

THE SOUTHERN

PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW,

CONDUCTED BY

AN ASSOCIATION OF MINISTERS

IN

COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA.

---

Vol. XXII. JANUARY, MDCCLXXI. No. 1.

---

COLUMBIA, S. C.

PRINTED AT THE PRESBYTERIAN PUBLISHING HOUSE.

1871.

## CONTENTS.

ARTICLE	PAGE
I. Moral Philosophy and Christianity. By Judge W. ARCHER COCKE, Monticello, Florida, - - -	1
II. Asceticism, - - - - -	33
III. The Presbyterian Church in South Carolina, - -	51
IV. Manses. By the Rev. T. B. BALCH, Prince William Co., Va., - - - - -	73
V. The Dealings of Christ with the Chinese Nation. By the Rev. M. H. HOUSTON, Hanchou, China. -	88
VI. The Church. By the Rev. J. A. SMYLLIE, Milford, Texas, - - - - -	111
VII. Our Church—Its Condition, Wants, and Prospects,	125
VIII. Paul, the Church at Rome, and the Epistle to the Romans, - - - - -	141
IX. CRITICAL NOTICES :	
1. Dabney's Sacred Rhetoric, 173. 2. Doedes' Manual of Hermeneutics, 175. 3. Freese's Old World, 177. 4. Hudson's Greek and English Concordance of New Testament, 178. 5. Hart's Manual of Composition, 181. 6. Zincke's Extemporary Preaching, 101. 7. Searing's Æneid, 182. 8. Mrs. Preston's Old Song and New, 182. 9. Grasty's Faith's Battles and Victories, 186.	

THE SOUTHERN  
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW,

CONDUCTED BY

AN ASSOCIATION OF MINISTERS

IN

COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA.

---

VOLUME XXII.

---

COLUMBIA, S. C.  
PRINTED AT THE PRESBYTERIAN PUBLISHING HOUSE.

1871.

THE LIBRARY  
THE UNIVERSITY  
OF TEXAS

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Moral Philosophy and Christianity. By Judge W. ARCHER	
COCKE, Monticello, Florida, . . . . .	1
Asceticism, . . . . .	33
The Presbyterian Church in South Carolina, . . . . .	51
Manse. By the Rev. T. B. BALCH, Prince William Co., Va.,	73
The Dealings of Christ with the Chinese Nation. By the	
Rev. M. H. HOUSTON, Hanchou, China, . . . . .	88
The Church. By the Rev. J. A. SMYLLIE, Milford, Texas,	111
Our Church—Its Condition, Wants, and Prospects, . . . . .	125
Paul, the Church at Rome, and the Epistle to the Romans,	141
The Doctrinal Various Readings of the Greek New Testa-	
ment, . . . . .	191
Memoir of the Rev. Samuel B. McPheeters, D. D., . . . . .	235
The Church and the World, . . . . .	255
Ulster. By the Rev. T. B. BALCH, Prince William Co., Va.,	270
The Life of Christ, . . . . .	282
Testimony and Faith, . . . . .	321
Pastors and Evangelists <i>versus</i> Stated Supplies, . . . . .	341
The Religious Principle the Life of the Nation. By Judge	
WM. ARCHER COCKE, Monticello, Fla., . . . . .	349
The Presbyterian Reunion, North, . . . . .	379
What is Truth? By the Rev. J. S. GRASTY, D. D., Shel-	
byville, Ky., . . . . .	406
Inauguration of the Rev. Dr. Wilson, . . . . .	413
The Reformation in the Sixteenth Century. By the Rev.	
THOMAS E. PECK, D. D., Union Theological Seminary,	
Va., . . . . .	455
Education and Christianity. By Rev. J. A. QUARLES, Mis-	
souri, . . . . .	474
The First and Highest Office in the Church, . . . . .	484

	PAGE
Education. By the Rev. M. J. WALLACE, Marlbrook, Ark.,	496
Sustentation, . . . . .	524
The General Assembly of 1871, . . . . .	538
The Practical Efficiency of our Church. By the Rev. B. W. MOSELEY, New London, Va., . . . . .	584

## CRITICAL NOTICES :

Dabney's Sacred Rhetoric, 173. Doedes' Manual of Hermeneutics, 175. Freese's Old World, 177. Hudson's Greek and English Concordance of New Testament, 178. Hart's Manual of Composition, 181. Zincke's Extemporary Preaching, 181. Searing's Aeneid, 182. Mrs. Preston's Old Song and New, 182. Grasty's Faith's Battles and Victories, 186. Parker's *Ad Clerum*. Advices to a Young Preacher, 311. Anderson's History of the Evangelisation of the Sandwich Islands, 312. Plumer's Short Sermons for the People, 316. Gilfillan's Martyrs, Heroes, and Bards of the Scottish Covenant, 318. Epistle to the Hebrews compared with the Old Testament, 319. Martin on the Atonement, 429. Quirinus's Letters on the Council, 434. Anderson on Regeneration, 440. Barnes's Prayers for Families, 445. Geer's Conversion of St. Paul, 448. Life of Rev. Dr. George Junkin, 449. Questions of Modern Thought; or Lectures on the Bible, 600. The Divine Human; or some Remarks on Inspiration and Atonement, 603. Among my Books, 609.

THE SOUTHERN  
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXII.—NO. 1.

---

JANUARY, MDCCCLXXI.

---

ARTICLE I.

MORAL PHILOSOPHY AND CHRISTIANITY.

Moral philosophy as a science is older than Christianity, and many of its doctrines can be traced to the earliest pagan writers; and while some are true, because drawn from natural law, recognising principles imbedded in human nature by the Author of our being, yet many are false, being the fruit of minds beclouded by human depravity.

In looking to the origin and history of ethical philosophy, it cannot be denied that many of its truths were first recognised in the principles of Roman jurisprudence. But this, with all its merit, is an imperfect basis; and while it has performed a most useful mission, in being thus connected with that great system which has modified the equitable principles of law throughout the civilised world, yet, when placed among the great family of sciences and there left to be sustained by the inherent merit of its principles, from its earliest day to the present time, it has failed to attain the great end for which it was designed.

We do not say that moral philosophy as a science has entirely failed, but that it has fallen far below the noble purposes intelligent minds designed for it and had a right to expect at its

VOL. XXII., NO. 1.—1.

hands. From Aristotle to the present day, no writer has placed the science of moral philosophy upon its true basis—the Christian religion.

It will not be attempted to review the tenets of pagan writers on ethics; for, notwithstanding the development of an occasional truth, it is clear that they could make no progress in building up a science, the foundation of which was essentially defective.

The ancient Greeks and Romans had no idea of moral philosophy except such as arose from principles of human nature, from fallen man's conception of natural right and justice; which we all know, left to a human standard, must have been tinged with every hue of imperfect human nature.

Any one acquainted with the writings of ancient authors will recognise at once the great and fundamental error of their entire system of moral philosophy, in reducing every principle to a practical test. At best, their efforts were directed either to the practical application of their jurisprudence, or mere political schemes to the ever shifting wants of the community. Is it surprising, then, that we find that moral philosophy, jurisprudence, and politics, attempted to be mingled in one common structure, were all a failure, and especially as far as the sublime science of ethics was connected with them?

The principles of jurisprudence as a human science have not failed, but it has often been the regret of the jurist that they have fallen very far below human anticipation. The philosophy of government has ever been fluctuating, and its application to the necessities of the body politic as changeable as the different forms in which nations and communities have ever existed. And why? They are mere human appliances for man's human wants. Moral philosophy has a higher mission. It addresses itself to man's moral nature, and seeks to establish a code and to make known those principles which will announce his duty to his fellow man, and teach him his relations not only to society, but to God.

It is wonderful, though capable of explanation, why all writers, since the Christian era, have failed to establish permanent theories in moral philosophy; and it is from the fact that they

have without exception treated this science, as did every writer before the advent, as resting on merely human and political views, and in total disregard of the teachings of the Bible.

We do not underrate the philosophy of the ancients. Every educated man admires the beauty and eloquence that adorn the writings of those classic pages which have enriched Grecian and Roman literature; but, from Aristotle to Cicero, notwithstanding the vast mental power of the one, and the moral and intellectual accomplishments of the other, reaching almost to the sublime, and the many philosophers which existed between the periods in which they lived—we can only bestow on the best of them the award of learning, talent, and sometimes high-toned virtue; to which their moral philosophy added a few fragrant wreaths, whose freshness could last only for a time; because not only in the sense of the poet, but in the spirit of an unfailing Christian philosophy, it did not and could not rest “on the Rock of Ages.”

We announce, then, this truth, and wish to maintain it, that Christianity is the only basis of moral science embracing political and social ethics. The subject presents to us a wide field for historic and philosophic research, embracing many departments of literature in ancient and modern times. We do not undertake to review the vast number of writers on moral philosophy, ethics, and politics; but to examine in some respects the difference between pagan philosophy and moral science as it has existed since the Reformation.

The examination of this question will present a rich and beautiful field, laden with the fruits of cultivated minds. The dawn of pagan moral philosophy—we dread the use of the term—may be distinctly traced to Greece, at a period about the middle of the sixth century, B. C.; and, notwithstanding its many glaring defects, cultivated nations to this day attribute inestimable blessings to its influence.

The various tenets of ancient moral philosophy were based alone upon the natural feelings, and were consequently often false. Whatsoever truth they contained was mostly inculcated from a personal or selfish motive—motives in themselves only

TxU



partially good, and wholly insufficient to support the grand fabric of a science the most useful, and indeed the most necessary, of all the intellectual pursuits of man.

We gain a full and satisfactory insight into the power as well as the extent of Pagan philosophy, by reference to the doctrines of Plato, Socrates, Epicurus, and the sophists in Greece; while among the Romans we learn all that is necessary to our subject from the pages of Cicero and Quintillian, especially the former, who stood preëminent in the philosophy of Roman jurisprudence, was a voluminous writer on morals, and, like Socrates, came nearer the doctrines of Christian truth than other pagan writers. But to suppose Socrates, or Cicero, or any writer of pagan philosophy, the representative of Christianity, is an error of frightful magnitude, and from which Christians of this day should endeavor to be delivered.

We have before us a work from the pen of a distinguished Arminian, the object of which is to show that Greek philosophy fulfilled a preparatory mission for Christianity,\* a doctrine the essence of infidelity.

We have been taught, and it is the creed of the educated, to attach the utmost importance to the opinions of popular writers on moral philosophy, because it is expressive of the sentiments from which the public and private character of nations are formed, as it modifies their laws, and social and domestic habits, and is an unfailing source of accurate information in reference to their religion. Poetry deals with the ideal, the immaterial; but moral philosophy with the practical every-day exercise of the political and social virtues, the public and private character and acts of a people. The established relations of society, and the institutions of a state, must and do arise out of the conception of the moral relations which men bear to each other; nor can the student fail to observe how absolute has been the influence either for good or for evil, of the connection of moral

---

\*Christianity and Greek Philosophy; or, the Relation between Spontaneous and Reflective Thought in Greece, and the Positive Teachings of Christ and his Apostles. By B. F. Cocker, of the University of Michigan.

philosophy with Christianity on the one hand, or Paganism on the other.

Before advancing further in this discussion, it is proper that we should explain the sense in which the term moral philosophy is used. Wayland defines it "the science of the moral law;" Paley, as "the science which teaches us our duty, and the reasons for it." We prefer the definition of Paley, and from it, it is obvious that the period which preceded the New Testament was inadequate to produce such science. Pagan philosophy knew nothing of the true foundation on which rests the beautiful fabric of moral science. The mere natural principle of right and wrong was all that pagan philosophy could grasp; it knew nothing of the moral law until the advent of the Saviour; and, as we have previously alluded to Dr. Cocker of the University of Michigan, we say it is a great mistake in him to contend for the contrary, for there is no evidence in sacred or profane history that the Grecian philosophers ever knew any thing of Hebrew literature or Hebrew worship; as even in the days of St. Paul, they knelt to "*the unknown God.*"

To this broad and comprehensive science is allied the beautiful and instructive one of intellectual philosophy, as it woos its sister into its almost illimitable range. Moral philosophy involves the conscience, the great faculty which is the main spring to duty, and aids in adjusting the moral machine for action. In the moral, social, and political relations of life, it is to be regretted that the great writers on moral philosophy, on law, on civil government, have ignored the true principles of duty. Not one since the Reformation, and none before it, has written a work, or published an essay, embodying the principles of moral philosophy, as correlated with the truth of religion, with the exception of C. A. Row of England. This writer has contributed a powerful pamphlet to the cause of moral science.\*

In every department of public and private life, natural reason has exercised very rightfully a powerful influence; for it may be

---

\*Contemporary Review, July, 1869. November and December numbers of Theological Eclectic, 1869.

truthfully maintained, that whatsoever it appoints for all mankind, becomes the law of nations. But human reason is full of error; and natural, as well as national law, as understood by the human mind, have each in the course of a few centuries been often subverted by new views, and in their application to the wants as well as the desires of nations been exceedingly fluctuating.

It is a lamentable truth that politics has done much to demoralise and degrade the science of moral philosophy in the public eye. History is replete with what are considered brilliant acts of diplomacy, accomplished in disregard of truth and honesty for the paltry purpose of securing some advantage in a treaty, or public negotiation; and now, under such influence, political ethics, through its own self-distorted medium, has induced the world to applaud, in a political sense, the idea that an honest diplomat is unfit for the situation, on account of his honesty.

Political philosophy, like national law and moral philosophy, is the reduction of moral truth to a system; but it is a system which has failed, and this we shall endeavor to prove.

A very eminent English author, writing on ethics and the Roman law, traces with much force the power of the former over the jurisprudence of the latter, and also the indebtedness of moral philosophy to Roman law. He confines his efforts to the period preceding the Reformation, and remarks that, since the rise of critical philosophy, moral science has almost wholly lost its olden meaning, and except where it is preserved under a debased form in the casuistry still cultivated by Roman Catholic theologians, it seems to be regarded nearly universally as a branch of ontological inquiry.\*

“The science of moral theology, as it was first called and is still designated by the Roman Catholic divines, was undoubtedly constructed, to the full knowledge of its authors, by taking principles of conduct from the system of the Church, and by using the language and methods of jurisprudence for their expression and expansion. While this process went on, it was inevitable

---

\*Maine's Ancient Law, p. 336.

that jurisprudence, though merely intended to be the vehicle of thought, should communicate its color to the thought itself.”\*

The amount of Roman law in moral theology became smaller and smaller; and moral theology, degraded into casuistry, has lost nearly all interest to the leaders of European speculation.

Moral philosophy in the hands of Protestants may be considered almost a new science. And, in the language of Maine, “casuistry went on with its disastrous refinements till it ended in so attenuating the moral features of actions, and so belying the moral instincts of our being, that at length the conscience of mankind rose suddenly in revolt against it, and consigned to one common ruin the system and its doctors.”†

This branch of the subject we shall pursue no further, but direct our inquiry into the failure of the system of moral philosophy as a science, in its practical bearing on the jurisprudence, the politics, and the social relations of modern life; for to these it extends. Within the last four centuries, many authors of great learning and talent have devoted their time to inquiries upon the various branches of moral philosophy; and while it is evident, that in many instances they have elaborated important truths, useful, practical, and brilliant, they have left the most important, the most valuable and indispensable science known to man, in some respects more benighted and more incomplete than any other—the science of moral philosophy.

It is appropriate, and worthy of notice in this place, that moral philosophy, without ever having acknowledged it, is vastly indebted to the judiciary for many of its best principles, as far as it can be applied in a worldly sense.

It was forcibly said by an American statesman, “Where was there a higher function or dignity than that of a chancellor to dispense equity between litigants and to the widow and orphan? Learned and virtuous judges were the great masters, and lawyers the apprentices of justice. No morality, save that of the Saviour of mankind, was more ennobling than that of a court of

---

\*Maine's Ancient Law, p. 337.

†*Ib.*, p. 341.

equity.”\* In a moral sense, the influence of the pure and beautiful maxims of law and equity have exercised an extensive influence on the political and social ethics and morality of many nations.

But now we come to the investigation of the principles of moral philosophy as a science, and its mission as an intellectual and moral agent in purifying and elevating the human race; and while it has done much thereto, yet the student pursues a painful track as he wends his way along the weary and misty and obscure path that conducts him through its history during the last three or four hundred years, with here and there only a faint torch-light, which seemed to be extinguished by each succeeding wind of doctrine.

A mere glance at the opinions of a few leading philosophers will fully illustrate the position we maintain; and with all their transcendent genius and skill and learning, lighted up in many instances by purity of sentiment and exalted character, their efforts to found a moral science upon human ethics and mere intellectual philosophy have been but a series of failures, in which every department of life bears full melancholy testimony.

Let us but refer to the doctrines of a few great writers who erected a light-house now and then along this dark and clouded coast. Among English philosophers we are met by the systems which imply the impossibility of a law of obligation, and boldly asserting that there can be no rights or duties in a proper sense. Under this head may be classed pantheism, mysticism, scepticism, and finally systems denying the freedom of the will.

