elder* or *presbyter* equivalent to *bishop*, and the *ruling* power of elders to be the *pastoral* or the shepherd's power. At the same time our correspondent, we think, equally errs in denying that the minister's office is "the first in the Church both for dignity and usefulness." It is, we must believe, *immeasurably* the first in both respects; and this statement does not touch the question of *parity*, for that only regards the ruling function. Just bear in mind that the whole government of the

Church is in the hands of bodies of presbyters, and that preachers *as such* have nothing to do with it; and then you may exalt their preaching function as much as its preëminent importance demands, without any damage to the freedom of the Church.

Our correspondent denies (p. 218,) that there is any Scripture for the superiority of teaching to ruling. It is enough to quote the apostle's saying, they must "give themselves to prayer and the ministry of the word;" and Paul, that Christ "sent him to preach the gospel;" and that "God had set in the Church first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healing, helps, governments, etc.;" and that the elders who labor in word and doctrine are especially worthy of double honor. Our correspondent certainly gets upon prelatic ground if he means to say that ecclesiastical jurisdiction pertains to a higher function than ecclesiastical instruction.

Another point respecting which we must differ with our correspondent, is, his representing "the power of the keys" (see p. 215,) as if it referred only to the ruling, and not also to the teaching office. Certainly the keys are two; and while the one is the key of discipline given a joint power to the whole body of apostles and to every presbytery as rulers; the other is the key of doctrine given a several power to each one of them and to every minister considered as an individual teacher.

So far we have been dwelling upon points of difference. But we have now to say, that in almost every thing advanced by our correspondent in his last six pages, we very cordially agree with him, and would urge the especial attention of our readers to his remarks.

It is very clear to our minds that the theory which makes the presbyter necessarily and always a minister of the word, does leave the ruling elder out of our system; and that to leave the ruling elder out, or even to shear him of his rightful importance and influence in the government of the Church, is to turn it into a clerical domination and pave the way for prelacy, after which and out of which comes popery. We must ever insist that the true and proper and original presbyterate was ruling and not teaching, which was a separate and a higher function.

It is quite certain that besides the diaconate there is but one other office (that of elder or presbyter or bishop) which Paul describes articulately; and that besides him no other New Testament writer has undertaken to set before us distinctly the office-bearers of the Church. But Paul himself, after describing the presbyter in full, does, in the same Epistle to Timothy, divide this order into two classes—the ruling and the teaching elders. But we have no zeal at all for insisting on the number *two* being sacred, albeit prelatists do make so much ado, as our correspondent points out, about their “*three orders.*” In the Scriptures the matter is presented as we have stated it above; nevertheless the language of the Mobile Assembly will satisfy us, if it will satisfy those who have differed with us.

Our correspondent we think proves very fully that “apt to teach” (the only *oratorical* feature in Paul’s description to Timothy of the presbyter) can not have an exclusive reference to the teaching elder, but that on the contrary it is unquestionably the ruling elder specifically whose portrait is there drawn in full. And he sets forth in suitable terms the ruling elder as holding no doubtful place in our system, as that system is revealed in Scripture. That officer is indeed no “lay element in the government of the Church,” but fills a high “spiritual office instituted for the edification of the body of Christ.” Indeed, it is very clear to our minds that in a certain sense the ruling and the teaching elders are, to use our correspondent’s expression, (p. 220,) “substantially the same.” We mean to say that there is a profound philosophy in our Saviour’s constitution of his church government, which makes one out of two, as well as two out of one. The teaching office is immeasurably higher than the ruling, and yet there is a sense in which they who rule must *ipso facto* teach; just as on the other hand it can not be doubted that he who teaches must *ipso facto* rule. What is any decision which a church court makes but a declaration of what is the word of the Lord as applied to that case? Every court of rulers, then, does as such in a certain sense teach by ruling. On the other hand, what is the teaching elder doing in the pulpit whenever he preaches but ruling the church on a grand scale, and with that

almighty sceptre, the word of God, to which we must all bow as he wields it over our heads? This is no fancy sketch. The Scripture describes but one presbyter, and yet makes this one to be two; and so on the other hand the Scripture takes the two and makes them one by giving to both the one name *presbyter*, as when Peter, the apostle and teacher says, "who am also an elder." Again the apostle, in Ephesians, speaks of the extraordinary and ordinary office-bearers thus: "He gave some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers." Why does he not repeat the pronoun after pastors and before teachers? Why does he not say "and some teachers," and so complete the sentence as he commenced it? The omission is certainly remarkable, and it must have some significance. We are quite aware that eminent authorities have understood it to point out that ministers of the Word are both rulers and teachers; also that others as eminent have understood these terms to refer to the ordinary minister, and the doctor or professor in the church-school. But comparing scripture with scripture, it does not seem consistent that the presbyter or ruling elder can be left out here, for they are every where else set forth as *pastors*. And that is certainly a reasonable interpretation of this language of the apostle which holds that he means by this remarkable omission to signify that pastors and teachers are two classes of one order, and one order of two classes.

Touching the question of the adoption by our Church of the Book of Church Order, one thing is very plain: that Book is an honest and earnest effort to bring up our formularies of Order to the level of our doctrine of church government as actually existing amongst us at this time. The half century which has elapsed since the last revision was made, has been one of very thorough and lively discussion and debate respecting points of church order. Shall there be no recognition whatever of the progress made? Shall our Church, called in God's providence to assume an independent position some ten years ago, and again recently called still more solemnly to the mission of perpetuating the lately so much dishonored testimony of 1837 for Old School theology—shall this Church in the outset of her career, when ar-

ranging in other respects the platform of her external life and movement, take no note of the great advance in sound Presbyterian ideas during fifty years past? Knowing, as we all do, how far short our present Form and Discipline fall of carrying out the prevailing belief of our hearts respecting what God has revealed, how can we suffer these imperfect statements of his truth to continue the law of his Church amongst us? Our doctrine of the courts of the Church needs a fuller and more perfect exhibition. The nature and duties of church officers require more ample description—especially the evangelist or missionary demands to be treated much more fully and distinctly, for the ideas of Presbyterians have made large progress on this important subject since the year 1820. Then again the unscriptural method in which the Book provides for ordaining ruling elders and deacons without imposition of hands should be revised and amended. Such are some of the defects of our present Form of Government; and our Book of Discipline, it is agreed on all hands, is equally defective.

Now we do not understand our correspondent as objecting to a revision, but we do understand that for him the Mobile Assembly's Book of Church Order fails of going far enough in some directions. For ourselves, we have no idea that that Book is perfect or complete. No doubt it might be made better in various respects by more time and more labor, notwithstanding the vast amount of both which so many men have already spent upon it. And we do not doubt that ten years more might be well devoted to perfecting it in every phrase and every word. Moreover we do not doubt that a dozen different committees could produce a dozen different models for the Form and the Discipline, respecting which the Assembly might debate for years and years without fully determining which one of the dozen should on the whole be preferred.

It is indeed no light job the Church has undertaken. But the great and peculiar difficulty is that about fifty different bodies of men are called upon, and very properly, to state exactly what they do and what they do not approve in reference to a mass of particulars altogether many hundreds in number.

It seems to us that if the general character of the revision is acceptable to the Presbyteries, they will probably content themselves with signifying that, and *vice versa*; for there remains but one meeting for most of them in which to do the whole work of critically examining and stating their opinions. We hope there will be a thorough dealing with the business, even if it should require a fortnight from every Presbytery. We believe such a study of church government as this would help all our ministers and elders to understand their system better, and induce them to carry it out more fully into execution. And so we close these editorial comments with the earnest prayer that our Master and Lord may guide his servants into all truth and duty respecting this important undertaking, so that his glory and our Church's prosperity may thereby be promoted.

ARTICLE VI.

CHRIST AND THE STATE.

The powers that be are ordained of God. The state is a political person, moral, responsible; for to it pertain rights, duties, and obligations, which connect it directly with the government of God. It is indeed the organ through which that government is administered in its relation to man's highest earthly interests. Mankind every where, naturally and constantly, recognise in their various dialects, the personality and responsibility of nations, showing that this doctrine commends itself to the universal conscience. They speak of national virtue and national vice, national rewards and national punishments. So, too, the word of God addresses nations in their collective capacity, condemns national sins, and denounces national judgments. To say that responsibility, in its last analysis, is individual, is no just objection, but only a quibble; for though it be true, it is true of the individual, not as a disconnected unit, but *as so and so related*. Man is not an individual being complete

in himself. His existence is connected with and dependent upon others—not in one way, but in every way. His character—mental, moral, and religious—is formed by the influence of others. His very nature points to others. It is not an individual, isolated nature, but a relational, associative, civil, and political nature. A state of individualism, could such exist, would be destructive of nature. That is as much natural to which the necessities of nature drive us, as that which is born in us. Or, to state it in another form, the necessary developments of nature are nature—nature completed and perfected. Man's nature, then, is the family, society, the state, and the Church, (for the Church was natural to holy Adam, formed in the image of God, and engaged in the open worship of God on the Sabbath day.) Endowed with understanding, conscience, and will, man is, by his nature, a moral and religious being, the subject of the moral law; and constituted, also, a social, civil, and political being, he is also, as such, moral and religious; for his whole nature was made by God and for God. God made society and government as much as he made man. The duties of the second table, as well as those of the first table, he owes to God—to God first, to his fellow man next.

Again: being social, he must be moral and religious; since to deny to him moral distinctions would be to attribute to his nature elements destructive of society. Social, civil, and political relations imperatively demand the exercise of moral qualities, in order to harmony, perpetuity, and peace. Moral responsibility, having its foundations in man's nature, must also characterise every outgrowth of that nature, and so be indelibly impressed upon the family, society, and the state. Relational responsibility, family responsibility, social responsibility, national responsibility, are as much natural as individual responsibility. Relations are as much realities as individuals, and will exist as long. The Church as the Church, and not as a collection of individual believers, will continue for eternity. As a *Church*, it was given to Christ before the world began; as a *Church*, it was redeemed; and as a *Church*, it will be glorified in heaven forever.

As well deny the responsibility of man as deny the responsibility of the family, the state, and the Church; for the family, the state, and the Church are *man*—man whole and complete. On the same principle that we deny the responsibility of the nation as such, must we also deny the responsibility of the *race*, as such, under the covenant of works, and the responsibility of the *Church*, as such, under the covenant of grace. In both cases, federal being and federal responsibility preceded actual being and actual responsibility. By the one covenant, Adam and his race were constituted a federal body. By the other covenant, Christ and his Church were constituted a federal body. In neither case was there simply a collection of individuals. Adam's race was a party to the covenant made with him. Christ's Church was a party to the covenant made with him. Adam's guilt was not the guilt of the race because it was imputed to them, but it was imputed to them because it *was* theirs. Christ's righteousness is not the righteousness of the Church because it is imputed to her, but it is imputed because it *is* hers. For God's judgment is always according to truth. Under the one covenant, the responsibility of the race was not met. Under the other covenant, the responsibility of the Church was met.

They who charge indefiniteness on the term "national identity," would do well to consider if it be in their power to define *personal identity*. But the identity of a nation is, however, as real as the identity of an individual. The individuals that compose it, like the particles of matter in the human body, pass away, and are succeeded by others; but the body politic continues essentially the same. The identity of a nation is distinct from the identity of the individuals that belong to it; for whilst human beings *collectively* are essential to the existence of a nation, individually they are not; just as the particles of matter in the human body are collectively essential to its existence, but not individually. They, then, that deny personality, individuality to a nation, or call it a mere figure of speech, must, on the same principle, deny personality, individuality to a person, an individual, and call it a mere figure of speech.

Moral obligation belongs to a nation all its life. Sometimes

the obligation to punishment it has incurred, descends from generation to generation, until at length the accumulated guilt of centuries becomes concentrated in one unhappy generation, and the penalties due to the numerous offences of their forefathers are exacted with interest from the individuals then happening to exist. Thus said the Saviour to the men of his generation: "Behold, I send unto you prophets, and wise men, and scribes: and some of them ye shall scourge in your synagogues, and persecute them from city to city: *that upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the days of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias son of Barachias, whom ye slew between the altar and the temple. Verily I say unto you, All these things shall come upon this generation.*"

What a proof of the personality, responsibility, guilt, and punishment of nations! It is generally the case that nations are sinning most when punished least. They are left to fill up the measure of their iniquity. And so, too, punishment overtakes them at a time when they are chargeable with fewest public crimes. Rome had ceased to be an aggressive power centuries before her downfall.

A state which does not recognise its dependence upon God, is false to the law of its own being. Subjects that have no religion are incapable of law. If the tie that binds man to God is not acknowledged, the tie that binds man to man cannot be enforced. Every state must have a religion, or it must cease to be a government of men. Hence, no commonwealth has ever existed without religious sanctions. A modern author well observes: "Whether true or false, sublime or ridiculous, man must have a religion. Every where, in all ages, in all countries, in ancient as in modern times, in civilised as well as in barbarian nations, we find him a worshipper at some altar, be it venerable, degraded, or blood-stained." To the truth of this remark every student of history will promptly subscribe. It is a common mistake to suppose that religion is restricted to the Church. Religion embraces all the ties which bind men to God. "*Civil*" is distinguished from "*ecclesiastical*," not from "*religious*." Religion, of necessity, belongs to every divine institution—the

the family, society, the state, as well as the Church. All these institutions are from God; all are dependent upon him, and all are designed for his glory. As religion is not only profitable, but necessary, for the life that now is, as well as for that which is to come, so religion is necessary for the being and well-being of the state, to fit it to accomplish its ends. And therefore the state is a religious institution.

The design of government is to confine men within the circle of their obligations, and to protect the sphere of their rights. Laws are rules of conduct, directing men to the end for which they are created. Therefore, though appertaining to different parts and aspects of human life, they must partake of the unity of the end itself. Hence it is impossible to separate the fundamental doctrines of jurisprudence from religion, without throwing out of consideration the more excellent part of man, and the only permanent existence of which his nature is capable. The Christian religion, by teaching man the real end of his creation, has given him a clearer view of law, which is the rule of his conduct, directing him to that end.

Suarez lays it down, that all human laws are originally derived in some way or other from the divine law; and he cites this passage of Augustine: "*Conditor legum temporalium si vir bonus est et sapiens, legem eternam consulit ut secundum ejus immutabiles regulas, quid sit pro tempore jubendum vetandumque discernat.*" Zallinger and Domat deduce natural law from the two great primary laws of the Bible: Love to God; love to thy neighbor. The former observes: "Some writers on natural jurisprudence fall into error at the very outset of the science by taking a maimed and imperfect view of the nature of man, and referring all that man ought to regard in the observance of natural laws to this temporary life only, and to its interests; and so they deem themselves more philosophical, in proportion as they separate religion from natural law." "A rule of men's outward actions is not sufficient in itself for the government of mankind. This is so, not only because the government of men's minds, which are the most excellent part of them, is necessary even for the purpose of regulating their outward acts, but also because man

must be considered with reference to the immortality of his soul, even in regard to human government." "Not only external acts, but even the internal movements of the will are subject to natural laws. This is the reason why *intention* is material to the legal effect of human actions; and hence we see the connexion between natural jurisprudence and ethics." This shows the necessity for government to recognise Christianity as the only effectual means for accomplishing its end.

But it is not only necessary that the state have a religion, but equally necessary that it have the *true* religion, which only can convert obedience into a living principle. Falsehood and error are mighty for evil, not for good. Only that which comes from God can secure God's blessing and promote man's interests. A false religion incorporated with government, must ultimately bring it to ruin; and many such will rend it in pieces. A commonwealth can no more be organised which shall recognise all religions, than one which shall recognise none. The sanctions of its laws must have a centre of unity some where. "To combine in the same government contradictory systems of faith, is as hopelessly impossible as to constitute into one state men of different races and languages. The Christian, the Pagan, the Mahometan, Jews, Infidels, Turks, Hindoos, Mormons, cannot coalesce as organic elements in one body politic. The state must take its religious type from the doctrines, the precepts, the institutions, of one or the other of these parties. That the state should treat all religions with equal indifference, is to suppose that its subjects can have a double life, flowing in double streams, which never approach nor touch—a life as citizens, and a life as men." The state is not only a religious, but a *Christian* institution. Christianity is its organic life. It sustains vital relations to the Lord Jesus Christ. It has nothing to do with an absolute God, for an absolute God has nothing to do with it. It stands related to God only through Christ, the Mediator. For the Son of God, as such, being an absolute God, can have nothing to do with it. The essential kingdom of God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, over the universe, is administered through the mediatorial kingdom of Christ. It is only as Mediator that he

can be the head of the state. *For every relation, through which rights were conferred upon, and benefits enjoyed by man, was once forfeited by sin, and subsequently restored by the Mediator, and hence is the redeemed property of Christ.* The state, with every other conservative institution built upon man's nature, went down with that nature in man's fall, wrecked and ruined. It was once lost, then saved—saved by grace. It owes its present existence to grace. In man's fallen nature, no foundation exists for any institution that was based on his unfallen nature: such as the family, the state, property, etc. The foundation was quite taken away by sin, which doomed his nature and all its interests to eternal destruction. The institutions based on his original nature are therefore derived now from his *redeemed* nature—redeemed in the sense in which this world and all things in it have been redeemed by Christ—redeemed from present, if not future destruction—redeemed, if not regenerated. All men are the redeemed property of Christ, though all men are not the redeemed family of Christ.

To save man's nature, and all the interests and institutions originally derived from it, necessity required that it be committed to Christ. Christ is the Lord of man's entire nature, and of all its original developments. The state therefore owes its present existence to him, and should acknowledge its obligations to its Preserver. If creation imposes obligations, redemption imposes still greater. For nihility, which the former terminates, is not so far from God as sin, from the consequences of which the latter delivers. *Nothing* has no moral character, and offers no opposition to the divine power; but *sin* is the *infinite opposite* of the divine character, the invader of the divine rights, the rebel against the divine majesty, the eternal antagonist of God, whose government it aims to subvert, and whose being it aims to destroy. The rescue of a nature, the willing subject of sin, from merited destruction, even though it be temporary, and in a way that makes far greater demands upon the resources of Deity than creation does—nay, requires them *all*—certainly imposes far greater obligations than creation does. And every institution derived from that nature now rescued, whether it be of

temporal duration only or eternal, is morally bound to acknowledge its Redeemer, and to a greater degree than it is bound to acknowledge its Creator. The Godhead has, and can have, nothing to do with the sinner in his *civil*, any more than in his individual relation, except through Jesus Christ. To his very existence and preservation as an individual, Christ is necessary; and the more complex his relations, of course the more need of Christ's interposition, and of the coherence in and subjection to Christ, of all institutions which proceed from the manifold nature of man, and the various circumstances in which he is placed.

Although man is redeemed and restored by a mediator, yet such is the character of sin, the infinite opposite of God, and so altered are the relations of the creature to God by sin, that though reconciled and restored, he can never be so restored, as to dispense at any time with the offices of the Restorer or Mediator, but will need them forever in heaven, as well as upon earth. Thus the Mediator not only stood between the sinner and God when reconciled, but he stands between them now, and he will stand between the saint and God forever—the bond of union and communion between God and the glorified Church forever. The mediatorial person will abide God-man forever. The mediatorial throne will be occupied forever. The mediatorial kingdom will endure forever. The mediatorial offices will be discharged forever. The Lamb will both conduct the worship of heaven, and feed the flock of God forever. The passage in Corinthians, which speaks of the Son's delivering up the kingdom to the Father, so far from militating against this doctrine, establishes it. That this "delivering up," relates to the *trusteeship* of his kingdom, and not to the kingdom itself, is evident, for it is expressly stated, that when all things shall be subdued unto him, the Son also himself shall be *subject* unto him that put all things under him. But in what sense is, or can be, the Son "subject" to the Father, except as *Mediator*? The "subjection" of the Son establishes his mediatorialship. The first cannot be without the last. For as long a time as he is "subject," for so long a time is he Mediator. So

that the *eternal subjection* of the Son (which this passage asserts) proves the *eternal duration* of the Mediator's kingdom.

Man's very *nature*, then, with all that is founded upon it, being lost by the fall, and then restored by the Mediator, and its dependence upon him for its preservation being absolute, entire, and everlasting, it follows that every institution, based upon a nature that is for every moment of its being dependent upon its Restorer, is equally dependent every moment upon that Restorer. The State is under the mediatorial care and government of the Lord Jesus Christ. It is his subject. To him it is responsible. It is a Christian institution, designed to secure first the glory of God, and next the civil good of man. It is a monstrous proposition, that any institution terminates on itself or on man. In God, not in the creature, it lives, moves, and has its being. To ignore its Maker and Preserver, is atheism. To withhold allegiance, is treason. To substitute the good of man for the glory of God as its end, is idolatry. The state owes allegiance to Christ its divine King, and is bound to respect his statutes, and observe those which relate to it. "*By me,*" says Christ, "kings reign, and princes decree justice; *by me* princes rule, and nobles, even all the kings of the earth." "The kingdom is the Lord's, and *he is the governor among the nations.*" "Be wise, now, O ye kings, be instructed, ye judges of the earth. Serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice with trembling. *Kiss the Son,* lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way."

That the reference is to kings and judges in their official character, is evident from the passage in Acts iv. 26-28: "The kings of the earth stood up, and the rulers were gathered together against the Lord, and against his Christ. For of a truth against thy holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and the people of Israel, were gathered together, for to do whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel determined before to be done."

In the same character in which kings oppose are they to serve the great Mediatorial King. Herod and Pilate, as rulers, are commanded to own the Son. Dr. Owen well observes: "Judges and rulers, as such, must kiss the Son, own his sceptre, and ad-

vance his ways. Wait upon *your King*, the Lord Christ, to know *his* mind. If you lay any stone in the whole building that advanceth itself against his sceptre, he will shake all again. Dig you never so deep, build you never so high, it shall be shaken. Say not this or that suits the interests of England, but look what suits the interests of Christ; and assure yourselves that the true interest of any nation is wrapped up therein!" Alexander also considers this Psalm as referring to nations as nations. It deserves notice, too, that the Psalm considers opposition by rulers to Christ, to be opposition to Jehovah also: "The kings of the earth set themselves against Jehovah, and against his Anointed;" shewing that there can be no medium for officials, any more than for others, between Christianity and Atheism. He that denieth the Son denieth not only the Father, but the Godhead also. Opposition to the Mediator is opposition to the absolute God; for through the kingdom of the former, the kingdom of the latter is administered. Even heathen kings did sometimes acknowledge the authority of the God of revelation. The king of Nineveh, under the preaching of Jonah, caused his people to observe a solemn fast. Nebuchadnezzar made a decree, extolling the God of Israel, and threatening destruction to those who should speak against him. Darius decreed that his subjects should fear the God of Daniel as the living God, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed. (And yet Christian ministers are found in our day who deny that to be a duty, which even heathen acknowledged and performed!) "Say ye *among the heathen* that the Lord reigneth," is the command. "The *shields* of the earth belong unto God." "The earth is the *Lord's*, and the fulness thereof; the world, and *they that dwell therein.*" "Thy Maker is thy husband; the Lord of hosts is his name, and thy Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel; *the God of the whole earth shall he be called.*" Christ, the Redeemer, Husband, and Head of the Church, is the God of the whole earth! "O Lord *God of Israel*, who dwellest between the cherubims, thou art the God, even thou alone, of *all the kingdoms of the earth.*" "O Lord God of our fathers, art not thou God in heaven? *and rulest not thou over all the king-*

doms of the heathen?" "Arise, O God, judge the earth; for thou shalt *inherit all nations.*" "God hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, *whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds.*" "And there was given the Son of man, dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, *that all people, and nations, and languages, should serve him.*" "And the kingdom, and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom, *under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him.*" "And I will shake all nations, and the desire of all nations shall come." "Thou shalt also suck the milk of the Gentiles, and shalt suck the breasts of kings; and thou shalt know that I the Lord am thy Saviour and thy Redeemer, the Mighty One of Jacob." "All kings shall fall down before him; all nations shall serve him; all nations shall call him blessed." "So the heathen shall fear the name of the Lord, and all the kings of the earth thy glory; when the people are gathered together, and the kingdoms to serve the Lord." "Come near, ye nations, to hear; and hearken, ye people; let the earth hear, and all that is therein; the world and all things that come forth of it." The God of revelation—Christ, the Mediatorial King—addresses the nations. "The nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish; yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted." "Who would not fear thee, O King of nations?"

The moral law, in all ages of the world, has been administered by Christ. It was "*the angel of the Lord,*" as the martyr Stephen said, who appeared to Moses in the burning bush, and who spake to Moses on Mt. Sinai, and gave him "the lively oracles." An absolute God never governs transgressors by laws, nor counsels, nor threatens, but damns them at once and forever. An absolute God did not tolerate for one moment the sinners in heaven—the angels that kept not their first estate. And can an absolute God tolerate for one moment sinners on earth? Impossible! Reprieves, and laws, and counsels, and promises, and threatenings, all belong to a mediatorial government. And the addressing these to nations and governments

and rulers, proves of itself the existence of a mediatorial government over them, and the direct responsibility of nations and governments and rulers to Christ, the mediatorial King of kings and Lord of lords. And so the Apocalypse shews us the pouring out upon the NATIONS of the *wrath of the Lamb*. Civil government, then, is under the Mediator's control. "All things were created by him and FOR HIM." "The Father hath delivered all things into the hands of the Son." "The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son." "The Father hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the Church." This universal headship being *given*, points to his mediatorial character; for his universal headship, as the Son of God, is essential, and not derived. He is not simply "Head over all things," but "Head over all things *to the Church*." The headship of nature, providence, and grace are his. Possession of universal power is necessary to the interests of the Church. Power beyond the Church is *essential* to the existence, increase, and welfare of the Church itself. For the enemies which beset her are not confined to the false disciple within her bosom, and to the worldling and the infidel without, but are found likewise in the invisible world, and comprise the entire host of fallen angels, who are ever tasking the resources of their gigantic intellects to accomplish her destruction. It is needful therefore that Christ be head over them, to overrule their machinations and assaults for his glory and the Church's good, to make their wrath to praise him, to curb their fury, and say unto them, "Thus far shall ye go, and no farther." In like manner, they who minister to the welfare of the Church are not her faithful members alone, but mighty angels also, who are *all*, without exception, ministering spirits to the heirs of salvation. It is needful therefore that Christ be head over them, to direct their agency, and derive from it a revenue of glory to his name and of blessing to his people. The headship of the nations is his, for the interests of the Church in every age have been and are inseparably interwoven with theirs. Under the mediatorial government of Christ, the respect paid to the moral law, and their bearing towards the

Church of God, determined the prosperity or the decay of the ancient nations. It is true that their measure of light was less than ours, and consequently their measure of responsibility was less; and Christ, as head of nations, bore long with them, although their religions were false religions, and he did not immediately sweep them away; for their false religions contained some principles of rectitude in common with the true religion. And so he continued to prosper them (though they knew him not), annexing success to the exercise of virtues, superficial indeed, but necessary to the being of society, until his secret designs were answered by them, in relation to his Church, which is the great end of all empires, kingdoms, and peoples, and the entire system of providential dispensations.

The office of each of them in relation to her was clearly indicated by the providence of God, and their conduct and fate were shadowed forth in that solemn declaration of his word: "The nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish; yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted." This relation and this destiny have been set forth in graphic language by a modern writer: "Egypt was the nursery and school of the infant Church, where, by the discipline of centuries, a handful of wandering shepherds were to be transformed into a nation of civilised men, governed by regular laws, living in fixed habitations, possessed of all those arts and appliances that should fit them for their new career in their own land, and when this office is discharged, and she begins to regard this people as her own, and resist God's commands in regard to them, he brings them out of her with a high hand and outstretched arm. Assyria he uses as a scourge and rod to his rebellious people, though it was not in the heart of the king, nor did he think so; and when that purpose was subserved, the indignation of God laid Nineveh in the grave. Babylon was the prison-house in which the Jews were cured of their apparently incurable idolatry, and the nation of Israel was utterly dissolved. Cyrus and his dominion were made the deliverers of God's Church, and the avenger of her wrongs on Babylon. And when that empire had grown hostile to the purposes it was raised up to subserve, it was shattered to atoms by the conquering

power of Alexander. His conquests in their turn spread the Greek language and culture over all the East, and prepared the way for the diffusion of the gospel in that tongue, wherever Jews were dispersed that spoke and read the Greek language. To Rome was assigned the work of making commerce free and intercourse safe, of teaching the idea of law to a barbarian world, of binding together discordant races in one vast dominion, and affording safeconduct for the preachers of the religion of Christ through all the Roman world. And when she was no longer needed for this purpose, when her civilisation became effeminate and corrupt, and her religion superstitious, she went down before the hardy nations of Germany. Thus one by one were these great empires raised up to minister in their several ways to God's Church, and as they turned against her, and became unfit to advance her interests, were laid in the grave by a resistless hand." Thus did the Church determine the rise, decline, and fall of ancient empires. It is worthy of notice, too, that the Church imparted to them the knowledge of those fundamental truths and principles that constitute the moral life of a nation, which, imperfect and feeble as it may be, preserves its being so long as it does exist. Religion is the principal foundation and ligament of political society. And in that Church, which, upon emerging from the ark, possessed the whole world, the doctrines and institutions of pure Christian religion were found. These transmitted to succeeding generations, abused and corrupted as they were, yet held together the political framework of the nations. The religious life of the nations was continued and strengthened by contact more or less direct with the Church of God; and the increased mental activity thereby engendered was manifested in the progress of philosophy, science, and art. The learning of the Egyptians was proverbial. But it was principally due to the institutions established among them by an illustrious *Israelite*, Joseph, who held the second rank in the kingdom. By the king's appointment, he "instructed his elders or priests in wisdom," Ps. cv. 22. And in Genesis xlvii. 22, mention is made of Joseph's care of and provision for the priests, by assigning them portions, and settling their lands. That Joseph, in the colleges of priests,

and other institutions of learning founded by him in the kingdom, would be zealous in communicating to them the knowledge of the true God, and instructing them in the principles of revealed religion, we may readily infer from his tried character and eminent piety. Melancthon observes: "Egypt excelled in arts, and laws, and other learning; Joseph had planted a Church there; but after his death the kings turned aside to idols, and in the following times Egypt was full of idols and magic arts." Thus the famed Egyptian wisdom in which Moses was learned was derived in no small degree from the "lively oracles" of revelation.

In the days of Solomon, Egypt derived no little benefit from intercourse with the land of Israel. Clement of Alexandria, well versed in Egyptian rites, shows their resemblance to the Jewish: the Egyptian cantor corresponding to the Jewish singer; their sacred scribe to the Jewish; their sacrificing cup to the Jewish cup of drink-offering; their bread set forth to the Jewish shew-bread; their prayers, festivals, sacrifices, firstfruits, hymns, to those among the Jews. Serranus the philologist, in his preface to Plato, observes: "That the Egyptians retained many things from the traditions of the patriarchs, the ancient history of Moses demonstrates; and that they derived many things from the clear fountains of the Scriptures, which yet they contaminated by their own mud (or fables) is no way to be doubted." Pythagoras, founder of the school which bears his name, and who, according to Jamblichus, first gave name to philosophy, regarded with the utmost reverence by a multitude of disciples as an oracle in philosophy, ethics, and theology, whose *αὐτὸς ἔφη* was sufficient authority with them, was also indebted to the Jewish Church and Scriptures for all that was valuable in his philosophy. Hermippus, his biographer and a pagan, testifies that "Pythagoras translated many of the Jewish laws into his own philosophy," and that "he was an imitator of the Jewish opinions" touching God, the creation of the world, the soul, purification, excommunication," etc. Porphyry, who also wrote a life of Pythagoras, states that he had converse with the Hebrews. Vossius says that "out of a desire to get learning Pythagoras

was conversant with the Persian magi, and with the Assyrians, under whose government the Jews then were found. Many testimonies exist to show that this indefatigable philosopher pursued his investigations among the Jews in Phenicia, Egypt, Babylon, and Judea. Josephus, speaking of Pythagoras, says: "Not only was he well skilled in our discipline, but he also embraced many things greedily." The renowned Plato likewise drank of the sacred fountain of inspiration. Aristobulus, a Jew, affirmed this of Plato: "He followed our institutes curiously, and diligently examined the several parts thereof." Clement of Alexandria says: "Plato remarks, that 'God, as also the ancient discourse teaches, comprehends the beginning and the end, and the middle of all things.' Whence, O Plato, did you thus darkly set forth the truth? The nations of the barbarians, says he, are wiser than those. Truly, I well know your teachers, though you may wish to conceal them. *From the Hebrews you have borrowed both all your good laws, and your opinions respecting the Deity.*" Numenius, the Pythagorean philosopher, undisguisedly writes: "*What is Plato save Moses Atticizing?*" "Your philosophers," says Justin Martyr to the Greeks, "through the agency of divine providence have, unwillingly, been even themselves compelled to speak on our side the question; and now especially those who sojourned in Egypt, and who are benefited by the theosophy of Moses and his ancestors. For those of you who are acquainted with the history of Diodorus, and with the productions of other similar writers, can scarcely I think be ignorant that Orpheus, and Homer, and Solon, and Pythagoras, and Plato, and several others, having sojourned in Egypt, and having been benefited by the history of Moses, afterward set forth matters directly contrary to their former indecorous speculations concerning the gods. Thus, for instance, Orpheus, though the first teacher of polytheism among you, declared to his son Musaeus, and to other sincere hearers, the unity of the Godhead. We find him also adjuring the *Voice of the Father*; by which expression he means the *Word of God*; through whom were produced the heavens and the earth, and the whole creation, as the divine prophecies of holy men teach us. For becoming par-

tially acquainted with those prophecies in Egypt, he thence learned that the whole creation was produced by the *Word of God*." In like manner, Tertullian affirms: "Truth is more ancient than all, and if I am not deceived, the antiquity of Divine Writ has in this profited me, that I am fully persuaded it was the treasury of all following wisdom. *Which of the poets, which of the sophists, who did not drink altogether of the prophets' fountain? Thence also the philosophers quenched their thirst; so that what they had from our Scriptures, that we receive again from them.*"

Thus, under the mediatorial kingdom of Christ, not only did the nations of antiquity minister, in one way or another, to his Church, but their qualifications for this service were also derived from her. Out of her fulness did they all receive, and of her own did they give unto her. Conformity to the partial revelation they had, kept pace with their fidelity to their mission—the ministering to the Church of God. But the rejection of the truth was followed by the persecution of the Church; and this, sooner or later, insured their ruin. The light afforded now is greater than formerly; consequently the responsibility and the guilt are greater too. If the respect had to an obscured and distorted gospel must be taken into account when we estimate the former posture of nations and governments before God, much more must respect be had to a clear and perfect gospel when we estimate the present posture of nations and governments before God. And these positions are established by the moral law itself. The moral law for *holy man* included not only the law written on his heart at creation, but also all positive precepts given to him by God. The obligation to obey the latter equally with the former rests upon a moral principle. Positive laws do not create, but suppose a previous obligation to obedience. The right to punish a breach of these laws does not arise from the prohibition, but from the authority of the prohibiter. The moral law for *fallen man* still requires of him what he has lost by sin—knowledge, righteousness, and holiness—but cannot impart them; requires also the endurance of the penalty for transgression. The moral law for *redeemed man*

includes not only the law written originally on the heart at the creation, but also that further revelation of the divine will rendered necessary by the fall, and graciously given in the Scriptures. The latter is necessary to the former—means to the end. Without the Scriptures, there is, and can be, no obedience to the law written upon the heart. Revelation enables nature to accomplish its end. The moral law includes, of necessity, *all the means* that are essential to its end; and therefore includes *faith in Christ* and *obedience to Christ*. It has been said that faith in Christ, not being competent to Adam when created and so being no part of the religion of nature, is therefore not binding on any of Adam's posterity. As well argue that Adam in Eden, being unable to perform the duty of a father, and take care of children, because he had none, therefore the duty of taking care of children is not binding on any of his posterity! Adam could not relieve the miserable, for none existed; therefore his posterity are not bound to do this! But it is not true that Adam had not the *power* to nurture children, or to succor the miserable; neither is it true that he had not the *power* to believe in Christ; had it been revealed to him. He had power to believe every communication from God; and so the gospel, if revealed. He had the power to love and obey God in all things; but love and obedience presuppose faith. Therefore he had the power of believing all things. Angels knew a Redeemer before he came, by revelation, and rejoiced in it. And so Adam could have known by revelation from God his fall and recovery, and believed in his Redeemer. The principle of holiness in Adam and the believer is essentially the same, though circumstantially different. 1. Both are formed after the same likeness, *the image of God*: "God created man in his own image." "Put ye on the *new man*, which, *after God*, is created in *righteousness and true holiness*. There cannot be two specifically different images of the same original. 2. Both are a conformity to the same standard, the moral law. 3. The terms used to describe the one imply that it is of the same nature as the other. Conversion is a *return* to God. Regeneration is styled a washing, implying the restoration of the soul to lost purity. 4. Supreme love to

God is acknowledged to be the principle of man in innocence. This principle, if possessed, would lead a fallen creature to embrace the gospel. Guilty man cannot love and serve God. Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to the believer. The obligation that is on man, as man, to love God and obey his law, is therefore now the obligation to believe in Christ, in whose person the believer rendered a perfect obedience to the law as a covenant of works, and from union to whom the believer is enabled by the Holy Spirit dwelling within him to obey the law as a rule of life. Thus the obligation that perpetually binds man to obey God, binds the sinner to believe in Christ, in order to obey God. And so the Saviour said to the Jews: "I know you that ye have not the *love of God* in you. I am come in my Father's name, and ye *receive me not*;" showing that "receiving Christ" is "the love of God," otherwise the neglect of the one would be no proof of the lack of the other. It was Christ who republished the moral law on Sinai, and who uttered as the very first command those solemn words: "Thou shalt have no other gods *before me*."

Christianity is necessary to the existence and well-being of society and the state; for law supplies no power to fallen man to obey its commands. It points out duty, but furnishes no ability to perform it. Some conservative influences outside of law are necessary for this, and those influences proceed from the Spirit of Christ. The gospel, in the hands of the Spirit, is the only conservator of law, of society, and the state.

Jehovah, through his prophet Habakkuk, denounces the pride and ambition of the heathen monarchs, Nebuchadnezzar, Belshazzar, and others, and proclaims the judgments that awaited them. He shows what is destructive of national greatness, and what is requisite for national security: "Behold, his soul which is lifted up, is not upright in him; *but the just shall live by his faith*." "Justification" and "faith" are connected with *national*, as well as with *individual life*. Unrighteousness on the part of a prince or people will destroy them. Righteousness only exalteth a nation. But whence is that righteousness? It comes not from within, but from above—not from man, but from God. It is

that righteousness, as the prophet shows, which is the matter of *justification*, and which is received through *faith*, even Christ's righteousness; accompanied by the conservative influences of the Spirit, who only can generate those virtues that are essential to the permanence of society and government. "*The just shall live by his faith*," or as the pointing is, "The justified by faith shall live." Christianity is the only religion that can save a nation. Lord Bacon observes, "There never was found in any age of the world, either philosophy, or sect, or religion, or law, or discipline, which did so highly exalt the public good, as the Christian faith. Whence it is very evident, that one and the same God gave to his creatures the laws of nature, and to men the law of Christianity." (De Aug. Sci.) Great stress is laid upon the "light of nature" and "natural religion" by certain divines in our day, as well as by sceptics. But no one, either of the former or latter class, has instructed us what they mean precisely by these terms so convenient for them to use, though not to define, and what is embraced in them. How comes it to pass, that a theory of pure deism was never presented, and a platform of natural religion never constructed, without the aid of the Scriptures? And this has been done generally, not by infidels, but by believers in Christianity. They supposed that they were following the mere light of nature, when in truth they were walking in the broad daylight of Revelation. Lord Herbert, the most consistent of Deists, presented in his treatises, "*De Religione Gentilium*" and "*De Religione Laici*," his system of natural religion. But it was borrowed from the Scriptures, to which he refers as a source of information. (Tucker shrewdly observes: "I think I have found on conversing with unbelievers that they have more of the Christian in them than they know of themselves.") His system cost him much labor, he tells us, and yet he considered it suited for universal acceptance! If this be the system of universal religion, why does it not spontaneously present itself to the universal intelligence of the race? Whence the necessity of labor to prove it? That of itself refutes its pretensions! And if it cost him, a scholar, so much study to discover it, what must become of the masses who have

neither inclination, nor time, for such investigations? The fact is, that all such writers have, as was well said, "with true philosophical gratitude, bedecked their reason with garlands stolen from the tree of life and given themselves credit for the gift of God." On the part of Christian defenders of natural religion, most of their mistakes are due to the common but erroneous distinction between "natural" and "revealed" religion. The true distinction is between "natural" and "supernatural" religion: and both of these are *revealed*. By natural religion is meant the religion of man *before* the fall. By supernatural religion is meant the religion of man *after* the fall. Those doctrines which were known to Adam before he sinned, constitute the system of natural religion. Those doctrines which were known to man after he sinned, constitute the system of supernatural religion. The former were revealed to him equally with the latter. The light of nature or reason was not a sufficient guide to Adam, even in a state of innocence. It was not a perfect rule even then. For though man was free from the imperfection which results from *sin*, yet not from the imperfection which attaches to *creatureship*. Had Adam's reason been an all-sufficient guide, he would not have needed any directions as to what he was to do, but would without assistance have discharged his entire duty. But this was far from being the case. He did need special instruction; and he received it. Several truths were revealed to him. How, but by revelation, did he know of such a creation of his wife as to pronounce her flesh of his flesh and bone of his bone? that dominion was given him over all creatures? that he was to till the soil, and that herbs and fruit should be his food? that he was forbidden to eat of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, on pain of death? that he should perform instituted worship, and observe the seventh day as a day of sacred rest? How, but by revelation, did he know God as subsisting in three persons? how did he know the Trinity? whom he *must* have known—otherwise he was an idolater and his worship could not be accepted. How did he know the immortality of the soul, and a future state of rewards and punishments, but by that covenant which was made with him, containing revealed truth

embraced in the promise of life on the one hand, and the threatening of death on the other? Here then were special revelations from God to Adam, which would not have been given if not necessary, and which could not be necessary if reason were a complete guide. And if revelation before the fall necessarily entered into natural religion, there can be of course no distinction between them. If reason at its best estate required the aid of revelation, can it dispense with it now at its worst? What has it done for its votaries who worship it as their god? Has it led them to the knowledge of any great fundamental truth in religion? Has it even convinced them of the existence of a Deity? No, indeed. The idea of a God is not "innate" in the mind. There never was a man known or heard of who had the idea of a God without being taught it. Children always need to be taught it. There are instances of persons born deaf and dumb who never had it. Travellers tell us of nations who do not have it. Even in this land, in the nineteenth century, there are not a few *now* who have no idea of a God! It is one thing to demonstrate the reasonableness of an idea after it is once made known, and quite another thing to originate it ourselves. No one would have considered the creation as an *effect*, had he never heard of a *cause*. Even a Plato acknowledged that the idea of a God can never be discovered by reason, and candidly admits that it was learned by tradition from the barbarians, meaning the Jews. Whole sects of philosophers denied the very being of a God. And some died martyrs to Atheism, as Vaninus, Jordanus, Bruno, and others. And those who admitted his existence believed him to be altogether such as themselves, subject to the same passions. The idea was even *lost* after it had been revealed; willingly, culpably lost. The apostle declares that the heathen world "*did not like to retain the knowledge of God.*" They "*suppressed the truth in unrighteousness.*" They were without excuse. Ever since the creation of the world, the being and power of God had been revealed to men. (Rom. i. 20, "from the creation of the world;" ἀπὸ not ἐκ, referring to *time*, as in eighty-four other places in Scripture, and so considered here by Beza, Erasmus, Piscator, Vatablus, Valla, Winer, Robinson,

Hammond, Whitby, Olshausen, Alford, Hodge, David Brown, and others. The apostle refers to the work of creation, not as an explanation of the origin of the idea of God, but as corroborating and illustrating the original revelation of God to man.) The heavens declared the glory of God; but they were blind, willingly blind, and did not see it. The light shineth in darkness, but the darkness comprehendeth it not. Tholuck well observes: "An impartial examination of heathenism will afford the important result, that heathenism is a *corrupted truth*, a divine utterance, heard falsely, which in its own nature comes from God." The tendency of fallen nature being downward—from God, not to God—abusing and willingly losing the revelation made to it, proves the unreasonableness of attributing it to the power of *discover* unwelcome and hated truth. Do men have, originally, a conception of that God whom they "do not like to *retain* in their knowledge," after he is made known to them? Did that nature, which from its first existence "loves darkness rather than light," yet, of itself, apprehend somehow the hated light? Nothing but the restraining hand of a gracious Providence laid upon the mind of man kept a fallen world from universal atheism, devilism, and perdition. Separated from God, all nature's instincts lead to corruption and death. What are termed the "instincts of nature" are just the promptings or the aversions which God, by the insensible methods of his providence or *common grace*, has implanted in the hearts of men. Culvernel, one of the most eminent defenders of the "light of nature," which he styles "the candle of the Lord," is yet compelled to make concessions fatal to his theory. "It is true, they do not follow the candle of the Lord, for then reason would have guided them better. But this very consideration shows the weakness of their candle-light, for if it had been brighter *it would not have been so soon put out.*" "Sin entered in first at a corporeal, then at an intellectual window, and stole away the heart, *and the windows have been broken ever since.*" "Those laws which nature had engraven 'upon the tables of their hearts,' *sin, like a moth, had eaten and defaced,* as in all other men it had done; but in them, those fugitive letters were called home again, and those

many 'blanks' were supplied and made good again, by comparing it with the other copy (of God's own writing too) which Moses received in the mount." Then, in support of his theory, he goes off in this strain: "Some will grant that the Gentiles had their candle and their torch, but it was lighted at the Jews' sun. They may have some bottles of water to quench their thirst, but they must be filled at their streams. Say some, Pythagoras lighted his candle there, and Plato lighted his candle at theirs. But what, did they borrow common notions of them? Did they borrow any copies of nature's law from them? Was this 'written law' only some Jewish manuscript which they translated into Greek?" But, if "sin, like a moth, had eaten and defaced" these common notions, whence come they now, if not from the light of an original revelation? "*I never* heard," says he, "of a nation apostatising from common notions." "You will scarce find any nation that did generally and expressly, and for long continuance, either violate or countenance the violation of any precept clearly natural." These assertions are directly in the face of Paul's declarations touching the Gentile world in his Epistle to the Romans. "All the more civilised and renowned nations gave due obedience to nature's law." This argument is on the other side. And why was this the case with them, so far as it was true of them? Because under the universal kingdom of the Mediator, the ordinary influences of the Spirit, in nature and providence, preserve in the minds of all nations some traces of the moral law originally engraved upon the heart, but obliterated by the fall, and now restored by him, for maintaining the sense of their responsibility, and for securing the coherence of society, all with reference to the divine plans for the coming of the kingdom of God. The remark of Colliber is true and just: "It is no difficult matter to make appear from the testimony of former ages, that there has actually been an ancient, immemorial tradition of the formation of the world by a beneficent, wise, and most powerful Being: which tradition alone was sufficient to diffuse the principles of religion as universally as the pretended innate idea is conceived to have done."

Revelation having entered into natural religion, and being

necessary to it, as we saw, even in a state of innocence, it follows that to oppose natural religion to revelation, is to overthrow it. And so it has always happened, that a disbelief of Christianity in particular, was followed by a disbelief of religion in general. Not to come to Christ, is to depart from the living God. Hence the votaries of natural religion are found characterised by a determined hostility or a settled contempt for all that is sacred—not merely for the gospel of Christ, but for all that relates to the belief and the service of the living God. To avoid the odium attached to the name “Atheist” which was previously given, and justly, to all unbelievers in Christianity, the name *Deist* was assumed, by this class, in the middle of the sixteenth century. Viret, in his Epistle Dedicatory of his “Christian Instruction,” states that these men, though they put on this mask, and accommodated themselves to the religion of those with whom they were obliged to live, though they professed to admit the existence of a God and the immortality of the soul, were nevertheless in the habit of *ridiculing all religion* as the dream of folly, or of reprobating it as the offspring of fraud or priestcraft. So that the system of the hypocritical Deist was invented by him simply as a pretext for being altogether irreligious and for living without God, as he was living without Christ in the world. So too, in after times, we find a Bolingbroke denying goodness and justice to God; a Hume denying God to be wise and good; a Hobbes affirming virtue as vice, creator and creature to be terms invented by men, not realities; Voltaire, D’Alembert, Mirabeau, Diderot, all declaring, “No God, no responsibility, no rewards and punishments, no world to come!” It follows, then, that to build the state, not upon Christianity, but upon “natural law” or “natural religion,” is to build it upon *Atheism*, the destruction of all law, all religion, all morality, all virtue, all happiness! It is said: “Without the Bible, enough can be known of God’s eternal power and godhead to ground the responsibility of natural religion and ethics.” Even were it true, which it is not, that without revelation “enough can be known,” the question is, IS “enough known” by fallen man? Does not the apostle shew that the heathen first abused,

then lost the knowledge of God as creator, and worshipped and served the *creature* rather than the Creator? And if idolatry were permitted by God to have *any where* its *full* influence, without the restraint of his Spirit acting in providence, without a particle of that indirect influence which belongs to the system of Christianity, where, we ask, could be found the foundations for society, for law, and for government? Is such a case possible, even? Produce it, if you can, and do not point us to nations which owe their continuance, so long as they do continue, to those conservative influences connected with that remnant of revelation they have handed down from generation to generation. But, it is said, "Pagan Rome had a legitimate government, for Christians were enjoined to render her conscientious allegiance." "Legitimate," *providentially*; for the mediatorial King, whom she knew not, used her for the accomplishment of his purposes, and the interests of his kingdom—sometimes making her "the rod of his anger," wherewith to correct his erring Church, to submit to which was to submit to him—and kept her in being until she had accomplished all her mission, and so enjoined upon his people subjection, for he was her head, and she was made by him to afford protection to them, and they were made to pray for her, especially as hindering the development of the man of sin, that most fearful enemy of the Church, which could not accomplish its purpose until the Roman government were "taken out of the way." But not "legitimate," scripturally, (*i. e.*, not conformed to the scriptural model,) else why her decline and fall? If possessed of "the righteousness which exalteth a nation," would she not have continued?

If by the "law of nature" be meant the sum of those moral rules discoverable by reason, then, as one man's reason reaches further than another's, what is obligation to one is not obligation to another. The law is by no means fixed and uniform—therefore, imperfect; nay, the wisest philosophers have frequently contradicted each other, and have sometimes been wrong on both sides,—another proof that the law of nature is imperfect. Again, to give this law effect, obedience must be secured by proper rewards and punishments, which, if not dis-

tributed sufficiently in this life, must be expected in another. But how many philosophers even were persuaded of a future state? And what of the multitude? So that the uncertainty of the sanction proves again the law of nature to be imperfect.

What state ever owed its existence and preservation solely to the truths supposed to be contained in natural religion, and not to the influences of those truths which are derived from revelation? The state owes its life to the gospel. The very earth owes its continuance to the gospel. The new grant of the earth to Noah was founded on the covenant of grace. Every nation—the whole world—has had the gospel. The institutions still in force among heathen nations prove it. So that they are not under “natural law” solely, and never were. And it deserves to be considered, how much the doctrines of revelation, though distorted among them, have to do, in maintaining their social organisation and government. Belief in a God and in a future state of rewards and punishments, is not enough. For the heathen universally acknowledge *guilt*, and have recourse to *sacrifices* to propitiate their offended deities. Hence the doctrine of the atonement is their only hope of safety. Were it not for this, their future prospect would be one of punishment solely. But *fear alone* will not lead men to the practice of those virtues that are essential to social order, nor restrain them from indulgence in those vices that are destructive of it. Fear alone leads to despair, and despair generates lawlessness and crime. And this is *death* to society. Thus, the doctrine of the atonement underlies heathen society and government. And whence is that doctrine derived? Nature knows nothing of it. It is found in that system of revealed truth which has been in the possession of the race since the fall of man,—in that gospel which descended from Adam to Noah, and from Noah, the second father of the human family, to the various nations of the earth.

Thus are both the indebtedness and the responsibility of the whole world to the gospel evinced. And if that gospel does not wield its legitimate influence over the consciences and the hearts of men, not only as church members, but also as citizens, then.

are they threatened with the most terrible calamity that can possibly befall them—the withdrawal of God's Spirit, and consequent blindness of mind and hardness of heart. Better, far better, that the genial influences of the atmosphere should be suspended; better, far better, that the heavens above us should be brass, and the earth beneath us be iron, than that the soul-quickenings, life-giving influences of the Spirit of God should be taken away! And what can be expected of a country whose government does not acknowledge the headship of Christ, but that it be cursed with desecrated Sabbaths, abandoned sanctuaries, abounding ungodliness, and desolating judgments? The stream cannot rise higher than its source. "If the state is to be rescued from the darkest dangers that threaten it, we must preach Christ. Christ, not merely as the supreme revelation of God; Christ, not merely as the sacrifice for human sin; Christ, not merely as the Head of the Church; but Christ, as the Ruler of all men, the Regenerator of nations, the Saviour of society."

And what can be expected of a government whose constitution, like that of the American government, contains not even *the name* of God? In the year 1793, that eminent man, faithful witness to the truth, and pure patriot, Dr. John M. Mason, addressed the following words of warning to his countrymen: "That very constitution which the singular goodness of God enabled us to establish, does not so much as recognise *his being*! Yes, my brethren, it is a lamentable truth—a truth, at the mention of which shame should crimson our faces—that, like Jeshurun of old, we have 'waxed fat and kicked.' 'Of the Rock that begat us, we have been unmindful; we have forgotten his works, and the wonders that he hath showed us.' From the Constitution of the United States, it is impossible to ascertain *what* God we worship, or whether we own a God *at all*. This neglect has excited in many of its best friends more alarm than all other difficulties. It is a very insufficient apology to plead, that the devotion which political institutions offer to the Supreme Being is, in most cases, a matter of mere form. For the hypocrisy of one man, or set of men, is surely no excuse for the infi-

delity of another. Should the citizens of America be as irreligious as her constitution, we will have reason to tremble, lest the Governor of the universe, who will not be treated with indignity by a people, any more than by individuals, overturn, from its foundation, the fabric we have been rearing, and crush us to atoms in the wreck." So spake, in years long gone by, that faithful, fearless man of God. The omission deplored was a fearful one; and it should not be matter of surprise, if a holy God, who proclaims his jealousy of his own glory, should let fall a blow that would shatter a disloyal and rebellious government. Neutrality in religion is as impossible for a state as for a man. The individuals which comprise it are the subjects of opposing kingdoms—Christ's and Satan's. Each class contends for the authority of its own master. The only question is, which master will the state obey? Which influence shall predominate in her constitution and laws? It is no reply to this to say, that legislators may be moral men, though not Christians. For it is Christianity which has supplied those influences which hold in check the tendencies of their unrenewed natures, and even adorn their characters with artificial virtues, and illumine them with a kind of *dry light*. Death is one thing, and decay is another. A dead body, nor a dead soul, betrays its true condition when it is *embalmed*. Again, the state must either be Christian or anti-Christian and anti-church. The recognition of Christ's headship by the state is essential to its recognition of Christ's headship of the Church. Without the former, there can be no true sense of national responsibility; hence no restraint; but disregard of the rights of the latter, lawlessness, and persecution, will mark the character of the state. If it does not recognise Christ's headship, it will very practically recognise the devil's. And then the enmity of the serpent will discover itself, more or less, through the state, against the Church—the sphere of the latter invaded by the former, its rights infringed, its independence destroyed, its constitution perverted to hostile ends, its very being assailed. It is only by Church and state recognising each its allegiance to one common head, Christ, that each can be confined within its own appro-

priate sphere, and kept from encroaching upon that of the other.

The doctrine we advocate does by no means confound or unite two distinct institutions—the Church and the state. There is no inconsistency in affirming that two institutions are under one divine head, when each is kept to its own sphere, without interference or collision between them. The planets which belong to our solar system revolve all around one common centre, the sun, and yet their orbits are distinct. In like manner, the family, the Church, and the state, are all subject to Christ, the head of all power; and yet these institutions are kept each within its own peculiar orbit; to transcend which, and encroach upon that of another, would be to rebel against the authority of their common head. Christ wears “many crowns” upon his august brow.

The renowned Gillespie, in his controversy with Hussey, who held, that as magistrates were under Christ, they might exercise rule over the Church, went to an erroneous extreme, and *denied* that magistrates were under Christ as Mediator. But Hussey's own premises were sufficient to furnish a just conclusion—the very opposite to that he reached. For if magistrates are under Christ, then they are bound to respect the law of Christ; and that law insures the spiritual independence of his Church.

It is objected, that, as civil government is derived from nature, not from grace, therefore it cannot be subject to Christ as Mediator. With equal reason might it be urged that, as the marriage relation, the parental relation, and the relation between master and servant, are not founded in grace, therefore the parties to these relations cannot be subject to Christ as Mediator. But all original relations we have seen were dissolved by the fall, and afterwards restored by Christ the Mediator; and so all lawful relations are his redeemed property, and are bound to recognise their Lord and Redeemer. Hence Christians are bound to marry *only in the Lord*; fathers to bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord; servants to be faithful to their masters, *as unto Christ*; masters to remember their responsibility *to their Master in heaven*. The theory of fallen man's right to society and government, on the ground

that these are founded in nature, not in grace, is, like the theory of his natural right to liberty, the offspring of infidelity. Well did Wickliffe say: "Dominion belongs to grace." Nature itself was saved by grace.

It is objected that the state cannot know the Trinity or Christ, because the state is founded in nature, which knows nothing of the Trinity or of Christ. But if the true knowledge of the true God be essential to duty and to happiness, both for the individual and the state, then it is evident that the doctrine of the Trinity is a doctrine of natural religion, and, as such, must be recognised by the state. And, though the doctrine of a Mediator belongs to supernatural religion, yet if it be a fact that he does sustain relation to the state, then that relation must be acknowledged by her. As Bishop Butler observes: "How the relation is made known, whether by reason or revelation, makes no alteration in the case; because the duty arises out of the relation itself, not out of the manner in which we are informed of it." This just position it has been attempted to set aside by the following sophistical reasoning: "The state, being determined in its constitution exclusively by the light of natural religion, *cannot*, as a state, know whether Jesus is king. The relation of Jesus to the state is not 'a true relation'—not even to us possessed of revelation. Why? Because that revelation nowhere requires states, as such, to ground their rightful powers on the mediatorial authority of Jesus." This objector does not see that this reasoning, 1. Represents the Jewish theocracy as contradicting the principles of natural religion. If the state, as the state, cannot know whether Jesus is king, then the Hebrew state, as a state, could not know Jesus as its king. 2. Holds good against *the family* as well as against the state. 3. Holds good against *man as man*. For man cannot recognise the Bible, as man, but only as a sinner, upon his principle. The light of nature must be his exclusive teacher as man. All the utterances of the Bible, apart from the plan of salvation, he is at liberty, nay, *bound* to ignore and reject. On this ground many are advocates of the all-sufficiency of the light of nature, contending that this falsifies the claims of all pretended revela-

tions. Thus the light of nature is made to deny revelation altogether. 4. Begs the question; assumes that revelation does not teach the supremacy of Jesus. 5. Is inconsistent with itself. For, if the relation of Jesus to the state "is not a true relation," then the state cannot listen to a revelation that declared it to be "a true relation," and that taught the supremacy of Jesus. If the state, as such, *cannot* know Jesus, then for a revelation to assert that it *can*, is just to prove itself to be an imposture. This shallow reasoner elsewhere overthrows his own position, and falls into grievous errors besides. "If it be said that, as Christ is head over all things to the Church, his supreme headship should be acknowledged by 'all powers that be,' we answer, that, by all means, it ought to be done where it can be truly and honestly done; and we doubt not that the day is coming when 'all the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ,' and 'all kings shall fall down before him, and all nations shall serve him.' But how is it now? No man calleth Jesus Lord, but by the Holy Ghost, says Paul." Now, 1. This writer admits the first three texts quoted to be proof-texts of our doctrine. 2. Shows that the state, during the millennium, will know Jesus, and so, according to him, must contradict the principles of natural religion, and recognise that to be a true relation which "is not a true relation." 3. He makes the obligation to duty turn upon the *sincerity* of the ruler. Rulers are bound to represent the *obligations* of their people, not their erroneous beliefs. Error has no rights. "The rights" of a disloyal, anti-Bible, anti-Christian conscience, are the rights of a rebel and a robber. 4. He is inconsistent with himself. It ought not to be done in any *case*, if, as he teaches, the state represents only man's natural relations to a Creator. If his principles be true, the state is bound to testify *exclusively* to what originates in nature, and is bound to ignore every thing that springs from grace. The same principle would condemn the subjection of the angelic world to Christ, and pronounce irrational and unjust the decree of the Father, "Let all the angels of God worship him"! 5. According to him, obligation does not exist where the Holy Ghost is

not given! No man *can* say that Jesus is the Lord but by the Holy Ghost; therefore no man *should* say it who has not the Holy Ghost! Does a sinful inability exempt from an essential obligation? Must men be released from duty, in order not to be guilty of hypocrisy? And is hypocrisy unavoidable, when the gracious offer of the Spirit is made us, the acceptance of which will prevent it? Another objection is, that, if Church and state both profess the true religion, the two are confounded. As well say that, if both acknowledge the same God, they are confounded equally as if they acknowledged the same Christ. Does the common recognition of the same head, Christ, destroy all distinction between them, as to nature, duties, powers, sanctions, and ends? The state professes the true religion, not as the Church, but as the state; and this she owes (1) to her sovereign, Christ; (2) to herself, her well-being demanding it; (3) to her subjects, their duty, and happiness as subjects requiring it. If the magistrate, as such, is not to recognise Christ's supremacy, then neither *Christ's day*, the Christian Sabbath. If the state, founded on nature, not on grace, is therefore not to acknowledge Christ and redemption, then also is it bound *not* to acknowledge the redemption Sabbath, the Lord's day, but only NATURE'S Sabbath, the last day of the week. So that the Church is bound to keep *one* Sabbath, and the state *another*! It is objected again, that our argument requires that all associations of men, such as banking companies, railroad companies, sewing-machine companies, etc., are bound to acknowledge Christ in their meetings. And are we not bidden to acknowledge *him* in *all* our ways? Is not the providence of God in his hands? and is not every dollar that goes into our pockets, put there by him? And if we desire not merely wealth, which may prove a curse, but the blessing that maketh rich, are we not to render unto him the honor that is his due? Is there any thing incongruous, unbecoming, ridiculous, for an association, any more than for individuals, to be "not slothful in business, fervent in spirit, serving the Lord?" Are we not to do whatever we do to the glory of God? Is it so, that THE NAME which is above every name, which confers dignity and honor and blessing upon all that is associated with it, would

be out of place, would be regarded as an intrusion or an interference with business, if introduced into *any* company of men? If so, then, "O my soul, come not thou into their secret; unto their assembly, mine honor, be not thou united." But it deserves to be noticed, that the objector admits the responsibility of the state, of society, and of all associations of men to God, if not to Christ. And of necessity; for otherwise we would have an irresponsible body having responsible members. Prayer being the universal acknowledgment of dependence, the objector must admit that every association should acknowledge by prayer its dependence upon God. And as the body as such cannot know Christ, and the individuals belonging to it cannot know God, except in Christ, then it follows that the body prays to *one* God, and the individuals pray to *another*!

Another objection is that this doctrine leads to persecution. On the contrary, it interferes not at all with a man's individual relations to God. Macaulay regards civil disabilities as persecution. This is a mistake. It is simply *self-defence*. It is the government protecting itself from influences which threaten its existence—withholding arms from those who are enemies to its Divine Head, and who would endanger its life. Loyalty to Christ is the sole guarantee of its continued being and well-being, and not the favor and support of those who deny their Lord and Master. "It is better to trust in the Lord, than to put confidence in princes." The favor of Christ must not be exchanged for the favor of ungodly men. Christ must be allowed his proper place in all the governments of men. The *disabilities of the Great King* are not to be preferred to the "disabilities" of his rebellious subjects. Protection is one thing, and persecution another. The Papist—that deadly serpent, cherished now to such an extent in the bosom of American States—the Infidel, the Unitarian, the Jew, and the Moralist, are not to be disturbed in their persons and property, but they are not to *give character* to government. They are the parasites of Christianity: they may feed at her table, but they are not to rule in her house. Infidelity left to itself would subvert all government. A nation of infidels could not exist. Well did Burke

remark, "Infidels are outlaws of the constitution, not of this country, but of the human race." And the Jews are not allowed by God to be a nation. The very reason why they ceased to be a nation, was their unbelief in and rejection of *Christ*, their divine head. They were unfaithful to their theocracy, or more definitely, their *Christocracy*, and hence their national bands were dissolved by Christ, and they are scattered through the world. And those who would give them a place in government would undo what God himself has done, and restore those to government whom God has deprived of government for this very reason: rebellion against CHRIST, the head of government! It is the duty of every people to acknowledge the headship of the Lord Jesus Christ. The time will certainly come, when "the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ." They will still continue the kingdoms of this world, and at the same time be the "kingdoms of our Lord Jesus Christ." Their moral character will be changed. Their government will be theocratic. "And the Lord shall be king over all the earth: in that day shall there be one Lord, and his name one." The Hebrew theocracy shadowed forth the ultimate character of all the kingdoms of earth. The true relation of the state to Christ was set forth therein. There was no confounding of Church and state then, as so many suppose. The Church was not the nation, nor the nation the Church. Each had its distinct rulers, courts, laws, subjects, penalties, and duration. Moses and his successors were the rulers in the state. Aaron and his successors were the rulers in the Church. The Church had her courts of the synagogue and ecclesiastical sanhedrim; the state those of the gate and the civil sanhedrim. The ceremonial laws were those of the Church; the judicial those of the state. Civil and ecclesiastical privileges were not necessarily extended to the same persons. Proselytes might be members of the Church, without participating in the privileges of the state; whilst, on the other hand, scandalous offenders against the ceremonial and the moral law, permitted to enjoy civil rights, were nevertheless debarred the fellowship of the Church. The distinction was marked, too, in respect of penalties. Those

of the Church were purely ecclesiastical, as casting out of the synagogue; those of the state extended to fine and to death. The distinction, too, in respect to duration was equally marked. The Jewish state ended when it became a Roman province; the Jewish Church subsisted and retained its ecclesiastical character down to the destruction of the temple and the dispersion of the people among all nations. The normal character of a republic was exhibited in it. Just as the principles of the Jewish religion were those of the Christian religion, only not so clearly revealed; just as the ecclesiastical principles of the theocracy were, when subsequently divested of their Jewish covering, the same as those on which the New Testament Church was founded; just so were the *governmental* principles those which are destined one day to characterise every government on earth. The theocracy was a mirror which reflected the universal Church and the universal state. The elements of the gospel were in it; the elements of the Christian Church were in it; the elements of a pure, permanent, universal republic were in it. Every government will one day be a Christocracy, and this was represented in the Hebrew theocracy.

“My kingdom is not of this world,” was as true under the theocracy, when Christ was the recognised head of both the Church and the state, as it is true now. Different forms of government did not affect the theocracy then, neither will they necessarily do it in time to come, should different forms exist. Christ may occupy the same throne in the state without the least interference one with the other, or collision between the two. A theocracy does not *necessarily* involve miracles. The Church is *a* theocracy from its very nature, and none the less because Christ’s rule over her now is not signalled by miracles. Under the Old Testament, miracles were frequent; so were they at the beginning of the New; because the spiritual sense of the Church was weaker then than now. Miracles were necessary as aids to her weak vision. They were the Church’s *spectacles* or *magnifying glasses* through which she saw clearly the hand of God in her history, his power and majesty. But *now*, her eyesight being strengthened, she needs spectacles no more—she does

not, in this matter, see through a glass darkly. The increase of spiritual sense puts the Church now in the same relation to the providence of God, in which miracles placed the Church formerly, *i. e.*, enabled her to see Christ in providence.

Such then is the glorious destiny which awaits our now convulsed and distracted earth: "the Lord shall be king over all the earth." It was for the establishment of this universal theocracy our Lord taught us to pray in the words: "THY KINGDOM COME!"

Now what are we doing to bring about this blessed consummation? Christianity should be distinctly recognised in the constitution as the religion of the people, and all their legislation be pervaded by its spirit. For the adoption of Christian sentiments, principles, and practices, by the great bulk of a people even, is not sufficient to constitute the nation, the kingdom, a kingdom of Christ. Something more is necessary. A nation, as a nation, expresses its religious character, and makes its profession of Christianity *through its constitution and its laws*. When through these it distinctly recognises Christ's authority, and observes those statutes of his which relate to it, and subordinates its interests to the advancement of his glory, then and not till then is it entitled to the distinction of a *Christian nation*. And the time will come (for God has promised) when not one only, but all kingdoms will become the "kingdoms of our Lord." Let Christians realise the responsibility which is on them to do all they can to effect most desirable consummation. Not the present, but the future, condition of the nations of the earth is their normal condition. Not until the kingdoms of this world shall have become the kingdoms of the Lord, will those kingdoms have fulfilled the end of their existence, and given to Christ the glory which is his due. And not till then are Christians at liberty to be contented with the religious status of their nation, but are bound in the mean time to use all their influence in every legitimate way, as citizens, to cast the governments under which they live more and more into the mould of Christianity—to secure through the constitution and laws of their country the clear recognition of Christ's headship and authority,

the faithful observance of his precepts which pertain to them, and the freedom from national sins, which sooner or later bring ruin upon any people. "Them that honor me, I will honor," says Christ, "and they that despise me, shall be lightly esteemed."

To say that such an end *cannot* be accomplished now; that society is not prepared for this; that public sentiment is not yet sufficiently christianized;—to dismiss such matters as "theoretical," "not practical," "not important;"—is only to say that the present condition of things cannot continue, and that Christ must carry on his work of overturning, overturning, overturning, until all things be brought into subjection to him, and he reign King of nations, as well as King of saints. But before it is decided that such an end cannot be accomplished now, Christians should solemnly, as in the presence of God, interrogate themselves, whether they have used *all* the influence which their divine Master has given them in society in endeavoring to bring about this glorious result? For what purpose did Christ give them influence? For their own glory, or for his? And are they defrauding the Master of his due? One of the most august spectacles ever beheld on this earth, equal in moral grandeur to that solemn scene when the nation of Israel, assembled before Sinai, entered into covenant with God, was presented more than two hundred years ago, when the kingdoms of Scotland, England, and Ireland, by both Houses of Parliament, by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, and by the Assembly of Divines in England, and then by the people generally, entered into a "solemn league and covenant" with God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, "for the reformation and defence of religion." The immortal document thus began:

"We, noblemen, barons, knights, gentlemen, citizens, burgesses, ministers of the gospel, and commons of all sorts, in the kingdoms of Scotland, England, and Ireland, by the providence of God, living under one king, and being of one reformed religion, having before our eyes the glory of God, and the advancement of the kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, for the preservation of ourselves and our religion from

utter ruin and destruction, according to the commendable practice of these kingdoms in former times, and the example of God's people in other nations; after mature deliberation resolved and determined to enter into a mutual and solemn league and covenant, wherein we all subscribe, and each one of us for himself, with our hands lifted up to the Most High, do swear"—(here follow the objects of the covenant: the preservation of the reformed religion; the preservation of the king's rights; the rights and privileges of the parliament; and the liberties of the kingdoms). And in these ever-memorable words of solemn, manly dignity, does this matchless state-paper conclude: "And because these kingdoms are guilty of many sins and provocations against God and his Son Jesus Christ, as is too manifest by our present distresses and dangers, the fruits thereof, we profess and declare, before God and the world, our unfeigned desire to be humbled for our own sins and for the sins of these kingdoms: especially, that we have not as we ought valued the inestimable benefit of the gospel; that we have not labored for the purity and power thereof; and that we have not endeavored to receive Christ in our hearts, nor to walk worthy of him in our lives; which are the causes of other sins and transgressions so much abounding amongst us; and our true and unfeigned purpose, desire, and endeavor for ourselves and all others under our power and charge, both in public and in private, in all duties we owe to God and man, to amend our lives, and each one to go before another in the example of a real reformation; that the Lord may turn away his wrath and heavy indignation, and establish these churches and kingdoms in truth and peace. And this covenant we make in the presence of Almighty God, the Searcher of all hearts, with a true intention to perform the same, as we shall answer at that great day when the secrets of all hearts shall be disclosed; most humbly beseeching the Lord to strengthen us by his Holy Spirit for this end, and to bless our desires and proceedings with such success as may be deliverance and safety to his people, and encouragement to other Christian churches groaning under, or in danger of, the yoke of anti-christian tyranny, to join in the same or like association and covenant, to

the glory of God, the enlargement of the kingdom of Jesus Christ, and the peace and tranquility of Christian kingdoms and commonwealths."

Oh that the Lord Jesus would bless this land, and dispose it by his grace to join itself to him in a perpetual covenant that shall never be forgotten!

"Come forth out of thy royal chambers, O Prince of all the kings of the earth! Put on the invisible robes of thy imperial majesty. Take up that unlimited sceptre which thy Almighty Father hath bequeathed thee; for now the voice of thy bride calls thee, and all creatures sigh to be renewed!"

"Come then, and added to thy many crowns,
Receive yet one, the crown of all the earth,
Thou who alone art worthy! It was thine
By ancient covenant, ere nature's birth;
And thou hast made it thine by purchase since,
And overpaid its value with thy blood.
Our song employs all nations; and all cry,
'Worthy the Lamb, for he was slain for us!'
The dwellers in the vales and on the rocks
Shout to each other, and the mountain-top
From distant mountains catch the flying joy,
Till, nation after nation taught the strain,
Earth rolls the rapturous hosanna round!"

ARTICLE VII.

THE LITERATURE OF THE SOUTH.

It is not our intention to notice the many works which the South has already produced in a literary way. A sketch of these various productions has quite lately been given to the public, and, notwithstanding some omissions, it was satisfactory. It embraces political science, history, biography, poetry, and many other branches. But the subject is more important in a prospective than in a sense retrospective. From what has been already done in the South, we anticipate for this section of our country great future results.

It cannot be said consistently with truth that any destitution exists among us of materials, either for the pen of the author or the pencil of the artist. The author needs scenery which it is his office to depict; habits among the people which he seeks to portray; peculiarities of character which must be placed before his readers; legends, whether Indian, colonial, Revolutionary, English, French, Spanish, or purely American; modes of thinking, forms of speech, heroic deeds, and many other things which constitute the staple materials out of which a literature is created. Such southern materials are spread out before the eye of the imaginative man, whether he be a Burns or a Byron; and he has only to enter the extensive field as a laborer with a determined purpose to write some work, the merits of which may defy the lapse of time.

To return for a moment to the summary as before stated. What can the North show in the way of natural scenery which cannot be matched in the South? We have blue mountains, running in parallel lines; magnolia, palm, and orange groves; to which may be added unrivalled vales and sloping hills, the bright savannah, the silver lake, the spacious bay, the beetling cliff, and waterfalls tinted more gorgeously than that of Tivoli. Our Flora might have tempted the eye of Linnæus, our Fauna that of Buffon, as our birds did that of Audubon and of Wilson.

Ten thousand glades have been laid open in our tangled wilderness, which are being occupied more and more by portions of the human family. Literature is closely coupled with our habits and affections either in a subjective or objective sense. Its descriptive pen follows in the track of our simplest joys; and Goldsmith's "Deserted Village" has given pleasure as well as the Iliad of Homer. Nor are we without legends. When little Anacreon Moore was in Virginia, about 1804, he heard a tradition about the Dismal Swamp, which he wrought into a ballad. The story of Pocahontas has been often told, and it is more striking than the one enacted by the Maid of Orleans. It would have borne repetition from the pen of Schiller. Flora McDonald was years on our soil, the woman who of all others Dr. Johnson was ambitious to see. The adventures of Boone challenged the pen of Lord Byron, who was a sovereign in his imagination, but a reptile in morals. We cannot deny merit to Uncle Tom's Cabin, but it would be quite easy to construct a more pathetic tale out of a Wall street palace; for have not thousands been drowned in the gold pools of the Knickerbocker city both for time and eternity? Mrs. Stowe sought Southern materials in preference to any she could collect on the rocky hills of New England. How sublime was the moment in which the Mississippi was discovered! Scarcely less so than when Columbus exclaimed, "'Tis land, 'tis land," as his vessel approached the Bahamas.

But to the views just expressed it has been objected, that our country is too young for the growth of literature. There are no ruins dispersed over the area of our territory, of which Sir Walter Scott made so lavish a use in his works. We have no Melrose, Dryburgh, and Jedburgh Abbeys, such as are found in Scotland, nor any Waltham, Glastonbury, or St. Albans, the fragments of which have been scattered among English ferns. We rejoice in the fact. We want no monuments of Romanism, for we are a Protestant people. Nor do we want any mouldering castles to remind us of feudalism; for we are opposed to that system as well as to Papistry. But one object of a writer is to represent things that are here, and

not things that are away. Thus Campbell wrote his poem on Wyoming at Sydenham in Surrey, England, without adventitious help. He did not concern himself about any thing absent from the Susquehannah town, and yet he produced a work of great tenderness, and which from that time to the present, has gilded the woods of Pennsylvania. So far back as 1803, Wirt wrote the "Letters of a British Spy," which glided from a newspaper into a miniature volume. These letters deal exclusively in objects to be found at Richmond and in its environs. They show more eloquence than the "Chinese Letters" of Oliver Goldsmith, and we only wish that the distinguished barrister had displayed in his other productions the same severe taste which pervades his earliest performance. The truth is, that Joseph Dennie of Philadelphia, and William Wirt, were the pioneers of polite literature in the United States; and they ought to wear the palm by whom it has been so fairly won. But we must begin, whatever may be the amount of our capital. The Greeks commenced with the crude letters of Cadmus, and exquisite were the fruits which rewarded the invention of that mercurial people. All nations have been regaled at the intellectual banquet. Nor ought we to forget old Chaucer, who, in the reign of Edward III., wrought out his Canterbury Tales in seclusion at Oxford. Sheltered by the maple tree of Queen Philippa, he there unlocked a fountain which since his time has played merrily all over England, inciting the good humor of its people. Virginia felt his influence, when, in 1607, knights landed on her grassy quays, and Anglo-Saxons began to hew down her forests.

The people south of the Potomac will not be satisfied with the literature of England, though our attachment to the mother country stands tolerably high in the thermometer of our affections. It may have been cooled, but was not extinguished, by the achievement of our independence; for George III. lost his colonies by simple mismanagement. The tide-water country of Virginia was then an ambrotype of England. To this day the names of our rivers, towns, and rural seats, are either English or Indian. We always admire the attachment of John Randolph for our ancestral land. Milton seems to have been his favorite

poet, and Chatham his favorite statesman, and never was he half so eloquent as when he opposed the war of 1812. He detested every mean action, and for this reason drew a broad line of distinction between the moral and mental character of Lord Bacon. But we cannot be satisfied with the imported books of our fatherland. There is between us an ocean of three thousand miles, and foreign authors cannot catch the lights and shades of the life we lead. James, the historical novelist, failed in his attempts, though he was a resident among us for several years. Standard works we are willing to receive, but the current productions of England are not suited to our circumstances. They are not indigenous to our intellectual soil. Dickens and Thackeray have been read in the South, but not without many attempts at criticism on the part of their readers, who are too dignified to approve of human nature being thrown into comic attitudes. We never liked the coarse facetiousness of Robin Hood's chaplain. From the volumes that have been sent forth by the English press, we could cull many that inspire delight; but we are simply contending that we want no literature to take precedence of our own, for we are not any longer the colonies of Queen Anne.

But again, the French literature would not suit us at present, though Gallic associations were introduced among us by the Revolution of 1776. Multitudes of our people do not read the language in which that literature appears, and to such its productions would be sealed books, except through the medium of translations. We are under obligation to cultivate our own vernacular, for it is the same noble tongue which was used by Spenser among poets, Newton among philosophers, and Burke in the House of Lords when he impeached Hastings, the great culprit of India. The French are a fickle people, and theatrical even in their religion. In the Revolution of 1789, the French literati did a great deal by their pens to convulse the country of which they were citizens. The very heads which the science of mathematics had made steady became giddy over the craters of anarchy. Artists reddened their pictures to make slaughter familiar, and philosophers hastened to the scene of

blood. We could not feed our minds on a literature that produced such results any more than we could make a repast on the cinders of Vesuvius. We are aware of the many exceptions which might be made in the French literature. Racine composed scriptural dramas under the chestnut trees of Port Royal. The writings of Marmontel, St. Pierre, and Chateaubriand, have had many admirers; but we want a Parnassian Mount of our own, a Delphic steep, a Castalian fount, and a Pierian spring. At one time the French language was current over Germany, but the Germans cultivated their own tongue and produced a home literature. Weimar and other localities became the haunts of the muses. But it seems strange that men of letters who are idealists in the productions of the pen, are not always idealists in the acts of their lives. The moral standard is far below the intellectual. In one of his letters, Schiller remarks that Goethe might have been happy if he had not turned his household into a Gehenna, by violating the laws of God. Some of the German literati are atheists; and we can only recommend them to read the sublime odes which Russian poets have addressed to the Great Supreme of the Universe.