Every system of scepticism necessarily ends in throwing doubts over every idea of obligation, and consequently in a denial of human rights and the existence of moral principle. In reference to the system of necessity, as illustrated by Hobbes, human liberty is absolutely denied and man made a mere machine; and Hume reaches the same point of infidelity by tracing the origin of all our knowledge to experience.

There is no system connected with moral philosophy which

---

\*Webster's Speech to the Charleston Bar, 1847.

has involved more subtle thought and disquisition than the doctrine of mysticism, implying a direct communication between man and God through the inward perception of the mind, and it in its turn has confused and bewildered the French and German mind into more forms of infidelity than any branch of modern speculation. Then may be noticed that abominable system which has existed in various ages, which either sought the absorption of the infinite in the finite, of God in nature, or the absorption of nature in God, and is known as pantheism. It has appeared under so many different forms, and has received so many modifications from philosophers, that it is difficult to distinguish at all times its essential principles, further than a constant and perpetual atheism, and an unfailing tendency to degrade the human mind to a mere mechanical operation, in which the soul stands in the same relation to God as the animal body or the tiny leaflet that quivers in the breeze.

Then grave philosophers spring up and proclaim what is known as the selfish system, among the leaders of which may be classed Hobbes. It has for its basis the doctrine that human actions have no other origin than the desire of pleasure and abhorrence of pain. At a later day Bentham adopted the selfish system of Hobbes, with which he interlinked the false theory of utilitarianism. All of these systems deny the existence in human nature of any disinterested motive, than which no grosser or more unchristian error ever existed, for the Bible forbids it. Among the great systems which have been adopted from time to time as a human basis for moral philosophy may be noticed that of the moral sentiments. The most distinguished writer on this subject was Adam Smith. In his "Moral Sentiments," our actions are ascribed to sympathy; a doctrine which during the latter part of the eighteenth century formed the basis of a large and popular school in moral philosophy, which, seventeen years after the publication of the "Theory of Moral Sentiments," was much impaired by the publication, by the same author, of a work of more power, "The Wealth of Nations," in which he boldly asserted and maintained the very opposite—that human actions were to be ascribed to selfishness; which may be true under that universally

false administration of political affairs with which the world is afflicted, but which a sound morality so deeply regrets and rejects. Buckle has attempted, quite unsuccessfully, to harmonise the two theories of this distinguished writer. A clear analysis of the two systems will show that the idea of men being governed by sympathy is unsound as a moral principle, and consequently equally so in a Christian sense, inasmuch as it would induce mankind to sustain fallen human nature in every crime, by covering its wickedness with a sympathetic tear for every offence; and while in the political world selfishness is the god of the day, it is but a deity taken from the heathen Pantheon, as it is evident that it is mammon who has established his dominion over the feelings of those who are devoted to the pursuit of wealth and the gratification of a corrupt nature.

We would ask no stronger argument to show to intelligent and thinking men the truth of our position that moral philosophy has all along through its misty history rested upon a false foundation, than these constant appeals to man's evil nature to sustain the truth of its doctrines.

Hume, the infidel, and after him, Hutcheson, assumed the sympathetic theory to be true; and no one will deny that it is, next to selfishness, a powerful motive to human actions, but, as we remarked above, an unsound dogma to be introduced into moral philosophy, especially when it becomes so very popular among infidel writers.

Jouffroy has treated this subject with much clearness and truth. He says:

“Imagine now some instinctive philosopher—Smith, Hume, Hutcheson, for instance—seeking among the various kinds of good, which have all the same character, the moral good, that is to say, the supreme good, to which all others should be sacrificed; and among other various motives, all having equal authority, the moral motive, the sovereign motive to which all others should yield, and which may impose duties and obligations,—and conceive of his embarrassment. He is to find, among these diverse kinds of good, one which may rightfully be placed before all others, and be called emphatically the true good; he is to find, among these desires one which has some title of sovereignty

T x U

over all others, and which may be recognised as obligatory. Here is the rock upon which the instinctive system is ever in danger of being wrecked; and to avoid it the advocates of the system have followed two different courses—some following Smith and others Hume.

“Now how has Smith attempted to escape this difficulty? He has simply selected, from these various kinds of good, one which he declares to be the moral good, and the true good; and among the different desires he has chosen one which he calls the moral motive, the motive that ought to control all other desires.”\*

Moral philosophy, after floating over an unknown sea, without chart or compass, and as if desiring to escape the many errors which centuries had gathered around her, fell upon another device—a system fatal to a sound philosophy, though approaching more nearly the solution of the problem than any yet examined. This is the rational system, which, in modern times, owes its popularity to Dr. Price, a celebrated metaphysician and a very popular writer on moral science.

In the first place, rationalism as a doctrine of philosophy, supposes that reason furnishes certain elements of knowledge, and without which experience would be useless. It opposes all sensualism, and refuses to refer our knowledge either to sensation or reflection. It will be readily perceived that in theology it has led to scepticism—a mild phrase by which modern infidelity is often designated; for it adopts reason as a sufficient ground of faith, exclusive of revelation. That human conduct is to be regulated by reason is to a large extent true—it is an old dogma, and is the lonely and isolated prop of pagan philosophy. Such was the Platonic theory four hundred years B. C., and in it are many glimpses of heavenly truth, surrounded with mystical extravagances which could never have been dissipated by the unassisted power of mere reason.

Reason being a power of the human mind, is liable to constant error; indeed truth itself, which is abstractly right, and based upon principles which are unerring, is often under the guidance of reason misapplied in the conduct of worldly affairs, and we

---

\* Jouffroy, Vol. II., p. 206.



see daily in the administration of our business transactions the many false steps reason alone is answerable for.

In moral philosophy, then, it must be acknowledged that the strongest principle, that of rationalism, not only falls far below the true and exalted standard by which human action should be regulated, but has been the fruitful source of individual and national crime.

There are two fatal objections to the rational systems: in morals it leads to the most wicked habits and disastrous results; and when it seeks an unnatural and forced connexion with theology, it leads to infidelity.

In reference to its evil influences in an ethical sense, it leaves every question to be decided by human reason, subjected to all the fallibilities and wicked passions of the human mind; which, unassisted by divine revelation and the direct influence of Deity, has ever, and always will, prove a mistaken guide to the pathway of truth and right. Look to the many wicked deeds men have committed, which they satisfy themselves are right, by a process of reasoning purely mental in its operation. Cast but a glance along the historic page, and we see cabinets and congresses in solemn session, and after deliberate debate, resolve on and execute plans which, with the most violent wickedness, ultimately overwhelm nations by the rude and violent shock of war. Elaborate essays are written, vast volumes composed, to justify the course of nations whose track is marked year after year with blood; and this under a system of ethical philosophy which has the imposing and rightful nomenclature of rationalism, whereby every crime known to the Decalogue is defended upon some principle of utility, or policy, or necessity.

That this rational system, in its connexion with theology, has led to some of the most shocking forms of infidelity, cannot be denied; for it places the impotent and short-sighted capacity of man in open opposition to the will of God, the voice of revelation, and the influence of faith on the human mind—that sanctified communion of man with his Maker. That such a system of moral philosophy, which, like every one that has been the product of human reason, should not only be defective but ruin-

ous, is no longer surprising; because upon investigation it is evident no system of moral philosophy has ever yet been erected upon the only foundation on which there can be a lasting superstructure—the religious principle.

It must appear as true to every one that the different systems of moral philosophy which have been examined, and the various theories they present, have been the fruitful agents of the evil spirit of scepticism, which we find not only pervading the principles of human conduct and human sentiment in their relations to man with his fellow-man, but investing itself with every form of infidelity, in the vain and frantic effort to sever the faith of the Christian—that bright and unsullied chain which binds him to his Maker's throne.

From the rationalism of modern schools we learn much that is true, beautiful, and practical; but we have seen how defective, indeed, how dangerous is the system, not only to the political and social interest of the community but to the most vital interest of morality itself. We are compelled to resort to higher principle than reason—the conscience—by which we not only mean the faculty of judging of one's conduct in reference to right and wrong, but something still higher—the moral sense.

The correlation between reason and conscience involves some very nice and beautiful views in intellectual as well as in moral philosophy—relations to which are strongly though delicately intertwined.

Conscience springs from the moral faculty; and here we adopt the position of Stewart that the moral faculty springs from a principle in human nature. We take this to be true, and to constitute a permanent stand-point in moral philosophy. It is the doctrine of Stewart, and reflects the views of the modern school in England and America, that the moral faculty, like that of reason, requires care and cultivation for its development; and, like reason, it has a gradual progress.

In looking to the origin and development of the moral faculty, it is apparent that the reciprocal relation between conscience and reason is maintained under the laws of mind, and that no system of moral philosophy can be established upon the development of

the moral faculty that does not involve the rationalistic system; and we are afraid to adopt as a system any principles that are not subjected to the crucible of reason.

Since the publication of Stewart's work on the Active and Moral Powers of Man, two theories on the nature of virtue have appeared and attracted considerable attention in Europe and America—Sir James Mackintosh's *Dissertation on the Progress of Ethical Philosophy*; and Jouffroy's *Cours de Droit Naturel*. They are brilliant and beautiful works.

Mackintosh, while holding that morality is an original quality of actions, admits that it would be a dangerous thing to acknowledge the existence of a moral conscience in man free from the operations of reason. The distinguished author did not intend to make the admission claimed for him in this essay, for he attempted in the paper before us—the Progress of Ethical Philosophy—to build up a theory that claims supremacy and command over the conscience; but while doing so, he yet could not escape the inevitable authority of reason. In his remarks on Butler, he says: "Nothing stands between the moral sentiments and their object;" yet he admits that conscience is the creature of education, and if educated, by what? By some mental process, which can be none but reason.

According to Price and Stewart, the idea of good is only an idea of a quality in actions recognised by *intuitive reason*. "In my opinion," says Jouffroy, "this is true only of moral good. I grant the idea of moral good is the idea of a certain quality in actions, a quality which really exists in them, and which my reason discovers."

It is not to review these two last mentioned writers that we have introduced them before the reader, but simply to use them as distinguished authority to show that all systems of moral philosophy which have been presented to the world, even the most imposing, are necessarily erroneous and defective; and so long as they are based upon intellectual philosophy, and it makes no higher effort for the absolute good than can be attained and appreciated by human nature under the operation of the intellect, the entire system of moral philosophy will be, as it has been with

all of its grandeur, but a waif on the great ocean of human thought, which, when picked up by one age, is as surely abandoned by another; and though founded as a science upon natural law, it will never reach its true dignity, nor perform its mission, so long as human intellect seeks to perpetuate its truths by the puny efforts of unassisted human reason.

In moral philosophy, the office of reason must be to lead us to cultivate with care that good disposition which will induce us to avail ourselves of all the means in our power for the wise regulation of our external conduct. Here we see no ethical system can be perfect which stops at this point; indeed, it has been a false genius which has misled philosophy far from the truth, as it plays around the head, but comes not to the heart. Then the effort of good and enlightened men has been directed to those nice and subtle questions often puzzling the science of ethics, and has given rise in modern times to a department which determines cases of conscience, and is now distinguished by the title of *Casuistry*.

Reason has either failed to satisfy us, or has misled its victim; and hence the feeling

Whatever creed be taught, or land be trod,  
Man's conscience is the oracle of God:

—a false sentiment of the past, introduced into man's philosophy, which, like a luminous mental meteor, has often proven an *ignis fatuus* that has seduced many a soul into the inextricable bogs and quagmires of infidelity.

We do not deny that conscience is an original faculty by which we form conceptions of moral qualities, that it is the only means by which we acquire a knowledge of right and wrong, and that it is a universal faculty; yet we cannot build up a system of moral philosophy from it, nor with it and reason combined. If we attempt to separate reason and conscience, where is the compass by which the moral faculty is to be guided? Is it nature? That is subject to human training. The moral faculty cannot be separated from the dominion of the intellect; and however pure and unsullied may be the conscience, its surface will be discolored by the moral atmosphere inevitably breathed by human

nature; and the rays of light that might guide it to truth will be darkened by human reason.

“To understand man, we must look beyond the individual man and his actions or interest, and view him in combination. It is in society that man first feels what he is; first becomes what he can be. In society an altogether new set of spiritual activities are involved, and the old immeasurably quickened and strengthened.” Thus wrote Carlyle, the great systematic opposer of all systems.

With regard to morals, we may say, it is in society that it takes many new forms, and as it appears to expand itself, it grows into many errors.

It is admitted on all sides that the metaphysical and moral sciences are falling into decay. Carlyle says: “In most of the European nations there is now no such thing as a science of mind; only more or less advancement in the general science, or the special sciences of matter.” Equally true is it in America.

Our metaphysics have all become physics; not a spiritual philosophy, but a material one; and the civilised world has suffered from it. We again quote from Carlyle, who says: “In fact, an outward persuasion has long been diffusing itself, and now and then even then comes to utterance—that, except the external, there are no true sciences; that, to the inward world, our only conceivable road is through the outward; that in short, what cannot be investigated and understood mechanically, cannot be investigated and understood at all.” This was written in 1829; and the author complained that this exclusive faith in mechanism is no where more visible than in politics.

The distinguished critic has lived to see more than now and then “an utterance” of this philosophy. It has become a system, and as such has affected not only politics, which is generally at this day the reverse of morality, but the system of ethics itself.

F. Guizot, the prime minister of France, delivered a course of lectures on the history of civilisation from the fall of the Roman empire to the French Revolution; they present a splendid review of the history and philosophy of that period; grand and mo-

mentous as it was. Guizot was the first distinguished author who intimated the influence of physical geography on the wealth and development of different nations. If philosophers had been content to leave the historical question in the hands of the great French philosopher, it would have done no harm. But the question was agitated by political as well as moral philosophers, until with sacrilegious hand it has invaded even the temple of Christianity itself. And for this no man is more responsible than our distinguished and learned English philosopher, Henry Thomas Buckle, whose *History of Civilisation in England*, though never completed, is yet a monument of almost unprecedented learning, though of often misapplied philosophy. The author looks to the material development of a nation for the tendency of its laws and the sentiments of its moral writers; and these, he contends, are controlled by the laws of physical geography—climates, mountains, valleys, seas and rivers, with heat and cold, sunshine and clouds, working out the political, the moral, the sentimental views of a people; and thus, by making every interest subservient to filthy lucre, moral philosophy has been subverted from its true mission, and theories of ethics made the sport of political gamblers, philosophical tradesmen and speculators, who test science, and even religion itself, by the ring of the metal.

A more distinguished and abler writer than Buckle has discussed this question from a different stand-point. Dr. Draper, of New York, who, while he bases some of his leading theories of political philosophy upon physical geography, does not go to the extreme length of Buckle in making it rule the moral and religious sentiments of nations.

But it is a lamentable truth to find that this faith in physical science has planted itself so deeply in the human intellect that men have lost their belief in the invisible, and scarcely look to this as a religious age. The material, and not the divine, has fastened itself upon Europe and America. In the language of Carlyle: "The infinite, absolute character of virtue has passed into a finite, conditional one. It is no longer a worship of the beautiful and good, but a calculation of the profitable." Making, alas! too true the irony of the poet Pope—

VOL. XXII., NO. 1.—2.

Know all the good that individuals find,  
Or God and nature meant to mere mankind ;  
Reason's whole pleasure, all the joys of sense,  
Lie in three words—health, peace, and competence.

The doctrine of the controlling influence of physical geography over the destiny of nations is part and parcel of the moral philosophy which has prevailed in England since the days of Locke. He borrowed the system of materialism from pagan writers who knew nothing of spiritual religion; but all was material, from which Hume and his followers were rapidly towing the learning of the schools into atheism and fatalism.

Reid, and Stewart, and Brown, and Hamilton, and Jouffroy, with other great Christian philosophers, have done very much to dissipate the clouds that earlier writers threw over the true Christian theory of moral philosophy; but it was only a moral structure that had been presented to the world; and such were its materials, though rich and beautiful to the eye, yet unsubstantial and the subject of countless modifications.

In this essay we have uniformly maintained the doctrine that the moral faculty is an original part of the human mind, the great laws of which are engraven on the heart. Here we coincide with modern standard writers, especially those of the school of that eminent teacher in the science of moral philosophy, Dugald Stewart. It is not now our purpose to differ generally with the great masters of this science, but to show that they have presented to the world and built up a scientific system, limiting the origin of human motive and seeking the regulation thereof, without a due and proper recognition of that principle which arose in the mystic depth of man's soul, and which, though it flew like hallowed fire from heart to heart, is nevertheless embodied in the words of God in the writings of the Old and New Testament. It is only by adopting the Christian religion as the master element and controlling principle in the moral faculty that we ever expect to reach the great truths of moral science and to give them that influence which alone can render them of value to the world. Ingenuity and mechanical philosophy may build up the resources of a nation in wealth and bodily comforts, and in

all the luxuries that human beings can crave, yet there is a philosophy beyond the touch of reason; there is a national grandeur whose magnificence extends beyond the reach of proud cities adorned with all the skill of architecture, or of a cultivated country rich only in physical resources, with railroads and ships to carry the products of the workshops and fields to every door. All of the great improvements of mechanical philosophy and the great advancements of wealth have very often proven the source of those mighty streams of corruption whose waters, instead of purifying, have distempered the moral atmosphere with death-bearing malaria, and have erected along the track of time many monuments that but mark the sepulchres of nations.

If we can but engraft the principles of the Christian religion upon moral philosophy and make its richness permeate its literature, we would do much towards destroying the present age of voluptuous materialism in which the civilised world is steeped. It is unfortunately true, interests which are called positive, all of which are embraced in gold and pleasure, have acquired such an ascendancy throughout the civilised world that society in many instances has lamentably retrograded almost to that period of paganism which may be summed up in the deification of matter, or the impersonation of passion in the form of a Venus, a Bacchus, or a Plutus.

A very distinguished and eloquent philosopher says: "Observe what happens with respect to industrial progress. Those steam vessels which leave our ports with the rapidity of an arrow to traverse the immensity of ocean; those burning vehicles which skim along our plains and penetrate into the heart of mountains, realising under our eyes what would have seemed a dream to our fathers; those other machines which give movement to gigantic workshops, and, as if by magic, set in motion innumerable instruments and elaborate with the most wonderful precision the most delicate productions—all this is great and wonderful."\* But with all this man is dissatisfied, and the present age, which physically and even intellectually, administers so much to mate-

---

\*European Civilisation, by Rev. J. Balnes—translated from the Spanish.



rialism and to passion, is much to blame. Alas, how deeply does it minister to human misery! for, in the language of the author just quoted, "Man feels that he is still greater than these machines and master-pieces of art; his heart is an abyss which nothing can fill; give him the whole world and the void will be the same. The depth is immeasurable; the soul, created in the image and likeness of God, cannot be satisfied without the possession of him."

It is evident to the historic student, that ancient civilisation is vastly different from the modern; the former being built up entirely by the increase of the wealth of the nations, owes its success to that source, and the development of physical science; but trace the various civilisations of antiquity to their end, how many nations of immense power, revelling in every luxury that wealth could bestow, have found their end in the indulgence of passion, and the effect of vice? It was but the natural consequence of the vitiated habits and character of every nation of antiquity, down to the overthrow of Roman civilisation, that its extinction should be the result of the violation of every moral law; and if it were true, as Guizot and Buckle have contended, that European and English civilisation are the result of the development of the physical laws of science and their application to human wants, then will every form of modern civilisation pass away in similar whirlpools of corruption as have swallowed up every nation that lived before the Christian era.

It cannot be denied by intelligent men, that the development of the wealth of a country, and the application of the arts and sciences to human wants, is necessary to its civilisation, and facilitates the highest intellectual cultivation. We agree that the material elements of ancient civilisation are very extensively diffused through that of modern nations; and unless the only conservative and antiseptic power that is known to man, the laws of morality as purified by the Christian religion, shall be more thoroughly incorporated in its every principle, man's natural depravity will exercise a powerful and destructive influence upon it—not entire and absolute, because the vital spark of Christianity can never be extinguished; though the moral phi-

losophy of the civilised world at the present day is deeply poisoned with infidelity as that of antiquity was with materialism.

How beautiful are the remarks of Ruskin, which we insert as applicable to our subject :

“And all real and wholesome enjoyments possible to man, have been just as possible to him since first he was made of the earth as they are now, and they are possible to him chiefly in peace. To watch the corn grow, and the blossoms set; to draw hard breath over ploughshare or spade; to read, to think, to love, to hope, to pray—these are the things that make men happy; they have always had the power of doing these, they never will have the power to do more. The world’s prosperity or adversity depends upon our knowing and teaching these few things; but not upon iron, or glass, or electricity, or steam—in no wise.”

How beautifully has an American statesman and jurist, whose mind was deeply impressed with the rich and splendid principles of moral philosophy, expressed an idea german to our subject, when he said :

“If we work upon marble, it will perish; if we work upon brass, time will efface it; if we rear temples, they will crumble into dust; but, if we will work upon our immortal minds, if we imbue them with principles, with the just fear of God and our fellow-men, we engrave on these tablets something that will brighten to all eternity.”\*

Dr. Alexander says :

“Indeed, to know that our conduct should be conformed to the will of God, supposes the existence of a moral faculty, of which this is one of the intuitive judgments. If we had no moral faculty, the obligation to be conformed to the will of God would not be felt. It is true, undoubtedly, that it may be inferred from clear data, that ultimately all duty and all virtuous actions may be referred to the will of God as the standard by which they should be tried.”†

This coincides with our view in reference to adopting as the basis of moral science the principles of the Christian religion. All institutions which propose to unite the different members of

---

\*Daniel Webster.

†Alexander’s Moral Science, p. 182.

the human family and bind them by the tie of reciprocal obligations, must necessarily repose upon a religious idea; that religious idea, under our present form of civilisation, is Christianity, which is indeed its soul.

Modern history has fully proven, that all institutions which propose to govern men have attained to no valuable influence or effective jurisdiction, unless based upon Christianity, which alone can operate upon the diverse and wicked tendencies of the human mind, give life and unity to society, and make it tend to the accomplishment of the duty of each of its members—living to the glory of God.

We deprecate the union of Church and State as unchristian and impolitic; ruinous to the one, and corrupting to the other; but no one denies that the full recognition and practice of every Christian virtue by those who make and execute the laws, having always the fear of God before them, would bring about a condition of morals, public and private, that would exhibit not only a state of moral science, but of Christian excellence never yet attained on earth.

The moral faculty is imperfect, and so variously developed under the different avocations and education of the human family that it requires a unity which Christianity alone can give to make it conform to truth and justice; and as far as it attains purity then it will be uniform and correct in its application to secular affairs.

All writers on moral philosophy admit that the moral faculty is capable of cultivation, and that it is trained by the laws of virtue, or subjected to the dominion of vice; and, as a consequence, we see the necessity of making the principles of Christianity the basis of every work on moral philosophy. It is because this has never been done that we find every system defective and different ones produced by successive generations, displacing each the other, like the ephemera of party politics, to be followed by others equally vague and uncertain.

Socialism, which is called the science of reconstructing society, by substituting the principle of association for that of competition in every branch of human industry, is a feature of infidelity

which grows out of a corrupt system of moral and political philosophy. Fourierism, Saint Simonism, Humanitarianism, united under the motto *Solidarite*, are phases of social and political incendiarism, whose unscriptural dogmas would vanish beneath the light of Christian philosophy.

It must be acknowledged that the principles of moral philosophy pervade every department of life; and while its gentle beams shine around the domestic circle, they illumine the halls of justice and intermingle with our warmest patriotic faith.

There should be religion in the life of nations, which ought to pervade not only social justice but that higher intercourse among nations, which, under the purified moral sanctions of national law, and also what has been termed political ethics, would wield an influence never yet felt and enjoyed by the nations of the globe.

“There are rights in individuals, in the families, in the nation itself; and besides these, there are rights in the power. And because all these rights are vested in human hands, blind, passionate, they are liable to be brought together in terrible collisions. Oh, how needful in the midst of society that there should be some moral power to rise up and prevent or appease these collisions; political society needs it even more than domestic society. Harmony exists by natural law in the family; antagonism exists by natural law in the state.”\*

Christian moral philosophy has been unprogressive as a science since the early days of the New Testament. It is alike the design of the Christian system to purify all human government as it is the individual man, not by any connexion of Church and State, but by enlightening and purifying with the teachings of the gospel those who administer its affairs; for if the civil government is the institution of man, the state is an ordinance of God.

It is a melancholy fact that the various systems of modern moral philosophy have either overlooked, or very partially treated, some of the great truths of Christianity, neither attempting to treat them as a whole nor to take a philosophic view of them.

---

\*Lecture by Pere Hyacinthe, “Religion in the Life of Nations.”

We are brought to the same conclusion with Row, "that a great work, embracing the whole of Christian moral philosophy, remains yet to be written."

There has been a constant failure to recognise the relation of Christianity to the moral and intellectual nature of man. Mills, the distinguished English metaphysician, has even contended that Christian ethics are imperfect. Would not such objections be removed if our moral philosophy rested on what we have been contending was its true basis?

We are not surprised to find so much of moral philosophy previous to the Reformation involved in fundamental error. The Reformation of the sixteenth century was emphatically a Bible reformation. The fundamental principle of it was the Bible alone, the rule of faith and conduct. The chief means by which the moral perfection of human nature is to be accomplished is the truth. "Ye shall know the truth," said Jesus to the Jews who believed on him, "and the truth shall make you free."

No one denies that from the doctrine of the Scriptures the tendency of moral and religious truth is to produce virtuous affections and upright conduct. Then it is obvious that the Scriptures should be the basis of moral science, for they alone teach it perfectly, and in them the leading faculties of the mind, the intellect, the affections, the conscience, the will, are all recognised. It is clear that while the Scriptures teach a large amount of truth, they also give us the clue to all philosophic investigation on moral subjects.

An eminent Christian minister has very forcibly remarked, "If the study of mechanical philosophy, chemistry, anatomy, and of all the laws of nature, be adapted to invigorate the powers of the mind, how much more effectually does it accomplish this object when the mind ascends from these finite objects to the great Infinite; when in the works and laws of creation it beholds and admires the perfections of the Creator."\*

It is evident that the union of a false philosophy with Chris-

---

\* Dr. N. L. Rice, Lecture on the Moral Effects of Christianity, delivered at the University of Virginia, Session 1850-51.

tianity had a powerful effect on the pagan mind. In Egypt, where this unnatural union was first effected, Dr. Rice has clearly pointed out not only the wicked superstitions that arose therefrom, but has truly traced much of even modern infidelity to Plato and the old philosophy, which he justly says was characterised by perfect sterility. False in its first principles, it could make no progress.

“The ancient philosophy,” says Macaulay, “was a treadmill, not a path. It was made up of revolving questions—of controversies which were always beginning again. It was a contrivance for having much exertion and no progress.” This is true, and Dr. Rice gives the reason, when he said in the lecture referred to, “Holding to the eternity of matter and of mind, the ancient philosophers very naturally regarded the question, how things came to be as they are, as the first great question to be solved by philosophy. Consequently, their gigantic intellects were employed in endless theories and conjectures, which could never be more than mere theories and conjectures.”

After an examination of the principles of pagan philosophy, we are fully prepared to endorse the striking expression of Lord Bacon, who says, “From the systems of the Greeks, and their subordinate divisions in particular branches of the sciences during so long a period, scarcely one single experiment can be culled that has a tendency to elevate or assist mankind, and can be fairly set down to the speculations and doctrines of their philosophy.”

The Reformation found the world withering under the sterile philosophy of sixty generations—a philosophy barren of good fruits and infected with a poison which had nearly destroyed the vitality of the Church. Luther, Zwingle, Peter Martyr, and Calvin, boldly attacked the celebrated schoolmen who had brought such odium upon philosophy and upon religion; who were indeed followers of the great infidel Pelagius and of Aquinas, who were disciples of Aristotle. Luther wrote, “Aristotle is on the wane, and already totters to his fall.” And alluding to Popery said, “I desire nothing more ardently than to lay open before all eyes this false system, which has tricked the Church by covering itself

with a Greek mask, and to expose its worthlessness before the world." Plato and Aristotle, and Pelagius and Aquinas, were all overthrown. The Scriptures had done it, and the Reformation cleared away the rubbish and debris of centuries of error and sin.

With all the enlightenment which Christianity has thrown upon the world, we have seen in another part of this essay that the great defects of all the modern systems of moral philosophy consisted in too much disregard of the principles of Christianity, which we have been contending were the only basis on which the science of ethics could be properly built.

Christianity being a divine revelation, there can be no higher exercise of human intelligence than an examination of the relation of its truths to the moral as well as the spiritual nature of man. Why then should not the principles of moral philosophy be set forth and recognised by writers and teachers as the offspring of Christianity? Do not the beautiful and splendid truths of Christianity correspond with what there is of truth in the wisest and best writers on ethics? But this is not in itself sufficient. We want more than this; we want a demonstration of the suitability of the discoveries of revelation to satisfy the aspirations of the moral and spiritual nature of man.

What, we would ask, is the difference between Christianity and the truths of moral philosophy? They are vast, it is true, and Christ is the centre of Christianity. Why not make his teachings the centre of moral philosophy? The error philosophers have committed gives us an answer to the question—they have not seen sufficiently the defects of heathen philosophy, which furnished no source of moral power and duty higher than the relationship of man to man as members of a political society, which of itself weakened the force of human responsibility and blunted the sense of moral feeling as well as duty. Thus it is our entire system of ethics has grown up, as it were, under an evil habit of thought, the power of which has controlled human actions as it has shaped and modified human sentiment.

How can we grapple with the present existing state of moral evil? Ancient philosophy was unable to do it, and all its specu-

lation ran into policy or the ignoble science of politics. None of its systems could establish a Church, or even a permanent school. They failed to satisfy human nature, and Christianity alone can do it; and consequently its pure streams should ever intermingle with the current of moral philosophy. Row, from whom we have previously quoted, remarks: "While philosophy had attained a general view of what constitutes a virtuous and vicious course of action, its delineations of actual morality were tinged by the political aspect in which it was compelled to contemplate it. This led it to extol the heroic, and to disparage, if not deny, the humble virtues."

It appears that the philosophers of every age have left mankind with no chart or compass to use what truth they had. The only true teacher of moral philosophy published a new and perfect edition of the moral law; but he grasped at higher aims—the regeneration of the world, and addressed himself to those whom worldly philosophy had not reached and could not reach, and introduced a spiritual influence which should direct every principle of duty. This is the seed of all true moral philosophy, and there is no reason nor weight attached to any theory that is not the growth thereof.

This principle could not be put in operation by man's philosophy. Christ, the author, alone could do it; he created a state—the Church—under which man alone could work. Philosophy stood abashed, and acknowledged its weakness; and through it, the principle on which man could act and be influenced—this was faith.

This principle is laid down in the New Testament as the only means through which man's moral amelioration is possible. It was the result of a superhuman effort; it not only raised the human family intellectually, but is the means of saving them from a state of degradation which the highest powers of intellect could not do. Alas! how unfortunately true is it, that we often see the most gigantic intellects weakened by vice, and the most brilliant genius darkened by depravity.

The following extracts are taken from Row's very able essay, to which we have previously referred:



“There are two modes in which our intellectual conviction may become a great moral and spiritual power: first by creating a conception to which the mind has been previously a stranger, and by a steady contemplation of it. The second is by producing an intense conviction of some particular truth. It is clear that the truths of revelation are a spiritual power which reaches every depth of our moral being; and as such moral forces address themselves to our reason, it follows that faith is an influence partly intellectual and partly moral; it originates in the intellect, but penetrates to the heart. Faith, according to the teachings of Christianity, is a deep and earnest conviction of the mind, which penetrates and stirs the profoundest depths of man’s moral and spiritual nature.”

We agree with the author of the above extract, that faith is an earnest conviction of the mind which penetrates the profoundest depths of man’s moral, as well as spiritual nature; and all systems of moral philosophy which do not recognise faith as their corner-stone are defective. It is the duty of Christian philosophy to prove to the world that all the great truths of moral philosophy are derived from the Bible, and that its teachings are in conformity with the soundest principles of human nature.

But let it be remembered, “many depths of the human mind have yet to be sounded, before we shall be able to contemplate the Christian revelation in all its glory. The duty of gifted Christian men is to labor for its accomplishment. Every fresh discovery of truth will show that the teachings of Jesus of Nazareth have penetrated to the depths of man’s mental and moral constitution; that he has supplied the deficiencies of all previous teachings; and that he has discovered a system of truth suitable to the development of human civilisation from age to age. Other systems have been partial and imperfect; that of Christ is founded on the universal nature of man, and is capable of universal accommodation to its ever varying condition.”\*

We wish to see illustrated the manner in which great truths act upon the human mind; how their power may be most successfully brought to bear on vice and degradation; and to have

---

\*Row’s Essay.

the entire principle of human motive submitted to a successful analysis. The ordinary systems of philosophy overlook the bearing of the higher impulses of the human spirit on our moral character; and in looking to the very beginning of the science, and cultivating a more intimate acquaintance with its theories and its enchanting sentiments, we must ever remember that it is the Author of Christianity who has established the only true basis of moral philosophy, from which must spring those principles which regulate human conduct in all public and private relations, and extend even to the action of governments, as well as international intercourse.