But a more important question here presents itself for consideration. Shall the South be supplied with its literature from the Eastern and Northern portions of this country? We answer in the negative. But let us be fairly understood. No injustice is meant to any Northern author. There is no more charming work than the "Lay Preacher" of Dennie; no style more bland than that of Irving and Prescott; no facts better stated than those of Motley; no writings more replete with common sense than Franklin's; and, in short, to multiply names would be superfluous. But Northerners would never agree that their principles should be formed by our teachings, and who can blame them for such a determination? Who, then, can censure the South for aspiring to an independent exercise of the mind with which we may be endowed, and for the due employment of which we are responsible to God. Napoleon once attempted to cast his imperial chain over the mind of De Stael; but he might as well have tried, by a silken thread, to have kept a chamois

from its Alpine crib. We intend to think for ourselves, being a common sense people. We must conform to that standard of taste which we deem correct. We do not believe in Agassiz when he denies the unity of our race and the futurity of man; nor in Madam Stowe when she asserts that New England was the germ of this great confederacy; nor in Whittier and Longfellow when they proclaimed the late civil war to be a war against *barbarism*; nor in Emerson when he preaches the doctrines of Spinoza and Van Hattem. We are not ready for the snow of Pantheism. Should it fall among us, it would soon evaporate in the sunny South, and even our ebonies would trample down the last relics of the sediment it might leave. Twelve millions of people need a literature to inspire our sentiments, to mould our characters, to prompt our courage, to commemorate our sires, to depict our rural abodes, and range over our innumerable landscapes. Ireland, with six millions of people, does not depend on England for her mental repasts. Her own children have described the vale of Avoca, the lakes of Killarney, and her Giant's Causeway, whilst orators have defended her rights. Nor is Scotland a mere suburb to England; for, from the times of Barbour, Lindsay, and George Buchanan, she has possessed a racy and local literature which has fastened the hearts of her people to all objects, from the Orkneys to the Tweed, and from Dunbar over to the Hebrides. England may claim India, but she cannot hush the lutes of the Hindoo poets. The muses of the Jumna and the Ganges were domesticated in England by Sir William Jones, the great orientalist.

Another objection must be met. Some allege that literature is merely ornamental; that it tends to no practical good; and may be suited to the rich, but not to the peasantry. There is indeed a broad line of distinction between the ornamental and the useful. With the exception of Rogers, no poet perhaps has ever been a millionaire. It cannot be in vain that an all-wise Creator inserted the imagination among our mental powers. It proved a graft which has borne many blushing fruits and many Cashmere flowers. Were it not for this faculty, the world would wear the aspect of a desert. All mental philosophers agree that

we should be deprived of some of our sweetest pleasures. This view has been illustrated in the essays of Addison, the poem of Akenside, and the moral philosophy of Dugald Stewart. The desires of the mind are always surpassing the exhibition of themselves made by material objects. For this reason the imagination often acts the part of a censor in imparting a deeper blue to mountains and a deeper green to extensive fields. It finds a capital in the gold of the sun, in silvery planets, and in groups of stars which distance renders dim. In a word, it embellishes the round earth, and turns it into a kind of immense orange, the rind of which is rich and its interior sweet. Science may be more useful, but literature is the source of greater pleasures. The first is confined to the profoundly studious, but the other is more general in its application to the multitude. The story of "Paul and Virginia" sent a thrill of pathetic interest among the vinedressers of the Garonne, and the "Cotter's Saturday Night" delighted the peasantry of grand old Caledonia. There is a sort of union between science and literature. Ferdinand was stern and king of a rugged province, but Isabella was queen of Castile pastures. She pledged her jewels in the cause of discovery, and was accounted beautiful when riding to and fro on her palfrey for the good of her people. We cannot erase impressions received from an old-times lady of Virginia, who described the excitement produced by the arrival of vessels from England when the state was a colony. The periodical writers were on board; and the same lady, who lived nearly to the age of ninety, told me she was educated by reading the "Spectator" of Addison. It was a household book, and the writer can testify that she wrote as correct and chatty a letter as Madame Sevigné. We can easily imagine the sensation when "Rasselas" arrived at Shirley, Berkeley, Richmond Hill, Mount Airy, and a hundred other seats. There was no harm in such reading. It only made opulent ladies more kind to the poor, more condescending to the lowly, more sociable at church, less airy in their manners, and less proud of the niche they filled in their respective neighborhoods. But other things of more importance ought to be considered. Wales has not been destitute

of literature. Its bards, according to Gray, kept liberty alive till the time of Edward I., when the last survivor disappeared in the foaming Conway. They had long responded to the notes of liberty which had found an egress from the halls of Tara, and the banks of the Rhone. Science cannot assort the multiplied and still multiplying facts of history which are dispersed through a thousand channels of information. Sir Isaac Newton would have faltered in the task which was executed by Gibbon among the hills which overlook the Lemane Lake; or even the task of Sismondi, in his history of the Italian Republics. But we will not enter this vast field of observation. Our space forbids.

In throwing out these fugitive thoughts, we only remark that a civil war of huge proportions has just been enacted in our own country, the record of which will require an historian of peculiar qualities. No offence is intended either to Jew or Gentile. Half a century will elapse before a correct history can be presented to the public of a conflict which extended itself over such dimensions of space. Numerous pens have already been at work, both from Northern and Southern points of view. Ponderous volumes and miniature pamphlets have issued from the press. These will be useful to him who is to be the grand monarch of this history in time to come. He must thoroughly examine all such documents, to the disentangling of all erroneous statements. The causes of the war must be fully explored. Important political questions must be settled. For example, did the General Government make the States, or the States the General Government? But this question may be settled by a few dashes of the pen. The resources of the contending sections must be compared, and the inequality of forces stated. The foreign troops introduced into the strife must be accurately numbered. The amount of ebony soldiers must be ascertained. The historian must be a man of the strictest impartiality. Whenever and wherever a noble deed was enacted by a Northerner, full justice should be done to that deed. War gives rise to accomplished heroes, like Chevalier Bayard, who act without fear and without reproach. The historian must possess a talent for analysing the qualities which characterise such heroes. But

war gives rise to monsters like Nadir Shah, Haynau, Suwarrow, and the Duke of Cumberland ; and they ought to pass through the panorama of history, that they may receive the scorn they have earned by their cruelties, for history is a fearful tribunal before which to be tried. But the qualifications for the writer of this war are so many, that a detail of them would occupy more space than we can give. The work will be looked for with the deepest interest ; but an eager expectation on the part of the people should not hurry the historian. Let him take his time, and it cannot fail to be the greatest historical record which has ever challenged the attention of our race ; and a son of the South must be the fortunate individual who shall execute the task. It may be that the man is not yet born.

These remarks must be brought to a close, for fear of trespassing too far on the attention of the reader. We can see nothing to prevent us from the cultivation of an indigenous literature, instead of our depending on one that is exotic. The Creator has been kind in giving the South a territory which is capable of becoming an Alcinoan garden. He has bestowed on us a water power which has been the envy of mechanics, beds of coal and marl and quarries of fretted marble, an extensive coast, quiet harbors, fertile fields, pasture grounds, and a propitious climate. All this is for our material wants, but we need supplies for the mind. Mind was the standard by which little Dr. Watts was willing to be measured, and the Southern people desire the same standard. Who can deny talent to such people ? Our representatives for a long time prompted the deliberations of Congress. Our statesmen were never in the rear, but always in the van of legislation. More like them will arise. Except for James Madison, there never would have been a constitution ; and the sage of Montpelier regarded that constitution as a kind of milky way ranging over a confederacy of states. It was to be the observed of all observers. Our devotion to the science of government perhaps may have been an impediment to the achievement of a literature reflecting credit on us as a people. But our subject is not political. Let the dead bury their dead. Hitherto men who have spent their lives in the noisy halls of

debate, have not fancied the studio of the artist, the cell of the scholar, or the hermitage of the minstrel; and cells are indispensable to the production of literature. The collective body of Southern works evince very clearly what may be achieved by well directed efforts in the future. Positive science needs something by which it may be polished. Let us be true to our Raleighs, Smiths, Oglethorpes, Ramsays, and Whitefields, all of whom desired the prosperity of the South, and labored for its advancement. And may we not cordially invite the fair daughters of Eve to take part in all efforts to enlarge and elevate our literature? We have those among us who can easily rank with the Hannah Mores, and even the De Staels of the old world. That man misjudges who thinks lightly of female intellect. La Place did not so think of Mary Somerville; and we only wish that, like Cuvier and Guizot, that French philosopher had thrown his weight into the scale of reverence for Him who is the author of all celestial scenery, and had kept in view that moral constellation which holds religion as our polar star.

ARTICLE VIII.

THE LIVING WRITERS OF THE SOUTH.

The Living Writers of the South. BY JAMES WOOD DAVIDSON, A. M. New York: Carleton, Publisher. 1869. Pp. 635, 12mo.

The purpose of Mr. Davidson is "to show what literature the South has," and it would be injustice to suppose that he regards all the specimens in his volume as worthy of preservation. Nor would he content himself by making selections of the *best* only, and thus presenting our literature in its more favorable aspects. This is one purpose, and cannot be called an unworthy one; but this is far different from the end of our author. His aim is higher and more disinterested. He is willing to make the confession that the South, too, has among her aspirants for immortality men wholly destitute of literary merit, but who labor un-

der the strong delusion that they have a mission to enlighten and instruct mankind.

While our literature is presented as it is, it is most gratifying to find that there is so much of sterling merit; that the Southern mind has labored in every field of literary exertion with ability and success. Our author is entitled to the thanks of the whole South for having placed this fact beyond contradiction; and while it is so gratifying to our just pride, it is encouraging in its nature, as it foreshadows a period not far distant when, if true to ourselves, we shall have a body of literature which will compare favorably with that of the most renowned people of our times.

Our author's researches have given us a list of two hundred and forty-one living writers of the South: one hundred and sixty-six male, and seventy-five female; and he has classified them in respect to their several departments of labor. These embrace fiction, verse, poetry, history, including geography, biography, memoirs and travels, theology, science, law, philology, and medicine. It will be perceived that in this catalogue is embraced the general curriculum of subjects which employ human thought and speculation, and from it we learn that the Southern mind is to-day in a state of high activity.

The subject itself, the literature of the South, is worthy of any pen among us, however gifted. The literature of a people is the mirror in which they are reflected; it is the embodiment of their thoughts, their ideas, their sentiments, their feelings. Is our author qualified to become its historian? We think so. Now in the prime of life, with all the advantages of a liberal culture, a devotion to letters which has made him familiar with the literature of our language from its earliest period, and brought rich contributions from the literature of other peoples, himself a poet and a writer of ability, with those moral qualifications which are to be found in love of justice, freedom from prejudice, and independence of thought—what is wanting to fit him for the difficult and laborious task which he has taken upon himself?

That some of the notices are too brief, and on that account

unsatisfactory, must be conceded; but this was to a certain extent unavoidable; and it may be that some are excluded from the catalogue of living writers who are entitled to even honorable mention. This we are quite sure is not from design. But with these concessions, if the author has not fallen short of exhibiting the condition of the literature of the South, then his principal end has been accomplished. This we submit has been done.

We have said that he has given us the names of seventy-five female writers. While the number will create a general surprise, to the few perhaps it will give pride, and to the many regret.

Mr. Davidson has found among the women of the South not a few of genius and culture, whose works, both in poetry and prose, reflect the highest credit upon the sex. If subjected to the test suggested by some writer, it would be found, we think, that they have preserved their morals as pure, and continued to *sweeten their husbands' tea as well*, as their less gifted sisters. In Mrs. Downing, Madame Le Vert, Mrs. M. Preston, Mrs. Bryan, Mrs. Jeffrey, Mrs. King, Mrs. McCord, Miss Nelly Marshall, Mrs. Warfield, Mrs. Augusta Evans Wilson, and others, the women of the South are well represented. To a few of these only can we call special attention.

One of the best notices in the volume is that of Mrs. Preston. We would say nothing by way of determining the respective merits of the many admirable female writers who are introduced by our author, but we will take the liberty of referring briefly to this gifted daughter of Virginia. It is one of the most readable of the notices, and, though much condensed, we regard it as among his best, both in respect to style, and the critical taste which is exhibited. Mrs. Preston is distinguished both in prose and poetry. "To her," says our author, "the muse has not been a *medicina mali*, and hardly a *curæ requies*, as Ovid's was; nor has she had poverty to string her lyre, as the chief of the Roman lyrists said of his own. That which she has written has been the pastime and not the serious business of her life. Her utterances have all been spontaneous, and always thrown into literary form with great rapidity and ease. * * *

She is too happily situated in life to have much biography: a happy wife; a proud mother; the mistress of a home of affluence and taste; gifted as a poet; a lady of culture, of position, and of illustrious ancestry, her boat is gliding over smooth waters."

We have been pleased, too, with the notice of Mrs. Downing. Of her minor poems, the "Legend of Catawba" is regarded of high merit. "It is rich with the sweetest poetry, and redolent of the true aroma of genius and feeling." "*Egomet Ipse* is a psychological poem, full of the mad unrest of the thoroughly awakened soul—the soul thrown back upon itself, and into its very self-presence, with questions of life and death." Of her "Sunset Musings," he remarks, "that it is a gem in its way, no genuine lover of such sentiment will for a moment fail to see. It is the meditative heart in accord with sympathetic nature." But her principal poem is "We Will Wait," which is given at length.

But the most renowned, the most generally known of the literary women of the South, are Madame Le Vert and Mrs. Augusta Evans Wilson, better distinguished as Beulah Evans, both honored daughters of our neighboring sister State, Georgia. Of the two, Mrs. Le Vert has the widest fame. No lady in the South, no lady in the United States, ever had superior advantages. In early girlhood, to use Mr. Davidson's phrase, she *imbibed* rather than learned three languages, English, Spanish, and French. When quite a young lady she made the tour of the United States with her mother, and visited in turn the leading cities of the country, always moving in the first circles. She had the advantage of a long residence in Washington, where she made the acquaintance and earned the friendship of such men as Webster, Clay, Calhoun, Washington Irving, and others. She had, too, the advantages of extensive travel in Europe; and Willis says: "There probably never was a more signal success in the way of access to foreign society than fell to the share of Madame Le Vert." "Nature had given her titles of nobility, and she moved among her peers in the selected circles of British aristocracy." It was on the occasion of her second visit to

Europe that Lamartine advised her to write a book of travels. "You can fill with pleasure the hearts of your nation by describing what you have seen to them, as you are now delighting me. When you reach home, employ your leisure in giving to the world a few *souvenirs* of your European life." In accordance with this advice, she wrote her celebrated "Souvenirs of Travel." Mr. Davidson remarks that "it is the freshest and sunniest of all books of travel; that it is written without study or restraint, and comes gushing and free from the heart—a heart in which the sunlight of childhood seems still to linger." "In all that she has written, there is a life that Madame Ida Pfeiffer could never throw into her Travels; that Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe could never imitate, though she *did* the title; and that Miss Frederica Bremer could not give to her spirited personalities."

There is not a more interesting notice of any female writer than that of Mrs. Augusta Evans Wilson—Beulah Evans. It strikes us as a brief but thorough analysis of the gifted author. There are but a half dozen pages, but we venture the assertion that no one can rise from their thoughtful perusal without the feeling that he is now prepared to appreciate the author and her works. "Beulah," though not the first in order of publication, was the first to attract attention. Our author has a word to say of each of her works—that is, of "Inez," "Beulah," "Macaria," and "St. Elmo"; and in his whole volume has said nothing better. These several productions are well discriminated; and, though there is nothing elaborate, we think Mr. Davidson, in no portion of his work, has exhibited a better literary taste or higher critical ability. But we will let the author speak for himself. After a notice of Beulah, he writes: "Macaria has the same vigor, elevation, and suffering that characterised Beulah, with this difference, that its vigor is steadier, its elevation more stern, its sufferings more aimless. It is again the story of a woman's love, pride, self-sacrifice, suffering, and, I should be pleased to add, of triumph; but we lay down the volume with the painful feeling that the suffering is not paid for. Parallel with the sorrowing life of the heroine, Irene Huntington, seems

a similar life of manhood's trial and torture in Russell Aubrey. They impress one like brother and sister. There are at least four other characters in the book that wear on through life with the same fate—love without hope. In general, one feels that the sacrifices are too dear; that life, after all, is hardly worth. It is the same feeling that I personally have experienced on closing several of the novels of Goethe. There is too little hope and too much heart-corroding care. There is too much *iron* in the book. It may do to console the failing end of an unsuccessful life; but the young would better have something bright.

* * * * The scene-painting is in the highest style of literary art. The delineations are very fine, especially the female characters, which stand out like classic portraits. The style is elevated, a little ambitious, to be sure, but vigorous and direct. The tone is purity itself. The pathos is the strong point of the book. It is admirable—superior to any thing of the kind that I have seen for some years. The hospital scenes are perfect gems of pathos. The iron will of Aubrey, the haughty spirit of Irene, the demoniacal selfishness of her father, the flippancy of her betrothed cousin, the enthusiasm of the artists, the resignation of Aubrey's blind mother—all these things could not have been painted more powerfully. This power of characterization is wonderful." We would not have our readers to suppose that our author's notice is one of unmixed praise. This is not so; but, referring them to it, we content ourselves with the statement of the fact.

Let us not omit the special mention of Mrs. McCord. She has written poems, and, what few can boast of, a tragedy in five acts. In these she has acquitted herself well, and given proof of high talents. But our impressions of her are derived more from her contributions to reviews. Here she takes high rank; her papers are worthy of our best writers. In this field she was in honorable rivalry with the ablest and most accomplished men of the day; and among the number was her husband, the late Col. McCord, whose contributions are worthy of all praise. We have long entertained the idea that she has the most vigorous intellect of any lady of our acquaintance.

It is impossible to do more than call the attention of the reader to the notice of Mrs. Vance, who seems to be a special favorite of our author. It gives, too, some of the best specimens of his writing to be found in the volume.

We cannot help expressing our pleasure at the agreeable notice which has been taken of Mrs. Martin, of Columbia, who, though she dares no "adventurous song," nor "pursues things unattempted yet in prose or rhyme," has given us much to touch the heart and arouse the affections. We must congratulate the women of the South upon the showing which they have made, and upon the higher honors which we think are before them. We know some—one particularly, a dear young friend—whose modesty has kept them out of this volume. Their lips are now trembling for utterance;

"They strive to speak,
Like a frail harpstring shaken by the storm;"

and speak they will, in words more musical than Æolian sounds. But we would not mislead our fair readers; and at the risk of being charged with a want of gallantry, we give in parting the words of Professor Wilson: "Now, dearly beloved, do not all set yourselves down to compose *thoughts in verse*."

So much space has been devoted to the ladies that we must be briefer than we designed with the other sex. We find many who have achieved fair success in polite literature, and not a few who have risen to fame. We point to John Dickson Bruns, John Esten Cooke, Samuel Henry Dickson, Henry Lynden Flash, Gayarré, Paul H. Hayne, John P. Kennedy, Longstreet, Commodore Maury, Pollard, Requier, Father Ryan, Simms, Alexander H. Stephens, John R. Thompson, James Ryder Randall, William Theodore Thompson, and others. These writers have, of course, different degrees of merit, and have toiled in different fields. Looking at their success, we do assert that the South, in all the departments of literary exertion, has acquitted herself well, and in some will claim equality at least with the best living writers of any other section of our country. We confess to a feeling of pride when we think of the accomplished poet-physi-

cian, Dr. Bruns; of Cooke, who has written with merit in the three departments of fiction, poetry, and biography, and who as a novelist may take rank, in much that he wrote, with Simms and Cooper; of Flash, who, as a lyric poet, is regarded by our author as unsurpassed by any one in America; and of Hayne, one of the most gifted sons of South Carolina, who has already established a national reputation. We pause to say a few words of him, who, in the opinion of Mr. Davidson, has written several poems of which Tennyson might have been the author without damage to his reputation as the first artist among English poets. Of Mr. Hayne's lyrics he has the highest opinion, and gives us some beautiful specimens. But Mr. Hayne plumes himself on his sonnets, "laboring," as our author remarks, "with painstaking ingenuity to elevate the strait-laced sonnet to a respectable place among the forms of poetic utterance." He thinks, however, that his sonnets are as clever as any in English; that they are as good as those of Wordsworth, the Magnus Apollo of British sonneteers. The following extract may be regarded as a fair specimen of Mr. Davidson's style, and as giving his conception of the genius of Mr. Hayne: "He has an intense love of nature; a rich imagination, quick and bold; limited power of narrative structure, and a true sense of the music of words. His study of Tennyson has been in the spirit of the true artist. In the glowing sensuousness of his imagery, one is sometimes reminded of Alexander Smith; but he has a refinement and an art-finish that Smith could never have attained. His poetry is alive with pent passion, glowing, yet repressed; a tropical wealth of emotion, touched here and there with a dash of quaintness, or a flaw of affectation. He is fervent, but sometimes feeble; musical and dainty in phraseology; full of earnestness, tenderness, and delicacy. Over some of his exquisite ideal poems there hangs a veil of mourning so vivid and startling, that in the complex beauty of sorrow, one is puzzled while charmed."

Our old friend, Judge Longstreet, and William Theodore Thompson, are *world-renowned* for their excellence in a particular walk of literature. Who has not heard of the "Georgia

Scenes," and "Major Jones's Courtship," his "Sketches of Travel," and "Chronicles of Pineville." It is not for us to give any account of these well known works, nor to weigh their respective merits. Here we suggest the South may be bold in its claims, and challenge comparison with the world.

What an enviable fame has Commodore Maury! The sea has been the subject of his labors, and perhaps no man living has rendered greater service to the world. His "Charts and Sailing Directions" have left him without a rival, and his name is co-extensive with the ocean itself.

Mr. Stephens has laid the whole country under obligations by his masterly work, "A Constitutional View of the War between the States." It is one of the few books to which the times have given birth that will live.

One of our best literary men is John R. Thompson, who, though he has never published a book, has contributed largely to the cause of letters among us.

The Southern Literary Messenger, of which he was long the editor, acquired a rank we think superior to that of any other literary monthly ever published at the South. His claims as a critic are conceded to be of a very high order; and we would be wanting in justice if we did not add that he is a polished and highly cultivated poet, and one of the most attractive and successful lecturers in the United States.

The author of "Maryland" is worthy of distinct mention. Never was there a more stirring or opportune song. To this must be added *There's Life in the Old Land Yet*, *The Battle Cry of the South*, *John Pelham*, *Cameo Bracelet*, *Magdalen*, and others. Though Mr. Randall has not published a volume, he has done enough to give him rank among the most promising poets of the South. He has long been connected with the press, and is at present editor-in-chief of the *Constitutionalist* at Augusta, Ga., and is justly regarded as one of our best writers.

We come now to Simms, the last of the living writers whom we shall notice. This is the fullest of Mr. Davidson's sketches, and we opine that it is so, because the material is more abundant, and because Mr. Simms's claims upon him are not second to

those of any other writer. We are struck with the magnitude of his labors: his volumes may be counted by the *hundred*. With what luxuriance of thought, with what facility of execution is he gifted! We are willing to concede to the critic that some of these volumes have signal defects; that where there is so much, no little may be found that adds nothing to his fame. But there is nothing new in this; striking irregularities are observable in the labors of genius. A great author has said that "faultless mediocrity, industry can preserve in one continued degree:" "that in our Shakespeares and Drydens you may find alike the worst and the most splendid passages." Mr. Simms has published volumes of novels, poetry, history, and geography, biography, and to these must be added his contributions to the leading periodicals of the United States, and especially the *Southern Quarterly Review*, of which he was at one time editor, and any number of orations and lectures. We are, upon the whole, very favorably impressed by the views of Mr. Davidson. This is not only his longest notice, but there is none in his volume which can boast of superior literary execution. He withholds from him any great merit as a poet, though he gives him certain elements of the true poet, such as a fertile and vivid imagination, a quick sense of effects, and a ready faculty of construction. Be it so. Like Scott, he can afford to yield the palm to others, satisfied with the measure of fame which, by common consent, is accorded him in another field of labor. But let us not be misunderstood. He has written a great deal of poetry, and is a poet—a true poet—though he may occupy the less daring heights of Parnassus. He had no ambition to win the higher honors of the historian, but in his histories he had fully met the end which he had in view, which was to prepare an attractive book for the young, leaving the task of a more recondite research to Rivers and others. His biographies are very creditable to him as an author, and furnish most agreeable and instructive reading for all classes.

We ask indulgence for the following extract from the notice of Mr. Simms, the longest which we have made from the book; but we think that no one is more entitled to it than the distin

guished subject, and that in no place does Mr. Davidson appear to greater advantage:

“Once fairly before the public as a novelist, our author labored assiduously, and threw off from year to year, sometimes from month to month, his rapid series of fictions; now dealing with the rugged original and aboriginal characters of early American life; now depicting the heroic achievements of the knights of elder Spain and the crafty Saracen; now amid the tropic blooms of Florida; now in the *abandon* of Southwestern life; now on the dark and bloody ground—over the whole wide range of Southern and Southwestern American life. He was most at home in the Revolutionary times, when war, and craft, and treachery, and love, and death, ruled the hour; or in the older and pre-revolutionary times, when the stalwart and bloody Indian struggled with bloody hands for his erstwhile dominions, and yet hoped to wrest his lands from the pale-faces. From his little Legend of the Table Rock to his elaborate fiction of the Yemassee, he has done these things well. The tendency of our author’s mind has been from the subjective to the objective; from the inner life to the outer; from the motives and their analyses to deeds and events. Martin Faber presents to us subtle analyses of inner action, evolved through events; but we see that the author keeps in view his hero’s motive nature. Gradually, in subsequent books, Mr. Simms has left out of view more and more of the inner man, and has given us the outer with increasing vividness and power. And, further yet, many of his fictions thrust forward events—*events* rather than *deeds*—to the exclusion of almost everything else. We lose sight of the man—the hero himself, as well as the motives, in the dizzying whirl of events. In doing this Mr. Simms has determined for himself a position not held in the same degree by any other writer of fiction, North, South, or British. In that wielding of events, that sacrificing of characters to situations, he stands unsurpassed, to a great extent unapproached. In America, neither Brown nor Cooper is his equal in this regard, though both surpass him far in certain other qualities. Here the contest for first place in general merit, or in the balance of merits, (including quantity,) lies between our author and Cooper. In characterization and in polish, Cooper has the advantage; while in the energy of action, variety of situations, and perhaps in literal truthfulness of delineation—I mean the absence of fanciful and impossible personages—Mr. Simms has clearly the advantage. In general results—take both for all in all, quantity, versatility, and quality—it

may be reasonably questioned whether Mr. Simms has an equal in America. I believe he has not. In general value to his sphere of literature he is *facile princeps* both North and South. * * * * He is the Walter Scott of South Carolina. Both have done for their native lands the same thing—have traced up the stream of history to its sources, and from the *terre incognitæ* of legend and tradition have given us pictures of life in striking and fascinating colors.”

This we think is exalted praise, but it is praise well-deserved.

With the change in our form of society, we hope—we cannot believe otherwise—that the cause of letters will not suffer. With some the cry of *material development*, of *utilization*, of the *practical*, would seem to mean that the day for a higher education has gone, and that the old field schoolmaster, with his “reading, writing, and ciphering,” must assert his ancient sovereignty. We hope to see the reign of letters with that refining and elevating influence, which, when true to itself, it brings along with it. We hope to see a republic of letters, embracing North, South, East, and West; not that fancied republic spoken of by Goldsmith, only to be condemned, where the members calumniate, ignore, ridicule, and despise each other; where, if one man writes a book that pleases, others write books to show that it is of no value; but that true republic in which men are united as brothers, having a common interest and a common purpose, “acknowledging a just subordination, and all contributing to build up the great temple of knowledge.”

We have many among us with good promise, and we take leave of them in the words of Bulwer: “To prophesy whether or not in these times a rising author will become illustrious, let me inquire only, after satisfying me of his genius, how far he is the servant of truth—how far he is willing to turn all his powers to her worship—to come forth from his cherished mood of thought, from the strongholds of mannerism and style—let me see him disdain no species of composition that promotes her good, now daring the loftiest, now dignifying the lowest—let me see him versatile in the method, but the same in the purpose—let him go to every field for the garland or the harvest, but be there but one altar for all the produce!”

CRITICAL NOTICES.

An Inquiry into the usage of ΒΑΠΤΙΣΜΩ, and the nature of Judaic Baptism, as shown by Jewish and Patristic Writings.
By JAMES W. DALE, D. D., Pastor of the Media Presbyterian Church, Delaware County, Pa. Philadelphia: Wm. Rutter & Co. 1870. Pp. 400, 8vo.

It is well known to our readers that Dr. Dale is the author of a treatise entitled "Classic Baptism," which is characterised by great research, wonderful originality, and thorough exhaustion of its subject. The extraordinary ability of that work won for its writer a deserved distinction among philological scholars, and raised him to a position of absolute preëminence among the controversialists who had hitherto occupied the field of his choice. About sixty pages of the volume to which we refer are devoted to the import of the word βάπτω, and one hundred and fifty additional pages to the meaning of βαπτίζω,—both of these words being traced with rare skill through almost the entire range of classical authorities, accompanied by the acutest criticism, and followed by a deduction of inferences perfectly crushing to all immersionists. The present volume constitutes an appropriate sequel to the former. Indeed, it erects a superstructure of which that is the immovable foundation; for Dr. Dale here proceeds upon the classical usage of βαπτίζω, established by his own labors in a manner never before even attempted, to investigate by labors equally great and equally new, its usage in Jewish and Patristic writings. The success is complete, with which he accumulates evidence from these sources to sustain his previous conclusions. He clearly proves, that, whereas in "Classic Baptism" "the word makes demand for a *condition* and not for a *modal act*," in "Judaic Baptism" the same "word makes demand for a *condition of ceremonial purity*." This being shown, the controversy of centuries has an end, in the triumph of those who, as against Baptist assumption, have all along con-

tended for the fact that the "mode" of scriptural baptism is not signified by the use of the vexed word in question. Dr. Dale shows what *is* signified, viz., condition, and this alone.

Our author commences by giving us forty pages of exquisite writing, in which he reviews the Baptist reviewers of his first work. The number of these reviewers is not large, for the obvious reason that the process of gnawing a file is regarded as unpleasant by the masses of tender-mouthed men. Indeed, the silence of the great majority of our brethren "across the water" which divides them from the hosts led by Dr. Dale, is significant enough of their inability to stand before this powerful antagonist. But the utterances of the bolder few who have attempted a reply are even more significant of a general assent to the fact that no successful reply can be made. Six Baptist authorities, who are of any note, only six, have undertaken to run a tilt with "Classic Baptism," and nearly all of these have done so in the heat of an unmanly temper; so that from the ebullitions of their displeasure have proceeded sneers rather than arguments. It is interesting to see the way in which these reviewers are met by the calm, self-poised, patient, superior master of the situation. In no one instance, we are pleased to record, does he give place to the influence of the *theologicum odium*. He never returns railing for railing, although now and then "answering a fool according to his folly." His style is playful whilst dealing with these unfair objectors, like the style of one who being strong can afford to be gentle. We shall quote a passage (found on pp. 39 and 40) to illustrate the happy manner of our author in rejoinder. "*The Religious Herald* says: 'Baptist writers have maintained, in common with the most distinguished lexicographers and critics, that βαπτίζω signifies *dip, plunge, or immerse*; that it is a modal term, denoting a specific act, and not an effect resulting from an act: that it has the same meaning as βάπτω, except that of *dye or smear*.' To sustain the lexicographical part of this statement, it is said: 'Donnegan defines it: To immerse repeatedly into a liquid, to submerge, to soak thoroughly, to saturate; hence to drench with wine, *metaphorically* to confound totally.' Does the *Herald* in its gentle courtesy, mean

that in exchanging friendly buffets we should, like Friar Tuck and Richard, take turn about, and therefore quote this definition to give me, too, a chance for the *argumentum ad hominem*? The *Herald* says, through Donnegan, that βαπτίζω means 'to submerge,' in which there is no modal act; yet it says in proper person, it does mean 'a modal act;' how is this? The *Herald* says, through Donnegan, βαπτίζω means 'to soak thoroughly,' in which there is no specific act; yet it says in proper person, it does mean 'a specific act;' how is this? The *Herald* says, through Donnegan, βαπτίζω means 'to saturate,' which expresses not an act but an effect resulting from an act; yet it says in proper person, it does mean 'an act, and not an effect proceeding from an act;' how is this? Was the *Herald* napping when it wandered into the land of lexicography? Besides, Donnegan says, βαπτίζω means, *literally*, 'to drench with wine,' (to make drunk), and also, *literally* in secondary (metaphorical) use, 'to confound totally.' If a more suicidal blow was ever given to any cause than is given to the Baptist theory by the proffer of this definition, I cannot conceive when, or where, or how, it was done. This definition suggests the further remark: to look to dictionaries as authority to settle this controversy is folly." We heartily commend both Dr. Dale's mode of baptism and his mode of battle.

Having cleared away the rubbish of his objectors, whilst at the same time clearing up some points in his argument which they had misapprehended and others might fail to appreciate, he proceeds to the greater work he had in hand. In accomplishing this he passes in review the Jewish writers, Josephus, Philo, Jesus the son of Sirach; thirty-two passages of the Old Testament as interpreted by Patrists—such as Tertullian, Ambrose, Jerome, Cyprian, Chrysostom, Hilary, Origen, Gregory Nazianzen, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, and the Septuagint translators; all this being followed by a discussion of apposite references in the Apocrypha, the New Testament, and Josephus—the whole interspersed by a succession of refutatory arguments that disclose the utter untrustworthiness of the best approved Baptist authorities on this whole subject.

It is not possible to present even an outline of that process of investigation by which the learned and patient author reaches his grand conclusion, that "Judaic Baptism is a condition of *ceremonial purification* effected by the *washing* of the hands or feet, by the *sprinkling* of sacrificial blood or heifer-ashes, by the *pouring* upon of water, by the *touch* of a coal of fire, by the *waving* of a flaming sword, and by divers other modes and agencies, dependent, in no wise, on any *form of act* or on the *covering of the object*." Nothing can exceed the strength of the proof except the force of the conclusion.

Our readers will be grateful to us for presenting them with the following extract, in which Dr. Dale overthrows that great champion of our Baptist exclusionists, Dr. Carson, whose lack of knowledge and want of fairness are often elsewhere exposed in this masterly volume. What we are now to quote is a portion of our author's response to the challenge: "All cases of bathing described by this word (*λούω*) among Greeks and Scythians, Egyptians, and Indians, were cases of bathing by immersion."

"Few persons since the fall of man have equalled Dr. Carson in self-confidence. When such men err, they err prodigiously and persistently; for nobody is good enough to teach them. 'If the angel Gabriel' were to differ from them, they would, (as this wise and learned Doctor says he would,) 'send him to school' where they taught the primer and held the birch. In discussion with President Beecher, this writer had affirmed that '*λούω*, like our word bathe, applied to animal bodies only.' This position having been refuted by an amount of evidence which could not be gainsayed, was withdrawn, and this new position taken—'But none of the examples prove that the thing so washed was not *covered with water*; this is all we want.' In testing the defensive merits of this new position, we present, first, the following extract from Professor Wilson, occupying the Chair of Biblical Literature, Belfast, Ireland, contained in his work on baptism, (pp. 156-168): 'In the age of Homer the vessel for bathing went by the name of *ἄσαμίνθος*, and among Greeks of a later age it was called *πέλος*. Dr. W. Smith, in his Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities, in the article on *Baths*, presents

us with the following clear and important statement respecting the mode of using the *ἀσπίς*: 'It would appear, from the description of the bath administered to Ulysses in the palace of Circe, that this vessel *did not contain water itself*, but was only used for the bather to sit in while the warm water was poured over him, which was heated in a large caldron or tripod.' From this pregnant instance the advocate for dipping may learn an instructive lesson. It is no proof of immersion that a party is represented as *going into* the bath, and *coming out of* the bath. In the case of Ulysses, the descent and the ascent are both distinctly recorded; while the author expressly informs us that the ablution was performed by *pouring* or *affusion*, and not by immersion. This testimony must tell on every discerning mind. Dr. Smith further says: 'On ancient vases, on which persons are represented bathing, *we never find anything corresponding to a modern bath, in which persons can stand or sit*; but there is always a round or oval basin resting on a stand, by the side of which those who are bathing are represented standing undressed, and washing themselves.' This was one of the ordinary public baths of Greece. Where is the 'immersion?' These basins were called *λουτήρες*, as also similar basins at the porticos of Christian churches, in the earlier centuries, for washing the hands. It is not, then, a matter of fact, though Dr. Carson has stated it in strong and unequivocal terms, 'that *immersion* is almost always the way of *bathing*.' It may be so in our own age and country; and if this furnished the standard of comparison, no doubt his cause would be triumphant. But in regard to the baths of the ancient Greeks, his statement utterly fails, and failing in that quarter, it is nothing to his purpose. The common practice of Greece is, incidentally but very strikingly, referred to by Plutarch in his Ethical Treatise against Colotes. After stating that you may see some persons using the warm-bath, others the cold, he adds: 'Οἱ μὲν γὰρ ψυχρὸν οἱ δὲ θερμὸν ἐπιβάλλειν κελευούσι: 'For some give orders to apply it cold, others hot.' The force of *ἐπιβάλλειν* strongly corroborates the views which we advocate, and indeed constitutes an independent attestation. The ordinary system of bathing in ancient Greece *knew no immersion*, and *embraced no*

covering of the body with water. Among the paintings in the ancient tomb at Thebes is one containing a representation of a lady enjoying the luxury of a bath, and attended by four domestic servants. This precious relic of former art is thus described by Sir J. Gardner Wilkinson in his elaborate work on the Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians, iii., 338: 'One attendant removes the jewelry and clothes she has taken off, or suspends them to a stand in the apartment; another *pours water from a vase over her head*, as the third rubs her arms and body with her open hands; and the fourth seated near her holds a sweet-scented flower to her nose, and supports her as she sits (on a carpet or mat).' 'The same subject,' Wilkinson adds, 'is treated nearly in the same manner on some of the Greek vases, *the water being poured over the bather*, who kneels or is seated on the ground.' The mode of bathing in Egypt is thus 'identified with that of ancient Greece.' " "How evidently," adds Dr. Dale, "and how fatally these *facts* penetrate the centre of the 'new position' needs no supplementary words to indicate. The evidence however might be much extended did it not seem like inviting the remark: 'And thrice he slew the slain.' Still, one more fact developing in the most unmistakable and instructive manner the mode of bathing by a people widely separated geographically from those hitherto spoken of, may be adduced. Facts, like diamond points, will make their mark when all else fails. Dr. Carson refers to the bathing of the East Indians as supporting an 'immersion' bath. The following statement by the Rev. Mr. Löwenthal, missionary in India, is conclusive in more than one direction against unqualified assertions based on absolute assumptions. This missionary (eminent for talent, learning, and devotion, murdered at his post) says: 'The Hindoos use a small urn called *lota*, with which they bathe at the river, *pouring water over the body*.' How often have we been told that when a man 'goes to a river' to bathe or baptize, idiocy only could deny that he must go there for an 'immersion.' And yet here is the practice of a people (appealed to for the purpose of sustaining an immersion bath) who not only bathe by 'pouring water over the body, like Greeks and Egyptians,'

but who 'go to the river' for this purpose, taking up the water by means of a small urn. Assertions and assumptions should have a very small place in controversial writings. Having no knowledge of the Sanscrit, I rely upon others when I say, *Allava* in that language means *to bathe, to wash*. *Lota*, the vessel used in bathing, would seem to stand in the same relation to *allava*, as *λουτήρ* to *λούω*, and *laver* to *lave (lavo)*; and that *lota*, *λουτήρ*, and *laver*, were vessels, not for bathing in, but for holding the water with which, when poured out or drawn out, the bathing might be effected. The Septuagint uses the term *λουτήρ* for the brazen laver in the tabernacle for ritual purification. There was no immersion in this laver. The Scripture direction is: 'Aaron and his sons shall wash their hands and their feet with water out of it.'" After adducing another fact on this subject of Indian bathing, Dr. Dale concludes the part of his reply by saying, "If ever a crushing blow was delivered, such facts go right through the assertion, that *λούω, λουτρόν, washing, bathing*, require the 'immersion or the complete covering' of the object."

We have room for nothing more. Our wish is that every scholar would purchase this work; and if we are not greatly mistaken in our estimate of its transcendent merits, it will prove a valuable storehouse of evidence for such as desire a thorough investigation of a subject which has given rise to so much needless logomachy. Baptists themselves ought to thank Dr. Dale for the handsome manner in which he has furnished them with an opportunity for opening their eyes to their grave error in asserting the exclusiveness of immersion baptism.

New Pictorial Readers. By Rev. Prof. J. L. REYNOLDS, D. D., of the University of South Carolina. Duffie & Chapman, Columbia, S. C., Publishers.

We have here a series of *New Pictorial Readers*, prepared by the Rev. Prof. J. L. Reynolds, D. D., of the South Carolina University. This series consists of four volumes: the *First Reader*, the *Second Reader*, the *Third Reader*, and the *Fourth Reader*. In these *Readers* the pupil is led on step by step in

easy gradation. The First addresses itself to perception and memory, the Second to the imagination, the Third to the elaborative faculty or comparison, the Fourth to the reason. Each Reader involves the use of the faculties addressed in the preceding. This is the order of nature, as it is the order of development of the faculties of knowledge. It is the classification of Sir William Hamilton, which the author has adopted, and which he pursues in his teachings in the lecture-room.

The volumes are beautifully illustrated, printed on superior paper, in a clear large type, and tastefully bound. We have examined the series with great care, and regard it the best which we have seen. The author has rendered a real service to the cause of education. The character of the books which we read is never a matter of indifference at any period of our lives; and it is of the highest importance in childhood and in youth. "The child is father to the man." Our author has been engaged through life in the business of education, and his views therefore are not to be objected to on the ground that they are purely theoretical and speculative, but are to be regarded rather in the light of inductions from a long and fair experience. Few men among us have his scholarship and his accomplishments in letters, and very few we conceive are qualified to perform the task which he has so successfully accomplished. It is a great mistake to suppose that almost any one can prepare a book for children. The reverse is the fact. The best books have always been written by persons of unusual *cleverness*; and the greatest minds impressed by the importance of the work, and its difficulty, have *stooped*—pardon the word—to its performance. The good Dr. Watts descended from the proud heights of philosophy and took up his companionship with children. He published volumes on theology and philosophy which gave him fame; but he could not feel that his duty was discharged until he wrote a "Catechism for Children in the Fourth Year," and his "Hymns for Infant Minds." Paley wrote a volume for the use of the Sunday-schools in Carlisle; and Milton and Jeremy Taylor a Latin Accidence for children. The series of Professor Reynolds has an interest beyond the class for which it was specially prepared. It

contains many charming little stories—the Professor himself being the principal writer of them—and many choice specimens of poetry and prose from our best authors. These have attractions for all. They furnish food for men and women. Apart from this, there is another charm in these books for young persons—for *children* rather. They withdraw us from this world of care and sorrow, and carry us back to the period when our fresh hearts are full of joy and gladness, and when the future, with no darkening shadow, presents the rich perspective of never-varying sunshine. Who does not revert with pleasure to the day of simple faith and childish ignorance, when, as he looked upon the “fir-trees dark and high,

He used to think their slender tops
Were close against the sky.”

Thanking Professor Reynolds for this substantial contribution to the cause of education, we hope that the enterprising publishers, Messrs. Duffie & Chapman, will secure the reward to which they are entitled.

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXI.—NO. 3.

JULY, MDCCCLXX.

ARTICLE I.

THE HISTORY OF BAPTISM.

What is baptism? How should it be administered? Who are its subjects? What is its meaning? We propose to answer these questions, by tracing the history of the ordinance as unfolded throughout the Scriptures, first in the Old Testament, and then in the New. “To the law and to the testimony.”

I.—THE PRIMITIVE SACRAMENTS.

Baptism is one of the two sacraments retained by Christ in the New Testament Church from that of Israel. “A sacrament is a holy ordinance instituted by Christ, wherein, by sensible signs, Christ and the benefits of the new covenant are represented, sealed, and applied to believers.” It is an *ordinance*, and not a mere sign and seal. The bow in the cloud, the shechinah of glory overshadowing the mercy seat, the manna and rock in the wilderness, and many other things mentioned in the Scriptures, were sensible signs and seals of grace, but were not *ordinances* to be observed, and so were not sacraments. Extreme unction is an ordinance and sensible sign; but it is of man’s devising, and not *instituted by Christ*, and is therefore no sacra-

VOL. XXI., NO. 3.—1.

ment. The going back of the sun on the dial of Ahaz, was to Hezekiah a sign and seal, but not of *the blessings of the new covenant*, and hence was not a sacrament. Wherever we find these four things—(1) an ordinance, (2) of Christ's appointment, (3) consisting of sensible signs, (4) sealing the blessings of the new covenant of grace and salvation through Christ—there we have a sacrament. Wherever either of these elements is wanting, it is no sacrament.

The essential idea, therefore, in a sacrament, is a significant seal to be set to the covenant between God and his people. Hence, it ordinarily requires two parties—the administrator, acting on God's behalf, and the recipient. As to its matter, it consists of an external sensible sign administered, and a spiritual grace of God to his people signified and sealed by it.

The first sacrament instituted by Christ in the Church was sacrifice. There may be some who discredit the idea of the existence of the Church, and of Christ's presence in it, before the days of his flesh. But what is the Church? It is the society of Christ's covenant people—the custodians of his oracles and observers of his law. Such a people none will doubt to have existed from the beginning—owned of God as his, and sealed to him by covenant and sacrifice. In fact, no true definition of the Church can be given, which will not apply as well before, as after Christ. Not only so, but Jesus himself expressly said to the Jews: "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day; and he saw it, and was glad;" and explained this by the assertion: "Before Abraham was, I am." John viii. 56, 58. Paul declares that Moses "esteemed the reproach of *Christ* greater riches than the treasures in Egypt." Heb. xi. 26. The martyr Stephen cites the testimony of Moses: "A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear;" and declares, "*this is he* that was *in the Church* in the wilderness with the angel that spake to him in the mount Sina, and with our fathers." Acts vii. 37, 38.

God has never been without a Church in the world; Christ has always been in it; and his grace has always been sealed to it by sacraments.

Sacrifice remained for two thousand years the only sacrament in the Church; to the primeval patriarchs, the only seal of God's covenant of redeeming grace. Upon the call of Abraham, another sacrament was instituted, and the covenant as made with him was sealed with circumcision. Both of these ordinances were of unmixed blood, and signified and sealed satisfaction to the law, by the shedding of the blood of Christ; and both are now superseded by that blood.

2.—THE LEVITICAL SACRAMENTS.

The sacraments afterward instituted, and which are still perpetuated in the Church, set forth in clearer light, and seal, the richer blessings of grace bestowed upon those who have been bought with blood.

Upon the exodus of Israel from Egypt, God sealed himself as the Redeemer and Shepherd of that people by the new sacrament of the passover. In it the paschal lamb was slain and eaten with unleavened bread and bitter herbs, to which, according to the Levitical law, wine was afterwards added.*

The fourth and last sacrament constituted a mark of separation between those who were privileged to approach the sanctuary, and such as were excluded. Certain animals were stigmatized as unclean, and hence prohibited for sacrifice and food. Persons under specified circumstances were excluded from the sanctuary and society of Israel as unclean; and houses, tents, utensils, furniture, and almost every kind of personal property, was liable to contract ceremonial uncleanness, so as to be unfit for use by the clean or holy people. For the cleansing and restoration of such persons and things, the water of separation was appointed. This was living, that is, flowing, water, mingled with sacrificial blood or ashes, with which the unclean were sprinkled and cleansed.

*Numbers xv. 3, 5. All sacrifices were accompanied ordinarily with wine. See Numbers xv. and xxviii. Peace offerings and festival sacrifices, of which the passover was one, were eaten by the offerers.

3.—THE SPRINKLED SEAL OF THE SINAI COVENANT.

The first use of this ordinance was at Sinai, when Israel was thereby cleansed from the defilements of Egypt, and admitted anew into covenant with the God of Abraham. After the tremendous scene, amid which the ten commandments were proclaimed, Moses was called up into the mount, while Aaron and his sons, and the seventy elders, worshipped afar off. He was then sent down to the people, and told them "all the words of the Lord, and all the judgments; and all the people answered with one voice, and said, All the words which the Lord hath said will we do." Moses thereupon wrote the words of the Lord in a book, and having offered sacrifices, again read the book in the audience of the people; and they said, "All that the Lord hath said will we do, and be obedient." Ex. xxiv. 1-7. The covenant thus repeatedly and solemnly ratified by Israel was thereupon sealed by a new sacrament. Moses "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 (or covenant) which God hath enjoined unto you." Heb. ix. 19, 20, and Ex. xxiv. 8. Thus, by a new and special covenant and seal God took Israel to be his peculiar people, and gave himself to them as their King and God.

4.—SPRINKLING OF THE LEPER.

A modified form of this same ordinance was used in the cleansing of restored lepers. According to the ordinances of Sinai, leprosy rendered its victim unclean, and excommunicate from the commonwealth and covenants of Israel. If a leper were healed, his restoration to the privileges of the covenant was sealed in the following manner. He brought two clean birds to the sanctuary. One of these was killed by the priest, and its blood caught in an earthen vessel "over running water." The living bird was then taken, with cedar wood, scarlet, and hyssop, and dipped in the blood and water, and the restored leper was sprinkled therewith seven times, and pronounced clean. The

bird was then let loose into the open field. The person afterward washed his clothes and his flesh, and shaved his hair. This was repeated on the seventh day, and then followed with a sacrifice of a trespass offering. Of this, a part was oil, which was sprinkled on the altar and on the person to be cleansed. The offering of the sacrifice completed the cleansing. Lev. xiv. 4-20, 51. A hasty inspection of the directions respecting this ordinance might lead to the inference that the water "over" which (verses 5, 6,) the bird was to be killed was not to be sprinkled with the blood. But verses 51 and 52 justify the conclusion that the water as well as the blood was thus applied. This inference is sustained by the analogy of the ordinance already described, and by that of the water of purifying for those defiled by the dead.

5.—THE PURIFICATION FOR THE DEAD.

Whoever touched the body of a dead person became thereby unclean, and whatever touched a corpse was defiled and unfit for use. As sacrifice was lawful only at the sanctuary, and death was of constant occurrence throughout the land, special provision was made for this case. A red heifer was slain without the camp, and the blood of it sprinkled by the priest "directly before the tabernacle of the congregation seven times." The heifer was then burnt, while the priest cast cedar wood, hyssop, and scarlet wool into the midst of the burning. The ashes were carefully gathered and kept in a clean place. Thus sacrificial elements were provided in a form suitable for transportation every where, and for preservation without fear of corruption. When, therefore, defilement by the dead occurred, some of these ashes were mixed in a vessel with running water. A clean person then took a bush of hyssop and dipped it into the water, and sprinkled it on the person or thing to be cleansed. This was done on the third day, and repeated on the seventh. "And on the seventh day he shall purify himself, and wash his clothes, and bathe himself in water, and shall be clean at even." Num. xix. 19. This ordinance was formally designated "the purification for sin," and the water was called "the water of sepa-

ration." Num. xix. 9, 13, 21. The reader will please to mark the fact, to which we shall hereafter recur, that it was employed, not only for the purifying of persons, but of tents, houses, utensils, and furniture of every kind. Num. xix. 14, 15; xxxi. 23. Compare Mark vii. 3, 4. This water of purifying was used in the cleansing of the Levites when they were separated to the service of the sanctuary, and to have God for their sole inheritance. Josh. xiii. 33: The Lord said to Moses, "Take the Levites from among the children of Israel, and cleanse them. And thus shalt thou do unto them to cleanse them: Sprinkle water of purifying upon them, and let them shave all their flesh, and let them wash their clothes, and so make themselves clean." Num. viii. 6, 7.

It seems probable, from the language of Numbers xix. 20, that this water was always to be used for the purification of uncleanness, however contracted. By it proselytes from other nations were cleansed and admitted to the covenant of Israel. Of this we have an illustration in the case of the captives of Midian. When Midian was destroyed by the sword of Joshua, the female children were spared and held as captives. Command was then issued, "Whosoever hath killed any person, and whosoever hath touched any slain, purify both yourselves and your captives, on the third day and on the seventh day. And purify all your raiment, and all that is made of skins, and all work of goats' hair, and all things made of wool." This gave occasion to an exposition of the law by Eleazar. "And Eleazar the priest said unto the men of war which went to the battle, This is the ordinance of the law which the Lord commanded Moses: Only the gold, and the silver, the brass, the iron, the tin, and the lead, everything that may abide the fire, ye shall make it go through the fire, and it shall be clean; nevertheless, it shall be purified with the water of separation; and all that abideth not the fire ye shall make go through the water." Numbers xxxi. 19-23.

It is to be observed that these captives were about to be distributed as bond-servants to Israel; and that all bond-servants were included, from the days of Abraham, with their

masters' families in the privileges of the covenant. Gen. xvii. 13; Ex. xii. 44; Deut. xvi. 14; xxix. 11. This right of purification was therefore the initiatory ordinance, by which, as proselytes from the Gentiles, these children were admitted to the privileges of the sanctuary and the covenants of Israel.

6.—IDENTITY OF THESE ORDINANCES.

In the institutions above described, we see essential identity, with circumstantial variations. They were identical in the fact that, in each, the material symbols consisted of water and sacrificial elements, with cedar wood, hyssop, and scarlet wood; that they were dispensed by a second party, a priestly administrator; that they were applied by sprinkling with a hyssop bush; and that they were used for the purpose of cleansing the recipient, and sealing his title to covenant privileges.

There were circumstantial differences as to the sacrificial elements, and as to the administrator. The inferior dignity of a single person to that of the whole nation, and his comparative poverty, rendered proper the offering of a bird in the case of an individual leper, whilst goats and calves were offered for the cleansing of the whole people. For the case of defilement by the dead, the circumstances rendered special provision necessary, as already pointed out. The sacrifice was, therefore, reduced to ashes for preservation and conveyance; and since the proper place of the priests was at the sanctuary, and it might, therefore, be impossible to procure one of them where the death occurred, allowance was given to any clean person of that "kingdom of priests" to administer the ordinance.

Whilst in these circumstantial points there was a difference, it is evident that the ordinance was essentially one and the same in all these diversities.

As we have seen, the sprinklings were followed by certain "washings," which were also prescribed upon some other occasions. These were essentially different from the sacrament of purification in their nature and design. In them the person applied the water to himself, whilst the water of separation was always applied by another. In them the mode of application

was left to the discretion of the individual, who was simply required to *wash* himself, whilst the water of separation was always applied by sprinkling with a hyssop bush. They included no sacrificial element with the water, and did not express grace bestowed from above, but indicated the duty of personal holiness and purity of life in those to whom grace has been given already. For this reason, they were appointed as an observance, after the sprinkling, by those who were cleansed. The meaning of these washings appears in such language as that of God by Isaiah: "Wash you, make you clean; put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil; learn to do well." Isa. i. 16, 17. On the other hand, a sacrificial element was essential in the water of separation, and it signified and sealed to the believer cleansing from the defilement of a depraved nature, and of sin already committed, and life to the spiritually dead, by the efficacy of the imparted blood and Spirit of Christ. In a word, the latter was a sacrament, and the others were not.

7.—THIS SACRAMENT MEANT, LIFE TO THE DEAD.

The meaning of this ordinance is clearly traceable in the Scriptures. The leper was accounted as one dead (Num. xii. 12), and as such was excluded from his family and from the congregation and camp of Israel. It is agreed among intelligent commentators that the treatment thus appointed for the leper had reference to the peculiar nature of the disease with which he was infected, which was regarded as in a special manner a punishment of sin (Num. xii. 10; 2 Kings v. 27; 2 Chron. xxvi. 20), and was its most fitting symbol, alike in its loathsomeness, its deadliness, and its spreading and contagious nature. The same idea was involved in uncleanness by contact with the dead. Death is the wages of sin. Its occurrence is therefore a demonstration of the sinfulness of the victim. Whosoever touched the dead became ceremonially infected with the contagion of his spiritual disease—his depravity and death—and was therefore excluded with the leper from the sanctuary and the camp. Num. v. 2. So, too, the whole Gentile

world were "dead in trespasses and sins," and therefore "aliens from the commonwealth of Israel and strangers from the covenants of promise." Eph. ii. 1, 12. And although they were not excluded from the camp, as were the unclean of Israel, they were excluded from the sanctuary as dead. In all this a view is implied which the intelligent student of the Bible will find to pervade its pages every where. The idea of the ceremonial defilement thus purged, was not that of an extrinsic uncleanness or outward soiling of the living person; but of the putrefaction and loathsomeness of the dead. The remedy, therefore, was not to be found in an outward lavation of the person, however abundant, but in the communication and introduction of a new principle of life.

Such precisely was the significance of the institutions above described. While outward transgression was rebuked and condemned by the personal washings enjoined, the inadequacy of mere external morality was indicated and urged by the institutions of purification and the water of separation. By them the one profound necessity of our lost and ruined nature was most impressively indicated. The corrupt need purifying; the dead need restoration to life. But *how* shall this be accomplished? "*Can these dry bones live?*" The answer is given by Ezekiel in two successive chapters (Ezek. xxxvi. and xxxvii.), in the former of which, cleansing, and the latter, life, are promised, as the fruit of the Spirit's agency. "Then will I *sprinkle* clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean. . . . And I will put my Spirit within you." "Thus said the Lord God, Behold, O my people, I will open your graves, and cause you to come out of your graves, and will bring you into the land of Israel. And ye shall know that I am the Lord when I have opened your graves, O my people, and brought you out of your graves, and shall put my Spirit in you, and ye shall live."

This precisely was the meaning of the ordinance of purification for sin, with the addition that it set forth the value of the blood, as well as the power of the Spirit of Christ. It expressed the bestowal of these both upon his people. His blood redeems them from the curse, while the Spirit imparts cleansing to their

defilement—spiritual life to them, dead. Paul recognises as one, these various ordinances of purifying, and explains their meaning in one significant sentence. “If the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer, sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh, how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?” Heb. ix. 13, 14. Here “dead works” are the works of those who are dead in sin, and are put in contrast with the living works of those, who, purified and quickened by Christ, serve, in newness of life, him who is the God, not of the dead, but of the living.

The significance of this passage is yet more apparent when viewed in the light of the context. Paul had referred to the services of the sanctuary, “which stood only in meats, and drinks, and divers *baptisms*,” (so it is in the original) “and carnal ordinances.” “But Christ being come,” “neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood, he entered in once into the holy place,” etc. It is with reference to these “divers baptisms” that Paul goes on to speak of the blood and ashes as identical in their meaning, and their sprinkling as the means of the purification of the flesh. He then immediately proceeds, in the language which we have already noticed, to describe the sealing of the covenant at Sinai with the sprinkling of blood and water.

8.—CLEANSING WAS ALWAYS BY SPRINKLING.

Here the fact is interesting and significant, that in all the various forms of purification and consecration, the element significant of grace imparted by the Spirit, whether it was blood, water, or oil, was invariably applied by sprinkling or pouring. Thus it was with the blood of the passover, sprinkled with hyssop on the lintels and doorposts, by which Israel was sanctified unto God. Thus it was with the blood of the various sacrifices, whether sprinkled upon the altar as an offering of atonement to God, or upon the person, as a purgation from sin. See Ex. xxiv. 6, 8; xxix. 16. Lev. i. 5, 11; iii. 2, 8, 13; v. 9; vii. 2, 14;

viii. 30; ix. 12, 13; xvii. 6. Num. xviii. 17; xix. 4. Heb. ix. 21.

So also it was with the oil of consecration sprinkled on the tabernacle and its vessels (Lev. viii. 10-12), and with the oil of anointing sprinkled and poured upon the cleansed leper (Lev. xiv. 16, 17, 18, 29). The consecration of the priests is especially worthy of notice in connexion with this, in view of its analogy to and difference from that of the Levites. The latter, as already described, were purified for their office by sprinkling with the water of separation. The priests were consecrated by the sprinkling of blood and oil. They were first washed with water by Moses (Lev. viii. 6), who was to Aaron "instead of God" (Ex. iv. 16). This rite seems to have symbolised that original purity of nature which the Father, by the Spirit, bestowed upon that "holy thing" which was born of Mary. After this washing, "Moses poured of the anointing oil upon Aaron's head, and anointed him, to sanctify him." "And Moses took of the anointing oil and of the blood (of the ram of consecration) which was upon the altar, and sprinkled it upon Aaron, and upon his garments, and upon his sons, and upon his sons' garments with him, and sanctified Aaron, and his garments, and his sons, and his sons' garments with him." Lev. viii. 12, 30. So it was with prophets and kings, who were anointed to their offices by *pouring* the anointing oil upon them. See 1 Sam. x. 1; xvi. 1; 1 Kings xix. 16; 2 Kings ix. 6, etc. When it is considered that whilst *water* is the accepted symbol of the cleansing, life-giving agency of the Holy Spirit, *oil* is the symbol of his comforting, enlightening, endowing grace, the bearing of these observances upon our present inquiry will be manifest. See Isa. lxi. 1; Luke iv. 18, 21; Ps. xlv. 7; ii. 2; lxxxix. 20, 21; 1 John ii. 20, 27.

Here, too, the fact is significant, that Moses makes no mention of water in connexion with the sealing of the covenant of Sinai, although Paul assures us it was used, (Ex. xxiv. 8; Heb. ix. 19). This gives probability to the supposition that in all those places where the sprinkling of blood on the person was appointed, water was mingled with it; as evidently the nature and in-

tention of the rite were in all these cases essentially the same. The blood sprinkled on the altar and mercy seat signified satisfaction to the justice of God by the blood of Christ offered in the holy place in heaven. Its sprinkling upon the person of the offerer expressed the *application* of that blood for the cleansing of sin; which is always by the Holy Spirit, and accompanied with his imparted graces. Jesus "came by water and blood," as John so earnestly insists, (1 John v. 6,) and the mingled stream which that apostle saw flow from the pierced side, (John xix. 34,) was but a type of these two inseparable virtues which flow to sinners from the wounds of the Crucified.

9.—MEANING OF THE RITES OF PURIFYING.

There are some things in the details of the administration of the ordinances of purifying of which we have no explanation in the Scriptures. What was meant by the cedar, hyssop, and scarlet, we know not, unless we may suppose, from Isaiah i. 18, that the scarlet meant to indicate the conspicuous and ineradicable stain of sin; and the cedar and hyssop may have had some coincident sense. In the two birds used for the cleansing of the leper, there is a manifest and very beautiful type of the death, resurrection, and ascension of Him who "liveth, and was dead, and is alive for evermore, and hath the keys of hell and of death." Rev. i. 18.

In the red heifer, slain without the camp, and its blood sprinkled before the tabernacle, we see a type of Jesus crucified without the gate, (Heb. xiii. 11-13,) and his blood offered in the holiest place; whilst the ashes and water sprinkled on the unclean signified the incorruptible virtue of that blood applied to sinners by the Holy Spirit. Why the unclean were required to be sprinkled, specifically, on the third day, and on the seventh, in order to cleansing; and why it is so emphatically stated, that "if he purify not himself the third day, then the seventh day he shall not be clean," (Num. xix. 12,) is not stated in the Scriptures. But the nature and meaning of the ordinance would seem to indicate that the third day's cleansing was typical of the resurrection of Christ on that day, and taught that we must

have a part in the power of that resurrection, and become "alive unto God, through Jesus Christ," (Rom. vi. 11,) if we would not be excluded from the resurrection of the saints at the last day, which was here symbolized by the seventh day of purification, that being the number of perfection and completion.

The reason why the water of purification must be living or flowing water, as was constantly required, (Num. xix. 17, etc.,) is evident. It was the type of the Holy Spirit, which "proceedeth from the Father" (John xv. 26); the river of the water of life, proceeding from the throne of God and the Lamb. The first scriptural symbol of that blessed life-giving Agent was the river of Eden, which, from thence flowing, was parted into four heads to water the whole earth. Hence, throughout the Scriptures, "the river of God" constantly recurs with the same significance, until at last in the vision of the Revelation we see its crystal waters forever flowing through the restored paradise of God, now no longer the solitary garden-home of one human pair, but grown to be a great city, filled with an innumerable throng of the redeemed; yet still identified by the river flowing through its street, and the tree of life in the midst on the banks of the river. See Rev. ii. 7, and xxii. 1, 2. Compare Ps. xlv. 4; lxv. 9; Ezek. xlvi. 2, 9; John iv. 10, 14; vii. 38, 39.

10.—OLD TESTAMENT ALLUSIONS TO THEM.

It was of the Levitical ordinance of purification with ashes and water that David spake, when, in the fifty-first Psalm, with intense self-loathing he recognised the depth of his native depravity, and the enormity of his sins, and cried: "Wash me thoroughly from mine iniquity, and cleanse me from my sin." "*Purge me with hyssop*, and I shall be clean; wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow." Ps. li. 2, 7. To it Isaiab refers, when speaking of the atonement of Christ, and his introduction of the Gentiles to its benefits, he says: "So shall he *sprinkle* many nations," (Isa. lii. 15,) a promise anticipated in the privileges of the infant daughters of Midian. This passage finds a very beautiful parallel and illustration in the language of the Psalmist, descriptive of the comforting and sanctifying work of

Christ by the Holy Spirit. "He shall come down like rain upon the mown grass (or stubble); as showers that water the earth." Ps. lxxii. 6. Ezekiel, in a passage to which we have already referred, anticipates the future restoration of Israel, and utters promises which evidently take their form from the scene at Sinai, when the same people, rescued from Egypt, were restored to covenant by the sprinkling of water and blood—"I will take you from among the heathen, and gather you out of all countries, and will bring you into your own land. Then will I *sprinkle clean water upon you*, and ye shall be clean; from all your filthiness and from all your idols will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you; and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you a heart of flesh. And *I will put my Spirit within you*, and cause you to walk in my statutes; and ye shall keep my judgments, and do them." Ezek. xxxvi. 24-27.

With respect to these teachings of the Old Testament, it only remains to point out the fact, that the figure of sprinkling or pouring used to signify the bestowal of the Holy Spirit, was derived from the descent of the life-giving rain of heaven. Says God to Israel: "I will pour water upon him that is thirsty, and floods upon the dry ground; I will pour my Spirit upon thy seed, and my blessing upon thine offspring; and they shall spring up as among the grass, as willows by the water-courses." Isa. xlv. 3, 4. Compare Ps. lxxii. 6, above; Joel ii. 28, 29; Acts ii. 17, 18.

Such was the sacrament of purification under the old dispensation, the seal of admission to the communion of the clean or holy house of Israel, and to the blessings of the covenants made with them. In all the law, there is no trace of any sacramental cleansing, except by sprinkling or pouring upon the person. In one case only, in all the Old Testament Scriptures, is there any appearance of immersion or dipping being used—the case of Naaman the Syrian—and the circumstances make it very questionable whether even he was immersed. The command given him by Elisha was, "Go and *wash* seven times in Jordan." 2 Kings v. 10. The word in the original here used is that which

describes the washing of Ahab's bloody chariot in the pool of Samaria, (1 Kings xxii. 38); and that of the new-born infant before it is clothed, (Ezek. xvi. 4,) neither of which certainly was immersed. The same word is here used in the Greek, which is elsewhere employed, as we shall presently see, to describe the purification of one defiled by the dead. The original word, moreover, which in the narrative is translated "dipped," is that which is used in Genesis xxxvi. 31, where it is with evident correctness rendered into the Septuagint by a word meaning to bespatter. Had the coat of Joseph been *immersed* in blood, and so dyed all over, the imposture must have been detected at once; as no one could imagine that the garments of one slain by a wild beast would receive more than a bespattering or besmearing of blood. When to these facts are added the circumstance that, according to the law, the cleansing of a leper was by sprinkling him seven times, it seems scarcely to be doubtful that such was the mode of Naaman's seven times washing. Be that as it may, this extraordinary case is the only one in the Old Testament, in which it can be maintained that immersion even *seems* to be enjoined.

11.—BAPTISM FOR THE DEAD.

After the close of the Old Testament canon, the conquests of Alexander and the Greeks brought the Jews into intimate contact with that people, by whom they were greatly favored. The Greek language was in consequence so extensively adopted by them, that not only was it employed by all the writers of the New Testament, but the Hebrew Scriptures were translated into it in the Septuagint version for the use of the Jews. This version was much used by Christ and his disciples, and is still extant in our hands. Transmitted to us with these Greek Scriptures, there are certain other Jewish writings of that age in the Greek language, which shed much light on the history, manners, and customs of the Jews of the time; although the attempt of the Church of Rome to give them canonical authority has tended to disparage and fix a stigma upon them, under the name of Apocrypha.

We do not here cite the Apocrypha as of divine authority; but as documents unquestionably of Jewish origin, written before the coming of Christ, and therefore competent evidence of the sense in which the Greek language was at that time used by the Jews. Among these writings is the book of Ecclesiasticus, or the Wisdom of Sirach. In chapter xxxi. 30, of this book, (xxxiv. 25, of the English version,) is a proverb which reads literally thus: "He that hath been *baptized* from the dead, and again toucheth the dead, what availeth his washing?" The Greek word here translated "washing," is from the same verb which was used in Elisha's message to Naaman, to *wash* seven times in Jordan. That the proverb has reference to the ordinance of purification for sin is very manifest. That it designates that ordinance by the name, *baptism*, is also evident. This passage is not only in itself very important on the subject under discussion: it is also a key to a most significant passage in the writings of Paul—a passage which has no little perplexed expositors: "What shall they do which are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? Why are they baptized for the dead?" 1 Cor. xv. 29. Here Paul alludes to the Levitical purification for the dead. He urges that the resurrection of those who are physically dead is attested by that typical ordinance in which, by the sprinkling of water and ashes, the subjects of it were restored from ceremonial death to life. He insists that the type must have an antitype. From this passage, it appears that this ordinance was not only designed to subserve the purposes which we have already indicated, but to be a most cheering pledge and seal to bereaved friends, that, by the efficacy of the blood and Spirit of Christ, those that are in their graves shall rise again—a fact so vividly present to the faith of the sorrowing Martha, as she wept at her brother's sepulchre. John xi. 24. The profession of her faith, there uttered to Jesus, took place the very day after she and her house must have received the baptism of purification according to the law. How congruous and appropriate to all this was our Saviour's announcement of himself as the resurrection and the life, which were proclaimed in that ordinance, is at once apparent.

Our exposition of Paul's argument on the resurrection may be questioned, upon the supposition that the apostle would not presume the Corinthian church to be familiar with the Levitical sacrament of purification, as they were probably Gentiles. But in the tenth chapter of the same Epistle, verses 1-11, he addresses them as children of Abraham, familiar with the Pentecost, and with baptism by sprinkling. "Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye 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," etc. That Israel was not immersed in the sea, we know. That they were not *in* but *under* the cloud, Paul here testifies. How, then, were they baptized? The Psalmist expressly tells us: "The clouds *poured out water*" (Ps. lxxvii. 17); and we may reasonably presume that the east wind which piled up the waters as Israel passed through the Red Sea (Ex. xiv. 21) would cast a spray upon the people. Thus they were *baptized* in the cloud and in the sea.

12.—BAPTISM FAMILIAR AT THE COMING OF CHRIST.

It is evident that the purification for the dead must have been one of the most familiar, impressive, and influential of all the Levitical institutions. Familiar, because it was brought home to every house in which a death took place, and to every individual who fulfilled the last offices to the body of the dead. Impressive and influential, because of its exceedingly instructive character, and of the circumstances in which, and the frequency with which, its lessons were conveyed. It did not, however, escape the corruptions of the elders, who made the law of God of none effect by their traditions. Not satisfied with simple obedience to the law, in purifying themselves, their utensils, and furniture, under the circumstances specified in it, they multiplied occasions for such observances, both as to the personal washings and the sacramental sprinklings prescribed. "Except they wash their hands oft, they eat not, holding the tradition of the elders. And when they come from the market, except they *baptize*, they eat not. And many other things there be which they have re-

ceived to hold, as the *baptizing* of cups and pots and brasen vessels, and of tables." Mark vii. 3, 4. The statement of Mark is here given as it is in the original. In our English version, the words *baptize* and *baptisms* are rendered "wash" and "washings." The margin also substitutes "beds" for "tables." Neither of these *could* very well be immersed. Both of them, as we have seen, as well as pots, and cups, and brasen vessels, were occasionally to be purified, according to the law, by that sprinkling which Sirach designates by this very word *baptism*. Evidently the evangelist refers to an unauthorised and improper use of the water of separation. The same superstition is referred to by Luke. He says that a Pharisee with whom Jesus dined " marvelled that he had not first *washed*" (in the original, *baptized*) "before dinner." Luke xi. 38.

It would seem probable that the Pharisees who regarded the body of the people as accursed (John vii. 49), held themselves to be defiled by any contact with them. Compare Isa. lxxv. 5. Hence, on return from market and other occasions of such contact, they resorted to the water of separation for their purifying. "Except they baptize, they eat not;" and hence the water-pots of stone, which, "after the manner of the purifying of the Jews," were set at the marriage feast in Cana of Galilee. John ii. 6. These "held two or three firkins apiece," that is, fifteen or twenty gallons. Such were evidently inadequate for immersion, even if full, which they were not, until "filled up to the brim" at the command of Jesus; and had they been used by the multitude of the feast for any manner of bathing, our Saviour would hardly have appropriated them as receptacles for wine, nor made it of the water. But when we recollect that sprinkling with hyssop was the invariable mode of purifying according to the law, all is clear, and the water of purification, converted by the Redeemer into the wine of the marriage feast, anticipates the Lord's Supper, and foreshadows the wine of the kingdom. These facts elucidate the circumstance that "a question about purifying" should bring some of John's disciples and the Jews to John, with the report that Jesus was *baptizing*. John iii. 25, 26. They also illustrate the language of Jesus to

Nicodemus. John iii. 3-5. Persons who had been ceremonially dead, and were restored by the baptismal rite, were spoken of among the Jews as new born, since they thus entered upon new life. When, therefore, Nicodemus was perplexed by being told of the necessity of being "born from above," as the margin literally renders our Saviour's words, he was at once reminded of the spiritual significance of the familiar water of separation which was just then rendered so conspicuous by the baptism of John. "Except a man be born of water, even of the Holy Spirit, the true water of life, he cannot enter the kingdom of God." The conjunction here—"water *and* the Spirit"—is used in the same sense as in Matthew xxi. 5: "Thy King cometh sitting on an ass, *and* a colt, the foal of an ass." It is equivalent to *even*, and marks the one clause as expository of the other.

The facts here set forth confirm the meaning which we have already attributed to Paul's statement respecting the ordinances of the old dispensation, which "stood only in meats, and drinks, and divers *baptisms*, and carnal ordinances." Heb. ix. 10. Plainly he refers, as the context shows, to the water of purification as variously dispensed.

13.—IT WAS KNOWN AS BAPTISM.

From what has been presented, it appears that at the time of the coming of Christ, the word *baptism* was unquestionably in familiar use among the Jews, to designate *some* ordinance of the Old Testament; that it was so used by Sirach, by Mark, Luke, John, and Paul, in repeated instances; that, whatever the form of the rite thus named, it was a purifying; that in the Old Testament there is no trace whatever of any ordinance of immersion for any purpose whatever, and that purification was invariably accomplished by sprinkling or pouring; that Sirach expressly designates the sprinkling of the water of purification by the name of *baptism*; and that the New Testament writers here referred to, in their use of the word, plainly refer to the same ordinance. The Scriptures already cited show abundantly the meaning of this ordinance. It expressed the bestowal by Christ

of that Holy Spirit which, wherever and whenever given, is always the Spirit of life, and of that blood which cleanseth from all sin. It set forth the separation of the recipient from the world, dead in trespasses and sins, and was therefore called "the water of separation." It signified the consequent deliverance of the soul from the power of sin and death; its cleansing from spiritual defilement, and the implanting of new life to holiness and God; and it announced the final resurrection of the body, by the power of the Holy Spirit of life dwelling in it. All that was thus signified by this ordinance, it also sealed to the faith of the receivers. Its distinctive scriptural designation is, *the baptism of purification for sin*. Compare Num. xix. 9, with the other places above cited.

14.—JOHN'S BAPTISM.

After four hundred years of withdrawal from Israel because of their sins, God's mercy again returned to that people, and the forerunner John was sent to herald the coming of the long expected Messiah. Under similar circumstances, after centuries of alienation, God had renewed his covenant with Israel at Sinai by the baptismal sprinkling of blood and water; and in the restoration, which is yet to take place, of that people, now outcast from God, the covenant is again to be renewed in a similar manner, as we have seen Ezekiel testify. "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean." John was a priest, and came under the old dispensation, of which he was a minister, and to the ordinances of which he did not pretend to make any addition. Of his baptism, no description is given, as is the case in all new institutions. Neither he nor any of his contemporaries appear to view it as a novelty. On the contrary, as we have seen, it is spoken of as an institution of familiar use and significance, and only seems to have been remarkable for the extent of its administration by John, and the preaching with which he accompanied it. See John i. 25. In view of these facts, it would appear impossible to avoid the conclusion that "the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins" which John preached (Luke iii. 3) was identical with that

“baptism of purification for sin” which Moses ordained, which always conditioned its spiritual benefits upon true repentance and faith, and with which the whole nation were more familiar than with any other ordinance whatever of their religion.

It will hardly be denied that this baptism was eminently adapted to the intent and end of John’s ministry. No supposable modification of it would have rendered it more appropriate to the purposes of that ministry. There were, moreover, paramount reasons why this baptism and no other should be administered by John. He came to herald the advent of Him of whom all the law and the prophets spake—in whom all the types and shadows were fulfilled. He came especially to proclaim him as the promised Sprinkler of the nations, the Baptizer with the Holy Ghost. Of him, John the beloved afterward wrote that he came “by water and blood, not by water only, but by water and blood” (1 John v. 6)—by that gift of his blood and Spirit which was so strikingly prefigured by the Levitical baptism. Had John employed any other ordinance for this purpose, the unavoidable effect would have been to obscure and cast doubt upon the design and significance of this baptism, by which for fifteen hundred years the faith of believers had been sealed and pointed forward to the Coming One. It would have implied uncertainty as to whether it was fulfilled in Christ. But when John, calling Israel to repentance, administered to them the old baptism of purification, and announced the coming of him, the true Baptizer, with the Holy Ghost, who should search and distinguish between professed and real repentance, “thoroughly purge his floor, and gather the wheat into his garner,” but “burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire,” (Luke iii. 17,) he set his seal to the testimony and the faith of many ages, and pointed out in Jesus the antitype of all the meaning of this most conspicuous and richly significant rite. “I knew him not,” said John, “but he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost. And I saw, and bare record that this is the Son of God.” John i. 33, 34. Thus, like the star of Bethlehem,

did this type illumine the darkness of ages and point down their track, guiding the faith of kings, prophets, and saints, until, through the ministry of John, it singled out and designated Jesus of Nazareth as he of whom it was the herald and witness.

In the remarkable transaction of his own baptism, the Son of man, as the head of his people, received for them the seal of purgation from sin. In it he enjoyed, with the Levites and the priests, pledges of his separation to his office, and of those gifts and graces which adorned his ministry. In it the water of baptism sealed to him the promise of the Spirit of life by which he should triumph over sin and death. And immediately thereupon he received the thing so signified by the descent upon him of that eternal Spirit, through whom "he offered himself without spot to God," (Heb. ix. 14,) and through whom he rose from the dead. Compare Rom. viii. 10, 11. The priests were anointed with holy anointing oil. But Jesus was anointed with the Holy Ghost. He was thus revealed as the sole possessor, fountain, and administrator of the Spirit; which thenceforward abode upon him as his; and which therefore he only can impart. And since his distinctive office and endowment thus was to baptize with the Holy Spirit, he would never baptize with water, as did both John and the disciples of Jesus. John iv. 1, 2.

In the light of all that has gone before, we see a beautiful propriety and significance in the use, by John, of the water of Jordan for the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins. As we have seen, purification for sin could only be accomplished with living or running water, as typical of the living Spirit which Jesus gives. John therefore selected the waters of that one river which flows through Israel's earthly inheritance, to represent that river of the water of life, which flows from the throne of God and the Lamb for the refreshing of the heavenly Canaan. The same remark applies to the rejection, by Elisha, of Abana and Pharpar, the rivers of Damascus, and his selection of the waters of Jordan as alone adequate for purging the leprosy of Naaman the Syrian. See 2 Kings v. 10-14.

15.—JOHN'S BAPTISM ADMINISTERED BY CHRIST'S DISCIPLES.

The preaching and baptism of John soon came to an end, in his imprisonment and death. His ministry, whilst it continued, was perfectly identified with that of Christ and his apostles. John came, says Matthew, preaching in the wilderness of Judea, and saying, "Repent ye; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." Matt. iii. 2. And when Jesus heard that John was cast into prison, the same historian tells us that "from that time Jesus began to preach, and to say, Repent; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." Matt. iv. 12, 17. Thus, taking up the fallen trumpet of John's testimony, Christ and his apostles continued to the end of his ministry to preach the same gospel which John proclaimed, the gospel of the kingdom of the Coming One; and to call Israel by repentance and the fruits of it to prepare for admission to the privileges and blessings of that kingdom. Preaching thus the very same gospel, they sealed it with the same baptism that John administered, the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins.

We are not informed whether the disciples of Christ continued to the close of his ministry to accompany their testimony with baptism. In fact, it is only incidentally in connexion with the excited jealousy of some of John's adherents, (John iii. 26; iv. 1, 2,) that we learn the fact that Christ's disciples, in their earlier ministry, baptized at all. No mention is made of its discontinuance, and the same reasons which actuated the administration at first, would seem to render probable its continued use; thus proclaiming and sealing the fulfilment of that gospel which was shadowed forth in the water of purifying.