Moral philosophy, it should be remembered, in a public sense, assumes the name of political ethics, a change only of name but not of principles; and in all that pertains to public and political affairs and upon all great state questions, an honest and just policy is the only one that can mark the course of Christian statesmen, and obtain the sanction of a God-loving and God-fearing people. It is lamentably true that a very erroneous system of political ethics has grown out of the idea so often expressed by publicists, that a state is a metaphysical entity, a mere abstraction, and that a state has no conscience, no moral attributes. The law of nations has a moral intention, a moral principle; but Grotius, Puffendorf, Hobbes, and other distinguished writers on public law, failed to establish it on Christian principles. We would not have any one to suppose that we would substitute the most elevated system of moral philosophy for Christianity; but we would impress upon the reader, that its pure light alone can infuse life into all principles of ethics; without it all the doctrines of the schools are mere vagaries, or something incalculably worse—bold and reckless infidelity.

We have also undertaken to prove, that notwithstanding the close and intimate connexion of moral philosophy with the intellect, and the intimacy of Christianity with the highest exercises of the mind, that there are in Christianity things that cannot be brought within the compass of human reason. The ways are indefinable in which man occupies his thoughts and exercises his intellect upon the hopes, the fears, the expectations of a

future life; yet the truth of that future cannot be brought to his knowledge by any exertion of his mere mental powers, but can only be made known to him by other teachings than his own, and is received by faith, for no man by reason can find out God.

It is a melancholy truth, uttered by John Ruskin, that "there never yet was a generation of men, savage or civilised, who, taken as a body, fulfilled the words 'having no hope, and without God in the world,' as the present civilised European race;" and he might have embraced America. The truth of this remark is obvious, for the following reasons: Moral philosophy and metaphysics for several centuries have been mingled with every form of infidelity. To say nothing of the corruptions of theological tenets, writers on moral philosophy have tried to make theological questions yield to the subtleties of philosophy, instead of discarding every theory that did not harmonise with the teachings of the Bible; and these dissensions since the Reformation have in many instances become stumbling-blocks in the Church, which have been manifested by the many sects which have arisen, until there are numbered with the various schisms more than two hundred different schools, all professing to draw spiritual instruction from the same fountain of purity and truth. Surely there must be many elements of false philosophy, to say nothing of infidelity, mingling with so many divergent streams. These stumbling-blocks can only be surmounted by a proper system of education, by which all tenets of philosophy must be abandoned unless sanctified by Christianity and a well-trained judgment that will solve every difficulty by an appeal to the truths of the Bible.

Ruskin lamented that nearly all of the powerful men of this age are unbelievers; the best of them in doubt; the worst in reckless defiance; the plurality in plodding hesitation. Most of our scientific men are in the last class; and our popular authors take a position definitely against all religious forms, or give themselves up to fruitless statements of facts; some to doubting; some to blasphemy. These defects are traceable not to Christianity, nor the writings of eminent Christians, but to the errors of the very many infidel writers on ethics; and the baneful

system of a wrongly-trained judgment, which appears to render even highly educated talent incapable of perceiving and realising the truth of the Bible as the only foundation for all moral science.

This essay, which has been directed to an exposition of the failure of the science of moral philosophy, because its principles, instead of drawing their sustenance from the Bible, have relied upon man's unassisted reason, will fully show to the reader the many and manifest errors of that system of theology, which, disregarding the teachings of the Scriptures, has undertaken the vain and empty task of tracing the functions of Grecian philosophy to a purpose auxiliary to the sublime mission of Christ to redeem fallen man.

We are aware that some eminent divines, such as Cudworth, Trench, Merivale, Schaff, and the humanitarian Pressensé, and in this country Dr. Cocker, have maintained that Greek philosophy fulfilled a preparatory mission for Christianity.

It was our purpose to notice specially the work of Dr. Cocker, Professor of Moral and Mental Philosophy in the University of Michigan, but the length of this paper compels us to postpone a review of Dr. C.'s work to another time. It may be remarked, however, that as this work, "Christianity and Greek Philosophy," is presented to the world by a learned professor at a distinguished University, and by the hands of a very distinguished and learned minister of the gospel of the Arminian persuasion, that it deserves very great consideration, and we are disposed on that account not to deal lightly or inconsiderately with it. That it is a work of erudition, adorned by the grace of high talent, none will deny; but that it has any other grace, few will acknowledge.

This elaborate work of 524 pages, on "Christianity and Greek Philosophy," presents nothing new, but is a most ingenious compilation of unscriptural views, to show that, outside of the Abrahamic covenant, God provided by a system of philosophy a plan of salvation for those not embraced in the covenant, and that plan was pagan philosophy, the very reverse of the Mosaic law, and in direct opposition to the Old and New Testament. We intend to review this book and to show its unscriptural doctrine. It is

enough at this time to say we need no stronger evidence of the infidelity of the doctrine it teaches than we find on page 478, where, quoting from Clement, the author adopts his dogma, that "philosophy, before the coming of the Lord, was necessary to the Greeks for righteousness; and how it proved useful for godliness, being a sort of preliminary discipline for those who reap the fruits of faith through demonstration. . . . Perhaps we may say that it was given to the Greeks with this special object, for it brought the Greek nation to Christ as the law brought the Hebrews." Our author quotes a line from St. Augustine, "Plato made me known the true God, Jesus Christ shewed me the way to him." Now to apply this line to an illustration of the dogma of Clement is a total misapprehension of the meaning of the author, and in disregard of the great mission of Paul to Athens when he saw that they were worshipping the *Unknown God*. We would ask this distinguished professor and divine, when God shall "judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained," upon what will the Athenians rely? Not upon their "unknown God" nor their vain philosophy. These learned theologians are striking at the very foundation of Bible faith; and when St. Paul says to the Athenians, "Whom therefore ye worship, though ye know him not, him declare I unto you," he is met by pantheism, materialism, and mythology, or it may be by Socrates and Plato. We cannot say that these writers are infidels, but most unmistakably their doctrine amounts to infidelity; and we fear it may mislead many far away from the truth, far away from God, for it is more dangerous than rationalism.

It is an old theory which Dr. Cocker has dressed up in new Arminian finery, that "if the race of Abraham received the divine law and the gift of prophecy, the God of the universe led other nations to piety by natural revelation and the spectacle of nature." This is the doctrine of Theodoret and many other old writers, but it is not the doctrine of the Bible, and therefore must be rejected. We suspect that the author of "Christianity and Greek Philosophy" has attempted to use this distant muttering of pagan philosophy as a masked battery against the Bible

doctrine of election, and to fall back with too much satisfaction upon the favorite errors of his church, as illustrated by the unscriptural views of Arminius, and to substitute in the place of the teachings of the Bible the views of man. It is very remarkable to observe the many learned and ingenious arguments and devices used by the disciples of Arminius, which, if true, would overthrow the doctrines of the disciples of Jesus.

---

ARTICLE II.

ASCETICISM.

I. In the discourses of the Lord himself, as well as in the writings of the Apostles, the Christian life is nearly always described as a life of self-denial and daily cross-bearing. The texts that directly inculcate this doctrine are so numerous, and their teaching so unmistakeable, that there is no room for argument upon this point. The terms of discipleship are equally concise and inflexible. "Deny thyself." "Sell whatsoever thou hast, and give to the poor." "Take up thy cross daily, and follow me." "Crucify the flesh, with the affections and lusts." None of these commands are susceptible of modification, and no other possible meaning can be given to any of them, than that which is obvious.

II. The direct teaching of example, beginning with that of the Lord, and corroborated by the walk and conversation of most of the New Testament worthies, tends to the same conclusion. The Captain of Salvation endured a fast of forty days before he encountered the adversary. His entire life was a life of poverty and privation. His forerunner, John the Baptist, was the most remarkable ascetic mentioned in the Bible. And, without pausing to select instances or examples, it is sufficient to refer to the eleventh chapter of Hebrews, where the histories of numerous saints are compressed into brief sentences, recording lives of

positive asceticism. And the Apostle concludes these histories of "the cloud of witnesses" by the exhortation to emulate their example, and the example of Jesus, who "endured the cross, despising the shame."

III. The triumphs won by all these notable persons, are recounted as the victories of faith; and of a faith that is set over against the deeds of the law by which no flesh could be justified. "The just, by his faith, shall live;" and, then, beginning with the days when the earth emerged from chaos—when Abel, by faith, offered a more acceptable sacrifice than Cain—Paul recounts these lives of hardships and conflicts. So that the endurance of privations, and the practice of self-denial, are represented as the direct product of the royal grace of the new dispensation.

It is no marvel that asceticism should have been builded upon these broad foundations.

The present is an age of self-indulgence, if not of positive licentiousness. In this country, the morals of all large cities compare very accurately with the morals of Paris or Vienna. It is only in rare instances that a Christian gains a glimpse of the horrible wickedness prevailing in the numberless haunts of worldly men; but the tone of *Christian* society is undoubtedly far below the standard recognised during the first half of the present century. Since the beginning of the war, the drift of American society has been rapidly tending to laxity in morals, and the Church has not escaped the defilement. Professors of religion, in this enlightened age, allow themselves many indulgences which would have been regarded with horror by their fathers. The old standard was too high, and it has been lowered to meet the requirements of advancing civilisation. Taking the Presbyterian Church for an example, let any one familiar with her history, compare her present status with her old record ending less than ten years ago. In the valleys of Piedmont, in the Swiss cantons, on Scottish heaths and hill-sides, where the blood of her martyrs has been most freely poured out in defence of her ancient creed, her annals are remarkable for the grim determination wherewith her children resisted all

encroachments upon the crown-rights of Christ her king. But in these degenerate days, how many of her pulpits have been occupied by men who proclaimed that she had no king but Cæsar! "*Pro Rege sæpe—pro Patria semper.*" The motto that is good enough for a politician, may not be good enough for a Church. The morals of the Senate may be very immoral in the sanctuary.

The influence of a godly Church upon the ungodly community in which it is placed, has always forced a tone upon society. The purer the Church, the more marked the contrast between it and the world; though the unregenerate world is better for the purity of the Church. Consequently, the prevailing laxity in doctrine and manners, beginning in the Church, has induced a worse laxity in the morals and manners of society; and in this regard it is safe to assert that no previous chapter in American history can be compared with the record of the present generation. The outcroppings of this poisonous vein are visible all over the surface. One need not seek for the evidences in the lower strata of society. The immorality of the age is manifest in its literature, its sculpture, its paintings. In various forms, sensuality and greed, the twin idol-gods, are worshipped throughout the length and breadth of the land. The very pictorial embellishments of the weekly papers are growing more and more obscene and disgusting day by day. And as history repeats itself in the revolution of ages, the termination of this evil drift will infallibly lead to the establishment of asceticism in some one of the repulsive forms in which it has cursed the world in by-gone days. The seed-time of the Puritanism of New England was doubtless in the licentious reign of the Stuarts. And the chivalry of those dissolute cavaliers, brilliant and admirable even amid their enormous vices, disappeared and gave place to those sombre virtues which have made Plymouth Rock infamous in the world's annals. The contrast presented, is between the lawless wickedness of Rochester and Buckingham, and the piety of Connecticut Blue Laws.

It is hardly possible, in these pages, to designate more particularly the present habits of society in the large cities. The



French romances, whose scenes are laid in the reigns of the Valois kings, will give a fair idea of the voluptuousness and frivolity of this era, which is distinguished from the days of Charles IX. and Henry III. by the total absence of the elegance and refinement of the olden time. The contrast is peculiarly violent; because the gentlemen of the old French Court were probably among the bravest and most polished of earthly sinners. The history of that interesting period recounts the fits of asceticism of the third Henry, alternating with orgies and revels which were the more extravagant, because they were liable to sudden interruption, and to the substitution of penances and self-mortifications. Then came the voluptuous reign of Henri Quatre, in which the contrast between the gaiety of the court and the fasts and vigils of new monkish orders was more distinctly marked. Then the times of Richelieu, under Louis XIII., and after him, Mazarin, and, throughout all this long period, an undying contest between Huguenot and Papist, with more or less of ascetic observance on both sides.

The contemporaneous history of the English Court, where the Reformation had obtained a sure foothold, presents at once a contrast and a resemblance. In the kingdom of the Valois and the Bourbons, the contest between the voluptuous courtier and the voluntary ascetic, was modified by the still more relentless conflict between the Papist and the Reformer. But in England, the religion of the whole kingdom was identical with that of the Waldenses and the Huguenots, in so far as these were in opposition to Popery. And the fashionable excesses of the age were the vices of a nominally Protestant nobility. It cannot be denied that the men of purer morals, were, for the most part, men of inferior scholarship, who taught with the sublime truths of their better creed many absurd and fanatical superstitions. Something is perhaps due to a national moroseness of character, never found in the French Huguenot, or in his semi-Italian brother of the Piedmontese valleys, or even in the graver Reformers of Switzerland. The English Puritan was often sour, grim and repulsive. Asceticism in its highest development is inseparable from spiritual pride, and this from self-conceit and self-

righteousness, which are hateful alike to God and to man; and perhaps asceticism has found its very highest development in the regicides of England, and in that narrow strip of latitude on this side of the Atlantic to which they fled.

To avoid misapprehension, it is necessary to make a slight digression from the main argument at this point. In this country, and especially in the Southern half of it, the name of Puritan has obtained an evil odour, because this name has been appropriated by, or applied to, the inhabitants of those highly cultivated regions contiguous to Cape Cod and Passamaquoddy Bay. In either case, this exclusive application of the title is wrong, for several reasons. The citizens of that favored land claim an undue share of honors and advantages. Their attainments in a pious direction, are far beyond those of other people. Scorning the fetters of creeds and confessions, vast multitudes of them have discovered a higher law than the law of God, and shape their conduct in lofty disregard of all established systems of ethics. In matters of polite learning, their preëminence is beyond a doubt. What they do not know, is not worthy of human attainment. In that indescribable, innate refinement of soul which produces refinement of manners, they know no rivals on this planet, and have earned a reputation for instinctive politeness which is limited only by the boundaries of civilisation. It is hardly fair, in addition, to monopolize the goodly name of Puritan. And it is still less fair to include, by a sweeping classification, the worthies of Elizabeth's reign, in the same category with the worthies of Plymouth Rock.

The title was originally given to a community of God-fearing men, who rejected ritualism, and contended for the pure worship of God. The tribute paid to them in Macaulay's famous Essay is well deserved, and probably more accurately describes them than any contemporaneous history has done. At a time when political differences were distinguished by a bitter partisanship, and when violent prejudices gave color to men's opinions, it would be vain to expect a fair statement upon either side. In the main, the advantages of scholarship were on the side of those who zealously opposed the Puritans, both in theological

doctrine, and in the wider field of politics. The contrary examples were few and far between. In the times of John Milton, whose name furnishes the title to Macaulay's *Essay*, the Puritans were understood to be all those who adopted democratic theories of government, for the reason that the cause of the monarchy was identical with the cause of the Established Church. The Puritans themselves resisted this general classification; and, in all essential particulars, the antagonism between them and the Free-thinkers of their day was more apparent than the antagonism between puritan and cavalier. Among these fierce sectaries all shades of heresy abounded; and it is not likely that such men as Howe, Owen, Baxter, and other Non-conformists, would have winked at atrocious errors in doctrine for the sake of unanimity in political proclivities. But the free-thinkers were as hateful to the ritualists and the royalists of a later reign—as opposers of established authority—as the other non-conformists of a better creed.

It is not easy to overestimate the work and testimony of those eminent British saints, especially as purely secular history deals mainly with their record on its political side. In securing the liberty of conscience for which they first contended, and which, undoubtedly, was the prime object of their lives, they incidentally secured higher developments of human freedom, and certainly restrained the ferocity of the less instructed Independents of the days of the Commonwealth. It is very remarkable that the despotism of a military government of great power should have been no more galling and oppressive. It is more remarkable that the English nation should have emerged from the very threshold of anarchical ruin, with free principles, and with a legal canon of noble proportions, into the very best form of free government that the world had ever known. How much is due to the statesmanship and patriotism of the Puritans, manifested in averting the threatened evil, and in securing the desired good, will only be revealed at the last day.

Whether their political co-laborers were offshoots from the purer body, or only fellow-workers in the single cause of political freedom, does not matter. At the date of the American

emigration, the majority of the Pilgrim Fathers were not members of the religious body above-mentioned. They were sound haters of monarchical forms; but they were not ardent lovers of Calvinistic theology. In place of pure doctrine, these exiles lapsed into ascetic theories, and their theology rapidly fell into absurd practices of self-denial, and developed that family likeness which has distinguished ascetics of all ages, excepting, perhaps, the Essenes of the Old Testament dispensation. Comparing the doctrine of the Gnostic heretics, with that of the now well-known Brahmin superstition, and both with the medieval forms of monkery, and then all of these with the public deliverances of Ralph Waldo Emerson, one cannot fail to observe this family resemblance. Very few of those who read these lines have had the fortune to listen to this representative man; but it will hardly be denied by the admirers of Plymouth Rock and the Pilgrim Fathers, that he is a preacher of tolerably blank Brahminism. *De gustibus non est disputandum.* Nevertheless, amongst the numberless isms of New England, one would scarcely look for forms of heresy that have been twice dead and plucked up by the roots for twenty centuries. The only reason this latitude is selected for illustration, is the patent fact that it has been singularly prolific of heresies. And the enactors of the Blue Laws were unquestionably the most remarkable ascetics of comparatively modern times.

Enough has been written to suggest the inquiry as to whether or not these two extremes do generate each other. Is the unbridled licentiousness of the present age the legitimate offspring of asceticism in its sourest form? Is it probable that it will beget in its turn some new development of that old-fashioned idolatrous will-worship and bodily exercise, which failed to profit the Essenes, the Gnostics, the monks and hermits of the middle ages, and the grim progenitors of the present enlightened population of New England? To oppose this evil drift of the Church and country is the object of the present article.

It is proper to observe that the Bible exhortations to self-denial are of two distinct kinds. First, the prohibitions of excess in things that are not positively hurtful or wrong in them-

selves. Included in this class are all those sins which men commit in obedience to the dictates of appetites that are natural and sinless in their orderly exercise. Man lives by bread; yet undue indulgence is gluttony. God gave the fruit of the vine to cheer the heart of man; yet excess of wine makes the drunkard. And so it comes to pass, that the good gifts of the bountiful Creator are warped out of their normal uses, and made the occasions and the vehicles of rebellion in, and damage to, the creature. The temperance reformation, like all other addenda to the law of God, has sometimes gone beyond the record, and forbidden the uses of wine in the very sacraments of God's house. No pledge invented by man meets the case like the simple announcement of Paul—"I will eat no meat while the world standeth;" and the temperance reformers, like the old Anchorites with their pulse and water, have turned self-denial into asceticism. The exhortation, "Abstain from fleshly lusts, which war against the soul," includes no prohibition of the bounties of God's providence; and no man, no society of men, can make that sin, which God has not forbidden. There is, doubtless, sin in the abuse of the gift, but the gifts of God are always, in themselves, good.

The second class of prohibitions includes all indulgence in unlawful pleasures—unlawful, among other reasons, because they are positively harmful *per se*. With these the present argument has nothing to do. Asceticism is not the self-denial of vices. It is the voluntary renunciation of lawful enjoyments. But any attempt to catalogue these positive vices or sins violations of God's law, as written upon the nature of man, or revealed in his word, would fail, as the Christian world is not at agreement upon the point. One eateth, and giveth God thanks; another eateth not, and giveth God thanks. Moreover, the verdict of Christian society in one age reverses the verdict of another, as directed to the same acts or habits of life. In the Word the prohibitions are distinct and positive as applied to actions which terminate upon men, and which affect the rights of others; but concerning most of the modern objects of self-denial, it is entirely silent. Of course, the grand law of love, so elaborately expounded in

the New Testament, meets all conceivable cases; and when the full glories of the last dispensation are revealed, possibly no other law will be in force in heaven or earth. In the meantime the difficulty consists, in blindness concerning the application of this all-sufficient rule.

In the absence of positive revelation touching human indulgences—that is to say, direct commands touching special acts to be shunned—it is obvious that the general law which “worketh no ill to his neighbor,” and is therefore counted as entire fulfilment, is amply sufficient. Nothing can be added to this obligation, and nothing short of perfect obedience will meet the case. This much understood and admitted strips the subject of all difficulty as applied to enjoyments in which others are interested, or by indulgence in which others are affected injuriously. One with no conscience of the idol may not innocently eat the idolatrous offering, if another is “offended” thereby. The teaching seems to be this: the act *per se* has no moral quality, but obtains this moral quality through the brotherhood of the race whenever another comes under the influence of the act. Some acts were right or wrong, on account of “the present distress” in apostolic days, yet the same acts are measured by a different standard to-day.

Leaving all these considerations, which do not really touch the present topic in the aspect thus imperfectly suggested, look at the naked question of self-denial as a means of grace—that is to say—with no reference to the moral quality of the enjoyment renounced. For example—a man may feel a strong desire to sleep. In the fourth century, there were famous ascetics who denied themselves needful repose, upon the single ground that “the highest glory of Christian virtue is to tread nature under foot.” In the present day, and in the Christian Church, it would be difficult to find an upholder of this particular form of discipline; nevertheless there are multitudes of sombre believers who preach and practise equally unprofitable forms of self-denial and self-crucifixion. In the absence of direct revelation, it is thought to be safe always to crucify the flesh, or “to tread nature under foot.” In very deed, *are* the Christian graces

strengthened by such acts of self-denial? That they are not appears from several considerations :

1. Although the believer has a "new nature" bestowed upon him in regeneration, and differs from all the unregenerate world precisely because he possesses this divine life-principle, yet he is still a man. He does not get this new life by inheritance—it is "not of blood." He does not get it by virtue of any effort or agency of his native powers—it is "not of the will of the flesh." He does not get it by the effort or agency of any other man, or set of men—it is "not of the will of man." But it is "of God," who of his own good pleasure works in him to will and to do. In this new creation, God does not, however, destroy the old forms of existence. The new-born still eats and sleeps, and no change is wrought in any of his bodily attributes or appetites. On the contrary, his sensuous organism is ennobled by the change, and his native faculties are made the vehicles of new delight. He inhales the odours of sweet flowers with hitherto unknown joy, because he recognises the beneficence of the Creator who made them to minister to his senses. His eye dwells upon their beauties with new rapture, because he has learned that Solomon in all his glory was not so gorgeously arrayed. He quenches his thirst at the sparkling rill that bursts from the rock with unspeakable delight, because it is to him the earnest of that water of life which flows through his new inheritance. The gratification of these natural appetites is now proper, because he is entitled to the enjoyment of his birthright. Before, he was robbing God with every inspiration of his vital breath. He was allowed to eat the crumbs that fell from the table, by sufferance. But now he has a child's place at his Father's board; he has a new title-deed, with the inscription—"Verily shalt thou be fed." His bread and water are sure, by covenant; and God does not sustain him in life without them.

So, in the healthful enjoyment of the bounties of Providence, the new man grows into full stature. All the happiness he can find in the plain paths of duty tends to the development of his powers. He serves God the better, and not the worse, because his native faculties of mind and body are cultivated and strength-

ened by recreation alternating with toil. He denies himself ungodliness and worldly lusts that war against the soul; but he is an ingrate who refuses the good gifts profusely scattered in his pathway by the Giver of good. To tread nature under foot, is to dishonor the God of nature, who giveth us all things richly to enjoy. To imagine that God is better pleased with a groan of anguish than with a shout of praise, is to transform the Divinity of Revelation into the divinity of the Thugs. The most absurd development of ascetic piety is that which cultivates sores and bruises, as things pleasing in themselves to God, who is charged with the cruelty of inflicting them for the punishment of the sufferer. One man, in robust health, lives upon the finest of the wheat—upon butter and honey. Another, just emerging from the jaws of death, is sustained by scanty portions of gruel and panada. Whence came the popular idea, that the glad song of thanksgiving, offered by the sturdy recipient of God's bounties, is less acceptable than the querulous moan of the bed-ridden saint?

As the great Substitute has exhausted the penalty of the law, none of the inflictions which the saint endures belong to that penalty. It would be a contradiction in terms, as well as a contradiction of scriptural teaching. The failure of cherished schemes; the loss of a cause upon which millions of prayers have been apparently wasted; the unutterable anguish of bereavement, when precious lives have been lost, apparently in vain; the destruction, the positive annihilation of values, and the consequent poverty of helpless women and children, and the frightful addition of remorseless tyranny to all the rest—all of these together do not indicate the punitive wrath of God. They do not prove the schemes wrong, the cause wicked, or the prayers wasted. It is a sorry piety that jumps to such a conclusion. It is a poor manhood that dons the sackcloth and subsides in the ashes. Fasting and humiliation are not necessarily the indicated remedies. But, as we see only a spot on the surface of the grand circle, we cannot measure the designs of God. What he shall evolve from the sore trials we know not now, but we shall know hereafter. In the meantime, feeding upon panada and gruel



will not restore the vigor of manhood. But while we grapple the difficulties and endure the burdens, we may enjoy to the uttermost limit such bounties as God beneficently scatters all along the track of our life pilgrimage.

2. Another argument against asceticism as a means of grace, is in the charge already suggested, to wit, that it is of the nature of will-worship, and therefore idolatrous. No good can come out of such monstrous evil. No temptation of the devil is more constantly presented to the believer, than that which bids him "work out his own salvation," and omits the context. It is sometimes asserted that the original test which God ordained in Eden required the exercise of this very virtue of self-denial, and that the fruit of the forbidden tree was in itself "good for food," and was hurtful only *because* God had made it the test of obedience. So the temptation was ever before the creature, strengthened by the fact, which Adam knew, that the fruit was nutritious. There are grave difficulties in the way of this theory; but supposing it to be true, we are not now under that covenant. We do not work out our salvation by self-denial. The fast of forty days every year does not add forty grains to the eternal weight of glory which the saint *inherits*. The resistance of temptation by which a righteousness is wrought out, is not *our* resistance except by imputation.

Yet the curse of the broken covenant clings to the seed of the first transgressor; and this miserable remnant of the old tittle-deed, which is a part of it, attracts the sinner's attention, appeals to his manhood, his *old* manhood, and prompts him to go about to establish his own righteousness. How much more attractive this, than the obedience of faith! How easily those grand old saints, who earned their name by fierce contentions for pure forms of worship, drifted into arrogant self-righteousness and asceticism. In place of rituals and surplices—the simple forms of gospel worship. And, therefore, in place of sensual indulgence—asceticism. So the conscience-stricken wretch, who lately smote upon his breast, and muttered "God be merciful to me the sinner!" is now found thanking God that he is not as other men, because he fasts twice in the week. This, which God had

not required of him, he added to the tithes which God had demanded. In the history here referred to, the Pharisee does not seem to have thriven upon his means of grace. And in all the histories that shall ever be written, the same grand truth will appear, to wit, that additions to the law of God, efforts to eke out the saving grace of God by human virtues, attempts to share with the one Self-denier the glory of his perfected work, will end in miserable failure. He emptied himself of his glory for human redemption, and he accomplished it. Man cannot imitate him. Man tried the experiment in Eden, and failed, when in full possession of his normal vigor of body, soul, and mind. And now that his degenerate offspring, with crippled powers, essays the same impossibility, how absurd must his vain efforts appear in the sight of angels! how pitiful in the sight of the great Self-abnegator! That which human fasts and vigils could never do, Christ has done. By one offering he hath forever perfected them that are sanctified.

3. The teachings of the Bible cannot contradict the native instincts of humanity. God made both sets of laws: those which he has revealed in his word, and those which he has written in the depths of human nature. It can never be in accordance with the design of the Creator to inflict misery upon the creature. This is the legitimate work of the devil, the adversary, and he does not hesitate to do it in the name of God. From the beginning he has been a liar and a murderer. He forbids to marry, and commands abstinence from meats, which are the inheritance of them that know and obey the truth. This old and experienced deceiver assaults the saint with plausible theories, and assumes the authority of God even in the act of marring his handiwork. "Do not marry," he says, "because the great Exemplar lived a solitary life, and you grow into his image and likeness while you walk in his footsteps." Yet God ordained this marriage relation in Eden, hedged it about with stringent laws, and constantly uses it as the solitary type of the union subsisting betwixt Christ and his Church. "Abstain from meats," says the adversary, "because Christ fasted forty days in the wilderness. This world is a wilderness, producing only

briars and thorns. Seek for no flowers by the wayside. Take no delight in the pleasures scattered so profusely around you—they are snares and delusions. Ye are dead to the world, and God has adorned it with beauty, only to test your character." Yet God hath said, "All things are yours, because ye are Christ's. Freely use his bounties, and offer the sacrifice of thanksgiving." And so the same old consistent liar goes through the whole round of human interests, and poisons every inspiration. He makes every social gathering a deadly evil, unless it be transformed into a meeting for confession of sin and prayer for pardon. And he follows the hapless sinner beyond the confines of time, and builds gloomy purgatorial dungeons where the soul undergoes the final preparation for the beatitude of the saints in light, and emerges into the dazzling glory from the very antechamber of hell.

Every sane man recognises in this picture the perfect antithesis to all the cravings of his nature. It is one prolonged crucifixion; and in the contemplation of it, the expiation of the Redeemer sinks out of sight. His work was a waste of energy, and a waste of awful agony, if it must be thus supplemented by the agonies of his redeemed. Asceticism, in substituting human suffering, voluntarily endured in the purification of human souls, for the atonement of Christ and the work of the sanctifying Spirit, logically tears the adorable Trinity asunder, and trebly damns its unhappy votaries.

Rejoice evermore, O happy believer! Cast to the moles and bats these ghastly fragments of mediæval idolatry. There is no broken law thundering anathemas. It has been fulfilled to the uttermost jot; its frightful curse has been drowned in blood. The arch-fiend, who cheated Eve with the promise of good, follows her unhappy progeny, and spreads various wiles and snares before them. But he cannot undo the work of Calvary; so he tempts the weak believer to insult the Victim who suffered there, by adding to his *finished* work. He persuades the saint, perplexed by convictions of ill-desert, to lay the unsightly rags of his own mortifications, beside the costly sacrifice of the God-Man-Mediator. Away with these contemptible delusions! They

fade away in the gospel sun-light; they perish under the searching logic of Calvinistic theology; and they cannot even endure the investigation of human reason.

But what becomes of the Bible exhortations to self-denial? As stated at the beginning, these are numerous and emphatic.

The first answer is, that self-denial is not asceticism. We may deny ourselves the indulgence of lawful appetites without "treading nature under foot." We may abstain from excessive gratification, without total abstinence. God says, "Let your moderation appear;" but total abstinence forbids moderation by the simple force of the statement. Self-denial, for an object which is presently apparent, as when one divides his loaf with a brother in equal or worse destitution, is the mere fulfilment of the royal law. And this example will answer for all possible occasions, because the result sought is always the good of others. But it may not be erected into a meritorious exercise, as it is, so to speak, the *accidental* consequence of the brotherhood of the race. And when this brotherhood is contracted into the brotherhood of the gospel, the obligation to self-denial is amplified and strengthened. A man owes more to his family than he owes to his community; more to his community than to the world at large. So it is plain that one may deny himself needful sleep, nay, is bound to do it, if a sick brother should require his wakeful ministrations. But he may not habitually deny himself the repose which body and mind require for the mere sake of self-denial. "Take up thy cross and follow me," because the following involved the cross-bearing. "Ye cannot serve God and Mammon;" that is, ye cannot be slaves to both. But Christians are the slaves of Christ—bought slaves—his property—body, soul, and spirit; and the service they render to Mammon for daily wages, they render under their Master's authority, and they bring the fruits of their toil and lay them at his feet. In all the avocations of life, diligence is enjoined by the great Taskmaster; and the workers are reminded that they toil, not as men-pleasers and eye-servants, but as the slaves of the Lord Christ. Now compare this simple statement, with such a religious ceremony as the Lenten fast, for example. What

possible good is wrought for the Church or the world, by forty days' abstinence from meats? If it be answered, that the fish-mongers as a class are benefited by a larger demand for their commodities, then the objection comes in, that the butchers are damaged as a class to precisely the same extent. Do codfish, oysters, and eggs, taken into the stomach, induce holier emotions in the soul, than do beef, mutton, and pork?

This example is selected, because among all ascetic observances, this ranks highest as the part of regular and formal religious worship. That the observers of such forms do expect to find these services on the credit side of their accounts at the day of reckoning, can hardly be doubted. The expected gain of this kind of self-denial terminates upon self. The ascetic takes less pleasure in this life, that he may have more in the life to come. But the patent argument in favor of the virtue, is, that in denying oneself, others are *not* denied.

For, in conclusion, the King Christ is the King of the universe. All things are his positively. He is King of saints specially; but he is King of nations absolutely. All things were made by him and for him, and there is no conceivable limit to his sovereignty. And the astounding peculiarity of this government, is the transfer of royal prerogatives from the Ruler to his subjects. He makes them kings also. By virtue of their royal birth, they inherit all things. The regenerated son of the second Adam has as wide a dominion as that of the first Adam, who was made with dominion over all the creatures. He is free to serve himself with all or any of the gifts of God; and if he relinquishes any lawful enjoyment, or denies himself any sinless pleasure, he does it like a king, and claims no price for such denial. Because—and this is the other astounding peculiarity of Christ's kingdom—these high dignitaries, invested with regal titles and powers, reach ecstatic glory in the very act of dis-crowning themselves, and in casting their diadems at the feet of their one king, Jesus. In him they live and move and have their being. In him they partake of the pleasures wherewith he has enriched the beautiful earth, and they find the broad-arrow, symbolical of his supreme authority, enstamped upon them.

all. They serve their Lord with mirth and gladness, and honor him by diligently extracting all possible happiness from creation and providence. The flesh, with its affections and lusts, which they were required to crucify, *is* crucified, and is dying day by day; albeit in Christ's divine wisdom, the saint is obliged to carry the hateful corpse about with him until the fixed date of his deliverance. The enjoyments that he foregoes are relinquished, for the most part, because he cannot soil his purple robe with pleasures that are defiling. But the liberty wherewith Christ makes his people free includes certain and final deliverance from the bondage of asceticism.