Until the ascension of Christ, the gospel thus proclaimed by John and by Jesus and his disciples, was in the name of the Coming One. Publicly, Christ generally announced his true character and mission in parables and obscure intimations. Matt. xiii. 10-15. Except on a few occasions, it was only to his immediate disciples that he openly revealed himself as he that should come, the promised Messiah. But at the close of his ministry, he indicated to his apostles a change in this respect. After his resurrection he appeared to them in the upper chamber and

told them, "Thus it was written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day; and that *repentance and remission of sins should be preached in HIS name* among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." Luke xxiv. 46, 47. He thus appropriated to himself that gospel and baptism of repentance and remission of sins, which had hitherto been preached in the name of the Coming One. A few days afterward, meeting them again, he announced himself more fully, as having acquired the promised kingdom and assumed the throne. "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I command you." Matt. xxviii. 18-20.

Again, when he had for the last time met his disciples on the Mount of Olives, he commanded them to remain at Jerusalem, and "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." "Ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you: and ye shall be witnesses unto me." Acts i. 4, 5, 8. Leaving such commands and promises, Jesus was received up to the throne.

16.—THE BAPTISM OF PENTECOST.

The day of Pentecost came, and the promised baptism of the Holy Ghost was received. Of the mode of it, Jesus had said that the Holy Ghost should "*come upon*" the disciples. Acts i. 8. Peter declared that it was a fulfilment of the prophecy of Joel, "I will *pour out* my Spirit *on* all flesh," and represented it as "*shed forth*" and as "*falling upon*" the disciples. Acts ii. 17, 33; xi. 15. Immediately upon receiving it, Peter began to preach the gospel and baptism of repentance and remission of sins in the name of the Lord Jesus—the gospel of the kingdom. He proclaimed that the kingdom and power were now given to Jesus. "Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins." Acts v. 31. The baptism of the Holy Ghost,

Peter declared to be both the proof of Christ's exaltation and power, and the means of his dispensing repentance and forgiveness. "Being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this." "Repent, and be baptized 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 unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." Acts ii. 33, 38, 39. How intimately all this connects itself with John's preaching and baptism, and how directly it follows in the line of the Old Testament baptism of purification for sin, and the promises and prophecies relating thereto, is apparent.

Now, for the first time, baptism was administered in its distinctively New Testament form. Sacrifice and circumcision had been fulfilled in Christ. The passover, which hitherto had commemorated the deliverance from Egypt, and sealed a covenant of peace in the blood of the Coming One, had now been constituted the memorial of Calvary, and the seal of salvation through the blood of Jesus, the true paschal lamb; and his blood, now at length shed, took the place of the lamb of that feast. 1 Cor. v. 7. In a manner precisely similar and coincident, the baptism of purification for sin was now modified. No longer pointing in shadowy anticipation to the Coming Baptizer, it henceforward designated him in the person of Jesus of Nazareth. His blood, already shed, took the place of the blood of goats, calves, and birds, and the ashes of the heifer; and as Christ came to declare the Father, and to send forth his baptizing Spirit from the Father, the ordinance was administered thenceforth in the names severally of the Three blessed authors of our salvation, who are now, in Christ, so clearly and graciously revealed. Its meaning and office still the same as of old—to discriminate the clean from the unclean—its form was unchanged, except by the omission of the ashes of sacrifice, of which Christ's blood takes the place.

17.—BAPTISM BY THE APOSTLES.

The history of baptism in connexion with the ministry and teachings of the apostles, is brief. On the day of Pentecost, it

was administered to those who believed, as the seal of the promise of the remission of sins, and of the gift of the Spirit to them and their children. The Ethiopian eunuch was found by Philip reading Isaiah's prophecy of the atoning work of Christ. The reader is aware that the division of the Scriptures into chapters and verses is a modern invention without divine authority, and unknown to Philip and the eunuch. The argument of "the place where he read" begins with Isaiah lii. 13, and closes with the end of the fifty-third chapter. In very clear and striking terms, the prophet describes Him who, exalted to dignity and power at the expense of suffering and shame, should become the baptizer of the nations with the Holy Ghost. "He shall be exalted and extolled, and be very high. As many were astonished at thee; his visage was so marred more than any man, and his form more than the sons of men: so shall he *sprinkle* many nations." With this, compare Peter's citation from Joel: "I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh." It was therefore natural, that when, from that place in Isaiah, Philip preached Jesus, and told of the ministry of John, the sufferings and exaltation of Christ, and the baptism of Pentecost, the eunuch should have sought baptism. Nor is there, in these circumstances, room for doubt as to the mode in which he expected and the evangelist administered the ordinance.

Peter was called to preach the gospel to the house of Cornelius, the first-fruits of the Gentiles; and when the Holy Ghost *fell upon* them, he demanded, "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." Acts x. 47, 48. Here the *falling* of the Holy Ghost *upon* the house of Cornelius is recognised as the baptism of the Holy Ghost. The *bringing* of water is also distinctly implied in the expression, "Can any man forbid water?" language altogether incongruous to the idea of *going to water*, for the purpose of immersion, but distinctly suggestive of the bringing of water in order to its sprinkling on the converts, as a symbol of the Spirit which had "*fallen upon*" them. "As I began to speak," says Peter, "the Holy Ghost fell on them,

as on us at the beginning. Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized with water : but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost." Acts xi. 15, 16.

18.—MEANING OF THE ORDINANCE.

We are now prepared to appreciate the significance of the language used in the Scriptures every where, to express the mode of the Spirit's mission and agency. That by the baptism of the Holy Ghost, is meant the communication of the Holy Ghost by Christ, will not be questioned. That he never comes, except as he is sent by and from Christ, is also certain. But we will search the Old Testament and the New in vain to find any allusion to his mission by Christ, his coming, or his agency, in terms derived from the idea of immersion. On the contrary, the idea of outpouring or sprinkling is presented continually in both the Testaments. He is described as *poured out* and *shed down* by Christ. He is described as *descending*, or *coming down* as rain, as *falling upon* men, and *shed upon* them, and *received* by them. In fact, such forms of expression are the accepted and only ones used to indicate the baptizing office of Christ and agency of the Holy Spirit.

On the significance of baptism, clear light is shed in the New Testament. In the first place, it is recognised as a purification for sin, in precise coincidence with the Old Testament ordinance. "Purge me *with hyssop*," says the Psalmist, "and I shall be clean; *wash me*, and I shall be whiter than snow." Psalm li. 7. "Arise," said Ananias to Saul, "and *be baptized*, and *wash away* thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." Acts xxii. 16. So says Peter: "The like figure whereunto 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 Pet. iii. 21. In the second place, as Peter here intimates, it is life to the dead. Of this we shall have illustration in what follows.

The manner in which this cleansing is accomplished and this life bestowed is clearly set forth. "As the body is one," says Paul, "and hath many members, and all the members of that

one body, being many, are one body, so also is Christ. For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body." 1 Cor. xii. 12, 13. The Holy Spirit, dwelling in Jesus and poured out by him as the baptizer, enters and dwells in the believer, thus engrafting him into Christ, and giving him part in the unity of Christ's body. The result is, that we acquire thus a part in all that Christ is, or has done or suffered. In a word, "As many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." Gal. iii. 27. "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." Rom. vi. 3, 4. The baptism of the Spirit makes us one with Jesus Christ—members of his body. By consequence we are partakers with him in all that is proper to him as Redeemer: we are crucified with him (Gal. ii. 20); we are dead and buried with him (Rom. vi. 4, 8); and with him we are quickened and raised from the dead to new life and to heavenly places (Eph. ii. 5, 6.) Hence Paul's argument to the Colossians. He proclaims the mystery of ages, now revealed, to be "Christ *in you*, the hope of glory," and his own labor and aim to be to "present every man perfect *in Christ*." (Col. i. 27, 28.) He urges them, "As ye have *received* Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk ye *in him*—*rooted and built up in him*." He tells them that, whilst "in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily," the saints "are complete *in him*," "*in whom* also ye are *circumcised* with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ. *Buried with him* in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him," not by a burial made with hands and a rising out of the water, but by the faith bestowed by the baptizing Spirit; "through the faith of the operation of God, who raised him from the dead," and has "quickened together with him" you "who were dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh." Col. ii. 6-13. Thus every where the thoughts and arguments of the apostle have respect, not to a supposed immersion of the body in water, but to the effect of the baptism of

the Holy Ghost, administered by Christ, and uniting us to him. In all the forms of expression, one idea prevails. The eternal Spirit by which we are united to Christ, imparted to and dwelling in us as his Spirit, separates us from the world to him, imparts to us Christ in all his offices and works, and will cleanse and quicken us by destroying sin in us, and rendering us, as he was, dead to sin, and alive only to God. Not only so. It is the pledge of the resurrection of the body also. "If the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you." Rom. viii. 11. In a word, baptism signifies and seals to us deliverance from death and him that has the power of death, that is, the devil, and from every thing involved in the curse, and the enjoyment of all that is implied in the presence within us of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus—union with each other and with him by membership in his body, and consequent part in his life and glory.

19.—THE BAPTISM WHEREWITH CHRIST WAS BAPTIZED.

We are now ready to understand the meaning of Jesus in two remarkable places. Said he, "I have a baptism to be baptized with; and how am I straitened till it be accomplished!" Luke xii. 50. And again, when the mother of James and John besought him that her two sons might sit, the one on his right hand and the other on his left, in his kingdom, he asks, "Are ye able to drink of the cup that I shall drink of, and to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?" Matt. xx. 22. Baptism is cleansing from defilement and life from the dead. The Lord Jesus was defiled with our sins, and dead under the curse, and straitened thereby until the morning of the third day, prefigured by the third day's baptism of purification, when his baptism was accomplished and he arose from the dead. When, therefore, the two disciples sought rank in his coming kingdom, Jesus admonished them of what must intervene as intermediate and conditional to the dignities which they sought. They must taste the bitter cup of sorrow and death which he drained, and

partake in the power and glory of his resurrection, which was the baptism of his admission to the covenant kingdom and glory.

The reader can now see how it is, that in the New Testament baptism is so intimately connected with the doctrine of death and the resurrection; and how unmeaning, in comparison with the true conception, is that view of the ordinance which finds its significance in the burial of Christ, represented by immersion. According to that view, both the sacraments of the New Testament derive their form and meaning from the death of Christ—the one from his crucifixion, and the other from his burial; while the baptism of the Spirit shed down by him, and all the various, vast, and glorious results thence following, have no place in the symbolism of the gospel, although they are so fully set forth under the law, in an ordinance so significant, and to which the New Testament writers so constantly refer, as identified with Christian baptism and fulfilled in Christ.

20.—SUBJECTS OF BAPTISM.

We have seen that, under the old dispensation, baptism was administered at Sinai to the whole congregation without distinction of age or sex, and in like manner to all the Levites upon their separation to the service of God. So in the case of leprosy and of defilement by the dead, the water of separation was applied to all, old and young. We have seen that the first ingathering of Gentile proselytes to the Church of Israel numbered thirty-two thousand infant daughters of Midian, and that they were all received to the fellowship of the covenant people by baptism. When John and Christ came, reviving the covenant of Sinai, calling Israel to new repentance, and anew sealing the covenant with baptism, they came to a people with whom that covenant at Sinai had been sealed to old and young—a people all whose religious institutions, received from God, had recognised the children as entitled to the privileges and seals of the covenant, in common with their parents. Neither John, nor Christ, nor his apostles, ever hint at the idea of a change in this respect—a withdrawal of the privileges or seals of the covenant from the children. On the contrary, when Christ was preaching

the gospel of the kingdom, of which baptism was the distinctive seal, and his disciples forbade the bringing of infants to him, "he was much displeased, and said unto them, Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not; for of such is the kingdom of God. Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein. And he took them up in his arms, put his hands upon them, and blessed them." Mark x. 14-16. And can it be that he notwithstanding deprived them of his covenant of love, or forbade them its seal, which they had enjoyed from the days of Abraham, under whatever form administered?

No less significant is the language of Paul to the Corinthians. "The unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband; else were your children unclean; but now are they holy." 1 Cor. vii. 14. Baptism is the ordinance expressly set apart, both in the Old Testament and the New, as we have seen (Heb. ix. 13; 1 Pet. iii. 21), to discriminate and seal the separation of the clean from the unclean. The Jews recognised children, one of whose parents was a Jew and the other a Gentile, as clean, and entitled as Jews to the privileges and seals of the covenant. Hence the circumcision of Timothy by Paul, although his father was a Greek. What, then, can have been Paul's meaning in here using the well known language of the law, and appealing to the familiar customs of Israel? He was insisting upon the sanctity of the marriage tie subsisting between Christians and unbelievers, and his argument seems clearly this: Your children are confessedly clean, and so recognised by baptism, the seal of cleansing. They must, therefore, be the fruit of lawful wedlock; since by the law bastards were expressly excluded as unclean. At least this much is clear, Paul being witness. The children of believers are *clean*. But baptism is to the clean the seal of their rights and privileges.

21.—HOUSEHOLD BAPTISMS.

To all that has been presented already, it is not necessary to add any minute examination of the household baptisms, of which

we have repeated exemplifications in the New Testament. The house of Stephanas, the first-fruits of Achaia, (1 Cor. xvi. 15,) were baptized by Paul. 1 Cor. i. 16. So were the household of Lydia, and that of the jailor of Philippi; (Acts xvi. 14, 15, 30-34;) and in both of these cases, the emphasis is wholly given in the sacred narrative to the faith of the heads of the families. The Lord opened the heart of Lydia, and she was baptized and her household. That is all we are told of the case; and the former fact is related as the appropriate and sufficient reason for the latter. In the account of the jailor we see a like recognised dependence of his house upon his conversion and baptism.

Not only, moreover, is there no hint in the New Testament of the exclusion of the children from their ancient part in the covenant, an exclusion so incongruous to the greater privileges and grace of the gospel day; but we have no intimation of any complaint on the subject among all the questions which agitated the Christian Church, in connexion with the transition from the institutions of the Old Testament to those of the New. We can but, therefore, conclude that there was in fact no change; but the children were sealed as clean and holy by the same rite which was administered to their parents. The same covenant was transmitted to all the spiritual seed of Abraham, (Gal. iii. 29.) And that parental faith and love, which, of old, claimed the bloody seal of circumcision, and were subsequently confirmed with the sprinkling of the water of separation, are now privileged to bring the children as offerings to God, and set upon them the seal of separation from the world and membership in that kingdom which Christ so emphatically declared to be theirs, by baptizing them in his blessed name.

22.—GOD AND THE FAMILY SOCIETY.

The parental and family relation originated with God. They descend to us as an heir-loom from the innocence and happiness of Eden, and have been blessed of God as shadowing forth the ineffable relations and society of the adorable Godhead. Hence the respect which, throughout his word, God has shown to the parental relation; and the identity which is there recognised be-

tween parents and their children. Hence the consideration given to that parental love which he has implanted which images his own love to his eternal Son, and the first impulse of which, in every pious heart, finds expression in the cry of Abraham, "O that Ishmael might live before thee!" Having created such a relation, imparted such a love, and inspired such desires and prayers, God answers them, by identifying the parents and their children in his covenant of grace. "I will be a God to thee and to thy seed after thee." "This is my covenant, which ye shall keep, between me and you and thy seed after thee: Every man-child among you shall be circumcised." Gen. xvii. 7, 10. This was given as "an everlasting covenant;" and of it now baptism is the seal. Its proclaimed conditions are repentance and faith; and its benefits inure, not to the believer only, but to him and his seed. The administration, therefore, to infants is not predicated upon their presumed faith; but upon the fact that God recognises them as one with their parents, and, therefore, with and in them, parties to the covenant. Whilst the parents are accepted as authorised to dedicate, not themselves only, but their seed to God, he condescends on the other hand to pledge himself to accept, appropriate, and bless that seed. "Do you dedicate yourselves to me as living sacrifices, and consecrate your children to be trained for my service and glory? Then do I accept and appropriate them as mine. I will be your God and the God of your seed. I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a son. All the blessings of grace and glory, which the Father's love can give, the Son's blood purchase, or the Spirit's power bestow, I give to you and to them; and in pledge of my faithfulness to this covenant, I ordain the baptismal seal."

It is objected that the condition of baptism is repentance and faith; and as infants cannot exercise these, they may not be baptized. But what is the language which is thus interpreted? In the words of Jesus, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but *he that believeth not shall be damned.*" Mark xvi. 16. If this excludes infants from baptism, no ingenuity can avoid the conclusion that it equally excludes them from that

kingdom of heaven which Jesus has so expressly declared to be theirs. That surely is not the meaning of such passages. But they state the terms of salvation as addressed to intelligent hearers of the gospel—the terms on which they may be saved. With the case of infants, such language has nothing to do.

23.—RECAPITULATION.

We have now traced the history of this ordinance of baptism. From its first institution, through the successive ages, its glorious significance has been constantly unfolding to the Church, in a steadily increasing light. At first it merely announced deliverance from sin and the curse by the blood of atonement and the Spirit of God, and sealed to believers separation unto God from an apostate and outcast world, cleansing from sin, and new life to holiness. Gradually, in the successive pages of the prophets, the Coming One was foreshadowed as the atoning sacrifice and priest, and the baptizer with the Holy Ghost, who should impart thereby holiness and life to the soul and resurrection to the body. All which was thus obscurely intimated in the prophets was set forth by John the forerunner in unambiguous clearness. He identified the promised King of the house of David with the coming Baptizer of the nations, announced his immediate advent, and pointed him out in Jesus of Nazareth. "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." Mat. iii. 11. The doctrine of baptism thus set forth by the prophets and John, was yet more fully expounded by Christ and the apostles, who show us how it is that the guilty can live, the defiled be made clean, and the dead arise; how the significance of baptism can be realised. The Baptizer fills the throne—a throne purchased with his blood. Of his exaltation, the baptism by him administered is a conclusive proof; and of his royalty, it is one principal function. In its exercise he pours out his own Spirit upon his people, and causes it to enter into and dwell in them as the Spirit of their life. Thus by one Spirit they are made members of one body and partakers of one life with him. Hence their title to the merits of all he has done, whether of satisfaction to the curse, obedience unto righteous-

ness, or vindication of the Father's sovereignty and glory against Satan. In all this, they, as his members, are one with him, and so recognised by the Father and destined to the inheritance of life and glory.

That same baptizing Spirit, dwelling in Christ's people as a living Spirit, the Spirit of their life, gives them purging from native depravity, and a life of holiness and immortality after the likeness of Christ—a holiness gradual and growing now, and to be complete and spotless at last. Further, this baptism of Christ endows the believer with the adoption of a son of God. "Ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." Gal. iii. 26, 27. "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God." Rom. viii. 14. "And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father." Gal. iv. 6.

So, too, the purview of the ordinance comprehends the body as well as the soul, and assures and seals to it a part in the inheritance of glory. "Know ye not that your bodies are the members of Christ? Know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost, which is in you?" 1 Cor. vi. 15, 19. And shall a member of Jesus Christ perish? Shall a temple of the Holy Ghost be destroyed? No. If the Spirit dwell in you, "he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you." Rom. viii. 11.

Of all these precious things, the baptism of water is the symbol and seal. To individual believers, to believing parents, and to Christian households, this is the appointed token of their consecration and faith, the sign and pledge, on God's behalf, that he is their God, and will do these things for them. Thus fully is verified the statement of our Larger Catechism: "Baptism is a sacrament of the New Testament, wherein Christ hath ordained the washing with water, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, to be a sign and seal of ingrafting into himself, of remission of sins by his blood, and

regeneration by his Spirit; of adoption and resurrection unto everlasting life; and whereby the parties baptized are solemnly admitted into the visible Church, and enter into an open and professed engagement to be wholly and only the Lord's."

ARTICLE II.

WHAT IS A CALL TO THE GOSPEL MINISTRY?

In the October number of this *Review* for the year 1869, there appeared an article on this subject, which seems to us to yield too much to the prevailing tendencies of the age. Often while perusing the current literature of the day, have we exclaimed, Surely this is a rationalistic age! Men reason God out of regeneration, out of inspiration, out of providence, out of creation, and, finally, out of existence. There is perhaps no surer proof of the deep-seated, inherent depravity of the human heart than this disposition, so constantly manifested, and so frequently cropping out where least expected, to put God as far away from us as possible. We do not like to come into contact with him; and, therefore, if we allow his existence, we are ever denying his immediate, personal direction of his creatures.

The Christian science of this day is exhibiting unmistakable indications of this tendency. In its "Reign of Law" and enthronement of nature, it has practically legislated Jehovah out of his own kingdom. When professedly Christian men write a "Philosophy of Religion," they dogmatically announce that there can be no such thing as a direct revelation from God to man, and that inspiration is nothing more than a high, though natural, elevation of the intuitional consciousness. When they attempt to treat of that most hallowed, most sublime, and most mysterious work, the regeneration of the soul by the Holy Spirit, they dissect and analyse it with the utmost *nonchalance*, and announce that all of its ineffable facts can be explained by the

natural influences of truth. So, we shall find ere long that our religious belief and religious life have become a statue, exquisitely chiselled perhaps, but, after all, nothing but cold, unbreathing, lifeless marble.

Man's mind has a threefold aspect: his intellect, which gives him opinions; his sensibilities, which are exhibited in the affections; his will, which forms his purposes, under the influence of the first two, and leads him to action. The religion of the Bible has a corresponding threefold aspect, showing that he who made man, also provided for him a religion just suited to his nature. Revelation teaches us truth, all needful truth, and this is the *pabulum* for the understanding. Here faith is the leading thought. It also presents to us the most exalted, purifying, stimulating objects for our affections and desires; addressing itself to the heart; and stirring the innermost depths of the soul. Here love attains its prominence. But it stops not here. It not only says, Believe, love; it also thunders, Do.

Many of the errors which have existed in the Church, have been errors of partiality. By this is meant that only a part of the truth has been received and taught. There have been tendencies, more or less strong, in every age to errors of this nature, by an undue attention to each one of the three aspects above noted, to the exclusion of the other two. Those minds, in which the intellectual faculties have predominated—the Athenian mind—have too often yielded to the temptation to ignore the emotional and the practical in Christianity, and have thus become Sadducees, Rationalists. The warm-hearted have underrated precedent truth and subsequent duty, and have become Essenes, Pietists, Mystics. The energetic, practical mind, by the same natural but evil process, has been led to a deification of outward formal duty, and has thus produced a perpetual race of Pharisees, Ritualists.

There can be no doubt to the intelligent observer that the tendencies of civilised Christendom, in the present period, are very decidedly to an apotheosis of the reason, and a corresponding neglect of the mystical and the practical in religion.

The article above alluded to, seems to us to tend decidedly in

that direction. It is proposed to go carefully through this paper, and notice as far as may be necessary all its salient points.

After quoting the following clear and forcible statement of the true doctrine from the pen of the sainted logician of the South—"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"—it proceeds to say: "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."

It is for us to admit and justify the inference thus drawn, or to show that it is a *non sequitur*. The former is the true course. Ministers, in their call to the work, are, *quoad hoc*, inspired; with a decided emphasis on the *quoad hoc*.


This is nothing more than is taught in the word, and believed by all God's people, with reference to regeneration and sanctification. All believers are, *quoad hoc*, inspired; they are the temple of God, an habitation of God through the Spirit. Is it the mere natural force of the word, sacraments, and prayer, which makes them effectual unto the elect for salvation? No; it is the direct putting forth of the energies of the Holy Spirit which carries these home with a sanctifying power to the human heart. Our children who die in infancy are regenerated by the same heavenly agency, *without the use of any means* whatever. Will our author object to this, because it makes infants thus regenerated, *quoad hoc*, inspired? Many rationalists do, on similar grounds.

What is meant by inspired? Who are inspired? They in whom the Spirit of God dwells, whether as a revealer of truth, or a teacher of duty. The agency of God's Spirit, in the call to the ministry, is an influence extraneous to the ordinary power of the means employed. The influence accompanies the means, but is something entirely independent of the means. This influence is exerted only on those whom God has selected for his

work; so that it is a direct, an immediate, voice from him to them, saying: "Go work in my vineyard."

This article next affirms that the practice of the Presbyterian Church does not correspond with its theory. In a subsequent part of this article, it is denied that the theory is authorised by our standards. As to the first statement, it is a question of fact. Our observation is not very extensive, but we would be greatly shocked if we were made to believe that the practice of our Presbyteries is as stated by the reviewer. We do not, we cannot believe it. On the contrary, it is our decided conviction that it is the well-nigh universal custom of our Presbyteries to examine candidates closely as to the divinity of their call.

As to the second point, it is asserted that there is not a sentence or a word in our Church Constitution which suggests the theory for which we contend. More than this—it is affirmed that it is there excluded. If this be so, what is meant by the book, where it requires Presbyteries to make a close and particular examination of a candidate as to "the *motives* which influence him to desire the sacred office?" Taking into consideration the established practice of the Church, the almost uniform teaching of its representative men, is not the call suggested and authorised here as one of the motives—as *the* motive which should influence our candidates to desire the sacred office? Such we are sure has been the constant interpretation of this passage by the Church. Just here perhaps we may briefly explain more clearly what we mean by a supernatural call. We believe that whatever God does is supernatural; whether it is the germination of a mustard seed, the harmonious adjustment of a solar system, or the resurrection of the dead. There is nothing in the inherent capacities of his creatures to accomplish any of these results. They are all alike due to the direct exertion of his power. There is nothing, in our view, different between a miracle and what are called the works of nature, except that the one is the ordinary, and the other the extraordinary work of God. When, therefore, we speak of the call to the ministry being supernatural and divine, our idea is clearly expressed by the statement, that no man is authorised to take this work upon himself, who has not



received a direct, special, personal commission therefor from the Lord himself.

Passing over some points which will come up hereafter for consideration, we observe that the reviewer objects to the supernatural call as "inconsistent with our theory of the Church." This inconsistency appears in the fact, that each individual church is "a free corporation," and therefore has a right to determine "what sort of a man" it "wants for a minister." This is true just thus far: it is free and independent with respect to its fellow-creatures, or fellow-Christians. But it is not free in the only respect in which it can avail in this argument. With reference to God, with reference to Jesus, the only King in Zion, it is not free. His will is its law. Whom he chooses to bear office in his Church, them that church must receive. It has no right to accept any other. Of those whom he commissions, and of them alone, each church, in the exercise of its liberty, can make its own selection.

Our reviewer bewails the paucity of the ministry, especially in our Church, which he attributes to two causes: 1. Our popular theory of a supernatural call; and, 2. Our rigid requirements as to learning. We are particularly concerned with the first of these, upon which we would remark:

1. How does his attributing this as a barrier to young men entering our ministry, agree with his assertion that it is the uniform practice of our Presbyteries to make no such requirement?

2. If this should prevent conscientious, suitable men from applying to our Presbyteries for licensure, why does it not operate as a hindrance in the Methodist and Baptist churches? Are they not, equally with us, believers in a supernatural call? Yet their ministers are found upon every mountain, in every valley, over every prairie.

3. Our author thinks that the thin ranks of our ministerial force should be filled, by throwing down the barriers, abating the requirement of a supernatural call, and allowing all who may seem to have natural qualifications for the work to enter upon it. It seems to be forgotten that this is no new difficulty in the

history of the Church and world. There was precisely the same state of affairs in our Saviour's time—a great spiritual harvest, ripening for the sickle, and but few laborers to gather the golden sheaves. What was *his* counsel in such a crisis? Did he tell his people to search amongst themselves for suitable persons to engage in this holy work? Did he say that the Church would spontaneously produce men for the emergency? So he should have done, if the views of this paper are correct. Such, however, is not his counsel; but he says: "The harvest truly is plenteous, but the laborers are few. *Pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that he will send laborers into his harvest.*" Matt. ix. 37, 38. Here is what we need—more prayer to the Master, and more reliance on him to carry his work prosperously on. Instead of our pressing needs driving us from him, they should lead us humbly to his feet, that he may raise up chosen men to whom he would be pleased to give the victory.

4. While upon this point of the causes which have led to the alleged fewness of the ministry, we would give as our opinion that they are manifold. (1.) God chooses as many men as he needs, and gives to each Church its proportionate share for the accomplishment of its chosen or appointed work. (2.) A lack of prayer on the part of God's people to him for the supply of the ministerial deficiency. (3.) If we seek for human causes, they are to be found in the rigidness of our mental requirements, and the meagre, sometimes starving, support which is given to the ministry.

The other points requiring notice will be suggested during the examination, which we now propose to make of the Scriptures for the final settlement of this question. Here we make our decisive stand. Put the theories into the crucible of God's word, and thus see which stands the test as pure gold.

We do not fully agree with the remark quoted from Dr. Dabney, to the effect that the solid proof of the supernatural theory is not to be sought in those places of the Scripture where a special divine call was given to Old Testament prophets and priests. This is indeed not the most satisfactory or strongest proof; but yet it is applicable to the case before us, from the

consideration that the principle in the divine selection of either Old Testament priests or New Testament preachers, is the same. We will confine ourselves, however, to an examination of the light which the more recent parts of the divine revelation throw upon it; and must of course limit ourselves to a few texts.

Matt. xxviii. 18, 19: "All power (*i. e.* authority) is given unto me in heaven and earth. Go ye therefore and teach (or Christianize) all nations." Upon this, let it be remarked: 1. It is a commission general in its application, though addressed particularly to a few individual ministers. 2. It emanates from the source of all authority in the Church, its King and Head. 3. It is a clear declaration that the duty and the right to bear this commission can come alone from this central or supreme authority.

Along with this passage take two others: "Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you." "As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you," John xv. 16, and xx. 21. The following observations suggest themselves: 1. These words were not addressed to the apostles, as apostles. There is nothing in them which would so limit them. 2. They distinctly assert that it is not our province to choose the ministerial service of our Master. 3. They as clearly affirm that our Lord has reserved to himself the privilege of selecting and sending forth his chosen servants.

In the first chapter of the Acts we are told how the primitive disciples attempted to fill the place of Judas in the college of apostles. Dr. Addison Alexander was of the opinion that their action was altogether unauthorised; for this, among other reasons, that Jesus alone could choose his own apostles. This he thought that Christ did when he chose Paul to take the place of the traitor. However that may be, even admitting that their action was not a mistaken interference with the prerogatives of the Master, we can see from an examination of the narrative that their views were correct, although they may have erred in the application of them. Acts i. 24: "They *prayed* and said, Thou, Lord, which knowest the hearts of all men, shew whether of these two *thou* hast chosen." They then appealed to the lot that the Lord might decide whom he had called to the work.

The case of the apostle Paul is one altogether in point. No reference is intended to the unusual incidents connected with his induction into the Church and the Christian ministry. But the Apostle Paul received a direct, special, personal commission, as we may clearly see from the history given in the 9th chapter of the Acts. We maintain that Paul was not singular in this. The circumstances of his call were peculiar, extraordinary; but there is nothing to justify the belief that the call itself was so.

Upon the familiar passage, 1 Cor. ix. 16, the reviewer makes very extended and very appropriate comments. Its idea he has very correctly apprehended. Paul says: "For though I preach the gospel, I have nothing to glory of; for necessity is laid upon me; yea, woe is unto me, if I preach not the gospel! For if I do this thing willingly, I have a reward: but if against my will, a dispensation of the gospel is committed unto me." The reviewer very pertinently remarks: "The preaching of the gospel had been committed to him as a *trust*, and to neglect it would be dishonorable. * * * 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." To all this we give a hearty assent, and say that just such is the position and the feeling of every gospel minister.

1 Cor. xii. 4-11, and 28, and Eph. iv. 1, 11, contain valuable instruction upon the question under consideration. We are here taught: 1. That the Lord in his wisdom has adopted in his Church what is known in modern times as the principle of the division of labor. He does not expect any one of his servants to fill every post of duty, or occupy every position of privilege. 2. That the Lord exercises a sovereignty in these matters, assigning to each of his people that portion of the work which pleases him and for which he qualifies him. 3. That in the divine economy, it is the province of the Holy Spirit to make these selections and bestow the corresponding endowments.

2 Cor. v. 20: "Now then we are ambassadors for Christ."

Eph. vi. 20: "For which I am an ambassador in bonds." We are here greatly pleased with the reviewer's approval of Dr. Dabney's remarks upon the office of ambassador. "The sovereign alone is competent to appoint such an agent." He, however, makes three objections to the applicability of these texts: 1. He is not sure that Paul meant himself, or the college of the apostles, or the Church itself. We apprehend that the reviewer is the only one who has ever been seriously troubled with doubts on this question. Paul undoubtedly refers to himself and his fellow-laborers in the ministry. 2. But if this be so, our brother does not see how gospel ministers can be ambassadors of reconciliation, from the fact that the church to whom they are sent is already reconciled. If he had kept in view the great commission, Matt. xxviii. 19; if he had only carefully observed the immediately preceding verse, 2 Cor. v. 19, he would have seen that we are ambassadors for Christ "unto all nations," "to every creature," to "the world," whom we are to "beseech, in Christ's stead, to be reconciled to God." 3. There is, however, the still further difficulty that these ambassadors are provided with no supernatural credentials to attest their heavenly appointment. Let Paul meet this. 2 Cor. vi. 4-10, he gives us one series of divine proofs, by which the true ministry may be recognised. 1 Cor. ix. 1, 2, he gives us another. In this last passage, he says to the Corinthian Christians: "The seal of mine apostleship are ye in the Lord." So every divinely called ambassador can point to his spiritual children, and say, "Behold the credentials which my Master has given me." That these credentials may be given is the cause of the interval between licensure and ordination.

Having removed the objections conscientiously urged to the application of the term ambassador to the Christian ministry; we must say that its scriptural employment for the designation of those who preach the gospel of reconciliation, is an unanswerable proof that they must receive their appointment directly from the court of heaven.

We have but one more text to examine. Heb. v. 4, 5: "No man taketh this honor (*i. e.* of the priesthood) unto himself, but

he that is called of God, as was Aaron: so also Christ glorified not himself to be made an high-priest, but he that said unto him, "Thou art my Son," etc. We are taught here:

1. That neither Aaron, nor any other Old Testament saint, dared to assume the duties of a minister of the sanctuary, except by virtue of a direct divine call. Uzziah tried it, and was smitten with leprosy for his sacrilege. 2 Chron. xxvi.

2. That *our blessed Master himself*, the minister of the new covenant, of whom we are all most unworthy successors, did not *of himself* assume this station. Even he exercised the functions of the priestly office only by virtue of his Father's appointment.

4. May we not, must we not, infer from these things that it would be the height of presumption in us to dare handle the sacred vessels of the sanctuary, unless we are "called of God, as Aaron also was?"

In conclusion of the argument on this interesting question, is there not a significance in the very *names* employed in the Scriptures to designate the holy office?

1. "Who also hath made us able *ministers* of the New Testament." 2 Cor. iii. 6. This word, here rendered "ministers," is elsewhere translated servants. If we are God's servants, who has a right to appoint us a place in his service but himself? Surely he must be allowed the privilege, which each one of us claims, of choosing his own ministers.

2. "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you *overseers*," *i. e.* bishops. Acts xx. 28. This is also a relative term. An overseer is one who inspects and governs another's servants. What Southern planter of the olden time would have allowed any man to come upon his plantation and, without any direct authority from him, undertake to manage his business and his servants? Shall we be less respectful to our "one Master in heaven?"

3. In the Old Testament, and frequently also in the New Testament, as 1 Pet. v. 2, God's people are compared to a flock of sheep, and his ministers to *pastors* or shepherds. Here again we find the same essential idea of agency apparent, making it necessary for the spiritual shepherd to have some direct commis-

sion from the owner of the flock, before he can properly undertake its supervision.

We have written with some feeling on this subject, but not with more than its importance has deserved. It is no question of policy or human expediency. It is no isolated question, whose solution affects no other interests than those peculiarly its own. It is, we are sure, no unsettled question, about which God's people are allowed to differ. It is a question of the very life of the Church; a question involving the very spiritual relationship between God and man; a question which our Master has determined for us, and whose determination we are bound to respect.

It is our solemn conviction, that, so far from its being true that there are scores of men who ought to be in the ministry, and are not, because they have no divine call, we fear that there are scores in the ministry *who ought not to be, because they have no divine commission.* In these days of superficial piety, of the extensive spread instead of the intensive permeation of religion, so far from the Church lowering her standard of mental, spiritual, or divine qualification, it should more than ever heed the injunction: "Lay hands suddenly on no man," and beware of putting men to work who will build the walls of Zion with untempered mortar. May the Lord save his Church from the temptation of sacrificing quality to quantity! May he spare us the untold evils of an unsanctified and uncalled ministry!

ARTICLE III.

PROVIDENCE AND PRAYER.

All believers have a secret creed of some sort. In general terms, there is an acquiescence in the Confessions of the organisation to which one belongs—something similar to the New School adoption of the Westminster Catechisms, "for substance of doctrine." The professed creed has, of course, certain prom-

inent doctrines, distinguishing one sect from another, and sometimes distinguishing one sect from all others; and these salient points are held more or less firmly, as the professor is more or less pugnacious. But there is an inner circle, a hidden system of belief, a body of divinity, *lex non scripta*, belonging to each individual, in the main conforming to the acknowledged standard, but probably differing in some minor particular from all others. Some of these secret theories are held with rigorous tenacity, and some of them are vague and indefinite. Whether they be termed opinions, theories, or creeds, it is probable that the secret views of the great body of believers upon the two topics at the head of this article, are more universally vague than the ideas they entertain upon any other matter of divine revelation.

According to Presbyterian standards, which accord with the revelation of God, in the works of providence are included all that the Creator does for the preservation and in the government of his creation. With him there is no greatness or smallness in the events of human life in such a sense as that one series of providences requires special attention, while another is of minor importance. The solar system to which this planet belongs is a small atom in the boundless universe; yet within these limits there are contrasts so enormous as to baffle the highest powers of human conception. So the first suggestion upon this point is here presented. At every part of the wide orbit of Neptune, the divine providence is constantly engaged in sustaining the accurately poised planet, and in directing his diurnal revolutions. And each separate snow-flake in the countless myriads that go to form the white mantle covering half a continent, is sustained and directed by precisely the same divine providence. Throughout the vast interval between these creations, the constant interposition of Almighty power sustains and directs all the phenomena of nature. Only in him, all things having life and motion live and move; only in him, all things created have their being. This much admitted, all controversy touching the distinguishing articles of a Calvinistic creed is at an end; because the whole round of the doctrines, severally

linked to this, are logically interdependent. Therefore, all forms of heresy, differing in everything else, agree in the denial of a divine providence.

The trained thinkers of the old world—Atheists, Deists, Pantheists—and their shallow imitators who illuminate humanity through the pages of the *Atlantic Monthly*, have a form of argument that is triumphantly presented now and again, generally under the cover of known scientific facts. The admitted laws of attraction, gravitation, of chemical affinities, and the like, belonging to the nature of things, inherent, not superadded, regulate all the phenomena that Christians describe as the developments of providence. Many objectors admit the doctrine of divine superintendence, while they deny the special application of divine power in the production of any material results. Human intelligence and animal toil are employed in the cultivation of the field. The grain is deposited in the soil; and chemical affinities, operating in inflexible regularity, produce the harvest. The rain and the sunshine, blasting and mildew, move in established order, and the average product is invariable. This is a very taking method of reasoning, but the plain doctrine of the Bible contradicts it. One may plant and another water, but God determines the result. The command of God is, to cast the seed upon the surface of the subsiding waters now and again, because the sower cannot know which shall decay and perish, or which shall fructify and increase. The believer, however, is not driven to the denial of "fixed laws," or required to doubt their unerring operation.

Among these invariable laws, perhaps the most prominent and striking is the law of gravitation. It is the power that binds the satellites to the parent planet, the planet to the central sun, the sun to some unknown centre in the grand circle to which the visible heavens belong, and all of these circles, it may be, to the great throne, around which they sweep in their majestic orbits. It determines the flow of the mountain rill, and of the vast river to which it is tributary. It brings the aerolite from the clouds, and the autumnal leaf-shower to the earth's surface. Yet there is positively no phenomenon of the universe more en-

tirely hidden from human scrutiny than this. And men—cultivated men—in discoursing upon this theme, are like the ostriches of the desert, burying their heads in a mass of meaningless words, which only serve to conceal their helpless ignorance from themselves; for the answer of faith meets all the difficulties, and commends itself to the profoundest thinker, to wit, that your inflexible law is after all the finger of God, binding all creation to his central throne, and regulating even the fall of the leaf by his divine and orderly providence. If this providence includes the establishment of a uniform law of operation or development, it is only because so it seemed good in his sight, and he is able to set aside or reverse any or all such laws at his sovereign pleasure. The theory of a nicely adjusted system of centripetal and centrifugal forces is a patent argument, and peculiarly applicable here. Let any philosopher explain the existence of the law that regulates these mighty forces!

It is in the application of this grand doctrine to the ordinary affairs of human life, however, that unbelief opposes the most obstinate resistance. It may be credible that God, directly or mediately, controls and sustains the revolution of Jupiter and his satellites, and even that his providence determines the duration of dynasties and the revolutions of empires. But that he should interfere with the career of individual men, and the most insignificant details of their daily life, is more than incredible. The thinly disguised sneer with which this “blind, superstitious, and fatalistic doctrine” is rejected by worldly wisdom would be amusing, were it not also suggestive of innate hardness of heart and enmity to God. In the interval between blank atheism and Calvinistic theology, there are various schools of unbelief; but the present purpose will be served by investigating only one set of theories, most popular in Christian lands, and adopted with tolerable uniformity by the vast majority of professing Christians who reject Calvinistic standards, in whole or in part.

To state the case as fairly as possible: it is admitted that God governs the universe, but by the mediation of established laws, infallible because they are framed by infinite wisdom. He foresees all events, and adjusts his laws to meet all exigencies in

individual history. He does not retire and leave his creatures to the operation of these regulations, or leave them to work out their own legitimate conclusions, but exercises a watchful supervision, albeit without direct interference. Nay, more; he reveals a code under which men may govern themselves and determine their own destiny. The race is to the swift; the battle is to the strong. The proverbial philosophy of this school finds expression in the pithy saying of a great soldier: "Providence is ordinarily on the side of the heaviest battalions." If it be objected here that the exact reverse was true in the case of Gideon, for example, the ready answer comes in this form. All the instances recorded in Scripture of apparent reversal of ordinary laws, are instances of *miraculous* interposition, and the days of miracles are gone to return no more. If it be objected again that modern instances of failure to the swift and the strong, in the race and the battle, are not wanting, the ready answer is, that such failures are always explicable upon purely logical hypotheses. Some other law has come into operation. The centripetal force has met and vanquished the centrifugal.

It is doubtful whether this sort of logic satisfies those who make use of it. Its demonstrations are nothing worth, because it begs too many questions that may not be granted. The main fault in this popular mode of argumentation is revealed in the assertion that the "age of miracles is past." How much is included in this statement? It is not denied that God did exercise a peculiar and special providence in the case of Gideon, but it is asserted that similar reversals of known laws, or of apparent probabilities, are wholly unknown in the present age. Here, then, is the battle-ground.

It is noticeable, first, that in the story of Gideon's triumph, the miraculous interposition of God was only manifested in the secret communion betwixt him and the soldier. The token of the dew upon the fleece, and then the opposite token of dew every where else, while the fleece was dry, were both direct reversals of ordinary laws. Otherwise they were valueless, and could not have strengthened the staggering faith of the champion of Israel. The rest of the record may be merely the ac-

count of what would happen a thousand times in succession, under similar circumstances. A vast army demoralized and panic-stricken, under sudden fright, fell an easy prey to the man who had just come from God with assurances of success, so fortified by visible tokens of his power, that doubt was wholly impossible. The resistless energy of a man so upheld would naturally inspire his followers, and each man in the three hundred was magnetised into a hero for the nonce. While it is true that an assault upon the hosts of Midian by this little band, armed with firebrands and pitchers, would have been an act of mere madness but for the command of God, profane history furnishes a remarkably similar example of valor in the story of Thermopylæ, where a handful of heathen warriors encountered the greatest army the earth ever saw. Nay, more; the indomitable bravery of those three hundred Spartans possibly secured the ultimate defeat of the Persian forces, under God's wise providence, and thus preserved from utter extinction a nationality that afterwards gave birth to some of the profoundest thinkers of the race.

If therefore this overruling providence was exercised in behalf of Israel when Gideon destroyed the Midianites, what different power aided the heathen Greeks when Leonidas defied the Persian hordes? In both cases the adage failed—the battle was not to the strong.

Nevertheless, the accuracy of operation belonging to those "fixed laws" of God is not denied in this argument. His power and Godhead are revealed therein, and the highest attainments of science, the largest discoveries in nature's limitless domain, only serve to manifest his being, wisdom, and power, in which he is infinite, eternal, and unchangeable. So far from denying the existence of a uniform method of operation, it is rather claimed that he works with regularity and exactness in all parts of this domain—in the results that are wrought by the influence of mind upon mind, as well as in the influence of matter upon matter. In gravitation, in chemical affinities, in logical deductions, in algebraical analyses, in hopes, and fears, and affections, God reigns, ever present and ever efficient. No more

than this can the mind conceive in dwelling upon the perfections of Deity. No less than this can the mind accept as descriptive of the Power that made the universe.

To give an example of what is meant by this uniformity in mental processes, it is sufficient to refer to the effect produced by the recital of a story of innocent suffering. Take, as an instance, that of Little Nell, in Dickens's "Old Curiosity Shop." No man or woman ever read it without tears, unless the sympathies common to humanity were wanting. It is pure fiction; it is a recital of unreal sufferings; and perhaps it is a cruel and wicked invasion of human hearts; but, nevertheless, it is a triumph of genius that knew and acted upon the fixedness and universality of God's law of sympathy. Victor Hugo, who has attained a world-wide reputation as a writer of fiction, has built nearly all his stories upon this solitary trait of humanity.

Now, this unalterable law, in its common manifestations, is open to the scrutiny of mankind to a certain extent. But it is also in constant operation in depths that are beyond the scope of human vision. Those who habitually explore the hidden nooks in their own hearts are in the minority, even among the people of God, who are instructed to practise self-examination. And even a diligent seeker in this field, often repulsed and disheartened by the discovery of unattractive attributes, might easily miss the traces of God's providential and orderly interference in the very thoughts and intents of his own heart. But that he does verily interfere, wisely, powerfully, and *directly*, is a matter of positive revelation. And this statement naturally introduces the second topic—Prayer.

Confining the discussion within the narrowest limits, it should be noted that the public worship of the sanctuary and the private devotions at the family hearth-stone are both excluded. It may be said that these are notoriously regular and formal, so to speak, and the antagonism supposed to exist between the regular providence of God and private supplications for special gifts, does not obtain in either of them. The prayers of a congregation of believers are necessarily general in their objects and subjects, and this also by the decree of God. The blessings ob-

tained through their agency could not otherwise be secured. It should also be noted that the Bible, which abounds in examples of individual supplication, contains very few instances of united prayer. Therefore the ritualistic worship that affixes a set form of words for congregational worship, and omits the form for private devotion, precisely reverses the order indicated in Holy Writ. The individual suppliant can never afford the loss of the fifty-first Psalm; but its bodily adoption in a liturgy could only operate to deprive it of its startling emphasis as well as of its abounding personal consolation. The confession of the returning prodigal, the petition of the publican, and multitudes of similar scriptures, illustrate this point. This matter of salvation, with all its connexions and dependencies, is essentially an individual matter, and congregational worship is offered by men and women who have previously prayed themselves into a community by individual and secret effort. Nothing herein contained must be construed into an argument *against* united prayer, however; the present object being simply an examination of the apparent discrepancy between God's orderly providence and the fitful and variable petitions bubbling up from isolated hearts, for distinct and isolated objects of desire.

Thus led to a second point, it should be noted that all those individual supplications that terminate no where short of individual salvation, are also excluded from this discussion. The man who brings his soul to the fountain opened in the house of David is sure of salvation by the decree of God. It is not only a promise—it is a prophecy as well. It is the announcement of an infallible rule of law in Heaven's jurisprudence. The Supreme Judge has made it forever true that the believer in Jesus shall live forever. No reversal of this decision is possible, and herein providence and prayer are at agreement. The sovereign election of God, coincident with his holy, wise, and powerful providence, saves the individual soul, and the soul in believing only "sets to his seal" that God is true. In the sinner's application for pardon, adoption, and sanctification, he proceeds upon a beaten track. God can be just and justify, because in Jesus righteousness and peace have kissed each other. The stability

of the awful throne, which is builded upon justice and judgment, *makes* the security of the penitent; and the message of the heavenly heralds, mercy and truth, is, that the Royal Judge is "faithful and just" to pardon. No earnest suppliant, therefore, who apprehends these sublime truths, can be disturbed by doubts of God's secret purpose as affecting his final salvation. And his prayers to this end can be hindered by no dread of antagonism to God's development of *purpose* in his special providence.

There remains only one class of prayers for consideration; and in it are included all those petitions for specific personal gifts, whether spiritual or material, whether temporal or eternal. Here alone does the soul encounter the invisible barrier of divine providence, limiting its petition both in inception and results. If the effort to reach this last analysis has been tolerably successful, the reader will perceive that all succeeding discussion can only proceed upon this doctrine, to wit, that "no prayer can prevail that is not itself the product of God's providence, and accordant with God's decree." And if it can be shown that this doctrine does *always* encourage the believer to engage in the exercise, strengthening his faith, enlarging his expectations, and confirming his hopes, then these pages will not have been written in vain. Count your treasures, O inheritor of royal prerogatives, and see what is included in the solitary fact that you are in covenant with God!

I. The kind of praying to which attention is now confined, is essentially secret. The world doth not intermeddle therein, and in fact, the world must not know that the business is on hand. "Enter into thy closet, and shut thy door." In the forest-glade, in the thronged marts of commerce, where some quiet nook may be found for a fleeting moment, and the roar of the conflict shut out; in the stillness of midnight, when none are awake, except the man who prays and that other Man who hears; in the agony of some dire extremity, when the swift prayer is suddenly shot like an arrow into the portentous cloud, these secret petitions ascend and enter into the ears of the Lord God of Sabaoth. Very frequently the prayer is induced by circumstances and conditions known only to the petitioner and God.

A fretting leprosy, it may be, scrupulously hidden from the nearest and dearest, until the Master is found walking solitary in the desert, and then the occasion seized, and the heart-broken plea presented, "Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst!" It is a brief sentence, but it is enough, and the cleansed leper does not contract the disease again. Or, it may be the burden of some cross, some thorn in the flesh, irritating and tormenting, apparently hindering the Christian's usefulness—yet of such a nature that he shrinks from the appeal to human sympathy. Indeed, there are cases of positive suffering which earthly sympathy cannot reach, because they arise from some constitutional sensitiveness to which the kindest friends may be strangers; and in such instances the whispered plaint reaches only one ear in the wide universe. Or, it may be a long-cherished desire for a special attainment or a special deliverance, a desire begotten of some special providence, and strengthened by a series of peculiar dispensations, until it becomes a part of the very life, the absorbing topic for secret meditation, the topmost petition in secret prayer. Hidden from all besides, the suppliant murmurs: "Thou art my hiding place! All my desire is before thee, and my groaning is not hid from thee!" The freeness of access to the great throne, and the fulness of communion with its occupant, are known only to the dwellers in the secret place of the Most High. Large and glorious are the privileges and worship of the sanctuary, but far more precious to the saint are the oft-recurring and solitary devotions of the closet.

II. The subject is full of apparent paradoxes, and prominent among them is the fact that this sort of praying accords with positive contentment. The man who prays most is most content while the answer is delayed. He who crawls most frequently to the hiding-place with his intolerable burden, tolerates it the more cheerfully for each such visitation. It were lost labor to tell this story to the logical world, but the secret experience of every separate believer will corroborate the statement. Nor is the explanation difficult to those who are learned in the logic of faith, which argues in this wise: "I have been led by the providence of God to offer this petition, instructed by the word of

God, aided by the Spirit of God, who helpeth my infirmities in this special exercise, and I pray in absolute submission to the will of God. All this is certainly true, if I have prayed at all. The absence of any one of these conditions is fatal to the integrity of the prayer; and if these are all met, then there remaineth nothing but the patient waiting for fulfilment." You may assault the man who utters this language with all the wisdom of all the schools of philosophy the world has ever known, but you will only distract his attention for a moment, and his heart immediately whispers: "Lord, what wait I for? My hope is in thee!"

III. Prayer of this description presupposes a degree of intimacy subsisting betwixt the suppliant and the Hearer, of which no earthly relationship is an accurate type. There are secrets which may be whispered to a father alone, or to a husband, brother, friend, or pastor; but the praying man finds all these relations in the one Lord Christ, to whom he flees in every emergency. Here are no half confidences. The man creeps to his praying-place with the conviction upon his mind that his auditor already knows the whole story. It is true that the devil frequently suggests that the prayer will be more orderly and effectual if the supplicant will confine his attention to one topic; especially when it is a bundle of mixed sins, or when one sin is mingled with sinless causes of suffering. But when he begins to recount his griefs to his Father, he remembers that a Brother and Husband is listening, and he speedily forgets the orderly arrangement. The devil does not like the atmosphere of that prayer-place, and sometimes deserts him; and then he gets the touch in the hollow of his thigh, it may be. It requires very close communion to obtain that lameness; but it is attainable, and a royal name goes with it. The wrestler, in earthly arenas, contends with fierce energy for prizes that are of little value, even when judged by earthly philosophy—for fame that is transient, for honors that are empty, for wealth that takes wings and vanishes. But the athlete who comes *halting* from the conflict in the prayer-place, comes with the rank of a prince who prevails.

And here is the very point upon which the eager attention of all praying humanity is fixed. In very deed, can man prevail with God? In very deed, is prayer a power of such a sort that it will secure almighty aid? In very deed, can God the Creator be moved by the supplications of man the creature? Is it possible that the temporary interests of a solitary believer (of enormous importance to him, but utterly contemptible in comparison with God's vast designs,) can arrest his attention? And, above all, can the holy and wise providence which arranged the sequences of time before time began, be altered by the feeble plaint of a man who is crushed before the moth?

It has already been stated that the prevalent prayer must needs be the prayer that accords with God's unalterable decree. How can the supplicant know that he is proceeding upon this inflexible line? Because, if this difficulty is solved, all difficulties disappear.

In answer to this all-absorbing question, notice, first, that some of the deflections from this line are revealed. If you cast yourself down from a pinnacle of the temple, you may *know* that you will reach the ground, because your act will accord with one of God's revealed decrees—the law of gravitation. In vain you pray beforehand, and remind God that he has promised to give his angels charge concerning you, that they may bear you up in their hands. Your prayer was nothing worth, being deficient in all the elements hinted at above. It is revealed that you may not tempt the Lord your God. Again, if you pray over a stone until you die, you will not transform it into bread, because God has revealed another decree, making bread the product of toil. Moreover, he declares that bread is not the sustainer of life; on the contrary, fulness of bread breeds death. Once more, you may not fix your greedy gaze upon the glory and power of earthly kingdoms, and in the intervals of your covetous and idolatrous longings, pray for their possession. The glory of God is not the object of this praying, and it cannot prevail. So in searching for the trend of divine decrees, it will not do to lose sight of divine commands. The old question, "What hath God wrought?" occurs in close proximity to the other question,

“What hath God spoken?” Prayers, therefore, in opposition to the plain precept, are not the exercises of renewed natures. They are essentially earthly, sensual, and devilish.

Notice, again, that the power of faith, which can say to the mountain, “Be thou removed,” is a power that can be lawfully exercised only in the advancement of Christ’s kingdom. It were lost labor to cultivate this kind for use in ordinary emergencies in personal history. A man once heard a sermon upon the power of faith, in which the preacher used the history of Elisha for illustration. Part of this story was to the hearer *argumentum ad hominem*, for he was a wood-chopper. On the next day, while he rested by the margin of the river, he recalled the Sabbath discourse, and, with earnest diligence and self-examination, he sought for a similar faith in his own bosom, and thought he found it. So, to test the matter, he threw his axe into the stream. As the waves closed over the sinking iron, he muttered, “Ah! I thought so!” Old Bunyan tells of a frivolous and fantastic faith, which is a sorry counterfeit of the true, and which exists only in the loose imagination of ignorance. The Author and Finisher of Faith does not create that sort. Prominent among the graces added to faith is knowledge—knowledge of God, of self, and of others; to know what God approves, what you can accomplish, and what the Church and the world require at your hands. It is a heroic faith that attempts impossibilities under divine guidance; but it is a fantastic faith that attempts the removal of the mountain which God built, and built to endure. Waste no prayers in that direction when they are petitions for mere personal benefits.

The examples in the Bible of successful praying have been used so constantly in application to strictly spiritual cases, that the simple sense of the narratives is obscured. The story of Bartimeus has furnished the text for numberless discourses upon spiritual blindness. The bondage, the pollution, and the curse of sin, all find apt illustration in the history of the cleansed leper. And while the appropriateness of such application cannot be questioned, the plain truths of those histories remains. The leper was delivered from his physical disease, and from all

its attendant pains and disabilities. The blind man rejoiced in the sunlight, which gladdened the remaining days of his natural life, and doubtless his heart overflowed with love and adoration whenever his eyes saw the light and his heart remembered the healer. The woman whose issue of blood was staunched never forgot that temporal blessing in her joyful remembrance of the gracious words of pardon and acceptance that accompanied the miraculous cure. And as the identical beneficent Saviour is still alive and still accessible, it is still possible to press through the throng and touch the hem of his garment. O foolish doubt! what doth hinder? Do you think Jesus is less able or less willing to-day? What do you desire? What burden oppresses your soul? Ah! if you can but touch his robe, your troubles will all disappear.

Thus far the discussion of the second topic, prayer, has been mainly directed to the examination of it, as non-prevalent when confined to purely personal and temporal interests. And if the subject had no other side, the pilgrimage from the cradle to the grave would be dismal enough. Indeed, it may be safe to assert, that the sombre tone of Christian experience in many cases is due to the resolute avoidance of this sunlit side. Joy, peace, and hope, are thought too sacred for application to the affairs of time; and the best preparation for a life of eternal bliss is a temporal life of unchanging crucifixion. What a horrible libel upon the beneficent God of revelation! Yet the observation of many years—more than the quarter of a century—has discovered more examples of this gloomy proclivity, within the Church, than of the contrary faith, and in fact has induced this discussion. Men who secretly cherish a better hope are generally shy and reticent, while your glum ascetics parade their pious hopelessness, singing penitential psalms with mournful cadences, and render beautiful religion ghastly! In the remainder of this investigation, let us walk in the sunlight.

First, God is good—infinately, eternally, and unchangeably good. He was good far back in the eternal cycles, when the decree was made, and the happiness of his creatures was part of the decree. This is not only comforting doctrine, but is ortho-

dox. It were great folly to perplex the mind by hunting for examples of suffering to contradict this doctrine. God is good, and it is rank blasphemy to deny it. If you hang down your head like a bulrush, it is because you doubt God's goodness. The cloud that besets your pathway hides his face from you, but he is behind it, nevertheless; and the prayer of faith and submission will pierce through the thick darkness, and open a passage for the light of his countenance. Oh, taste and see that the Lord is *good!*

Secondly, God is true—infinately, eternally, and unchangeably true. He doth not keep the word of promise to the ear and break it to the hope. His word abounds in promises, so direct and explicit that great ingenuity is required to torture them out of their plain significance. Pious unbelief sometimes succeeds in spiritualizing the comfort into vague generalities, but the accurate statement abides: "Trust in the Lord and do good: so shalt thou dwell in the land, and verily thou shalt be fed. Delight thyself also in the Lord, and he shall give thee the desires of thine heart. Roll thy way upon the Lord; trust also in him; and he shall bring it to pass." And remember that he foresaw the precise exigency in individual history when he announced the promise. No strange and unlooked-for calamity can take him by surprise; no combination of untoward circumstances can thwart his purpose. And if he is *true*, the purpose is enveloped in the promise. Here is no antagonism between providence and prayer. The paradox is solved. He that rides upon the white horse is called faithful and true. The security of the petitioner is in the veracity of the promiser. And the unanswerable argument addressed to him, he furnishes. "Remember the word unto thy servant, upon which thou hast caused me to hope."

Very few sciences are infallibly exact. In general terms, it is known that the exhibition of mercury produces specific effect upon special and deep-seated organs, and upon the salival glands, in certain proportions and under certain conditions of the system. But practitioners of the healing art universally acknowledge that they grope in the dark; and, treating symp-

toms in the administration of remedies, are constantly liable to overlook some that are but faintly manifested. It is also true that the physical frame is sometimes prostrated by mental disquietude, and the secret cause of the trouble eludes the most careful scrutiny. Now, if this difficulty of diagnosis obtains in bodily ailments, how much more inscrutable are mental aberrations, complicated, as they are, with moral aberrations. In this view, the promises of Scripture are general and not specific. God says, "Ask and ye shall receive." But, in the nature of the case, this promise could not be absolute and unconditional. The invitation is addressed only to the disciple *in covenant* with the Promiser, and the terms of the covenant are explicit. So the wicked man who prays for the success of villanous schemes cannot charge God with falsehood because his prayer is not granted. The promise was not to him. Far different is the word addressed to him: "Ye shall call, but I will not answer. I will laugh at your calamity, and mock when your fear cometh." And in the terrible day, when this word is fulfilled, the song of the redeemed will be, "Just and *true* are thy ways, thou King of saints!"

None of these considerations touch the believer. The promise is his special inheritance, his birthright by virtue of his second birth, and he dishonors the giver by doubts and distrust. He hath spoken and will perform, and the prayer of faith is only the endorsement of the promise.

Finally, to consider some of the tokens by which the supplicant may estimate the character of his prayer.

The providences of God, which are *all* the events of human life, indicate the sort of prayers that are in order. He who observes providences may always find them, and they are instructive to all who watch for them. The soul that waits for the Lord more than they that watch for the morning, will see his hand at length so distinctly revealed that no lingering doubt remains in his mind, and the long-deferred answer to his petition comes. It is a peculiarity belonging to this business, that the Hearer frequently delays, though he always listens. It is another peculiarity that he demands many repetitions and long

importunity, albeit he suffers no one of the feeble complaints to be lost. Some day, when time is no longer measured by days, but when eternity shall be one endless day, we may be allowed to study the glorious retrospect, and see how accurately God met each supplication, and how the prayer merged into thanksgiving, as the answer, like a tree of life, burst into blossom.

Once more. When the inclination to seek for some special deliverance will not flag; when the stereotyped petition, so to speak, is slipped into sudden pauses in the whirl of worldly occupation; when the thought darts upon it as the eyes open to the dawn, and lingers upon it as the supplicant sinks into slumber; when the old promise meets the eye, and seems invested with new glory and power, and the petitioner hies to the "secret place" with it, and puts it into his plea anew; when the praying becomes more and more like waiting, and he catches the sound of those voices under the altar, "*How long, O Lord, holy and true!*" and makes his prayer the echo—then, rely upon it, the prayer is running in the grooves of providence, and though the vision tarry, wait for it. The Lord Christ, who has wrought the petition within the soul of his orator, holds the answer in his royal hand; and, sooner or later, the cloud-curtain that hides him shall fall away to the right and left, and the supplicant's prayer shall be transformed into praise, as his eyes, bedimmed with joy-drops, shall take in that enrapturing vision.

ARTICLE IV.

A MEMORIAL OF THE REV. DAVID HUMPHREYS.

There is a strong desire among men to perpetuate their names, and to secure for themselves a remembrance in coming time. Cities have been built, and monuments erected to transmit honored names to coming years. This thirst for renown has led to cruel wars, which have desolated countries, and overthrown empires. Some men have rendered themselves famous by their tyranny and oppression; while others have secured a lasting renown by their patriotism and philanthropy, and others again acquired eminence by their attainments in literature or discoveries in science. The world has awarded the meed of praise to her heroes and statesmen, her philosophers and poets; the annals of the past are crowded with the names of eminent men who are thought worthy to be honored and remembered for successive ages.

But the most brilliant characters, and the most renowned men, will be found at last among the servants of God. The righteous shall gain a celebrity, and win a distinction, beyond any thing which the world can give to its votaries.

“The righteous shall be in everlasting remembrance.” When they die, their names will long be remembered by those who live on the earth. “The memory of the just is blessed.” Their influence will be felt, and their example remembered for generations; nay, the memorial of their goodness shall endure forever.

Who are the righteous? This character does not properly belong to any of the human family while in a state of nature. The moral likeness which man bore to his Maker when first created, was lost in the fall; hence “there is none righteous, no, not one.” But the gospel reveals to us the way in which God can be just, and yet the justifier of every one that believeth in Jesus. “By faith, Abel offered a more excellent sacrifice than Cain; by which he obtained witness that he was righteous.”

Enoch, Noah, Abraham, and many others spoken of in the word of God, were men of faith; and hence they were righteous men. All true believers in Christ are justified in the sight of God; their sins are pardoned, and they are counted righteous, in consequence of the righteousness of Christ imputed to them. They are born of the Spirit; quickened and made new creatures in Christ; old things have passed away, and all things have become new. They confess and forsake sin, and walk in newness of life; they walk in the paths of righteousness. They hunger and thirst after righteousness.

The righteous must include all the saints of the Old and New Testament dispensations. All the members of the Church bought by the blood of the Son of God—every true Christian of any and every age. The Bible divides the human family into two classes—the righteous and the wicked. The righteous are the chosen people of God; who obey the gospel of Jesus Christ; who confess and forsake sin; and live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world. The wicked are the enemies of God; who disobey his gospel and despise his grace. These two classes will be separated in the day of judgment by Jesus Christ; who will place the righteous on his right hand, and the wicked on his left. The former he will commend, and invite to an inheritance of the kingdom prepared for them from the foundation of the world; the latter he will condemn, and order them to depart into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels. Then shall the wicked go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal. Matt. xxv. 32–46.

The righteous shall be greatly distinguished: they shall inherit glory. While on earth they are often despised and persecuted: their names are cast out as evil, and they are made the offscouring of all things. But though they are contemned by men, yet are they honored by God; and despite the vile slanders heaped upon them by the wicked, God will make them a name and a praise in the earth. Their righteousness will be a memorial, which will perpetuate their memory in the world; and in heaven they shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away.

Paul, while on the earth engaged in preaching the gospel, was

hated and persecuted, and finally beheaded; but at the present day, by the most intelligent portion of the human family, he is esteemed as more noble and honored than Alexander the Great, than Julius Cæsar or Napoleon Bonaparte. What sacred associations cluster around the names of Luther, Calvin, Zuingli, Knox, and all such righteous men. Even those who moved in a smaller orbit, and shone with less brilliancy in the Church on earth, have acquired a lustre which has not grown dim by the lapse of centuries. The poor woman who poured the precious ointment on the Saviour's head, did, by this service, secure a *memorial* which must give her honor wherever the gospel is preached to the end of time.

The history of the Church is a memento of the lives and labors of the righteous. These sacred archives contain but a partial and imperfect account of the doings and sufferings of God's people. The names of many of the righteous may not be found in written history, but they are registered in the Lamb's Book of Life. None of them will be forgotten or overlooked by the Saviour, who loved them and bought them with his blood. "Can a woman forget her sucking child, that she should not have compassion on the son of her womb; yea, they may forget, yet will I not forget thee. Behold, I have graven thee on the palms of my hands; thy walls are continually before me." Isai. xlix. 15, 16. The most obscure saint will be owned by Christ, and receive an inheritance among the saints in light. There is a crown, and a palm, and a seat in glory, for every righteous soul: "They shall be mine, saith the Lord, in that day when I make up my jewels." Mal. iii. 17. "Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father." Matt. xiii. 43. *The righteous shall be in everlasting remembrance.*

Our aged and venerated father, the Rev. DAVID HUMPHREYS, was, we believe, a righteous man. For fifty years he lived and labored among us; but God has called him to rest from his labors, and us to mourn his loss.

At the request of his congregations, we have undertaken a brief outline of his life and labors. The writer would have shrunk from this service if there had been any one under more

obligation to render it than himself. He grew up under the pastoral care of Father Humphreys; he received the gospel at his lips, and was brought into the church under his ministry; and by him he was early encouraged to devote himself to the same holy calling.

The history of this venerable man is intimately connected with the history of Good Hope and Roberts churches in the Presbytery of South Carolina. He took charge of them when they were weak and feeble, and through a long ministerial life devoted himself with efficiency and zeal to their spiritual interests. His labors were greatly blessed, and these churches built up under his instrumentality. Surely a minister who has exerted himself so diligently, so perseveringly, and so successfully, for the salvation of souls, is entitled to a lasting remembrance in the Church; and will be commended as a good and faithful servant by the Saviour in the last day. It is not man-worship to speak of the labors of a devoted servant of Christ, and record what he has been enabled to do for the advancement of the kingdom of his Master. No! We only magnify the grace of God which was given to him. Let us all be encouraged by the example of one whom we knew so long and so intimately to live the life of the righteous, that we may die as did our venerable brother, in the blessed hope of eternal life at God's right hand.

This eminent servant of God was born in North Carolina on the 30th of September, 1793. While he was quite young, his father, Maj. Humphreys, removed to South Carolina and settled on the Tugalo River, in what was then Pendleton, but at length Pickens District. There was then no Presbyterian church in that section of the country; and the means of grace, as dispensed by any denomination of Christians, were very limited.

David Humphreys, however, in early life made a profession of faith in Christ, and united with the Baptist church. He soon gave evidence of a desire to obtain an education, and to qualify himself for usefulness in the world. He was placed under the instruction of the Rev. Andrew Brown, with whom he studied for some time; at length he was sent to the academy at Willington in Abbeville District, under the care of the Rev. Moses

Waddel, D. D., with whom he completed his literary education. Here it may be proper to state, that while he was engaged in the study of the Greek Testament, his mind underwent a change in regard to the scriptural mode of baptism. His attention was arrested as he read Matt. iii. 11: "I indeed baptize you *with water* unto repentance; but he that cometh after me is mightier than I . . . he shall baptize you *with the Holy Ghost, and with fire*. He also read what Christ said to his disciples just before his ascension, Acts i. 5: "For John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence." He then read, Acts ii., where it is stated that on the day of Pentecost the baptism by the Holy Ghost took place; which fulfilled not only the prediction of John and of our Saviour, but also that of Joel, as quoted by Peter, in Acts ii. 17: "And it shall come to pass in the last days, that I will pour out of my Spirit on all flesh," etc. He also read the tenth chapter of Acts, where Peter went by divine direction and preached to Cornelius and his household; and in verse 44, "The Holy Ghost fell on all them who heard the word." He read also in Acts ix. 17, 18, the case of Saul of Tarsus, to whom Ananias was sent, that he might receive his sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost; which took place as soon as Ananias put his hands on him. "Then he arose," etc., or more literally—"then he *standing up* was baptized." As he carefully studied these passages of Scripture in the original, he was fully convinced that the scriptural mode of baptism was by affusion or pouring, and not by immersion. He united with the Presbyterian Church; and as he felt that he was called to preach the gospel, he was taken under the care of the South Carolina Presbytery as a candidate for the ministry. He prosecuted his theological studies also under Dr. Waddel; and was licensed to preach the gospel in October, 1819. In a short time, he and the Rev. Thos. C. Stuart were appointed by the Synod of South Carolina and Georgia to visit some of the Indian tribes in the southwest preparatory to the establishment of a mission among them. They set out on horseback in April, 1820, and visited the Creek Nation, and then the Chickasaws. The former gave them no encouragement to commence the missionary work among them

but they found the latter tribe willing, and even anxious, to receive the gospel. They selected a site for a missionary station, which was occupied at length by Rev. T. C. Stuart. These young brethren returned to South Carolina in July. The Rev. D. Humphreys visited Roberts church in the fall of 1820. From this church, in connexion with Good Hope, he received a call in the spring of 1821 for three-fourths of his time, with the promise of three hundred dollars as a salary; which call he accepted. He was ordained and installed pastor in the summer of 1821 by an adjourned meeting of the Presbytery held at Good Hope church. The writer was present, a small boy, on the solemn occasion, when the large congregation assembled in the grove, as the church was too small to accommodate the people. Impressions were made upon his mind, though then but a child, which have not been effaced by the lapse of many years. The venerable Dr. Barr presided on the occasion, and proposed the constitutional questions, and offered the ordination prayer. The young pastor, Mr. Humphreys, was most cordially welcomed by the heads of families in both churches, and settled on a small farm near the Rock Mills in the bounds of Roberts congregation. He hoped that he could raise supplies for his small family on the farm, and that he could pay for it with the salary promised to him by his churches; but he was soon reduced to the necessity of teaching school to accomplish the object.

He was, however, zealous and unwearied in his efforts to build up these feeble churches. Camp-meetings were then in repute; and one or both of his churches were favored annually with the special privileges of such a meeting. The Holy Spirit was often poured out upon the assemblies of the saints, and sinners were hopefully converted to God. About the year 1835, a large framed arbor was erected at Good Hope, at which place an annual camp-meeting was held, including the second Sabbath in August. Families from several contiguous churches erected comfortable tents, and came up yearly to hear the gospel preached for days together, by the different ministers who might be present to aid the pastor on the occasion. Many of these meetings are still remembered no doubt by many who attended

them from year to year. They were seasons of peculiar privilege.

While camp-meetings from some circumstances lost caste all over the Presbytery, they were still kept up at Good Hope till about the year 1851, when, by consultation, the church concluded to hold a three or four days' meeting at the usual time, which could be protracted for several days, if thought necessary. There has been no camp-meeting within the bounds of the Presbytery since the one last held at Good Hope, so far as known to us. The one-fourth part of Mr. Humphreys' time not called for by Good Hope and Roberts, was spent in preaching at New Lebanon and other small churches in Georgia. He was aided at times by some other ministers, and they held very interesting and profitable meetings, in first one and then another of these weak churches. Such an influence was exerted, and these churches were so strengthened, that they became the germ of the Cherokee Presbytery in the upper part of the State of Georgia. His labors in that region were entirely gratuitous. He also preached for several years in Providence church, now in Lowndesville, but which then stood about two miles northeast of the village. Here, through his labors, over one hundred members were added to the church. A camp-meeting was held at this place for a few successive years. On one of those occasions, in 1832, the Rev. Daniel Baker, so famed as a revivalist, preached for several days together with great success.

There is one fact in regard to these churches and their pastor, however, that we must not forbear to mention, though it be a sad one. It is this: after he had preached to them with great fidelity and success for about fourteen years, it was reported that there was a deficiency in the payment of the small salary promised the pastor to the amount of \$1,000 in each church. Here we think pastor and people were both in fault. He had scrupulously avoided saying one word on the subject to the congregations, or even to the sessions. There were then no deacons in these churches to attend to their finances. The deficiency increased yearly as the congregations lost sight of their obligation to pay up the pastor's salary, which they could easily have done.

When by some means attention was turned to the subject, and the accumulated deficiency was read out, the people were astonished, and they, with the pastor, were disconcerted and troubled. After a time, the pastor gave the churches a receipt in full of all demands against them; and by mutual consent, on application to Presbytery, the pastoral relation was dissolved. After the pastoral relation was dissolved, he continued as a stated supply to the churches at their request.

The church at Anderson C. H. was organised in 1837, by the Rev. Edwin Cater. Roberts church had to part with some very important members in order to have an organisation there. The infant church consisted of thirteen members, two of whom, viz., J. N. Whitner and J. P. Holt, were chosen ruling elders. It was supplied for a time by Rev. E. Cater, who preached there half of his time; while the other half was given to Rock church. In 1839, he was called by this latter church for all of his time, and the Anderson C. H. church was left vacant. It was next supplied by Rev. B. M. Palmer for some six or eight months, when he was called to Savannah, Ga., and the feeble church was again left vacant.

In 1842, Mr. Humphreys left Roberts church vacant, and became the stated supply at Anderson C. H., where he continued to labor for half of his time until the year 1850, when Rev. Robert H. Reid was called to Anderson C. H. for all of his time. He accepted the call and was ordained and installed in November of the same year.

Mr. Humphreys never ceased to supply Good Hope church. In fact he was called by it again, and installed pastor in November, 1845, for half of his time, with a salary of \$200.

In April, 1846, Roberts church gave him a call for the other half of his time; he declined the call, however, that he might supply the church at Anderson C. H. The Rev. W. H. Harris supplied Roberts church from April, 1842, to October, 1844, which was two years and six months. It was supplied from that time to March, 1845, about six months, by Rev. J. C. Williams. It was next supplied for about the same length of time by Rev. Joseph Gibert. In 1846, Rev. W. Carlile became the stated

supply, and continued so till about 1850, the space of four years.

In 1851, Mr. Humphreys was again called by Roberts church. He accepted the call and was installed in November of the same year. Thus after some years of absence from one of these churches, they were again united under his pastoral care.

Here it may be proper to add that, after he resumed the care of both churches for some years, there was a complaint in both congregations that the houses of worship were not sufficiently large and comfortable. In 1856, a large and commodious house of worship was erected by each congregation as if by concert; both of the same dimensions, viz., 60 by 40 feet. The one at Good Hope is a beautiful framed building built by the liberal subscriptions of the congregation, which at that time was larger and wealthier than the congregation of Roberts. It was nicely painted and ceiled, and is supplied with two fine stoves, which render it very comfortable in the winter season. The one at Roberts is built of bricks, which were made by the united labors of the congregation; only a few hundred dollars in money was collected to purchase nails, glass, putty, etc., and to pay the mechanics who put up the building. The members of the congregation formed themselves into little companies, and by turn made a given number of bricks until the supply was sufficient; others supplied lumber—every man according to his ability. When the brick was put into a kiln and ready to burn, on a Saturday evening, as the companies were about to separate, Father Humphreys, as if commander-in-chief, issued orders to this effect: "Now let every man return here on Monday morning with his axe; and let a few bring their wagons; and let us get a supply of wood to burn the brick which are now ready for the fire." The order was promptly obeyed. On Monday morning they came together, and soon gathered a sufficient quantity of wood; and we may say that through his efforts, aided by some energetic men in both congregations, the houses were both completed. The one at Good Hope, with every dollar of the cost paid up, was dedicated, we believe, in August, 1856. The one at Roberts, with a very small amount due, was dedicated on

Saturday before the fifth Sabbath in September, 1856. The congregations both increased in size after they were supplied with such comfortable houses of worship. Their influence extended further; other denominations of Christians in the vicinity have been moved by these examples to supply themselves with new and commodious houses of worship.

It was apparent to his friends that, for the last few years of his life, his strength was failing; yet, with the same untiring devotion and marked punctuality, he continued to preach a crucified Saviour to the people of his charge; to visit the sick and the bereaved; and to comfort them, and pray with them. His churches conferred together about employing some minister to discharge a part of the aged pastor's service; but no one could be found that was acceptable to all parties, hence he toiled on until called by his Master to rest from his labors.

The Rev. D. Humphreys represented the South Carolina Presbytery in the General Assembly in Philadelphia in 1831; again in Pittsburg in 1849; then again in Lexington in 1857; and, finally, in Baltimore in 1869.

Besides being noted for great punctuality and faithfulness in filling all his own appointments, and in keeping promises made to his brethren of assistance at their sacramental meetings, he was conspicuous for constant and diligent attendance upon Presbytery and Synod. In his own Presbytery, owing to the earnestness, honesty, frankness, and truthfulness of his character, his influence was well nigh unbounded. Some of his friends were accustomed to say to him, half seriously, and half in jest: "South Carolina Presbytery always does whatever you say." To one such who teased him for the reason why his own motions were often lost, while Father H.'s were so generally sustained, he answered with a smile: "Well, I never propose any thing but what is backed by common sense." He was sure to be disquieted whenever a presbytery's time was consumed in what he regarded as useless discussion. On such occasions he would be apt to cry: "You are burning daylight;" or, "The thing is as plain as the nose on my face." The following characteristic anecdote of Mr. Humphreys was often told by the eminent

Chancellor Job Johnstone, who knew and loved him well. On a certain occasion, when the Presbytery had been wearied by a long and unimportant debate, and was all in confusion, and the moderator quite at a loss what course to pursue, this venerated and earnest leader jumped to his feet, crying aloud: "Fiddle-faddle! fiddle-faddle!! What is all this long talking about? Those of you who are in favor of this motion, say aye!" And many obediently answered aye! "Now, those of you who are opposed to this motion, say no!" And some answered no! "There now," said he, "it is all settled. Moderator, you can go on to the next business."

The Rev. Daniel L. Gray and the Rev. Wm. H. Harris both prosecuted their theological studies under his direction. The writer's course of study was also commenced with him; but it was prosecuted and completed in the Seminary at Columbia.

From these two churches since they have been under the care of Rev. D. Humphreys, God has raised up nine ministers of the gospel; and three candidates for the ministry, two of whom are now under the care of the South Carolina Presbytery. From Roberts church there have been as follows, viz.: the Rev. Messrs. Wm. C. McElroy, Wm. H. Harris, John McLees, Robert McLees, J. S. Willbanks, D. W. Humphreys, and Hugh McLees, with the candidates J. A. McLees, L. A. Simpson, and T. H. Cunningham. Of these ministers, the Rev. Messrs. McElroy, Harris, and R. McLees, have ceased from their labors and gone before their venerable pastor to receive their reward. From Good Hope church, the Rev. Messrs. Robert H. Reid and Isaac J. Long. They are both active and efficient ministers of the gospel; the former pastor of Nazareth church in Spartanburg, South Carolina, and the latter is at Batesville, Arkansas. May they long be spared to the Church and the world!