The object of all the foregoing argument has been to suggest that God intends his creatures to extract all possible happiness from the present temporal life. And this proposition is stated without limitation, because the pleasures of sin do not yield happiness. God has connected suffering with sin, by law, as cause and consequence, as well as by authoritative announcement. He not only inflicts the penalty *positively*, but unites it with the transgression *naturally*. And as suffering, viewed as a *penalty*, cannot come upon the saint, whose substitute has exhausted the penalty, it is a poor sort of piety that seeks to grow under clouds and darkness. In all forms of asceticism, these portentous clouds are exhalations from mortal unbelief and folly. They are not set in the heavens, obscuring the blessed sunlight, by the hand of God directly. So the sorrows of this mortal life are without the sting that belongs to the sinner's suffering. The trials of the saint are purely disciplinary—never penal; and in the case of saint or sinner, any voluntary addition to the orderly and exact appropriations of divine providence are both worthless and wicked—both will-worship and idolatry.

If this general statement is true, how much more emphatic is the conclusion that God intends his covenant people to be happy. If his dealings with the race are characterised by tireless beneficence, surely his dealings with his beloved elect household are full of tenderness and compassion. He doth not willingly afflict any of the children of men. But his own elect, precious, *pur-*

*chased* people, he keeps as the apple of his eye. It were a mere waste of time and space to meet the objection here suggested, to wit, that the evil acts of the child bring their *native* evil consequence. For, though this be true, the consequence is still disciplinary, and not punitive; and secondly, it is not in the commission of these wrong acts that the Christian becomes the ascetic. Rather afterwards, when, with burdened conscience, he seeks to efface his scars by his miserable fasts and vigils and self-mortifications. There is but one fountain for sin and for uncleanness—but one righteousness that is acceptable to God.

Strait and narrow is the way that leads to God's right hand. It is the clear teaching of Holy Writ that tribulations abound in the King's highway. But the pilgrims who walk there are crowned pilgrims, and it is no part of their vocation to add to the pains and disabilities of the journey. Moreover, their dominion is as really over the whole earth as over the narrow path, because they reign with him who is King of kings. When they stray into forbidden paths, the King brings them back again, and they resume their pilgrimage it may be foot-sore and weary. But they need not gather the rough flints that belong to that forbidden ground, and insult the Lord of the way by self-inflicted penances. When will the Christian Church get rid of these detestable rags of Popery? They are foul with the accumulated filth of a dozen centuries. From the Essenes and Gnostics, through numberless orders of monkery, through sackcloth and ashes, fasts, penances, pilgrimages, flagellations; through segregated lives of useless privation and mortification; through the accursed heresy of the Jesuits, superadded to all that was essentially hideous in monkery before; through the toilsome rituals of a Protestant priesthood—this old, old idolatry comes upon the Church of our day. And now it is presented as a valuable aid to the work of the divine Spirit, helping to sanctify the soul.

But God accepts none of these human inventions. He commands his people to rejoice evermore. "Him serve with mirth" and not with fastings. When the bridegroom is taken away the children of the bride-chamber *may* fast; but who will dare to say

that he is absent now? While the stricken child lived David mourned and fasted, but all in vain. When we suffer under bereavement—that sorest of all human trials—we instinctively turn from all the pleasures of sense, until the light of the gospel dawns once more upon us and we remember that the Lord our God is unalterably good.

---

ARTICLE III.

THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN SOUTH CAROLINA.

*History of the Presbyterian Church in South Carolina.* By GEORGE HOWE, D. D., Professor in the Theological Seminary, Columbia, South Carolina. Prepared by order of the Synod of South Carolina. Vol. I. Columbia: Duffie & Chapman. 1870. Royal octavo, pp. 709.

Perhaps there has never been so opportune a period for the publication of this long wished-for and most instructive work, as the present. The declension of the Presbyterian Church, as of all other churches, in wealth and apparent prosperity consequent upon the second Revolutionary war, is like the plunge of a steamship passing over the great “rollers” after a storm. She leans downward, and sinks on and on, until, in spite of reason and knowledge, one expects to feel the grinding of rocks and the cracking of the keel, and the universal inburst of the waves to overwhelm her forever from sight and life. It is good to look back across the waters and see far abaft the foam-crest of the first Revolution, and remember how disasters prevailed and ruin threatened then as well as now, and how the builder’s skill and the pilot’s faithfulness, were stronger than the mighty waves of the sea.

And beyond that, again, we dimly discern, or laboriously decipher from fragments of burned records, and tattered letters,



whose very signatures are sacred heirlooms, or gather by ingenious collation of family traditions, memoirs of the voyage of a hundred years before in these waters, and this only a transshipment from older, stormier, and darker seas. And we learn, at last, that trouble for the Church on earth is a cyclone—a gale that never ceases its sublime revolutions, whose ocean is the whole world, an ocean laden with wrecks of everything except the Church of the living God.

The volume before us is of the nature of annals rather than of history, strictly speaking; yet this is by no means a reflection upon the venerable author or his work, for nothing else was possible under the circumstances, so various and so many were the sources whence we sprung. Indeed, hardly anything strikes one so oddly as what may be called the *transverse development* of churches as of states, by which we mean that the characteristic *facts* are often in strong and seemingly necessary contrast with the special purposes and principles of the organisation. Here, for example, is a church whose peculiarity it is to repudiate government by one man on the one hand and individual self-rule on the other. Its *differentia* is confederation. It would thus have been natural to expect that Presbyterians, above all immigrants, would have come out in organised colonies; would have felt that only in sufficient numbers and competent officers, and full ordinances, could they transfer their life to a new, wild land.

But the sturdy self-reliance which their system and their history had bred, produced just the opposite result. They were not afraid of a transition period and temporary anomalies. They knew their peculiarities were rooted in Scripture and in the best attributes of human nature. They committed themselves, therefore, to the sea and to the wilderness without fear, just as the providential opportunity arose, singly or in families, or in clusters of families, with pastors if it might be, without pastors if so it must be, sure that if the members struck root, the Church would grow up; sure that opposition and oppression would run out their little race and disappear, but the institutes of religion and freedom would reëmerge and stand fast forever.

And this spirit of individual action stands in the bolder relief

because it might have been expected rather of the Independent or Congregational type of Protestant; and it is just there that it does not so strikingly appear. They were much more given to organising colonies, and depending upon that organisation. The Brownists (so to speak) built portable houses, and brought them over; narrow and cheap, but far better than none. The equally sturdy Presbyterian knew that his house was here growing in the trees, and trusted to time and labor to hew and build.

The result, as we were about to say, the result of this independence of spirit and action on the part of the early Presbyterian settlers of South Carolina, was that there were a hundred beginnings instead of one, and a hundred threads of history to be woven into one web. It results, also, that there were many subordinate failures merged in the general success.

There were, however, three great European stocks from which, in very unequal measure, our grafts were taken. The first in point of time and the second in point of importance was the French.

Perhaps the informing power of a great principle has never been more strikingly displayed than in the elevation given to the Gallic character by the Calvinistic theology. A people without depth of character or of feeling, whose superb gallantry took the form of treating even death as a trifle, whose infidelity was largely due to inability to receive the very conception of a God, who made mountains of molehills, and therefore made molehills of mountains; a people whom it is easier to admire than to respect, and which might be classified as the fiery-frivolous—members of this race are led to receive the idea of a fore-ordaining God and a sovereign Redeemer: led to it by a personal religious experience under the power of divine grace. HE hewed a niche in the rock and set Christ there, as Paul had by inspiration expounded and declared him; and the very pressure of his kingly feet softened and fertilised the rock, gave “depth of earth” to the roots of the good seed, and prepared a harvest for France, such as her broad and noble fields have never yet borne.

Indeed, one cannot but linger upon the question, what that

mighty kingdom would have become, if Presbyterian Protestantism had been permitted to prosper by its own inward vigor and fruitfulness. Looking to the industries that sprung up where Bible Christianity lived; to the virtue, order, and peace that possessed its communities; to the education it bestowed, the freedom it fostered, the cities it created, the moral power it had begun to wield, even in those savage days, and while only in its infancy there—looking to these facts, and to the rapidity of its expansion, we see that the fears of its enemies were fully justified, and that it was just about to become “a great tree,” in whose branches the fowls of the air might lodge, and under whose shadow even the wild beasts might lie down. The angel of the gospel stood poised, as it were, above France, ready to pour out the temporal and spiritual blessings which prophecy has with eloquent fulness promised to “the people whose God is the Lord.” A sober manfulness, a high ideal of right and virtue, a sense of man’s final and direct responsibility to God, honor to the family relation, true citizenship in the State, universal priesthood in the Church: these qualities rival the blossomy footprints of the spring in the miracles they work, renewing the face of the earth.

But France, as a nation, had no welcome for the gospel or its author. The mob of princes affected the mob of saints. No gates lifted up their heads for the King of glory but the gates of martyrdom or exile. The blood of his chosen ones washed at his feet; the smoke of their torture went up into his nostrils. He turned away from the land that slew him in his people; and he led their heroic remnant like a flock, their blessing going with them, to nations of a nobler strain, or to the wilderness that was to become the garden of the Lord.

Of their first immigrations, and the disasters that crushed them in South and North America, we need say nothing now. They did at last effect a lodgment in and near Charleston. They threw out detachments to the right and left—the northeast and northwest; and though, as distinctive communities, they have ceased to exist—for even the French Protestant Church in Charleston is not pure Huguenot—their influence is felt and will be felt

until old South Carolina itself shall be obliterated. They infused elements of their own into the social and political character of the low country. They enriched our history with some of its brightest names.

But in their disappearance as a distinct body we are taught a lesson our immigrating brethren, and some enterprising people at home, alike need to learn—that churches cannot thrive upon a distinction which is not one of principle. The sentiment of national pride, the love of an ancestral tongue, the preference of characteristic forms of ordinance—these, and such as these, are not grounds on which a Church can be perpetuated. Those who would continue it in being must either enounce and identify with themselves some principle that is their true differentia, or they must *superinduce* a principle and imbed it in the prejudices, the partisanships, and the history of their organisation. The French Calvinists, not being differenced from other Presbyterians by principle, and making somewhat too much of the sentiment of nationality to the overlooking of their principle, have become merged in other churches—in the English-speaking Presbyterian churches for the first of these reasons, and in the Episcopal and Baptist churches for the second.

But their history is too beautiful and too instructive to be lost. Who can read without tingling blood such passages as these?—whose style, too, is well worthy of their subject :

“They [*i. e.*, the Huguenots who settled in Abbeville] came to America as a refuge from the most bitter and inexorable persecutions. We have described in earlier pages of this history the extreme hardships to which the French Protestants were reduced. The people were at length deprived of all their ministers and all the means of education. It was not wonderful, if under these circumstances, and under the irritation of terrible persecutions, there should spring up, in the absence of a clergy who had always inculcated submission to the government, the spirit of resistance, This especially manifested itself in the most southern portion of France. De Baviille, who was the supreme administrator of the province, became known, in the language of the populace, as “the King of Languedoc.” Exasperated at their obstinacy, he would ferret out their places of secret convocation, surround them with his troops, charge upon them

sabre in hand, or fire into their crowded assemblies with a discharge of musketry. The most notable of the prisoners were hung on the nearest trees, and others sent to the galleys, where they were chained to oar-benches in perpetual bondage. At the commencement of the eighteenth century there had been two thousand of these convicts, and among them men of gentle blood and ministers of Christ, who were more severely treated than highway robbers.

"The war of the Camisards was different, wholly, from the struggles which had preceded it. In those the gentlemen of France were engaged, under experienced leaders, on tented fields and in regular battles. This was a war of peasants, ignorant of the art of war, without arms, except such as they wrested from their enemies, and obliged to sell their lives dearly behind the rocks and thickets of their mountains. In the Vivarais, in the higher and lower Cevennes, amid their naked peaks—their bristling crests—their horrible precipices—"the image of a world tumbling to ruins and perishing with old age"—they found their strongholds. The caverns of the mountains served them for granaries, magazines, stables, hospitals, powder mills, arsenals, and armories. Their government was a military theocracy. For purposes of military discipline there were captains of tens, of fifties, and hundreds. Their chiefs were prophets, acting as they believed, under a divine inspiration. Their God was Jehovah, their temple Mount Zion; their camp the camp of the Eternal; their people the children of God. Religion was their solace; desert and lonely places, sanctified by their tears, and often by their blood, were their temples of worship. . . . They believed themselves to hear the word of God, and went into conflict as if clad with iron. Boys of twelve or fourteen years of age fought like veterans. . . .

"There arose then a new order of pastors, who took the place of those whom cruel death or foreign exile had removed from them; the 'pasteurs sous la croix,' or 'pasteurs du désert,' pastors beneath the cross, or pastors of the desert."—Pp. 344, 345, 346.

Then appeared Antony Court, who "deserves the name of Restorer of Protestantism in France." He conceived at an early age "the plan of reorganising the churches. To four points did he direct his efforts: to repress the disorders of those who pretended to be inspired; to collect the regular religious assemblies; to restore the government of consistories, colloquies,

and synods; to raise up young ministers, who should undertake the work of preaching the gospel amid scaffolds and gibbets, in the spirit of martyrs." P. 346.

This is the highest strain of heroism. It was no mere facing of death for himself—the firing of a passionate heart under intolerable wrongs, or to achieve lofty hopes. It was a perfect appreciation of the truth that the glory of Christ was in his house, and that to rebuild it in the face of such a foe, was to crown him King with a lustre above rubies. It was a will and a power serenely to work out the problems, which most of all desiderate peace for their solution, amid wars and fightings and flight for life.

That Theological Seminary of the "pastors of the desert" actually lived and thrived at Lausanne. It searched out, and trained and sent forth "young men who were willing to take upon themselves the vocation of martyrdom."

Among those men was one whom brutal tyranny lifted high, and swung afar, even across the ocean: the head of a colony, the pastor of a church, the bright exemplar of a Christian and a man—Jean Louis Gibert. Under his guidance, a number of his persecuted people set out for Carolina. Stinted in provisions almost to starvation—driven back and forth by contrary winds—undergoing in England, where they were detained, "much trouble, which is too bitter to speak of here;" stranded in the English Channel; torn by mutiny; poisoned with spoiled meats and bread full of worms; run aground on a sandbank near Charleston, and escaping only by the sacrifice to the sea of nearly all their possessions—the hardy survivors debarked at last at Charleston.

And their troubles had not ended, even then. They were long delayed in that city, and afterward at Port Royal, "almost worn out with fatigue and grief," poor faithful souls! And when they had reached their own ground, and built their little French hamlet, and planted their crops, came the threat and the dread of Indian hostilities to dishearten them. But their faith was in God, and they struggled bravely on, founding their homes, and in

each home an altar of domestic worship; sustaining, also, the public ordinances of God's house.

And when, in the lapse of years, and the multiplication of misfortunes—among which the greatest, perhaps, was the loss of their high-hearted pastor—they could no longer maintain their national worship, the inevitable transmutation came, and came through the operation of Christian love and Presbyterian brotherhood.

During the ministry of the Rev. Robert Mecklin in Rocky River and Hopewell, "the Huguenots, settled ten miles below on Little River, flocked to his church (Hopewell). . . . They still maintained their lay worship and their Sabbath-schools at home; yet taught, as they had been, that they were bound to assemble themselves together, even in woods and deserts, it is not a matter of wonder that they should seek to be fed with the crumbs of the blessed gospel, though they were obliged, many of them, to walk eight or ten miles for this purpose.

"For a considerable period all, and for a longer time many, of these desolate and sanctuary-loving people owed their spiritual teachings to the ministrations at Hopewell, thinking themselves happy that here they could meet to commemorate the love of their dying Lord. 'It was affecting,' said one of their number, 'to see them meet at this place, always saluting each other with a kiss, while tears flowed down their cheeks.' 'They wept, yea, they wept when they remembered Zion.'" Pp. 552, 553.

There is, indeed, a rare pathos in that simple record. Their native land forsaken, their pastor ascended to his rest, their dear gospel no longer spoken in the "tongue in which they were born;" yet they humbly thank God that they are made welcome in the house of their brethren, and can gather "crumbs" of inward nourishment from the Word as preached in a foreign language. They weep with longing for what they had; they praise God for what he gives. It is like the shouting and the weeping for the Second Temple.

In the rebuilding of Hopewell Church, a delicate and beautiful hospitality set aside "two of the most desirable pews" for these

Huguenot brethren, and thus made them permanently at home in an American Presbyterian Church. And the next step virtually completes the story. "It was thought proper they should have a representative in the session, and Peter Gibert, Esq., was elected an elder." Though their lay services seem to have been maintained for some time longer, and their ancestral language very slowly lost its charm, they may now be said to have become incorporated with Hopewell Church, and in it is their ecclesiastical history gradually merged. And this, *mutatis mutandis*, is the story of immigrating Presbyterians from the continent, if they love their own doctrine and government well enough to abide by it.