From the history of these churches written by the pastor some five years ago, we learn that when he commenced his labors there were in Roberts church, in 1820, some thirteen families and forty members; in 1864, there were forty-seven families and ninety members. In Good Hope there were, in 1820, some fourteen families and forty-six members; in 1864, there were

forty-seven families and one hundred and thirty members. These numbers may not hold good at the present time.

The roll of the members dismissed from these churches during Mr. Humphreys' ministry would perhaps equal the number of those now on the church books. Some of the churches in South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi, are partially, if not altogether, offshoots from Roberts and Good Hope. The list of the deceased members is also very long. The dead may outnumber the living. Only four of those who were members in 1820, are alive at the present time. A. Reid, Esq., ruling elder at Good Hope, the father of Rev. R. H. Reid, stands alone in that church. At Roberts there are two members. These three representatives of these churches a half century ago, are now lingering with a trembling step on the shores of mortality, daily awaiting the summons that is to call them to follow their aged pastor.

"One army of the living God,
To his commands we bow,
Part of the host have crossed the flood,
And part are crossing now."

But some account must be given of his conflict with the last enemy, which is death. Providentially hindered from seeing him in his last sickness, we can only present the few but cheering statements made to us by others. He fell with his armor on. He assisted the Rev. W. F. Pearson in a communion meeting at Varennes, on the second Sabbath in September. The Spirit of God was present; a number of persons were inquiring what they must do to be saved. On Monday, Father Humphreys preached from 1 Tim. i. 15: "This is a faithful saying and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners, of whom I am chief." His illustrations were so clear, and his appeals so tender and earnest, that some present regarded the sermon as one of the best they ever heard him preach. It was his last sermon. He was taken ill that night and suffered extreme pain. In a few days he reached home, but it was only to die. He had previously appointed a meeting at Roberts church. His son, the Rev. D. W. Humphreys, of Mississippi,

was on a visit to his father, and with the Rev. H. McLees, carried on the meeting for some days. It was evident that the Spirit of God was present with them. When the dying man of God heard this, he said: "By all means go on with the meeting;" but circumstances forced them to close it. Presbytery met at Pendleton on the 23rd of September. As the brethren from different quarters assembled in the house of God, Father Humphreys, so long and so regular in his attendance on such occasions, was not present among them. The report of his extreme illness produced deep anxiety in every bosom. On motion, the Presbytery, on his behalf, united in fervent supplications at a throne of grace, led by the Moderator, Dr. Buist; who also, by the order of Presbytery, despatched to him the following affectionate letter:

"DEAR BROTHER: Your brethren and your sons of the Presbytery of South Carolina, now met together at Pendleton, have heard with deep concern of your illness. We pray God, if it be his holy will, to spare your life and restore your health, and continue your labors on earth. We miss you, dear brother, from our councils at the present meeting. May the Master give you patience and grace. Should it not be his will for you to join with us any more in labors for the Church on earth, it comforts us, and let it comfort you, beloved brother, that you shall only be translated to a higher sphere of duty. The Lord whom you trust in and serve, be with you living and dying."

The sympathies and prayers of the brethren, however, could not abate the violence of disease. He grew worse every day. In one of his paroxysms of pain, he said: "There is a storm without, but all is calm and peaceful within. The waves are rising high; but I am resting securely on the Rock of Ages. I have never regretted taking the step which I took in early life. I have ever found the Saviour faithful to his promises. He has never deceived me. He is my wisdom and righteousness and sanctification and redemption." These words were distinctly heard; then his voice grew faint and his words indistinct. A short time before he died, he again spoke audibly, and said: "All is well; I shall soon enter the green pastures, and walk by the still waters, which the Saviour has prepared for me." He spoke no more, though he still retained his reason to the last. When

evidently dying, his son, the Rev. D. W. Humphreys, asked his father if he, with the apostle, could say, "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?" He was not able to speak; but his countenance beamed with a heavenly radiance as he twice nodded in assent to the truth. Soon after this, he peacefully closed his eyes in death, on the night of the 28th of September. He was buried at Roberts church on the 30th of September, which would have been his 76th birthday. A large congregation assembled in the church, and service was conducted by Rev. W. F. Pearson. After which, with sad hearts, they gathered round the grave, to which they consigned the remains of their aged and beloved pastor.

He had intended to preach his fiftieth anniversary sermon on the first Sabbath in October. The sermon was about half written. By request, his son read it in the church on the Sabbath on which it was to have been preached by the venerable father.

The Rev. D. Humphreys was thrice married: first, to Miss Susan Gibert, of Abbeville District; the second time, to Miss Rebecca Cunningham, of Laurens District; and the third time, to Miss Mary Hunter, of Pickens District; and she, with one daughter by the first marriage, and five sons by the second marriage, is left to mourn their sore bereavement. But they are not the only mourners. His vacant churches, with their numerous families, can unite in the mournful elegy:

"Dearest pastor, thou hast left us,
Here thy loss we deeply feel,
But 'tis God who hath bereft us,
He can all our sorrows heal.
Yet again we hope to meet thee
When the day of life is fled,
There in heaven with joy to greet thee,
Where no farewell tear is shed."

In his death the Presbytery has lost its oldest and one of its most efficient ministers. He was an associate with Drs. Waddel and Barr; and with the fathers Kennedy, Dickson, Lewers, and Ross. With them he now rests from his labors, and his works

do follow him. The Synod, and the Church at large, have cause to mourn his loss.

Can the remembrance of such a man—such a worthy and devoted minister of the gospel be soon forgotten? We think not. His manifold labors and great sacrifices for the cause of Christ will be a memorial which will perpetuate his memory for years to come. His influence can never die; it will be transmitted and perpetuated to the end of time; yes, and throughout eternity. “The righteousness of a righteous man endureth forever.” Ps. cxii. 9. If in the flight of years he is forgotten on earth by men, yet will he not be forgotten by God. If not known and remembered on earth, he will be known and remembered in heaven. “Behold, his witness is in heaven, and his record is on high.” Job xvi. 19. He shall be in everlasting remembrance.

This brief but thankful record should impress every reader of it who may be a votary of the world, with the truth that the way to glory and honor, is the way of holiness—the path of the righteous where Christians walk. Reader, come walk in wisdom’s ways! They are pleasant and peaceful, and will lead you to durable riches and everlasting remembrance.

To the congregations of Good Hope and Roberts he may no longer preach righteousness, for his truthful tongue is silent in death. His long and efficient labors, and his bright and holy example, should still speak to them in solemn notes of warning, and in cheering words of encouragement. For almost half a century he preached a crucified Saviour to them, and warned all to flee from the wrath to come. Let none who have ever heard his faithful warnings meet him at the bar of God in their sins; for he will be a swift witness against them in that day, and their guilt will be aggravated in proportion as their privileges have been abundant. Let the members of his churches, both the aged and the young, remember his instructions and follow his example; and, with him, they may hope to share in the blessedness that awaits the righteous. Nor let them feel cast down by this afflictive dispensation of providence, through fear that those churches must decline after the loss of so good a pastor. Rather let them

cheer up, because our Saviour still lives, and his Church can never perish. God can, and will in due time, answering humble and fervent prayer, give them another pastor after his own heart. When Moses was removed by death, God appointed Joshua to lead Israel into the land of promise.

His brethren in the ministry who may read these pages, and especially the ministers of South Carolina Presbytery, should be stimulated by the example of Father Humphreys, and also encouraged by his success. He claimed no eminent abilities as a scholar, or as an eloquent speaker. His manner was plain and unaffected; his style was simple, yet earnest; his heart was sincere and his life consistent; his disposition was cheerful, and his labors were abundant. Two weak churches have grown up under his fostering care to rank with the largest in the Presbytery. May his mantle fall on him who may be called to be his successor.

Let his bereaved wife and children; his sorrowing relatives and friends; his vacant churches, and the Presbytery of which he was long a member; comfort themselves and one another with that word of God, which assures us it shall be well with the righteous; that death is gain to them; and that though they sleep in the dust, they shall in the final day awake to everlasting life. And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars forever and ever. Amen.

ARTICLE V.

THE NATURE OF THE ATONEMENT—WHY IT IS
NECESSARILY VICARIOUS.

It is our duty reverently to accept the atonement as it is given to us in the word of God; and if it be involved in mystery, if it be beyond human comprehension, if it be apparently inconsistent with our ideas of justice, and opposed to our processes of reasoning, still to receive it as the power of God, and the *wisdom* of God, for our salvation; yet it is none the less our duty reverently to seek to understand its nature from the revelation we have of it in the Bible, and to determine whether we can reconcile it with our ideas of justice, and with reason; and if not, wherein it is irreconcilable?

There is no truth more clearly and emphatically taught in the word of God, than that the atonement is essentially *vicarious*; that Jesus Christ, innocent and sinless, was *substituted* for us, guilty and sin-cursed; that the punishment of our sins was inflicted upon him; and that through this infliction upon a perfectly sinless being, the door of mercy was thrown open, and salvation offered to all men; yea, more, that *in no other way* could the sins of fallen man be forgiven, and his salvation be secured. "Without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sins." Why was this necessary? How could the voluntary suffering of an innocent being atone for the sins of the guilty creature? Where is the connexion between the two? Does not the guilty still remain unpunished?

This train of inquiry shows us that if we would understand the nature of the atonement, we must understand the nature of the punishment which the violated law demanded.

God's law being righteous, and man being created holy, if in the exercise of his free agency, he voluntarily determine to break this righteous law, all will agree that he should be punished for its infraction. We, therefore, have no difficulty in yielding a

ready assent to the justice of inflicting punishment upon the sinner.

But what is punishment? It is of two kinds: the imposed and the endured; or, to express it somewhat differently, the inflicted, and the consequential.*

In the physical world a violated natural law is followed by an injurious consequence. The stomach is organised for the reception of food. You insert poison, you violate its law of health; the result is, the destruction of its organs. This is simply cause and effect. Precisely so in the moral world. Disobedience of God's commands is antagonism to God's holiness; antagonism to his holiness is sin; sin is evil; evil is unhappiness. This is consequential; it is the effect from the cause. It inheres in the nature of things. It is a law precisely as cause and effect is a law in the physical world. This "consequence" is punishment, because being unholiness, it is unhappiness; unhappiness is suffering; and hence we say that one element in punishment must always be that which is consequential. This unhappiness of the moral agent is the consequence of his disobedience; so long as the disobedience—the cause—exists, so long will the unhappiness—the effect—likewise exist. Everlasting punishment in hell, must result as a consequence from the everlasting disobedience of the soul. Until the cause is removed the effect must exist, and must exist just as long as the cause exists. This

*The author has thus expressed the distinction made by our old divines between the penalty of sin as to its *essence*, and as to its *accidents* or *adjuncts*; or, as others have expressed it, between rewards and punishments as they are *extraordinary* and *positive*, or *ordinary* and *natural*. The wrath, curse, and dereliction of God belong to the *essence* of punishment, and proceed from the direct and *positive* act of the Lawgiver in vindication of his violated law. This must be borne either by the offender or his sponsor. In the case of the real criminal there is the accident or adjunct of remorse of conscience and despair, which if Christ be rejected must be eternal. It is the result of sin to every transgressor. It can not be otherwise, the Creator being just and holy. This the innocent sponsor can never feel, however much he may otherwise suffer the penalty due the sinner.—Eds. S. P. R.

would answer the objection to eternal punishment, if nothing more was involved in it.

But this "consequence" is not all of punishment. There remains another element of punishment—that which is inflicted. This is totally distinct from the other. It may begin and terminate without having any effect upon the "consequential" element.

Let us take a practical illustration. A man commits the crime of forgery. Ten years' imprisonment is inflicted. He serves the term. This kind of punishment has begun and ended. He is none the less morally guilty of the crime; he is none the less a *forger*, when released, than he was when he entered the prison walls. The punishment which is consequential still remains.

Man broke God's holy law and became a sinner. Why could not God forgive him and restore him to his former state? God is omnipotent. Forgiveness is one of his darling attributes.

Let us seek for the elucidation of this point by recurring again to human government. Suppose the chief executive of the state, in assuming the gubernatorial office, should issue a proclamation, stating that inasmuch as many crimes would be committed in the state in the future—as such was the history of all states—he therefore publicly declared that all persons who should thereafter commit the crimes of murder, rape, arson, burglary, theft, or any other crimes known to the law, need only send up a petition to his excellency, expressing their repentance for the crime, and he would at once pardon them. Here would be the exercise of the divine attribute of forgiveness; and should we not say he was a most humane, a most righteous governor?

Should we not, on the contrary, say, that such a course is sanctioning crime? that it encourages criminals? Must not the result be that crime would be increased to a fearful extent? Would not our sense of justice be shocked? Would we not say that so far from the government expressing its disapprobation of crime, and manifesting a purpose that crime should not be tolerated, we here had an invitation held out for its commission?

We now see what is the true meaning and purpose of inflicted punishment. It is to give expression on the part of the government *to its want of tolerance* of crime. The gallows, the prison,

the entire machinery for inflicting punishment, is but *the mode of giving forth this expression* on the part of the government. There is no element of revenge in it. All men condemn cruelty in punishment. If a man commits murder, the state which would punish him by pulling his limbs to pieces or roasting him alive, would be condemned by the whole civilised world. Why? Because the crime of murder is not condemned by the world? Not at all. But the infliction of pain upon the individual is not the *object* of punishment. The infliction of pain may be, and is, *the mode of attaining the object of punishment*, but is not the object of punishment. It is sometimes said that its object is to deter others by means of the example. But this is merely stating the above definition of inflicted punishment in a different manner. What is there in the example if it stand isolated? What is its effect upon others if it is never to be repeated? It is because the *example* teaches the beholder that so it must be in every case; that the government *will not* tolerate crime at all, whenever and by whomsoever committed. This is the whole of it. When it has attained this object, when it has furnished this expression of intolerance on the part of the government, it has answered the purpose for which it was ordained; and the executive clemency can only be exercised in subordination to this expression. Consequently only isolated cases can be the subjects of pardon, while the many must be punished.

If a man murders your sleeping infant, you take his life to revenge its death; but all men, every where, strangers to you and it, would cry aloud for his life, not from the same motive which actuated you. It would be the universal expression of horror of the crime, and of a purpose that it could not be and should not be tolerated. And this would be so whether there were organised society or not. This sentiment in man, in his collective capacity, is what we call justice, or public justice, or the spirit of justice. It is but the reflex of the sentiment in God. This necessity for expression in human society is a moral principle, belonging to the moral government, inhering in it, fundamental and eternal.

It is impossible for God to hold out a free pardon to all sin-

ners, simply if they will ask his forgiveness and express sorrow for what they have done. It is tantamount to saying, "Go on and sin to your heart's content, then come to me, and I will forgive you."

Where would be the expression of hatred of sin? of the utter intolerance of sin? of the irreconcilable antagonism between holiness and sin? Surely, to sin would be a small matter. God cares not how much we sin; indeed, it is in effect to say, "Sin as much as you please and I will forgive you, if you will ask me, and express your sorrow for what you have done."

What would become of the dignity of the violated law? Where would be the fearful, awful antagonism between the pure and holy God, and the hideous deformity, sin?

If God can be the justifier of the sinner, he must at the same time be just. The preservation of the integrity of his law must not be jeopardized in the pardon of the breaker of it. The object of the inflicted punishment upon the fallen human race was to furnish this expression. It was thus "to satisfy justice." It was to perpetuate the expression of intolerance of disobedience of the moral law on the part of the moral government. This is the meaning of justice, or the spirit of justice.

The consequential punishment was entirely different. It was the effect following the cause. It was the sense of guilt, remorse, despair—all the accumulated suffering and degradation which sin brings upon the soul.

If the purposes of the inflicted punishment could be attained, the consequential punishment might be removed. True repentance and earnest entreaty of God's forgiveness would reach his mercy, and the sinner could be pardoned. If the expression of intolerance of sin could be furnished and perpetuated, every barrier in the way of the forgiveness of the sin and the restoration of the sinner would be out of the way. The divine attribute of forgiveness could be exercised; the sinner could be pardoned.

But the punishment must be inflicted; there is no room for forgiveness, because it is impossible that it can be exercised and at the same time the inflicted punishment visited upon the sinner. Hence the door of mercy is closed.

Now God, in Christ Jesus, voluntarily endures the inflicted punishment, and thus furnishes the eternal expression of intolerance of sin on the part of the moral government. If the expression is furnished in this way as effectually as by inflicting the punishment upon the sinner, then is justice satisfied. God cannot forgive the sinner consistently with his holiness without at the same time giving expression to his intolerance of sin. He must inflict the punishment in order to give this expression; but he cannot inflict the punishment upon the sinner and also pardon him. Hence the sinner never can be forgiven unless this expression of intolerance can be given in some other way.

Christ's suffering and death is therefore *of necessity* vicarious. He suffers the punishment and accomplishes the same purpose as if the sinner suffered the punishment. If the same end is accomplished, it may be inflicted upon him instead of upon the sinner, and the demands of justice be met, if he is willing to endure it. It is the person alone who is substituted, not the punishment.

It must never be absent from the mind that it is God himself who is the substituted sufferer. It is his voluntary act. What higher expression of his eternal, unappeasable hatred of sin could he give, than by himself voluntarily condescending to meet all the terrible inflictions which his eternal justice demanded? Not *as* a sinner, but *for* the sinner. What a magnificent vindication of the holiness of his law, that rather than manifest the least leniency towards unholiness, or the slightest tolerance of any violation of righteousness, God himself with all his purity should voluntarily take upon himself all the inflicted punishment that the sinner must suffer, still himself sinless! How divine the love, how boundless the compassion, that would make him thus remove every barrier to the full pardon, the entire forgiveness of the sinner!

Now it is because it is the *inflicted*, and not the consequential, punishment which Christ suffered, that he who knew no sin is enabled to suffer it and remain sinless. He does not suffer the punishment which is consequential, the sense of guilt; but the imposed suffering, required, as we have seen, to vindicate the violated law.

All the machinery of human government for punishing has nothing to do with the sense of guilt on the part of the criminal. You hang men, you whip them, you imprison them, just the same whether they suffer the pangs of remorse, or are as callous and dead to sensibility and the suffering attendant upon it as the prison wall or the gallows frame. So the sinless God may take upon himself the inflicted punishment and still be sinless, still be untouched by the consequential punishment of sin. There is no analogy between this substituted or vicarious atonement, and the often supposed case of the innocent man dying for the guilty, and for many reasons, only some of which can now be suggested. The innocent man has no right to give his life for his guilty friend; it does not belong to him; it not only belongs to God, but, in a certain sense, also to the human government. He holds it in trust. Jesus Christ said, "I have power to lay down my life, and to take it again." No man can say this. Again—and here the analogy most essentially fails—the man is the *subject*. He does not represent the government. It is not the act of the government when his life is offered. It is his own officious interference. It is the voluntary act of the *individual*—the expression of the subject, and not of the government; it answers no purpose of punishment. Now it is manifest that the sinner can only seek forgiveness through the sufferings of Christ; the punishment must be inflicted or forgiveness is impossible. Out of Christ God is a consuming fire. The flaming sword of *justice* is all that meets the sinner's gaze. "There is," therefore, "no name given under heaven whereby we *can be* saved except Christ Jesus." We must, *of necessity*, come to God through him. Coming through him, we approach a heavenly Father.

It was, as has already been said, the person who was substituted, and not the punishment. The punishment which Christ suffered was not an *equivalent* (as many will have it) for the punishment which the violated law required to be inflicted upon the breaker of it. It was *the very* punishment. He who knew no sin "bore *our* sins upon the tree." The confusion of ideas as to the *nature* of punishment has led to this error; Christ, sinless,

could not suffer the very punishment the sinner must suffer, it will be urged, because the sinner's suffering involved the *guilt* of sin. But he did not suffer the punishment which was *consequential*, but that which was *inflicted*. He suffered "the *wrath* of God;" he was made "a curse for us," "the *chastisement* of our peace was *laid* upon him." It was "the *curse* of the LAW" that he redeemed us from.

What was the inflicted punishment? It was God's wrath; it was banishment from his presence and favor, pain and death. Did Christ suffer these upon the cross, or some equivalent for them? Let the anguish of that awful hour answer in the agonized cry of "*Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani!*"

What was the consequential punishment? It was unholiness, guilt, remorse, despair. Christ knew them not. He was sinless. True, the mission of Christ was more than "to satisfy justice." It was to magnify the law, and vindicate its excellence by his perfect obedience to it: and this harmonizes with, and is indeed a part of, the stupendous design of his life and death, which was to portray the righteousness of the law, and, at the same time, show that its violation could not be tolerated. Yet the infinite grandeur of the atonement, the height and the depth of this wonderful exhibition of *love*, is in the voluntary endurance of the curse of sin for us by the sinless God himself.

The nature of the atonement we may understand; but who can comprehend the height and depth of the love of God which it manifested! It was this "satisfaction of divine justice" which "reconciled God to us," or placed us where we could be the recipients of his mercy; but it was the infinite love that prompted the sacrifice which "reconciles us to God," and brings us in adoration to the foot of the cross; it is this which draws us to Christ, makes us hate sin, fills our hearts with love to him, and causes us to plead his righteousness at the throne of mercy for our forgiveness.

ARTICLE VI.

The Life of Joseph Addison Alexander, D. D., Professor in the Theological Seminary at Princeton, New Jersey. By HENRY CARRINGTON ALEXANDER. 2 vols. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1870. Pp. 921, 12mo.

The notable volumes, whose title we have thus recited, appeared early in the present year; and whilst they were hailed with sincere delight by a numerous class of biographic readers, were almost enthusiastically received by the former pupils of the great man whose life their teeming pages were designed to commemorate. Frequent notices of them, all eulogistic and some extensive, have occupied from time to time the columns of our religious and even our secular newspapers. The reading public has, therefore, to a considerable extent, already been made acquainted with their principal contents, and there may seem to be scarcely a necessity for again calling attention to what is so well known. But we cannot refrain from occupying a few pages of this REVIEW with some further treatment of a subject which cannot easily be exhausted—a subject we approach with pleasure and will quit with reluctance.

Some have objected to the ponderous size of these volumes, and have ventured the criticism that their most obvious merit consists in the fact that they are merely a storehouse from whose treasures the future biographer shall be enabled to cull suitable materials for more popular use. For our part we are free to say that there is scarcely a paragraph we should be content to see expunged, or a chapter we would care to have condensed. Whilst, indeed, it might be well if an edition of Dr. Alexander's unique life were published, which, having been cast into a form better adapted to a cheap and wide circulation, would perhaps be in a condition for accomplishing a greater good; yet our belief is that no one of the particular class of readers whose minds and hearts the study of such a life is calculated most to benefit would be willing to spare any portion of the nine hundred pages now given to the world. We heartily thank the gifted author for

the cheerful pains he has taken to portray the many-sided character of his illustrious uncle; for the literary labor he has expended in tracing by touches so fine and so minute the career of a man whose like we of this generation shall probably never look upon; and for the industrious love with which he has followed from his childhood to his death-bed the successive steps of this mighty scholar, profound thinker, rare instructor, hard intellectual worker, and great preacher, for whose existence and endowments the American Church has the most abundant reason to thank its Head. The work that thus has been accomplished was a delicate one to undertake when the relationship of the biographer to the deceased is considered: but the task has been well, even nobly, discharged, and we take the opportunity to express our gratitude therefor.

JOSEPH ADDISON ALEXANDER was one of a family whose head, the great Archibald, and whose oldest member, the much-lamented James, would of themselves have rendered it conspicuous and memorable. But it is no damage to the reputation of the distinguished father, nor detraction from the fame of the eminent brother, to say that they were both excelled by the wonderful man, the theme of this memoir, who has shed a lustre more brilliant than that of either upon the name he bore. This seems the language of extravagance. The contents of these volumes forbid a eulogy less strong. We had thought, before reading this charming biography, that we were well acquainted with the characteristic worth of its renowned subject. We had known him personally. We had studied under him. We had enjoyed the privilege of many conversations with him. We had often heard him preach, and lecture, and expound. We had listened to descriptions of him from others whose opportunities for measuring his mental magnitudes were much superior to our own. We had read about him, before and since his death, a hundred things that freshly excited our wonder, our admiration, and our reverence. We knew that his exploits of erudition were prodigious, that his attainments in various scholarship were astonishing, that his gifts of genius were as numerous as his mental powers, and that his laboriousness in acquiring unusual

knowledge was something incredible. But until we perused these volumes we possessed no adequate conception of his gigantic understanding, of the high and comprehensive sweep of his intelligence, of the marvels of his learned achievements, of the majesty of his mind altogether. We could, indeed, hardly believe what is here told us, did it not come substantiated by every compelling proof. In languages he was a prodigy; in general literature he was a universal master; in theology he had few equals; in argumentative invention he displayed talents of the highest order; in oratory he reached the point of preëminence; in the art of composition he exhibited qualities which alone would have won for him shining distinction; in epistolary correspondence he was simply fascinating; whilst in his piety he was thoroughly child-like, and in his intercourse with intimate friends there was the charm of a flowing geniality for which he never received sufficient credit by the outside world—all this set off by the entire absence of self-assertion and by the frequent presence of much positive amiability. Such is the imperfect outline of a character of which mankind has known very few samples, and which is delineated in the work before us in a manner that leaves nothing to be wished. It ought to be added that, in his ordinary intercourse with men, this lordly son of genius oftentimes exhibited a reserve that resembled actual shyness. This, partly due to constitutional temperament, but mainly to his recluse habits of study, seemed to withdraw him from general society, and by-and-by rendered contact with his fellow-men at large distasteful and irksome. His accomplished biographer has not brought to view the whole effect of what thus came to be one of his best known peculiarities. It rendered his greatness less efficient than could have been desired. Intellectually qualified to stand at the head of his denomination, had he chosen to mingle more with others less great than himself, he could have occupied the very forefront as an influential controller of all its great movements. If, in addition to making the extensive use he did of his unrivalled talents and his unequalled attainments within the selected, but by no means narrow, circle to which his tastes confined him, he had stepped out into the spacious arena of active life, had become

a leader in ecclesiastical bodies, and had sought to impress himself upon his contemporaries, who often needed the light he could best emit and the healthful stimulus he could best impart, there would have been nothing wanting to the completion of a character every way transcendent. We cannot help regretting that such a man as he shunned the platform of debate, the floor of public deliberation, those places of official concourse where mind comes into collision with mind and strikes out sparks of otherwise latent truth and kindles the torch of general enlightenment. We regret that he did not find in the map of his duties a region into which he might have felt called, wherein to exhibit those wide and generous sympathies for his race, of which, in his soul, he was undoubtedly conscious, and which he frequently expressed in a quiet way. Had he done this, we might now be comparing him, not only with the greatest scholars of the age he adorned, but also with such men as those of whom Thomas Chalmers was a type—men whose ardent nature threw them into the van of every important church enterprise, and made them the glory of their generations. That Dr. Alexander might have equalled, if not excelled, that famous Scotchman in a similar public career, no one can doubt who has acquainted himself with that class of his harmonious abilities which were calculated to make him as illustrious in the ecclesiastical court as he was productive in the private study. But he seems to have shown no desire to achieve victories where fame such as that which Chalmers won would have crowned the conqueror. He wished no one to consider him a great man at all. He was even anxious for such obscurity as should screen him altogether from the gaze of men. He sought to do his congenial work in the depths of a quietude where no intrusive eye could follow him, where no popular applause could ever offend his ears, and where no conspicuous importance could appear to attach to his person. We must say that if this was a fault, it was at least a noble one. And we are not meaning to lay upon his memory our poor blame, when we say that he could have done a greater good to his Church and the world at large, if he had found it consistent with his other plans of Christian service to come forth from his walled

privacy and made his tremendous power felt in the manner we have indicated. When, in 1835, for example, he went to New York, to attend, as an outsider, some of the anniversary meetings, we can imagine what would have been the result had he been present as an insider; how, young as he then was, he would have answered and hushed Binney and Thompson, who, in one place, were pushing forward the cause of abolition in the spirit of a fanaticism that soon overleaped all bounds; and how he would have helped Bethune and John Breckinridge, who, in another place, were engaged in pleading the cause of colonization, that better solution of the negro problem! Or, we can fancy how, the same month, if he had been in Pittsburgh, a member of that General Assembly in whose proceedings he evinced a deep interest, his voice might, more powerfully than that of almost any other, have served to guide the storm then raging, and made the division into Old School and New more tender and not less complete. But he read his duty otherwise, and we must be satisfied with what he was—the light of knowledge—and need not deplore the loss of what he was not—the fire of action. Perhaps he was, after all, right. “*Totus in illo*” is a capital motto for ordinary minds, and may be it was so for his. Had he been more of a public man, we must have missed something of the depth of his impress in other respects; and if he did not choose to become both a great ecclesiastical chieftain and a great church-exegete, he at any rate made himself all that was possible in the latter and safer character.

The biography dwells at commendable length upon the opening years of him who afterwards became so great, and furnishes us with a variety of pleasing and pleasantly-told reminiscences of his rising genius. Those notices, too, of his truly charming mother, (a daughter of the “blind preacher” of Virginia,) of his venerated father, of his engaging brother and playmate, and of the scenes in Philadelphia and Princeton where the family successively resided, are really very fresh and picturesque. Nor could we well spare the allusions made throughout the work to a large number of persons, not relatives, who stood associated, more or less nearly, with the youthful or the mature “Addison.”

Indeed, our author has contrived, with rare skill, to convert his pages into an extensive gallery of exquisite portraits, some of them looking down upon us with faces that have long been familiar, others of them strange, but which we are made glad to see; and, amid these, to hang up in a sort of illuminated frame that large, prominent, central picture, which all the others serve to adorn, without for a moment distracting the principal view.

Hardly had the infant Addison learned to walk before he learned to think, and with each opening bud of thought appeared that thirst for knowledge which soon became insatiable. At the age of four, he was "a gentle, retiring, observing, thoughtful child, full of animal spirits and genuine humor; the delight of the household, the astonishment and despair of his little school-fellows; invariably attracting the notice of every visitor by the sparkle of his wit and the originality of his remarks." When six years had passed, he exhibited in a remarkable degree that fondness for attempting the mastery of dead and foreign languages which so eminently characterised him in subsequent life. Even then, too, he showed himself the "omnivorous reader" he ever afterwards was. At this infantile period he commenced, under the judicious guidance of his father, the study of Latin, and soon was introduced to the Hebrew itself, in unfolding the mysteries of which language and its cognates his progress was surprising and well-nigh incredible. At twelve, he indulged his active imagination in efforts at poetry, his talent for which difficult species of composition steadily grew to an extent that, had he given special attention to its cultivation, he would eventually have been ranked among its celebrated masters. Surely the boy who, at an age so tender, could compose a versified piece like the following, might have reached a rare eminence in this direction. It is entitled

"SOLITUDE.

"Now in the eastern sky the cheering light
Dispels the dark and gloomy shades of night;
And while the lowing of the kine is heard,
And the sweet warbling of the songster bird;
Where from afar the stately river flows

In whose bright stream the sportive goldfish goes ;
 Where the thick trees afford a safe retreat
 From public eye and summer's scorching heat ;
 There let me sit and sweetly meditate,
 Far from the gleam of wealth and pomp of state.
 And while I listen to that murmuring rill
 Which pours its waters down the neighboring hill,
 I can despise the pride and pomp of kings,
 And all the glory wealth or power brings.
 Here in deep solitude, remote from noise,
 From the world's bustle, idleness, and toys,
 Here I can look upon the world's vast plain,
 And all her domes and citadels disdain."

At thirteen, he was enabled to write the Arabic characters with a facility and neatness that ripe Oriental scholars might have envied. At this period he studied fourteen hours of every day. "He wrote Latin, both in prose and verse, with great ease and purity," imitating the odes of Horace with admirable grace and precision. In connexion with this, we must quote four amusing verses of Latin hexameters, which, mockingly condolatory, were written on the occasion of an attack of illness experienced by his older brother and sent to him for his amusement :

"Crede mihi, juvenis docilis, me maxime tædet
 Audire ægrotum esse virum, tam longe celebrem.
 Pulveribus (quid tu Anglice vocas?) te cumularint,
 Et medicus, veneranda materque, An Eliza, niger Ned."

He pursued the study of Greek and of Mathematics with equal success before he was quite fourteen. He also cultivated the art of public speaking, in which, after a number of failures, he succeeded in making real proficiency; and his talent for English composition was, even thus early, something marvellous. There never was a boyhood more remarkable, nor one that gave evidence of greater native powers of mind. The man that grew up out of such a soil of fertile genius could not avoid the greatness we have already attempted to characterise. As an academician, as an undergraduate, it is now hardly necessary to relate, this youth was further advanced than many a scholar (himself perhaps regarded by his friends as a none-such) who had passed

through his entire college curriculum and borne off in triumph the "first honor" of his admiring class. Space would quite fail us, were we, as we are tempted to do, to draw from the rich volumes we are reviewing, the magnificent proofs that are scattered everywhere with a profusion at once delightful and bewildering, of the splendid gifts possessed by this rising scholar, and displayed at an age which ordinarily is so scant of promise and so barren of fruit. He took his diploma at Princeton in September, 1826, when about eighteen years old, and delivered a finished valedictory oration on "The Pains and Pleasures of College Life," which is described as unusually "touching and impressive," as we can well believe it was. Previously to this, however, he had become a contributor to the public press; and, in less than three months after quitting college, he contributed (to the pages of the *New Jersey Patriot*) an extended article on Persian poetry that attracted the admiration of scholars. Even while yet in his teens he became the principal editor of that journal, and his pieces, when acting in this capacity, were fine specimens of manly composition and patient reflection. He wrote, too, a beautiful eastern tale, entitled "The Jewess of Damascus," which in its style bears a certain resemblance to that of the novels of Sir Walter Scott. It was thought by some at the time "that this story would not have done discredit to John Wilson, or to Lockhart, on the score of imagination and diction; whilst it was doubted whether either of them could have more successfully preserved the oriental, and yet modern, *vraisemblance*. Again reverting to the poetry of this universal genius (partly because it has not been generally known to what an *extent* he possessed the poetic power, and partly to show how rapidly it grew from the germ, a sample of which we have already given,) our readers will pardon us for quoting the following dramatic piece, written at the age of eighteen years:

"THE TEARS OF ESAU.

"Mark yon tall chief returning from the chase:
Canst thou not read in that deep wrinkled brow,
That quivering lip, that fiercely flashing eye,
The mingled characters of smothered grief

And rankling discontent? Thou readest well.
'Tis Esau, first-born of the ancient Isaac,
And monarch of the chase. There! did'st thou see
The sudden gleam his eye shot forth upon us?
Approach him not too nearly: drop thine eyes:
He loves not to be scanned so searchingly.
Yet men have guessed in vain what hidden crime
Preys on his soul, and makes his eye a coward.
The story which thou readest in his aspect,
Is written in the process of his life,
And stamped on all his deeds. Proud, fearless, fierce,
Relentless—ever mindful of his wrongs,
Forgetful of the kindness which repays them.
Who would not say that, from an eye so hard,
So diamond-like, infusible, though bright,
The kindly drops of pity, love, or grief,
Ne'er found a vent! Yet have I seen him weep,
Ay, see him weep, and heard him cry aloud
In sorrow, as a child. 'Twas on that day,
When Jacob—but you know the tale of old.
Ah, Arioeh! 'twas a sight to chill the blood,
I scarce believed it; though I stood in service
Upon the dying bed of Isaac. There
The rugged hunter knelt, and when he heard—
The savoury food still smoking in his hand,
And gently offered to his father's taste—
Yes, when he heard the old man's faltering tongue
In broken accents tell the treachery;
And saw those sightless eyes, with bursting tears
Of agony distended; and that hand,
That withered hand, whose hallowed imposition
Had laid on Jacob's head the promised blessing—
When its cold trembling touch reminded him
Of all that he had lost—what did he then?
I stood in staring terror to behold
The wild and fearful bursting of his wrath
Come forth in frenzied action: but it came not;
I looked again: for how could I believe
That Esau, the fierce hunter—that the Esau
Whom I had known so terrible in anger,
Should bear his griefs thus meekly? When I looked,
His head was bowed upon his father's hand,
His own concealed his face; his mighty frame

Was shuddering in anguish : but anon,
 Between his fingers, drop by drop I marked
 The scalding tears were oozing, and I heard
 Those strong convulsive sobs, which, more than tears,
 Betray a *man's* proud grief. I could have wept
 To see *him* humbled thus. The gentler Jacob
 Might weep, and who would mark it? 'Tis his nature.
 But to see tears upon the manlier cheek
 Of rugged Esau—'twas a moving sight.
 Long did he weep in silence, but at last
 There came from him a wild and bitter cry,
 And then, in deep and hollow tones he said,
 'Hast thou for me no blessing, O my father !'
 What could the old man say? Before him knelt
 The eldest born—his best beloved son,
 Him whom he would have blessed, but for the arts
 Of Jacob and his mother. Once again
 He murmured forth, "Thy brother—'twas thy brother."
 Again wept Esau, and again he asked,
 'Hast thou reserved no blessing for thy son,
 Thine Esau, O my father ?' Then once more
 The biting, blasting, thought, that he had lost
 That mystic benediction, by whose virtue
 The favor of Jehovah seemed ensured,
 Rose on his mind; and as it rose, he cried
 In bitterness of soul. But with that cry
 His weakness ended, and his agony
 Passed from him as a dream. Across his brow
 He drew his hand impatiently, then sprang,
 As if in anger, to his feet. His eyes,
 No longer bathed in grief, were fired with rage;
 And on his quivering lip there seemed to hang
 Unutterable things. The child was gone,
 And vengeful Esau was himself again."

But, returning again to notices of his scholarly studies, what industry he exhibited whilst yet in his teens, and what advancements he was steadily making in learned investigation will appear in a few extracts from his dairy. One day, the record is this : "Arabic—Al Koran, Sura 19. Hebrew—Exodus, Ch. xix. Italian—Tasso, Ger. Lib., Canto 12. Latin—Cicero in Q. Cæcilium. German—rules of pronunciation. Greek—Matt., Chap.

Was shuddering in anguish : but anon,
 Between his fingers, drop by drop I marked
 The scalding tears were oozing, and I heard
 Those strong convulsive sobs, which, more than tears,
 Betray a *man's* proud grief. I could have wept
 To see *him* humbled thus. The gentler Jacob
 Might weep, and who would mark it? 'Tis his nature.
 But to see tears upon the manlier cheek
 Of rugged Esau—'twas a moving sight.
 Long did he weep in silence, but at last
 There came from him a wild and bitter cry,
 And then, in deep and hollow tones he said,
 'Hast thou for me no blessing, O my father !'
 What could the old man say ? Before him knelt
 The eldest born—his best beloved son,
 Him whom he would have blessed, but for the arts
 Of Jacob and his mother. Once again
 He murmured forth, "Thy brother—'twas thy brother."
 Again wept Esau, and again he asked,
 'Hast thou reserved no blessing for thy son,
 Thine Esau, O my father ?' Then once more
 The biting, blasting, thought, that he had lost
 That mystic benediction, by whose virtue
 The favor of Jehovah seemed ensured,
 Rose on his mind ; and as it rose, he cried
 In bitterness of soul. But with that cry
 His weakness ended, and his agony
 Passed from him as a dream. Across his brow
 He drew his hand impatiently, then sprang,
 As if in anger, to his feet. His eyes,
 No longer bathed in grief, were fired with rage ;
 And on his quivering lip there seemed to hang
 Unutterable things. The child was gone,
 And vengeful Esau was himself again."

But, returning again to notices of his scholarly studies, what industry he exhibited whilst yet in his teens, and what advancements he was steadily making in learned investigation will appear in a few extracts from his dairy. One day, the record is this :
 "Arabic—Al Koran, Sura 19. Hebrew—Exodus, Ch. xix.
 Italian—Tasso, Ger. Lib., Canto 12. Latin—Cicero in Q. Cæcilium. German—rules of pronounciation. Greek—Matt., Chap.

i.-iv." The succeeding day, it runs thus: "Hebrew—Exodus, Chap. xx. Persian—Hafiz (Nott's Ed.) Ode 16. French—auxiliary verbs. Spanish—Don Quix., Chaps. 27, 28. Greek—Matt., Chaps. iv.-viii." And so on, from day to day. His studies, too, were not those of a mechanical memorizer. He penetrated his authors with the probe of a discriminating criticism. For instance, under the head of Spanish, he thus writes with reference to Don Quixote:

"The most elaborate passage in this work of Cervantes which I have yet met with, is, 'La Novela del Curioso Impertinente.' Indeed, from the pains which he takes to introduce all his episodes, it is evident that he labored them with a care which he did not give to the main story. To this fact he seems to allude himself, when he speaks of the enjoyment which his hero had been the means of affording to the world, 'no solo de la dulzura de su verdadera historia, sino de *los cuentos y episodios della, que la misma historia.*' If the author had any partiality for this episode 'La Novela,' it was certainly not a blind one. This story is finely conceived, ingeniously developed, and elegantly expressed. The speech of Lothario, in opposition to the proposal of his friend, is so fine a specimen of elegant argument and eloquence, that the reader is tempted to exclaim, as Sancho to his master—'Mas bueno era onestra merced para predicador que para caballero andante.' The following sentence contains a strong but most expressive description of the effect of suppressed sorrow—'No excusarás con el secreto tu dolor; ántes tendrás que llorar contino *si no lagrimas de los ojos, lagrimas de sangre del corazon.*'"

So, too, under the head of Persian, this young critic remarks:

"Persian and Hebrew are radically distinct, in their genius and structure, as well as vocables. They agree, however, in this remarkable circumstance, that the government of one substantive by another, is denoted by a change in the latter and not the former, as in almost all other languages. The cardinal number for six is the same also in both the Hebrew and Persian languages. The Persian agrees with the Syriac (a derivative of Hebrew) with respect to the definite article, which is formed in both by adding a vowel at the end of the noun. The coincidences between the Persian and English are very numerous

VOL. XXI., NO. 3.—7.

and striking, and are rendered more remarkable by the fact that many of the words common to both are simple, original, primitive terms used in ordinary intercourse, and not mere technicalities."

In examining the Koran, written in Arabic, he expresses his views of its remarkable author in language well worth quoting, as exhibiting that decided independence of thought which always characterised his original mind :

"I differ in toto from all writers who assert that Mohammed, in devising a religion for his followers, proceeded upon any regular plan whatever. We are too apt to ascribe motives to those who never felt them, and regard as deep-laid contrivance what probably arose from accident. He was first an enthusiast—a half-mad visionary. In this character he began his revelations, and afterwards finding their effect, became an ambitious aspirant after power. The idea that he endeavored to adapt his doctrines to the belief and propensities of particular sects, I think unwarranted; not only from his ridiculous anachronisms, but from the character of the stories which he gave as sacred history. All that he has borrowed from the Scriptures has the appearance of being caught from oral narration. When we consider the fondness of the Arabs for story-telling, we may readily believe that the Jews and Christians who were among them found abundant employment in rehearsing impressive narratives of the Pentateuch and Gospel. That these should take strong hold of Mohammed's mind, then in a low condition, is not surprising. By nature imaginative, he may have brooded in secret over these historical facts, till he felt their influence in a rising desire to emulate the ancient prophets. This I believe to be the source of his scriptural information. That he was actually assisted in the composition of the Koran by either Jew or Christian, I think improbable; because either would have given more connected narratives. In his own, not only is the truth diluted, but the facts confused and out of order, like the attempts of a man to repeat a half-forgotten story."

We cannot help treating our readers to a sample of the youthful Alexander's critical acumen in discussing the relative merits of English authors. It is well known that J. Fenimore Cooper has, by his admirers, been favorably com-

pared, as a novelist, with Sir Walter Scott. On this point, he says :

“I think the comparison, or rather the equalizing, of Cooper with Scott is highly unjust, for these causes following: (1.) Scott, it is evident from every page of his works, is a man of taste; Cooper not. (2.) Scott is always at his ease; Cooper constrained, and apparently striving after something unattainable. (3.) Scott is always perspicuous. His pictures are not only striking in distant view, but perfectly intelligible in all their parts. Cooper, on the contrary, is often obscure, and that when he has no intention to be mysterious—and his descriptions frequently leave the mind confused and clouded without any definite image to occupy it. Cooper may be a man of more depth and strength of feeling; but Scott is vastly his superior in liveliness and fertility of fancy. Cooper relies on the interest of his scene, and, at most, on variety of incident, to arrest the attention of his reader. Scott enchains it by the delineation of character. All Cooper’s passages may be resolved into one or two varieties; and of these few, some are unnatural and even monstrous; while Scott has an endless diversity, and all of them true to nature. The only passage in Cooper’s writings I have met with approaching to sublimity, is the description of the storm in the first volume of the *Pilot*; but, although the advantages as to scene and circumstances would appear to be on his side, that description is nothing when compared with the escape of Sir Arthur Wardour, his daughter, and Edie Ochiltree from the sea, in the *Antiquary*.”

In another place, speaking of Cooper, after reading his “*Red Rover*,” he says, after somewhat complimenting it :

“There is a sameness, however, in his descriptions which nothing but the comparative novelty of naval romance enables us to tolerate. The ships are forever ‘bending their tall spars as if to salute’ this or that object, and then ‘gracefully recovering their erect position.’ He is too fond, moreover, of ‘lurking smiles,’ and ‘struggling smiles,’ and other cant phrases of his own, which would appear to indicate that he had no very vivid impression of the object in his own mind, but described rather by rote; so that his descriptions, especially of men, are like set speeches, differing only in minor particulars, but capable of being adapted by a little alteration to any character. In denouement he is never successful.”

A student who, at the age of nineteen, could write such a critique as the following, in comparing Aristophanes and Shakspeare, must have been born a reviewer, such a one as Lord Jeffrey would have taken to his heart:

“I have finished the famous ‘Clouds of Aristophanes,’ but can scarcely say what my feelings and opinions are as I close the book. Such a combination of extremes, intellectual and moral, I have never before known. Such transitions from earth to heaven, from Parnassus to the dunghill, are to me new and startling. Shakspeare is unequal, but his inequalities are nothing to the fits and starts of Aristophanes. The English poet never dives so deep into pollution, nor rises, in point of artificial elegance, so high as the Athenian. Shakspeare’s genius is obviously untutored. His excellences and his faults are perhaps equally attributable to his want of education. It is altogether probable that many of these original and most significant and poetic modes of expression which he has introduced into our language, arose entirely from his ignorance of grammar and of foreign tongues. Had he been familiar with technical distinctions and etymological analogies, his thoughts would have been distracted between *words* and *things*. The dread of committing solecisms, and the ambition to exhibit that sort of elegance which results from the formal rules of an artificial rhetoric would have cooled his ardor. His ‘muse of fire’ would never have reached ‘the heaven of invention,’ but would have stayed its flight amidst the clouds and mists of puerile conceit. I never read any of Shakspeare’s real poetry (for much of his verse is most bald prosing) without feeling, in my very soul, that no man could write thus whose heart was fixed on propriety of diction as a principal, or even a secondary object. He seems to have let his imagination boil, and actually to have taken the first words which bubbled up from its ebullition. Hence his strange revolt from authority in the use of ordinary words, [in senses] as far removed from common practice as from etymology. And that reminds me of another circumstance. In the common blank verse of his dialogue, not only is he habitually careless, but seems not to know (in many cases) the method of constructing a harmonious verse; and perhaps his broken measure is more dramatic than one smoother would be; certainly more so than the intolerable tintinnabulum of the Théâtre Français. But let him rise into one of his grand flights, and his numbers are as musical as the ‘harp of Orpheus.’ I defy any man to bring forward any specimen of heroic blank verse, where the rhythm

is as melodious as in some passages of Shakspeare, and the sense at the same time within sight—I mean comparably good in any degree. Milton, you say, etc. But who can read the *Paradise Lost* without thinking of the square and compass? Even when we admire, we admire scientifically—we applaud the arrangement of the cæsuras and pauses, and are forever thinking of iambuses and trochees and hypercatalectics, and all the hard words that Milton himself would have dealt forth in lecturing upon his own versification. Whereas, I do verily believe, that Shakspeare knew no more of prosody, than of animal magnetism or phrenology. Thomson, again, is among our finest specimens of rich and musical blank verse, but Thomson is labored too; not in Milton's way, by weight and measure, but in a way no less artificial and discernible. He is always laboring to make his lines flow with a luscious sweetness: every body knows that he succeeds, but every body, alas, knows how. He does it by presenting words in profusion which are at once dulcet to the ear and exciting to the imagination. The method is the only true one, but he carries it too far. One strong proof that Shakspeare was a genius and a unique one, is that his excellence is not sustained and equal. Moonlight and candlelight shed a uniform lustre; but who ever saw or heard of a continuous flash of lightning? Our bard trifles, and proses, and quibbles, and whines, (but always without affectation) till something (whether accident or not I cannot tell) strikes a spark into his combustible imagination, and straightway he is in a blaze. I think a good rocket is a capital illustration of his muse of fire. First, we have a premonitory whiz, then a delicate but gorgeous column of brilliant scintillations stretching away into the bosom of heaven, and at last dying away in a shower of mimic stars and comets of tenfold—of transcendent brightness. What then? Why, then comes darkness visible, or at best, a beggarly gray twilight. But I began with Aristophanes, and have been raving about Shakspeare. All I have to say, however, about the former is, that he is a perfect contrast to the Englishman. He is evidently a master of the art of versifying, but he knows how to temper the formality of systematic elegance with the charm of native poetry. Compared with the Greek tragedians, his flights of choral and lyrical inspiration appear to great advantage. More coherent and intelligible than Æschylus, more vigorous and nervous and significant than Sophocles, more natural and spirited than Euripides; he notwithstanding excels them all in the music of his numbers and the Attic purity and terseness of his diction."

We could stud these pages, and adorn them as well, with gems like the above. But we must forbear.

The subject of the memoir before us, when he was only twenty years of age, became a contributor to the "Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review," a title which this celebrated quarterly (begun in 1825,) assumed in 1837, and has ever since retained. In 1829, J. Addison and James Alexander both had a hand in preparing for its pages a very fine biographical sketch of Erasmus—a life-portrait of the great Rotterdam literary giant, whose varied merits no two men were better capable of appreciating than these twin brothers of genius. But the articles which mainly distinguished the "Repertory" in the last named year and the year before were certain translations from the Latin of Flatt, on the Deity of Christ, and a couple of elaborate pieces, entitled "The History and Religious Opinions of the Druses." All these were due to the pen of the unbearded "Addison." This essay on the Druses, says our biographer, "is one of the most singular and startling demonstrations, among the many that he has left us, of his learning and capacity. The theme was one which exactly suited him. It was strange, mysterious, difficult, romantic; calling for all the hidden resources of his historical and linguistic attainments, as well as for all the acumen of his intellect and delicacy of his critical judgment; and bringing into play not only his powers of reason and analysis, but his impassioned energy, his talent for rapid and graphic description, and his talent, no less surprising in one who was still scarcely out of his teens, for the mere construction of a sentence. The aim of the article is to arrive, if possible, at an approximate solution of the vexed questions touching the origin and early history of the mysterious fraternity or sect of the Mowahhidûm of Mt. Libanus. The treatise is mainly historical and critical, but it is marked by broad outline views and vigorous generalizations, together with a marvellous acquaintance with the repositories of oriental learning, and with everything relating to the oriental people, and particularly the Arabs; as well as masterly sketches of character, and lively and engaging, but condensed, narrative."

The playfulness of his humor and the airiness of his fancy were early exemplified. See an instance of both "in the subjoined burlesque on the disproportionate zeal with which writers often advocate their hobbies:"

"PRIZE ESSAY UPON NOTHING."

"The apparent incongruity of coming forward, at the present crisis, when the minds of men are agitated by the fear of fiscal and political convulsion, with a systematic treatise on nothing, will, it is fondly hoped, be found excusable, on a deliberate examination of the principles maintained and the practical inferences thence deduced.

"Chapter I. 1. Nothing may be defined not any thing. 2. It naturally divides itself into two species, positive nothing, and negative nothing. 3. Positive nothing includes everything of which the non-entity is demonstrable. 4. Negative nothing includes every thing of which the non-entity may be presumed, but cannot be demonstrated. 5. The principal use of nothing is to nullify everything. 6. Nothing may be converted into something by abstracting its non-entity. 7. Nobody may become nothing, by being deprived of its negative personality. 8. Anything may become nothing, by annihilation. The only other remark which I propose to offer in this interesting and important point is—nothing."

As to Dr. Alexander's great scholarship, which grew until it became truly immense, it ought to be remarked, that much of the rapidity of his progress was undoubtedly due to his marvelous *memory*. Instances of the extent of this power are given in these volumes, which exhibit it in a light truly astonishing. It was more difficult for him to forget than to remember. In the acquisition of languages such a faculty as this is of first-rate importance. Many great men have possessed it. Macaulay, Mezzofanti, and others, will occur to the reader as prodigies in this direction. It is rare, however, to find a man whose judgment is as wonderful as his memory, if the latter be excessive. But Dr. Alexander's mental abilities—all—were equally and concordantly great. His capacious memory vastly aided him in his studies, but it did not make him what he was. It was only

one point in the immense circle of those gifts with which his Creator had endowed him.

Turning now from these exhibitions of character, we wish we were at liberty to display another phase of this remarkable man's life, and follow him, step by step, in his journey across the ocean. He made his first transatlantic tour when at the age of twenty-four. At this period all his powers were fresh and ripe, ready for the complete enjoyment of every novelty, and capable of fully appreciating all he saw, whether persons or places. His descriptions of old-country scenery are very fine; his estimates of foreign character charitable and yet discriminating, and his views, (generally expressed in prose, sometimes in verse,) upon whatsoever subjects were being constantly suggested to his ever-wakeful mind, just such as might have been expected from one so charged with varied scholarship and with the spirit of poetry. Often, too, his humor was most playful, and then, seeing things through the medium of the ludicrous, he would delight a congenial companion by pouring forth the treasures of his wit, or write home budgets of queer fancies to his friends. At every turn he showed that his sympathies, which touched whatever interested his fellow men, were as broad and as kindling as his large and pervasive soul.

In Scotland, he visited Professor Lee, the great Oriental scholar; in France he calls upon Lafayette; but he soon makes his way to Germany; where, at Halle, he remains to study. Here he attends the lectures of Tholuck, of Rödiger, of Fuch, of Pott, of Wegschneider. The Rev. Dr. Sears (manager now of the Peabody fund in the South,) was his intimate friend at this time. S. writes of him, among many other pleasant things: "He was a great favorite of Tholuck's, more so than any other American or English visitor. After he left Halle for Berlin, Tholuck often spoke to me of him in terms of the highest eulogy and admiration. 'He is the only man,' said he, 'who could *always* give me the right English word for one in German, apparently untranslatable.' Indeed, these two men were, in several respects, very much alike. They were both fond of the languages, classical, ancient, and modern, and were adepts in them, being

able to speak I know not how many of them. I have heard them both speak at least six. Both were great readers, and remembered every thing they read. The studies of both had a wide range, especially in all that related to any one of the departments of theology. When they were together, conversation did not flag for want of topics."

At Berlin, he heard Strauss and Lisco preach, listened to Hengstenberg's discussions, sat in Neander's lecture-room, studied with Bopp, and was interested in Schleiermacher and Von Gerlach, as, in their way, they unfolded the Scriptures. As one result of his stay in Europe, it is instructive to read, from one of his familiar letters: "The other point on which my feelings have experienced a change is Presbyterianism. Everything that I have seen in England, Scotland, France, and Switzerland, gives a rational confirmation to my hereditary confidence, and thus cements a prejudice into a strong conviction. Look at the various systems of church polity, and inquire to what extremes they run, and you will find these various and opposite extremes, almost without exception, shunned and remedied by scriptural Presbyterianism. The extremes of clerical and popular power, the extremes of strict and loose communion, the extremes of pomp and meanness as to form, the extremes of rigor and license as to doctrine, the extremes of superstition and irreverence as to sacred things, the extremes of learning without piety and the converse, among ministers—all these are held at arm's length by the wise yet simple constitution of our Church."

Again, at the age of forty-three, he visits Europe, and spends there the summer of 1853, flying from point to point with all the speed, but nothing of the *ennui* of a regular tourist. Extracts are given by his biographer from his epistolary chronicle, intended for affording "the best lights in which to view *the man*—his strong and peculiar intellect; his almost perpetual vivacity of spirits; his learning; his command of English; his power of description; his quick discernment of character; his dislike of sameness; his contempt of many fashionable usages, maxims, and opinions; his whimsical tastes; his fancy for odd people, startling adventures, queer expressions, and street signs; his pas-

sionate love of children, and fondness for courts and public spectacles; his delight in attending different churches and comparing different preachers; his quick and impulsive sympathies; his rare humor; his sterling common sense and orthodoxy; and his devout piety." He went to hear Candlish in Edinburgh. He describes his appearance as grotesque and even mean. "It was that of a sickly boy, just roused from sleep, and without any washing or combing—his eyes scarcely open and his hair disordered—forced into the ugliest and clumsiest black gown you can imagine—dragged into the pulpit and compelled to preach. The illusion was kept up by what seemed to be incessant efforts to get his gown off, or to button his clothes under it, with occasional pulls at his hair, as if it was a wig which he had just discovered to be hind-part before, and was pettishly trying to reverse or throw away. Now and then, too, a white handkerchief would come out in a kind of whirlwind, and go back again without performing any office. Add to all this that one shoulder was held up, as if by a painful effort, a foot higher than the other, and the neck quite nullified—and you have no exaggerated picture of the preacher's personal appearance. As to speech, imagine the funniest burlesque of the Scotch sing-song, and the broadest Scotch pronunciation of some common words, such as *wawn* (one), *naw* (no), *Hawly Gawst*, etc., with a voice rather husky in its best estate, and sometimes a mere rattling in the throat; and you have the impression made upon my ear as well as my eye. He read the first three verses of the eleventh chapter of 2d Corinthians, and repeated as his text the third. He read every word of his sermon from a small MS. in the pulpit Bible, never looking at the congregation, but once in every sentence raising his eye to some fixed point or turning it on vacancy." We have not space for the description of the sermon itself, but it caused Dr. Alexander to regard Candlish as the greatest preacher he ever heard. "The composition was masterly; both strong and beautiful; no Scotticisms; no provincialisms; no violations of taste, except perhaps an occasional excess of ingenious and pointed antithesis. Under one head he accumulated all the difficulties men feel as to election, ability, the

unpardonable sin, insufficient conviction, faith, hope, love, etc. There was something fearful in this part of the discourse. I shuddered as he enumerated the terrible contingencies. But when to these (as the subtleties of Satan) he opposed the simple truth that Christ had died and God was in earnest in offering salvation; and exhorted us to let God take care of his own attributes, and to look at the atonement, not from his side, but ours; not to debate with Satan, or wait for the solution of all puzzles, but simply believe what Christ has said, and do what he requires; it was like coming out of an English railway-tunnel into the paradise of an English landscape. And then, when he appealed to the experience of the convert, and described the escape of the poor soul from the knotted meshes of the devil's snare to the 'simplicity that is in Christ,' I was completely overcome. I shook with violent agitation; and I don't know how I could have sat still if my eyes had not relieved me. But I passed entirely unnoticed. Many were in the same condition, and the rest were unconsciously bent forward to catch every word."

How we would love to linger amid the garden-like pages of this biography, and introduce our readers more and more into the depths of its healthful, bracing atmosphere! But we must hasten to the close. The life of the wonderful man herein depicted in colors so rich and so faithful, is, at least after his manhood was reached, familiar, in its main features, to most of our readers. So that we need not dwell. How he was revered as an instructor, admired as a preacher, allowed preëminence as a commentator; how he advanced from step to step in a career of scholarship almost without a parallel in our day; and how he at last died at the comparatively early age of fifty-one, mourned by an entire Church, and by almost a whole nation—all this is well known to nearly every one who shall peruse these lines.

We had intended to tarry a little upon that other trait of his character of which we have only made brief mention, his piety—his humble, self-subduing, earnest, manful piety. But our readers must go to these volumes for a full portraiture of Dr. Alexander considered as a man of God. We know of nothing in our language, which, in the way of a religious diary, is comparable

with the few pages—too few—wherein he sets forth his first experiences as a Christian. Not a syllable of cant, not a trace of insincerity, not a shade of presumption, appears in these daily notices of his struggling sainthood, as it was emerging into the full sunshine of the kingdom of grace. And throughout his entire life, he gave abounding evidence, always however of an undemonstrative kind, of that steady growth in godliness which was so surely ripening his spirit for the glory of his Father's house above. With all his genius, with all his surpassing knowledge of the word of God, it is interesting and encouraging to note that he had precisely the same difficulties to contend with in his heavenward career that we all have. There were seasons of doubt, hours of depression, clouded days when the light from above seemed to be almost quenched; yet there was constant advancement in the divine life, with blessed and prolonged seasons of the possession of that inward peace which passeth understanding. And when he lay down to die, it was to sleep the tired but bright sleep of childhood in the arms of a loving Father.

We have thus discharged a sadly-pleasing duty. We invite special attention to this most admirable biography, and urge every minister and student of divinity—these at least—to procure copies for themselves, if they would be both delighted and profited. It is full, to repletion, of the most attractive matter, even independently of the halo it throws about the character and pursuits of the loftiest scholar in the department of sacred learning this land has, we think, yet seen. It is, too, attractively, racily, written. It is altogether a worthy monument, both to the affection of its author and to the memory of its great subject.

ARTICLE VII.

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF 1870.

The tenth General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States convened in the city of Louisville, Kentucky, on the 19th of May, 1870. The meeting had been anticipated with more than usual interest, on account of the important nature of the business which was to come before the body; and especially did the commissioners look forward with pleasure to the meeting, because it was to be held within the bounds of that noble Synod which had but recently been received into the Assembly; and, among that large-hearted people, who, with such kind sympathy and generous liberality, came to our aid in the time of our trial and suffering. And we may here say, that the cordial hospitality which was extended to their visitors by the people of Louisville, fully sustained the reputation of our Kentucky friends. Every commissioner esteemed it a privilege to be a member of that Assembly, and hence not one of the fifty-five Presbyteries which form the constituency of that body was unrepresented—a circumstance which has not occurred before since its organisation in 1861. Of the one hundred and sixteen representatives appointed, one hundred and twelve were present—six more than attended the meeting at Mobile—and hence it was the largest Assembly of our Church ever held. It was composed in large part of men of prominence and of well known ability, both ministers and ruling elders; so that in point of learning and talent the body was above the average.

The sessions were held in the church of the retiring Moderator, the Rev. Dr. Stuart Robinson, who opened the meeting at the appointed hour with a sermon of very marked ability. The subject of the discourse was, *The Preaching of the Gospel, pure and simple, the Antidote to the Sceptical Tendencies of Modern Religious Thought*; and it was characterised, as his sermons always are, with great vigor and originality of thought, energy of expression, and power of argumentation. It is to be regret-

ted that a discourse so valuable was not published in full for the benefit of the Church, and especially of our ministers at large. We are sure that those who had the privilege of hearing it, are disappointed that they have been unable to read it over carefully at home. We hope it may yet be published in a permanent form.

The sentiment of the Assembly was perfectly unanimous as to who should have the honor of presiding over their deliberations; for the Rev. Dr. R. L. Dabney of Virginia, Professor of Theology in Union Theological Seminary, was chosen Moderator by acclamation; and he performed the delicate and difficult duties of his office with much honor to himself—presiding with courtesy and firmness, and with distinguished ability.

The reports of the proceedings of the Assembly were very imperfect; and yet they were as good perhaps as could be expected from those who are unaccustomed to the business of ecclesiastical courts. But in view of the great desirableness of having accurate reports from year to year, we trust that the clerks, who, by order of the Baltimore Assembly, were made a Standing Committee, “authorised to make such arrangements as they may deem proper for securing full and correct reports of the proceedings and deliberations of the General Assembly,” will give the subject their special attention. Cannot they employ some one who will make a specialty of this work, and perfect himself as a reporter for the Assembly? We have a young brother in mind, who is a skilful and experienced phonographic writer; and we have no doubt that he would esteem it a privilege to be allowed to attend the meetings of the Assembly every year for this purpose.

The first thing that attracts our attention in the proceedings as given in the daily paper in which they were published, is, that the prayers with which the sessions were opened and closed, are reported in full. This is a novelty, and we regard it an undesirable one. But it gives us this opportunity of asking, whether our ministers generally give that attention to this important part of their public duties which they should? Some of these prayers were appropriate and devout; of others, we would rather express

no opinion. If the prayers which are offered in public worship could be accurately reduced to writing, would not some of our brethren be surprised, and sometimes mortified, when their addresses to the throne of grace were thus reproduced? We are no advocates of a liturgy; but we think too little attention generally is given to the preparation of this part of our pulpit exercises.

In reviewing the proceedings of this Assembly, we shall not attempt to notice everything that was done; nor shall we call attention to the various subjects which were considered and acted upon in the order in which they came up. But as the four great organs of the Assembly—Sustentation, Foreign Missions, Publication, and Education—have become marked features in our Church's operations, we first notice the reports of the committees in these several departments of church enterprise.

The Assembly first heard the report of the Committee of

PUBLICATION.

This report was elaborate and minute, and gave evidence of energy and skill on the part of the Secretary and his associates in the management of the affairs of the Committee. Among the evidences of progress in the work of Publication, may be noticed the following facts:

1. The debt that had existed for three years, and which last year was reported to be \$1,069.85, has during the year past wholly disappeared; and on the 1st of May there was an actual cash balance on hand of \$1,906.61, after paying bills then due.

2. The increase of business during the year has been \$1,807.36 over that of the year previous.

3. The value of assets on hand is given at \$39,050.27, against \$36,819.74 last year; and this, too, after deducting \$2,593.89 to bring stereotype plates on hand to their present value.

4. The endowment capital has been increased during the year by \$3,921.57; thus raising the fund to \$34,243.67, and leaving \$15,756.33 yet to be raised.

5. The contributions from the churches have been \$8,415.90, an increase over the year previous of \$1,024.10; and the sum

used in colportage, and in making donations, amounts to \$4,494.43.

Says the Standing Committee:

“These evidences of growth and prosperity are gratifying. They show that the cause of Publication is making some progress, though this progress may be slow.

“The reasons why so little has been done are, first, the want of an adequate endowment fund; and, second, the meagre contributions from the churches. Let the endowment be completed up to the amount heretofore declared necessary by the Assembly; and let the contributions of the churches be increased so as to justify liberal donations to needy Sabbath-schools and individuals; and the work of the Executive Committee will be greatly enlarged, and the glorious results to our Church and the world will be correspondingly great.”

In his report, the Secretary says:

“Our business up to this time has paid all expenses, and gives us a clear profit over the capital invested of \$4,806.60 to cover all risks of loss in the collection of accounts and in the various mischances of business. The great fact which it is important for the Church to know, is, that it is put to no expense in the conducting of this important agency for promoting the cause of Christ; but that the business pays its own way—the profits covering all expenses. To do this on an inadequate capital is a work of much labor, and requires constant watchfulness. We feel thankful to God that we have thus far been successful in our efforts; and that, from the first, we have been able to carry on this work without drawing on the funds of the Church for the expenses of managing the business.

“The work of this Committee is of such a character, that in its progress it attracts less attention from the Church at large than any other of its enterprises; and yet it affects the great interests which are involved in the scheme of evangelical effort on which we have entered as vitally as any of them can do; while it practically reaches more families, individuals, congregations, and Sabbath-schools, in the accomplishment of its benign mission, than any other. It is, indeed, a pressing duty to send the living teacher to the destitute and perishing, at home and abroad, as fast as God in his gracious providence shall raise up the men; but in the absence of the regular ministrations of the gospel, and as an auxiliary thereunto where these ordinances are enjoyed, the publications of this Committee are of incalculable advantage. Without the aid of the printed page in this age of the

world, the labors of the missionary would be well nigh spent in vain. We do not see how any reflective mind can fail to perceive the great importance of this enterprise, and that its success and prosperity are absolutely essential to the existence of our Church as a separate denomination. If we send our people, but especially our children, to others in order to be indoctrinated, we must expect them to embrace the principles which they have learned; and it would be amazing if they did not wholly forsake us. Moreover, at this present time, it is perfectly manifest that a wider door of usefulness is rapidly opening before us; that our mission, if we were only able to enter fully upon it, is rapidly enlarging its proportions."

We were pleased to hear that we are soon to have Dr. Dabney's "Lectures on Sacred Rhetoric." They "have been stereotyped on special funds furnished by the Doctor and his friends, and he has thus been enabled to make the book and the plates a donation to the Committee. We have no doubt this work will prove a very acceptable and valuable addition to our theological literature, and that it will be in demand by many others besides the students of the learned Professor, to whom he dedicated it."

It will also be gratifying to those who have been waiting anxiously for years for the appearance of Dr. Thornwell's works, to learn that they will soon be issued from the press. Says Dr. Baird:

"The Committee has undertaken the heavy work of bringing out the theological lectures and other writings of our lamented brother, the Rev. Dr. Thornwell. The first volume has just been sent to the stereotypers, and it is our purpose to bring out two or three volumes this fall. Several liberal contributions have been made to our funds for the special purpose of enabling us to issue these works; and others are promised. The subject especially commends itself to the liberality of the Church, in view of the fact that his works are the only legacy which that beloved minister and learned and able servant of the Church has left to his family. The Committee have agreed to give them a large per centage on the sales; and hence the extensive circulation of these works will not only be of advantage to his brethren as an acquisition to their libraries, but it will directly benefit those most dear to him."

The Assembly directed the Committee to take steps for the
VOL. XXI., NO. 3.—8.

preparation and publication of a Sabbath-school hymn-book at as early a day as may be practicable. We trust that the Committee will approach this work with great care, and that they will do it thoroughly. Such a book as it is proposed to make, is a felt necessity in our Church. The great majority of the books prepared for Sabbath-schools, and which now flood the country, are utterly unworthy, to say the least, to be put into the hands of our children. We hope that the Committee will see to it, that the hymns introduced into the book which they are to prepare, are not only attractive in their style, and adapted to the capacity of children; but that they are orthodox and spiritual, and that they contain only such sentiments as are worthy of being treasured up in their young minds.

SUSTENTATION.

The report on this subject was the fourth which has been presented, this great scheme having been inaugurated since the war.

In the annual report, the Secretary, the Rev. Dr. J. Leighton Wilson, says:

“If its financial condition is not altogether satisfactory, there are other respects in which its condition and prospects are decidedly encouraging. Its principles and ultimate ends are better understood by the great body of our Christian people; the apprehensions once entertained about its becoming an overshadowing institution in the bosom of the Church, have been allayed; experience has shown that the chief burden of labor and responsibility rests upon Presbyteries and presbyterial committees, and that upon their prudence and energy mainly depends its ultimate success; the necessity and importance of concert of action among all our churches and Presbyteries is now very generally acknowledged; that dependent and eleemosynary spirit which at one time threatened to take possession of all our feebler churches, is gradually giving place to a more independent and self-reliant spirit, and to more enlarged benevolence; presbyterial committees are beginning to understand that the best welfare of the feeble churches for whom they have to provide, does not depend so much upon the amount of funds that may be drawn for them from the common treasury, as upon the cultivation of their own benevolence and self-reliance—thus verifying the truth of the scriptural adage that it is more blessed

to give than to receive. The duty of strengthening the bonds of Christian fellowship and common brotherhood throughout all our widely-scattered churches is now very generally seen and acknowledged; so that in these and other kindred ways our beloved Church, it is confidently believed, is growing in faith and Christian activity, and is becoming better prepared for any destiny that may be assigned her by her great Head, whether that destiny be one of patient suffering or active aggression."

The Sustentation scheme originated, as is well known, in the necessities in which we found ourselves at the close of the war, when we were utterly prostrated and impoverished, when many of our ministers were turning aside to secular employments to provide bread for their families, and when many churches were on the verge of extinction. The condition of the Church was distressing and alarming; and it was evident that something must be done very quickly, or the most serious consequences would ensue.

It was at the Macon Assembly, in 1865, that a sustentation scheme was proposed by the Committee of Domestic Missions, and a plan, in a somewhat crude form, was adopted. At the same Assembly, a special messenger from Louisville, Ky., arrived, as commissioner from the "Kentucky Board of Aid for Southern Pastors," an association which had been formed only the week before. But, though its formation was so recent, it sent by the hands of its commissioner \$6,000, which was presented to the Assembly for the benefit of its suffering pastors and their families. This timely and generous donation, as well as the kind expressions of Christian sympathy and love which accompanied the gift, greatly cheered the hearts of our ministers and people, relieved the pressing necessities of the chief sufferers, and gave an impetus to the cause of Sustentation. \$6,000 more, soon received from the same source, and nearly \$7,000 from our kind friends and brethren in Baltimore, together with upwards of \$15,000 collected chiefly within our own bounds, placed in the hands of the Committee nearly \$35,000 for their first year's operations, and gave vitality and energy to the scheme at the very outset.

The next Assembly was held at Memphis, and then a more

perfect plan was submitted in a memorial from the present honored Secretary of Sustentation, to whose practical wisdom and zeal the Church owes so much of her present prosperity. The plan was adopted and at once set in operation, and the Committee has continued with great energy and success to prosecute their work; and this great scheme has now become firmly established in the policy of our Church, and we trust in the affections of its membership.

The prosperity of this enterprise is vital to the interests of the Church; and hence it is with deep sorrow that we note the fact, that the last report is by no means so encouraging as those that have preceded it. The great difficulty from the first has been to get the churches generally to cooperate in the scheme. There was a gradual improvement in this respect until last year. The first year (and before the plan was fully inaugurated) 217 churches contributed to this object. The next year the number increased to 450. The next report covered a period of six months. Nevertheless, the number of contributing churches was 439; the year following they were 652. But the year following, which was the last, the number had decreased to 624, which was 28 less than the year previous. And this becomes the more serious when we remember that during the year the number of churches has been increased 137 by the addition of the Synod of Kentucky. Of our 1,460 churches, 836 have contributed nothing to this cause.

Again, the aggregate receipts last year were \$670 less than they were the year previous. This was unlooked-for and alarming. In 1866, the receipts of the first year were reported to have been \$34,747, of which our own churches contributed \$15,878. In 1867, \$30,343 was reported, of which the churches gave \$18,257. In 1868, the report for six months gave the total receipts as \$24,000, of which \$14,752 came from the churches, now including the Patapsco Presbytery, whose generous donations hitherto had been reported as coming from beyond our bounds. In 1869, \$30,572 was reported, the churches giving \$27,244. In 1870, the whole amount reported was \$29,901, of which the churches, (now including those of the

Synod of Kentucky, which, however, carries on its own sustentation scheme independently of the rest of the Church,) gave \$27,530. While, therefore, the aggregate receipts of the past year are \$670 less than of the year previous, the contributions of the churches have increased \$286. But when we compare the small increase in their contributions with the large increase in the number of churches, we see that there has been a sad decline. Says the report:

“It must be confessed with some considerable measure of anxiety, that our beloved Church has not come up to the full standard of duty the last year. It is not sufficient that we have held our own. The improved circumstances of the country, as well as the urgent demands of the cause, justified the expectation that there would have been a material increase both in the funds and in the number of churches that would have contributed to them. But in neither case have these reasonable expectations been fully realised. We occupy substantially the same ground that we did one year ago. Is it not strange, and as humiliating as strange, that of our 1,460 churches more than one-half have contributed nothing at all to this and perhaps to none of the other schemes of benevolence of the Church? Why this great delinquency? Is there no way by which the Presbyteries can reach and influence such churches? Are they never to be brought into ranks and led to coöperate with their sister churches in the great work of building up and extending the Redeemer’s kingdom among men? Can it be possible to continue churches themselves long in existence where there is no Christian activity, and where the benevolence of the people is never exercised? When will there ever be a more propitious time to arouse such churches from their lethargy and indifference and make them feel the obligations of Christian duty?”

We commend this entire report, so remarkable for its ability and wisdom, to the careful attention and study of all our ministers and churches. Especially would we ask the churches to consider those portions in which so much information is given in regard to the meagre salaries of our ministers, and the difficulties the Committee has had in raising the salary of every laboring minister to \$750.

The management of the fund for disabled ministers and the families of deceased ministers is a part of the duties of this

Committee. The receipts for this purpose during the year, says Dr. Wilson, "have amounted to \$6,470.42—very nearly double what was given last year. As showing a growing interest in this important charity, the result is very gratifying. But the number of applicants for aid has been so greatly multiplied that the actual relief extended to individuals and families has not been materially increased. The sums appropriated have ranged from \$30 to \$130. The generality of families have received about \$100. Many of the cases brought to the knowledge of the Committee have been very urgent, and it has been a matter of painful regret that no larger sums could be given. The whole number of families and individuals that have received aid is seventy-eight; but the number of such families is increasing, and, it is feared, at a much greater ratio than that of the increasing means and benevolence of God's people. Ere long the Church may have on hand a burden that may seem to be, if it is not so in reality, insupportable."

In connexion with this subject, we may refer to the

RELIEF FUND.

A year ago a plan was submitted to the Assembly by the Rev. Dr. J. Leighton Wilson, which was considered, and committed to the Executive Committee of Sustentation, with instructions to mature and perfect it as to its details, and present it to the next Assembly. This was accordingly done. The Committee gave the subject the most careful and laborious consideration, consulting eminent and experienced business men on all the financial questions involved, and laid before the Assembly a paper, which was carefully examined by a special committee, discussed at great length in the Assembly, and, finally, with slight modifications, adopted. Some opposed it on the ground that it was a life assurance enterprise, without those principles in life assurance which secure safety to the corporation; others, on the ground that it was undesirable to accumulate a large fund under the care of the Assembly; and others on other grounds. But that it is not a life assurance enterprise will be evident to any one who will examine the paper. Nor will there

be an unsafe accumulation of money under the care of the Assembly. Nor does it involve the Assembly or its Committee in any responsibility—the security for the payments being based entirely on the mutual faith and confidence of the churches in each other.

According to this plan, the payment of \$30 secures to the family of the minister after his death a claim to an annuity of \$200 for six years; or \$60 secures a claim to \$200 for twelve years, or \$400 for six years. No discrimination is made on account of age, health, or the number of years a minister may have been engaged in preaching the gospel.

We commend the paper, which we cannot here give in detail, to the careful attention of the Church. Whether the plan adopted is expedient and wise can be determined only by experiment. But should experience show that this plan, in all its details, is not wise, it may lead us to something better, by which the great and important end in view may be attained. We hope that a hundred churches, the number requisite to start the enterprise, may soon be found ready to enter into the scheme, that it may without delay be put into operation.

FOREIGN MISSIONS.

The report on this subject, which lies so near the hearts of all Christians, was highly encouraging; and one of the most interesting evenings of the session was that devoted to the consideration of the report of the Standing Committee.

During the year six missionary laborers have been added to the force previously in the field; and two have been removed by death, viz., Rev. C. C. Copeland and Mrs. Kingsbury, both of the Choctaw mission. The whole missionary force in the field at the present time consists of fifteen ordained missionaries, of whom four are natives, one native licentiate, six female missionary assistants, and eight native helpers, making thirty missionary laborers in all, and all depending upon the churches for the means of their support.

The following statements in regard to the financial condition of this department of our work are full of encouragement and hope:

“The receipts from all sources, including \$1,112.49 given by Christian friends outside of our own Church, \$3,433.35 contributed by Sabbath-schools for the education of heathen youths, and \$2,300 given for the purchase of a printing press for the Chinese mission, amount in the aggregate to \$29,054.81. This shows an increase in the contributions of the churches over those of the previous year of nearly fifty per cent. This is an encouraging fact and calls for expressions of gratitude to Almighty God for inspiring our people with a spirit of increased liberality. A similar advance in the contributions of the present year will bring the Church up to the full standard of liberality which she had attained while yet in connexion with the Northern Church, and in the days of her greatest affluence and prosperity. During the period referred to she gave of her abundance, but now, if not from absolute poverty, yet from resources greatly reduced. There has also been an increase in the number of churches that have contributed to this cause, being 633 to 598 the previous year. Still, however, reference cannot be made to this particular matter without bringing to view the painful and humiliating fact, mentioned also in the report on Sustentation, that more than one-half of our 1,460 churches have contributed nothing at all to this sacred cause, and perhaps to none of the other schemes of benevolence of the Church. The contributions of the Sabbath-schools are also in advance of those of the previous year about twenty per cent. This is a cause of encouragement, not only on account of the material aid which it brings to the missionary treasury, but for the happy influence which is thereby exerted upon the character of the children themselves. It is a matter of great moment, therefore, that all our Sabbath-schools be enlisted in this work, and the Committee would express the earnest hope that ministers would take the matter into consideration, and let every possible effort be made to employ the rising generation in the great work of building up and extending the Redeemer's kingdom among men.”

The Committee stated, that “after a careful consideration of the subject, they have come to the conclusion that the effort ought to be made to raise the missionary fund to \$40,000 for the present year. Several new missionaries will probably be sent out. Mission dwellings ought to be purchased, especially in South America, and the missionary work generally ought to be enlarged, so that the contributions to the treasury ought to be increased at least thirty-three per cent.”

In its report, the Committee says further:

“It is only about five years since the great heathen nations of the earth were rendered accessible to us. We had just emerged from a long and wasting war; the resources of the Church were exceedingly meagre, and it scarcely seemed possible to uphold our tottering churches at home, much less take part in evangelising the heathen nations of the earth. Many among us doubted the propriety of entering upon the work at the time; others remonstrated on the ground that the claims of the home field would be overlooked in the time of our extremity; and by many outside of the Church we were told that it would savor more of humility and good sense to build up our own broken-down walls before going abroad to assail the powers of darkness. But, notwithstanding all these remonstrances and taunts, our beloved Church, under the influence of her own spiritual instincts, and led by the hand of God’s providence, went steadily forward to the execution of the Saviour’s great command to preach the blessed gospel every where. Our young men and our young women readily offered themselves for this service, and the churches, even in the time of their prostration, freely and cheerfully furnished the means necessary for carrying on the work. And now where is the Christian man among us that does not rejoice that the Church took precisely the course she did? The home-field, instead of being neglected, has been cultivated with even greater diligence; new life and energy have sprung up in all our borders; doubts and remonstrances have ceased, and the taunts of enemies have been silenced; our efficiency as a separate branch of the Church is fully acknowledged on all hands; and our beloved Church may now, with humble gratitude to Almighty God, look abroad and see her representatives in one of the principal cities of the interior of Brazil, in one of the largest seaport towns in the United States of Colombia, in an important town in the heart of papal Italy, in two of the great cities of the Empire of China, and in four of the principal Indian tribes in the southwestern Indian territory.”

The presence at the Assembly of Rev. Allen Wright, a native Choctaw, now governor of his nation and missionary to that people, tended to give interest to the cause of Missions in general; and his artless and earnest appeals in behalf of this great work impressed all who heard him address the Assembly and the several congregations before which he spoke.

A resolution, couched in the tenderest words of Christian

love, was passed by the Assembly, expressive of their sympathy with the Rev. Dr. Kingsbury in his recent afflictions, and assuring him that in his old age and solitude, he is not forgotten by the Church. This venerable man, now in his eighty-fifth year, was the founder of the Choctaw mission, and for more than half a century has been a faithful laborer among that people.

Intelligence was received during the sessions of the illness of Rev. Mr. Inslee, our senior missionary in China, and the Assembly testified their interest in him by uniting in prayer that his valuable and useful life might be spared.

EDUCATION.

The Executive Committee of Education records "a steady and healthful advancement in this part of the work of the Church." The report continues:

"Some embarrassments were experienced in the course of the year which have not been wholly surmounted; but these arose from the very prosperity which the King and Head has granted the Church in calling her sons to come to her help. These embarrassments have begun to disappear under the animating influence which has gone forth among God's people, from the manifest evidences of his presence among us.

"The number of students for whom aid was asked during the year was one hundred and eight, being an increase of twenty-eight over the number aided last year.

"Under these circumstances, that we are permitted to present so favorable a financial statement, is a clear manifestation of the presence and blessing of the King and Head of the Church.

"The amount of money raised is \$17,369.09, being an increase of \$6,173.25 over the sum of the contributions to this Committee last year.

"All the appropriations for the aid of students asked by the Presbyteries have been granted, which were presented in proper form, except that the Committee found the necessity of adopting the rule to make all its appropriations prospective, and hence to pay no back bills, and to discharge no debts.

"The amount raised for Education in its various phases throughout our Church, besides the contributions to the Committee, we cannot accurately state, but it does not fall short of \$12,000, and probably much exceeds that sum.

“The Franklin Street church, Baltimore, has supported two students; Tabb Street church, Petersburg, the ladies of the First church, Richmond, the Sunday-school of the church at Norfolk, the church at Rome, Georgia, have each undertaken to furnish the Committee the means of supporting one candidate; and the ladies of Dr. Leyburn’s church, in Baltimore, furnished us about \$200 in money to extend aid to two students. It is greatly to be desired that other churches and ladies’ societies would undertake to aid the Committee in a similar manner.

“As the result of our inquiries, we are able to report over 200 candidates actually under the care of the Presbyteries. No effort has been made to ascertain the number not under the care of the Presbyteries; the whole number will not fall below 250, but may approach 275 or 300. We believe that never before in the history of the Church in the South has she had candidates whose number was equal to the third of her entire roll of ministers.”

In his address before the Assembly, Dr. Baird “reviewed the history of this enterprise, showing the wonderful progress made in the increase of educational facilities by the Church. The first report of this Committee made after the late war showed that there were but two candidates for the ministry and contributions of only \$1,800. By the next year they were increased to 18 candidates and \$3,900. The next year it was 43 candidates and \$4,000. The year after, the contributions were increased to \$11,000; and now the Committee reports 108 candidates and \$17,370.”

We were pleased that the Assembly approved “the rule adopted by the Executive Committee as to making the appropriations prospective, and that they be not bestowed until the applicant has made some trial of his talents and gifts, etc., by having prosecuted his studies to about what is usually called the freshman class.”

The tendency of this rule will be to check a dangerous evil. For some time we have been impressed with the thought that many of the Presbyteries are very hasty in receiving candidates under their care. Many young men (boys we may say) appear before Presbytery, applying to be received as candidates for the ministry, who have no definite ideas in regard to their duty;

and they need wise and faithful counsel, rather than to be at once received as candidates upon the first intimation of their desire to enter the ministry. The Presbytery has no right to take the simple expression of a wish on the part of any young man, or a sense of duty which he may feel, as conclusive evidence that he is called of God to the sacred office. Their own calm judgment must be exercised in the matter. Our Book requires that the examination of candidates respecting their experimental acquaintance with religion, and the motives which influence them in seeking the ministry, "shall be close and particular, and in most cases may best be conducted in the presence of the Presbytery only." Frequently this rule is disregarded. The examination is neither "close and particular," nor is it "conducted in the presence of the Presbytery only." A few general questions are asked, which are answered more or less unsatisfactorily, and the Presbytery has no clear ideas in regard to the young man's real state of mind, who perhaps is very much embarrassed by so public an examination. But as ministers are needed, and as it is a serious thing to discourage one from entering the ministry who is truly called, they conclude to "give him a trial," forgetting that it is quite as serious an error to encourage one to enter the sacred office whom God has *not* called as it is to discourage one whom he *has* called. But, further, this "trial" is often at the expense of the Education Committee. The Presbytery recommend that their candidate receive aid in prosecuting his studies. In some cases he gives up the idea of preaching the gospel, or the Presbytery dismisses him, after being for several years an expense to the Committee; or, what is much worse, if he be really unworthy, he enters the ministry to the dishonor of the Church. Unfaithfulness, therefore, on the part of the Presbyteries, with whom the whole responsibility in this matter rests, involves great expense to the Committee. No young man should be recommended for aid, in regard to whose qualifications and fitness for the work, there is any serious doubt in the minds of the Presbytery.

The Education cause is of vital interest to the Church, in aiding to supply her with an able and educated ministry. But

if the Presbyteries fail in their duty, it may become the agent of incalculable evil, by paving the way to the sacred office so as to introduce unsuitable and unworthy persons into the ministry of the gospel.

In its report last year, the Committee expressed much anxiety, lest among the unusual number who were seeking the ministry, many might be influenced by improper motives; and the Assembly, sympathising in the fear, passed a resolution requiring the Presbyteries to exercise great caution in the matter. It may seem strange that any should seek an office from which, on account of the great responsibility which it involves, all might justly shrink—a calling, too, which is attended by life-long poverty and toil. But to those who are not influenced by the high motives of piety and principle, it presents no inconsiderable attractions, if the choice is between this and the plough-handle, or any other equally hard work. Besides, it is something to get a good education for nothing. And, moreover, if the ministry does not give wealth, it gives social position, and this has great influence with multitudes. The only safeguard is faithfulness on the part of the Presbyteries.

THE UNIVERSITY.

This subject was brought before the Assembly, by a memorial from the Synod of Mississippi.

The idea of a great Southern Presbyterian University was first proposed at the Assembly in Augusta in 1861. We had just begun our separate career as a Church. Not yet had we felt the terrible pressure of the war, nor experienced any of those fearful disasters which soon fell heavily upon us. The Church was wealthy, full of hope, enthusiastic, and ready to undertake great things. A convention was held one evening during the sessions, composed of all the members of the Assembly and the friends of education generally, for the purpose of considering this great subject. The meeting was marked with considerable enthusiasm, and the following resolution was passed:

Resolved, That a committee of ten be appointed to draft a plan for the establishment of an institution of the highest order

within the Confederate States, which committee shall report to a convention of the friends of education, to be held in the city of Memphis on the day preceding the meeting of the next General Assembly."

This committee, of which Dr. Lyon was chairman, was composed of some of the leading men of the Church. But it never reported. The Assembly met four months after; but not in Memphis as was expected. That vicinity had become the seat of war; hostile armies there confronted each other; and the meeting was held in Montgomery, Ala. The country was beginning to feel the awful burden of a war which was destined to tax her energies to the utmost; and the University scheme was lost sight of.

When we emerged from the conflict impoverished and ruined, the exigencies of our condition forbade all thought of such schemes as had filled our minds four years before.

But with returning prosperity the idea was revived; and at the Assembly at Nashville, in November, 1867, through the influence chiefly of Dr. Lyon, a paper was passed, which, while saying nothing of a University, yet was understood as having that in view. It was resolved "that the Assembly deems it of the utmost importance that the Church elevate its standard of learning, and widen its domain in prosecuting the educational interests of the people over whom it exercises a controlling influence; and that the Presbyteries throughout the bounds of the Church be requested to take this subject into consideration at their next regular meetings, and report their action to the next General Assembly."

The next Assembly was memorialized by the Presbytery of Tombeckbee, "to take the initiative at once in establishing a great central institution of learning under their supervision and control, in which the whole Church shall be united, and in which the youth of the Church shall be trained and qualified to become intelligent office-bearers in the Church of God, whilst at the same time they may pursue the different professions and callings in life." Twenty-two out of forty-eight Presbyteries reported to the Assembly their action under the resolutions passed at Nash-

ville. Two recommended the establishment of such an institution. One simply affirmed the resolutions sent down by the Assembly. Seven denied the right of the Church to engage in the work of secular education. Thirteen declared that it was inexpedient to undertake such an enterprise. Twenty-six made no response. Hence it was resolved "that the whole matter be indefinitely postponed."

But the zealous friends of the enterprise continued to agitate the matter; and now again the Assembly has been formally memorialized on "the importance of investigating the expediency of establishing such an institution of learning" as had once been proposed. The memorialists did not ask that the Assembly would begin at once the work of establishing a Church University, by elaborating a plan, selecting a location, etc., but that it should "appoint a committee *ad interim*—a tentative committee, if it may be so termed, clothed with authority, and provided with the necessary means to bring this matter fairly before the mind of the whole Church, in order to create an adequate interest in the subject, and to elicit a full and intelligent expression of opinion on the importance and feasibility of the undertaking, and to make a complete report of the same to the next General Assembly." The memorial was sustained by a very able and eloquent speech by Dr. Lyon, whose heart is always "devising liberal things," and whose courage is equal to every emergency. The matter was referred to a committee, who brought in the following resolutions, which were adopted:

"*Resolved*, 1. That this General Assembly be requested to recommend a convention, to consist of one representative from each Presbytery, to meet at 8 p. m., on the Monday before the opening of the next Assembly, at Huntsville, Alabama, for the purpose of discussing the whole educational policy of the Presbyterian Church, together with this scheme of a Southern institution common to the whole body, and to report to the next Assembly.

"2. That the Committee asked for in the above memorial, be appointed for the simple purpose of calling the attention of the several Presbyteries to the above mentioned convention; this committee to consist of the Rev. Drs. J. A. Lyon and C. A. Stillman, and T. A. Hamilton, Esq."

“To the overtures from the Presbyteries of West Hanover, of Roanoke, and of Memphis, objecting to the establishment of a church university, and suggesting doubts both as to the constitutionality and expediency of the same, and to the overture from the Presbytery of the Western District, calling for such an institution, this Assembly gives answer: That a scheme so vast can have no prospect of success without the hearty coöperation of the entire Church; and that, before its inauguration, the judgment of all the Presbyteries should be obtained, through a distinct response to some proposition, hereafter to be sent down to them for that purpose; and that, meanwhile, the Assembly does not commit the Church either for or against the enterprise.”

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES.

The reports from the two Theological Seminaries connected with the Church were more than usually favorable, and indicated a most encouraging degree of prosperity in both institutions—for in both there had been an increase of students, and an improvement in their financial condition.

The report from Union Seminary, Virginia, stated that the plan of instruction had been fully realised by the election and inauguration of the Rev. Dr. H. C. Alexander as Professor of Biblical Literature and Interpretation, and by placing the Rev. Dr. Dabney fully in the department of Systematic and Pastoral Theology. The number of students during the year had been thirty-five, of whom eight were in the Senior Class. The library contained eight thousand volumes, of which one hundred and fifty-eight had been added during the year. The Seminary would also receive, under the will of Rev. Urias Powers, \$3,000 per annum for three years, to be expended in the interests of the library.

The report of the Directors of the Columbia Theological Seminary showed a decided improvement in its financial condition—its investments having materially appreciated in value, and the endowment funds having been considerably increased. The library contains eighteen thousand two hundred and fifty-two volumes, of which one hundred and thirty-five have been added during the year. The number of students was thirty-two, of whom six had completed their course of study.

The Board of Directors united with the Faculty in requesting the Assembly to elect a Professor to the chair of Pastoral and Evangelistic Theology and Sacred Rhetoric, hitherto filled by Rev. Dr. Leland, who has long been disabled from service.

The Assembly decided that this request should be granted; and the election resulted in the unanimous choice of Rev. Dr. Joseph R. Wilson, Stated Clerk of the General Assembly, and pastor of the church in Augusta, Ga. Dr. Wilson was nominated by the Rev. Dr. James A. Lyon, of Columbus, Miss.

In regard to this election, the *North Carolina Presbyterian* says: "The friends of the Seminary will have cause for thankfulness at the accession of such a man to the Faculty of that institution. Dr. W. possesses in an eminent degree the qualifications necessary to the chair to which he is elected. A fine scholar and a good preacher, he is not too old to grow or too young to have the maturity necessary for his position."

The *Central Presbyterian* also says: "This election will no doubt be welcomed as an auspicious event for that institution by all its friends. By gifts of nature and of grace, by education and happy associations through life, he unites rare qualities for this work. To this let it be added, that he has had a ripe experience as a pastor, and especially during the long period of about thirteen years in his present charge—hardly second in importance to any other in our whole connexion. To the people of that charge, it will be a severe trial to part with one so endeared to them by a long and successful ministry. But the call made by the voice of the whole Southern Presbyterian Church has claims so commanding that they can hardly be set aside by those of any single church. As this election has been so heartily made, it may be confidently expected that Dr. Wilson will soon find the path of duty made plain to accept the appointment; and, if so, in his removal to Columbia, he will be followed by the prayers of his brethren that his days in that place of hard work and grave responsibility, as well as of honor and influence, may be many, and may be crowned with the blessing of heaven in training up a ministry for the Master's use."

We may also state, while on this general subject, that a com-
VOL. XXI., NO. 3.—9.

munication was received from the Hon. Jesse G. Wallace of Tennessee, in relation to the Maryville College, an institution for the training of students for the ministry, and formerly under the control of the United Synod. There remained of this property \$12,000 in funds, besides the grounds and buildings, and portion of a library. There are certain men having some kind of connexion with the Presbyterian Church, North, who have taken the control of this property, and now claim it, "while," says Judge Wallace, "there is no question but that the funds and property thus appropriated by the usurping Boards belong to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, as assignees of the United Synod." The Trustees of the General Assembly were directed to investigate the matter, and take steps for securing the property to our Church, if it appears that we have just claims to it.

SABBATH-SCHOOLS.

The Committee on Sabbath-schools complained that papers had been placed in their hands from only "thirty-three Presbyteries, leaving twenty-two from which no information has been received. Among the reports that have come before the Committee, only a few contain full and satisfactory statements in regard to the matters about which the Assembly desires information. The great majority are meagre and imperfect. The reason assigned for this is, that the necessary information was not furnished to the Presbyteries by the churches. But this, in turn, was doubtless due to the fact that the churches were not properly instructed by those who had the oversight of them as to what was expected of them."

We were pleased, however, to learn that sufficiently general information had been received to enable the Committee to gather the following encouraging facts:

"1. Increased interest on the subject throughout the Church. Presbyteries, church sessions, and our people generally, seem to be gradually waking up to the vast importance of this part of the Church's work. More attention is being paid to it, and more interest is felt in it. 2. Broader and sounder views as to the nature and end of the Sabbath-school, and its relation to family

instruction, are beginning to prevail. The idea is gaining ground that the Sabbath-school is simply the method which the Church adopts to preach the gospel to the children—to feed the lambs of Christ's flock; and that its sole end is to lead them to Christ; and, accordingly, that it is no more intended to supersede the necessity of parental instruction and care than is the public preaching of the gospel to adults intended to supersede the necessity of the domestic and secret duties of religion. In connexion with this, the impropriety and inconsistency of committing the religious instruction of the children to voluntary associations outside of the Church is becoming more and more seen and felt, and schools under the direct control of the Church and its officers are rapidly increasing."

The following order was taken by the Assembly :

"1. That it be enjoined upon the Presbyteries that they take such action as will in the future secure full and accurate reports from all their churches of the Sabbath-school work in their bounds.

"2. That those Presbyteries which have not already done so, be directed to appoint executive committees to take the oversight of the Sabbath-school work in their bounds, and that the chairmen of these committees be furnished with the means to procure and distribute blank forms of reports to all their churches.

"3. That the Presbyteries be directed to urge it upon all their churches, wherever it is practicable, to establish schools directly under the control of the church sessions, and that in these schools greater prominence be given to the study of our Catechism, Confession of Faith, and Form of Government."

THE BOOK OF CHURCH ORDER.

The revision of the Book of Church Order was looked forward to as a work which would occupy much of the Assembly's time, and involve much labor. But the matter was disposed of very easily, and to the satisfaction of all. The reports of the Presbyteries on the subject were placed in the hands of a committee, of which Dr. Palmer was chairman; who examined the papers, and reported the result as follows :

"Of the fifty-four Presbyteries on the roll of the General Assembly, returns have been received from forty-seven. Of these forty-seven, fifteen express in general terms their approval of the new Book with certain specified amendments. Two Presby-

teries approve the Book as it stands. Ten Presbyteries simply send up amendments and express a desire for continuance of the revision. All these, twenty-seven in number, may be classed together as favoring the further revision and early adoption of the Book. On the other hand, twelve Presbyteries send up amendments, with an expression of general disapproval of the Book. Seven Presbyteries express a wish, in view of the unsettled condition of the present period, that the adoption of the Book may not now be pressed upon the Church. One Presbytery has not yet taken action. These, twenty in number, may be classed together as being unfavorable to the present agitation of this subject. If to these should be added the seven silent Presbyteries, it will make an exactly equal division of the Presbyteries, so far as the question of the present adoption of the Book is concerned. In view of this fact, and in view also of the great importance of a general agreement in the change of our fundamental law, your committee recommend that all these proposed amendments by the Presbyteries be referred to the original Committee on Revision, to be examined and incorporated in the new Book, according to the mind of the majority in the Church as therein indicated, which, in its amended form, shall be reported to the next Assembly."

This report was adopted. All seemed willing to let the matter rest for another year; though they seemed to be influenced by different motives in desiring the same thing.

Dr. Lyon yielded his assent for two reasons: First, the report does not require any further discussion, and his Presbytery suggested that its discussion would be productive only of evil. He hoped by the expiration of the year the Church would be unanimous in this view of the matter, and it would then be disposed of forever. Dr. Robinson yielded to the report, because he hoped in a year or two the Church would be ready to adopt it unanimously. Dr. Palmer, he said, was a compromise man between the two extremes. He was willing to vote for it as a compromise, and await the development of the future.

We ourselves desire very much the adoption, by the Church, of the New Book as to its main features; but should it finally be rejected, the discussion of the subject during the years that it has been before the Church, will have been of lasting benefit. It has caused our ministers and people thoroughly to investigate

a subject which is too little understood; and the result will be that they will be more deeply grounded in the principles of Presbyterianism.

OVERTURES.

An unusual number of overtures were sent up to the Assembly; and as they were read one after another, it was evident that the Committee on Bills and Overtures would be overwhelmed with work. To relieve that committee as far as possible, therefore, whenever the nature of the overtures admitted it, they were referred to other committees, *e. g.* the Judicial and Education Committees; still some sixteen of these papers were placed in the hands of the Committee on Bills and Overtures. When they were examined, however, several of them were found to refer to the same subjects, or admitted of being answered together. The Committee were most industrious; and their energetic and indefatigable chairman, Dr. Stuart Robinson, brought in their answers as early as possible during the sessions, that the Assembly might have time for their consideration.

In most cases the subjects had been so carefully considered in committee, and the answers were so judicious and satisfactory, that they were adopted without discussion. Not so, however, with all. The subject of "lay preaching" seems to have greatly exercised the Presbyteries, for there were no less than six distinct overtures from various quarters requesting the Assembly to rescind the action of the preceding Assembly on this subject. The reply to these elicited a protracted and animated discussion. For some time the debate was conducted entirely by the ruling elders, and with so much ability and eloquence, that the thought must have occurred to every mind, that such talent, if it were *not*, certainly *ought*, in some way, to be brought under contribution in the work of proclaiming the gospel to the world. We call special attention to the report on this subject, that there may be a clear apprehension in the minds of all in regard to the precise attitude of our Church touching this matter. The Committee reported that they had carefully considered the various overtures, "praying this Assembly to rescind the action of the last Assembly on the overture from ministers of the Presbytery of

South Alabama, which action is in these words, viz.: '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 the churches of 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 presbyteries.'"

The Committee recommended for the adoption of the Assembly the following minute:

"1. That the overtures requesting the rescinding of the action of the last Assembly, seem in a large measure directed rather against the action requested by the ministers of South Alabama Presbytery, viz., 'To adopt some plan whereby presbyteries may be authorised to license as lay preachers, etc., without requiring of them the course of literary and theological training,' etc., than against the action really taken by the Assembly, viz., its 'approbation of presbyteries granting permission to persons to hold meetings and speak the word of exhortation, etc.; requiring them to abstain from assuming the proper functions of the ministry'—which action is manifestly different from the action proposed by the overture.

"2. It will be perceived that under this deliverance no issues arise concerning the propriety of confining the ministry exclusively to educated men, or of admitting a new class of authoritative teachers as prophets of the Church to expound and enforce officially the word of Christ. But the Assembly, in the most guarded manner, simply expresses approbation of presbyteries granting special permission to particular persons, by way of incitement and encouragement, to the exercise of these gifts in doing what, within the limits of Christian prudence, every Christian man has inherently a right to do under the broad commission of the great Head—'Let him that heareth say come.'

"3. Even had the deliverance of the last Assembly gone further than this, without involving palpable violation of the order or imminent danger to the interests of religion, an immediate rescinding of the act of the previous Assembly would consist neither with courtesy to the Assembly, nor with that reverence which the Assembly, by its example, should inculcate upon the people for 'decrees and determinations of synods and councils not contrary to the word of God, and which are to be received with

reverence and submission, not only for their agreement with the word, but for the power whereby they are made.' (Conf., Ch. xxxi. 2.) And this the more especially when no time has been allowed to test, by experience, whether the measure is liable to work injuriously or not.

"4. The Assembly, therefore, declines to take the action suggested by these overtures."

The argument which seemed to weigh most with the Assembly, was, that the experiment had not yet been fairly tried; and as it had been started, it would be better to let it alone for a while; good might come of it; and if at any time it seemed to work injuriously, it could easily be stopped.

Overture No. 10 requested the General Assembly "to inquire into the expediency of discontinuing the separate publication of the reports of the Committees of Sustentation, Publication, Foreign Missions, and Education, and, instead thereof, of inserting these reports, or abstracts thereof, in the published Minutes of the General Assembly, and distributing copies of the Minutes without charge to every minister, and to the session of every vacant church. .

The Committee recommended the following answer, which was adopted:

"1. That the separate publication of these reports be left to the discretion of the Committees.

"2. That it be recommended to the presbyteries to make arrangements for furnishing every minister and the session or every vacant church within their bounds with a copy of the Minutes of the General Assembly; and, in order to encourage the circulation of these Minutes, that the Stated Clerk be authorised to furnish the Minutes at thirty cents a copy to any Presbytery which shall order twenty-five or more copies, when sent to one address."

The first resolution was adopted in view of the fact that the separate publication and extensive distribution of these reports, serve to bring the great enterprises of the Church before the minds of the people; and the small amount of money thus expended is considered by the Executive Committees a good investment, inasmuch as it brings a far larger amount into the treasury than it takes out, to say nothing of the good accomplished in

other respects. The second was adopted, because, while it was considered very desirable to have the Minutes circulated in the churches generally, the plan proposed in the overture would have necessitated a large increase in the Assembly's assessments on the Presbyteries; and it was thought better that each Presbytery should make such arrangement as it saw best for supplying its own ministers and sessions with these Minutes.

We invite attention also to the answer to Overture No. 8, in regard to changes in the form of statistical reports. It was

“*Resolved*, That the Stated Clerk be directed to prepare a separate column in the statistical tables for the contributions for disabled ministers and the families of deceased ministers; also separate columns for pastors' salaries actually paid, and for congregational expenses; and that presbyterial assessments be reported in the miscellaneous collections.”

Two overtures were received, asking the General Assembly to reconsider and rescind the action of the General Assembly of 1869, found on page 376 of the Minutes, with reference to our ministers remaining permanent supplies of churches of other denominations—for example, Congregational churches.

The Committee recommended that the Assembly make the following answer, which was adopted: “That, while the General Assembly recognises the general correctness of the principle stated in the action of the General Assembly of 1869, yet, as circumstances may arise which would render the entering into such a relation for a longer or shorter time right and expedient, and for the best interests of the Church, this whole matter ought to be, and is hereby, left primarily to the judgment of the presbyteries to which such ministers belong.”

It will be seen from this that the Assembly declined to rescind the action of the previous Assembly in this matter. On the contrary, it reëffirmed the principle involved; but put the matter in a somewhat different attitude, leaving it primarily to the judgment of the presbyteries in which such cases may occur. We regret that action was not taken in this form at first—it would have saved much trouble in certain quarters. The Assembly should not be required to settle such questions *in thesi*. It can-

not know who are affected thereby, nor how, nor in what degree, they are affected. Presbyteries have jurisdiction in these matters, and should act according to their best judgment, and in the light of all the facts of the case, of which they have the fullest and most intimate knowledge. When difficulties arise, an appeal may be made to the Assembly, by the church, or presbytery, or minister, as the case may be; and in the light of the facts brought out, the Assembly can make a more intelligent decision.

RECEPTION OF DELEGATES FROM CORRESPONDING BODIES.

One of the most pleasant occurrences connected with the proceedings of the Assembly, was the reception of the delegates from the Cumberland and the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Churches. The first was represented by Rev. Dr. J. C. Bowdon, who presented the salutations of the General Assembly of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, and after alluding in very complimentary terms to our Church, referred with evident pleasure to his own—stating that after sixty years of separate existence from the mother church, they numbered 25 synods, 100 presbyteries, 2,000 churches, 1,400 ministers, and 150,000 communicants.

In the Moderator's reply, he reciprocated very warmly the expressions of Christian affection; alluded to the sad changes that had come over the mother Church since their separation from her; and expressed the wish "that all who profess to hold the Reformed theology, preached the great truths of man's fall and corruption; of imputed guilt, and imputed righteousness; of the true vicarious satisfaction of Christ for the guilt of penitent believers; of justification by faith alone; of regeneration by the almighty grace of God; of the full inspiration and infallible authority of the Scriptures, as the Cumberland Church does."

The Rev. W. M. McElwee was the delegate from the Associate Reformed Synod. It was pleasant to see him at our Assembly, as it always is to see brethren from that noble old Church. And though by a formal vote, their Synod, after maturely considering the basis of union proposed by our Assembly at its first meet-

ing in Augusta, declined to consider further the question of union with us, we cannot but hope that they will yet come to us, if not in a body, yet in fragments, as they are continually doing.

The address of their delegate was most excellent, and, was listened to with great pleasure by the Assembly. In the course of his remarks, alluding to the union of the Associate Reformed Presbytery of Kentucky with the Presbyterian Synod of Kentucky, he said:

“The preliminaries to that union are now definitely settled, and nothing remains but to consummate the union in an orderly way. And, sir, it is the ardent wish of my heart that this union may become general, so as to embrace the entire Synod to which I belong. And in this, I think I but echo the sentiment of the great majority of our ministers and people. Such desires, I know, are often expressed on occasions like the present by the representatives of our respective bodies; and they may be regarded by mere lookers-on as nothing but the conventional courtesies of denominational etiquette. But such, I am persuaded, is not the case with us. Such expressions are rather the outgushing of the mutual affection and confidence which makes us yearn for a fusion of the two bodies into one. We all feel that a cordial, harmonious union, if it could be effected without compromise of principles, is a ‘consummation devoutly to be wished.’”

This address, conceived in the happiest spirit of Christian love, was cordially responded to by the Moderator. In connexion with this, we invite attention to the action of the Assembly, which was taken at the request of a committee of the Synod of Kentucky that the Assembly would express its judgment concerning the propriety and expediency of the organic union of the Associate Reformed Presbytery of Kentucky with the Synod of Kentucky:

“*Resolved*, That this Assembly hereby expresses its hearty approbation of the action of the Synod in this matter of organic union with the Associate Reformed Presbytery of Kentucky, on the following terms, viz.:

“The Committee of Conference on union, recognising the fact that the two bodies are one in doctrine, government, and discipline, and that the difference between them on the subject of

psalmody is a proper matter of forbearance, agree to the following propositions:

“1. That the Associate Reformed churches, in their worship and in the ministration of the gospel, shall be undisturbed in their usages.

“2. That the Synod will secure, as soon as practicable, the insertion of an acceptable version of the Psalms in the general Book of Praise.

“3. That on the acceptance of these terms by each body, the Associate Reformed congregations and ministers, being received as a Presbytery, shall become connected with the Presbyteries of Synod most convenient to them.

“4. By the terms of the second proposition in the basis of union is meant—that the Synod will secure, as soon as practicable, the insertion in the general Book of Praise of that edition of Rouse’s version now in use in the Associate Reformed Church, for the accommodation of those churches in our connexion that may desire to use it.

“*Resolved*, That the Assembly hereby instructs the Committee of Publication to insert Rouse’s version of the Psalms in the Book of Praise, now in use in the Church, as part of the authorised Psalmody of the Church; and that the Committee be directed to provide the whole book thus constituted, or the separate parts of it, according to the demands of the people or congregations respectively.”

COMMISSIONERS FROM THE NORTHERN GENERAL ASSEMBLY.

The visit of our Northern brethren, and the action of our Assembly in regard to the propositions which they were commissioned to present, is the last subject which requires to be noticed here, as it was the last that engaged the attention of the Assembly. And of all the matters that were considered during the entire sessions, none awakened greater interest, or called forth more earnest discussion; nor was any, we may say, of more vital importance to our Church.

Previous to the meeting of the Assembly, there had been some correspondence on the part of certain Northern brethren with various persons in our Church, inquiring whether a delegation from their Assembly with friendly overtures would be kindly received. Hence the Assembly was not surprised by receiving early in its sessions, official telegrams from the Philadelphia

Assembly, stating that delegates had been appointed to convey to it the Christian salutations of that body, with propositions for opening a friendly correspondence. In due time the delegation arrived, consisting of Rev. Dr. Backus of Baltimore, Rev. Dr. Van Dyke of Brooklyn, and the Hon. W. E. Dodge of New York. They were received with the utmost courtesy and kindness when they arrived in the city, and expressed themselves both gratified and surprised thereby; for, by a singular misunderstanding, they had anticipated a less cordial reception. The next day they were formally received by the Assembly, and presented the following paper, which they had been appointed by their Assembly to convey:

“Whereas the General Assembly believes that the interest of the kingdom of our Lord throughout the country would be greatly promoted by healing all unnecessary divisions;

“And whereas the General Assembly desires the speedy establishment of cordial fraternal relations with the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, commonly known as the Southern Presbyterian Church, upon terms of mutual confidence, respect, Christian honor, and love;

“And whereas we believe that terms of reunion between the two branches of the Presbyterian Church at the North, now happily consummated, present an auspicious opportunity for the adjustment of relations; therefore, be it

“*Resolved*, 1. That a committee of five ministers and four elders be appointed by this Assembly to confer with a similar committee, if it shall be appointed, by the Assembly now in session in the city of Louisville, in respect to opening a friendly correspondence between the Northern and Southern Presbyterian Churches, and that the result of such conference be reported to the General Assembly of 1871.

“2. That with a view to the furtherance of the object contemplated in the appointment of said committee, this Assembly hereby reaffirms the concurrent declaration of the two Assemblies which met in the city of New York last year, viz.: ‘That no rule or precedent which does not stand approved by both bodies shall be of any authority in the reunited body, except in so far as such rule or precedent may affect the rights of property founded thereon.’

“3. That two ministers and one elder of the Committee appointed by this Assembly be designated as delegates to convey to

the Assembly now in session in Louisville, Kentucky, a copy of these resolutions, with our Christian salutations.”

Dr. Backus then addressed the Assembly, his address being brief, but very appropriate and delivered with much feeling. He was followed by Dr. Van Dyke, who spoke at greater length and argued the question with ability and earnestness. Mr. Dodge closed with a short speech, in which he reiterated the kind feelings expressed by the preceding speakers. The Moderator replied briefly, acknowledging their courtesy, and assuring them of the good will, both of the Assembly and of all our people, to them and to those in the Northern Church like-minded with them.

The Assembly was very favorably impressed by the manifest sincerity and Christian spirit of these delegates. They were treated with every appropriate mark of respect and esteem, and were invited to take seats with the Assembly during its deliberations.

In the course of Dr. Van Dyke's speech, he said:

“First—We are not here to make propositions for an organic union between the Churches. We are not authorised to say anything upon that subject, for we recognise the fact that neither of the two bodies is prepared for the consideration of such a subject. We do not contemplate an organic union, but something higher, better—without which a union would be a dead form. What we contemplate is a union in the spirit and in the bonds of peace—a union which your Master and mine prayed for when he stood with his foot on the threshold of the holy of holies and besought the Father that those who were given to him might be one. Sir, if these two great bodies of Presbyterian Christians in the United States can be made one in spirit, it will send dismay into the ranks of our common enemy, and make more joy in heaven than the repentance of ninety-nine sinners.

“I desire, in the second place, sir, to notice that that paper does not propose to make an interchange of corresponding delegates. We are prepared to take that step, so far as I can judge; and we come now to see, first, whether or not you are prepared. It only proposes to appoint a committee on each side to see whether we are prepared.

“I desire you to notice, next, that it neither makes nor

asks any humiliating concessions. We do not come here to cry *peccavi*, and we do not ask you to do so; for I tell you that Presbyterians can't be reconciled in that way. There is too much militant blood in them for that. Their convictions are too deep and clear for them to do so. I do not want you in any way to humble yourselves before me, and I will not consent that the body which I represent shall do such a thing; but let us humble ourselves before God and stand up face to face before the world.

“In the fourth place, that paper recognises the existence of difficulties between us—difficulties which stand in the way of even an interchange of correspondence; and it proposes a plan for their removal—a plan which I think is consistent and scriptural and promotive of our common good. It is the plan proposed by the Apostle Paul in the sixth chapter of his Epistle to the Corinthians, in which he says: ‘Dare any of you, having a matter against another, go to law before the unjust, and not before the saints? Do you not know that the saints shall judge the world? And if the world shall be judged by you, are ye unworthy to judge the smallest matters?’ Shall we then go to the court of Cæsar?

“We have appointed nine men with especial reference to their adaptation to this work; and we ask you to appoint a similar committee, in a similar spirit, to see if all these difficulties growing out of the questions of jurisdiction and church property, with all matters pertaining to the past and future, can be settled in a Christian spirit, and report the same to the General Assembly.

“In the fifth place, I desire you to notice the fact that, preliminary to entering upon these formal negotiations, and with a view to the removal of all obstacles on all sides, the General Assembly has passed a resolution which declares that ‘no rule or precedent which does not stand approved by both bodies shall be of any authority in the reunited body, except so far as such rule or precedent may affect the rights of property founded thereon.’

“Let me say, in regard to the concluding clause, that it does not refer to property in dispute between the Northern and Southern Assemblies. It refers principally to the funds of the Boards. It means simply this—that, while we didn't intend to repeal history or the acts of the Assembly, those acts which our Southern brethren considered offensive and dangerous to them are declared to be no longer in force. They are simply laid upon the shelf. If the acts of 1865–6 were in existence, we could

not offer nor you accept any negotiations; therefore, in a spirit of Christian kindness, we have declared them no longer in force."

At the conclusion of the remarks of the Moderator in replying to the delegates, Dr. Robinson offered the following resolution, which was adopted:

Resolved, That this body, duly appreciating the marked courtesy and kindness of the General Assembly now sitting in Philadelphia, in commissioning brethren so peculiarly acceptable to us a delegation to be the bearers of its resolutions to this Assembly, will take into careful consideration the proposition presented by them; and that, in order to proper deliberation and care upon so important a matter, these resolutions, together with the message and exposition of the delegation, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Correspondence, with instructions to report at the earliest possible time, recommending an answer to the proposition."

On the evening of the following day, an interlocutory meeting was held for the purpose of considering this whole subject. There was a full and free interchange of views and opinions. Some of the ablest speeches made during the Assembly's meeting were then made, and the meeting continued till near midnight. The next morning, Dr. Palmer, from the Committee on Foreign Correspondence, brought in the following report:

"The Committee on Foreign Correspondence, to whom were referred the overture for reunion from the Old School General Assembly, North, of 1869, at its sessions in the city of New York; and also the proposition from the United Assembly of the Northern Presbyterian Church, now sitting in Philadelphia, conveyed to us by a special delegation, respectfully report:

"That the former of these documents is virtually superseded by the latter; because the body by whom it was adopted has since been merged into the United Assembly, from which emanates a new and fresh proposal reflecting the views of the larger constituency. To this proposition, then, 'that a committee of five ministers and four elders be appointed by this Assembly to confer with a similar committee of their Assembly in respect to opening a friendly correspondence between the Northern and Southern Presbyterian Church,' your Committee recommend the following answer to be returned:

"Whatever obstructions may exist in the way of cordial intercourse between the two bodies above named, are entirely of a

public nature, and involve grave and fundamental principles. The Southern Presbyterian Church can confidently appeal to all the acts and declarations of all their Assemblies, that no attitude of aggression or hostility has been, or is now, assumed by it towards the Northern Church. And this General Assembly distinctly avows (as it has always believed and declared) that no grievances experienced by us, however real, would justify us in acts of aggression or a spirit of malice or retaliation against any branch of Christ's visible kingdom. We are prepared, therefore, in advance of all discussion, to exercise towards the General Assembly North and the churches represented therein such amity as fidelity to our principles could, under any possible circumstances, permit. Under this view, the appointment of a Committee of Conference might seem wholly unnecessary; but, in order to exhibit before the Christian world the spirit of conciliation and kindness to the last degree, this Assembly agrees to appoint a Committee of Conference to meet a similar committee already appointed by the Northern Assembly, with instructions to the same that the difficulties which lie in the way of cordial correspondence between the two bodies must be distinctly met and removed, and which may be comprehensively stated in the following particulars:

"1. Both the wings of the now united Assembly, during their separate existence before the fusion, did fatally complicate themselves with the state, in political utterances deliberately pronounced year after year; and which, in our judgment, were a sad betrayal of the cause and kingdom of our common Lord and Head. We believe it to be solemnly incumbent upon the Northern Presbyterian Church, not with reference to us, but before the Christian world and before our divine Master and King, to purge itself of this error, and by public proclamation of the truth, to place the crown once more upon the head of Jesus Christ as the alone King in Zion. In default of which, the Southern Presbyterian Church, which has already suffered much in maintaining the independence and spirituality of the Redeemer's kingdom upon earth, feels constrained to bear public testimony against this defection of our late associates from the truth. Nor can we, by official correspondence even, consent to blunt the edge of this our testimony concerning the very nature and mission of the Church as a purely spiritual body among men.

"2. The union now consummated between the Old and New School Assemblies North was accomplished by methods which, in our judgment, involve a total surrender of all the great testi-

monies of the Church for the fundamental doctrines of grace, at a time when the victory of truth over error hung long in the balance. The united Assembly stands of necessity upon an allowed latitude of interpretation of the standards, and must come at length to embrace nearly all shades of doctrinal belief. Of those falling testimonies, we are now the sole surviving heirs, which we must lift from the dust and bear to the generations after us. It would be a serious compromise of this sacred trust to enter into public and official fellowship with those repudiating these testimonies, and to do this expressly upon the ground, as stated in the preamble to the overture before us, 'that the terms of reunion between the two branches of the Presbyterian Church at the North, now happily consummated, present an auspicious opportunity for the adjustment of such relations.' To found a correspondence professedly upon this idea would be to endorse that which we thoroughly disapprove.

"3. Some of the members of our own body were, but a short time since, violently and unconstitutionally expelled from the communion of one branch of the now united Northern Assembly, under ecclesiastical charges which, if true, render them utterly infamous before the Church and the world. It is to the last degree unsatisfactory to construe this offensive legislation obsolete by the mere fusion of that body with another, or through the operation of a faint declaration which was not intended originally to cover this case. This is no mere 'rule' or 'precedent,' but a solemn sentence of outlawry against what is now an important and constituent part of our own body. Every principle of honor and of good faith compels us to say that an unequivocal repudiation of that interpretation of the law under which these men were condemned must be a condition precedent to any official correspondence on our part.

"4. It is well known that similar injurious accusations were preferred against the whole Southern Presbyterian Church, with which the ear of the whole world has been filled. Extending as these charges do to heresy and blasphemy, they cannot be quietly ignored by an indirection of any sort. If true, we are not worthy of the 'confidence, respect, Christian honor, and love,' which are tendered to us in this overture. If untrue, 'Christian honor and love,' manliness and truth, require them to be openly and squarely withdrawn. So long as they remain upon record, they are an impassable barrier to official intercourse."

It was moved to amend this report by striking out all provision for the appointment of a committee, letting the paper go as

our reason for declining to enter into a correspondence. A minority report was also presented, recommending the appointment of the Committee of Conference, without instructions or any declaration of principles. Later in the day, and just at the close of the debate, a substitute was offered by Dr. Bullock, proposing the appointment of the committee, but providing for the preparation of a separate paper of instructions for their guidance; and, further, for the preparation of an address to our own people, assuring them that, while the Assembly deems it necessary to enter into negotiations for the settlement of existing differences between the two bodies, no idea is entertained of any ultimate reunion with that body.

A careful examination of these several papers will show, what was more distinctly brought out in the discussion that followed, that there was perfect unanimity in the Assembly in regard to the question of organic reunion. To this all were opposed, and even to continued official correspondence, unless certain difficulties were removed. The object in view was precisely the same in all the papers proposed. The only point upon which there was a difference of sentiment was in regard to the means by which that object could best be attained, or the manner in which it should be sought. To *reunion* all were utterly opposed, either at the present or at any future time, or upon any conceivable conditions; not because of any ill feeling towards our Northern brethren—however abundant the ground for that—but because all were fully persuaded that the separate existence of our Church is necessary to her best interests in every respect, and because our peculiar mission as a Church can only be fulfilled by the preservation of our ecclesiastical integrity.

But organic reunion was not proposed; indeed, this object was expressly and repeatedly disavowed. And yet no thinking man can fail to see that the meeting of Committees of Conference from the two bodies would be the first step in this direction, and would be expected by all to lead to it. Dr. Backus himself, in his address before the Assembly, said:

“I need not, with these resolutions before you, undertake to speak of reunion. We did not come here to propose organic

union; we are not authorised by our Assembly to do so, and we are well aware that the time has not yet come. But we have hoped that a conference of brethren, in mutual respect and in Christian honor and love, might open a door by which this step can be taken. And, sir, I feel that there is so much true piety in this Church and in that to which I belong that we cannot meet without devising means which will attain this end."

Nothing could be more evident than that reunion was in the minds of all. When, after the adjournment of the Assembly, certain of our ministers visited Philadelphia, every member of that Assembly, who, in conversing with them, alluded to the matter, spoke of it as their "proposition for reunion." And when our answer was reported to that Assembly and their committee was dissolved, one of the speakers said:

"I rise to correct the impression in the minds of some in this Assembly that the day will be long deferred before this union will be consummated. Sir, I ground my conviction in the belief, first, in the superintending providence of God, which, having brought this nation together as one, will bring the Church together as one. I believe that Almighty God, who is still favoring this united Assembly and our beloved Church, may give it in charge to us to be the instruments in this work. This is not a question affecting only the addition of another portion of the Church, but affecting the true union of the land."

The Assembly, therefore, was put in the embarrassing position of having to answer a paper which involved the idea of future reunion, while it professed only to seek a friendly correspondence; and the matter had to be discussed from that point of view. Nothing could be more adroitly calculated to place the Southern Church in a false position than this paper from the Northern Church. It was a trap into which there was great danger of our falling. We do not say that it was *designed* to be a trap—certainly it was not so designed by those honorable men who brought these overtures to us. But a trap it was, nevertheless, and one from which we would not easily have been extricated had we been ensnared by it. But the majority report was well calculated to expose its sophistries, and restore any discussion that might arise to the basis of fundamental principles.

In a recent letter to the *Christian Observer* (Louisville), Dr. Van Dyke says: "Your most eloquent and influential speakers did not conceal the *suspicion* that some fatal snare lurked under the fair proposal we had laid before you." We hope that we are not suspicious; certainly we have never had unworthy suspicions of Dr. Van Dyke. But we have learned to be *watchful*. If we seem to be suspicious, he will excuse us when we remind him that the reunion overture adopted last year, was adopted at the instance of a Presbytery which at that very moment had its hand on some of our property, which we have vainly tried to rescue from its grasp; and that the Assembly which adopted that overture, couched in such friendly terms, passed a resolution appropriating \$5,000 for the purpose of prosecuting in the courts those cases by which they designed to wrest from us our church property. We confess that *that* did excite our *suspicions*. And now, when an effort was made which looked in the direction of reunion, that famous "disintegrating policy" was forced upon our recollection which was adopted by formal vote in the Assembly of 1865, the express object of which was to attempt to recover a footing within our territory by sowing discord and creating schism in the bosom of the Southern Church. We are not *suspicious*, but they have compelled us to be *watchful*.

Again, there was a *quasi* retraction on the part of the Northern Church of all offensive utterances against us, to which great prominence was given in the paper sent by the Philadelphia Assembly, the emptiness of which this paper exposed with terrible distinctness. They thought to avoid an open and manly acknowledgment of having wronged us, by adopting a resolution that "no rule or precedent which does not stand approved by both bodies shall be of any authority in the reunited body." This was no retraction. It was an easy way of getting rid of all those anathemas, and political utterances, and violations of the constitution, which loaded their records for nine years past, and which they ought, even in justice to themselves, to have retracted in the most open, explicit, and unequivocal manner. We would not demand any "humiliating concessions." We

were told that "Presbyterians cannot be reconciled in that way." If we understand Presbyterians, when they are conscious of having done wrong, their first impulse is to confess it, and to confess it openly and freely, and so to set themselves right. And so far from this being *humiliating* to noble minds, they feel that they are untrue to themselves until they have done it—until they have openly disowned and renounced their error. Said one of the speakers:

"The Northern Assembly lost an opportunity for doing a noble act. They should have rescinded their past deliverances before sending the delegation. How can the Northern Assembly feel any Christian love for us if a tithe of what they say of us on their records is true? if we are heretics, covenant-breakers, schismatics? How, if they feel this Christian love, how can they fail to see that those things ought to be rescinded?"

The passing of such a resolution as that "no rule or precedent," etc., was a confession that they had placed obstacles in the way of official intercourse which they ought to remove, if indeed it was intended to have any reference to their political acts, or those which were directed against us. While doing it, why did they not do it in such a way that there could be no misunderstanding about the matter? Why were they so indefinite? Why leave so much to be assumed or taken for granted? Why did they not expressly retract those things which they very well knew had offended us? They had "beaten us openly uncondemned being Romans; and now do they thrust us out *privily*? Nay verily; but let them come themselves and fetch us out." Their reparation should have been as public as their offence. By a formal act they had virtually expelled us; by formal acts they continued to wrong and injure us. Why could they not by as formal an act retract their offensive legislation? They desired a Committee of Conference. Why? The action that was called for in the case, required to be done in open Assembly, not in close committee. But there were questions of property to be adjudicated. If they were sincerely desirous of being just in this matter, a very plain and easy mode of doing it would have been simply to take their hands off our property. Who ever imagined that the Jacksonville church in Florida,

belonged by any sort of right to the Central Presbytery of Philadelphia? What was there to adjudicate in such a case? No; a very simple course was before them if they had sincerely desired to reëstablish friendly relations. They knew very well what stood in the way. There was no need of a committee to find it out. We had not been aggressors; we had done them no wrong, themselves being the judges. All that they had to do, then, was just to retract their offensive legislation. The whole thing was in their own hands; and this would have been acting in a true Christian and manly spirit. For us to have gone into a conference as they proposed to see what the differences between us were, would have been to admit that we may have been partly to blame—that there was some question in regard to our own conduct. This was requiring of *us* a “humiliating concession,” and this we could not for a moment think of making.

We may here say also that the Assembly was somewhat embarrassed by the difficulty of *identifying* the body from which the friendly overture proceeded. It was not, as some one has said, the old orthodox body which, by formal enactment, had ejected us nine years ago, and which had not ceased from that time to follow us with persecutions. Nor was it exactly that heretical body which we had helped to eject thirty-three years ago. It was both, yet neither. Should this great reconstructed body be held responsible for the past acts of either or both bodies? with whom are we dealing? were the questions in every mind.

Dr. Lyon moved the adoption of the minority report, and opened the discussion with a speech of great ability. We cannot here give any idea of the debate which followed. Dr. Rice, Dr. Ross, Dr. Hopkins, Dr. Palmer, and others, took part in it; and none who failed to hear it, can ever appreciate the power and earnestness which marked the whole discussion. Strong ground was taken on both sides and maintained until the whole subject was thoroughly argued. There was no excitement. All was calm. Yet the most absorbing interest was felt, for all the members seemed impressed with the great solemnity of the occa-

sion; and not a single bitter or unkind word was spoken from first to last. Most of the speakers took very high ground, rising wholly above the petty feelings of malice or revenge, or of peevish resentment. Their hearts seemed to be "penetrated with the majesty of the principles they were called to maintain." "Sir," said Dr. Palmer, "it is not a question of forgiveness at all; it is not a question of resentment at all. I solemnly avow, so far as I know my own heart, I am not filled with the spirit of resentment toward the Northern Church. The point is made distinctly in the report under consideration, that this is a matter of principle, and not of feeling. We are here to sustain the principles upon which our Church is founded, and we wish that it may be so understood."

The discussion having continued through the entire day, late in the evening the Assembly came to a vote. The minority report was rejected. The amendment proposing to strike out the resolution providing for the appointment of a Committee of Conference, was then put and lost. Dr. Bullock's substitute was offered and voted down. The vote was then taken on the majority report, and it was adopted by a vote of 83 to 17. When the result was announced, a feeling of great relief was experienced; for the anxiety of mind for several days had been intense.

The Committee on Foreign Correspondence was then directed to prepare a pastoral letter on this subject, to be addressed to the churches. We presume that this remarkably able document has been generally read. We commend to the special attention of the Church that portion which so forcibly expounds the instructions given to the committee relative to the difficulties lying in the way of an official correspondence between the two bodies. We cannot refrain from giving the following extract, which sets forth the reasons for the adoption of the paper:

"It may perhaps appear to you, and it will doubtless be so represented by others, that a proposition so simple as that of conference for the adjustment of difficulties might have been left unembarrassed by any antecedent enunciation of what the Assembly regards as the obstructions to fraternal and official correspondence. It is precisely this which we desire you to under-

stand, as well as the reasons which impelled us to the course we have pursued. The reflective and thoughtful amongst you will at once recognise that, in diplomatic intercourse, the first step is always the most important. It is this that determines all the future and dependent negotiations; and, however unobtrusive the initiatory measure may appear to be, it is often pregnant with concealed results of vast magnitude. This is preëminently true in the case before us. It was incumbent upon us to watch narrowly, lest, in the very opening of negotiations, we might incautiously surrender the principles we hold, which, slipping from our grasp, we might never be able to recover.

“The overture from the Northern Assembly was based upon the fatal assumption that mutual grievances existed, in reference to which it became necessary to arbitrate. This assumption is precisely what we cannot truthfully concede. Our records may be searched in vain for a single act of aggression, or a single unfriendly declaration, against the Northern Church. We have assumed no attitude of hostility towards it. In not a single case has there been an attempt to wrest from them their church property. In not a single case has there been hesitation in receiving their members into our communion upon the face of their credentials, amongst the hundreds who have come to make their home with us since the war. In not one instance has there been exhibited a spirit of retaliation in regard to any of those very measures instituted against ourselves by the Assembly of 1865, and by subsequent Assemblies.

“Whatever obstructions may be in the way of ecclesiastical fellowship were not created by us, and we could not allow ourselves to be placed in the false position before the world of parties who had been guilty of wrong to the Northern Church. Having placed nothing in the way of Christian fraternity, there was nothing for us to remove. Whilst, therefore, in Christian courtesy, we were willing to appoint a Committee of Conference, it was necessary to guard against all misconstruction and misrepresentation by instructing our commissioners to remember this fact, and restricting them to the duty of simply reporting and expounding what we considered indispensable to an honest correspondence, which should not, by its insincerity and hollowness, be an offence to our divine Master.

“Inasmuch as we had never been aggressors against the peace, security, and prosperity of the Northern Church, and had not undertaken to approach them with proposals of any sort, Christian candor required us, as the party approached, to state exactly the difficulties which did embarrass this question of cor-

respondence. Without going into much detail or multiplying the specifications, these were summed up under four heads; the significance and importance of which we would have you to appreciate."

Whether this action of the Assembly was wise, the experience of the future alone can determine. Whether any other course would have been better, is simply a matter of conjecture. As for ourselves, we are satisfied with what has been done. We do not claim that it was the best thing that could have been done; for the *form* of the paper adopted might have been somewhat modified, and perhaps we would then have been even better satisfied with it. But one good has resulted already, and that is no inconsiderable matter—*the minds of the people are set at rest on the subject*. Had a committee been appointed without the most explicit instructions, the whole Church would have been in a state of anxiety and suspense for a year to come. We differ entirely with Dr. Palmer, who said: "If you enter into this conference, in three years there will be a fusion between this Assembly and the North." That such a result should take place is inconceivable, whatever concessions might have been made, or whatever inducements offered, or whatever diplomacy employed. But one thing is morally certain, that the first step of our General Assembly looking to organic reunion, would be the signal for the general abandonment of the Church by the people. The ministers may go back if they choose, but the people never will. Much as they love and reverence their pastors, they will not follow them when they take this step. We do not mean by this to intimate that the ministers are more likely to go back than the people; for we say with equal truth, the people may go back if they choose, but the ministers never will. In this the whole Church, ministers and people, are perfectly agreed. If all the difficulties said to be in the way of official correspondence were removed, still we would be no nearer reunion than before. For the conviction of the whole Church is profound and ineradicable that a separate existence must be maintained, if the true interests of the Church are to be promoted.

If our Assembly had not the worldly wisdom of so shaping its course as to meet this approach of the Northern Assembly in the most advantageous way, as some maintain, we thank God that it had the grace to meet it in the most honest and open way. It came out with the *truth*, fearlessly and manfully. It has not yet learned to quibble and evade. If we seem to be placed in a false position in the eyes of the Christian world, we cannot remain so if our Assembly continues to be as frank and open and honest as it has been up to this time.

As a matter of history, the final action of the Northern Assembly in regard to this whole subject should be here inserted:

“Whereas, this General Assembly, at an early period of its sessions, declared its desire to establish cordial fraternal relations with the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, commonly known as the Southern Assembly, upon the basis of Christian honor, confidence, and love; and with a view to the attainment of this end, appointed a committee of five ministers and four elders, to confer with a similar committee, if it should be appointed by the Assembly then in session at Louisville, ‘in regard to the amicable settlement of all existing difficulties, and the opening of a friendly correspondence between the Northern and Southern Churches,’ and for the furtherance of the objects contemplated in the appointment of said committee, and with a view to remove the obstacles which might prevent the acceptance of our proposals by our Southern brethren, reaffirmed the concurrent declaration of the two Assemblies which met in New York last year, to the effect that ‘no rule or precedent which does not stand approved by both the bodies shall be of any authority in the reunited body, except so far as such rule or precedent may affect the rights of property founded thereon;’ and as a further pledge of our sincerity in this movement, sent a copy of our resolutions, together with our Christian salutation, to the Assembly at Louisville, by the hands of delegates chosen for that purpose:

“And whereas, the Southern Assembly, while receiving our delegates with marked courtesy, and formally complying with our proposition for the appointment of a Committee of Conference, has nevertheless accompanied that appointment with declarations and conditions which we cannot consistently accept, because they involve a virtual prejudgment of the very difficulties concerning which we invited the conference: Therefore,

“*Resolved*, That the further consideration of the subject be postponed, and the committee be discharged. At the same time, we cannot forbear to express our profound regret that a measure designed, and, as we believe, eminently fitted, to promote the establishment of peace and the advancement of our Redeemer’s kingdom in every part of our country, has apparently failed to accomplish its object. We earnestly hope that the negotiations thus suspended may soon be resumed under happier auspices; and hereby declare our readiness to renew our proposals for a friendly correspondence whenever our Southern brethren shall signify their readiness to accept it in the form and spirit in which it has been offered.”

We thank Dr. Van Dyke for all the kind things he was pleased to say of us in his speech upon the adoption of this paper. In the years past, he has greatly endeared himself to the hearts of our people; and he is no less beloved now that we have failed to agree with him in what he has so earnestly desired of us. We thank him for saying before his Assembly: “I love and honor them, just as I always have done, for their firm adherence to the doctrines of grace; and there is not a sounder body on the face of the earth than that Assembly. I love and honor them for their zeal and energy, and the success with which, under all the disadvantages of their circumstances, they are prosecuting the work God has given them to do. Yea, I honor them for even what you may suppose their mistaken zeal—for adherence to their avowed principles, under which they have manifestly in this case gone against their interests. It is something in these days of mammon-worship and temporary expediency to see men sacrificing interest to what they believe to be their principles; and even though in this case we may think their feelings swayed their judgments, we ought not for one moment to suspect their motives to be anything but pure and lofty.”

These are noble words, and they fall pleasantly on ears accustomed to hearing words of bitterness and reproach. But we had hoped that, after listening to the discussions of our Assembly in regard to the matter in which he felt so much interest, he would have perceived that our judgments were not “swayed by our feelings,” and that we were not influenced by the “bit-

ter memories of the past," but that from the purest motives we sought to uphold those great principles which we know are as dear to his heart as to our own. And whatever the compliment which he designed to pay to our Assembly in saying that "in their adherence to principle they had gone against their interests," we must remind him that we regard the interest of *truth* as paramount to every other. Not a single principle for which we have so long contended dare we sacrifice or even imperil for any temporal advantage whatsoever. We can afford, poor as we are, to lose every dollar's worth of property now in litigation between his Church and ours; we can afford, weary as we are of misrepresentation and calumny, to bear unmerited reproach and scorn; we can afford, much as we love peace, to be engaged always in warfare and strife; but we cannot afford to yield a single principle, or to surrender one jot or tittle of the sacred truth committed to our keeping. And when we are led to any course which to us seems necessary for the maintenance of principle and truth, it is vain to talk to us of "interests."

CRITICAL NOTICES.

Religion and the Reign of Terror; or, the Church during the French Revolution. Prepared from the French of M. EDMOND DE PRESSENSÉ, Author, etc., by Rev. J. P. LACROIX, A. M. New York: Carlton & Lanahan; Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1869. Pp. 416, 12mo.

This is not a translation, but a digest and abridgement of the original, which consists of 475 pages, 8vo. The abridger is a professor in the Ohio Wesleyan University. He has appended to his abridgment certain biographical notes of the leading characters in the French Revolution, which are a valuable addition to the work. The author is a prominent minister of the French Protestant Church, who has written a "History of the First Three Ages of the Christian Church," and also a "Life of Jesus," in reply to Renan; and is editor of the *Revue Chrétienne*.

Professor Lacroix holds that the French Revolution was, on the one hand, a struggle of liberty against absolutism, of free thought against spiritual despotism; and, on the other, of Christianity against a godless philosophy. But the movement made shipwreck by becoming atheistic and bloody. Then came anarchy, and then despotism again. Why, he asks, did similar principles work such different results in America? In Europe, he says, political and spiritual despots have been using the French Revolution, with its terrors, to scare away the people from all efforts in favor of liberty and Church reform. Now, this book of M. de Pressensé vindicates the holy causes of liberty and free-churchism, and assigns the true reason of the miscarriage of the Revolution, viz., the twofold influence of governmental interference with personal liberty and with church affairs.

M. de Pressensé himself characterises the spirit of 1789 as

“one of the noblest movements of humanity breaking out over France and Europe, drunk with youth (*sic!*) and inspired with an inexperienced ardor for universal reform.” “Whatever may be said by hired sophists, ever ready to laud and beautify servitude, the essence of 1789 was the great principle of general liberty.” But the movement was “a sudden abortion.” While many eminent writers have treated the problem as a whole, he desires “to write the history of religion during the Revolution, and to show that nothing contributed more fatally to the downfall of liberty than the errors of our forefathers as to the mode of organising religion in France.” The Revolution “proclaimed immortal truths and recognised sacred rights,” and yet it “infringed on the sacred domain of conscience;” was exasperated by the opposition which ensued, and turned aside from the path of fruitful and lasting reforms. The revolutionists were “timid conservators rather than daring reformers”—were governed by the ideas of ancient France when they thought they were destroying them, and so strengthened beyond measure the central power, and gave to the state what belonged alone to the individual. On these shoals, “for a short time only, as we assuredly believe, one of the noblest of revolutions has made shipwreck.” P. 22.

At the eve of the Revolution, the Church was the strongest support of the government, and as a barrier to reform, was attacked by liberalism, which thus became identified with irreligion. The young of heart and the lovers of right and liberty were hence ready to reject Christianity. All life and all conviction were on the side of a sceptical philosophy. The Church was not only stationary in the midst of this life, but sought to beat it back. The eighteenth century was imbued with one of the grand ideas born of the gospel—the idea of human rights. The Church took sides against what it should have been first to proclaim, since its own Scriptures said, *In Christ there is neither bond nor free*—words which constitute the chart of equality and true liberty. Thus liberal spirits came to regard religion as the very foe they must first conquer. Pp. 23, 24.

Our author proceeds to describe the complete monopoly of

privileges held by the Roman Catholic Church, and its enormous wealth, while Protestants and Jews were under every kind of cruel restraint and oppression. Yet this established Church was reduced by the state to the most cramping dependence. The famous Gallican liberties he represents as just the Church free of the Pope to be the slave of the state. In the meanwhile, religion all over Europe was in a deplorable condition. In England and Germany, the withering breath of Deism brooded over all. The Protestant pulpit was languid and cowardly. In France it had had no eloquent voice since Massillon's death in 1742. In the Romish Church, Jansenism was in its dotage and Ultramontanism rife. The Romish clergy were continually implicated in scandals; free-thinking and gallant abbots encumbered the drawing-rooms. Meanwhile the attacks of infidel philosophy grew more pressing. Voltaire and the Encyclopedists poured out their wit upon the Church; and Voltaire becomes the apostle of toleration. Then Rousseau arises, and, though crying out with one breath for toleration, assigns the penalty of death to all who should dissent from his new religion of Deism. De Pressensé says Rousseau's *contrat social* was Louis XIV. in a Jacobin's coat, and that in his words above referred to, published about 1764, were to be heard in the distance Robespierre celebrating the festival of the Eternal in the presence of the guillotine.

Such were the tendencies about to enter into conflict, and which brought on the Revolution of 1789. In May of that year, the Assembly of the States-General assembled at Versailles. It had not met since 1614, and was now summoned as a last expedient to save the nation from bankruptcy and ruin. It consisted of deputies from the three orders of society—from the estate of the nobles, that of the clergy, and the third estate, *i. e.*, of the people. This last was predominant from the beginning. The nobles were induced to renounce their feudal rights. The clergy relinquished their tithes; but the radical spirit grew with what it fed on. De Pressensé describes well (see p. 57) what the ignorant masses will always do when they have power thrown into their hands. The despotism of the street is a dan-

gerous power to call into play. "We applaud the people who destroyed the Bastile, but it was the same people that afterwards revelled at the foot of the guillotine." The Revolution was not yet radical enough. It is proposed to take possession of the property of the Church. Talleyrand, a youthful bishop and also a noble, was the man who first spoke the word. The discussion in the Assembly began as usual with philosophical generalities, and this was perhaps its most dangerous feature; for what property is it whose original title will bear the test of metaphysical examination? P. 70. De Pressensé says the reforms already made "naturally led to others of a more radical character—so much the more as the legislators of 1789 were governed not by precedent, but by abstract principles. This method of procedure, so different from that of the English (he means, of course, the English of ante-radical days), leads often to chimerical and impracticable measures." P. 66. Mirabeau, "the chief of a party, and therefore very dependent," threw his weight into the ultra-radical scale, and, closing the debate, carried the majority with him. The treasures of the Church, it was resolved, belonged to the nation on condition that she provide for the support of the clerical orders. Thus the affections of that powerful body, the French clergy, were alienated from the Revolution, and yet the Church was bound fast to the new state in a troublesome and dangerous connexion. Thus a new church constitution was made an immediate necessity of state. The Jansenists were numerous in the Assembly and preponderated in the ecclesiastical committee; and, in league with the politicians, they framed a constitution to embody all their favorite notions. The Assembly became a theological battle-field—the combatants the two parties which for ages had divided the French Church; the judges, Voltaire's and Rousseau's disciples. This constitution abolished the old bishoprics, and made eighty-three new ecclesiastical districts conforming to the political. No bishop whose see lay in the jurisdiction of any foreign power, was to be acknowledged by any Frenchman. Thus the Papal authority was well nigh abolished in the French Church. The election of all bishops was to be by popular vote in place of the canonical

forms, and Protestants and Jews might vote as well as Catholics.

Thus did a political assembly claim to impose laws on the Church. A bitter opposition was roused on the part of the clergy. This irritated the Assembly, and led it to persist in and to multiply its faults. It came to regard the clergy as an enemy to be crushed by any and every means. In Paris, the priests were often insulted in the streets. In the provinces, the priests excited their flocks to send violent protests to the Assembly. "Companies of the Cross" were organised to withstand the National Guard. There were meetings at night in the churches, and violent harangues and incendiary pamphlets. Then collisions took place and blood was shed. And thus the Assembly was exasperated to more severity, and the Church looked on by the Revolutionists more and more as an enemy, and the movement itself came more and more to be both antichristian and bloody.

It is not necessary to go any further with this sketch of our author's representations and views. The cruel persecutions of the priests and the noble Christian behavior of many of them under their sufferings; the inhuman butcheries also of the Protestants by the population of the excited provinces; the rising of the Catholics in La Vendée in defence of their non-juring priests, and for their own liberty of worship; the assembling of the National Convention, and with it the end of the reign of law; the appearance of Robespierre on the stage; the reign of terror; the first public outbreak of Atheism; the organisation of the worship of reason; the entire proscription of religion; and all the other onward and downward steps of the fearful drama, are briefly referred to by M. de Pressensé in illustration of the fatal errors of the Revolution. The whole work will well repay the reader's very careful and considerate examination.

1. The first remark we have to make in the way of criticism, is, that although, as appears above, our author constantly censures the radical spirit in which the Revolution commenced and went forward, yet his own statements very often, as expressed by himself, are quite too radical for a wise and good man to

cherish. He is carried away with the idea of the rights of man and the notion of universal equality. Look, for example, at what he says of the eighteenth century being imbued with that grand idea born of the gospel—the idea of human rights; and that the Church ought to have been the first to proclaim that idea, seeing that *in Christ there is neither bond nor free*. What is the value of all he says about the separation of Church and State, if nevertheless the Church have any commission to proclaim the principles of universal political freedom? And what but an abuse of Scripture is it to make the apostle teach, in what he says about *bond and free*, that all political and social distinctions have been abolished by Christ? No; the gospel is not and never was a levelling system. It never did set itself for human freedom nor against human bondage. It no where teaches that all are to be equal, or to claim equality, in any worldly respect. What else does M. de Pressensé do but make Christ's kingdom to be of this world, when he declares that these words of the apostle “constitute the chart of equality and true liberty?” As to the idea of human rights being born of the gospel, all we have to say is, that it is easier to find in the gospel the *wrongs of man* than the *rights of man*. Man in the gospel is a criminal who has forfeited every right. Bondage, oppression, and every other evil thing, are his due, because he has sinned. If liberty or any other blessing is vouchsafed, it is God's mercy, and no matter of human right at all. True, man may claim from man by right what he cannot claim by right from God; but the gospel no where undertakes to settle how many or what particular things every man is bound to give to every other; or what precise share of property, or what exact degree of personal liberty, it is the right of every man to be allowed by all other men. That depends on a great variety of circumstances. That is a matter which the Sovereign Disposer determines in his providence, and not in his word. The rights of man, so far as his fellow man are concerned, do cover whatever is needful to constitute him *a man*; but they do not cover what is necessary to constitute him a Frenchman in distinction from a Russian, or an Englishman in distinction from a French-

man; or what is necessary to constitute him a rich man in distinction from a poor man; or a free man in distinction from a bond man. We are all born to manhood, but we are not all born to wealth or to freedom in the same degree; and some of us are born to no degree of these blessings at all. Wealth is a matter of inheritance or of lawful acquisition. So freedom is a matter of inheritance or of lawful acquisition. The author says well that the English way is of *precedent*, and not of *abstract principle*. English liberty is indeed the truest and best liberty, because it is matter of inheritance, of slow growth, of rightful acquisition; and American liberty was in its origin the same as English. Every man as such can claim the right from his fellow-man to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience; the right to think for himself, provided nevertheless that he may not always put his thoughts into words or deeds; the right to do whatever God requires of him as his duty. No man has a right to hinder any other of his fellows from being *a man*. No man has the right to treat any other man as if he were not a man; but it is one thing to be a man and quite another thing to be an American citizen, or a rich man, or even a free man. Thousands and millions in all ages have lived and died in slavery; but they were as truly men all the time from the gospel point of view as were their masters. Of course we would not deny that the gospel is friendly to freedom as well as every other kind of progress in good; for it fits man for freedom by delivering him from the dominion of sin; and, by teaching him self-control, prepares him to conduct himself properly without the control of force. But the gospel gives the Church no authority to preach the rights of man as against any kind of political government whatsoever. The American editor holds up the author as eminent for learning and piety, not only in France, but throughout Europe, and as standing at the head of the evangelical French clergy. But we are compelled to say that his language—or perhaps it is the language of his Ohio editor—in many parts of this volume, seems to stamp him as very strongly impregnated with the humanitarian doctrines of the age, which are entirely hostile to the gospel.

2. Our next criticism relates to the author's account of the dreadful failure of the Revolution in France. It became irreligious and atheistic, and so bloody and destructive; because the alienation of the property of the Church alienated from it the clergy and the Church, and their alienation reacted on the Revolution, and again reacted on the feelings of the Church; and so action and reaction went on, down to the fatal culmination. Now we do not question the correctness, but the adequacy of this statement. No doubt the effects M. de Pressensé describes were produced, and on both sides just as he describes them. But was there not a previous and more potent cause of the irreligiousness of the French mind? Was not that Church, of which M. de Pressensé speaks in this account so charitably, herself the guilty cause of French infidelity, at least in great part? Had the Church of Rome retained the truth and preached the pure and simple gospel, would France and Europe generally have plunged into the abyss of unbelief? Does not Popery always prepare the way for scepticism? First, it makes the people ignorant and superstitious, and shuts out the light of all truth from their minds. By and by, in one way or another, the most independent and vigorous minds burst her shackles in part and renounce her creed of fables and lies. But if they do not get access to the gospel, they must then fall into infidelity. And thus Popery is the natural mother of unbelief wherever she cannot altogether subjugate the mind to her yoke of will-worship and superstition. Does not the intelligent Protestant minister, M. de Pressensé, know all this? And how is it, then, that not a hint of this appears in his book? How is it that he undertakes to put the blame of the terrible failure on a subsequent and a minor cause?

We hold that without the injurious blunder described, the Revolution must needs have been a failure, because France was not prepared for freedom. And we hold that no people are prepared for freedom who have lived for generations under Popery, whether they still believe in the Church or have become infidel. We think it is easy to answer Prof. Lacroix's question, Why did the principles which have succeeded so well (?) in America

meet only with disaster and failure in France? But M. de Pressensé does not give the right answer.

The men who settled America certainly were better prepared than the French for self-government, both by their Protestant creed and training, and by their political training and experience. We say they were better prepared than the French, but we can not say their experiment has been successful. That remains to be seen. But should it prove a failure, all the world may see more plainly than ever before how true it is that all nations are not capable of self-government. The settlers of this continent were a different kind of men from the motley throng from every country of Europe who have succeeded them. You cannot make men free. You cannot give them freedom. It is a development from within, and that only under favorable circumstances and the peculiar guidance of Heaven.

We declare that we look on Rome as one of two great enemies of the human race and barriers to human progress. She is now putting forward with new boldness her old claim to infallibility—the peculiar wickedness of which is that it seeks to set up another standard of truth besides God's written word, and is just one of the various crafty substitutions of the evil one: the Church for the word of God, the Virgin for the Son of God, the sacraments for the Spirit of God. To establish this utterly baseless and wicked claim, we find her always perverting and misconstruing Scripture whenever and wherever she cannot hide it from the eyes of men. The other great enemy of mankind is unbelief, the twin-sister of Popery, or, as we have said above, her daughter. Both are deifications of the human mind as against God and his word. Both spring from the same unwillingness to bow to God's revealed truth. These were the two kindred enemies of France in the days of her wild and fierce endeavor to secure liberty. These are the two kindred enemies that threaten to make the American experiment a failure: on the one hand, the Romish Church, which our politicians all tremble at and obey; on the other hand, Rationalism in its various forms—the setting up of human reason above the Bible; the devising a better wisdom and a better morality, a better law and

a better God, than the Bible's—the humanitarian religion which, spreading abroad through all the country from New England—New England settled by men who prized the word of God above everything else—now seeks, by the hands of their degenerate sons, to insinuate itself even into those religious communions which profess that the Bible is the sole rule of faith and practice.

3. We have one more criticism to offer upon this work. It relates to the manner in which it decries the famous Gallican liberties. De Pressensé speaks of them as nothing more than a declaring the Church free of the Pope in order to enslave her to the king. This is the substance of what he says on this subject on pages 29–31, 97, 98, 242, 339, and 352–354. Now, this is precisely what the Ultramontanes of France and elsewhere charge upon the Gallican Liberties, that they subject the Church to the state. And it appears to us a little strange that a leading Protestant minister of France should not instinctively avoid all sympathy of opinion and feeling with that portion of the Romish Church. Bishop Lynch comes back from Rome and tells the people of Charleston that the American bishops who were unfriendly to a declaration of Papal infallibility by the Vatican Council, *have modified their views*; and that, as for himself, he had always held to it; and Bishop Lynch, on the same occasion, more than once referred to Gallicanism in a way which showed how hostile to it is his earnest Romanism. And we repeat that it is strange to find our author evincing so much sympathy with Ultramontane dislike of Gallicanism. In fact, his delineation on pages 353, 354, of the “Organic Laws,” made at the time of Buonaparte’s Concordat in 1802, as cutting off “the Holy Father” from the French bishops, might well be the production of the bitterest Jesuit foe to the Gallican liberties. We account for M. de Pressensé’s want of sympathy with Gallicanism as we do for his erroneous sentiments criticised above. He has the Republic on the brain. He is somewhat of a radical, and quite too much of a politician—not hesitating, as we saw above, to publish, although a minister of the gospel, that the *noble Revolution* of the last century is only suspended, he

assuredly believes, *for a short time!* He calls the state "the great French idol." (See page 31.) Doubtless he is sighing for the downfall of the empire; and so the Gallican Liberties, important as they are in the estimation of all who hate Popery, find no place in his sympathies absorbed with politics.

Our readers may find in the *North British Review* for August, 1850, a very full account of the Gallican Liberties, from the pen of the late Principal Cunningham of Edinburgh. It is republished in his collected works. He makes the chief eras in the history of this subject to be—1. The quarrel between King Philip the Fair and Pope Boniface VIII., at the commencement of the fourteenth century. 2. The Pragmatic Sanction of 1438, based on the decrees of the Councils of Constance and Basle; which bodies the reader should understand made Councils to be superior to Popes. 3. The Concordat of 1516 between Francis I. and Leo X., in which the king sacrificed Gallican Liberties to Rome. 4. The excommunication, deposition, and absolution of Henry IV. 5. The Declaration of the Gallican clergy in 1682, under Bossuet's influence. 6. The controversy early in the eighteenth century about the acceptance of the Bull *Unigenitus*. 7. The Concordat of 1801 between First Consul Buonaparte and Pope Pius VII., and the "Organic Law" founded upon it. Dr. Cunningham should have put first upon this list of eras, however, one which he has omitted entirely, viz.: 1268, when Louis IX., afterwards canonized, about to go on his crusade, published his famous ordinance, or "Pragmatic Sanction," to secure the rights of the Gallican Church against the machinations of the pontiffs.

Now, it is very well known that Bossuet's famous production, the Declaration above named, has been regarded ever since 1682 as "the authoritative standard of the Gallican Liberties and the peculiar symbol of the Gallican Church." The reader will find its four articles quoted in full in a note to Murdock's *Mosheim*, Vol. III., p. 309. Dr. Cunningham gives the substance thus: the first asserted that the civil power is independent of the spiritual; that the Pope has no authority in temporal matters—no right to depose sovereigns or absolve subjects; the second af-

firmed the doctrine of Constance, that the Council is superior to the Pope; the third, that the Pope must regard the canons of the universal Church and the ancient laws of the Church of France; the fourth, that the decision of a Pope was not "irreformable," etc. Now, what is there in these four articles of the Declaration which at all resembles a subjugation of the French Church to the state?

Of Bossuet's famous defence of the Declaration, published in 1730, long after his death, Dr. Cunningham says that he "has certainly proved by evidence which cannot be answered, that the Pope has no legitimate claim upon any ground of Scripture, reason, antiquity, or ecclesiastical authority, to any jurisdiction, direct or indirect, in temporal matters; to superiority over a general council; to exemption from the authority of the canons; or to infallibility in questions of doctrine; and he has not scrupled to produce, in confirmation of his position, cases in which Popes have contradicted each other, and have unquestionably fallen into error in matters both of faith and discipline." Bossuet's defence would be nice reading, we think, for the Protestants of Charleston, to whom Bishop Lynch has been discoursing so smoothly of late concerning the Vatican Council and the Infallible Pope.

Dr. Cunningham distinctly expresses the judgment that the Gallican divines avoided all Erastian ideas of the subjection of the Church to the State, and that they in fact hit the golden mean of Scottish Presbyterianism as to the relations of Church and State.

While differing thus widely in some things with our author, we nevertheless recommend his work as able, instructive, and valuable. The subject of the relations of Church and State is of the profoundest interest, and as difficult as it is interesting. M. de Pressensé has made an important contribution to its thorough investigation.

Reminiscences of the Indians. By the Rev. CEPHAS WASHBURN, A. M., many years Superintendent of the Dwight Mission among the Cherokees of the Arkansas. With a

Biography of the Author, by Rev. J. W. MOORE of Arkansas, and an Introduction by Rev. J. L. WILSON, D. D., Secretary of Foreign Missions. Richmond: Presbyterian Committee of Publication. Pp. 236, 12mo.

We have read this book with very great delight, and we adopt Dr. J. Leighton Wilson's words, "In no book have we ever found more graphic or life-like sketches." It furnishes evidence that Mr. Washburn was, to use Father Moore's expression, "no ordinary man." Dr. Henry R. Wilson of Ohio, once associated with him, and afterwards missionary for some years to India, also says in his letter which appears in the volume, that his mind was "far above the ordinary standard, and that mind had been admirably trained and cultivated. My first impressions in my ignorance were, that it was a pity such talents and scholarship had not been employed in some city pulpit or theological chair, instead of being unappreciated and unprofitably employed among the untutored and ignorant savages. But it was not long before I learned through my own deficiencies my mistake; for a clear and well-disciplined mind is necessary to a clear and simple exhibition of truth to the minds of the uneducated and uncultivated. Just such men as brother Washburn are, of all others, the men needed to tear away the rubbish of heathenism, and lay broad and deep the foundations of truth upon which the Church of God must stand, etc." P. 45. Just here we must remark, that we cannot comprehend why Mr. Washburn is called "Superintendent of the Missions;" or why Dr. H. R. Wilson, who was a member of that mission for a while, is said to have been "assistant to Mr. Washburn." P. 44. The American Board, whose that mission then was, we know never made any such distinctions, and it is strange that, believers in the parity of presbyters as Presbyterians are, such representations should find their way into this Presbyterian book.

And here let us observe what Father Moore refers to on page 65, that Mr. Washburn was born and reared a Congregationalist; but that that was a different thing fifty years ago from what is so called now. "At that time the New England Primer was among the first books put into the hands of children, and the

Shorter Catechism which it contained formed the basis of their religious belief." "The Beechers and Cheevers and Garrisons had not then risen up to scatter the seeds of error and infidelity broadcast over the land." The form of church government constituted the principal difference between the Congregational and Presbyterian churches in those days. Mr. Washburn having been providentially thrown amongst Presbyterians, and having studied their system, became convinced "that it was not only more scriptural," but "better adapted to exclude error and preserve purity of doctrine. When speaking of the fearful strides of fanaticism and infidelity as recently developed in the land of his fathers, he was often heard to say, that *Congregationalism had not power sufficient to keep out heresy.*" P. 66.