The concluding clause of that sentence suggests the second chief stock of our Presbyterian growth—the German. Of the Salzburgers and their martyr-spirit at home, too much can scarcely be said. Carlyle has given us nothing more stirring than the story of their exile, sorrowfully accepted rather than return to Romish errors. But it seems to have been simply upon the broad and vital issues of Protestantism they fought and suffered, and that church-government, and even Pauline theology, failed to assert their importance before their eyes. Thus, though the first church organised, and the first house of worship built in Orangeburg were Presbyterian,\* the second pastor succumbed to the tyrannical pressure of the Established Church, and of the straitness and peril of the times—accepted reordination at the hands of *another* bishop, and thus gave precarious and transient life to an Episcopal Church, where representative republicanism ought to have prevailed.

The loss was theirs, as well as ours. The golden band of their unity was broken. They had no sacred associations with the Church into which they were thus imported. As prudence took them into it, preference could take them out again. Now they are found in all the denominations in middle South Carolina—chiefly,

---

\* Traces of its foundation-lines are believed to be still visible in "the old graveyard," and ought to be preserved by the brethren of our Church there.



perhaps, the Methodists; and only here and there does a name recurring among the elders of our churches remind us that the people of that rude and simple tragedy, who loved not their lives unto the death and their country unto exile, were Swiss and Salzburg Presbyterians.

The third, and far the largest and most important contribution to our population, was that of the Scotch and Scotch-Irish. And though these two are really one, yet they divide into two streams—a direct and a secondary immigration.

Nothing shall induce us here to tell the story of the Siege of Derry, or of the signing of the Covenant. Even the children of the Mayflower seem to suspect that they may have boasted a little too importunately on that classical adventure; and our modesty must avail to keep our rehearsals of ancient glory within due bounds.

And yet there was never greater reason than now to illustrate the imperishableness of a faithful Church. While the aged fathers are dying, and their sons have preceded them with fiery haste from battlefields and dungeons; while streams of emigration are pouring from the desolated States into the untrodden West, carrying with them the ark of God across the river, and the poor relics of brighter days; while, through the operation of these causes, church after church burns dim, glimmers a little while, and then (*for a time*) disappears, as sailors on their watch see the home-lights round the harbor go out, one by one, in the deepening night—it is good to be reminded that the thing which which is, is that which hath been. Other nights have followed days. They have also heralded days. The extinguished lamps, have they not the oil in them still, and shall they not be tipped with radiance again, before the dawn?

But to return. The persecutions that beset the Presbyterians of Scotland and Scottish Ireland drove them in great numbers across the Atlantic: many banished by the authorities, many voluntarily "seeking a country." One portion, that had heard marvels of the goodness of the land, came straight hither; built up Charleston, colonized upon the islands, dotted the lower level of the State with settlements and churches. They bore

the impositions and exactions of the Established Church with true Scotch impatience and fortitude—paid the taxes under protest, and supported their own ordinances besides; complained, threatened, almost rebelled, but throve and began to fill the land.

During the same period—the first half of the eighteenth century—many immigrants from Scotland and northern Ireland into Pennsylvania renewed their wanderings, and extended in a chain of settlements through Virginia and central North Carolina into and across upper South Carolina. Speaking generally, one might say that the immigration from the North, *i. e.*, from Britain *via* Pennsylvania, took possession of the region of the red clay hills; and that from the South, *i. e.*, from Britain *via* Charleston, entered upon the low country; and they blended in the higher pine lands.

And so persistent are the habits and dispositions, even of communities, that there remains to this day a marked difference between these two masses of the same race, as to their restlessness. The Presbyterians of lower Carolina are comparatively a stationary people, while those who had swept on in a march of colonization through Virginia and the States to the south of it, have advanced “without haste and without rest” across the whole southwest, and carve on the gravestones of Arkansas and Texas the same names that are household words in Spartanburg and Cabarras.

The remark made, some pages back, that the founders of our Church here were not afraid of anomalies, was not made without book. Formal irregularities meet us at every turn, during the first century after settlement began; and those which still exist, and make precisians’ hearts to ache, are memorials of those plastic but heroic days. Licentiates ordained elders. Churches sent blank calls to Presbyteries, or even to friends abroad, to be filled at their discretion. Immigrating ministers were dismissed to Synods, and Synods ordered Presbyteries to receive certain men and send them to certain fields. Churches named themselves “Presbyterian Congregational,” and “Independent Presbyterian;” and asserted and maintained their independency. And

such independent churches invited Presbyteries to install their pastors, and the invitation was accepted.

Our object in stating these facts, we need hardly say, is not to produce a justifying precedent for unnecessary irregularities now; but to suggest, in the first place, the profitable remembrance that most of the remaining anomalies in our churches are simply survivors of a much larger and most respectable company. They are not *parvenues*; they "have come down to us from a former generation," and deserve a forbearance, and even a respect at our hands, which no interlopers could pretend to.

Another lesson presented in such facts is the self-regulating quality of our system; a wholesome elasticity, which, while it endures exceptions, cures them. Cures them, not by the knife, but by kindly pressure and skilful medication. Patience, charity, enlightened learning, Christian wisdom, good sense and tact—these are the pillars of order, sustaining it and held upright by it.

In approaching the Revolutionary period—short in years, but long in influence and glory—we cannot better introduce what falls to be said than by a quotation:

"From that illustrious Frenchman, John Calvin, proceeded an influence which has regenerated civil governments. Exiled from his own country, he still exerted a powerful influence upon it. The city of Geneva, like a young mother, nourished in her fruitful womb the germs of many tribes of men who have been the advocates of civil and religious liberty. They remained there, exiles from their own lands, to issue forth at the propitious hour to deliver them from tyranny. The new republic of Holland adopted the principles of Calvin; Scotland received them with tumultuous joy, and transmitted them to England, to obtain their full triumph under Cromwell. They passed over to North Ireland; and from all these sources poured themselves forth over this Western Continent, and prepared it for the high destiny which has awaited it." P. 357.

Perhaps no trait of character marked more signally the Revolution of 1776—always excepting the contrast between the patriotism and the high standard of duty on the one side, and the open tyranny and barbarism on the other—than its stub-

bornness. The fire would not be stamped out. It smouldered on under seeming extinction, presently rekindled and soared higher than before. New Jersey was won; New York was taken; Philadelphia hurled prostrate; the patriot army shrank into Valley Forge—a mangled, apparently perishing remnant of a noble host. If it did not quake before the towering strength of Great Britain, it was because it could not. Just there, in the absolute inability of such men to surrender a principle or vacate a trust, lay the secret of their ultimate success.

And it was just so in the South; even more remarkably so, because the population was so scanty, and their visible resources so slender and so precarious. Overborne and harried, taunted, robbed, decimated, betrayed, imprisoned, exiled, they gathered strength in their prostration; they learned vigilance of treachery; they proved the power of good faith and mutual confidence; aye, and the power of accumulated trivial successes. The ever-gathering masses finally rolled upon the invader, and crushed his strength to dust.

But among the many schools in which this lesson of sublime tenacity was learned, none sent forth pupils more thoroughly trained than the persecutions of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The hereditary purpose to be free in the house and kingdom of God bred a temper which could brook bondage nowhere. They who made conscience of life naturally became their country's champions and the martyrs of duty. The glorious bead-roll does not need to be recited: it is the prattle of the children and the memory of the sage.

“Our own has been preëminently a witnessing and a wrestling Church. She was so in the Apostolic period, and has been, from the time of her restoration among the Alpine Mountains by the Lake of Geneva, on the sunny plains of France, in Holland wrested from the sea, among the hills and glens of Scotland, and in the northern provinces of Ireland. She has wrestled with flesh and blood, with the principalities and powers of earth, and with spiritual wickedness in high places. She has borne aloft the banner of the Covenant, and raised her voice of testimony for God's truth and Christ's kingly crown, both as witness and martyr, and has watered the soil of many lands with the

blood of her sons and daughters. In her struggles for the supreme headship of Christ over his own body, the Church, she has wrought out, to a large extent, in connection with those who held her truth, the problem of individual freedom and civil liberty. Her traducers are indebted to her, more than they know, for constitutional law, representative government, and freedom from oppression.

“The Presbyterians of France, of Switzerland, of Germany, of Holland, of Scotland, England, and Ireland, disciplined in the fires of persecution and tossed by the waves of innumerable calamities, guided by Christ their King to these savage wilds, have built here their altars and planted their institutions of religion and learning, and we their descendants are bound to cherish their memories, and to strengthen ourselves in our love of truth and hatred of wrong by their example. Our own history cannot be truly understood till we understand theirs. This is true of our Church at large, especially true of every portion of it planted in those thirteen States occupying the Atlantic coast—themselves settled by direct emigration from Europe—which wrought out the problem of American independence.” Pp. 16, 17.

But the supremely arduous task of revolutions is not their work of destruction: it is construction. The highest honor is not his who lifts up his axe against the thick trees, but his who replaces the doddered and decaying, when they fall, with a stouter and more beneficent growth. And it is here, in the fabric of a free government, that the bequests of Calvin and Knox are to be found. Their scheme of representative ecclesiastical control, drawn from the Scripture at first and carried on in the same line for the unification of a whole people in the Church, suggests point by point the representative political government by which our scattered young tribes became a nation: a system which, like the vulcanized rubber driving-wheel, yields sufficiently to obstacles, but loses neither shape nor impulse upon them.

True, there is no pretence that the actual framers of the American Constitution were members of the Presbyterian Church, or consciously derived from it the principles of which it is compacted. But the leaven was in the mass; the thought of the people laboriously shaped itself in that scheme of national conduct; and nothing but the large previous education of men in

the views and practices necessary to representative government, no ideal less profound and wise than that of orderly liberty evolving its will according to law, would have made the working of that Constitution possible.

Another aspect of the quality spoken of above—their tenacity of purpose—deserves especial mention, both for the honor it did them and for the instruction it offers to us. We allude to their patient conscientiousness about the training of men for the ministry, and not lowering the standard of qualifications for the preaching of the gospel because of the great harvest and the need of laborers. We have quoted here an address to the South Carolina Presbytery by Rev. Thomas H. McCaule, President of Mount Zion College, which illustrates the views which prevailed:

“I need not use formality in assuring you that strictness and universality in the examination of our young preachers are expedient and highly necessary to keep our order RESPECTABLE. The vocation of an attorney has become tenfold more odious than ever by an indiscriminate admission to the department of law. The physicians of this State are taking measures to be incorporated, with a view of ejecting every empiric, and admitting none to practise but such as shall be regularly licensed by the most learned and respectable of that profession. I have seen some of their circular letters on the subject. They mention in terms of high approbation the strict discipline of the clergy in admission to ecclesiastical functions. If the medical part of our citizens should carry their intentions into effect, there will be as great outcries against windfallen Irish doctors as there have been against windfallen Irish preachers.” P. 671.

This quotation is preceded by a list of thirty-three candidates for the ministry, received under the care of this (South Carolina) Presbytery during the last ten years of the last century; and to the list is appended the following comment:

“This is a remarkable list of young candidates for the ministry, thirty-three in number, only two of whom failed to pursue their trials through to a successful completion. Those of them who died young had a successful ministry. Most of them lived to a good old age, and came to their grave full of years. Some of them became professors in colleges, three of them

VOL. XXII., NO. 1.—5.

presidents of such institutions, five of them were adorned with the title of D. D. Several of them were eminent instructors of schools and academies, which the necessities of the country and the small provision made by the churches for their pastors obliged them to set up. . . . Those whose office it was to introduce them into the order of preachers of the gospel, followed the apostolic injunction to lay hands suddenly on no man. They sought to send these young men into the ministry with the most ample qualifications the country then afforded." P. 670.

And yet it would be hard to name a period—we will not say in which there was so much temptation, but—in which there were so many and so weighty reasons why they might, and should, lower their intellectual standard of qualifications. The education of children in schools had been almost arrested for seven years. Military requisitions and British arms, cruelly turned upon the helpless, had combined to "grind up the seed-corn"\* of the nation. Manners, culture, morals, had all suffered grievous deterioration; the niceness of the public taste was lost in great measure, and with it the demand for trained, polished, and learned men in the pulpit declined. Then the desolations were frightful. The whole country had been harried and torn; when it ceased to bleed, it lay panting, maimed, entangled, threatened with utter collapse. How natural to have decided that for such a country in such a plight, any willing, honest laborer must be welcomed, honored, sent forth with generous commendations, in the hope that, as things could hardly be worse, he might be the chosen vessel to make them better! And how wise and strong the hearts that dared to be jealous, even then, of rash and unenlightened zeal, and refused to send forth men who could not rightly divide the word of truth!

Now all these things happened to them for ensamples; and they are written for our admonition upon whom the ends of the world have come. (See the original, 1 Cor. x. 11—"Whom the ends of the ages have confronted.") Many precious things are fallen, and many sway in a feebleness that threatens fall.

---

\* President Davis's Reply to the Cadets of the South Carolina Military Academy, volunteering to serve in the late war.

Education has again been largely interrupted; much evil leaven has been forced into the commonwealth; the standard of culture, of manners, of personal dignity, of public virtue, stoops low, even where it is not trailed tyrannously in the dust. Pulpits are silenced, churches burned, congregations scattered, fruitful fields of spiritual labor turned into a wilderness, and the water-springs of privilege into dry ground. Again, therefore, the fathers in Israel are bearing the grievous burden of a dismantled, impoverished, bewildered Church. Again must the question be faced, Is the day of straitness and pressing need a day to accommodate pulpit tests to a lowered and indifferent public taste? Is it a day for mere zeal, or to temper zeal with a holier discretion; to assail darkness with even purer and thus diviner light, to win power by commanding reverence, to exalt mental and spiritual strength and not mere numbers?

We thank God that these questions have been largely and practically answered in the good old Presbyterian "spirit of '76," and that the carefulness of our Church courts seems to be rather greater than less, compared with fifteen or twenty years ago. Enhanced and enlightened earnestness would show itself in that way; and we rejoice in the belief that it has done so. But the pressure and the danger are not yet passed; perhaps they have not yet diminished; and therefore we have thought good to refresh the mind of the Church with this historical recital. Looseness of admission to the ministry is not the remedy for the destitutions of the day. It would be irrelevant to discuss the question, What is that remedy?

But there is another matter suggested, at this point, of a practical nature, to which we call a moment's attention. How were these thirty-three young brethren supported, and where were they trained? \* On this point, the work before us does not give all the information, with all the emphasis, that could be desired. Many things are necessarily slighted in a work so multifarious. But we all know that theological seminaries were non-existent at the time we write of, and the whole of that apparatus by which men are helped forward at the hands of the Church, officially, had yet to be contrived. Yet here is one



Presbytery bringing out thirty ministers within ten years— really, as the record shows, in about six years!

The methods were those of individual labor and private aid. Ministers took young aspirants into their houses, and shared their modest comforts and their abounding toils, with them. Those who desired to become their "brethren in the kingdom," were made brethren first in "the patience of our Lord Jesus Christ." And the un-officed church-member, who desired to help so good a work, did it from his corn-crib, or his orchard, or his wife's loom.

In the wisdom and goodness of God, the Church has been led to borrow aid for her almost intolerably great and solemn work, of the principle of coöperation. She adds together the little gifts of the many to form a steady and sure fund for the support and education of students, and the maintenance of seminaries; hoping to compensate the loss that must result from the *impersonality* of the aid by the greater safety of a general system. But it seems important to suggest that that impersonality should not be accepted, except in so far as it cannot be escaped; and that the privilege of being a donor to a definite object or for a definite purpose, is a privilege still possible and that should be widely enjoyed.

And we trust we shall not have sinned against the dignity of these stately pages, when we propound the doctrine that corn-cribs and orchards have not utterly played out their part, and gone into desuetude as aids to philology and dogma. Let the farmers hear and remember that there is needful brain-food in their fields, and barns, and cellars, as well as in lexicons and the lore of bristling controversies. Neither is the day passed when the student who cannot resort to the seminary, may sit down at his pastor's side, and begin, at least, his professional preparations there. Every honest aid in *really fitting* men for the preaching of the gospel has a double value: it helps a great and needy work, and it bears practical witness to the necessity of fitness in the highest of vocations.

Who that has even looked upon the walls of our seminaries has not had his soul stirred by the pathetic sublimity of the

undertaking to which they are devoted? Every one of these young hearts of hope and zeal has come hither from secret conflicts and a sacred experience, bearing the baptismal dew of believing parents' tears and prayers upon his brow, and accepting hardship, and toil, and lowliness of lot, as the proper environment of an apostolic life. They seek instruction of the living men whom the Church delights to honor, and are led by them to enrich themselves from books, "the convenient wisdom of the mighty dead."\* They work as hard for leave to be poor and obscure, as the sons of the world do for fame and wealth. And he who gives to such an institution, practically says: "I appreciate the soundness and the magnanimity of your choice; the end you have in view is worth all it can cost; I will help you to enter this life where men suffer and bless; where defeat itself would be more precious than other victories; and where defeat to the truly faithful soldier *is impossible.*"

If this be a digression, we beg pardon for it. There are some things that cannot escape being said.