The details of missionary sufferings in the wilderness presented on pages 47-49, 83-88, and 94-102, are in the highest degree affecting. The simple, unaffected style of the narrative would at first impress the reader with the idea that the writer was a plain and simple man, fit only to drive a little wagon through the forest and across swollen creeks and rivers. A closer examination, however, reveals the simplicity which greatness confers, and the clearness of conception and statement which marks the first rate intellect. As a writer, as an actor, as a missionary, as a man, we are disposed to place Mr. Washburn in the front rank. The story of Col. Bob Bean (pages 90-93) would well illustrate all these points, but we have not room to copy it. The details of witchcraft amongst the Indians, (pages 134-139), and of their knowledge—that is, their ignorance—of medicine (pages 141-145), are very interesting. Mr. Washburn declares by the way, that "celebrated Indian specifics" are humbugs. Having lived amongst six or seven of the Indian tribes, he testifies that he had "never known or heard of any people who have suffered more from ignorance of the *materia medica*, as well as of the characteristics of disease, than the Indians." P. 141. But by far the most striking and valuable part of the book is its history of particular characters amongst the Cherokee chiefs, and particular cases of conversion amongst the people. As to the latter, we think the history of Tah-neh's conversion,

and subsequent life and experience and death, (pages 148-159), equal to any thing of the kind which we have ever met with. And as to the former, we confess that the pictures drawn by the author, of Ta-kah-to-kuh, of Ta-ka-e-tuh, and of Dik-keh the Just, have awakened in us all the romantic admiration of our youthful days for Indian manhood, dignity, politeness, and eloquence. Still further, the particulars stated concerning the religious ideas of the Cherokees before they ever saw a missionary, which Mr. Washburn derived from these chiefs, who were all of the Indian priesthood, are such as may well excite to curious speculation concerning the origin of our native tribes. Dr. Boudinot, and many others, have been led by them to the conclusion that they were of Jewish origin. Mr. Washburn dissents, however, mainly on the ground, that he never had any satisfactory proof of any Indian rite like circumcision.

Should this charming volume be extensively read by our people, and especially our ministers and students of theology, we should hope, as one good result of it, for a great increase of interest amongst us respecting our present missions to the Indians. The volume closes with a letter from Mr. Washburn, urging the peculiar claims of our red brethren of the West upon our Christian sympathies. It deserves to be pondered by us all.

The Law of Creeds in Scotland. A Treatise on the Legal Relation of Churches in Scotland, Established and not Established, to their Doctrinal Confessions. By ALEXANDER TAYLOR INNES, M. A., Solicitor before the Supreme Courts of Scotland, and Member of the Faculty of Procurators of Glasgow. William Blackwood & Sons, Edinburgh and London. 1867. Pp. 495, 8vo.

Creeds and Churches in Scotland. With an Appendix. By SIR HENRY WELLWOOD MONCREIFF, Bart., D. D. Edinburgh: Edmonston & Douglas, Princes Street. 1869. Pp. 98, 8vo.

These are not books to be dealt with summarily. For this reason alone they have lain for a long time on our table unnoticed. We live in hopes of being able at some future day to examine and report upon both of them in full to our readers.

At present we undertake merely to introduce these interesting and able discussions to their attention.

The author of the former work says it is not a book of church law, but of the civil law of Scotland, in so far as it affects or controls churches in the matter of their creeds. The first part of his book is devoted to the relations of the law of Scotland to the Established Church in respect to its creed. The second, to the more difficult and the newer question of its relation to the non-established churches in respect of their creeds. He divides his treatise into seven chapters, and each one has appended to it Statutes, Acts of Assembly, Articles of Faith, Legal Decisions, Judges' Speeches, and illustrative documents generally. Chapter first treats of the Scottish Confession of 1560, and the Acts reënacted in 1567. Chapter second treats of the Westminster Confession of 1647, when it was adopted by the Church of Scotland, and of the Act of Parliament in 1690, settling the Presbyterian church government. Chapter third discusses the Treaty of Union between Scotland and England, and the controversy about patronage in 1843. Chapter fourth considers the present legal relation of the Established Church to its creed. Chapter fifth treats of the legal theory of non-established churches. Chapter sixth takes up questions of property of non-established churches in relation to creeds. Chapter seventh and last discusses the position assumed by non-established churches in Scotland in reference to their creeds.

Sir Henry Wellwood Moncreiff is an eminent minister of the Free Church. His book is founded on a series of articles in review of Mr. Innes' treatise which he contributed to the *Edinburgh Daily Review*. He expresses his high sense of the ability and value of the work, but makes objections to some of its positions and representations. His book is divided into nine chapters, and a long and full appendix. He first discusses the legal views held by the Church of Scotland previously to 1843, and then devotes two chapters to the Auchterarder case which came up at that time. After that, he takes up the existing legal relations of the Established Church to her creed. Next he discusses the foundation for the legal claims of unestablished

churches. The Cardross case comes up in Chapter sixth. The remaining chapters are devoted to the questions of the liberty of an unestablished church as to its creed; the right of such church to civil property; and the effect on property of the union of unestablished churches.

The reader will perceive that the main points under discussion relate to the property rights of churches changing their creeds, both as to churches connected with a civil government, and as to churches free and independent; but a vast amount of information is communicated upon various points relating to the whole question of Church and State.

The Bible Text Cyclopaedia: a complete classification of Scripture Texts in the form of an Alphabetical Index of Subjects. By Rev. JAMES INGLIS, Author of "The Sabbath-school." First American from seventh English edition. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co.; Edinburgh: Gall & Inglis, 6 George street. Pp. 524, 8vo.

This is not a common dictionary of the Bible, but a complete classification of texts, and a full index of subjects alphabetically arranged. Every student who values his moments knows the advantage of a full index to any work of reference. Mr. Inglis has prepared such a companion to the Bible, and we think he has done it well. He claims to have put into his index *every subject* which has place in the sacred volume, whether doctrinal, devotional, practical, ecclesiastical, historical, biographical, or secular, and the name of every person and place connected with any historical event; also, to have collected *every text of Scripture* belonging to each topic—which has employed his leisure hours for more than seven years. The book contains 524 large pages, in very small type, which is at the same time very clear and distinct, so that it presents an immense collection of texts. We had occasion to examine it soon after it came into our possession, on a particular subject, and received entire satisfaction. The subject was prayer. We wished to ascertain at a glance how much and what the Scriptures contain respecting prayer for temporal blessings. The first thing we saw was that eight full pages were taken up with the general

subject of Prayer, under the heads of Prayer Enjoined, Prayer Answered, Examples of Answer to Prayer, Prayer Denied, Prayer by Divine Aid, Prayer Intercessory Enjoined, Prayer Intercessory, examples of, Examples of Intercessory Prayers Answered, Prayer Intercessory Solicited, Prayer at Meals, Pleas Employed in Prayer. At different points we were bidden to refer to correlative topics. And there was a special notification that Prayer in connexion with the following objects, will be found under the heads: Affliction; God's Favor; Holy Spirit; Ministers; Pardon; Spiritual Blessings; Temporal Blessings; Temptation; Wisdom. Turning then to the particular topic of our search, we found a full half page of texts authorising and commanding prayer for temporal blessings; and also a variety of examples of prayer for temporal blessings on the part of Old Testament saints.

We are confident that we may safely recommend the book to all ministers and other students of the Scriptures.

Sorrow. By Rev. JOHN REID, Author of "Voices of the Soul Answered in God." New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 530 Broadway. 1870. Pp. 373, 12mo.

The wise man says: "Of making many books there is no end." If this were true in Solomon's day, much more true must it be now. The idea of a *book-maker* is that of one seeking out a theme, then raking up materials respecting it, and then putting these together, and the job is done. Now, considering the quantity of books which already exist, and the labor and toil which they impose on the reading world, and especially on reviewers and critics, ought it not to be counted a penitentiary offence for any person to perpetrate book-making? There ought to be no such thing allowed. Only when a man's bones are on fire with some subject to which he must give vent or be consumed—only when his mind and heart are full to overflowing of certain ideas long reflected on and demanding expression, should he be suffered to resort to types.

Now, here is a preacher who could find time to make a book. His theme is a tender one, but he coolly anatomizes it. He sits

down deliberately and indites twenty-two mortal chapters, telling us *all about sorrow*. One chapter treats of "The Causes of Sorrow;" another, "The Sorrow of Great Minds;" another, "The Loneliness of the Human Spirit as affecting its Sorrow;" another, "Sorrow as connected with the Love that subsists between the Sexes;" another, "The Sorrow of Children;" another, "The Sorrow of Different Races. There are some references in the volume to the Man of sorrows, and there is a brief and shallow chapter on sorrow for sin; and there are a number of good things and many pretty things and interesting stories scattered all through it. Moreover, the style is pleasing, clear, vigorous, and lively. The writer is evidently a man of reading, of cultivation, and of thought, and we should hope a Christian. We have not met with an unsound opinion in the volume, and we do not know that it would injure anybody who should read it. But it appears to us a preposterous thing for a minister to have time for such work as this. And it looks very cold and unfeeling to take the human bosom apart and put all its tenderest feelings and emotions on the shelves of a cabinet. The anatomists do that sort of work on dead bodies—this writer upon living hearts. He reminds us of a medical author taking up fever, or cholera, or hydrophobia, and describing the causes and the symptoms and the effects of such a complaint. But the parallel is not complete. Such a medical writer would, of course, give adequate consideration to the methods of cure. Mr. Reid is minute and full in his account of the causes and symptoms and operations of sorrow, but it is very little which he says of the remedy, and that little not very satisfactory.

We know nothing about Mr. Reid; but we believe him capable of producing a book much more worthy of a minister and of a man than this.

Macaulay remarks that Demosthenes is said to have transcribed six times the History of Thucydides; but adds that if he had been a young politician of the present age, he might, in the same space of time, have skimmed innumerable newspapers and pamphlets. He goes on to express some doubt whether the changes on which the admirers of modern institutions delight

to dwell, have improved our condition as much in reality as in appearance. Rumford proposed to feed the Elector of Bavaria's soldiers cheaply, and his plan was simply to compel a thorough mastication of their food. Macaulay says to digest a page gives the mind more nutriment than to devour a volume. The great critic also ridicules Johnson's contempt for the taste and knowledge of the Athenian people, because they had few books. "Books were indeed few, but they were excellent and they were accurately known. It is not by turning over libraries, but by repeatedly perusing and intently contemplating a few great models that the mind is best disciplined. A man of letters must now read much that he soon forgets, and much from which he learns nothing worthy to be remembered."

Now, would it not be a task thoroughly to masticate and perfectly to digest a page of such a book as the one before us? It would be the mastication and digestion of water-gruel! And the fact is, we are just flooded with this water-gruel. All that we can do with the greater portion of the hundreds of new books is just what Macaulay calls *skimming*; but alas! it is but a thin coating of cream generally which the *skimming* yields. The country is in the condition of our Southern farmers generally—it has too many cattle for its pastures. It has too much of this kind of book-making stock. It ought to kill off three-fourths of them, and then the rest would improve. But let it be observed that we do not apply a word of all this to our Southern country or people. The South is deficient in writers. She should take up the pen and assert herself with it. Our remark applies to the North, and especially to the Northeast.

For the country to be flooded with corrupt reading in yellow covers, is a dreadful evil; but we believe it is incomparably a more dreadful evil for the Church to be deluged with trashy books. Where will the Church be in a century if the present process goes on, and goes on, as it seems likely to go on, with accelerated speed? What will the effect be of a hundred years of *diluting* our faith? The Scriptures pushed out of the way, and all the great uninspired masters in Israel forsaken, and millions of pages that cannot be masticated, swallowed whole—or,

to change the figure, poured through the minds of our church-members like barrels of water through a sieve. What kind of a faith would be found remaining within these minds, if, after a century of this sort of deluging, it were to be taken out of the hands of these pious book-makers; and, being well dried and carefully rubbed to get into it a little warmth, it were then to be compared with the only standard? And where is the hope of the world, yellow-covered literature or no yellow-covered literature, if the faith of the Church is to be not only a candle put out, but drowned in this cold flood of many waters?

A Constitutional View of the Late War between the States; its Causes, Character, Conduct, and Results. Presented in a Series of Colloquies at Liberty Hall. By ALEXANDER H. STEPHENS. "Times change and men often change with them, but principles never." In Two Volumes, Vol. II. National Publishing Company, Philadelphia, Pa.; Cincinnati, Ohio; St. Louis, Mo.; Boston, Mass.; Atlanta, Georgia; Zeigler, McCurdy & Co., Chicago, Ill.; St. Louis, Mo. 827 pages, 8vo.

Reviewing the first volume of Mr. Stephens's great work, we said: "We do not know what may be the spirit of the second volume—yet to be published, perhaps yet to be written—or how far we may be able to approve Mr. Stephens's deliverances upon the facts of our late great struggle for liberty. His strictures upon the policy of the Administration may possibly displease many, who, like ourselves, are of opinion that, on the whole, Mr. Davis and his Cabinet showed wise and prudent statesmanship, which posterity will better appreciate than the present generation can. That noble army of devoted men, who won such glorious victories over hostile nature as well as over an enemy vastly superior numerically; that yet nobler army of devoted women, who at home endured worse than physical trials, he cannot fail to do justice to, so far as language of mortal man can portray a heroism the very doing of which exalts humanity beyond even the highest ideal the merely speculative mind of man can form. Whatever may be the merits or defects of the promised second volume, we cordially commend this first one. It deals only, as we have said, with the principles which impelled

the Southern States to their grand historic movement in vindication of the vital doctrine lying at the root of all federative union—that is, right of withdrawal so soon as the union becomes oppressive. It deals only with these matters, and it handles them well.”

The misgiving expressed was felt by many, as it was well known that Mr. Davis and Mr. Stephens differed widely in regard to the policy to be pursued in the conduct of the war. It was, therefore, with a feeling of positive relief from an annoying apprehension, as well as with a sense of increased admiration for the high and noble qualities of the author, that we read this dreaded second volume. Its masterly exposition of the principles for which we contended, could add but little to our estimate of his statesmanlike views and his profound insight into the philosophy of history. But the fair, temperate, and dignified statement which he makes of the differences in opinion between Mr. Davis and himself, compels us to confess—and we do it gladly—that we have heretofore misjudged the man and failed fully to apprehend the nobility of his character, mistaken as we still think his views to have been. It is due to him, in view of the large misconception which his course during the war suffered in the minds of our people, that no small part of this review should be devoted to an exhibition of his own representation of what his position was. We quote from scattered passages enough to clear up this point. Opening this subject on page 500, he says:

“In the first place, then, I must state most explicitly, that there never was any *feud*, properly speaking, between Mr. Davis and myself. We differed, it is true, very widely upon several matters of policy, as well as upon some principles of constitutional law. We had differed, as before stated, upon the policy of introducing the new feature into the Democratic platform in 1860, which caused a disruption of that party and led to the election of Mr. Lincoln. He was, as we have seen, the distinguished leader on that line of policy in the Senate. We differed also upon the policy of secession, when that course was adopted. After the rejection of the Crittenden proposition, he advised secession, as we have seen. I did not concur with him in the expediency of that course. But on these and other points

of difference, there was nothing like a feud between us; nor were our personal relations, or free interchange of views upon public questions, interrupted at all by them. On the same points I differed as widely with Mr. Toombs, and two-thirds perhaps of the Montgomery Congress. So likewise I differed with Mr. Davis, after the organisation of the new Confederacy, and the war was waged to overthrow it, upon several matters connected with the proper administration of our affairs. These related to the internal as well as the external policy of the Government—to wielding most efficiently our internal resources of men and money, as well as proper external agencies, for the success of the great cause involved in the conflict—the sovereignty of the several States—to which no one could be more devoted than I was. These differences, however, wide and thorough as they were, as we shall see, caused no personal breach between us. None of them, moreover, related to the general treatment of prisoners. On that point there was no disagreement between us.”

He then goes on to discuss the subject of the treatment of prisoners, to show that the responsibility of all their sufferings rested entirely upon the authorities at Washington, and to unfold the plan which he proposed in reference to those in our hands. This was to release upon parole all except a few thousand officers, under the conviction that such a course would have a powerful political effect in favor of our cause at the North. The Confederate authorities thought otherwise. But on this point Mr. Stephens had no direct conference with Mr. Davis.

“This,” he says, “brings up the consideration of some of the real differences, as I understood them, between myself and him, as well as others connected with the administration of our affairs, as to the true external policy, especially towards the Northern States, to be pursued by the Confederate States, from the time of their separation throughout the war.”

According to this statement, Mr. Stephens’s “leading object” was to secure the accession to the new Confederacy of not only the Border States, but ultimately of the great Northwestern States also, and even, if possible, in the end to prevail upon all the States of the old Union to come together once more—this time on clearly defined federal principles, which would exclude

every thought of consolidation. But these views were against the general sentiment of the South. The separation was held by our people to be complete and final. "In this doctrine so given forth, [by the press and by public speakers,] I understood Mr. Davis to concur." He goes on to say:

"This general policy, stated in the speech from which I have quoted [the "Corner-stone speech"], was what subjected me to the charge of "Unionism" by some of the presses in the South throughout the war, and by some of them the charge may have gone to the extent of impressing the public mind with the idea that I was opposed to the further prosecution of the war on our side. A greater mistake, however, was never made. The only difference between me and any other of the most ardent devotees in the cause, was as to the best objects to be aimed at in its prosecution, and the best means to be used for accomplishing whatever object should be resolved upon as the best, if nothing *else* but the averting of ultimate subjugation."

After this follows the history of the mission, in 1863, of Mr. Stephens to Washington, with the definite purpose of effecting an amelioration of the condition of prisoners, and with the hope of also doing something toward opening the way for future negotiations which might lead to peace. This measure had been suggested by Mr. Stephens; but before it could be carried out, such a change had taken place in the condition of affairs, that he felt quite hopeless of any good result. On reaching Richmond, he received information from Mr. Seddon which convinced him of this. The next paragraph (p. 564) presents his views as to the effect of our military movements at this time:

"I also had an interview with the President as soon as it could be obtained. We talked freely over the subject of my letter, as well as the then position of affairs in the military view. I explained to him more fully than I had done in the letter, the ulterior objects I had hopes of effecting when it was written, but stated that the change in the military aspect since the letter was written had entirely changed my views as to the propriety or policy of then undertaking anything on that line. The movement of our army into Pennsylvania would greatly excite the war spirit and strengthen the war party—effects directly opposite to those which I had hoped to produce while our armies were remaining quiet after their recent victories, and

with the then state of feeling at the North. I stated that it was a question of great doubt with me when my offer was made whether I would be received by Mr. Lincoln in the character of such commissioner as was proposed, but I now considered it almost certain that any application of the sort would be rejected under existing circumstances; and my judgment, in consequence of the changes referred to, was as decidedly against the policy of making the proposal *then*, as it was in favor of it *when* the letter was written."

The President and Cabinet, however, were more sanguine of a successful result for the mission, and Mr. Stephens was accordingly sent. But Mr. Lincoln refused to receive the special commissioner; and Mr. Stephens returned more strongly impressed than ever with the conviction that a strictly defensive war was our true policy.

"In this connection," he states in conclusion, "in speaking of these differences between Mr. Davis and myself on this branch of our external policy, I will add that they became so wide and decided in the following year, during the Presidential canvass at the North between Lincoln and McClellan, as to lead to a correspondence between us on the subject, which excited perhaps a little temporary feeling on both sides, but which in no way interfered with our personal relations, or with our full, free, cordial, and continued interchange of views upon all matters of public interest. There was, as I have said before, at no time, upon these or any other questions, a personal breach, or anything like a *feud* between us. So much, then, in answer to your inquiry touching our differences, so far as they related to matters of foreign policy."

He then explains the nature of their differences upon matters of internal policy and questions of constitutional law. Mr. Stephens thought the "produce-loan" scheme an inadequate method for utilising our staple productions as financial means; believed in supporting the armies by a tax in kind on bread-stuffs, and was strongly opposed to the stringent war measures of the Administration—"the impressment of provisions at arbitrary prices, the suspension of the writ of *habeas corpus*, and the raising of the necessary military forces by conscription."

But he denies in warm and emphatic terms that his dissatisfaction with the course of the Confederate Government in these matters in any way influenced his zeal for the cause. (P. 574.)

“These differences, wide as they were, in no degree caused me to withhold my cordial support and coöperation wherever I saw the possibility of effecting any good on that line of policy which the Administration thought proper to adopt, even though it was against my own judgment. I neither headed nor countenanced anything like factious opposition to the execution of those measures which I thought would be attended with the worst consequences. This would have produced dissensions and divisions, which in my judgment could lead to nothing but the most disastrous results. My views upon them were given to Mr. Davis, the members of the Cabinet, and members of Congress, in the most earnest and friendly manner. When they were so given, without avail, I remained silent before the country, except in a few instances in which self-vindication became a public duty.”

So much for the relations between Mr. Davis and Mr. Stephens. The general spirit of the latter may be best seen perhaps in the passage in which he describes the conduct of the President immediately after the failure of the Hampton Roads Conference:

“By the course he proposed, I understood him to hold the opinion that Richmond could *still* be defended, notwithstanding Sherman had already made considerable progress on his march from Savannah; and that our cause could *still* be successfully maintained, without any change in the internal policy upon the subjects referred to before. His general views and purposes at the time were set forth with that firmness and decision so characteristic of him, in the message he sent to Congress on the report of the commissioners, and in a speech he made at the African church, (a noted place for public speaking in the city of Richmond,) on the night of the second day after our return. The newspaper sketches of that speech were meagre, as well as inaccurate, in several particulars, and, upon the whole, came far short of so presenting its substance even, as to give those who did not hear it anything like an adequate conception of its full force and power. It was not only bold, undaunted, and confident in its tone, but had that loftiness of sentiment and rare form of expression, as well as magnetic influence in its delivery,

by which the passions of the masses of the people are moved to their profoundest depths, and roused to the highest pitch of excitement. Many who had heard this master of oratory in his most brilliant displays in the Senate and on the hustings, said they never before saw Mr. Davis so really majestic! The occasion and the effects of the speech, as well as all the circumstances under which it was made, caused the minds of not a few to revert to like appeals by Rienzi and Demosthenes. While it was well calculated to awaken associations and suggest comparisons of that sort, it nevertheless, by the character of its policy, equally reminded me of the famous charge of the '*Six Hundred*' at Balaklava, of which some one—I forget who—in witnessing it, said, in substance: 'It is brilliant; it is grand—but it is not war!' However much I admired the heroism of the sentiments expressed, yet in his general views of policy to be pursued in the then situation, I could not concur."

His discussion of the situation is summed up with the following tribute to those leaders whose counsels he disapproved:

"I doubt not that all—the President, the Cabinet, and Congress—did the very best they could, from their own convictions of what was best to be done at the time."

This is manly and generous language from one who so thoroughly disliked the policy pursued, so strongly felt the truth of his own convictions, and suffered so much contumely and misrepresentation in the columns of our newspapers throughout the struggle.

The discussion of the principles involved in the contest is such, in comprehensive reach of thought, clear analysis, dispassionate search for naked truth, and large and sound use of historical illustration, as to ensure the book a high place among the great political works of all the races capable of constitutional government. All that we said of the merits of the first volume in this regard will justly apply with perhaps still greater force to the volume under review. It contains, besides, vivid and generous pen-and-ink sketches of the prominent actors in the late war, the most striking of which is the surprising picture given of the genius and bearing of General Grant, whose powers Mr. Stephens certainly estimates far more highly than our people have been disposed to estimate them.

We cannot do better in closing this sketch than quote one of the paragraphs in which Mr. Stephens treats of our present situation and the political suicide it behoves us to avoid:

“We, it is true, cannot resist, or offer any violent opposition. We can only bear with patience and fortitude, as best we may, what is imposed upon us; but in the name of all that is sacred, do not let us attempt to *govern ourselves*—not as *we see fit*, but as our *conquerors see fit*! That would be but *their* government at last, without any of its responsibility. By every consideration, then, we should not, by giving these measures a formal approval, put ourselves in the position of being told, when the disastrous consequences follow, which will inevitably ensue, that it was *we* ourselves, and not *they*, who brought such ruin upon the country!”

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXI.—NO. 4.

OCTOBER, MDCCLXX.

ARTICLE I.

THE PROVIDENCE OF GOD AS RELATED TO THE WORK OF REDEMPTION.

There are two great chains connecting man in his destiny with eternity and with God. One is the chain of God's providence; the other is the chain of Christ's redemption. It might at first appear difficult to decide which of these, considered in itself and apart from its relations to the other, affords matter of more profound and interesting inquiry.

How wonderful, for instance, is the chain of divine providence, as, taking its origin in the depth of the eternal purposes of God, and interweaving itself with all the details of human history, it forges its successive links in the midst of the rise and fall of empires, the growth and decay of civilisations, and the revolutions and dismemberments of states, presenting to us the finger of God in every event of history, from the falling of a sparrow to the overthrow of a kingdom or the extinction of a world.

How wonderful, on the other hand, is the chain of redemption, which takes its rise in the depth of the same unfathomable eternity, which we may trace backward link by link to the same deep counsels of the same unchanging Jehovah; and

VOL. XXI., NO. 4.—1.

which, as we follow it onward through all coming time, unfolds itself link by link in the calling of those who have been predestinated, in the justification of those who have been called, and in the glorification of those who have been justified; whose last link shall then be formed, when "the ransomed of the Lord shall return, and come to Zion with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads;" when "they shall obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away."

But while either one of these departments of truth opens to us a field of thought unlimited in its extent, and transcendent in its range, it must be admitted that the profoundest subject of inquiry open to man—that which in his present state involves for him most of mystery; that which, as it shall be unfolded to him in a future state, shall constitute the theme of enraptured and unwearied contemplation—is the connexion between these two great departments of truth: the truth of providence and the truth of redemption; the interlinking of these two chains in the purposes of God, by which all the movements of his providence are related to his purpose of redemption; by which all the events of time stand connected with his methods of grace, and all human history becomes more or less directly the history of salvation through the cross of Christ.

This is the great theme which engages the attention of the Apostle Paul in the eleventh chapter of his Epistle to the Romans. Having in the preceding chapters sufficiently unfolded the divine method of redemption through faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, and having sufficiently vindicated this method from all the attacks and aspersions of its enemies, he proceeds in the eleventh chapter to consider the relations of God's providence to this one and only method of salvation. He views the human family as divided by the line of God's covenants into two great classes—the Jew, embracing those originally taken into covenant relation with God; and the Gentile, embracing those originally excluded from this visible covenant relation. He traces the history of God's providence in reference to these two classes through the ages that are past, showing that in it all there was distinct reference to the personal coming of Christ

and the preparation of the world for his coming. Then, taking a still broader range of argument, and sweeping downward along the course of the ages yet to come, he shows that all the dispensations of providence toward the Jew and toward the Gentile, even to the end of time, shall have reference to the great work of salvation through Jesus Christ; for, reasons the apostle, if, as we know, the gross darkness which for ages rested over the heathen world, was a judicial darkness, God having by the methods of his providence "given them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient" until such time as the purposes of his covenant with Israel should be accomplished, so also the blindness which is now happened unto Israel is a judicial blindness—God having by the methods of his providence given them over to blindness of mind and hardness of heart until such time as his purposes with the Gentile world shall be accomplished. As the exclusion of the Gentile under the former dispensation was temporary and not final, so the exclusion of the Jew under this dispensation is temporary and not final. As there was a purpose of mercy in the former exclusion, so there is a purpose of mercy in the latter. As when the purpose of mercy in the first instance was accomplished by the coming of the "fulness of the times," the middle wall of partition was broken down and the Gentiles became fellow-heirs of the promise; so when the purpose of mercy in the second instance shall have been accomplished by the fulness of the Gentiles coming in, then the veil shall be taken away from Israel's eyes, and so all Israel shall be saved. There shall then be one fold and one Shepherd, and the ultimate design of all God's providence shall have been realised in the gathering together in one of all things in Christ.

To this view of the providence of God, as related to his purpose of redemption, we ask attention, as involving matters of exceeding interest to all who love the Redeemer's kingdom and pray for the speedy conversion of the world to Christ. Let us take the teachings of the inspired apostle as our guide, and let us step reverently and with caution, not seeking to be wise "above that which is written," but within due limits to trace

out for our edification and comfort the precious lessons of the providence of God.

I. The first thought which claims our attention is the relation of providence to the work of redemption during the ages which preceded the personal coming of Christ. What this relation was the apostle very distinctly tells us, when, in the thirty-second, thirty-third, and thirty-fourth verses of the chapter to which we have already alluded, he says, addressing the Gentiles and speaking to them of the Jews: "For as ye in times past have not believed God, yet have now obtained mercy through their unbelief; even so have these also now not believed, that through your mercy they also may obtain mercy. For God hath concluded them all in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all."

The word "concluded," or, as it is rendered in the margin of our English version, "shut up together," is expressive of the result of a demonstration fully and fairly made, or the solution of a problem, wrought out so as to place it beyond the possibility of peradventure or doubt, and to seal in silence the lips of all who would deny it. In the case before us, the word *concluded* is expressive of the result of a broad induction, wherein by numerous and varied experiments, all tending to the same result, though instituted under widely different circumstances, a certain great fact has been established in the history of the world, as clearly and as fully as its truth has been recorded upon the pages of Revelation.

The fact to be established was the unbelief of the natural heart—*unbelief*, as the exponent of a depraved and sinful nature, being employed to express that deep depravity and sinfulness of which it is at once the fruitful germ and the matured and ripened fruit. The design of God's providential dealings with his own people and with the heathen had been to establish this great fact, that man is totally and helplessly depraved, having in him no latent germ of spiritual life—no element of holiness that might be developed into the true worship and service of God. To establish this fact, God was pleased to institute, so to speak, in Judaism on the one hand, and in heathenism on the

other, two great experiments, or rather two great series of experiments upon human nature, to see whether or not there was in it any power of self-redemption.

Let us look at these two experiments separately; and first let us study that which is connected with the history of paganism. The object of this first experiment was to demonstrate the truth that man, under the light of nature and under the guidance of reason and conscience, can never attain of himself to any true knowledge of God, to any real communion with him, or to any satisfying hope of eternal life; that so deep are the stains of depravity, and so total is the alienation of the soul from God, there can never be, even under the most favorable circumstances, the unfolding of any true spiritual life, or the attainment of a religion suited to man's necessities and wants.

This experiment, which had been in progress for four thousand years when our Saviour appeared upon the earth, was both fairly and fully tried. Man, in the full possession of all his faculties and powers, was placed in the midst of a *cosmos*, reflecting from every part of it the infinite glory of God. In the heavens above him and in the world about him, in air and earth, in sea and sky, in all things material and spiritual, intelligent and unintelligent, he beheld shadowed forth the wondrous perfections of the Maker and Preserver of all. In addition to this light from without, there were vestal lamps kindled from the altar of God, and burning within the soul with unquenchable light. There were innate principles, primary laws of belief, which in their very nature tended to point man to God. There was moreover a conscience, God's own vicegerent in the soul, bearing testimony to the existence of law and a lawgiver, and to the reality of a future state of reward and retribution. Thus, with "the heavens declaring the glory of God, and the firmament showing his handiwork," with "the invisible things of him from the creation of the world clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead," with "the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another," the heathen nations entered upon

their probation of forty centuries. Not an element that could promise success was wanting. As we look along the pathway of history, we behold nation after nation raised up by the providence of God. We see empire succeeding upon empire—the Egyptian, the Assyrian, the Babylonian, the Medo-Persian, the Alexandrian, and the Roman—empires that rose, and flourished, and fell, each having its own peculiar type of civilisation, its own peculiar features of social and ethical development, and its own peculiar system of theology and worship. We see how God, in his providence, lavished upon each one of these nations all that might have seemed necessary to the complete development of its religious life. The prestige of national greatness and renown, the patronage of nobility and rank, the homage of genius and philosophy, the servitude of literature and science, the refinement of art, all were made tributary to the work of religion. Architecture yielded its grandest conceptions for the stately and majestic temples of worship. Sculpture and painting, eloquence and poetry, music and minstrelsy, all combined to present a ritual of worship, that vainly sought to charm the mind away from the love of sin, and lift it upward through the sphere of the beautiful and the sublime to communion with holiness and with God.

Surely if it were possible for man, under the light of nature and under the guidance of reason and conscience, to attain to a true knowledge, a spiritual worship, and a holy love of God, we shall find all these among the religions of the cultivated nations of heathendom. Alas, no! The failure of the experiment is written upon the very history of it. As system after system of religion was tried, it was found utterly defective. "The blossoms of the pagan worship, after exhibiting an unnatural and premature expansion in the conservatory of the religion of nature, were found to be sterile, and fell to the ground from the unproductive tree. Although heathenism had attained to the highest eminence with respect to the culture of the intellect, it could not resist the conviction of its own emptiness, and of its entire inability to satisfy the wants of man's moral nature."*

*Kurtz's Sac. Hist., §120.

To the masters of sculpture and painting, to the votaries of music and poesy, the religions of the heathen world gave themes full of beauty and sublimity; but to the heart asking deliverance from its burden of guilt, to the soul struggling in the conflict with its own lusts and passions, these religions could offer no solid ground of comfort, and gave no real sense of relief. They were utterly powerless in checking the evil propensities of the human heart. They were utterly unable to lift off the burden of human guilt.

To know what was the real issue of the experiment as to man's capacity of self-redemption, we have only to take our stand in the midst of that era in the history of Greece, marked by its greatest enlightenment, its highest civilisation, its most cultivated literature and art, and be the mute witnesses of a scene that is transpiring there. It is at Athens, amidst all the grandeur of her temples erected for religious worship, and all the light reflected from her schools of philosophy and learning. It is a day of public solemnities in honor of the national divinities. Alcibiades, on his way to the temple, meets Socrates, the pure and exalted philosopher, whom all ages and nations have delighted to honor as the very impersonation of all that was purest and best in paganism. Alcibiades expresses his surprise that Socrates does not go to join in the public ceremonies of worship, and the following conversation, touching beyond all expression, takes place:

“To me,” says Socrates, in substance, “it seems best neither to worship nor to reason against those who worship, but to be quiet, seeing we know not enough of the nature and will of the Supreme Being to know how to worship aright. It is the part of true wisdom, therefore, to wait until it is revealed to us how we ought to behave towards God and towards men.” “And when, O Socrates,” says Alcibiades, “shall that time be, and who is he that will instruct me, for gladly would I see this man who he is?” “He is one,” replies Socrates, “who cares for you; but as Homer represents Minerva taking away the darkness from the eyes of Diomedes, that he might distinguish a god from a man, so it is necessary that he should first take

away the darkness from your mind, and then bring near those things by which you shall know good and evil." "Let him take away," is the plaintive response of Alcibiades, "the darkness or any other thing that he will, for I am prepared to decline none of those things which are commanded by this man, whosoever he is, if only thereby I shall be made better."

What is this but the confession, wrung from humanity in the very hour of its highest self-development, that it cannot attain to the true knowledge and worship of God? What is it but the testimony of human experience confirming the testimony of God's word, that "in the wisdom of God, the world by wisdom knows not God?" What is it but the demonstration, upon a grand and imposing scale, of the native depravity and hopeless ruin of human nature? What is it but the providence of God concluding man in unbelief, writing over against him the record: "There is none that understandeth; there is none that seeketh after God; they are all gone out of the way; they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good; no, not one."

Here it would seem that the demonstration of man's unbelief might be regarded as complete, and that nothing more would be necessary that "every mouth might be stopped and all the world become guilty before God." But he who knows the end from the beginning foresaw that it might be pleaded on behalf of human nature that it had failed simply for want of sufficient light; that the error was not so much in man's heart as in his head; that if there had only been a revelation of God sufficiently clear and explicit, and accompanied with sufficient evidence to authenticate it as divine, man would not have failed. Human reason might still proudly affirm its sufficiency under a clearer light to attain the highest end of man's being in communion with God. A second demonstration is therefore necessary; and to effect it, we have, under the providence of God, in Judaism a second experiment, or rather, as before, a second series of experiments, the object of which was to determine the question "whether or not righteousness could come by the law"—that is, whether or not a revelation from God, however clear and explicit it might be, and with whatever sanctions it might

be accompanied, however much of light it might irradiate upon the understanding, and with whatever authority it might impinge upon the conscience—whether such a revelation would be sufficient to meet man's wants, and whether by the light which it afforded man would naturally make his way upward to spiritual fellowship and holy communion with God. This is the aspect of Judaism to which the distinguished writer already quoted alludes as "the negative mode by which it prepared the way for Christianity" as the religion of the world—the positive mode consisting in the preservation in its integrity and purity of the great doctrines concerning God and redemption.

Let us, then, occupy ourselves for a little while with the history of this second experiment, wherein man is to be placed under the full sunlight of divine revelation in circumstances the most favorable for the cultivation of holiness, that it may appear that his departure from God is the result of an evil heart of unbelief, and not of the outward circumstances by which he is surrounded.

Of this experiment, as of the other, we must concede that it was both fairly and fully tried. A nation was chosen and separated from all the other nations of the earth, that it might be the depository of the divine revelation. The nation selected was one which, in its ancestral lineage and previous history, gave highest promise of success. It was brought forth from the bondage of Egypt; and, in the midst of a series of splendid miracles and tokens of the divine presence, was led across the desert to the wilderness of Sinai, where it received, both by audible voice from heaven and by written statute, the revealed will of God unto salvation. Thence the nation was conducted in the same supernatural and miraculous manner to the land which had been specially chosen as its inheritance, where, segregated not more by natural barriers of mountain and sea than by strict rules of ceremonial observance, intended to cut off intercourse with neighboring peoples, it stood for centuries, shut out from the degrading superstitions and abominable rites of the heathen world. Thus distinctly separated from other nations, it was taken into special covenant relations with Jehovah.

He himself condescended to be its ruler. It was a theocracy, whose civil and religious institutions were all moulded by the divine hand. The law of God was written on tables of stone, and laid up in the chief city of the nation for perpetual preservation. An inspired history of the creation of the world by the power of God, and of all his wonderful works in the past, even down to the time of the settlement of the people in the land of Canaan, was also given and placed on record. The tabernacle and the temple, both framed according to the pattern shown in the mount, both provided with ordinances of divine appointment and a priesthood of divine ordination, were erected in the midst of the people to perpetuate the knowledge and worship of the true and living God. A line of inspired prophets, commissioned to teach to each successive generation the great principles and truths of religion; miracles repeated through each successive age; divine interpositions manifesting beyond all doubt and cavil the supernatural presence and power of God: all these and a hundred other sources of light beamed upon this chosen nation as century after century passed away. Surely in the midst of this flood of holy light, with tabernacle and temple, with priesthood and prophecy, with law and testimony, with oracle and Shekinah, with new moons and Sabbaths, with sacrifices and ablutions, all divinely appointed, and all pointing to the true God and eternal life, this experiment must succeed! A holy love of God and a holy delight in his salvation must fill the heart of this chosen and honored people!

Shall we go backward and trace the history of its failure in the very history of the experiment itself? The Red Sea is scarcely crossed, and the wail of Egypt's drowning host has scarcely died upon the air, ere the murmuring Israelites, in impious rebellion, are clamoring for a return to the bondage of Egypt. The brow of Sinai is still wrapt in clouds, amidst which, in voice of thunder and in lightning flash, Jehovah is signalling his fearful presence, while this chosen people at the base of the mountain are worshipping a golden calf. The people are not yet fairly settled in the land of Canaan, until they have contracted idolatrous alliances with the heathen nations

around them, and have erected altars of worship to the most licentious and bestial of all the divinities of paganism. As generation follows generation, there is perpetually manifested an aversion to the worship of the true God, and an adulterous lusting of the soul after the degrading and abominable systems of heathen worship that nothing can repress. The magnanimous appeals of Joshua; the earnest expostulations of Samuel; the stern denunciations of Elijah; the plaintive entreaties of Jeremiah; the fires of persecution; the sword of devastation; the chains of captivity; the dreariness of exile—none of these, nor all of them combined, could break the heart of this stiff-necked and rebellious people, and bring them to acknowledge their dependence upon God, and forsake the abominations of the heathen. A few of every generation were found among the number that bowed not the knee to Baal, but the great majority were hopelessly enslaved in idolatry and sin. Nor was the only sin of this people that of rejecting the light which shone upon them from heaven. Over the head of guilty Jerusalem hung the still more fearful charge of stoning her prophets and killing them that were sent unto her, so that her streets ran crimson with the blood of martyr prophets, “from the blood of Abel to that of Zacharias, who perished between the porch and the altar.”

But of man's utter apostasy from God, even under the light of revelation, as exhibited in the history of the Jewish nation, the darkest and most amazing proof remains yet to be adduced. The Lord of glory was once in human form upon the earth. He made his appearance not in the midst of a heathen people, but in the midst of this very nation upon which the light of revelation had for so many ages been shining. He came as the long promised Messiah of Israel, the Immanuel, the God with us, of whom prophets had delighted to sing. The time, the place, the manner and circumstances of his birth, had all been distinctly foretold. He had been typified in altar and tabernacle, in priesthood and sacrifice. His birth had been heralded by John the Baptist, his great forerunner. His birth was divinely announced through the ministry of angels, who sang

their anthems above his cradle; through the ministry of heathen Magi, who saw his star in the east and came to worship him; and through inspired prophets in the temple, who blessed God that their eyes had seen the salvation of the Lord. He came, and for three years as he walked in peerless excellence through the midst of this people, everything conspired to attest his divinity. All nature did him reverence as its Lord. At his word the dead were raised to life; the sick were restored to health; devils were cast out; the waves of the tempest were stilled; the eyes of the blind were opened; the ears of the deaf were unstopped; and the lame man was made to leap as an hart. All power in heaven and upon earth was manifestly his; and yet this glorious Son of God, the brightness of his Father's glory and the express image of his person, whose divinity was proven by his birth and by his life, by his works and by his words, in the very midst of his sublime teachings, and his ministry of grace and love, was arraigned as a malefactor, ignominiously condemned, and inhumanly executed between two thieves upon the cross! O humanity, where is now thy boasted power of self-redemption? O morality, where is now the "righteousness which is of the law?" Only once was the Son of God upon this earth, and then he was murdered by men under the full light of divine revelation, and in the boasted possession of the purest morality upon earth. "I bless God," as another has truly said, "that this fearful experiment is never to be tried again—this fearful drama never again to be reënacted; for the same principles are still at work in the human heart. Man is as depraved to-day as when the Saviour appeared; and those who now trample in unbelief upon the blood wherewith we are sanctified, would not only reject the Son of God, but would crucify him afresh and put him to an open shame."

One great truth the providence of God has written upon the page of human history: man is totally depraved, helplessly, hopelessly enslaved in sin. Heathenism has failed—Judaism has failed. In yon human victim bleeding upon the altar of paganism, and in yon divine victim bleeding upon the cross of Calvary, we read the same lesson. God hath concluded us all

in unbelief. Let every mouth be stopped, and all the world become guilty before God.

II. Having thus seen the nature of this providential conclusion in unbelief, we next come to its design. This is sententiously expressed by the apostle when he says God has thus concluded all in unbelief, that he "might have mercy upon all," and still more fully when he says, "For as ye (the Gentiles) in times past have not believed God, yet have now obtained mercy through their unbelief, even so have these (the Jews) also now not believed, that through your mercy they also may obtain mercy." God's great design both in Judaism and heathenism was to prepare the way for the gospel of Christ. Depravity is the fundamental postulate of redemption. If the world is not depraved, it has no need of a Saviour. If it is not totally depraved, it has no need of a salvation such as that which Christ brings. He comes not to educate, but to regenerate; not to develop a germ of holiness, but to implant one; not simply to repair a disordered nature, but to restore a ruined one; not simply to heal a diseased world, but to recall to life by his almighty power a world that is dead in trespasses and in sins. The work, therefore, which he proposes to do for man is not a partial work, but a complete one. The righteousness which he offers is not supplementary, but substitutionary. The salvation which he brings is not partly of grace and partly of works; it is all of grace—free, sovereign, and unmerited grace. The exclusive source of this salvation is the fountain of his infinite and unspeakable love. The exclusive ground of it is his own blood-bought and imputed righteousness. The exclusive power in it is his own divine and eternal spirit; and the exclusive revenue from it is his own personal and perpetual glory.

But there is nothing that a man will with so much reluctance receive from another as that which constitutes the ground of his merit before God. When the question springs, "Wherewith shall I come before the Lord and bow myself before the High God?" man instinctively seeks for something of his own. As Cain sought to worship God with the fruits of his own cultivation, as Nadab and Abihu sought to minister before his altars with

fire of their own kindling, so man naturally seeks to propitiate the Most High with gifts of his own; nor will he ever accept at the hands of another that deliverance which he feels to be in any manner or to any extent attainable through his own exertions.

Hence, when the cross of Christ was to be erected, and salvation was to be proclaimed freely as his gift, it was necessary that man's hopeless condition should first be discovered; that every remedy which man could devise should first be applied; that the whole question of man's capacity for self-amelioration should first be definitely and fully settled, that there might be hope in no other than the great Deliverer of Souls. These failures, therefore, in Judaism and heathenism, which betrayed so sadly the vanity of all man's hopes and the emptiness of all his professions, were part of the great providential dispensation which prepared the "fulness of the times" in which the Son of God was to appear. During all these ages God had been digging deep through the shifting sands of human life, that he might reach a solid foundation upon which to erect the cross of Calvary. Archbishop Trench, in some one of his numerous works, calls attention to the significance of the fact that the inscription upon the cross was written in Hebrew and Greek and Latin, and says that while no doubt the immediate design of the threefold inscription was that the writing might appear in the three languages spoken at Jerusalem, there was another and more far-reaching design, inasmuch as these three languages were the representatives of the three great elements of power with which Christianity was to come in conflict, and over which it should ultimately and gloriously triumph. The Greek language—the language of literature and science, of philosophy and learning—stood forth as the representative of the wisdom of this world, in the view of which salvation through the cross was foolishness. The Latin language, the official language of Rome, stood forth as the representative of that thirst for national greatness and military renown, which beheld in the peace-loving spirit of Christianity only inchoate weakness, effeminacy, and inaction. The Hebrew tongue, the language of the Jewish

people, stood forth as the representative of that "righteousness which is of the law," in the view of which the cross of Christ was a stumbling-block. The inscription in these tongues was the prophetic announcement of the triumph of the cross over all these elements of opposition.

Already the triumph signified by the first two has been realised. The Greek, from the height of his intellectual ambition, after a vain and fruitless effort to attain the wisdom that profiteth, has returned to bow in humility beneath the cross and read in the inscription upon it, "Christ the wisdom of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." The Roman, after carrying the eagles of his country into every land, and learning the vanity of human ambition, has returned with his blunted spear and battered shield, and laying down his plumed helmet at the foot of the cross, has read, "Christ the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." The Jew still wanders on in blindness of mind and hardness of heart. Going about to establish his own righteousness, he will not submit himself to the righteousness of God. The veil is upon his eyes when Moses is read. Given over for a time to blindness of mind and hardness of heart, his feet stained with the blood of his Messiah, and his heart abandoned of the Spirit of God, he wanders through the world without a temple, without a nationality, and without a home, a stranger among strangers, his hand against every man and every man's hand against him. But this wandering is only for a time. God hath not cast off his people whom he foreknew. The day is coming when the eyes of Israel shall be enlightened, when the veil shall be taken away; when the mercy of God that ever follows the Jew shall overtake him and bring him back; when he shall come to the foot of the cross to look upon him whom he has pierced, and mourn, and in that cross shall read, "Christ the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth."

Thus Greek and Roman and Jew shall meet at the foot of the cross, each to find his wants completely met in him who is "the Saviour of all men;" and when this blissful consummation shall have taken place, then shall the great purpose which linked

providence and grace together have been accomplished, as God shall have "concluded all in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all."

It thus appears that the cross of Christ is the central figure in the providence of God as well as in redemption. Indeed, it is the great central point of all history. All that went before was a preparation for it. All that comes after derives its significance from it. Around it revolve all the destinies of nations, as well as all the doctrines of grace. All that is bright in the world's history is a reflection from it. All that is mysterious in God's providence finds explanation in it. That mercy of which it is the revelation and the seal is the keynote of all God's dealings with men. It was mercy that in the hour of man's first apostasy stayed the sword of avenging justice, and held the iron gate of death until with a beam from the cross she had illumined the darkness that lay beyond. It was mercy that kept her perpetual watch by the altars of paganism while the fearful experiment of heathenism was being tried. It is mercy that to-day follows the Jew as he tracks his footsteps with the blood of God's broken covenants. It is mercy that shall yet gather together all in one, that there may be one fold and one shepherd; and thus mercy, free, sovereign, and unchanging mercy, shall be written upon every dispensation of the divine economy, upon every page of human history, and upon all the dealings of God with man.

III. It remains that we shall indicate a few practical inferences from a theme of so much importance. 1. The providence of God never moves backward—never returns upon itself. It may sometimes seem to us to do so. Seeing, as we do, but a small part of the scope and range of God's purposes, and unable to comprehend fully even that which we see, it may often appear to us as if great providential movements, looking toward the rapid extension of the Redeemer's kingdom and the speedy conversion of the world to Christ, have been suddenly reversed, as if the great wave of providence had rolled back upon itself. Our own plans are all thwarted; our own hopes baffled; our own expectations disappointed. But let us remember that the

disappointment is with us, not with God. It is only our interpretation of the movement that has failed, not the movement itself. Our short-sighted views have changed like the shifting winds, but with him is "no variableness neither shadow of turning." The mariner coursing through northern seas sometimes meets with vast icebergs, which have been loosed from their moorings in the polar regions, and are being floated by ocean currents downward toward the southern sea. To the unpractised seaman, borne himself upon the wave, subject to all the changes of wind and tide, it might seem as if the motion of this immense mountain of ice were anything but uniform. As the waves ran strongly in one direction, it would appear as though the iceberg were rapidly moving in the other. As the wind changed, the motion of the iceberg would seem to change, and it might appear to be as fickle in its motions as the winds and the waves about it. But such deviations are apparent, not real. The iceberg, with its huge base lying thousands of feet beneath the surface of the sea, borne steadily onward by the deep undercurrent that imparts its motion, feels not the light impression of the shifting wind or the surface wave, but moves onward with resistless course to the accomplishment of the great destiny which God has marked out for it. So is it with the providence of God. Man's purposes change; God's are unchangeable. Man's meet with disappointment; with God there is no oversight, no failure, no reverse. In all the ages and in all the world, his counsels have stood fast, and his purposes of grace have been fulfilled.

2. Let us learn to wait. If four thousand years of discipline were necessary to prepare the world for the personal coming of Christ, let us not expect the conquest of the world in a day. If we are disposed to wonder that after eighteen centuries, so much of the world remains yet to be redeemed, let us remember that with God a thousand years are as one day, and one day as a thousand years. If the great empires of China and Japan have been so long closed against the missionaries of the cross, it is because for them some great providential problem has remained as yet unsolved. "The fulness of the times" for them

has as yet, in a certain sense, not come. If the dealings of God with our own stricken and peeled Church seem utterly mysterious and unfathomable, let us remember that it is in his wisdom and love that these calamities have come upon us which have robbed us of the wealth which we had hoped to use for the honor of his great name and the extension of his kingdom in the world. "Be patient, therefore, unto the coming of the Lord."

3. The great duty of the Church is to follow in the wake of the providence of God. Hers is to be the attitude of the children of Israel in the wilderness. Whenssoever the pillar of cloud lifts itself above the tabernacle, she is to gird her loins for the march, and whithersoever the divine signal leads the way, she is to follow; whenssoever and wheresoever there is opened unto her a great and effectual door, she is to move forward with her missionary enterprises and possess the land.

In whatever direction we turn our thoughts to-day, we behold the pillar of cloud moving. China and Japan, and the great heathen world which they contain, are being opened to receive the gospel. Spain has just thrown off the shackles of a spiritual despotism more degrading than the political despotism of Japan, and now the people are crying out for the word of eternal truth. Among the Jews there is a great feverish movement toward the recognition of Christ as in some sense a prophet of Israel—a rationalistic movement it is true, and yet one which is breaking down the great barriers of prejudice against Jesus of Nazareth, and teaching lips to speak his name with reverence which once uttered it only in blasphemous derision and scorn. Rome, in its Œcumenical Council, has been, under the providence of God, permitted to bring to open consummation the folly which has been secretly developing for centuries. With a blindness that is fatal, she has placed herself before the civilised world in an attitude in which she must either go forward and proclaim, in the face of civilisation and history, the absurd and preposterous dogma of infallibility, or ignominiously recede from claims which, though she has asserted privately, she has not the courage and manliness publicly to defend. To assert the dogma is to render herself ridiculous in the eyes of her most

intelligent and influential adherents; to discard it from the Syllabus is to withdraw with her own hand that which has been her principal prop with the vulgar and uninformed. Let her hug either horn of the dilemma, and the result must be to the weakening of her authority, and to the furtherance of the gospel of Christ.

Under these circumstances, how urgent is the call upon the Church of our Lord Jesus Christ to arise and gird herself afresh for the issues that are freshly springing upon her. The harvest-field was never so wide before. The grain was never more white for the sickle. Will the Church enter in and reap? This is the question of questions to-day.

ARTICLE II.

GIVING, AN ESSENTIAL PART OF TRUE PIETY.

Contributions to the cause of God is a subject on which the views and more especially the practice of the Church are still far below the truth. It is no new theme. It has been a matter of revelation and instruction, plain, full, and explicit, for many ages. Latterly it has been largely and ably discussed in our land. This discussion has done good. It has placed this claim on its true grounds; vindicated it from many wrong notions long and widely cherished; and assigned it its rightful position in religion. We think the conscience of the Church has been enlightened and quickened. A real advance has been made—measured not indeed by the greatly increased amount given, but by the improved tone pervading the appeals from our ministers and church courts, and by the spirit with which many of our people respond. Many, however, seem to be still in the dark, or at least unmoved by this increased light, and we all need to have our convictions strengthened. The practical side of this subject impinges upon a hard mass of covetousness which is al-

most impenetrable. "A continual dropping" seems necessary to wear away this rock, whose *strata* underlie even the Church of God, and crop out here and there in every section of its extended territory. It is the hope of aiding somewhat this slow but wholesome process that induces us to offer the following thoughts, not as original, but as partially reproducing what inspiration has taught on this subject and what Christian learning has explained. Real progress on this, as on every other topic of revealed truth and duty, consists not in going forward to novelties, but in going back to the "old paths"—in learning truly and correctly what God's ancient "law and testimony" teach.

With the Bible before us, it seems remarkable how the duty of giving has come to occupy in the minds of the Church a secondary, almost a secular position. The grand service which modern inquiry and discussion have rendered, and it cannot well be overestimated, consists in showing that giving to God's cause is not a mere incidental but an essential part of true religion—not the mere scaffolding, but a constituent part of the building; and that, while it has a secular aspect, and is often a mere act of the flesh, yet in its required motive and spirit it is an important element in the most spiritual piety. Paul repeatedly calls it *a grace*—by which he evidently places it side by side with faith, repentance, and love to God. Equally with these it is a divine gift—the fruit of a supernatural operation. The disposition and ability to perform this act aright is never natural nor acquired from any human source. It is a result of divine grace in the soul. Probably there does not exist a more conclusive proof of the reality and power of such a spiritual operation in the soul of man by which the strongest tendencies of the natural mind are reversed. Human nature, in some instances, does exhibit noble impulses and generous emotions; but Christian giving, in the religiousness of its motives, is as far above human nature as is the exercise of living, purifying, and saving faith. It is such giving alone that God requires or will accept. So that the same view which elevates this duty to such a high rank distinguishes it widely from much that bears its

name, but only a slight resemblance to its real character. When we learn the real nature of this grace, we have no difficulty in locating its exercise amongst the most sacred services of religion.

Practical religion, in its largest sense, exhibits itself under three leading forms of action, based on the several relations we bear to God. 1. Worship. 2. The discharge of a responsibility. 3. The response of love and gratitude for redeeming mercy. If giving to God's cause is embraced under either one of these forms, it is clearly both a legitimate and an essential part of practical religion. But it is embraced under each one of them, not only as allowing but as requiring it.

1. *Giving to God's cause is an act of divine worship.* The worship of God, in its essence, is the rendering to him the due homage of the heart—its reverence, adoration, love, gratitude, faith, submission. Evidently it must be sincere, supreme, and in accordance with the divine will. We can conceive of such homage apart from all forms, whether of word or act. But God's glory and our nature render outward and formal expression necessary; and such is as distinctly required as the inward feeling. Nor are the forms optional with us. Too much depends on the character of these forms, both as to their fitness to express and cultivate heartfelt devotion, and as to their appropriateness to God's nature, to justify the leaving of such a question to our choice. With all the restrictions which God has imposed, man has continually sought to degrade and corrupt his worship. But whatever may be the grounds upon which God has done it, it is perfectly clear that he has explicitly prescribed the forms in which he is to be worshipped. These include *praise*, by which, in sacred song and otherwise, his glorious attributes, word, and works, are celebrated; *confession of sin*, in acknowledgment of his authority over us as Ruler and Judge; *prayer*, by which we make known our wants to him and supplicate their supply; and also the *offering* to him of due parts of our material substance. These offerings are tributes to him as Creator, Proprietor, Preserver, and Benefactor. We thereby confess him as the author and owner of all we have,

our entire dependence on him, and our fealty to him as our Lord. The fitness of this is apparent to all. Subjects readily pay tribute to their kings, and conquered provinces are invariably required to make similar acknowledgments to their conquerors. This may to some appear derogatory to the spirituality and all-sufficiency of God. But God is to be worshipped by beings who have bodies and material possessions; and though "the earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof," it is necessary that such a being as man should express his devout affections by voluntarily and submissively giving back to God a part of what he has received from his hands. There is indeed something wonderful in the fact that Jehovah, who is a spirit, who is invisible and intangible, who has no wants, and who cannot be benefited by our gifts whether small or great, should nevertheless require to be worshipped by the contribution of perishable and inferior forms of matter out of our little store. Yet it is nevertheless so, and a full explanation of it is found in his condescension to our weakness and meanness. He has simply adapted his worship to our constitution and condition. We doubt not this method of worship was required and practised before the fall—it may be in beautiful and fragrant offerings from the bowers of Eden. It was certainly embodied in the sacrifices which began immediately after the fall, formed a conspicuous part of the patriarchal worship, and was most extensively incorporated in the ceremonies of the Mosaic dispensation. Very true they were instructive and typical of the great atonement, and that this was their chief signification and design. But they were no less gifts to God. They were brought from the flocks and herds of the people, were contributions from their property, and were given up to be slain and burnt or consumed by the priests, at God's express command. They all had their value to their original owners, and the giving them, however cheerfully done, involved more or less self-denial. Had they kept them from God, they could have used them on their tables or sold them for money. And yet the offering these sacrifices formed the most solemn and impressive parts of the holy worship of God, in which not only the offering priest, but the giver

of the victim, acted an important part, expressive of his devout affections. As he parted with his lamb or heifer, if a true worshipper, he exercised the grace of submission to God's requirements; and as he saw it consumed on the altar, with the ascending flame and smoke arose the ardent love, the humble reverence, and the self-consecrating devotion of his heart to him to whom he already owed everything, and who would in due time himself provide the great and efficacious sacrifice for sin. What could more truly deserve the name of worship than this? Could the swelling melody of song, could the most imposing forms of uttered prayer, could any combination of most solemn rites, convey to Jehovah a more fitting or ample expression of devout homage?

But God required of the Jews many other offerings, not of a strictly sacrificial character, and not liable to have their meaning as gifts lost sight of in view of their grand typical signification, such as thank-offerings, peace-offerings, the first-fruits of their increase of all kinds, and tithes. The amount or proportion of many of these gifts was fixed by divine appointment; of others, left to the liberality of the offerer. One fact applies to them all—they were gifts to God. They were all appropriated to the maintenance of divine worship. When properly given, they were as truly devotional tributes as were the sacrifices of slain beasts. They were the formal expression of love, gratitude, reverence, and submission to God. These offerings were brought to God's temple and to his priests, and mingled with the vocal praises and prayers which ascended to God in the holy place. Hence these gifts had all the essential features of divine worship. When, therefore, the primitive Christians, who were mostly converted Jews, were told by Paul to "do good and *communicate*, for with *such sacrifices* God is well pleased," and that the gifts sent to him, as God's servant, were a "*sacrifice* acceptable and well pleasing to God;" and when they were directed by him "to lay by in store on the first day of the week, (or the Lord's day,) as the Lord had prospered them" in view of a collection for God's saints, they would readily understand that, while the offerings under the new dispensation differed ma-

terially in form from those which the Mosaic law required, they nevertheless were still gifts to God, and were as truly a part of his holy worship. We doubt not that they made all their contributions with devout reverence, in the spirit of prayer and praise. It is to be deeply lamented that this duty has fallen, in the spirit and practice of the Church, so far below its true original position, that it is degraded by many to the level of a mere financial transaction, or of mere almsgiving, and that it is treated often with levity. If it be not of the nature of a gift to God, then it forms no part of worship, and ought to have no place in the sacred services of the sanctuary; but if it be of that nature, then we should cast in our contributions as with the solemnity and devoutness of prayer. It is the affectation of spirituality, if it be not the blindness or the hypocrisy of an intense covetousness that would exclude all handling or even mention of money from God's house as profane. God's command, a holy motive, a purpose to express supreme love, devotion, and gratitude to Jehovah, a desire to honor him with our substance, and to aid in spreading the glory of his name and the power of his gospel, are certainly enough to sanctify our temporal gifts when laid upon the altar. The real secret of this objection is an unwillingness to sacrifice the god of a base idolatry to a God who is only professedly worshipped.

It follows from the foregoing conclusions that it is at least eminently expedient and appropriate to incorporate this religious giving with the other parts of public worship. The recommendation of Paul to the Corinthians "to lay by in store, upon the first day of the week," while it does not specifically order a *collection* on that day, does direct the setting aside from other property *then* the proportion which God claims, and thus the virtual giving of it to his cause. It is thus made a proper part of the observance of the Sabbath; and as it is worship, the conclusion seems inevitable that the apostle meant to recommend, if not to enjoin, the including of this act in the regular services of the Lord's day. Certainly the practice is in every way appropriate and promotive of the faithful discharge of this great duty. We can best honor God with our substance while our

hearts are under the sacred influences of his day and house. While drawing near to him, in the attitude of devout contemplation of his person and character, under the teachings of his word, we are most deeply impressed by his claims and most apt to respond to them. While we praise him in song and in the adorations of the public prayer, we are certainly most likely to glorify him by the sacrifices which we may bring from our worldly store. While we enjoy communion with him, holy, and sweet, and endearing, and feed on his precious gospel, and repose our weary hearts on the rich promises of his grace, and draw water with joy out of the wells of salvation, surely we shall most freely and cheerfully and faithfully render a return of a part of our temporal possessions. And when are we so likely to give to God a proportion of what he has given us, as while beseeching him for blessings which our souls need and no other can give? If there be any virtue in the associations of time, place, and employment, especially of the mind and heart, there can be no comparison between the advantage of giving to God amidst the scenes of his worship and of giving at our places of daily toil or in our homes, surrounded by the influences of this world.

2. *Giving to God's cause is the discharge of a responsibility*, which is a second form of practical religion. It is all-important to put this matter on its true footing. While men regard religious giving as mere charity, and thus as appealing to a mere emotional sentiment, not only will they give far less than they ought, but their gifts will entirely fail of divine acceptance. Humanity, sympathy, generosity, are not religion, however included in it and promoted by it, and however excellent in themselves. Unless our charities to man are dictated by piety toward God, they are not approved by God even as charities. All true virtue lies in conformity with the divine will. But preëminently the gifts offered to God for his cause must spring from a sense of *duty*. We are to give because God requires it. It has already been shown how explicitly and how largely he required contributions from his ancient people for the maintenance of religion in the sacrifices and services of his worship.

The forms of worship are changed, but not the essentials. It still requires suitable sanctuaries, with their necessary appointments, and an order of men to conduct its services and impart instruction; and these must be provided and sustained by the gifts of the people. In addition to this, while the costly furniture and the expensive ritual of the temple are substituted by the simple sanctuaries and the unadorned rites of the Christian dispensation, God has devolved upon his people the grand undertaking of preaching the gospel to every creature, and of converting this whole earth into one glorious temple, to be filled with devout Christian worshippers, bringing their spiritual sacrifices from the four quarters of the world, and speaking and singing his praise in all the various dialects of the human tongue.

There can be no doubt in regard to the obligation which God has imposed. He certainly requires, "Honor the Lord with thy substance and the first fruits of all thine increase." "Whatever ye do, do all to the glory of God." "Freely ye have received, freely give." "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature." It is impossible to obey these commands without contributing of our money, according to our ability, to promote the cause and glory of God. But it is too late in the day to offer an argument to prove this position. And yet does the Church regard religious giving as an *imperative duty*? Look at the immense number of blanks in her statistics of benevolent contributions, and the vastly greater number of church-members, represented by these blanks, who give nothing to the cause of God in carrying forward his work! If it were known and felt that religious giving, being commanded by God, is just as binding as the duty of remembering the Sabbath day to keep it holy, and of honoring father and mother, and that withholding these required gifts is as *really* sinful as bearing false witness against our neighbor or taking God's name in vain, could these church-members continue to neglect this duty? It seems impossible. It is all important, then, that the conscience of the Church be thoroughly enlightened on this subject, that they be delivered from this sin. The Scriptures also plainly teach that what God has given to his servants is

not an absolute gift, but a literal *trust*. He gives worldly substance with the command, "Occupy till I come." He makes them stewards of his (their Lord's) money; and he calls upon them to use it in executing the expensive commission of disciplining all nations. To keep back from these uses even a part of what God requires them to appropriate thus, is nothing less than a breach of trust—an embezzlement—a fraud; it is robbing God. There is no discretion given in this matter, except as to the mere circumstantials. We have no option as to whether we shall use God's money as he requires or as we wish. The responsibility is plain and fixed. We must discharge it faithfully or incur dreadful guilt. It will not do to confess failure and then content ourselves with including it in the mass of failures of which all are guilty. When a man deliberately and systematically refuses to respond to God's calls for a due proportion of his means, it is not a mere inadvertence or infirmity. It is persistence in a wrong. It is plain rebellion. When a man has money for ostentation and indulgence for the world for his family to waste, and for the gratification of self, and none or only a pittance for God, he may call himself a Christian, but he is an idolater. It is time that the delusion which has prevailed so long and so widely in the Church on this plain practical subject, were thoroughly exposed; and the truth, however trying and painful, distinctly understood and recognised.

But this responsibility is not discharged by bare giving. There must be giving according as God has prospered us. How much shall we give? is a question often asked as well by the cheerful as by the grudging giver—by the one to learn the real extent of his duty, and by the other to ascertain the *minimum* with which he can be released from an unwelcome claim. In both cases the demand seems to be for the answer of a definite sum or a definite proportion. And yet we are not authorised to give such an answer. No doubt the exact sum due from each one is fixed in the divine mind. But God does not in his word, nor by any other medium, communicate to each one what that sum is. Even the law of tithes was not such a revelation of duty. That law covered only a part of the contributions of the

people. They were also to make voluntary gifts, undetermined in amount, as expressions of gratitude. There was a broad margin for the exercise of pious affections. Many indications are given in the scriptural history to show that the Jews, as a general thing, were liberal in their religious gifts. And yet it is computed that, apart from these free-will offerings, the aggregate of their assessments amounted to one-fifth, at least, of their income. We mention these facts not by way of setting up a general rule, but to show what God has required when he has undertaken to lay an assessment. They certainly throw important light upon this practical question. Still we are not authorised to affirm that every man is bound to give one-fifth or even one-tenth. Some have adopted the rule of tithes, and thus settled the question for themselves; and yet we are not sure that they have in all cases settled it correctly. Baxter very justly says: "A tenth part of their entire income is too much for some and much too little for others; but for the most part it is, I think, as likely a proportion as it is fit for another to prescribe in particular." It is plain he does not mean a tenth after deducting personal and family expenses, but a tenth of our whole income. For he adds, "after such provision is deducted, it is far more than a tenth, if not all, that must be given."

The fact is, God has evidently given us a different rule under the Christian economy—a rule based upon general principles, appealing to the sentiments of the pious heart, and thus leaving the matter of amount and proportion to the convictions and promptings of each Christian, under the instructions of his word and the calls of benevolence and piety. This rule, indeed, is capable of being abused by multitudes wearing the Christian name, who, because they are left to their own judgment and feelings, content themselves with giving the smallest sums compatible with decency. But, on the other hand, it ennobles the gifts of the truly pious, gives them a higher value in the sight of God, and we doubt not also greater efficiency as means of usefulness. We should certainly regard, in our estimate of the real worth of religious gifts, the principle and motive infinitely more than the mere amount. The latter, however, it should be

remembered, all things considered, is a fair criterion of fidelity and benevolence.

This leads us to consider—

3. Giving as the *response of love and gratitude for redeeming mercy*. It was all this indeed to the pious Jew. He felt the claims of divine goodness, not only in the increase of his fields and flocks; not only in the great deliverance which made Israel a people, and the many subsequent deliverances which preserved them from extinction; but, above all, in the provision of redemption from sin through a promised Messiah. As he experienced a sense of pardon through the blood typified by his sacrifices, he freely gave himself and his all to God. But as the gospel was then but dimly revealed, as the Church was coextensive with the nation and identified with it, and as the peculiar arrangements of the ancient ritual required it, God gave to the Jews a fixed law of contributions. This, too, no doubt helped to prepare his Church for the freer method of the New Testament. He now lays no tax, but appeals to the hearts of his blood-bought people. He throws every interest of his spiritual kingdom, every enterprise connected with his glory, and every claim of a world perishing in sin, unreservedly upon their affections and convictions of obligation. If this plan fails, then all these interests fail, so far as they are connected with the employment of pecuniary means. If his people refuse to give, he will not compel them. He has provided no alternative. He will use no other expedients for supplying his ecclesiastical treasury. He has staked his whole cause on earth, so far as instrumentality goes, upon the love and gratitude of his redeemed people. The Lord loveth the cheerful giver; no other will he even tolerate.

This would seem to risk these precious interests upon a basis too uncertain. Human wisdom would have preferred a tax or perhaps an endowment. But God proceeded in this matter as he did with regard to the whole matter of personal holiness and good works. He saves his people by grace without works—before works—relying upon the fact that a salvation given without works as a consideration, is most sure to be followed by works

as the heartfelt expression of grateful love. He knew that hypocrites would turn this grace into licentiousness; but this was no argument with him against a plan which would glorify himself by ennobling the hearts and lives of his true beneficiaries.

But has the result justified this method? We believe it has; and yet we are constrained to admit and to lament that the Church has, as a body, failed to rise to the full height of this great argument. Why is this? It is easy to account for it on the same grounds which explain all instances of unfaithfulness and imperfections in Christians. But we are satisfied that there is a specific cause for this particular failure. The appeal for religious gifts is not put as distinctly and as strongly as it ought to be upon the divine claim for redeeming mercy. The claim is indeed recognised; but the connexion which our giving has with the cross of Jesus Christ seems to be remoter and feebler than that of any other of our religious habits. The view is too much confined to other aspects of this duty. We need to look at it more intently as the claim of redeeming love. We need to bring our offerings to Calvary and lay them down at Jesus' feet, in full view of his dying agonies, and with hearts full of the impressions of his amazing love—fresh with the recollections of our utter ruin by sin and overflowing with thankfulness to him who gave himself for us. Here is the place to learn our duty, to determine the question, "How much owest thou unto thy Lord?" and to bring our dull selfish hearts to the exercise of a true Christian gratitude. Let us regard Christ as the author and Christ as the ground and motive of all these appeals.

It is mortifying to see how this plain scriptural view of the subject seems to be ignored by thousands in the Church, who appear to regard the calls of religious benevolence as originating with the church officers or the church courts, or as coming only from man. If asked to give to Christ's poor, they either refuse or give an *alms*—not remembering Christ's words, "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these, ye have done it unto me." If asked to contribute to spread the gospel, they complain of the unceasing calls of those who are taking the

only possible method of obeying the parting command of Christ, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel unto every creature"—to obey which is just as obligatory on them as on the ministry or the courts of the Church, and in obeying which the very least they can do is to give their money. If asked to aid in the education of candidates for the ministry, they are ready to complain of such demands, as if these candidates were paupers burdening the Church, and not the gifts to the Church from the ascended Saviour, in answer to the prayer for laborers to be sent into the harvest. And so with regard to all calls. The prevalent feeling is that they are called upon by persons having no claim upon them, rather than by their divine Lord, through his constituted agencies in the Church. No sooner are such calls made from the pulpit or by a deacon in private, than such persons throw themselves into an attitude of self-defence, if not of actual hostility, as if an injustice or fraud or some imposition were attempted, and either *protect themselves* and their pockets by a bold refusal or a mere evasion, or else, if they give, cherish the feeling that they have incurred a loss or submitted to a wrong. To hear the replies given to such appeals one would suppose that the whole burden of sustaining and propagating the gospel devolved exclusively upon the church officers, courts, and committees, who have the direction of these enterprises; or rather that they were levying oppressive taxes upon the membership to furnish them a living; that the private members have no responsibility in the matter; that the *great commission* was not given to them; that they were never bought by the Saviour's blood, but are still *their own*, to live for themselves and their children; in a word, that they are a different party and interest from Christ and his Church; and hence that it is an unwarrantable as well as an offensive impertinence to require their coöperation in bearing these burdens, or rather in carrying forward these glorious and divine enterprises. No one will deny the wide prevalence of this feeling. Now, we charge that the ministry and deaconship have yielded too much and too long to this grossly erroneous and sinful feeling. We do not counsel severity, nor harshness, nor dictation. Like the Mas-

ter, they should leave the practical decision of every such matter to the consciences and hearts of the people. But they should use far more effort to correct their errors, enlighten their consciences, and enlarge their hearts—showing them how utterly wrong are their views, how unchristian is their spirit, how unfaithful and ungrateful is their practice. They should meet ignorance with light, selfishness with love—their own and the love of Christ—and unfaithfulness with unfailing zeal and constancy in pressing the solemn claims of duty. They must not shrink from contact with the repulsive and sometimes insulting selfishness of the unfaithful stewards of God's gifts. They must not let the claim go by default, or even meet it themselves, as is often done, on the ground that they would rather give beyond their means than ask some church-members for money. They must not come to the despairing conclusion that it is useless as well as unpleasant to press these claims further upon these unwilling hearts. All this is neglect of duty; it is shunning the cross. The Church must be trained, as children are trained, patiently, gently, by instruction, by precept, by example, by the presentation of Christian motives. It must be brought to believe that it is really "more blessed to give than to receive," so that they shall love to give, enjoy it, prefer to do it, and hence abound in the blessed privilege. Then will the modern Church become like the primitive—counting nothing they have as their own, and parting with their goods as every man may need, or as the Master may require, and yet eating their meat with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God, and having favor with all the people.

The neglect of these scriptural methods of cultivating the grace of giving has opened the door for those modes of inveigling the people into the discharge of the duty, by appeals to pride and emulation, and by various artifices suited only to deceive, by which the Church has often been disgraced and corrupted. The demand for money has been urgent; the people have not been prepared to give on right principles and with Christian motives. Hence the resort to these unlawful and injurious contrivances. They should be utterly abandoned. Mo-

tives of economy will require this, even if a sense of propriety does not, since all such expedients soon wear out. It is high time that the Church had left far behind her all the rudiments of the world and of the flesh, and under the lofty inspiration of true Christian sentiment, were acting a manly part in the great work to which her divine Master has called her.

Is it too early in the day to expect to see the wealth of the Church entirely consecrated to Christ? It does not seem strange to see men and women giving their energies of body and mind, their time, their acquirements, their influence, their opportunity to gain wealth, all to that Master's cause, in the work of the ministry, and in the more self-denying work of missions. Why should we not see thousands of private Christians, who have time, talent, and opportunity to make money, engage in *making money for Christ*, and thus furnishing what is so much needed in executing his parting command? Yea, why should not each Christian do this to the full extent of his ability? Is he not the Lord's? Was he not bought from as awful a hell, for as glorious a destiny, and by as precious blood, as were Martyn, Williams, Judson, or Paul? Why should he stop at a consecration less complete than theirs, or a love less ardent, or a gratitude less generous? Why should not every Christian look upon the cause of Christ as really and literally his own; and regard the great work of the Church not merely as bearing a remote and incidental relation to the great business of his life, but as constituting the supreme, all-comprehensive, all-controlling interest of his whole being, and therefore engage in it with the same zeal, earnestness, and cheerfulness, as now mark the efforts of a selfish and a worldly life? We believe this will become the general sentiment of God's people; and then will dawn the latter-day glory of the Church.

ARTICLE III.

THE REIGN OF LAW.

The Reign of Law. By the DUKE OF ARGYLL. Fifth Edition. George Routledge & Sons, New York. 1869. Pp. 433.

The culminating points of the successive ages of human culture are marked by the interpenetration of religious and philosophic thought. It distinguished the Socratic period. It was the vital principle of the Alexandrian school. It was the redeeming feature of the alchemical and scholastic discussions of the Middle Ages. And it imparts a growing significance and dignity to the studies and the controversies of the present day. Indeed, it is the goal to which, manifestly and naturally, any course of wide and deep investigation must finally tend. The tracts of thought are not divided, nor even bounded; they shade insensibly into each other. Though we begin with the material, we are presently environed by the intellectual; and while we grapple with the intellectual, we are confronted with the moral and drawn within the solemn shadows of religion. All tangents to the surface of the earth point to heaven.

For the first time in its long and evil life, infidelity has now attained to the utterance of a positive doctrine. The spread of logic, and the wide domination of the inductive philosophy, have imbued the thinking world with the idea of law. Hither, by a tacit concentration, the powers, the passions, and the hopes of believing and unbelieving minds are drawn; but chiefly, for a time, the unbelieving.

One who looks up from the unsightly "foothills" to a range of lofty mountains, is the subject of a strong and delightful illusion. These rough and awkward elevations are clearly clay, or mould, or stone; but those towers of amethyst and violet that lift the sky—those starry heads that kindle with the sunrising and blaze as he descends—they are fairy-land at least. Let judgment say what it will, even the enlightened imagination sees something more than stolid soil, or snow, or ice; while supersti-

tion always kept its mountains clad in raiment of the supernatural, and the unbalanced mind bestowed its illegitimate wonders there.

Now, when induction began to gather up its local conclusions into "laws of nature," and to discover or invent generalisations which bound together groups and congeries of such laws, and these, in their turn, were found unifiable in still larger utterances, it is hardly to be wondered at that imagination not only outran reason, but misinterpreted her deliverance. It associated power with grandeur. It mistook the light—*reflected* light—that bathed and glorified those heights, for an interior, spontaneous, and substantial glory. It crowned as actual king, not reigning only, but governing, those very principles, when lifted into broad generalisations, which, amid the foothills of homely experience, it had taken at their proper value.

And thus, again, unbelief is seen as the twin of misbelief, and godless philosophy may find, justly diverted to itself, the prophetic accusations of Holy Writ against Popery, inasmuch as law, like "the man of sin, the son of perdition," "opposeth and exalteth itself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that, as God, it sitteth in the temple of God, *shewing itself that it is God.*"* Yea, to His own transcendent, world-embracing thought, His own plan and will embodied in the creation, has man tried to give a frame and power to crowd Him from His throne and reign over His works.

This, therefore, may be called the first doctrinal phase of infidelity. While it *denies* that the being and handiwork of God can be proved—and is thus far on old ground with somewhat new weapons—it also *declares* that everything we see and know, have discovered or may yet discover, can be accounted for by reference to the laws of nature.

The Church, according to her wont, while abundantly ready to defend the truth committed to her charge, has been slow to join issue on the main point. She has yielded reluctantly and ungracefully to the progress of new sciences, and the evidence,

*2 Thess., ii. 4.

continually widening in its testimony and demands, of the prevalence of law in nature. And although she had certain obvious responses to make, such as that "law necessarily implied a law-giver," so little confidence had many of her champions in the force of their own plea, that there grew up a very general feeling that all territory won for science was lost to religion. Every conquest of law was felt as a defeat to the gospel. So much more jealously was guarded all that remained: so much more loudly, though with an increasingly tremulous voice, did many "watchmen" warn off intruders from a domain which their weak faith and weak reason converted into cloud-land. We have carefully said "many champions" and "many watchmen," because, though they were many, they are not all. Some have been found, and in rapidly growing numbers of late, to see the true line not only of defence, but of reconquest.

It is, indeed, amazing that any who knew God should have forgotten that the reign of God is necessarily the reign of law. Religion without law is superstition. Superstition is atheism in a delirium. And he to whom the Almighty Maker has become known, even in outline, must surely see that creation expresses thought, that thought necessitates a plan, and that plan, by excluding chance, enthrones law.

But the difficulty has not lain in a denial or forgetting on the part of theology of this bald and general statement of the truth. We have taken refuge in it—sheltered ourselves behind it, as behind a wall, against the details and mingled reasonings and imaginations of the philosophers. They, as we have seen, were the subjects of a very natural illusion. They predicated life and causal power of the "laws of nature." They grouped such heterogeneous and diverse formulæ under that one title—the simplest and most casual generalisations of natural history classed as "laws" along with the sublime, invariable, sovereign force of gravitation—that they turned both their own heads and ours. The "Vestiges of Creation" accounted for the first appearance of vegetation in the world, (which, it was assumed, must have been brush-shaped,) by crediting it to electricity, because certain particles of matter, under certain electrical condi-

tions, arrange themselves in a brush-like shape. And "an eminent professor and clergyman of the Church of England" is said to have sided with the Comtists on questions of law in nature, and yet preached "high doctrinal sermons from the pulpit until his death, . . . on the ground that propositions which were contrary to his reason were not necessarily beyond his faith!" So inference ran riot with the infidel, and common sense forsook the clergyman. It was indeed high time for some true man to be endowed with courage to look the formidable error in the face; for the "reign of law" threatened to end speedily in chaos.

The Duke of Argyll was by no means the first to dare this contest, or even to enter upon it. It is his distinction that he seems very nearly to have finished it. The crude attempts of his predecessors did little more than prepare the way for the superb book before us. Studiously plain in its attire, it is transcendently rich in thought—rich in the rare grace of thoroughness. The style is a model of lucidness and severely chaste beauty.

The first and great thing to be done in the settling of this controversy was to settle the meaning of terms in common and even incessant use. Indeed, it is startling to find how nearly all it is of what needed to be done. To define the natural and supernatural, and fix their true boundaries, if they are distinct, and obliterate all spurious boundaries, if they are one; to analyse the phrase, "laws of nature," and show us how many things we meant by it, and what their respective values and powers are—this is more than half the battle.

"We must cast a sharp eye indeed on every form of words which professes to represent a scientific truth. If it be really true in one department of thought, the chances are that it will have its bearing on every other. And if it be not true, but erroneous, its effect will be of a corresponding character; for there is a brotherhood of error as close as the brotherhood of truth. Therefore, to accept as a truth that which is not a truth, or to fail in distinguishing the sense in which a proposition may be true, from other senses in which it is not true, is an evil having consequences which are indeed incalculable. There are

subjects on which one mistake of this kind will poison all the wells of truth, and affect with fatal error the whole circle of our thoughts." Pp. 56, 57.

Perhaps few thinking men, who thought upon the old basis, have read the first chapter of "The Reign of Law" without being startled at the difficulty of discriminating the province of the natural from that of the supernatural. The world had assumed that they must be not only distinct but contrary; and it seems probable that the *usus loquendi* which opposes them to each other will prove stubborn and deep-rooted, despite the profound and forcible reasoning which endeavors to remove it. And this will indicate, if it does not establish, the conclusion that this *usus* is founded on an ordinance of thought, which in turn must be founded on a truth. In other words, the distinction between the *ideas* represented by the two words, "natural" and "supernatural," must be a real distinction, whether the things so named actually occur or not.

We are somewhat surprised that, among the various accounts of the supernatural, quoted from various works, the following, from Butler's immortal Analogy, escaped the eye of our author: "What is natural as much requires and presupposes an intelligent agent to render it so, *i. e.*, to effect it continually, or at stated times, *as what is supernatural or miraculous does to effect it for once.*"* Here is a real and just distinction upon the surface of things—one which the common mind, accepting phenomena as they come, and "looking on the outward appearance," cannot but recognise and name; and that is the distinction between continuous sequences and occasional appearances.

But Bishop Butler immediately proceeds to show, in words that constitute a marvellous anticipation of the very latest reaches of thought in this direction, how utterly without foothold in true philosophy that classification is; that it is an antithesis, and not a distinction. We quote the passage now in full:

"But the only distinct meaning of that word [natural] is, *stated, fixed, or settled*—since what is natural as much requires

*Part I., Chap. I.

and presupposes an intelligent agent to render it so, *i. e.*, to effect it continually or at stated times, as what is supernatural or miraculous does to effect it for once. And from hence it must follow that persons' notion of what is natural will be enlarged in proportion to their greater knowledge of the works of God and the dispensations of his providence. Nor is there any absurdity in supposing that there may be beings in the universe whose capacities and knowledge and views may be so extensive as that the whole Christian dispensation may to them appear natural, *i. e.*, analogous or conformable to God's dealings with other parts of his creation—as natural as the visible known course of things appears to us."

Compare with this the following from the work before us:

"The truth is, that there is no such distinction between what we find in nature and what we are called upon to believe in religion, as men pretend to draw between the natural and the supernatural. It is a distinction purely artificial, arbitrary, unreal. Nature presents to our intelligence, the more clearly the more we search her, the designs, ideas, and intentions of some

‘Living Will that shall endure,
When all that seems shall suffer shock.’

"Religion presents to us that same will, not only working equally through the use of means, but using means which are strictly analogous—referable to the same general principles—and which are constantly appealed to as of a sort we ought to be able to appreciate, because we ourselves are already familiar with the like." P. 50.

The concession, then, is complete on the part of belief, as represented by these great thinkers, that there is but one domain, and that a domain of law: Butler pointing out that it may be so, and probably is; Argyll contending that it is and must be so. The only regret we have is, that this ever needed to be a *concession*; that the Church had not from the first seized and held this ground as its own impregnable citadel. But this is an anticipation.

We accept, then, broadly, the doctrine of the absolutely universal "reign of law." We proclaim it as emphatically and more joyfully than the philosopher who makes law his God. Height above height the mighty pile arises—

“The world’s great altar-stairs,
That slope through darkness up to God.”*

Turn where we will, we find cause and effect moving in ordained sequences. The shape of the earth, the place and velocity of the moon, the solar reign, the stellar and nebulous systems; the submission of light to spectroscopic analysis; the principles of crystallisation and of vegetative and animal life; mechanics, chemistry, magnetism; geology, sociology, and, as we shall show in the conclusion of this article, religion itself—all, all confess the presence and prosper in the sway of law. Law is the one, supreme, and universal predicable of being. It does not stop, as in Wordsworth’s confession of it, with “the round ocean and the living air, and the blue sky, and in the mind of man.” Its range is wider and higher still.

But this sweeping acceptance of universal law does not settle the controversy between belief and unbelief. It only opens the last chapter of the present volume of it. That conflict will endure while there remain minds which will not have the Lord to reign over them. Just at this point the question recurs which has been so often and so unfruitfully discussed—What is a “law of nature?” He who has tried his dialectical skill upon a simple definition of it, has not failed to find it very awkward to manipulate. And the reason of that awkwardness will immediately appear: it is that formulæ so varied and even incongruous have been grouped under that single title and denominated “laws.” But while this has been a signal and almost vital philosophical error, as a feature of language and thought, it has its value, as an evidence of man’s irresistible tendency to believe in a common principle where he beholds a constant result.

Without pausing upon the criticism of the various definitions proposed, all of them colored more or less by the several schemes of thought intended to be sustained by them, we turn to the work before us, and find a notable substitution for all such ineffectual attempts, of a clear and exhaustive classification, under five heads, viz.:

*Tennyson: *In Memoriam*, LIV.

“First—We have law as applied simply to an observed order of facts.

“Secondly—To that order as involving the action of some force or forces, of which nothing more may be known.

“Thirdly—As applied to individual forces, the measure of whose operation has been more or less defined or ascertained.

“Fourthly—As applied to those combinations of force which have reference to the fulfilment of purpose or the discharge of function.

“Fifthly—As applied to abstract conceptions of the mind—not corresponding with any actual phenomena, but deduced therefrom as axioms of thought necessary to our understanding of them. Law, in this sense, is a reduction of the phenomena, not merely to an order of facts, but to an order of thought.

“These great leading significations of the word law* all circle round the three great questions which science asks of nature—the what, the how, and the why:

“(1.) What are the facts in their established order?

“(2.) How—that is, from what physical causes—does that order come to be?

“(3.) Why have these causes been so combined? What relation do they bear to purpose, to the fulfilment of intention, to the discharge of function?” P. 65.

The example chosen to illustrate the first and lowest sense of the word law is the Three Laws of Kepler. They were “facts of constant numerical relation between the distances of the different planets from the sun, and the length of their periodic times; and, again, between the velocity of their motion and the space enclosed within certain corresponding sections of their orbit. These laws were simply and purely an ‘order of facts’ established by observation, and not connected with any known cause.” P. 67.

But “an observed order of facts, to be entitled to the rank of a law, must be an order so constant and uniform as to indicate necessity, and necessity can only arise out of the action of some compelling force. . . . All order involves the idea of some arranging cause, the working of some force or forces, of which

*“In its *primary* signification, a “law” is the authoritative expression of human will enforced by power. . . . It becomes . . . necessary to define the *secondary* senses with precision.” P. 64. The italics are ours.

that order is the index and the result," p. 68; and we say that such order of facts must be due to some "law." This is the second of the five senses specified above.

Of law in the third sense, "the one great example before and above all others, is the law of gravitation; for this is a law in the sense not merely of a rule, but of a cause—that is, of a force accurately defined and ascertained according to the measure of its operation." P. 69.

We arrest the enumeration here a moment, as our author does, to remind ourselves that "no one law—that is to say, no one force—determines anything that we see happening or done around us. It is always the result of different and opposing forces nicely balanced against each other. The least disturbance of the proportion in which any one of them is allowed to tell, produces a total change in the effect. The more we know of nature, the more intricate do such combinations appear to be." P. 76. This is one of the cardinal truths of this whole body of thought—one of the great "strategic points" of the Church. As examples of the use well and convincingly made of it, we refer in passing to Whewell's *Indications of the Creator*, and McCosh on the *Divine Government*, Book II., Chap. I., §§2, 3.

And here we come upon the fourth sense of the word law.

"It is used to designate not merely an observed order of facts—not merely the bare abstract idea of force—not merely individual forces according to ascertained measures of operation—but a number of forces in the condition of mutual adjustment; that is to say, as combined with each other, and fitted to each other, for the attainment of special ends. The whole science of animal mechanics, for example, deals with law in this sense—with natural forces as related to purpose and subservient to the discharge of function. And this is the highest sense of all—law in this sense being more perfectly intelligible to us than in any other; because, although we know nothing of the real nature of force, even of that force which is resident in ourselves, we do know for what ends we exert it, and the principle that governs our devices for its use. That principle is, combination for the accomplishment of purpose." Pp. 78, 79.

But law in this sense is not only most easily intelligible as a

statement—it is also the most easily provable as a fact. When, for example, by the study of an organ in any animal, we have discovered its function, we know not merely what it does, but what some special construction enables it to do. “It is not merely its work, but it is the work assigned to it as an apparatus, and as fitted to other organs having other functions related to its own. The nature of that apparatus . . . is not an inference from the facts, but it is part of the facts themselves. The idea of function is inseparable from the idea of purpose.” P. 82.

As a case in point, let us take the poison of a deadly snake, as described on page 34:

“It is a secretion of definite chemical properties, which have reference not only, not even mainly, to the organism of the animal in which it is developed, but specially to the organism of another animal which it is intended to destroy. Some naturalists have a vague sort of notion that, as regards merely mechanical weapons or organs of attack, they may be developed by use: that legs may become longer by fast running, teeth sharper and longer by much biting. Be it so; this law of growth, if it exist, is but itself an instrument whereby purpose is fulfilled. But how will this law of growth adjust a poison in one animal with such subtle knowledge of the organisation of another, that the deadly virus shall in a few minutes curdle the blood, benumb the nerves, and rush in upon the citadel of life? There is but one explanation—a mind, having minute and perfect knowledge of the structure of both, has designed the one to be capable of inflicting death on the other. *This mental purpose and resolve is the one thing which our intelligence perceives with direct and intuitive recognition.*”*

Another convincing illustration is the case of the electric fish; where we see “the subordination of many laws to a difficult and curious purpose—a subordination which is effected through the instrumentality of a purely mechanical contrivance.” P. 103.

But here confronts us the great bugbear—the objection whose strength lies in the obscure terrors of a long word—even anthro-

*The italics are ours.

pomorphism. Purpose and design are said to be human conceptions—conceptions which it is not logical, at least not philosophical, to transfer to God. To this the entirely satisfactory answer is, that we can neither speak or think at all on these topics, as believers or as unbelievers, without borrowing not only words but conceptions from the processes of human thought and action. “The idea of natural forces working ‘by themselves’ is preëminently anthropomorphic. This is undoubtedly the way in which they seem to us to work when we employ them.” P. 106.

There is no need, however, to rely upon the argument *ad hominem*, as in that last quotation. The thing censured is absolutely inevitable. “Every conception of a mind, even though it be described as ‘universal,’ must be in some degree anthropomorphic. [For] our minds can think of another mind only as having some powers and properties which in kind are common with our own.” P. 106. This is patent and requires no argument.

But if the objector insist that the infirmities of our minds can be evidence of nothing but their own existence, and that the incorrigible anthropomorphism of our minds is such an infirmity, and cannot, therefore, avail to ascertain the mode of the divine existence, we waive the consideration so often and so justly urged, viz., that if we would know or hold any truth whatever, we must assume the veracity of our faculties; and that not to assume it is to deny the veracity of God. We waive them, in order to bring forward another and most important view of the matters involved, suggested by a reflection of our author’s. It surprises us to find that he has not used it in this connexion; that is, *God’s systematic self-subjection to his own laws*:

“The divine mission of Christ on earth—does not this imply not only the use of means to an end, but *some inscrutable necessity that certain means, and these only, should be employed in resisting and overcoming evil?*” * What else is the import of so many passages of Scripture implying that certain conditions were required to bring the Saviour of man into a given relation

*Italics ours.

with the race he was sent to save? 'It behoved him . . . to make the Captain of our salvation perfect through suffering.' 'It behoved him in all things to be made like unto his brethren, *that he might be,*' etc.—with the reason added: 'For *in that* he himself hath succored being tempted, *he is able* to succor them that are tempted.' Whatever more there may be in such passages, they all imply the universal reign of law in the moral and spiritual as well as in the material world; that those laws had to be—behooved to be—obeyed." P. 52.

The dominion of law is the government of God. And the thought here expressed is not that a fate called nature has set up its throne, and a Demiurge called God is constrained thereby, but that it has pleased the sovereign Jehovah to impress a certain type of law on this world, and to order his own course in an immutable conformity thereto. Whether, and how far, this same type of law is impressed, in all particulars, upon all places of his dominion, is a question immaterial to the present discussion, to which we cannot turn aside. But no reader or thinker can fail, when once it has been suggested to him, to discover, or discovering, to adore, the march through all nature of this sublime and self-imposed obedience. Natural history is full of descriptions of ingenious circuities for the accomplishment of ends which could have been more directly reached but for the interposition of some law. We pass by all minor instances, however, to adduce one signal and final fact—the more willingly as it has been used on the other side: the imprint of one plan and order on the whole vertebrate kingdom.

Throughout this vast department of animal existence there is a curious fact that recurs so often and so conspicuously, that a word has been formed—mal-formed rather—to describe it. Almost every animal beneath the grade of man has "*aborted*" members, whose sole use is to keep up their connexion and signalise their particular rank in the scale of life. The limbs of all the mammalia, and even of all the lizards, terminate in five jointed bones or fingers, though many of them need and use only one, two, or three. Those which are not needed are dwarfed, but always traceable. In the horse, only one is used, and that one is developed into a hoof; yet parts corresponding to the

other four can be detected. There are monkeys which have no thumbs for use; but they have thumb-bones under the skin. So has the wingless bird of New Zealand hidden wing-bones. Snakes have the rudiments of legs, and the slow-worm aborted blade-bones and collar-bones. These are only part of the examples collected by our author upon a single page (p. 195); but they suffice to suggest a problem and introduce the solution:

“These useless members, these rudimentary or aborted limbs, which puzzled us so much, are parts of a universal plan. On this plan the bony skeletons of all living animals have been put together. The forces which have been combined for the moulding of organic forms have been so combined as to mould them after certain types or patterns. And when comparative anatomy has revealed this fact as affecting all the animals of the existing world, another branch of the same science comes in to confirm the generalisation and extend it over the innumerable creatures that have existed and have passed away. This one plan of organic life has never been departed from since time began.

“When we have grasped this great fact, all the lesser facts which are subordinate to it assume a new significance. . . . A plan of this kind is in itself a purpose. An order so vast as this, including within itself such variety of detail, and maintained through such periods of time, implies combination and adjustment founded upon and carrying into effect one vast conception. It is only as an order of thought that the doctrine of animal homologies is intelligible at all.” Pp. 196, 197.

And in this conclusion, we have reached the most signal instance of the fifth sense assigned to the word “law,” viz., “a reduction of the phenomena not merely to an order of facts, but to an order of thought.” Another, almost as striking example, is the first law of motion—a law “not corresponding with any actual phenomena, but deduced therefrom as axioms of thought necessary to our understanding of them.” And we see clearly that anthropomorphism is a law of nature as well as of thought. We may remark here, in passing, that if the idea of law as an efficient cause—law filling the place of a God—needs any exposure, this analysis and classification of the senses in which the word is used suffices of itself for its overthrow. It is not law, but force acting according to law, that is here seen as hav-

ing any efficiency. And all the instincts of man—his fears, his reason, and his affections—combine to make him abhor the conception of a blind but self-existent force. There *must* be a God to wield it.

It is with great reluctance that we pass by the remaining topics of this great work, such as the Reign of Law in the Realm of Mind, and the Law of Natural Consequence in Sociology; but our space is rapidly diminishing and restricts us to two most important matters of which the Duke of Argyll has not treated—of one of which he has indeed taken no notice—but which are indispensable to the complete treatment of this subject.

The first is, the appearance of law in evil, and the fallacious inference (intended to operate as a *reductio ad absurdum*) that law here proves an evil lawgiver as cogently as law in good proves a good lawgiver. Perhaps no more transparent sophism ever found popularity among cavillers, or inflicted perplexity upon friends of the gospel. But let it be noted that this is its farthest reach of success. It has never, at least in modern times, created believers in the hideous notion it professes to establish. Men may be atheists, but they cannot be Manicheans.

The problem presented here is not the insoluble, unfathomable problem of the origin of evil. It is the alleged appearance of design, the alleged existence of law, the setting up of a kingdom of sin and pain, with the consequences thence ensuing.

Now, there is no principle more fully recognised in all departments of science and art than this: that *a permanent defect or abnormal element in that which is subjected to constant forces will work constant results.*

Suppose a cog to be broken in Babbage's Calculating Machine; the calculations would all come out wrong, but they would do so in a manner and to a degree which could be themselves ascertained even in advance by calculation, and which would be as invariable as the work of the original and uninjured machine. And the resulting errors, had we not this principle to guide us, might be as confidently charged upon the inventor as the wonderful achievements now seen redound to his honor.

So, again, though the interference of the heavenly bodies with each other's motions and times cannot be called a defect, it so far resembles it as to come under the same rule. And thus perturbation becomes a guide. The constant deviation, amid constant forces, points to an element which, though not in fact abnormal, is abnormal in respect of the system as hitherto understood, and requires now to be enrolled or newly characterised.

On the supposition, therefore, that the kingdom as created is a kingdom of good, and that into that good kingdom an element of evil has somehow found its way, the consequences would be not merely evil, but evil *seemingly framed by a law*; that is to say, there would be definite sequences, constant results, measures and fruits of apparent adjustment, which would perfectly resemble design.

If it be asked whether the appearance of design in good cannot be accounted for in the same way, we must answer: both Good and Evil cannot be so accounted for; because constant forces, combinations, and laws, infer design, and that design must include one result or the other. It remains now only to inquire, Which is the normal principle and which the anomaly? Sin is the transgression of the moral law; pain and sickness are witnesses to the transgression of physical law; government is simply the bulwark of social law. It is thus utterly incredible that Evil should be the normal principle and Good the anomaly.

Repeating the *caveat* that the matter before us is not the origin of evil, but the alleged appearance of law in evil with the corollary of law, viz., design, we advance to a second reflection, bearing upon this appearance. Assuming this world to be a stage upon which God administers his moral government, or any part thereof, and assuming—what cannot be denied—his knowledge of the moral character man would put on, *i. e.*, that he would fall and sin, there are but three possible suppositions: that this sinner should be introduced into a heaven, into a hell, or into a broken world, like this. The first was obviously impossible to a Holy Ruler; the third—we bless his mercy for it!—was forbidden by his infinite compassion and the purposes born of his tender pity. There remained, therefore, but the second

possibility. In the realisation of it he has shown the inestimable riches of his goodness, forbearance, and long-suffering.

Sin, introduced into the soul of man, which remains the subject of natural law, even when it has despised the moral law—sin works itself out into a life and becomes a definite element in the *cosmos*, according to the law stated above, concerning an anomaly under the operation of constant forces. And in a probationary world, sorrow, pain, and toil, would be—

1. The witnesses of the divine disapprobation;
2. The discipline of virtue and piety;
3. The instruments of providential control.

But if they were thus taken up among the instrumentalities of his government, they would wear every mark of design. All these appearances are thus explained on the one hand without surrendering our position concerning the reign of law, and on the other without admitting the horrible idea of a kingdom of evil.

“She comes, she comes! the sable throne behold
Of Night primeval and of Chaos old;
Before her, Fancy’s gilded clouds decay,
And all its varying rainbows die away;
Wit shoots in vain its momentary fires;
The meteor drops and in a flash expires.
As, one by one, at dread Medea’s strain,
The sickening stars fade off the ethereal plain;
As Argus’ eyes, by Hermes’ wand oppressed,
Closed, one by one, to everlasting rest;
Thus, at her fell approach and secret might,
Art after art goes out, and all is night.
See skulking faith to her old cavern fled,
Mountains of casuistry heaped o’er her head;
Philosophy, that leaned on heaven before,
Shrinks to her second cause and is no more.
Religion, blushing, veils her sacred fires,
And, unawares, Morality expires.
Nor public flame, nor private, dares to shine,
Nor human spark is left, nor glimpse divine.
Lo! thy dread empire, Chaos, is restored,
Light dies before thy uncreating word;
Thy hand, great Anarch, lets the curtain fall,
And universal darkness buries all.”—*Dunciad*.

This is all we can properly be called upon to do. The question of the origin of evil presses alike upon all schemes of religious and irreligious thought, and is equally unanswerable by them all. *Why* a revolted prince was permitted to exist and to work evil, is a problem we suppose to be insoluble by finite minds. It may be that we could not receive the solution if it were given us. It may be so simple and obvious that when it is given, we shall be amazed that it had never occurred to us. But one thing we know—that evil, with all its mystery and might, is wielded by a power as sublime in goodness as matchless in force. “The day will declare it.” To that awful resolver of entanglements, and simplifier of complications, and finisher of sore trials, we humbly and undoubtingly remit the innumerable mysteries of life.

The last paragraph of the author’s preface will serve to introduce the topic, with a few suggestions upon which we must close this article:

“I had intended to conclude with a chapter on ‘Law in Christian Theology.’ It was natural to reserve for that chapter all direct reference to some of the most fundamental facts of human nature. Yet without such reference, the reign of law, especially in the ‘realm of mind,’ cannot even be approached in some of its very highest and most important aspects. For the present, however, I have shrunk from entering upon questions so profound, of such critical import, and so inseparably connected with religious controversy. In the absence of any attempt to deal with this great branch of the inquiry, as well as in many other ways, I am painfully conscious of the narrow range of this work.” Pp. 11, 12.

We greatly regret the absence of that chapter, even though the eminently brave and ingenious writer had avoided the subjects of controversy between the churches, and had thus given it but a broken and fragmentary character. It is in consequence of this “reserve,” of course, that so little is said of miracles, and almost nothing of prayer and its answers—though what is said is exceedingly rich and stimulative of thought, (see pages 23–26, 61.) With due diffidence, we offer two or three suggestions on this class of topics.

The common conception of a miracle is, that it is an autocratic setting aside or violation of law. That this is at least a defective account of the matter is seen at once when we reflect that miracles were intended to produce and did produce their results *according to law*. The miraculous loaves and fishes, for example, were offered to the same organs, and to the same result, *i. e.*, nutrition, as those produced naturally. The healing of the palsied man restored his frame to its normal condition, and set his life going again, just where it had run down. Miracles were not disorganising but reorganising agents.

Note, again, that "a miracle would still be a miracle [not only if accomplished by law, but] even though we knew the laws through which it was accomplished, provided those laws . . . were beyond human control. We might know the conditions necessary to the performance of a miracle, although utterly unable to bring those conditions about. Yet a work performed by the bringing about of conditions which are out of human reach, would certainly be a work attesting superhuman power." Pp. 25, 26.

If, now, it be objected that the setting aside of the laws which normally obtain in certain conditions, and the production of effects other than the normal ones, is itself a violation of law, inasmuch as the operation of law is in its very essence necessary, immediate, and invariable—that is precisely the issue we desire to raise.

One of the most general observations of science is this: that *in the various series of laws the higher continually countervails and sets aside the lower*, within certain limits. The operation of that principle is always in favor of organisation; the contrary operation, *i. e.* without those limits, is the general formula of disintegration.

The laws of mechanical attraction are subordinated to chemical forces. These, again, are modified, and even overruled by magnetic, and still more by vital action. And the vital energies in the same way are under allegiance to the mind, and are greatly influenced by its states; though this, we confess, is a very limited monarchy indeed.

But, be it more or less, here is the frustum of a great pyramid; not only law above law, but series dominating series; the higher usually controlling the lower, and thus maintaining the glorious order of nature. And though there are outbursts of volcanic violence, and the strata beneath are hurled through those above, this is a visible and disastrous disorder, and a signal confession of the need, and the blessed reign, of law.

Now, therefore, the question arises: Is this pyramid of systems of laws as incomplete as our account of it thus far? Does the ascending scale break off with man, as a matter of law? Is not the burden of proof thrown on those who assert that it does break off there? those who admit that there is a God, that there are duties, that man is immortal, and yet deny the connections of law between Him and us?

And though we must admit our ignorance of the next gradations of being above us, so far as the light of nature is our teacher, and that thus "the world's great altar-stairs slope *through darkness up*;" yet, have we all reason, and all man's best instincts, and all the "sounds of glory ringing in our ears," to teach us that they slope through this darkness "up to God."

For we are not denied the knowledge where these series end. The point of the pyramid, the zenith of the heavens, the infinite towering consummation of the glory and order of the universe, is Jehovah. His essential attributes are the laws of his being, and his moral attributes are the laws of his nature. Out of his absolute freedom, in his perfect reigning, all his works proceed. The culminating series in the ascending scale of laws is that of the laws of the divine life.

But now, having reached this awful height, and having carried with us the truth that superior systems of law control the inferior in their respective measures, the problem of miracles is already solved, and their alleged inconsistency with the reign of law finally disappears. They are simply the impact of these great first laws upon the (comparatively) temporary and local ones,* and prove the immovable firmness of the throne of God.

* . . . "It might be part of the original plan of things that there should be miraculous interpositions." Analogy, P. II., Ch. II.

It is now logically in order to introduce the kingdom of grace into the realm of law—that blessed interpolation of light into the darkness upon the altar-stairs.

And the first fact that presents itself here is one of which we can never exhaust the significance in any direction: that Jesus Christ, the Son of God, was “made under the law.” The main reference here is undoubtedly to his assumed relations to the moral government of God, his voluntary subjection to both precept and penalty; but this, as we have already seen, was for a reason, and inferred a previous plan still vaster than itself. And this plan reveals itself, not merely in his obedience to the precept, and endurance of the penalty, of what we call pre-eminently “the law.” His bodily and mental frame stand in similar relations to natural law. He hungers; he thirsts; he is weary; he sleeps; he weeps. If they scourge him, his dear flesh breaks; if they crown him with thorns, “his visage is marred more than any man’s” by his trickling blood. When the “broken body” can bear no more, he dies.

Thus, while the central work of his life was to do homage to the highest law, and reconcile it with our salvation, it was an integral part of his work to accept all law within its own domain, and establish the kingdom of grace within the domain of nature. Thus his miracles are never wrought for his own convenience or relief, but always for specific and (so to speak) *official* reasons. His parables, as Trench so forcibly shows, every where imply, and rest upon, the analogy—more, the inward and vital identity—between the phenomena of nature and the facts of grace.*

One other remark. The life of grace in the soul is not only begun in us in accordance with the general laws of our being, as so many divines have said and shown; but it develops upon certain vital laws—opens out from within, as all finite life must, under a preëstablished plan peculiar to itself. It is the grafted “branch” upon the vine; it is the “wheat” growing in the field; it is the grain of mustard seed, or the fig-tree in the vineyard. One of the summary commandments is—“*Grow in grace.*”

* On Parables; Introduction, p. 19, *seq.*

But this spiritual life, though it be peculiar, is not all isolated. It is *inlaid* in the life of nature, both inwardly and outwardly, with the most exquisite joinery. It inhabits the body, and informs the mind, and lives in a marvellous partnership with them. It is both the subject and the object of the providential government. It threads with its own gold the whole tissue of human history. And in all these respects it is, beyond all question, a province within the universal reign of law.

And now, if it should be objected that there is no room left, in this view, for that personal and vital union of God with the regenerate soul, which is the most precious part of its inheritance; we reply that this is precisely that "peculiarity" which we have repeatedly mentioned. Every department of the vast kingdom of God is characterised by some law of its own—some principle at least not so prominently applied elsewhere. And the special law of the spiritual kingdom is the law of personal union with God by faith through grace.

Miracles on the one hand, and the laws of gracious life on the other, are like the great timbers and bars of iron that are built into the walls of great structures, to bind the parts together. They "lodge" amid the ordinary phenomena of nature, and they tower into the sublimest heights of grace. Jesus Christ is thus seen to be the chief corner-stone, not merely of the Church, but of all that immense edifice of the love and power of God, of which the Church is the crown, the beautiful consummation. The mere mineral world is the base, not without wise and good laws of its own. Each successive remove upward is finer and yet finer built. The Church is "gold, and silver, and precious stones" built in; yea, living stones. Then dimness veils a mighty space; but from the height of heaven flashes, sun-like, the throne of the King.

"As some tall cliff that lifts his awful form,
Swells from the vale, and midway leaves the storm,
Though round its breast the rolling clouds are spread,
Eternal sunshine settles on its head."

ARTICLE IV.

AUTOBIOGRAPHY.

Biography is a department of writing fraught with peculiar interest. In examining public libraries the writer has remarked that the shelves containing personal memoirs are the most frequented, with the single exception of those that hold the novels, or romances, as they are sometimes called. We naturally admire those who have sought *true* distinction; for there is a difference between the notoriety of a showman and the eminence of a philosopher. The contrast is striking between Dr. Chalmers and any divine who would have made a comic chaplain to Robin Hood of Sherwood Forest. At all periods of the world there have been pretenders; but like discarded fossils, they experienced the degradation for which they were designed. Whilst such are buried in obscurity, we cherish the memory of those who have aimed at noble objects, and we instinctively trace the steps by which they achieved their eminence and accomplished the great purposes of life. Life has been called a pilgrimage, and we are curious to know when and where the pilgrim started, the arid tracts over which he passed, the hills he may have outstripped, and each oasis on which he found a temporary repose. It has been likened to a voyage by periodical writers in the reigns of Queen Anne and George III. We feel anxious to find out what storms assailed the mariner, or whether the waves were level, and whether the green lawns of the sea correspond to the green spots of the desert. In the voyage alluded to, how many statesmen, heroes, and poets have been wrecked.

There is no dispute about the advantage derived from general biography. The question has long since been decided. It is a conquest gained by literature over popular ignorance; and in the use of the victory we are made acquainted with various classes of men, from speculative philosophers to useful mechanics. What a deprivation would it be to seal such a fountain of instruction, coupled as it has often been, with sparkling inci-

dent. But autobiography is still open to discussion, and we propose to offer a few remarks on the subject, which may go for what they are worth. The writer wishes to be its advocate without impinging on the views of any who may differ in their opinions. The objections, however, are for the most part confined to the Simon-pures, both of the Christian and literary world.

Self-biography is said to be closely allied to self-complacency. It engenders a feeling of personal consequence. The man rates himself at more than he was rated by the world. His virtues will be sent to the front, but his faults ordered to the rear of his book. He will not write with impartiality; but his leanings, like the tower of Pisa, will always be in one direction. Far be it from the writer to advocate anything that ministers to human vanity. The man who burns incense to self and disperses its clouds among his admirers, must expect the fate of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, in a moral if not miraculous sense. But we apprehend that the objector is needlessly alarmed. We have glanced over a number of autobiographies, and compared the objections with the facts; but our limits will not admit of more than the selection of a few examples. We will take the memoir of himself by Watson, Bishop of Landaff, and what do we read? Why, murmurs about the poor village in Glamorgan to which he was sent, complaints about the salary of four thousand pounds sterling, the mistake of the Premier in giving him such a rusty mitre, and sundry other grievances rather too numerous to be mentioned. If Peter had gone on after that fashion, we doubt whether he would ever have been installed as Pope. The prelate places himself in a most unenviable position, and we regret it, for he had done good service in rebuking the temerity of Tom Paine, the Deist and Jacobin. The impression produced by the whole volume is painful, and leads to the belief that the Bishop on the Tof was acquainted with the externals far more than the internals of the Christianity he defended. Religion is not regarded by him as something stereotyped in the heart. This may be thought uncharitable by some, but not so in the presence of revealed truth. We take up the *Life of Scott*, the prelimi-

naries of which were written by the Commentator. And what do we read but that when professing to have been called to the ministry he committed the sin of Ananias and Sapphira? He tells us that he went into the sacred office destitute of all piety, and to shear instead of saving the flock. *Vide* the "Force of Truth," *passim*. The same is true of Chalmers and Legh Richmond. These are startling disclosures, and it is almost a question whether the blushes of these excellent men ought to have been made visible to the public. More than forty years have gone by since the writer has seen the Life of Fuller, who preached at Kettering, Northampton, England; but if memory serves him right, the depreciation of self was about the most conspicuous feature in the book. The reader could find no silver lining to the cloud of unworthiness in which the luminary seemed to live. This morbid feeling might have been the result of natural causes, but the fact has been correctly stated. Southey alleges that the author of Pilgrim's Progress has made himself too great a sinner. The Keswick Recluse glosses over and explains away the transgressions which gave to Bunyan the keen convictions he has recorded. It is a pity that Southey ever undertook to portray religious characters. For reasons which might be given, he was not fitted to the task. His portrait of Wesley was a failure, and that of Whitefield a caricature. His "Book of the Church" is written in a bland and elegant style, and he says some fine things about the Smithfield and Oxford martyrs; but he was such a changeling, both in religion and politics, that had he lived to these Puseyite times, he would have cast a shadow over the blaze in which those illustrious confessors were consumed. The heart knows its own bitterness; and a formalist, as Southey was, he could not judge the moral condition of Bunyan or fathom the depth of his superinduced convictions. There is a monkish legend at Subiaco, Italy, that St. Benedict was so beset by his sins that he rolled himself among nettles and that the nettles were all metamorphosed into roses. And unless we feel the brambles of sin, we may never wear the flowers of Sharon on our scallops in our pilgrimage through the wilderness. So thought Bunyan. But instances need not be multiplied, for

their name is legion. This, however, may be a peculiarity, confined for the most part to Christian biography. Religious men are apt to dwarf themselves just as the people of Japan reduce their trees. They can bring down a robust oak to the dimensions of a green-house by stopping the sap of the tree. Why is this so often done by Christian men? Because objects external to themselves are to be magnified. When we reflect on the magnitude of the sun, our planet scarcely rises to the dignity of an asteroid; and humility has always been the best stand-point from which to view the mysteries of revelation. But how is it with that species of autobiography which is purely literary? Do not its writers seek after self-exaltation? It must here be borne in mind that personal memoirs are not usually written with a view to publication during the natural life of their authors. It is true that Hayley was an exception to this rule; but we may kindly excuse him, from the fact that Eastham, his patrimonial seat in Sussex, England, was about to be sold, and of course he was blameless in resorting to any honorable expedient to raise money. These self-records are prepared in view of that honest hour in which we become indifferent to the censure or the applause of the world. The incentives to vanity for the most part lose their force. The writer would not have advised Horace Walpole to have written his own life, because it would have been made up of gossip which had reached Strawberry Hill; nor Macaulay, for he would have dogmatized, even to inspiring disgust; nor Lamartine, for his vanity was of too ponderous a kind. Self-praise is no praise, and stands in opposition to the Proverbs of Solomon. Nor would we have advised Sam Johnson, for he would have latinized so much that he could not have taken the salient points of his own character. But we wish that Addison had taken pen in hand for the purpose already designated, for it would have been done with an archness characteristic of the man; or Walton, because he told so naturally the lives of others; or Goldsmith, because he was artless as the Vicar of Wakefield; or Sir Walter Scott, because his playful vanity led him to criticise his own works; or Irving, for he called himself nothing but a scribbler. The truth is, that men of letters who review their own

existence have shown a sensitiveness to the errors they may have committed, and an ingenuousness in making them known. But give their lives to others than themselves, and the biographer immediately finds a Chevalier Bayard in his subject. There must be no spots in the luminary given into his keeping. He must shine at all events, even if the heavens fall that hold the orb. Miss Seward set herself to the task of writing the Memoir of Dr. Darwin; and what is it but a tissue of indiscriminate laudation? The lady supposed that she shone in the exaggerated shining of the provincial doctor. The physician of Litchfield was respectable in his profession, but a free-thinker and deist—the *magnus Apollo* doubtless of his neighborhood—and he ambitiously aspired in his botanic garden to rival Lucretius as a philosophical poet. Like the Roman, he leaned to atheism; but Lucretius wrote some sublime poetry, whilst that of Darwin resembles a huge bed of glittering sand. Who can stand the pomp of Miss Birney in the memoir of her father, who was a teacher of music, and no doubt an amiable man; but it would have been well to have asked whether he had ever achieved anything worthy of a volume. He took home a straw from the broom of Dr. Johnson when he could find nothing else as a relic. He had occasion to cross the Alps, and from the biography one would infer that he had either borne them on his shoulders or that he had set them to dancing on the point of a cambric needle. There is but a step from the sublime to the ridiculous. What man of correct taste can endure the swollen biographical sketches of Gilfillan, or the grandiloquence of Carlyle in magnifying slight incidents into great events, as he does everywhere, whether in his *Life of Burns* or the *Prussian Frederick*? Small incidents have been used to create great results; but our eloquence must be reserved for the consequences in which we may admire the infinite wisdom of the great First Cause.

Now let us suppose that a man is preparing to write the life of any individual, whether the subject were a statesman, soldier, divine, litterateur, artisan, or any thing you please in the varied departments of society. What is the first inquiry which the biographer uniformly makes before entering on his

allotted task? Has the deceased left any record of himself which can start me in the work? Has he designated the time and place at which he was born? for no one knows the locality where Homer first saw the light; and there is the same uncertainty about Knox, the great Scottish reformer. We cannot settle the time by two years when Napoleon I. appeared at Ajaccio, or when Oliver Goldsmith drew his first breath among the sham-rocks of Pallas. If no record has been left, the inquiry may be made, has he left any diary like the one kept by Pepys in London, which included the great fire and the great plague? for biographical materials have been often found in journals, especially when kept in times of popular excitement. Indeed, fictitious ones have been published; but happily it is not difficult to distinguish between truth and fiction. What is the chaff to the wheat? Should this resource fail, there is a call for the letters of the deceased, though some of them may have been confidential, or written by a dash of the pen, and in moments of literary gaiety. The Life of Cowper, by Hayley, is made exclusively in this way. There is but a scanty portion of original composition in the work. The same is true of the Memoir of Hannah More. The letters are by no means devoid of interest; but we ask, by what authority the communications of the Barley Wood Lady were excluded from the volumes, which were addressed to *Dissenters*? Strange that letters to Walpole the deist could pass muster, and those to the Rev. Wm. Jay are set aside. The calumniator of the unfortunate Chatterton is preferred to a man who had rough-hewed his way through difficulties into the polished circles of Bath. Even some of the Scottish and English nobility, who flocked to that place of fashionable resort, went home healed of their moral, if not of their natural infirmities. Under his ministrations they caught their first view of the river of life, and the bloom of that tree, the leaves of which are for the healing of sensual individuals, as well as of blinded nations. And how did he effect such benign results, except by convincing the button-hole gentry that they were all noughts, unless the *one* Mediator would place himself at the head of the row, for he was King of kings, and Lord of lords?

We regret that any of the letters of Burns were ever published. He was not good at prose composition. The letters of Thomson were published; his songs are very superior to those of the poet. The taste of Burns was often coarse, and his letters betray an ambition to shine. No man should aspire to be grand, unless he be content to reach the sublime through the medium of simplicity. The best prose sentence that ever emanated from the peasant bard, is the following: "The muse of Coila found me at the plough, and threw over me her inspiring mantle." We equally regret that Moore should have made such lavish use of Byron's letters, for some of them are remarkable for a vulgar profanity; and even profane men have generally shunned this sin in their private correspondence. We will venture to say, that all the eyes of Argus would have failed to detect the slightest irreverence in the letters of Sir Robert Boyle; but Byron was a different sort of personage. His intellect was brilliant, but his moral character was so detestable that we supposed it incapable of being calumniated. But strange to say, even he has not escaped an article which appeared in the pantheistic *Atlantic*. We imagine it must have crept into that work when its editors were asleep. These remarks naturally lead to the following statement: If in a hundred biographies the private records of men have been used to help out the writers, why may not any individual prepare his own memoir? It is a privilege guaranteed to the plainest yeoman, if any thing has occurred to him worth the telling; and if our life has been a Persian tale, no one can possibly relate it so well as the one by whom it has been enjoyed. A man, so to speak, can pursue himself into every lane, and round every angle, and through all the windings of his pilgrimage. He can mark his own deviations from the right line, for they are engraven on his memory, and defy all erasure. His sins he need not confess, for we hold that God alone is Lord of the conscience. He knows better than any one else the objects that he loved, the pursuits which gave him pleasure, the temptations by which he was assailed, the disappointments to which he was subjected, the breaking away of clouds, and the brightening prospects by which he was cheered. The German auto-

biographers are remarkable for the minuteness of the details into which they enter. If one of them happen to be born near a mountain, knoll, milla, copse or strip of meadow land—the writer never fails to attempt the descriptive. Not a few of them have risen from the obscurest poverty; but they are not averse to confessing the fact. This is true of Stilling, a Westphalian, who rose from the humblest kind of life to be Aulic Counsellor to the Grand Duke of Baden; and perhaps Baden never saw in any of its circles so profound a believer in a special providence. This cannot be said of Herder, Goethe, Schiller, Körner, Wieland, *cum multis aliis*. So far as literature was concerned, these Germans seem to have lived in a green-house; but in all that concerned their immortal interests they lived on an Alpine avalanche. Their libraries were but shelves of polar snow. There is quite a surprising sentence in one of the letters of Schiller to Körner. He says “the home of Goethe is a Gehenna.” We infer from this letter, that the Wiemar dramatist was living in violation of all laws both human and divine.

Juvenile days are apt to fill some space in every species of biography. The boy is generally supposed to foreshadow the man. Both Pope and Wordsworth were of this opinion, and the opinion has been confirmed in thousands of instances. Youth is the Arabia Felix of life. It occurs before we begin to clamber over rocks, or to feel the loneliness of age. Old age, at least without piety, must be dreary. It was like Arabia Deserta to Humboldt the atheist, though he was not without a free access to the palace of Sans Souci. We quote his own words: “There is nothing beyond the present. This life is our little all.” He died with no paradise in view. Its bosky bournes and groves of long repose were not even mentioned when the heartless philosopher was dying. It is difficult to see how any outsider to the man himself can depict the days of youth, when the boy ranged abroad without restriction—rearing castles in the air, and creating Edens never to be fully realised, for anticipation is seldom fulfilled by possession. Such is the experience of youth before we mingle in the sympathies, and encounter the loss of uphill life. Feuds may arise in more mature life, love grow

cold, friends may become estranged, disappointments may take place, bereavements may crush us down; and though existence be still sweet, the golden coat which was wrapt round the sweetness has been stripped off by painful reality. Nor are men of eminence exempt from severe trials. How did Pericles, Burke, and Beattie, mourn over the coffins of their sons; and Cuvier, Lowth, Fillmore, and Webster, over the shrouds of their daughters, and perhaps mental improvement only added to the keenness of their sorrows? Autobiographers are apt to dwell on the juvenile period of their existence with fondness. This is a striking feature in the memoirs of Marmontel, and the narrative is highly entertaining. Who can be at a loss for materials? for it is the period at which education is begun, and every man, whatever the position may be to which he has been elevated, loves to recall his school days. Bacon, when High Chancellor of England, if he had tried, could not have forgotten his hornbook; and it is certain that Goldsmith did not lose the recollection of his Pallas preceptor, or Shenstone of his Shrewsbury preceptress. It may seem puerile to talk of the satchel, the bell, the holiday, the tussle; but they leave reminiscences which cannot be effaced. Chateaubriand left a work evidently intended to be posthumous. The vicissitudes through which he passed were so various that no biographer could have followed him without great perplexity. We doubt not the authenticity and genuineness of all the facts he has stated from his boyish days spent in one of the castles of Brittany to the close of his long and chequered life. He was somewhat imaginative, but at times very forcible as a writer; and his denunciations of the murder of the French duke, seized at midnight on the neutral territory of Baden, are thrilling, and even terrible. Alas! in our late civil war, such seizures were common; but the captured were not dukes. They were something better, however, for they were free citizens of the United States. Chateaubriand, when in this country at the close of the last century, predicted the disintegration of these States; but we shall not enter into any speculations on our future destiny. Except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain.

In connexion with this branch of our subject, we remark that some eminent men, in passing through the process of their education, have encountered difficulties with the several colleges to which they were sent. Tasso, Milton, Locke, Penn, Gibbon, and Shelley, are certainly found in this category. Shelley probably paraded his irreligion throughout his college, for he afterwards wrote himself atheist on the brow of mountains which God weighed in scales, as if they had been but walnuts in his sight. Gibbon embracing Papistry, and Penn Quakerism, might have produced the eddies to which they were exposed in the quiet stream of academic life. Locke might have expressed political opinions at variance with those of his professors; but we would give a fair hearing to all the supposed culprits. Their own pens could have given the best narration of all the facts; and this is one advantage of autobiography, that men can write in their own defence, and disperse every cloud of suspicion. Who can blame Marshal Grouchy for vindicating himself against the aspersions of Napoleon, touching the battle of Waterloo? This he has done triumphantly. It's all gammon about Blücher's turning the fate of the day. Napoleon was defeated horse, foot, and dragoons, before Blücher appeared, notwithstanding Headley, Abbot, *et id omne genus*. There is nothing more pleasing in biography than the domestication of distinguished men in families, though they may be remote from cities. Dr. Johnson felt the charm of this in writing the life of Dr. Watts, who found a home for six and thirty years at the seat of Sir Thomas Abney, about two miles from London—an extraordinary instance of refined and elegant hospitality. Perhaps the window of the divine may have overlooked the lawn on which light and shade so often alternated. The grasses of England are of a greener hue than those of our country; and among rural embellishments, the Christian poet probably hummed his spiritual song on walks bordered by the violets of spring, or by the roses of June. He made piety, rather than ambitious poetry, to take the lead in his hymns; and, like the rod of Aaron, that piety swallowed up inferior things; whilst it bloomed in the sweet blossoms peculiar to the hill of Zion. But this was not the only instance of domestication.

We find Thomson at Hagley; Swift at Moorpark; Gibbon at the Sussex seat of Lord Sheffield; Coleridge at Highgate; Locke at Oates; and Sir William Jones at Wimbledon, the residence of Earl Spencer. Swift and Gibbon are no favorites of ours; but Locke and Sir William are not without many admirers. We wish that each of them had given an autobiography presenting a picture of their indoor life during the periods of their seclusion. We should like to know more of Sir Francis Masham, and of his lady, who was the daughter of Cudworth; and a little more about High Laver, the hamlet in Essex, near which stood the residence that sheltered the great and good metaphysician when sick and dying. We should like to know whether Prior of Down Hall ever rode over from Harlow to see Locke. We suppose not, for his morals were not quite so good as those of the philosopher. It is absurd to say that a retired man can find nothing about which to scribble. Why, Wordsworth wrote up all the lake country, because his cottage was on a hill, and he could see Grassmere, Winder, and Derwent, at a glance. What said Lady Austen to Cowper: "Write about any thing. Write about this sofa." There was once a people who could not make bricks without straw. But there is an abundance of straw in the country, and therefore we say, "Go to, ye are idle, ye are idle, and we hope you may build Pithom and Rameses as monuments of industry." Sir William Jones was a man of great diligence—but this article must not be protracted. We wish, however, that he had written his own memoirs.

It is to be hoped that autobiography may open still wider fields for the entertainment of readers than it has yet disclosed. If executed in a modest way, no one ought to object. Locke wrote his own epitaph, for fear, no doubt, that some one might try to make him a great man. The Rev. Dr. Wilson, of Philadelphia, did the same thing, and probably for the same reason. If biography be properly written, it might to some extent abate the burning thirst which now prevails for novels like those by Dickens, Thackeray, and Collins. We should like to know what intellectual delta will ever be fertilised by the overflow of our railroad literature. The Nilometer shows twenty-eight Paris feet,

and a famine will be the consequence. They tell us that Lord Lytton is very low spirited, because he has written so many novels. The inundation must be reduced, before Egypt, or even the boastful United States, can become an intellectual granary. In biography we want to know how the minds of its subjects were nursed and developed. This is the most important part of that kind of composition. The admirers of Daniel Webster tell us that he first read the Constitution of the United States printed on a pocket handkerchief. Very well. His mind may have been started in that way, as the jealousy of Othello was nursed in the same way. We wish that John C. Calhoun had left a memoir of himself, for he could have told us what it was that set his wonderful mind on the track of statesmanship. The Scotch have evinced quite a talent for biography. The lives of Knox and his coadjutors George Buchanan and the Melvilles are deeply interesting; and so are those of John Erskine, Beattie, Campbell, and Ladies Yester, Glenorchy, Colquhoun, and the Duchess of Gordon. We can understand perfectly well the sources from which the mind of each one of these individuals was fed. Letters and records of their own are often used; and, after all, every person is the most capable judge of his own feelings, experience, motives, attainments, and aims. Alfieri in his autobiography tells us that he was born with a passion for horses; and he must have been—for he drove fourteen of these animals all the way from England to Piedmont; Gifford, the critic, that he was so poor that he used a part of his leather for a slate, and his awl for a pencil wherewith to work out his algebra. Wilson the ornithologist tells us that he was very hungry on the Delaware, and that he killed a bird, the plumage of which so enchanted him that he determined to explore all our American forests. Addison, according to Miss Aiken, was so alarmed by a threat of his teacher that he spent a night in the hollow of an old tree. Would that the urchin had given us from his own pen his ruminations through that eventful night. We regard the biographical work of Dr. Sprague as evincing great research, and as an honor to the American Church; but cannot any one see at a glance that the work is greatly helped by the

five hundred letters which accompany it from those who knew the men and their peculiarities. Know thyself; and as every one knows himself better than a stranger, we see no harm in a person writing his own life. But should any body differ with us, he will find the writer perfectly tolerant in all his opinions. We have been favored of late with some fine specimens of biography. Among them are lives of Dr. Raffles of Liverpool, and Hamilton of London, and Dr. Miller of Princeton, and Addison Alexander. But it would have been better perhaps had these distinguished individuals written their own memoirs. We may add to these the biographies of Lady Colquhoun, and the late Duchess of Gordon, for these ladies must never be forgotten.

ARTICLE V.

THE NEW CHURCH.

1. *Dr. Van Dyke's Pamphlet, reviewing the Correspondence between the Northern and Southern General Assemblies.* Brooklyn, 23d June, 1870.
2. *Dr. Dabney's Letter to Dr. Van Dyke.* Christian Observer. Louisville, 6th July, 1870.
3. *Proceedings of the Presbyterian Assembly in Philadelphia.* New-York Observer.
4. *The Delegation to the Southern General Assembly.* Princeton Review, Vol. XLII., No. 3, Art. VII.

It is proper to observe at the outset, that whatever may be here said concerning the Northern Church, is uttered from a stand-point as really separate as it would be if that Church occupied a different continent. The nature of the differences, therefore, separating our own organisation from theirs, is dissimilar from the nature of the differences existing between the Southern Presbyterian Church and any other sect of Christians; as, for example, there are more points of resemblance betwixt that

Church and the Free Church of Scotland, than would be found as betwixt the Southern Presbyterians and the Southern Methodists. The Northern Church is a large and powerful body of Christians, holding substantially similar standards, and following a similar church order; and it is not probable that any controversies touching these points could arise in the proximate future between them and ourselves. But these controversies are tacitly understood to exist perpetually between us and our Methodist or Baptist brethren, with whom we agree to differ in the bonds of Christian brotherhood.

In the next place, it should be noted that the mere fact of existence in different sections, does not create this difference between the Northern and Southern Churches. Ten years ago, the General Assembly of the Old School Presbyterian Church was composed of delegates from all parts of the country—north, south, east, and west. When Christians, North and South, were, in the providence of God, separated by long lines of hostile armies, the churches in the two sections naturally fell into independent organisations for the time. But, with the return of peace, and with the reestablishment of United States authority, these separated brethren would just as naturally have fallen into the old organisation, but for positive ecclesiastical legislation, which forbade it in distinct terms. And while it is true, that many unhappy deliverances, uttered with due solemnity by General Assemblies, stood in the way of the return of cordial relations; it is also true, that the most formidable obstacles to reunion were the deliverances that were made *since* the close of the civil strife. The best Christians are still human, and there was doubtless great need for mutual forbearance to allay the sectional feelings enkindled by doleful years of warfare. But no manifestation of a desire for the restoration of fraternal relations was ever presented by the Old School Church, North, from 1861 to the recent date of its extinction. It uttered but one word, addressed to the professors of the same faith south of the Potomac, and that word was "anathema," with the single exception of the sending an overture to the Southern Church at its last Assembly in 1869. And, if this solitary act of grace, in the proffer of

fraternal greetings, had not been invested with the solemnity belonging to a death-bed confession, it would have been positively absurd, from its contrast with violently belligerent acts of the same body. Instance—the voting of \$5,000 from its Publication fund to contest our claims to church property within our lines. This is a matter of sober history.

Let it be observed, therefore, once more, that the identity of the Southern Church does not depend upon any official act of any of its courts. With the new organisation now under examination it has never been identified. Indeed, to the ruling element in that body it has been antagonistic for more than forty years; and since the formation of the Free Church of Scotland, the identity of the latter with the Old School Church in America, in very essential particulars, has been far more apparent. Because, independently of a general resemblance in outward forms and in church government, the Old School Presbyterian Church and the New School body have had nothing in common for thirty years. In doctrine, which is the essential particular, these two have been as violently antagonistic as could be possible with two Protestant organisations. For, while there has been no authoritative and formal denial of Calvinistic standards on the part of the excised body, the preaching of its most prominent teachers and the drift of its literature have been decidedly opposite to the acknowledged standards of the orthodox Church. As it retained the name, and perhaps the polity of the Presbyterian Church, it also retained the enmity and opposition of Episcopal bodies, more strongly manifested in their case than towards Congregationalists, for example, only because the New School Church presented a more combined and symmetrical form inviting assault. In doctrine, as preached from New School pulpits, Methodists, Congregationalists, and any other Arminian sects, were substantially at agreement with the expounders of Auburn theology. None of these have attained to any prominence by controversial discussions with old forms of heresy, mainly because their lack of scholarship prevented.

Now the drift of this organisation since 1837, when it took formal shape, has certainly not been towards orthodoxy. The

great bulk of its preaching has been flaming exhortations to do, mingled with shadowy and inconclusive exhortations to believe. Because the stern logic of a Calvinistic creed, pure and simple, has found no place in any New School pulpit. The Arminian expounder is longing for the salvation of souls, and all other considerations are overshadowed by the urgency of this mighty interest. He preaches his hearers "into the kingdom"—that is, into the visible kingdom, by the use of any appliances he can secure. His strong argument is the native ability of the sinner to repent and believe; and he employs anxious benches, or any other invention by which he can induce the sinner to "commit himself" on the Lord's side. But your Calvinist does not dare to employ any of these agencies. He announces the commands of God in God's own language, and prophecies to dead bones which he *knows* he cannot restore to life. The total helplessness of the sinner is his grand argument, when he presents the fulness of Christ. He dares *not* tell the man, dead in trespasses and sins, that he is able to save himself.

Stripped of all its drapery the contest which resulted in the separation of 1837, was upon this naked principle—human ability on one side, and divine sovereignty on the other. But the New Schoolmen did not abate one jot of their ancient deliverances when the reunion was accomplished. Indeed, the leaders of the orthodox Unionists, with ostentatious zeal, proclaimed their anxiety to bury those unhappy disputes in eternal forgetfulness. The precious doctrines of grace, for which they fought a good fight thirty years ago, were of little worth in comparison with organic union. The eternal headship of the Lord Christ was a matter of secondary moment when compared with the growth and glory of a big, Union, loyal, and national church. The illustration of Herod and Pilate reviving ancient friendship over the dishonor of the Nazarene, has been frequently used in commenting upon this union; but it is terribly apposite.

These pages are not the place, nor is the present the time, to review the history of the two churches up to the date of the union. The New School body with remarkable unanimity con-

structed and issued political platforms from 1861 to 1869. At the last session of its last Assembly, a prominent member offered a paper containing a formal declaration of war against England for the non-payment of the Alabama claims. The other adopted political papers, year by year, from 1861 to 1869; and its last dying act was the appropriation of \$5,000 from its Publication fund to pay legal expenses in church property litigations. In the South the universal feeling is that the title to this property is, beyond dispute, in the Southern Church. In the North, many contributors to the Publication Board think the aforesaid appropriation was illegal and unwarranted. Whether or not the Alabama claims ought to be settled, is not the question here. Whether or not the Northern Christians should seek to wrest church property from the hands of their poorer brethren, is not now under discussion. Any one who is curious upon this point may profitably consult the *Southern Presbyterian Review*, Vol. XXI, No. 2, Article 5, where the whole subject is thoroughly discussed. But these two crowning and culminating acts are instanced merely to indicate the *animus* of the two bodies when they passed out of ecclesiastical history to reappear under a new organisation.

One other remark is necessary. Before the two Assemblies fell asleep, they passed a concurrent declaration in these words: "No rule or precedent which does not stand approved by both bodies shall be of any authority in the reunited body, except so far as such rule or precedent may affect the rights of property founded thereon." Whatever may have been the object of this declaration, one cannot repress his admiration of the ingenuity that invented it. It is not probable that the two bodies spontaneously uttered this deliverance. The verbal exactness forbids this conclusion. But the inventor had not fully studied the "fatal force and imposture of words," or the liberal quotation of the joint declaration in the Louisville Assembly was a blunder. Because, by implication, the adroit mixture of oil and honey is transformed into gall, by simply looking at the converse of the proposition. Suppose we read: "All rules and precedents, which do stand approved by both bodies, shall be of full au

thority in the reunited body!" By this reading, you confer immortality upon all the extra-legal and extra-religious legislation of the old bodies, and leave the Southern Christians withering under their joint anathemas. No doubt can exist in any sane mind, that the two Northern bodies, the poles apart in all else, were at agreement in their loyalty to Cæsar and their hatred of slavery and rebellion. So the new organisation to which we have arrived at last, emerges into the sunlight. *Ecce Ecclesia.*

I. The first point for consideration, in looking for the true status of this Church, is indicated by the title of the present article. Is it, in point of fact, a New Church?

It is worthy of note that members of the Louisville Assembly held precisely opposite views upon this point. Those who argued and voted against the pastoral letter and the instructions to the Conference Committee, proceeded upon the assumption that the Philadelphia body could not be held responsible for the acts of Old or New Schools. In so far as these former organisations had injured the South, they had paid the penalty. They had both been shot dead by the same popgun, and at one discharge. The fulminating powder was brotherly love. The fatal projectile was "no rule or precedent." On the other hand, there were some brethren, hampered by old-fashioned notions, who inquired in vigorous Saxon how the artillery of two dead armies could be employed by the new one, unless it had inherited or adopted the old quarrels. It was not an old army reinforced by deserters from the enemy's camp. On the contrary, *both* armies had laid down their weapons, spiked their guns, buried their tomahawks. All the trophies won in a warfare of thirty years' duration were sunk in an ocean of oblivion. The writers of text-books on either side, asked permission to withdraw their publications, and to issue new editions, expurgated and amended. Such old warriors as had won a deathless renown during the "thirty years' war," Dr. Robert J. Breckinridge for example, had to take back seats, unless they could "keep step to the music of the holy 'union.'" Here was a leader, whose illustrious record, in the long fight for orthodoxy, could not be obliterated

even by his course since 1861, absolutely shelved, hustled out by a multitude of cold-shoulders, because he refused to swallow Doctors Barnes and Duffield. It is not likely that any one questioned the genuineness of his hatred of Southern rebellion.

If you ask any of the dignitaries of the New Church, which one of the old bodies *admitted* the other into its communion, you will find the whole idea of tests and compromises steadily ignored. No questions were asked. The union was formed "upon the basis of the standards;" but the New Schoolmen had all along professed to accept the Westminster Confession "for substance of doctrine." This is another example of the "fatal force and imposture of words." The substance of doctrine—if Calvinistic theology is meant—has been diluted so thoroughly, that none of the old taste is left. It is not a substance, but a shadow. Perhaps it may be said, that Old School pulpits at the North, with a few exceptions, have also dealt in diluted doctrine since 1861, "when they added a new Trinity to their creed—the union, the war, and the negro."

So the novelty of the new organisation seems to consist simply in the slight change in external relations. New synodical and presbyterial boundaries to be established, new appointments in the several boards, with the suppression of natural jealousies by double appointments in some cases—and the experiment is fairly started. Its first and solitary step, in the way of aggressive warfare, was the appointment of a Conference Committee, with fraternal greetings to the Southern Church, and the discharge of the same committee without the formality of the projected conference. The possible drift of the New Church is therefore to be sought in this double act.

II. The first question presented, then, relates to the appointment of this committee. What motive induced it?

Nothing could be more simple than to accept the apparent, the surface-view, and say that brotherly kindness and charity induced this fraternal greeting. Dr. Van Dyke forcibly asserts as much, in his pamphlet; and this statement might be allowed to pass, were it not for the subsequent action of the same body. If it was brotherly kindness that appointed the committee, what

was it that discharged it? All that Philadelphia had asked of Louisville was granted, and a little more. They asked for a corresponding committee, and they got one; with published instructions. Dr. Van Dyke says the instructions amounted to an indictment "flung across the threshold." Dr. Dabney replies, that there verily was an indictment, but the "instructions" were only a counter-plea. The *New York Observer*, speaking editorially and by the card, says the Southern response was precisely what it expected. Now it does not need an algebraical analysis to get a result from these premises. Simple induction reveals the motive thus: The object of the New Church was attained when its greeting had brought forth the expected Southern reply, and its committee was discharged, because its work was accomplished. The olive branch had been offered to a lot of petulant children, who rudely stripped it of its oleaginous fruit and verdant foliage and turned it into a rod for the back of the peacemaker. Thus the Southern Church stands arraigned at the bar of Christian public opinion, while the Northern new body coolly appropriates "the beatitude of Christ." If any one supposes this is an extreme statement, let the doubter read Dr. Van Dyke's pamphlet.

Not one word of the present article would have been written, if any less worthy name than his had been presented as championing the New Church. Those who know this eminent Christian gentleman best love him most. He witnessed a noble confession through long years of sore trial, and quailed not when this confession demanded more than ordinary courage. When the union was projected, he fought zealously against it. His letters, written while the controversy was pending, exhausted the subject, and were far more "terrible" in their resistless, merciless logic, than any "indictments" ever framed by Southern Christians. The crowning calamity, in the calamitous union, is his involvement in the fatal vortex. The most painful part of the present discussion is the inevitable presence of Dr. Van Dyke in the forefront of the New Church, and therefore in the forefront of the contest with which its history begins.

His pamphlet, which is the main matter under review, con-

tains the correspondence between Philadelphia and Louisville, with the addresses delivered in both cities, and his comments upon the whole story. With his present views upon the subject, nothing could be more fair and truthful than these comments. That these views do not precisely accord with the opinions expressed in his letters to the Philadelphia *Presbyterian*, is a misfortune. That they somewhat misrepresent the actual *animus* of both Philadelphia and Louisville, is the natural consequence of his "change of base."

For, notwithstanding Dr. Van Dyke's earnest disclaimer, he *has* changed his ground. He boldly avows that he takes back no word of his former manly protests against the various evil acts of Assemblies. But the painful truth is, his prominent position in the controversy, voluntarily assumed, potentially obliterates his former record. Personally, he retains his friendship and brotherly affection for his Southern friends. Officially, he promptly assumes the posture of positive antagonism.

Under the old law, when the body of a murdered man was found in the field, the distance was carefully measured, and the city nearest to the corpse was obliged to purge itself of guilt by formal denial before God of even the knowledge of the crime, and by certain prescribed ceremonies. Now, as Dr. Dabney clearly shows, this unwholesome corpse "across the threshold," which so annoyed Dr. Van Dyke, was not done to death within our lines. The carcass was found to be nearer to Philadelphia than to Louisville. That which he calls our indictment was simply a double quotation. As applied to the acts of Northern Assemblies, it was a quotation from their Minutes. As applied to the happy reunion, it was a quotation from Dr. Van Dyke's letters. So here we have the first evidence that he looks at the past from a new position, and the known events of history are warped out of their plain teachings by reason of a mental strabism. To a mind like Dr. Van Dyke's the assumption of "newness of life"—a life evoked out of two heaps of dead ashes, was a self-evident absurdity. He knew, as well as we know, that twenty churches in East Tennessee, transferred to the Northern Assembly by military authority, are this day counted

among the inherited possessions of the reunited Church. And he also knew, as well as we know, that the prosperity and usefulness of these churches are hindered by their present ecclesiastical relations. Consequently his innate nobleness of soul forbade him to build any argument upon the innocence of the new-born Church.

One cannot fail to be touched by the warm-hearted affection with which our author spoke of the Louisville Assembly, even while the mortification over the failure of his mission was new. It is not difficult for any ingenuous Christian to enter into his feelings. His position was peculiar, owing to the relations he had sustained towards the three bodies at the points of the triangle. His generous friendship for the Southern Church was constantly manifested while that Church was clad in sackcloth, and now that she is attiring herself in her beautiful garments once more, his affection is not lessened. His constant protest against the usurpations of the Old School Assembly North, he boldly renews, on the floor of the first reunited Assembly. But his controversy with Barnes and Beman terminated when the *mariage de convenance*, whose bans he so sternly forbade, was duly solemnized. One thing is certain. His present attitude is the result of due deliberation, and, in his judgment, is in the interest of the cause of Christ. No man who knows him will dream of impugning his motives. And the brightest promise for the future of the New Church, independently of the favor of God, is Dr. Van Dyke's presence within her ample fold.

III. Accepting, then, the correspondence and the consequent controversy as the most salient manifestation of the new organic life, and accepting Dr. Van Dyke as the most able and candid expounder of the new principles, look, in the next place, at the implication contained in his Philadelphia speech. "The peacemaker," he says, "shall inherit in his own soul and before God the beatitude of Christ, even though the olive branch he bears be stripped of its green leaves and torn to a rod for unreasonable man to lay on his own back." There is a good deal implied here besides the beatitude. And now for the sober facts.

Nothing herein must be construed into an apology for Louisville. The Southern Church is content to stand upon that record without note or comment. She does not dread the judgment of the Christian world, and awaits with calm confidence the more searching judgment of the great day. That which was offensive in her reply to the peace-makers was briefly a recital of wrongs which she had endured, wounds which had not been bound up or mollified with ointment, and which would not get well under such slight treatment as the "no rule or precedent" application. Next, she intimated that she received these hurts in the defence of the eternal principles of righteousness, as she understood them, as hinted in her protest against the auspicious union betwixt orthodoxy and broad-churchism, to use the mildest term. Our author asserts that these were her profound convictions, and he carefully warns his colleagues not to mistake these earnest convictions of earnest men for mere sectional prejudice. Indeed, it would not be possible for Dr. Van Dyke to endorse the common and popular cant that ascribes all antagonistic utterances to the imperfectly crushed rebellious spirit of Southern Christians.

Proceeding upon the admission of our author that the sufferings referred to above, were endured for righteousness' sake, we are suddenly brought face to face with another beatitude which he does not notice. It is next to that promised the peace-maker, and belongs to those who are persecuted for righteousness' sake. If the inheritance of the kingdom of heaven depended upon the endurance of this form of persecution alone, it might be suggested that the title of the New Church was not so clear as that of their Southern brethren. Says Dr. Van Dyke: "The pastoral letter addressed to the Old School Church in 1866 in order to vindicate an Assembly whose violent doings now have few, if any defenders, pronounced the Southern Church guilty of the dreadful sin of *schism*, and declared that one of its pastoral letters had uttered *blasphemy*." Discussing the naked question of "persecution," which secures the inheritance of the beatitude, it does not seem likely that the entire capital of the Board of Publication would do any good here—the case is too plain for litigation.

But confining the examination to the peacemakers' beatitude, there are two things asserted which we have endeavored to answer. First, the branch was not genuine olive; and, secondly, the Southern Church did not strip off its artificial foliage, or use it for a rod of castigation. They did not attempt any castigation, in point of fact. All that they said about Old School Assemblies, Dr. Van Dyke had said with intrepid emphasis scores of times before. All that they said about the consummated union, Dr. Van Dyke had said with such vigor of expression, when the union was only projected, that he was excluded from the columns of the *Philadelphia Presbyterian*, and had to get a hearing finally through the *Central Presbyterian* of Richmond.

IV. In commenting upon the Southern Pastoral Letter, and the suggestion therein, that the injurious epithets of former Assemblies should be "squarely withdrawn," Dr. Van Dyke applies the same rule to the Louisville Assembly. Here is his charge: "In the year 1870, the Southern Assembly, in response to our overture for peace, whose presentation by friendly hands and voices drew tears into many of their eyes, proceed to make these these two sweeping and terrible changes against us: First, that we were *fatally* complicated with the State; have *betrayed* the cause and kingdom of our Lord; have, in effect, *taken the crown from the head of Christ*, and, as their pastoral letter expounds it, *bound his Church to the wheels of Cæsar's chariot*. Secondly, that by the union of Old and New School bodies, all the great testimonies of our Church for the doctrines of grace are *totally surrendered*; that we stand now upon an *allowed* interpretation of the standards which opens the door to all heresies; that we are (as their pastoral letter explains it) 'a sort of broad church, *giving shelter to every creed*, lying between the extremes of Arminianism and Pelagianism on the one hand, and Antinomianism and Fatalism on the other.' Now is there any thing more severe than this in the pastoral letter of the Assembly of 1866 in St. Louis? The phrase may be more courtly; but is the meaning less terrible?" Then our author asks two questions: "Why," says he, "did they not kindly, but firmly, reject us, in God's

name, as the mistaken ambassadors of an apostate Church, who has discrowned their Lord, and bartered away his truth for worldly gain?" And the second triumphant question is: "Do we demand that these charges of the Southern Church against us shall be 'squarely withdrawn,' as the condition precedent to the renewal of friendly intercourse?" The quotations are exact, italics and all.

Those who are learned in the manners and customs of the canine race affirm, that a thorough-bred setter invariably leaves a room when he observes preparations being made to kick him out. And they add, you may whistle, snap your fingers, and cluck to him as much as you please, but he will not reënter that apartment while the memory of the affront lasts. This breed is thin-skinned and aristocratic. But he will wag his tail, and treat you with his accustomed politeness, if you visit him at his kennel. So the answer to the first question is ready. The Louisville people were not only Christians, but they were gentlemen; and the memory of wrongs which no lapse of time can efface, and which can never be rectified by so flimsy a paper as the "no rule" precedent declaration, could] never make them forget their manners. There is a great deal of brutality that passes muster in the world under the name of "rugged" honesty, but no cultivated Southerner practises that kind. It would have been highly indecorous for the Louisville Assembly to offer any different treatment to their guests, to say nothing of the *personal* character of the gentlemen who came to them with official greetings. But all the charges made in their response to these greetings were as undeniably true, while the speeches were being delivered, as afterwards; as true as they were a year ago, when our author wrote those eloquent letters that still live in the memory of all lovers of pure orthodoxy. And no collection of English words could more sharply convey the precise meaning intended, than the reply to which he now objects.

The answer, therefore, to his second question is, that the question is irrelevant. The Southern Church does not desire to remove any obstacles. There are none on her territory. The middle wall of partition is, every foot of it, on Northern soil,

and is the dear inheritance of the New Church. On our side, we have not essayed to climb over it, to break it down, or to crawl into the big body under it; and it will crumble into dust under the iron tooth of time, or fall into fragments amid the throes of the earthquake when the "world shall rock into ruins" at the last day, before the Southern Church will assail it, either with fraternal greetings, or with angry vituperations.

V. Dr. Van Dyke's pamphlet concludes with a letter to the *Louisville Observer and Commonwealth*, in which he reviews the Louisville proceedings, and explains his own personal status in the discussion. If any *touch* of personal resentment, as against this dear Christian brother, had instigated this present article, all semblance of unkind feeling would be dissipated by the perusal of this final letter. But in the large membership of the New Church, there is probably not a man who gives to Dr. Van Dyke a similar place in his affections to that he occupies in the heart of the present writer. As men descend the slope that lies beyond the meridian of life, the friendships and attachments of youth and early manhood are thinned out through various agencies. The school companion, and the acquaintance of riper years, are removed by the stroke of death, or by change of dwelling-place, or by disparity of views and the clash of rival enterprises. So there are not many men who retain a multitude of friendships beyond the high ground of their life-pilgrimage. But those that abide with the traveller are tried friends; and if his pathway happens to be the narrow one, his companions are doubly dear to him, and he clings to them with a tenacity wholly unknown to earlier experience. He does not love many, but he loves the few with a tender and an undying affection. Their joys are his joys, and their griefs are his. It is a vulgar error to suppose that maturer years bring callous indifference. On the contrary, increasing age increases sensitiveness and profundity of regard. And when you add to these conditions the brotherhood that the gospel reveals—when the voyager constantly recognises in his friend the lineaments of their common Lord—then you have the manifestation of a love that no temporal relations can disturb. And such is the love for Dr. Van Dyke,

that, without one moment's intermission, has possessed the writer of these lines. He looks with imperturbable confidence to the enjoyment of an eternity by his side. With such anticipations and with these conditions met, anything else than a perfectly amicable discussion is here wholly impossible. In all that Dr. Van Dyke has spoken and written upon these questions, he has spoken and written with perfect candor, with unfailing courtesy, and with the spirit of a true Christian. It is the fault of his side of the controversy that his arguments have not been more weighty and conclusive; and it is not probable that any lesser light will essay to illuminate the ground he has traversed. With his present ecclesiastical relations, he has an arduous work before him; and it is safe to predict that this work will be worthy of his record.

VI. There remains for examination the article in the July number of the *Princeton Review*, which carves out of the proceedings of the Assembly in Philadelphia, that part of them which relates to the Southern Church. After giving the original resolutions of the new body, the Southern response, and the final resolutions of the Philadelphia Assembly, the reviewer proceeds thus: "The action of our Assembly speaks for itself, and is its own vindication before all Christendom. In the kindly, but considerate and cautious original proposition to the Southern Assembly, in the character of the committee deputed to bear it, in the acceptable presentation of the matter to that body by this committee, and in the final disposal of the subject responsive to the reply given to its proposal, our body has made an admirable exhibition of Christian charity, magnanimity, and forbearance," etc.

No reasonable man can object to these modest expressions of commendation or self-gratulation. If the venerable editor of the *Repertory* may not say these things, who is entitled to sing the praises of the new organisation? How would the Christian world otherwise discover the evidence of magnanimity and forbearance, unless they had thus been designated by authority? To a disinterested looker on, there does not appear to be any special call for the exercise of those virtues in the present case.

That the Philadelphia Assembly, individually and collectively, would have manifested these and kindred graces, under provocation, is violently probable perhaps; but what did they forbear to do in this instance? If they were tempted to utter harsh sentences "responsive to the reply," they were barred by their fatal previous declaration about old rules and precedents; because it was only concerning the things they thus designated that the Louisville document offended. Dr. Van Dyke's pamphlet says the reading of the response from Louisville excited a laugh in Philadelphia, in which he refused to join. If these brethren received our reply as a "little joke," notwithstanding the grave charges therein contained, or indulged in merriment at our expense, Dr. Hodge has vainly wasted a vast quantity of ink in making out the forbearance. Those who win have the right to laugh. If Philadelphia won, its hilarity was appropriate; otherwise, the laugh was, perhaps, sardonic. In either event, there was no place for "forbearance" or "magnanimity," and Dr. Hodge has been unhappy in his choice of terms.

The reviewer expresses his amazement and grief at the outrageous charges and demands of the Southern Church, and says the extra-legal deliverances of former Assemblies are "simply recorded opinions," and the idea of erasing these offensive utterances "is impracticable and absurd." Then he pertinently asks: "Have our Southern brethren, claiming to be the sole surviving heirs of the failing testimonies of our Church, expunged or abrogated the testimony of 1818 on the subject of slavery, which affirms that it 'creates a paradox in the moral system?' " etc.

This is a remarkable question. It is not possible that Dr. Hodge has forgotten the acts of Assemblies before the war, in which this very testimony was formally scattered to the winds. In one of them, the subject was brought before the body by memorial and the nearly unanimous verdict was to this effect: That the Church had no power to legislate upon this topic, and no shadow of authority to impose other tests of communion than those ordained by Christ. In 1860, the Assembly unanimously laid upon the table, without discussion, a paper that

was constructed solely for the purpose of getting an expression of "opinion" upon this subject of slavery. But if these later deliverances had been wanting, it does seem plain enough that the Assembly of 1870 at Louisville certainly spoke with sufficient plainness to clear the skirts of all Southern Presbyterians. Now concerning these politico-religious deliverances, the same writer says: "While there is danger of committing the organised church to the advocacy of the specific measures of political parties, there may be exceptions, on rare occasions, of paramount and overbearing necessity, when the national life is at stake; where there is no room for reasonable doubt or debate, and the Church itself is essentially a unit, *as in some exigencies of the late war.*" The italics are ours. The animus of this reviewer seems to be clearly revealed. "Dr. Beatty, Dr. Musgrave, and others," he says, "while avowing themselves republicans who voted for General Grant," opposed certain resolutions, because "they regarded it as a beginning and precedent for political deliverances by the united church, which might work great mischief in the future." He *naively* says in another place: "If the advocates of the President (Grant) may seek this sanction, *so also may his opponents!*"

There is one other quotation from this Princeton reviewer which needs attention.

"Moreover, was not every pretext for such a plea removed by the express and emphatic assertion of our Assembly, that no 'rule or precedent,' such as the special action to which our brethren object, is now of force? With what desperate and infatuated ingenuity do they try to neutralize this, and to embarrass the removal of what they esteem barriers to renewed fellowship? But who are they that stigmatize us as having 'taken the crown from the head of Jesus Christ, and chained his bride to Cæsar's chariot wheels,' and, under the lead and by the pen of Dr. Palmer, charge us with a 'sad betrayal of the cause and kingdom of our common Lord and head,' and summon us 'to place the crown once more upon the head of Jesus, as the alone King of Zion?' Is not their leader the same Dr. Palmer whose great sermon in advocacy of secession for the conservation and expansion of slavery, more than any one immediate exciting cause, 'fired the Southern heart' for that fatal plunge which pre-

cipitated the country into a war that exterminated slavery, drowning it in seas of blood? What of the Synod of South Carolina bestowing its benediction upon the legislature of that State in its initiation of secession? What of the repeated declarations of sympathy with the Confederate Government and armies by this same Southern Assembly that now hurls its denunciations at us as having 'disowned the crown and kingdom of our Lord,' and disdains to 'hold official correspondence with the Northern Church unless the Saviour is reinstated in the full acknowledgment of his kingship?' Do they think it enough to say of all this—

“No ingenuity of sophistry can transmute into political dogmas the scant allusions to the historical reality of a great struggle then pending; or the thankful recognition, in the middle of a paragraph, of the unanimity with which an invaded people rose to the defence of their hearthstones and the graves of their dead; or to the pastoral counsels addressed to the members and youth of our own churches, passing through the temptations and perils of the camp and the field; or the half-hour spent in prayer for a land bleeding under the iron heel of war; or even the incidental declaration in a narrative to stand by an institution of the country, a traditional inheritance from our fathers. Even though, from the ambiguity of human language, these chance references may not have been always discreetly expressed, the most that a just criticism could pronounce, is, that they are inconsistent with the judicially pronounced principle upon which the Southern Assembly entered upon its troubled career. And when exaggerated to their largest proportions by all the prejudices of bitter partisanship, they dwindle into motes and specks by the side of those elaborate and colossal deliverances repeated each year through formal committees, and exalted into solemn testimonials coördinate with the doctrines of religion and faith, which disfigure the legislation of both the Northern Assemblies through successive years.’

“How dare they affirm that the war votes of our Assemblies were made ‘coördinate with the doctrines of religion and faith?’”

Some slanders never die. One might suppose that the attempt to fix upon Southern Assemblies the charge of passing “war votes” would disappear for want of more vitality. And while newspaper correspondents may be excused for making such baseless fabrications, one would hardly look in a stately quarterly for

the formal enunciation of an exploded *canard* under editorial authority.

It may be an open question whether or not the Southern Pastoral Letter has "said enough," but it is tolerably certain that the reviewer has said too much. There are, according to a modern philosopher, three kinds of misstatements. First, those which the author does not believe, but which he expects to deceive the hearer. Second, those which the author has told so frequently that he at last comes to believe them himself. And third, those which the author knows to be false, and which he knows every one else will reject. This charge of Southern political deliverances belongs to one of these classes. No intelligent Presbyterian, North or South, believes for a moment that any such stain rests upon the Southern Church; and we leave our readers to affix the proper status of this remarkable statement, copied *verbatim* from the *Princeton Review* for July, 1870.

In the foregoing discussion, incidental reference to the Southern Presbyterian Church has been unavoidable. It was no part of our purpose to speak of this Church, or to bring it into comparison with the new body. We have no desire to institute such comparison, or to foster any spirit of antagonism between them and ourselves. It has also been impossible to avoid some slight and occasional reference to the circumstances under which the Presbyterian Church in the United States obtained its identity. Out of calamitous providences this Church has grown into a compact organism, and under God's distinguishing favor she now occupies no mean place among the various branches of Zion. Before her, God spreads out vast opportunities; and all she asks of Christendom is permission to fulfil her destiny in peace. It is not credible that any one of her sons would wilfully obstruct the career of the New Church, just begun under flattering auspices. It is not credible that a solitary Southern Christian would wilfully hinder the settlement of differences or the healing of all unnecessary divisions now separating between them and their brethren in another latitude. There are certain contests relating to Church property which Christian men should be able

to terminate without appeal to earthly tribunals. There are disputes, perhaps, concerning ecclesiastical jurisdiction which Christians should be able to end without strife. But there is one termination of such controversies which is absolutely impossible, and that is the absorption of the Southern Church by the New Church of the North. To all the enterprises of that Church for the glory of Christ and the extension of his kingdom, we cordially bid God-spèed; and with all such we cultivate an ardent sympathy. The New Church has inherited a glorious record, marred latterly by ill-judged acts, weak or wicked, when men's passions were inflamed; but another generation may possibly efface such stains without "stultifying" themselves or their fathers; and then, while we fulfil our vocation in our humbler sphere, we will, with Dr. Van Dyke, look forward with joyful anticipation to a complete union with them "in the general assembly of the first-born in heaven."

ARTICLE VI.

NATURAL THEOLOGY.

1. *A Demonstration of the Existence and Attributes of God.* By M. FENELON, the late Archbishop of Cambray, etc. (*De l'Existence de Dieu*). Harrisburgh, 1811.
2. *Natural Theology.* By W. PALEY. Gould & Lincoln, 1864.
3. *Synopsis Theologicæ Naturalis.* Auctore GERSCHOMO CARMICHAEL, (Professor in Glasgow). Edinburg, 1729.
4. *Bridgewater Treatise, No. I.* By the Rev. T. CHALMERS, D. D. Two Volumes. London: William Pickering, 1834.
5. *On Natural Theology.* By THOMAS CHALMERS, D. D., LL. D. Two Volumes. Glasgow: William Collins, 1836.

Two hundred years ago the English deists had a fashion of extolling natural religion at the expense of Revelation. Leland, in his "View of Deistical Writers," says of Lord Herbert of Cherbury, "His lordship seems to have been one of the first that formed deism into a system, and asserted the sufficiency,

universality, and absolute perfection of natural religion, with a view to discard all extraordinary revelation as useless and needless."

The same doctrine was taught in the eighteenth century by Tindal, in his work, "Christianity as old as the Creation; or, the Gospel a Republication of the Law of Nature." The reaction against this on the part of the defenders of Christianity has driven them into the opposite error of extolling Revelation at the expense of natural religion. The pendulum has swung back beyond the vertical line of truth. Thus, no less a thinker than Sir Wm. Hamilton has said, that "the only valid arguments for the existence of a God, and for the immortality of the human soul, rest on the ground of man's moral nature." (*Philosophy of the Conditioned*, p. 506.) On one plea or another, natural theology has been overlooked or decried in a pietistic way, by what are called well meaning men, especially by such as are inclined to mysticism; until, by a very singular conjunction, atheists and devout Christians are found occupying positions much too near to each other.

To say that the light of the sun is greater than that of the stars, is to say what every body knows to be true. Yet the stars do shine. Their soft radiance cheers the benighted wayfarer, and guides the mariner through the trackless wastes of ocean. It is the opinion of some recent philosophers, that the combined warmth of the stars is very considerable, so great indeed that the want of it would render our globe uninhabitable.

So when it is affirmed that Revelation gives us a far clearer and more extended knowledge of God than the book of nature contains, we yield a prompt and hearty assent; but when men, who should know better, begin to disparage nature, we beg leave to ask them to pause, and not affect a contempt for the works of the great Architect. Surely the heavens declare his glory; the firmament showeth the work of his hands; and day in sweet intercourse with day, and night in solemn communion with night, alike tell of the wisdom, might, and majesty of God. Many of the sweetest notes of the royal Psalmist catch their thrill from nature. Everywhere in nature he saw the hand of nature's

God. Paul states the case more didactically, when he says that τὸ γνωστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, that which is or at least may be known of God, is manifest in the ungodly and unrighteous men of whom he speaks; for God hath shown it unto them—ἐφάνερωσε, manifested. For the invisible things of him from (the time of) the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by (the aid or light of) the things that are made—τοῖς ποτήμασι νοούμενα—even his eternal power and Godhead—θεϊότης, divine majesty—so that they are without excuse. Paul speaks of the heathen as, originally at least, knowing God. They forsook him, not for lack of objective manifestations, but because of that subjective darkness which is produced by depravity. Their foolish heart was darkened.

When Revelation itself, therefore, takes up and defends the cause of nature, who are we that we should withstand God? And who can undertake to say how much the claims of Revelation would be obscured, and its hold on our race weakened, if there were no nature to echo back, Jura-like,

“ . . . From her misty shroud,”

the grand utterances of heaven,

“ . . . That call to her aloud ”?

Surely the Most High has not spent ages of time, and vast treasures of divine power and skill, in elaborating a universe which we are on any account authorised to treat with disdain. The same Holy Spirit who regenerates and sanctifies the soul of man, inspired psalmists and prophets of old time to write those beautiful descriptions of earthly and heavenly scenery. It is an exquisite touch near the close of the 104th Psalm, to tell us that Jehovah rejoices evermore in his works; to which the writer devoutly adds, “My meditation of him shall be sweet; I will be glad in the Lord.”

PALEY'S NATURAL THEOLOGY.

This odd mixture of atheism and mysticism has been partially counteracted by Archdeacon Paley's work, written at the instance of the Lord Bishop of Durham. Paley's mind was well adapted

to the task set before him; singularly luminous, clinging firmly to the dictates of common sense, candid, fair, exact in particulars, broad in generalisation; it was perhaps the very best intellect in Great Britain for the special work he has done. It would have been too much to expect absolute originality on a theme that had been discussed for so many centuries on one of the "*loci communes*" of theology. But we claim for Paley that what others have done well, he has, at least in some points, done better. To adopt an illustration of Pascal's, he had the same tennis ball, but he played it better than they—for instance, in the opening illustration of the watch. Since the invention of portable time-pieces, it would have been almost impossible not to refer to them as an analogue to the mechanism of the material universe. Thus Fenelon says, section 73d of the work named at the head of this article, "If a man should find a watch in the sands of Africa, he would never have the assurance seriously to affirm that chance formed it in that wild place." The eye had been employed in the same way. "The single eye of the least of living creatures surpasses the mechanics of the most skilful artificers." Fenelon treats also of "animals, beasts, birds, fowls, fishes, reptiles, and insects;" of the sun, the stars, the planets; in a word, of well nigh every topic handled by Paley; yet how much clearer and more forcible in the main is Paley's presentation. We must be allowed to criticise one thing, and only one thing, in his introductory remarks. He seems to think a stone, against which one pitches his foot in crossing a heath, by no means so wonderful as a watch. A mineralogist would ask what kind of a stone it was. If in the volume of a few cubic inches it contained the silicious skeletons of a hundred millions of animalcula, if it were a lily encrinite or any other of a thousand interesting fossils, even if it were only a bit of marble, gneiss, or granite, it might evoke the geologist's most lively curiosity, and point to a creative hand as unerringly as a chronometer to the skill of its maker.

Bating this, however, as not affecting the argument, we cannot but admire the masterly way in which Paley handles his material. His work must long keep its place as a manual of

instruction for youth, and continue to interest the thoughtful reader of maturer years. More learned botanists, physiologists, and astronomers, may and will arise; they may correct a few unimportant errata in his statements of fact or his scientific theories; but they will hardly make the argument more lucid, more entertaining, or more convincing.

THE TELEIOLOGICAL ARGUMENT.

It is necessary only to know what the nature of the argument is in order to be astonished that any one could ever seriously question its validity. That every effect must have a cause, that this cause must be adequate to the production of the effect, that none but an intelligent agent can desire the accomplishment of an end and select the appropriate means for its accomplishment, are all propositions so plain that no one but "a fool or a philosopher" can call them in question. This is called the doctrine of "final causes," though it is in its totality, and, as commonly stated, a compound of the ontological with the teleiological. An ancient analysis assigns several causes to every phenomenon: the material, the formal, the efficient, the final cause, to which some added the *causa sine qua non*, or indispensable condition. The four causes of the table on which I write would be, 1st. The wood of which it is made, and which is of course necessary to the existence of the table—*causa materialis*. 2d. The particular shape or *forma*, which constitutes it a table, and more particularly the sort of table that it is and no other kind; for the wood might have been wrought up into a box, or a different kind of table—*causa formalis*. 3d. The efficient cause, the cabinet workman who made it. 4th. The final cause, the useful end it serves as a piece of household furniture. The last two of these are specially dwelt upon in the argument from design. The forms or structures of things do indeed receive much attention, but only as subsidiary to the purpose in view, the final cause; and this again conducts us to the efficient cause, the Maker himself.

We can scarcely open our eyes without seeing some illustration. For instance, the light by which I am writing. A metal-

lic pipe descends from the centre of the ceiling. Three arms or brackets extend in as many directions. Several of the arrangements are evidently for ornament rather than utility proper. Bronze and gilt alternate. Infant Bacchuses sport around the central shaft. But all this is secondary. That light may be afforded, burners are placed on the ends of the brackets. The orifices are so adjusted as to secure a perfect combustion of the gas. The whole chandelier is overhead, so as not to impede locomotion in the room; but in order to supply a brighter light for reading or writing, a flexible tube comes down from one of the brackets to a lamp-stand, an argand burner furnishes a brilliant flame, but to protect the eyes from the direct, unnecessary, and hurtful rays, a shade surrounds the blaze. That a little light may still go out into the room, the panels of the shade are translucent. To avoid danger from fire they are made of sheets of mica instead of paper; and to render them pleasing to the eye, they are painted with figures and landscapes in bright, transparent colors. Now to suggest to a rustic that all this adaptation was the result of mere chance, that no intelligence, no selection of means, no exertion of voluntary power, had a place in the affair, would be to amaze him beyond expression. We can hardly be surer of our own existence than that the chandelier is the work of an intelligent artisan.

DEFICIENCIES OF PALEY'S TREATISE.

While bestowing so high praise on Paley's *Natural Theology*, we must admit that there are some topics on which he is silent, and yet topics of very great importance. Is it not wonderful that he says so very little of the mind of man? If God is a spirit, may we not rationally expect to find more exact and more striking exhibitions of his attributes in the construction, so to speak, of other spirits, than in the adjustments of matter? How could Paley explore so thoroughly and so skilfully the casket and say nothing of the jewel it contained? The claims of the human intelligence to be considered in such an argument, must have perpetually obtruded themselves upon his attention, and we are almost persuaded that he purposely passed them by. He

may have thought that the readers for whom he wrote would not appreciate an argument drawn from our mental as distinguished from our corporeal machinery. Or the omission may have been due to the strongly objective turn of his mind; for the introspective element does not seem to have been vigorous in him. Whatever may have been the cause, he comes so near the subject as to treat of the *instincts* of animals, that obscure but curious branch of inquiry. It is very surprising to us that he restrained himself from taking one step more, into the broad and beautiful and sunlit domain of the mind. If anything could add to our surprise, it is that he has a chapter on "The relation of animated bodies to inanimate nature." The transition would have been not only easy, but we had almost said unavoidable, to the relation of the mind of man to the physical universe. We intend presently to offer some thoughts upon this subject, but just here would suggest that recent discoveries are showing a still more intimate relationship between our bodies and the general system of nature. The strength of our bony framework is nicely adapted to the weight of the planet. Our muscular force not only sustains a similar ratio, but is itself the resultant of many forces, among which may be mentioned the deoxidizing power of the sun and the special chemical affinities of the terrene elements. My ability to hold this pen might serve as the text for a detailed and marvellous physical commentary, so closely are we bound to the worlds.

Growing, as we suppose, out of too exclusive an objectivity of attention, is the disposition of Paley to fall back upon the *a posteriori* argument. "Chance never has done anything for us. A clod, a pebble, a liquid drop, might be the effect of chance," (which, by the way, we utterly deny), "but a watch, a telescope, never was." Now we merely say that he here descends from the height of his great argument. The necessary connexion between cause and effect is one of the intuitive, *a priori*, convictions of our intelligence. Chance not only never *has* produced, but never *can* produce any of those works which we are irresistibly led to attribute to design. The question does not appertain to empirical philosophy. It is not concerned with probabilities. It

does not count up instances. It does not balance one thing against another, or a thousand cases against one. By an ultimate *dictum* of the *νοῦς*, reason, intuitive power, or whatever we may please to call it, we decide the point once and forever. The actual results, as ascertained by the senses, or the discursive faculty, may be said, in a loose way of speaking, to corroborate this *dictum*; or there may be errorists who will call in question some of the fundamental laws of thought. Either or both of these considerations can serve as an apology for the archdeacon.

What he says concerning the infinitude of the divine attributes will be considered under another head. We proceed to the

RELATION OF THE HUMAN MIND TO THE PHYSICAL UNIVERSE.

1. *Perception.* I touch the writing-table beside me. Two sensations arise corresponding to the two sets of nerves—the sensation of coldness, and that of resistance. The former has in the main a subjective character; the latter, an objective. I do not stop at the sensations. I am irresistibly driven to the apprehension of an external object. How the chasm between mind and matter is bridged, I cannot tell. Why this belief in an external world accompanies, or in any way depends upon, or grows out of, the contact of my hand with the table, I know not. But this only the more assures me, that my perceiving mind has been made by another being.

I need, however, to perceive objects at a distance from my organism. It is a sunny winter's day. The smooth sward of the front yard is bounded by an arbor vitæ hedge, beyond which the pine and the cedar preserve a cheerful green, and over all the blue sky hangs like a heavenly benediction. It is certainly wonderful that light should thus reach the optic nerve; but is it not still more so, that the mind always, and in the vast majority of instances, without knowing anything of the laws of light, should refer to the location of objects back, along the course of the rays? Is not this the work of another? Why do I believe that what I see, exists? Because God has made me so. The senses put us in communication with the outer world. They open our ears to the voice of the teacher appointed for us, even

the material universe by whose glory we are continually surrounded.

A few hours hence, and nature will assume a sombre hue. Night with her soft mantle will enfold the earth, and myriads of stars will appear on high. Venus, now approaching her greatest eastern elongation, and consequently at her greatest brilliance, will light her silver lamp in the west. In the zenith, Jupiter, not far removed from the sweet influences of the Pleiads, will dominate the sky. In the east, the belted Orion will wield his ponderous mace, followed a little later by the bright-eyed Sirius; while northward Ursa Major will maintain his endless circuit about the pole. The tremulous light of those celestial orbs has been sweeping on for centuries through the wilds of space, and to-night it will tell of the glory of Him who is higher than the heavens. Impinging upon the nerve of vision, it will end its long, long flight. It will accomplish its mission and die, or rather by a sublime transmutation of force, it will emerge into the higher domain of mind, and the living soul of man shall learn that God is great. What we wish to urge is, that the transmuted force, the intellectual cognition, is not less worthy of our consideration than the course of the ray of light; that the domain of mind is, in truth, nobler than the domain of matter; and that the adaptation of the intelligence to perceive the truth is at least equally as conclusive of the being of a God, as is the adaptation of the eye to the perception of the light.

We can conceive of man as having the power, and perhaps the angels do have the power, of flying from world to world. A more extended locomotion may be granted us in the future state, than we now enjoy; but for the present we are limited to a very small part even of this atom, earth. Looking down from Trinity steeple, we see our fellow-creatures in the busy metropolis

“ . . . Show scarce so gross as beetles.”

The wide range of our perceptive faculties is adapted to our *limitation in space*.

2. *Memory* is adapted to our *limitation in time*. Let us not be misunderstood. There is but one moment of time ever in

existence for the entire universe. We do not except God himself from this statement. Most devoutly, most reverentially, do we object to the representation of his eternity as a "*punctum stans*," a to-day without a yesterday or a to-morrow. If there be such a thing as an eternal now, we say with Mansel that it is to us unthinkable. The words convey no intelligible idea. But the Eternal One contemplates the infinite past and the infinite future with one glance of the eye. Nothing is old to him; nothing is new. We, however, have a very narrow field-view. One thought crowds another out of sight. Yet it is absolutely necessary to us, in a variety of respects, that we shall be able to recall past perceptions. Without memory I could not so much as know that this is paper on which I am writing.

We need not name at length the three or four primary laws of suggestion, or the ten or more secondary or subjective laws. But it concerns our argument to say that these laws are *over* us. We are subject to them. We do not originate them, and yet they are the very ones we need. The paper suggests the pen, and the pen the paper; the telescope reminds us of the star, and the star of the telescope; the land of the plough, and the plough of the land. There is a pervading utility in the arrangement. It is the plan of an intelligence superior to our own; a law impressed upon us from without; a rule which we follow without (in most cases) knowing why, and whether we will or nill; and though the symmetry of our argument requires us to confine special attention to the external world, yet it is easy to see, in passing, that the principle admits of a wide application.

3. *Reasoning.* Limitation in space and time necessitate limitation in knowledge. We have often admired the singular wisdom and benevolence of the Creator in adapting the external world to our capacity of reasoning. The schoolmen say that God never reasons, but knows all things intuitively. *We* cannot know all things, even within our limited range, by intuition, yet without some intuitions we can never know any thing at all. By our perceptions we gain material for thought. If every thing we saw were entirely unlike every thing else, we should never get beyond the most elementary knowledge. Our minds are

fitted to perceive points of likeness, and we are not disappointed of finding them. We cannot help classifying, and the classes exist for us in nature, not in any realistic sense of course, but the similarity is there, and much of it is apparent on the surface. Early in life we form the conceptions of trees, flowers, and birds, of plants and animals, etc. Wearied of sameness, we require something different, we desire dissimilars, we distinguish; but we could not distinguish if there were nothing distinct. We learn what does, and what does not belong to a class. This is a tree; that is not a tree, but only a shrub. This is a Caucasian, that an Indian, the other a Mongolian. Thus the actual world is suited to the mind, and the mind to the world. God has so appointed.

Classification, however, is a subsidiary process. How does man reason? How does he infer the unknown from the known? Evidently from the similarity of the one to the other. The horned and cloven-footed animals which I have observed, are all ruminant; hence I conclude that they also ruminate, which I never have seen. Having thrust several small sticks of pine or poplar wood into jars of sulphuric acid, and found them to be charred by the process, I believe the same result will occur under like circumstances a century hence, or would have occurred a century ago. Descrying a certain yellow line in the spectrum when *sodium* is burned, and a line of like situation in the solar spectrum, I learn that *sodium* exists in the envelope of the sun. Like causes produce like effects. Man cannot but believe this, and nature responds to him. Every yea has its amen; otherwise man would have been an easy prey to universal and irremediable scepticism.

To use the nomenclature of logic—the major premise of a deductive syllogism must be the conclusion of a previous inductive syllogism, and the inductive syllogism itself must ultimately proceed on the assumption of the uniformity of the laws of nature. This belief, in other words, is a premise in the inductive syllogism. Now, whence this belief? It is an intuitive judgment. Mill absurdly ranks it among the conclusions of induction, because, forsooth, we find it in fact verified by obser-

vation. He fails to see this grand principle of the correspondence between the intellectual and the material.

It is of our intuitive beliefs that Fenelon speaks, when he says, "The superior reason that resides in man is God himself." Some of his remarks are very striking indeed. "That superior reason overrules and governs to a certain degree with an absolute power all men, even the least rational." What we desire to signalize is the thought that the lawgiver of the human intelligence is also the lawgiver of the worlds, and that he has adjusted them, mind to matter and matter to mind in the most wondrous manner. "Marvellous are thy works, O Lord, and that my soul knoweth right well."

WAS GOD CREATED?

If the orderly array of man's powers necessarily induces in us the belief that he is not self-originated, why not extend the same thing to God also? Are not the faculties of the Infinite One exquisitely balanced? Has he not sensibility, intellect, and will? Is not the first of these enthroned and crown-bearing in him, as it is in us? And do not the other two stand on either side of the ineffable glory, majestic ministers of his good pleasure? Does not the argument from design, then, prove too much? If it be valid in our case, why not in God's? The first distinct recollection we have of this question is the statement of it in Abbott's "Young Christian," a very readable book that was popular some twenty-five years ago. The author presents the difficulty and confesses his inability to solve it.

1. The first and most obvious remark we have to make is that at least nine hundred and ninety-nine men of a thousand who should feel pressed by this difficulty would be sure that after all it was only a puzzle, an apparent conflict of truths, and their faith would not be shaken. Such a state of mind is an interesting study to the psychologist. It arises when some truth has been established by incontrovertible evidence, and yet an unexpected objection is stated, which we cannot answer at the moment, if at all. Referring back to the illustration already employed, if the chandelier before me is the work of chance, or is self-

existent, I cannot feel sure of any truth whatever. My nature is a downright lie, or it is at least a witness, whose testimony cannot be trusted. On the other hand, the immense majority of our race have considered the conception of a self-existent God a wonderful, yea, transcendent conception, but not one that involved any contradiction. Carmichael (Synopsis, page 25) says that nearly all men of every age and nation, however they have differed about the nature and properties of God, nevertheless have unanimously agreed "*esse aliquod supremum numen,*" that there is some supreme deity. He pronounces the atheist's difficulties in conceiving a deity to be imaginary—" *dum imaginarias quasdam in numine concipiendo difficultates declinare satagit.*" We have no real difficulty in believing *that* to exist of which we can frame no exhaustive, positive conception; and just here, it is probable, most men who ever think at all of the subject let it remain—as a difficulty unsolved, but soluble; a question unanswered, but answerable.

2. We have sometimes advanced a counter argument. If the Creator of the worlds was himself created, then his creator must have been created too, and his also in an infinite series. So that the number of gods would be infinite, and the Hindoo mythology with its 330,000,000 of deities would become comparatively a sober and prosaic affair. But the "*law of parcimony*" to use an expressive phrase of Sir Wm. Hamilton's, requires that no more causes shall be assigned to any phenomenon, than are necessary to its occurrence. One God could produce the universe. Besides, the law of "excluded middle" would soon determine between one deity and an infinite number; the former hypothesis being encompassed with far less difficulties than the latter.

3. There is still another presentation of the case which may be more satisfactory to some minds. Let us state the original argument syllogistically.

Whatever bears marks of design has had an intelligent author. The physical universe bears marks of design. Therefore it has had an intelligent author. Or, the human mind bears marks of design. Therefore, etc.; which are syllogisms in "Barbara," as the logicians say.

Now, in place of the physical universe, or the human mind, substitute our Creator: Our Creator bears marks of design. Therefore he has had an intelligent author.

The syllogism is correct in form, and if the premises are granted, the conclusion follows irresistibly. Then one premise or the other must be false, and we must hold that nothing, or at least only *some* things, not all, that bear marks of design have had an intelligent author; that is, the major premise must be wholly or partially false; or we must hold that our Creator does not exhibit in his nature the marks of design, that is, the minor premise is false. We take the last alternative, and deny the truth of the minor premise. The physical universe, and the mind of man, have limitations and adaptations evidently superimposed upon them by a higher power and a higher wisdom; but the divine attributes do not by their correlation exhibit what are rightly called marks of design.

GOD'S INFINITUDE.

Is Paley right or wrong in thinking that a finite universe, as an effect, does not prove the being of an absolutely infinite cause? If an absolute Creator *ex nihilo* be not possessed of infinite power, we may well ask who is? Especially, since he must have possessed this power at every moment of his immeasurable existence; so that if the number of the worlds is not unlimited, it is not due to the want of power in the Creator.

The idea of the infinite is one which enters every human mind, and this is a phenomenon which has a cause, and may in some way be accounted for. Fenelon was a disciple of Des Cartes, and adopts the Cartesian explanation that every idea in the mind is produced by an objective reality. In vision—*εἶδος, ἰδέα*—the appearance, form, that which is seen, is outward as a cause, but makes an impression on our intelligence. Descartes extended this to other notions. Consequently the conception of the infinite is caused by the suitable presentation of an infinite object *ab extra*. Fenelon urges this view quite eloquently. Carmichael briefly refutes Descartes: "*Quod quidem argumentum recte fundari agnoscerem, si Deum nos hic conciperemus per*

speciem propriam, sive (ut loquuntur scholastici) quidditiam; qualem habere ab ipso objecto ceu causa exemplari impressam beatos cœlicos est credendum." He goes on to say, that in this life we have only an abstract idea of God, such as we form of various things by analysis or synthesis, and which need correspond to nothing external.

The "philosophy of the conditioned" would settle the matter at once by denying that we have any positive conception of the infinite; but we have not space for the discussion of that point. Revelation can not account for the conception. It does not furnish us with any new *elements* of thought, with any primitive cognitions. In other words, it is addressed to our nature as already made by the Creator.

We are led, therefore, to class the idea of the infinite among our intuitive conceptions, and there is no other so likely way to account for its presence within us, as that an infinite God has placed it in our souls in order to give us a knowledge of himself. We insatiably long for an infinite object of veneration and worship; and if our Creator were a finite *demiurge* or *æon*, we could not worship him as God.

This article has reached such a length that we are constrained to omit some remarks on the discussion of the unity and personality of the Deity, as well as the chapter of Theodicy, entitled the Goodness of God. The general considerations on the structure of society are highly valuable, particularly in these days of rampant radicalism, when everything established, everything sacred, is questioned or contemned; and thoughtful, sober-minded men cannot look forward into the future without misgiving, if not dismay.

Dr. Chalmers has two works on this subject, viz., the first of the celebrated Bridgewater Treatises, and two volumes on Natural Theology. The latter work is not so much a new production as an amplification of the former. The peculiarities of Chalmers's style are well known. There is a hyper-ciceronean "*copia fandi*;" there is a reiteration of the same thought, which might be dispensed with; but again there are passages of

singular beauty and elevation which would atone for a thousand blemishes. With nearly all that he says we agree; and, if in a few minor points we dissent from his views, we are charmed even when we are not convinced.

1. His opinion of Paley is substantially that which has been given in these pages. After commending some previous writers, he proceeds to say, "Even these, however, have been now superseded by the masterly performance of Dr. Paley, a writer of whom it is not too much to say, that he has done more than any other individual who can be named, to accommodate the defence both of the Natural and the Christian Theology to the general understanding of our times. . . . Of him it may be said, and with as emphatic justice as of any man who ever wrote, that there is no nonsense about him. . . . His predominant faculty is judgment. . . . Although never to be found in the walk of sentiment or of metaphysics, or indeed in any high transcendental walk whatever, whether of the reason, or of the fancy; yet to him there most unquestionably belonged a very high order of faculties. All the mental exercises of Paley lie within the limits of sense and of experience. . . . It is the perfection of his common sense which makes Paley at once so rare and so valuable a specimen of our nature. . . . It were curious to have ascertained how he would have stood affected by the perusal of a volume of Kant, or by a volume of Lake poetry. . . . He would have abhorred all German sentimentalism. . . . The general solidity of his mind posted him as if by gravitation on the *terra firma* of experience, and restrained his flight into any region of transcendental speculation." The amount of which is, that he was a very cogent *a posteriori* reasoner, but lacked at times the full, clear perception of those intuitive principles on whose validity all reasoning depends, and without which it cannot be legitimated.

2. Chalmers saw that Paley had omitted some of the most interesting themes appertaining to his grand subject. Paley's stronghold is in the evidences of design furnished by the human body. The wisdom of this is commended by Chalmers. "What an amount and condensation of evidence for a God in the work-

manship of the human body! What bright and convincing lessons of theology might man (would he but open his eyes) read on his own person—that microcosm of divine art. Anatomy is so much more prolific of argument for a God than astronomy.” “It is passing marvellous that we should have more intense evidence for a God in the construction of one eye, than in the construction of the mighty planetarium; or, that within less than the compass of a handbreadth we should find in this lower world a more pregnant and legible inscription of the Divinity, than can be gathered from a broad and magnificent survey of the skies, lighted up, though they be, with the glories and the wonders of astronomy.”

We cannot accept this without considerable qualification as to the comparison between anatomy and astronomy. However, the quotations bring out fully the author’s appreciation of Paley’s good sense in making a stand just where he did in the battle; while Chalmers could not but see that there were other and more commanding heights where batteries might well be planted. In his third book, therefore, he considers the “proofs for the being and character of God in the constitution of the human mind;” and in book fourth, chapter fifth, he treats of the “adaptations of the material world to the moral and intellectual constitution of man.”

3. It is at least questionable, whether Chalmers does not underrate the comparative force of the argument drawn from the mental constitution considered in itself. For instance: “In the mental department of creation, the argument for a God that is gathered out of such materials, is not so strong as in the other great department.” To understand this we must advert to the very striking and suggestive distinction he makes between laws and collocations. “The main evidence for a God, as far as this can be collected from visible nature, lies not in the existence of matter, neither in its laws, but in its dispositions.” “For, of what significancy is it towards any conclusion of this sort—that an isolated lump is possessed of hardness, or solidity, or weight; or that we can discern in it the law of cohesion, and the law of impulse, and the law of gravitation.” The laws might all exist, but without the proper disposition of the parts no intelligent

result could be evolved; just as the metals of all the wheels and springs, axles and levers of a watch, might exist with all their properties, in a shapeless mass, constituting no mechanism whatever. Of this we shall speak after a little. But just now we remark it is plain enough that the evidence of design does increase with the number of individual parts of an organism. If only two separate things, as light and the eye, were brought together in order to make vision possible, the argument would have a certain measure of strength. If a third concurrence is found in the refrangibility of the rays of light, and a fourth in the exquisite structure of the lenses of the eye, and a fifth in the varying adjustment of the distance and form of the lenses for seeing nearer or remoter objects, and a sixth in the contraction or dilatation of the pupil to suit different intensities of light—at every step the atheistical solution becomes, to use a solecism, more and more impossible.

Now, Chalmers argues, there is no such complexity in the mental constitution. A few distinct faculties or powers residing in a simple, indivisible substance, exhibit intelligence in the framer, but not so forcibly as do the more complex arrangements of the material economy. In answer to which, we would urge the views presented in the former part of this article. How many things must concur to render our ratiocinations possible! These again are largely dependent on the will; and that on the wonderful machinery of the desires; and they radicate in the emotions. Surely there is complexity enough here.

Again, our distinguished author does not consider the limitation of the creature, and the profound wisdom of the Creator in adapting our mental conformation to those limitations. He comes so near this thought occasionally that it is wonderful he does not stumble on it. He discourses upon the mental laws of association or suggestion, and our belief in the stability of the laws of nature, yet somehow fails to notice their relations to time and space and finite knowledge, understanding and power.

With regard to laws and collocations, we have another instance of this great man's excess of candor. As at one time of his life he was inclined to give up the internal evidences of Christianity

as unsatisfactory, and open to much objection from the infidel; so here we find him saying that the "chemical, and optical, and magnetic, and mechanical laws," "might be discovered in a confused medley of things," "and yet, from the study of these, no argument might be drawn in favor of a God." "It is not the law of refraction in optics that manifests to us a designer." His precise idea is a little hard to arrive at, but we take it to be that laws without collocations could never produce any work of design, and would not account for the material universe, which is true. But neither would collocations without laws produce the universe, or any existing organism whatever. Both are indispensable. Besides, law is necessarily opposed to chance. Chance is irregular and capricious; law is uniform and immutable.

4. Mr. Hume objected to every thing that is true; of course he must needs object to the almost self-evident proposition, that the world is in no important sense a *singular effect*; in other words, its having been made before our knowledge, its being larger than even the pyramids, and its being amazingly full of beneficent and skilful arrangements—these facts do not take it entirely out of the class of effects. Dr. Archibald Alexander thought that Chalmers had given an unnecessary amount of attention to this idle sophism of Hume. The Christian philosopher certainly does demolish the atheist; but we refer to chapter fourth, more particularly, because there we find so superb a vindication of one of our prime logical beliefs, viz., that "this instructive expectation of a constancy in the succession of events is not the fruit of experience, but is anterior to it." As this, however, has to do with Logic more nearly than with Natural Theology, we dismiss it with only a passing allusion.

5. If our earth had a creator, why, by parity of reasoning, was not God created too? This question has already been discussed in the foregoing pages. We have examined Chalmers's answer with a very curious attention, and the result is that we cannot but consider the fifth chapter the least satisfactory in the whole book. His reply to Mr. Hume is concisely stated thus: "We have had proof of a commencement to our present material

economy; we have had no such proof of a commencement to the mental economy which may have preceded it." His proof of the former is two-fold: first, from geology; second, from history. But the only history we have of the creation is that contained in the Bible, and must have been made known by revelation, as it antedates all human experience. The objection to the argument is not that it is invalid, but that it is foreign to the domain of Natural Theology.

The geologic argument is appropriate, and is a weighty confirmation of our belief in the world's having been created. Yet it does not seem to us to reach the other question as to the Creator himself. Grant that *we* have no proof of a commencement to the preceding mental economy. This does not show that proof may not exist. It is only an appeal to our ignorance. It is but a negative argument, on which we dare not rest our faith. In this chapter, Chalmers forsakes the high ground of eternal and immutable principles, and descends to the lower level of experience. To be consistent with himself, he ought to hold that "our expectation of a constancy in the succession of events" is *not* anterior to, but is the fruit of experience.

6. Only one point remains to be considered, and it occurs in Book fifth, chapter first: "On man's partial and limited knowledge of divine things." There is hardly a more interesting theme in the whole range of philosophy than this. The special question here is, why our Maker has employed such "complex instrumentalities" for effecting his purposes. Why might he not have grafted all our mental powers and capacities "on a simple elementary atom?" Why make these bodies so fearfully and wonderfully, microcosms of art, and so highly organised chemically, that only the mysterious potency of life can keep the atoms in combination?

This is akin to the question started by Paley, "Why resort to contrivance, where power is omnipotent? . . . To have recourse to expedients implies difficulty, impediment, restraint, defect of power." His answer appears to us very satisfactory, if it be modified slightly. "It is only by the display of contrivance, that the existence, the agency, the wisdom of the Deity, *could*

be testified to his rational creatures." Omit the word "only," or omit "the existence, the agency," and we accept his statement.

Chalmers, however, goes a step farther into the inquiry, by asking why the Creator should have first made so resisting a substance as matter, and thus hampered himself with difficulties of his own origination. This he pronounces to be "a mystery that we cannot unravel." Again, however,—for we wish to follow him to the very end of his reasonings,—he suggests that these manifold adjustments "give more intense demonstration to the reality" of the divine intelligence; but this only makes God's "policy more inscrutable."

To this we may be permitted to reply, that every explanation of a natural phenomenon conducts us to a broader generalisation only, and does not absolutely or finally solve. At each step in the ascent the circle of vision enlarges, and the dim borders of the horizon expand. In the second place, to develope Paley's thought, we are perpetually surrounded by matter with its laws already fixed, and unchangeable by any efforts of ours. If the Almighty condescends to be our teacher, he must subject himself to at least some of the same limitations under which we are constrained to act. In the third place, we often limit our own power for the pleasure of exercising our skill. A pretty illustration of which is seen in the game of chess, for instance. The pawn can ordinarily move but one square; even the queen, that potentate of the board, has her constitutional restraints; and without these *rules*, the game would be impossible. Now, why should not the Highest delight in the exercise of his exquisite wisdom? His is an endless activity that must have scope; it is not a blind power, but an intelligent, all-wise efficiency, and we can see no room for its action, unless under some form or other of restriction.

This again brings us face to face with a very deep speculation. Are these restrictions *all* self-imposed by the Almighty, or do some of them exist in the nature of things? Interesting as this is to many thinkers, it belongs rather to the department of metaphysics, that charmed region to whose confines we are irresistibly led along so many lines of thought.

We have already said much more than we originally intended, and will now conclude by expressing the wish that some writer may arise in the Church, who shall profit by the labors of Paley and Chalmers, and recast the whole subject into a text-book for our colleges and theological seminaries.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

History of the Reformation in Europe in the Time of Calvin.
By J. H. MERLE D'AUBIGNE, D. D., etc. Vol. V. England,
Geneva, Ferrara. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers,
No. 530 Broadway. 1869. Pp. 470. 12mo.

This is the tenth volume of D'Aubigné's *History of the Reformation in the Sixteenth Century*, and the fifth of the second series. The first series brought the history down to the Confession of Augsburg (1530). The second is to include the years from that period until the triumph of the Reformation in Europe generally. One or two volumes more, we are told, will bring the history to a conclusion. The author promises, after going a little further with his details of events in different countries, to concentrate his narrative, and present the progress of the great transformation in a single picture. In the next volume after the present, he will conduct us to Scotland, Denmark, Sweden, Hungary, and other parts of Europe; and then we shall return to Luther, Melancthon, and also see Calvin at his work in Geneva.

This is a feature of D'Aubigné's undertaking greatly enhancing the difficulty of his complete success. The field over which he passes is so wide and so varied that he does but touch at any point; and before we have time to rest a little, and look about us, he is calling on us to be up and away to new ones.

His minute details concern too many different scenes and subjects. He should have either selected fewer topics, or else not gone into so much brief mention; and so many minute facts.

Akin to this, we offer another criticism. He is writing the History of the Reformation, but he is drawn off into too many unimportant particulars of the political history of the times. In the present volume, for example, we have Book VIII. about England, and Book IX. about Geneva and Ferrara; and Chapters IX., X., XI., and XII., of the latter, four whole chapters, are taken up with the most circumstantial accounts of a little war between Berne in aid of Geneva and Savoy her enemy. We can understand how the venerable author, and every other Genevan, should be extremely interested in these matters, but they must be wearisome to the general reader. The truth is, such is not the entertainment to which we were bidden. The author wearies us with his full and minute history of these political events, when we expected to hear chiefly about a great religious movement. We do not despise the chronicles of Geneva, a city which must always possess the liveliest attractions for every Presbyterian, but we wish the author had given these to us in some other form. What we look for in this book is not so full and elaborate a statement of the petty struggles of the Swiss cantons with Savoy, but a more complete account of the Reformation itself. And then the author is so fond of the dramatic, and delights so much in setting his insignificant political and military heroes in such striking postures, and in startling us so constantly with sudden apparitions of new little personages upon the stage and rapid shiftings of the scenes before us, that we are sometimes provoked to set him down amongst the sensation mongers, and bid him not try to tamper so constantly with our feelings.

And yet we must say that this volume not less, but perhaps even more than the preceding ones, has very great charms and a very high interest and value as a history of the Reformation. It gives us a clear and full idea of the use of the Genevan Church. Taking up, about the middle of this volume, the story of affairs in that city, we read of the attempt of fanatical Papists

at Geneva to poison Farel, Viret, and Froment, the reforming evangelists, by the hand of the perfidious Antonia Vax by means of her spinach soup and corrosive sublimate; of the subsequent conversion to the gospel of Jacques Bernard, the head of the Franciscans in Geneva; of the public disputation which followed between the reformers and Caroli in the great hall of the city and in presence of the Council and assembled citizens, and of the decided victory gained by the former; of the silent preparations, during these times of noisy discussion at Geneva where there seemed to be going forward a skirmish with musketry, of that grand artillery at Neuchâtel not far off, whose formidable volleys should yet break down the walls of error—that very month, Wingle, one of the good printers of the sixteenth century, who had been driven from Lyons, having published at Serrière, near Neuchâtel, the first French Bible of the Reformation, translated by Olivetan; of the striking fact that the idea of this publication had been conceived no where else than in the Vaudois valleys of the Cottian Alps, and that the Vaudois had collected to meet the expenses of it five hundred golden crowns, a sum equivalent to about £2,400 sterling; of the important as well as speedy results of the public discussion, in the open abandonment of Romish superstition by priests, laymen, and women, of whom not a few gave evidence that the outward was accompanied by an inward conversion to the truth; of the subsequent demand by the converts that the council should abolish the mass and the images; of the fears of the council which led them to procrastinate; of the practical blockade of the city by the papists of the surrounding country, who would not suffer any provisions to be conveyed there for its sustenance; of the call of the reformed party on Farel should go preach the truth in the cathedral, and of his boldly lifting up his voice accordingly in venerable St. Pierre, as well as at St. Gervais and in the Madeleine; of his public denunciations of the idols of the priests in those temples; of the popular assault upon the images and their destruction, beginning strangely enough with the foolish play of some children; of the public agitators and the assembling of the council of two hundred to consider the matter; of Farel's speech and

the call of the syndics upon the priests to defend the mass and image-worship if they could, and their silence; of the flight of many of the priests, of the monks, nuns, and the vicar-general; and the suppression of the mass on the 10th August, 1535, which day, accordingly, the Genevan Church has ever since regarded as the jubilee of its reformation.

These events occupied about six months, and their story fills about fifty pages. They show what kind of power brought about the Reformation in Geneva. The State was certainly one of the instruments, but a subordinate one;—it was the word of God read and heard which constituted the real power. The victory was of the Truth over lies. As a specimen of the juggling tricks on which the popish system there had been built, take the account of the discoveries made by the people of the frauds practised on them by the priests at St. Pierre and at St. Gervais.

“They had made strange discoveries. Some who had begun to search after the famous arm of St. Anthony—upon which, in important cases, oaths used to be made with the ringing of bells and great pomp, found—not the arm of the saint, but the limb of a stag. Others, opening the precious shrine which enclosed the head of St. Peter, brought out a piece of pumice-stone instead of the skull, ‘See,’ they exclaimed, showing these objects to the surrounding crowd, ‘see what the priests used to make us worship.’ This gave another direction to the indignation of the delegates from the council, and, one of them, disgusted at such mean frauds, said to the other: ‘If the gods of the priests are true gods, let them defend themselves. As for us we can do no more.’ The Huguenots, wishing to make these scandals known to the people, put the pumice-stone, and the stag’s bone, under magnificent canopies, and prepared to carry these precious relics of an apostle and a saint all round the city. The novel procession attracted an immense crowd, and the disgusting falsehoods, of which it was a proof, opened the eyes of the most obstinate. ‘Now we know,’ they said, ‘the value of the priests’ words! They made us pay five florins for the ceremony; they pretended that if any one made a false oath the saint would wither up his hand. All that was only to frighten and plunder us.’ Every one began to despise a clergy who, for so many ages, had thus played upon the good faith of the people. An old writer has

said: '*Justæ quibus est iræ.*'* ·Woe unto the Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites!† There were at St. Gervais' scandals still greater than at St. Pierre's. The priests to procure money pretended that St. Nazaire, St. Celsus, and St. Pantaleon were buried under the high altar. When a poor woman approached, she heard a confused noise. 'It is the voices of the holy bodies,' said the priests, 'praying to be taken up and canonized; but that requires a large sum of money.' Others related how at the dead of night small luminous creatures were often seen moving about the cemetery. 'They are souls from purgatory,' explained the ecclesiastics, 'they wander about here and there asking for masses for their deliverance.' Certain persons, wishing to learn the truth, crept one night into the cemetery, caught some of those poor souls, and found that they were crabs, with small wax tapers lighted and fastened on their backs. Frivolous men laughed, but serious men seeing to what guilty manœuvres the priests had been driven by the love of gain, were seized with horror. . . . The three captains and their companies, having reached the church, began by exploring the vault where the three saints groaned, and discovered the trick. They found under the altar two earthen vessels connected by a tube and pierced with holes like those in an organ-pipe, so that the least noise over the vessels produced the effect of organ bellows, and caused a sound like the indistinct murmurs of persons talking. The poor papists could not believe it. 'No!' they said, 'it is St. Nazaire, St. Celsus, and St. Pantaleon,'—'Come and see them,' answered the reformers. They came and saw, and some of them from that hour refused to believe any more in such abuses.

“The judgment having been accomplished at St. Gervais, the three captains turned their steps towards the church of St. Dominic, one of the chief sanctuaries of popery between the Jura and the Alps. Great miracles were worked there; the Huguenots called them 'great swindles.' A beautiful image adorned in a costly manner, and representing Our Lady, stood in the church, and had the power (it is said) of calling back to life the children who had died without baptism. Poor people came to Geneva from all the country round, with their lifeless little children, and laid them on the altar before the image. Then a feather placed on the infant's mouth flew into the air, or else the cheeks flushed with red; sometimes the child perspired. The spectators cried out: 'A miracle!' 'The child is resuscitated'

*Virgil, *Æneid* x. 716.

†Matt. xxiii. 14.

(*revicouille*), said the monks! Immediately the bells rang, the child was christened, and then buried. 'The child had never been restored alive to its father or mother,' said the Huguenots, 'and yet they had to pay dearly for it.' The citizens lifted up the altar and found two machines under it; on one side were certain instruments in which they blew to make the child breathe, and on the other some stones which were heated to make the child turn color or perspire. An ointment with which they had smeared it became soft, and gave a certain hue to its flesh."— (Pp. 287–291.)

The authorities quoted for these statements are the Registers of the Council of Geneva, and Froment's *Gestes de Geneve*.

The consequence of this overthrow of Popery at Geneva, was the bitter enmity of Rome and of Savoy, and they threaten her utter destruction. But some Bernese helpers are raised up first for their succor, and then Berne herself decides to help Geneva; and after a while Francis I. is moved by political jealousy of Charles V. to attack Savoy, and so the little city is at length, in the spring of 1536, delivered from her enemies, and exults in the air of liberty and the gospel. We make again some extracts of thrilling interest, which all must read with delight.

"Here and there, however, sorrows and regrets remained. Many hearts were wrung, and many an eye was turned with mortification in the direction of Chillon, where Bonivard had been languishing for six years. He had done so much to give liberty to Geneva, and he alone was not free. He was pining away, imprisoned within those rocks, which, excavated below the level of the lake, form a gigantic sepulchre. A loop-hole permitted a feeble ray of light to enter the dungeon, and the prisoner, while walking slowly round the column to which he was chained, delighted to turn his eyes towards that side, and sometimes contemplated (according to tradition) a little bird which used to perch on the iron bars of the narrow opening. At the slightest noise the bird flew off to the wood behind the castle or skimmed away over the surface of the lake. The bird was free, but Bonivard was in chains. 'I had such leisure for walking,' he said, 'that I wore away a path in the rock, as if it had been done with a hammer.' When he was seized by the perfidious hands of his enemies, he had said: 'I am going alone with God to suffer my passion!' And suffer it he did. But while

his body and heart suffered, his mind was at work. Some of the thoughts which then occupied him have been recorded by his own hand. '*Live in remembrance of death—Courage increases by wounds;*' and such like. For five or six months the Geneva envoys, so traitorously seized at Coppet, had also been imprisoned at Chillon, but not in the underground dungeons.

"Such iniquities could not be tolerated. Berne again took up her *fire-sticks*, and Geneva prepared her boats. On the 20th of March one hundred armed men were embarked on four war-cutters and other vessels. The Genevese councils had given the command to Francis Favre and Francis Chamois. All the citizens would have liked to march in person to Chillon to set Bonivard and the plenipotentiaries at liberty. On the day of sailing everybody left their houses, and from an agitated crowd assembled near the Rhone there rose a universal cry, 'Rescue the captives!'

"On Sunday morning—it was the 26th of March—Bonivard being as usual in his dungeon, pricked up his ears. He fancied he heard an unaccustomed noise; he was not mistaken. Loud but still distant cannon shots reëchoed through the vaults of his prison. What was going on? It was the artillery of Berne, which, on its arrival at Lutry, between Lausanne and Chillon, announced its presence. But that signal of deliverance was to be the signal of death to Bonivard and the three envoys. 'If the Bernese appear before the place,' wrote the Duke of Savoy to the Governor, 'you will give the prisoners of Geneva the *estrapade* twice, and then put them to death without hesitation!' The Duke intended that the deliverers should find nothing but corpses."

* * * * *

"The Governor had surrendered just as he arrived. Nägueli, on leaving Berne, had written to him that he should answer with his head for the lives of the prisoners; he had, therefore, some hope of recovering them. Favre, Chamois, and the other Genevans hastily sprang from their boats, entered the castle, and in a minute they embraced the three envoys. But where was Bonivard? They seized the keys of the vaults, unlocked a sunk door and entered. It was the hall of execution; beneath its rude arches were wheels, axes, pulleys, cords, and all the horrible instruments with which men were crippled or killed. The Genevans, without stopping, ran to the door of an inner vault, undid the bars, pulled back the bolts. The friends of the prior of St. Victor sprang over the threshold, rushed into the gloomy dungeon, reached the column. 'Here he is! he is alive!' Bonivard

fell into their arms. His friends found it difficult to recognise him. The features changed by suffering, the long unkempt beard, the hair falling over his shoulders—had changed his appearance. 'Bonivard,' they said to him, 'Bonivard, you are free!' The prisoner, who seemed to be waking from a long sleep, did not think of himself; his first words were for the city he had loved so much. 'And Geneva?' he asked. 'Geneva is free too,' they replied. His chains were taken off, and, conducted by his friends, he crossed the door of that vast prison. The bright light which burst upon him affected his eyes, which had been deprived of it for so many years, and he turned them mechanically towards the gloom of his dungeon. At last he recovered himself and bade farewell to his sepulchre. The crowd looked at him for some moments with emotion, and then rushed into that dismal cell where the wretched man had suffered so long. Every one desired to see it, and for ages yet to come the traveller will visit it. The illustrious prisoner was delivered; the last fortress of tyranny was captured; the victory of the Reformation was complete. No traveller, wandering along the picturesque shore of Montreux, can fail to look at those walls, rising out of the water, without a feeling of horror for despotism and of gratitude for the gospel. Those rocks, so long the witnesses of oppression are now hailed with emotion and joy by the friends of the word of God and liberty.

'Chillon! thy prison is a holy place
And thy sad floor an altar.'

The flotilla was soon sailing back to Geneva with Bonivard and the three parlementaires on board. They were returning joyously through the help from on high, and in a short time they landed from their boats amid the joyful shouts of their fellow-citizens, and placed their feet on a free soil." Pp. 398-402.

The progress of the gospel in Geneva and its surrounding and dependent villages and territories, is detailed in Chapter XIV., covering the period from March to June, 1536. It closes with an account of the sense felt then and there, and, indeed, all over western Europe, of the need there was for a Doctor to arise who should explain the Scriptures with learning; of a champion against Rome; of a leader with administrative capacity who should establish order and raise amidst the ruins of the Papal system a temple for the true God to dwell in. "He was sought for," says D'Aubigné, "perseveringly, yet ineffectually." But the man was

already prepared, and at the very time was sojourning a refugee, under the assumed name of Charles d'Espeville, in the city of Ferrara, an honored guest in the palace of the Duke of Este, of his wife the Princess Renée of France, who was the pious daughter of King Louis XII., and who was to be his life-long friend and correspondent. Other fair and noble ladies were at that court who received instruction from the young Reformer—as Anne de Parthenay, wife of the Count of Marennes; and the beautiful Anne of Beauregard, who had come with Renée from France, betrothed and radiant with the joy of her youth, but marked by death for his victim, and yet victor herself over death in the triumphant hope of the gospel. There also were men waiting on his words—as Jean de Parthenay, seigneur of Soubise, trained to arms, and now becoming a valiant soldier of the truth of Christ; and Clement Marot, translator of the Psalms, afterwards so helpful in the establishment of the simple worship of the Reformed Church; and Titian, the great painter, who attended the Evangelical Assemblies, though probably not with any deep or lasting impression. There also was Bernard Tasso, secretary to the duchess, himself a poet, and likewise his son, afterwards the celebrated author of the “*Jerusalem Delivered*;” but we are not told of his relations with the yet more celebrated refugee. Far beyond the principality of Este, however, extended his influence while sojourning at Ferrara. The Jesuit Tiraboschi, one of the literary historians of the peninsula, declares that he corrupted the whole of Italy. But the inquisition had discovered his residence. He was getting ready for his departure when its agents seized and dragged him away a prisoner towards Bologna. Half way there, some armed men, probably sent by Renée, rescued the captive; but he was not conveyed, like Luther, to a friendly castle, but left alone in the midst of Italy to escape out of it as he could. What route he took is uncertain, but it probably was the shortest road to Switzerland, through the St. Bernard pass. He took Aosta, founded by Augustus and named after him, on his journey, and must have sojourned there or in the neighborhood a little while; for there is a cross in the principal street to commemorate his flight thence, which the Roman

Catholic population of Aosta erected in 1541; and again repaired, in 1741, and again renewed with fresh adornments in 1841. There are also still shown in the valley of Aosta *Calvin's farm*, where he found a shelter; *Calvin's bridge*, by which he took a more difficult and less frequented road than the St. Bernard; and *Calvin's window*, one of the lofty passes on the borders of Valais, a *col* enclosed by Mont Balme, Mont Combin, and Mont Vélan, which ascending, he by it entered Switzerland again. (Pp. 444-454; see also Guizot's St. Louis and Calvin, pp. 208, 209).

The most interesting chapter of the volume is the last, wherein the details are given in the most graphic style, of Farel's first meeting with Calvin at Geneva, as he was passing through towards Strasburg; of that evangelist's conviction that, lo! here was the Doctor, whose coming had been so eagerly looked for; and of his solemn and affective adjuration to the reluctant wanderer to abide in that city and cast in his lot with the Genevese Church. But we must have done with this portion of the book, and invite the reader to notice with us some parts of the story of the English reformation.

Amongst many remarkable examples of Christian patience presented in this account, we select two amongst the Roman Catholics.

Fisher, Romish bishop of Rochester, a venerable old man of fourscore years, who had been Henry VIII.'s own preceptor and the trusty friend of his grandmother, refused to make oath that the king was head of the Anglican Church and that the Bishop of Rome possessed no authority out of his own diocese. He refused when a great many bishops, doctors, and priests yielded, and he was sent to the Tower in December, 1534. At five in the morning of the 22d of June, 1535, they entered his cell, aroused him, and said it was the king's good pleasure he should be executed that morning. "I most humbly thank his Majesty," said the old man, "that he is pleased to relieve me from all the affairs of this world. Grant me only an hour or two more, for I slept very badly last night." Then turning towards the wall, he fell asleep again. Between seven and eight o'clock he

called his servant, and giving him the hair-shirt he wore next his skin to mortify the flesh, with orders to let no one see it, he called for his best clothes, saying, this was to be his wedding-day. At nine they came for him, and he took up his New Testament, made the sign of the cross and left his cell. Six feet high, and bent with age, and very weak, they were forced to carry him down stairs in an arm chair. Stopping near the gate of the Tower for some reason, Fisher rose, and leaning against the wall, opened his Testament and said, "O Lord! I open it for the last time," and prayed he might find some word of comfort in it whereby he might, at that last hour, glorify God. The first words his eye lighted on were, "And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." "That will do," said the venerable bishop, and on he went, repeating in a low voice in Latin the words of his Testament. His noble bearing, and his piety, moved all hearts. "God save the king and the kingdom! Eternal God, my hope is in thy deliverance!" These it is said were his last words.

The other case was that of a Roman Catholic layman. Sir Thomas More, who had been the familiar friend of Henry VIII. from the time he was nine years old, and whom he had made chancellor in place of Wolsey, was sent to the Tower along with Fisher, and for the same crime. "They must give way," said the king, "or I will make an example of them." But the conscientious sufferers could not give way. The Chancellor's imprisonment was made very harsh. An illustrious scholar, he was forced to pick up little scraps of paper on which to put down a few thoughts with a coal. They allowed him no apparel but what was ragged. He had to beg for food, and to complain of the coldness of his cell; yet he could write verses on the wall with a coal, expressive of the peace of his soul. Summoned on the 1st July, 1535, before the court of King's Bench, the former Chancellor of England quitted his prison in a frieze cloak grown foul in the dungeon, and was led on foot through the most frequented streets of London. His face thin and pale, his hair white, not with age, but sorrow and imprisonment, and his feeble steps supported by a staff, he reached the bar of that tribunal

where he had so often presided, and looked round on the spectators with a countenance full of mildness. All were moved. He would not speak until after his condemnation, when he said: "Now that all is over, I will speak. Yes, the oath of supremacy is illegal. The great charter laid down that the *Church of England is free*, so that its rights and liberties might be equally preserved." "The Church must be *free*," said the lawyers, "it is not therefore the slave of the Pope." "Yes, *free*," retorted More; "it is not, therefore, the slave of the king." He was condemned to be hanged at Tyburn, and then quartered whilst still alive. Henry spared his old friend this cruel punishment, and ordered that he be simply beheaded. On his way back to the Tower, an immense crowd covered the wharf at which the boat was to land him.

"Among this crowd, so eager for the mournful spectacle, was a young woman, trembling with emotion and silently waiting for the procession; it was Margaret. At length she heard the steps of the approaching guards, and saw her father appear. She could not move; her strength failed her; she fell on her knees just where she had stood. Her father, who recognised her at a distance, giving way to the keenest emotions, lifted up his hands and blessed her. This was not enough for Margaret. The blessing had caused a strong emotion in her, and had restored life to her soul. Regardless of her sex, her age, and the surrounding crowd, that feeble woman, to whom at this supreme moment filial piety gave the strength of many men,* says a contemporary, flew towards her father, and bursting through the officers and halberdiers by whom he was surrounded,† fell on his neck and embraced him, exclaiming: 'Father, father!' She could say no more; grief stopped her voice; she could only weep, and her tears fell on her father's bosom.‡ The soldiers halted in emotion; Sir Thomas, the prey at once of the tenderest love and inexpressible grief, felt as if a sword had pierced his heart.§ Recovering himself, however, he blessed his child, and

* "Cui jam pietas multorum virorum robur addiderat."—*Pro Unitatis Defensione*, p. 66.

† "Passing through the midst of the guards, who with bills and halberts compassed him round."—*More's Life*, p. 276.

‡ "Lacrymis sinum ejus applebat."—Polus, *Pro Unitatis Defensione*, p. 66.

§ "What a sword was this to his heart."—*More's Life*, p. 278.

said to her, in a voice whose emotion he strove to conceal, 'Daughter, I am innocent; but remember, that however hard the blow with which I am struck, it comes from God. Submit thy will to the good pleasure of the Lord.'

"The captain of the escort, wishing to put an end to a scene that might agitate the people, bade two soldiers take Margaret away; but she clung to her father with arms that were like bars of iron, and it was with difficulty that she could be removed.* She had been hardly set on the ground a few steps off, when she sprang up again, and thrusting aside those who had separated her from him she so loved, she broke through the crowd once more, fell upon his neck, and kissed him several times with a convulsive effort. In her, filial love had all the vehemence of passion. More, whom the sentence of death had not been able to move, lost all energy, and the tears poured down his cheeks. The crowd watched this touching scene with deep excitement, and they were very few in all the troop who could refrain from weeping; no, not the guards themselves.† Even the soldiers wept, and refused to tear the daughter again from her father's arms. Two or three, however, of the less agitated stepped forward and carried Margaret away. The women of her household, who had accompanied her, immediately surrounded her, and bore her away from a sight of such inexpressible sadness. The prisoner entered the Tower." Pp. 70, 71.

On the 6th of July, 1535, he was told early in the morning that he must hold himself in readiness. "At nine o'clock the procession quitted the Tower. More was calm, his face pale, his beard long and curly; he carried a crucifix in his hand," and his eyes were often turned towards heaven. A numerous and sympathising crowd watched him pass along—a man, one time so honored, Lord Chancellor, Lord Chief Justice, President of the House of Lords—whom armed men were now leading to the scaffold! Just as he was passing in front of a house of mean appearance, a poor woman standing at the door, went up to him and offered him a cup of wine to strengthen him: 'Thank you,' he said gently, 'thank you; Christ drank vinegar only.' On arriving at the place of execution, 'Give me your hand to help me up,' he said to Kingston, adding: 'As for my coming down

* "Ut vix ab eo divelli posset."—Polus, *Pro Unitatis Defensione*, p. 66.

† More's *Life*, p. 277.

you may let me shift for myself.’* He mounted the scaffold. Sir Thomas Pope, at the king’s request, had begged him to make no speech, fearing the effect this illustrious man might produce upon the people. More desired, however, to say a few words, but the sheriff stopped him. ‘I die,’ he was content to say, ‘in the faith of the Catholic Church, and a faithful servant of God and the king!’ He then knelt down and repeated the fifty-first Psalm: † *Have mercy on me, O God, according to thy loving kindness, according unto the multitude of thy tender mercies, blot out my transgressions!* When he rose up, the executioner begged his forgiveness; ‘Why do you talk of forgiveness?’ replied More, ‘you are doing me the greatest kindness I ever received from man!’ He desired the man not to be afraid to do his office, and remarked that his neck was very short. With his own hands he fastened a bandage over his eyes, and then laid his head on the block. The executioner, holding the axe, was preparing to strike, when More stopped him, and putting his beard carefully on one side, said: ‘This at least has not committed treason!’ Such words, almost jesting, no doubt, startle us at such a moment; but strong men have often been observed to manifest the calmness of their souls in such a manner. More probably feared that his long beard would embarrass the executioner and deaden the blow. At length that head fell, through which so many noble thoughts had passed; that keen, clear eye was closed; those eloquent lips were the lips of a corpse. The head was exposed on London bridge, and Margaret discharged the painful duty her father had bequeathed her, by piously burying his body.” Pp. 73, 74.

The many evangelical martyrs sacrificed in different countries showed in general a more ardent love for the Saviour and a lively hope of eternal life than Fisher and More, but none showed greater calmness. These two good men, as our author says, (p. 74,) wanted discernment of the pure gospel; they were both too much addicted to monastic practices—hair shirts and self-flagel-

* More’s *Life*, p. 286.

† The fiftieth of the Vulgate; *Miserere mei, Deus*.

lations to mortify the flesh. They had, (More, especially,) in the days of their power, persecuted the disciples of the Lord; and, though rejecting the king's usurpations, they had been fanatical defenders of the Pope's. Yet at a time abounding in cringing bishops and servile nobles, when multitudes bent their timid heads before the mad popery of Henry, these men firmly held up theirs. And so the author well says, "More and Fisher were companions in misfortune [we should prefer the word suffering] with Bilney and Fryth; the same royal hand struck them all. Our sympathies are for the victims, our aversion for the executioner." P. 75.

Upon the subject of the king's supremacy, D'Aubigné makes the following statement and gives his authorities. The time referred to was that of bloody Mary who put Cranmer to death.

"One day—it was some time later—Cranmer was asked, 'Who is the supreme head of the Church of England?' 'Christ,' was the reply, 'as he is of the universal Church.' 'But did you not recognise the king as supreme head of the Church?' 'We recognised him as head of *all the people of England*,' answered Cranmer, of *churchmen* as well as *laymen*.* 'What! not of the Church?' 'No! *Supreme head of the Church* never had any other meaning than what I tell you.' This is explicit. If the title given Henry only signified that he was king of the clergy as well as of the laity, and that the former were under the jurisdiction of the royal courts as well as the latter, in all matters of common law, there can be nothing fairer. But how was it that Cranmer did not find as much courage in Henry's life-time to speak according to his conscience, as when examined in 1555 by Brokes, the papal sub-delegate? An interpretative document drawn up by the government at almost the same time as the act of parliament, corroborates however the explanation made by Cranmer. It said: 'The title of supreme head of the Church gives the king no new authority; it does not signify that he can assume any spiritual power.†' This document declares that the words, *reform abuses and heresies*, indicate the authority which

* "Of all the people of England, as well ecclesiastical or temporal."—Cranmer, *Letters and Remains*, p. 224.

† "Not that he should take any spiritual power from spiritual ministers."—*Heads of arguments concerning the power of the Pope, and the royal supremacy*.—MS. in Record Office—Froude ii., p. 326.

the king possesses to suppress the powers which the bishop of Rome, or other bishops, have usurped in his realm. 'We heartily detest,' said Fulke, master of Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, 'the notion that the king can do what he likes in matters of religion.'* Even Elizabeth refused the title of head of the Church.† Probably these are facts which are not generally known." Pp. 50,51.

We now call the reader's attention to the history D'Aubigné gives of Anne Boleyn. She was brought up, not as has been said by Froude, "in the worst school in Europe," but in one of the best—in the household of the pious Margaret of Angoulême. From that protectress of all friends of the gospel, she had learned to love the Reformation and the Reformers. Accordingly, as queen, she was not only full of charities for the poor, but exerted herself in aiding pious youth of intellect who were poor, but had desires for the office and work of the gospel ministry; and she was the friend of Cranmer, and of Tyndale, translator of the Bible; Latimer, the bold preacher of the gospel, was her chaplain; and Parker, afterwards in Elizabeth's day Archbishop of Canterbury, was her almoner. Yet was Anne no "bigot," no cordial renouncer of the world and its pomps, and it is very doubtful if she knew the experience of spiritual Christianity. But she was a virtuous wife, an earnest Protestant, an enemy of the Pope, and having a hand in the separation of England from the Papacy, the savage hatred of Rome for her has known no bounds, and they have delighted to blacken her name as well as Luther's and Calvin's.

At her own court, and of her own family, she had bitter enemies in the proud Duke of Norfolk, her uncle and the chief of the ultramontanes; and in Lady Rocheford, the wife of Anne's brother, a perfidious and despicable woman, who plotted her ruin. And she came also to have among her ladies of honor, a rival for the heart of Henry, the young and beautiful Jane Seymour.

Anne, our author describes as gay of heart, of easy manners, frank and open, finding it difficult to conform to the strict eti-

* Fulke's Defence, p. 489.

† Jewell's Works, IV., p. 1,144.

quette of the court of England, and not trained to the circumspection demanded by her union to a husband like Henry—in two words, as a friend of the Reformers in the midst of a society which was Catholic at heart, and also a French woman in the midst of an English court, these were her two capital crimes. Moreover, she had married above her station. Having lived at court as the equal of the young nobles belonging to it, she was not always able, after ascending the throne, to be the Queen. Her enemies interpreted maliciously amiabilities that were innocent; the mistrustful Henry began to be suspicious; and Lady Rocheford fed his jealousy with her crafty insinuations. On the other hand, Anne became jealous of Jane Seymour, and Henry then was alienated from her more than before. The difficulty in the royal family grew apace. All the world saw that the wind at the palace had changed, and the heartless courtiers, like a pack of hounds, set themselves to hunt down the prey. It was arranged that three of the courtiers should give to Henry the first hints against his wife. Two or three circumstances, such as occur in the most innocent life, and which we shall not pause to narrate were the pretext for Anne's destruction. On the 25th May, 1536, a commission of twenty-six gentlemen, pliant courtiers for the most part, and one of the chief members of it the queen's implacable enemy, the Duke of Norfolk, were appointed by Henry to inquire into Anne's conduct. On the 1st of May there was a magnificent festival at Greenwich. The gentlemen who had been accused to Henry of liberties with the queen, one her own brother, were given foremost places in the tournament, and Anne was placed by his own side. All on a sudden, in the midst of the festivities, the king rose up with every appearance of anger, and hastily quitted the balcony. An ultramontane writer, notorious for malice and falsehood, says, "The queen dropped her handkerchief into the lists to one of the accused gentlemen." The confusion was universal, and Anne's anxiety to learn the cause of the king's behavior extreme. He ordered her to keep her room, and he rode off on horseback to London. The next day he had her arrested and conveyed to the Tower. By a refinement of cruelty, two of her enemies, Lady Boleyn

and Mistress Cosyns, were ordered to be always near her by day and by night. Every effort was made to procure testimony against her. The accused gentlemen resisted every attempt to wring from them a crimination of the queen. But Mark Smeton, a poor musician, of weak head and extreme vanity, being put to the rack, confessed all that was wanted.

Meanwhile Anne, satisfied that her doom was sealed, seems to have turned with more earnest hope, and a more spiritual faith than before, to her God and Father in heaven. Norfolk and others came now in the king's name to call upon her to speak the truth, with assurances of pardon if she would confess. With the dignity of a queen still on the throne, she threw back the accusations brought by these commissioners, and dismissed them, saying, "You call on me to speak the truth; well, then, the king shall know it." Then she sat down to write her celebrated letter to Henry, which we cannot refrain from copying here. She speaks without fear as one injured in her honor—without any other proofs, this letter proclaims her innocence satisfactorily.

ANNE'S LETTER.*

"Your Grace's displeasure and my imprisonment are things so strange unto me, that what to write or what to excuse, I am altogether ignorant. Whereas you sent to me (willing me to confess a truth and so obtain your favor), by such a one whom you know to be my ancient professed enemy; I no sooner received this message by him than I rightly conceived your meaning; and if, as you say, confessing a truth indeed may procure my safety, I shall with all willingness and duty perform your command.

"But let not your Grace ever imagine that your poor wife will ever be brought to acknowledge a fault, where not so much as a thought thereof ever proceeded. And, to speak truth, never a prince had wife more loyal in all duty and in all true affection, than you have ever found in Anne Boleyn—with which name and place I could willingly have contented myself, if God and

* A copy of this letter was found among the papers of Cromwell, at that time the king's chief minister. "It is universally known," says Sir Henry Ellis, "as one of the finest compositions in the English language." — *Original Letters*, ii, p. 53.

and your Grace's pleasure had so pleased. Neither did I at any time so far forget myself in my exaltation or received queenship, but that I always looked for such alteration as I now find; for the ground of my preferment being on no surer foundation than your Grace's fancy, the least alteration was fit and sufficient (I knew) to draw that fancy to some other subject.

“You have chosen me from a low estate to be your queen and companion, far beyond my desert or desire. If, then, you found me worthy of such honor, good your Grace, let not any light fancy or bad counsel of my enemies withdraw your princely favor from me; neither let that stain—that unworthy stain—of a disloyal heart towards your good Grace ever cast so foul a blot on me and on the infant princess, your daughter.

“Try me, good king, but let me have a lawful trial, and let not my sworn enemies sit as my accusers and as my judges; yea, let me receive an open trial, for my truth shall fear no open shames. Then shall you see either mine innocence cleared, your suspicions and conscience satisfied, the ignominy and slander of the world stopped—or, my guilt openly declared; so that whatever God and you may determine of, your Grace may be freed from an open censure, and mine offence being so lawfully proved, your Grace may be at liberty, both before God and man, not only to execute worthy punishment on me as an unfaithful wife, but to follow your affection already settled on that party, for whose sake I am now as I am; whose name I could, some good while since, have pointed unto, your Grace being not ignorant of my suspicion therein. But if you have already determined of me, and that not only my death, but an infamous slander must bring you the joying of your desired happiness, then I desire of God that he will pardon your great sin herein, and likewise my enemies, the instruments thereof; and that he will not call you to a strict account for your unprincely and cruel usage of me at his general judgment-seat, where both you and myself must shortly appear, and in whose just judgment, I doubt not, (whatsoever the world may think of me), mine innocency shall be openly known and sufficiently cleared.

“My last and only request shall be, that myself may only bear the burden of your Grace's displeasure, and that it may not touch the innocent souls of those poor gentlemen, who, as I understand, are likewise in strait imprisonment for my sake. If ever I have found favor in your sight—if ever the name of Anne Boleyn have been pleasing in your ears—then let me obtain this request; and so I will leave to trouble your Grace any further,

with mine earnest prayer to the Trinity to have your Grace in his good keeping and to direct you in all your actions.

“From my doleful prison in the Tower, the 6th of May.

“ANNE BOLEYN.”

This letter roused a tempest in the king's heart. It contained allusions which filled him with hatred and wrath, and ensured her death. A court of twenty-six peers, most of them enemies to Anne and the Reformation, were assembled—Norfolk presiding. Anne had no defender; but her modesty and dignity, and the peace which rested on her countenance, touched even her foes; and she might have been supposed, so assured and so majestic in her demeanor, to be sitting there to receive the honors of a sovereign. When called on to plead, she held up her hand and said, “not guilty,” and then she refuted and tore to tatters calmly but forcibly, and with words every one of which struck home, the accusations against her. The servility of the nobles of England in the sixteenth century was marked; and notwithstanding her successful defence, the queen was condemned to be burnt or beheaded *according to his majesty's good pleasure*.

Anne heard with composure her infamous doom, and then addressed the court in a short speech nearly or quite equal to her famous letter:

“My lords,” said she, “I am innocent of all the matters of which I have been accused, so that I cannot call upon God to pardon me. I have always been faithful to the king my lord; but perhaps I have not always shown to him such a perfect humility and reverence as his graciousness and courtesy deserved, and the honor he hath done me required. I confess that I have often had jealous fancies against him, which I had not wisdom or strength enough to repress. But God knows that I have not otherwise trespassed against him. Do not think I say this in the hope of prolonging my life; for he who saveth from death has taught me how to die, and will strengthen my faith. Think not, however, that I am so bewildered in mind that I do not care to vindicate my innocenee. I knew that it would avail me little to defend it at the last moment, if I had not maintained it all my life long, as much as ever queen did. Still the last words of my mouth shall justify my honor. As for my brother, and the other gentlemen, who are unjustly condemned, I would willingly die to save them; but as that is not the king's pleasure, I shall

accompany them in death. And then afterwards I shall live in eternal peace and joy without end, where I will pray to God for the king—and for you, my lords.”*

After these words, at Norfolk's stern command, she laid aside her royal insignia, in which she had appeared at her trial, and commending herself to all their prayers returned to her prison. On the 17th May, the four gentlemen, one of them Lord Rocheford her brother, and husband of her who had been chief instrument of the queen's persecution, were beheaded. Henry's next step was to divorce Anne; and yet, although it was declared that she had never been the king's wife, her doom for adultery must nevertheless be executed. She is led in her last hours to consider herself as having sinned against Catharine, by consenting to take her place, and at two hours after midnight, before she would receive the sacrament, she sends a very humble petition to the Princess Mary, craving her forgiveness for the wrong done to her mother. The devout adherents of the Roman primacy were full of exultation, and many of the evangelical belief prepared to quit the kingdom, imagining there would be none to protect them after Anne's death.

Her last hours were full of peace. Her last message to the king was that of a private gentlewoman; he had made her a marchioness, of a marchioness a queen, and that now, having no higher honors left, he was about to give to her innocence the crown of martyrdom.

On the 19th May, 1536, a little past noon, clad in a robe of black damask, she walked up to the block on the green of the Tower, with a firm step, and a look of great sweetness. She smiled pleasantly to the spectators. She spoke a few gentle words of the king, and commended him to God and to them; also asking their prayers for herself; then she took off her white collar and her hood. A few moments she spent in silent prayer, then laid her head on the block, saying, “O Christ, into thy hands I commit my soul.” The headsman, disturbed by the mild expression of her face, hesitated a few seconds, but his courage returned. Anne cried out again, “O Jesus, receive my

*Meteren, *Hist. de Pays-Bas*, p. 21.

soul!" The axe flashed, and her head fell, and the gunner on the wall touched off his cannon, which was the appointed signal to Henry that all was over. He was in Epping Forest at the time, dressed in white, with a hunting party. At noon they were all reposing themselves, and he sitting under an oak. He hears the cannon on the Tower wall. "Ha, ha!" he exclaimed, rising, "the deed is done! Uncouple the hounds, and away!" Next day he married the youthful maid of honor!

This volume contains many exceedingly interesting details respecting Tyndale and his Bible; but we are obliged to bring this notice to a close.

A Treatise on the Preparation and Delivery of Sermons. By JOHN A. BROADUS, D. D., LL. D., Professor in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Greenville, S. C.

Such is the title of a very readable duodecimo volume, containing 514 pages, well printed by Smith, English & Co., Philadelphia. Dr. Broadus is known to many of our readers as one of the first preachers in connexion with the Baptist denomination in the South, and was, therefore, admirably qualified out of the experiences of his own honored and excelling pulpit to prepare a work on the preparation and delivery of sermons. "This work is designed," the author informs us in the preface, "on the one hand to be a text-book for classes, and on the other to be read by such ministers, younger or older, as may wish to study the subjects discussed." Dr. B. has himself been engaged for ten years in instructing candidates for the ministry in Homiletics; and so was further qualified for undertaking the work he has now accomplished. He has certainly succeeded in throwing a good deal of warmth into his discussion, and studded his various chapters with most excellent counsel, conveyed in a style replete with life and strength. In our judgment, however, it is a book better fitted for the *preacher's* perusal than for the *candidate's* preparative study. We will not recommend it as a text-book in Theological Seminaries, but do advise ministers already in the field to procure it for their private reading. It will serve to refresh their interest in homiletical preparations, guide them

to success by useful rules, and encourage them to aim at superiority.

The Pursuit of Holiness: A Sequel to the "Thoughts on Personal Religion," intended to carry the reader somewhat further onward in the spiritual life. By EDWARD MEYRICK GOULBOURN, D. D., Dean of Norwich, and formerly one of the Chaplains in Ordinary. Rivingtons: London, Oxford, and Cambridge. Pott & Amery, New York.

The writings of the Dean of Norwich, Edward Meyrick Goulbourn, D. D., have met with much favor, not only from readers of his own Church, but from others. The freshness of their style and their deep spirituality, have given them a high place among intelligent Christians. He was moved, he says, to write this volume, by the assurances he had received that his "Thoughts on Personal Religion" had been made useful (under God's blessing) to many. This acknowledgment received from both sides of the Atlantic has made him almost regard these persons as if they were his flock, and he their pastor. He is minded to lead them on, if he may, a little farther, and to rivet the impressions already made upon them. This he has attempted in the pages before us, in some twenty-two brief chapters, in which he shows, first, that holiness is attainable; inquires, What have we to begin upon? then speaks of faith as the first principle of holiness, and of how we may attain it; that it is the point of departure in the right course, the spring of all virtue; that the experimental knowledge of God is the end of all Christian endeavor; that the end in religion is supreme love to God; that in this love to God is the love of natural affection springing from the Fatherhood of God, the love of moral esteem, and the love of benevolence; that there is affinity between God and man, man needs God, and God needs man as a field of display for his own perfections; that there is a filial relation of man to God, upon which the love of God is founded; that God has been made level to our apprehensions and our sympathies in the person of Christ; that the love of gratitude is a sense of the love of God to us shed abroad in our hearts; and that we are to act as if we

had the faith and love to which we aspire, in practising which we shall obtain them in full power; that this love involves antipathy to evil and purity of motive; that it is accompanied by peace of conscience and peace of heart; that this peace is attained by living in the present in active duty, rather than in the past or the future; that the centripetal and centrifugal forces of the soul, worship and ministry—as in the case of the angels, who are both “*officiating* spirits,” and are “sent forth to *minister* to the heirs of salvation”—are both needed to keep it in its proper orbit, binding it to its true centre, as it travels through its business, excitements, and cares; that an occupation rightly pursued is necessary to holiness, and self-sacrifice and love for the brethren are tests of our love for God; that this love is a principle rather than a sentiment; and that the attempt to exempt certain districts of our life from God’s jurisdiction, and confidence in the creature for happiness, are what shuts out Christ from our hearts. These topics are set forth in the 220 pages of this little volume, with much aptness of illustration and beauty of language. As was to be expected, the author shows his strong partiality for the Church of England, in which he holds so high a position, and rebukes those who share in the growing discontent with the doctrines and discipline of the Church of their baptism. In his chapter, too, “What have we to begin upon?” he says, “I answer, upon the grace of our baptism: this is the grand starting-point of all Christian effort. And the special blessing of *infant* baptism is this, that God, in it, ‘prevents’ us, (in the old sense of the word ‘prevents,’) anticipates us with his grace, anticipates consciousness, anticipates temptation, anticipates sin, so that when the powers of evil throw up their approaches to the soul, they find the Holy Spirit in possession of the fortress before them; and thus, before one who is baptized in infancy can be soiled with evil, he is tinctured with good.” He proceeds then to speak of “the relationship contracted by baptism—‘baptism wherein I was made a child of God,’”—and says, that “nothing which occurs in after life can rase the seal off the bond of their baptism.” He afterwards explains, that, “In God’s family there is a sonship of moral affinity, as well as a far wider sonship of

sacramental relation; and of course it is only those who exhibit the sonship of moral affinity that will be recognised as sons at the great day; all else will be repudiated and disowned by our Heavenly Father."

We are under no obligation to reconcile these two statements. Fidelity to the ritual of his own Church, which did not free itself wholly from Romanizing errors, gave rise to the first; fidelity to truth required the last. Baptism does not, as Rome maintains, impress an indelible character upon the soul, and secure to it an infusion of sanctifying grace. Nor is the grace signified, tied to the sign so closely by the sacramental union, as Luther held. Yet our Confession goes beyond the Zwinglian doctrine, that the outward rite is a mere representation of the truth by symbol. It affirms "that by the right use of this ordinance the grace promised is not only offered, but really exhibited" [administered?] "and conferred by the Holy Ghost to such, (whether of age or infants,) as that grace belongeth unto;" making its efficacy dependent thus upon the right use of the ordinance and the secret purpose of God.

These exceptional passages, to which we have well-founded objections from their ritualistic tendency, being abated, we recommend the book to those who are anxious to advance in that best of all studies and employments, "The Pursuit of Holiness."

A notice of the Rev. Dr. R. L. Dabney's work on Sacred Rhetoric has been unavoidably postponed.