The pleasant task remains to extract some passages which will sufficiently characterise the book, and illustrate its claim to be considered a history—a work which properly describes and expounds men, and which gathers their lessons of wisdom from events.

Here, for example, are some glimpses of the educational arrangements of Mount Zion, the "log college" of South Carolina:

"The accommodations of the college at first were of the most primitive kind. Mr. McCaule commenced his instructions in an old log-cabin about twenty-five feet by twenty, a story and a half high, with a single chimney. The English school was kept in a small out-building. Another cabin was built by the society to range with the first, at a distance of about thirty or thirty-five feet; the space between was filled by a frame building, and the roof of the additions was made to correspond with that of the original structure. The students who boarded with the steward had their lodgings in the upper part of the house. In this humble

---

\*James W. Alexander, in his *Life of Dr. Archibald Alexander.*

edifice the larger portion of those educated by President McCaule had their abode.

“The routine of academic life in this ‘log college’ of the South, was such as the students of the present day can [not?] well understand. The blast of a horn at daybreak was a signal to rise, perform their ablutions, and dress. Another signal at sunrise summoned them to roll-call and prayers, after which they went to their studies. At eight o’clock they were dismissed for breakfast; from nine to twelve they were brought together for study. After an intermission, study hours began at two and continued till five, when they were again dismissed after roll-call and prayers. On Wednesdays there was public speaking and the reading of compositions from nine to twelve. At nine o’clock a. m. the students were formed in line and were marched to the college building, where one half delivered declamations, and the other half read compositions, which were left with the president until the following Wednesday for his private examination and criticism. . . .

“As the old college building was small, the larger students had arbors in the summer season under grapevines and shady trees, (of which there was no small store at that time), furnished with tables and chairs, where they pursued their studies, seeking the shelter of the college roof when the rain drove them in.

“A new and more stately college edifice was projected, and its foundations were laid early in the year 1787, fifty-four feet in length by forty-four in breadth, to be two lofty stories in height. The foundation was laid with stone, rising some little above the surface, the remainder of the basement story with brick. The society sent oyster-shells from Charleston to be burnt for lime. But the workmen not being acquainted with the manufacture of lime, the greater portion of the lower story was laid in mortar made with tar instead. Saw-mills were few and distant, the timbers were fashioned by the broad-axe and whip-saw, and the plank had to be hauled from twenty to thirty miles.” Pp. 505, 506.

We would like to see such a spirit to overcome difficulties in 1871! How the Mount Zion College of Campinas, Brazil, would go up! How broken windows, and disbound bibles, and ragged churches, would vanish as in dissolving views, and give place to neatness, thrift, and beauty!

The only difficulty about making extracts concerning men, is that the notices of them being incorporated with the annals of

the churches which they served, and those annals being given in decades, the accounts are necessarily fragmentary and dependent upon the context for the meaning of allusions, etc. But we refer to such names as William Richardson, Archibald Simpson, William Tennent, and John James, to illustrate and justify our praise.

Here again is a paragraph well fitted to fan our zeal and assure our fortitude; it relates to the church of Long Canes, Abbeville:

“February 1st, 1760.—The Cherokee Indians broke in upon them, killed twenty-two persons, carried fourteen into captivity, and dispersed the survivors. Of the flight of these persons, some to the Waxhaw settlement, and others to the low country and the bounds of the Stoney Creek congregation, and the honorable testimony borne to them there, we have before spoken.

“In this state of dispersion they remained for two years, and in 1763, after the expeditions of Col. Montgomery and Col. Grant, they returned with considerable addition to their numbers. About the end of 1763, the Creek Indians broke in and committed some deeds of barbarity. . . . The people took refuge in such fortified places as they could reach. Under date of Dec. 26th, [*S. C. Gazette,*] it is said, ‘There are twenty-seven men, and one hundred and three women and children, in Fort Boone, (Calhoun’s); thirty-four men, and one hundred and five women and children, at Arthur Patten’s, (Long Canes); about the same number at Dr. Murray’s, on Hard-Labor Creek.’ . . . Still this calamity did not dishearten nor disperse the people. In their strongholds these virtuous and hardy men watched over their wives and children with sleepless vigilance till the danger was passed, and then returned to their accustomed employment.

“Thus were they situated and circumstanced until the year 1764, when Rev. William Richardson, a member of the Presbytery of Charleston, visited them as a preacher of the gospel. Though his visit was short, he contributed something towards the organisation of the church. In a few days he baptized about sixty children in the settlement. . . . *About this time they made strenuous efforts to secure a visit from Rev. Archibald Simpson, who would gladly have gone to them, but for the exceeding feebleness of his health.*” P. 342.

We rejoice to know that courage, perseverance, and Christian faithfulness and zeal, have many representatives among us still.

But there is a challenge and a sting in those simple words for many an elder or church member, and mayhap some ordained ministers too, whose hands hang down and whose knees wax feeble, and whose voice like tolling bells clang incessantly the "hardness of the times," or "the impoverishment of the country." It is not the temporal poverty of his people that humiliates our King; it is their spiritual poverty. When he can say, "I know thy poverty; but thou art rich," he glories in them.

It is with a feeling of profound dissatisfaction with our account of it, that we take leave of this admirable book. With emphasis we pronounce it to be of the most difficult class of works to prepare, and even more difficult to write than to prepare. It is a thesaurus of historical information concerning Presbyterianism in the southeast. And the ineffable weariness with which one plods through most books of the class—witness Carlyle's repeated tirades upon them in his *Life of Frederick the Great*—is the best proof of the ability displayed here. It is always interesting, honest, clear; often impressive; sometimes loftily eloquent, without a tinge of grandiloquence.

There were much to say of the venerable historian himself, and of what these "twenty years," one of whose fruits is this volume, have been to him, did not his own modesty, and his relations with this REVIEW, combine to forbid it. They who have been honored with his friendship through that period, however, will need no more reminder than this, across what waters of labor and sorrow the Lord's voice has called him, or in what spirit he has obeyed the call. Through the canvass which he has covered with the saints and heroes of earlier days, we see a monumental tablet, a ruined rural homestead, a flaming city; and we read in it the unconscious record of a heart which neither bereavement, nor perplexity, nor labor, nor years, have robbed of its patience, its faithfulness, its peace; of a mind which toil and grief have only sculptured in finer lines, and informed with a more admirable strength. May he be spared to us and to his work for many a mellow year, to instruct us by his wisdom, and to send forth like true laborers into the Master's vineyard!

## ARTICLE IV.

## MANSEES.

This is a pleasing subject on which to write. We pity any one whose fancy is not taken with a manse. When travelling in Scotland, the eye of Wordsworth caught a glimpse of *but one*, and forthwith his muse fired him up to sing. Perhaps it stood on a knoll, or was hid in a glen, or it might have been sheltered by a clump of fir-trees, or he might have seen it when crossing the glorious Bannockburn of 1314. However it was, we like the few lines which the bard of Grasmere was then inspired to write, although we cannot accept the canon of criticism given out by Edgar A. Poe, that every great poem must be limited to one hundred rhymes. Homer, Milton, and Dante, methinks would have dissented from that rule; and Pope would have satirised it; and it might have been ridiculed by the Author of the Task, or by Jonathan Swift, if a Christian poet could have been a co-worker with the Dean of St. Patrick's. At all events, a very lowly personage, among the larches and acacias of Prince William, Virginia, enters his protest against such a theory. It would create a *new* constitution in the tuneful art, and for this reason we have a right to secede; for all government in the land of enchanting song demands the acquiescence of the governed.

It has been said that ours is a pleasing theme, and the pen knows it, because it moves with unusual celerity. But the question occurs, can the *utile* be blended with the *dulci* in your ruminations about the mansees, or, in other words, ministerial homes? Certainly it can, for we did not call the lady of the manse to provide our paper, and hunt up our old goose quill for the purpose of just amusing the reader. Don't be alarmed. We shall ignore Windsor Palace and Buckingham House, the antique Kew and Hampton Court, and the tragic White Hall, as not congenial to one's taste. We do not intend a visit to Archbishop Tait at Lambeth, or Bishop Wilberforce, whose vote in Parliament for the disestablishment of the Erin-go-bragh Church,

secured him the chair of Winchester. We shall cut the acquaintance of Canterbury, Fulham, and York. Presbyterians love simpler things. We confess to a liking for Sir Walter Scott's "Old Mortality." It was a noble enthusiasm to rechisel the tombs of the martyrs; and he tarried till after twilight by mounds which he regarded as precious stones; whilst he said, "Tush," to the wood, hay, and stubble of relentless persecutors. There are some who admire Archbishop Sharpe and the Marquis of Montrose, more than the Dumfries peasant. What a pity it was, say the loyalists, to have executed the Marquis. But have you no sympathy for the platoons of heroic men and women whom he shot down at the mouths of mountain caves, with the plaintive echoes of which his ear became familiar? Are you partial to the thumb-screws of Beatoun, Sharpe, and the Duke of York? Suppose they were applied to your own thumbs? How would you like the operation? We dare say that the old chiselman was welcome to the manses of Dumfrieshire. He was known along the Nith, and made much of from Kirkconnel down to Gretna Green, and from Moss-paul Inn over to Cumber trees. The pastor trimmed up his peat-fire upon the advent of the wanderer, and placed some sentinel over his tools, and catechised him about the ashes of those who were slain by the Græme and the Grierson. Had he called at Abbotsford, we feel sure that Sir Walter himself would have ordered a repast for his pony, and a heather-bed for his slumbers, and all Scot-free. 'Tis said, but we will not vouch for its truth, that about 1803, one of his descendants was married to a Bonaparte in the monumental city of Maryland.

Episodes will not answer, and we must drive on to the manse country of Scotland. Kirk and manse are household words to every Caledonian, whether you sight him in London town, Pekin, or the Sunderbunds of India. At all points of the compass he wears the ambrotype of a manse on the front of his scallop. *In hoc signo* he is known. Our subject is multifarious, and for this reason we shall not go back beyond 1702, though we long to abuse the crafty Stuarts who panted to spread lawn sleeves on the shoulders of Scottish prelates. And we

should like to speak a good word for the Prince of Orange, who hushed the bugle of persecution which had rallied so many flocks of men to the slaughter. At the beginning of the last century a more perfect unification took place between England and Scotland. The union did not make the high contracting powers; but the high contracting powers made the union of course. Some regarded it as a kind of Gretna Green affair—like the marriage of churches where the parties are not precisely of the same way of thinking. But it is an easy thing to make a broad Church when it wants to swing into all sorts of latitudinarianism. In this way the Lord's heritage has more than once likened itself to a speckled bird. The Scotch indeed accepted an Establishment; but it was simple. There were no ecclesiastical palaces in the programme; no representation by its ministers in the House of Lords; no Canterbury muslin; no relics of papistry; no puerile rites; no manufacturing of ceremonial saints; no candles in the day time; no pictures, for spiritual objects defy the pencil of the artist. Papistry had been drowned in one of the Minches; and prelacy, with its branching horns, had been chased beyond the Cheviot hills. Queen Anne stipulated to provide a manse for each Scottish kirk, and the two made an excellent coupling, and no one forbade the bans. The preachers felt that they were not homeless, and of course cherished the domestic feelings. Had the pastor occasion to cross a moor, attend Presbytery, meet the General Assembly in Auld Reekie, go to Lanark in quest of wool, or to Wigton in search of a plaid, he could hum "Home, sweet home," all the way on his return. The reflection was a pleasant one, after all offices appropriate to the ministry had been duly performed. Perhaps he was stimulated in his work by the thought that he would not be forced to stand out in the rain, or be pelted by flakes of snow. The climate of Scotland is not very mild in winter. Christopher North has scribbled whole sheets of paper about the keen winds of Caledonia, and the ice that congeals on the interior lochs which are very beautiful in summer. More so, we think, than those in England which gave rise to the Lake School of poets. In fact, Como itself is dingy in comparison, either with



Lomond, Leven, or Etive. Thomson, too, has given an account of a man who died in the snow. Poor man! we hope it was not a pastor; for then the people would have been troubled in looking up another to feed the flock. But in the summer rambles of Christopher, he often came on ministerial abodes that wore a modest, but handsome aspect. The stone-porch was good to rest in, the garden-flowers made a pleasant contrast with the heather over which he had trudged. He could inquire for the best angling grounds, consult the library, collect traditions; hear the news of the parish, and talk at large with the preacher and all the occupants of the premises. And yet, he was a sublime professor in Edinburgh, and long editor of *Blackwood*, in which he pulled all poetry to pieces, unless written by Southey, Coleridge, Wordsworth, and the Ettrick shepherd. There is a permanency in these unpretending establishments. Some ministers have occupied their manses for half a century. The presbyteries rather frown on removals. There are, indeed, exceptions to the general rule; for Rutherford was translated from Anwoth to St. Andrews, Boston from Dollar to Ettrick, John Erskine from Kirkintilloch to Edina, and Chalmers from the vale of Kilmany to the great city of the Clyde, and subsequently to a less populous but more cultivated metropolis. Confidence between pastor and people is a plant of slow growth which needs to be nursed. It derives sanctity from the very moss which is thrown over the ministerial dwelling in the flight of years. But our church habits are different from those of Scotland. Our pastors are not accustomed to the same roof, the same parlor, the same study, the same paddock, the same kirk, the same wimpling brook, and the same warblers from familiar trees. There is quite a fluctuation in their *sames*. They skip about like birds, or skate away like some one on a Dutch canal, or a Hieland loch. It can't be helped, because, like Paul in Rome, they are forced to hire the houses in which they live; and this brings on the dead of winter when even the little humming-bird stops not short of Brazil, and the pastor *must* glide to some sunnier part of the world for fear of encountering a white cap at home. But the people may ask, Do you think if every

congregation in our Southern Church would provide a manse, that an end would be put to this incessant skating? It would help at least to stop it, in our opinion, and it might be well to try the experiment. But it may make them vain and presumptuous. What! vain, because of a few shingles over their heads, a hearth-stone at which to warm gloveless hands, and a few roods or acres perhaps on which the pony may feed. We trow not. The fee simple is among the archives of the people, and not among the parchments of the minister. The Scottish clergy were never spoiled by their manses. If the reader indulge such a suspicion, let him look back to 1843. It was a blooming day which the queen of months had bestowed on St. Arthur's seat, and on the ravines of Edinburgh. Mark that train of gownsmen as they emerge from Holyrood House on their way to the place of convocation. Hear the tolling of the St. Giles bell, as if its tongue were talking of moral rather than natural sublimity. Cast your eye on crowded galleries, aisles overflowed with expectants, on men who had panted in the heat of India, on mariners who had outstripped the billows of the sea, on quarriers who had scaled the granite shelving rocks, on nobles with their stars, and shepherds with their hooks. But above all, look on the five hundred pastors, who, in a few minutes, for the sake of *conscience*, are about to relinquish kirk and manse, and the endearments of home, the charms of neighborhood, the steeples which had so often chimed the people into the sanctuaries of the Lord, pulpits which had been thrones of light, and cemeteries overrun by shades of sorrow, but alive with beams of Christian hope. What was the great dividing question? The Premier of England had virtually claimed to be the head of the Scottish Church, though it was planted by our Lord, illuminated by the chariots of martyrs, nursed by Reformers, watched over by faithful pastors, held in honor by peers of the realm, and anointed by the prayers of Christian peasants. Shall Sir Robert Peel appoint unworthy pastors, and then demand of Presbyteries their ordination and instalment at his will? Shall he rule all our kirks along the green Ochils, the pastoral Grampians, the straths of Perth, by a hundred lochs and a hundred bens,

in lovely vales, crowded cities, and even in the heart of Midlothian. "This is no longer a free Assembly," was the thrilling announcement of the moderator when the great secession commenced. Truly the bush burned, but it was not consumed. A fresh verdure was seen in the blaze, and has become, like the fruitful bough of Joseph, the branches of which have run over the wall of separation between those who defied and those who succumbed to power; and long may it flourish in moisture drawn from the wells of salvation. But we will dwell no longer on a scene of spiritual grandeur unrivalled in the annals of the Church, and in which none but Caledonians could have performed so august a part.

A thousand dwellings dispersed over a country so circumscribed as Scotland, cannot fail to arrest attention in various ways. They are abodes fitted up for a peculiar class of men. In many instances their influence does not extend beyond the parish; but within its bounds that influence is often supreme. The affections of the people are entwined about the one whom they regard as a man of God. In the round of his duties he is not looked upon as a stern master or irresponsible dictator, but as friend, companion, and guide. He carries an olive leaf on his hat, expressive of peace on earth and good will to men. All his offices are so perfectly understood, that descending among the details would be needless. His home is a kind of central object even to the outskirts of the settlement, and where its spiritual interests often come to a confluence. It is important that there should be as few eddies as possible in the current of a life set apart to the sacred ministry. Numerous are the rites of kindness which have been performed at the manses since the sceptre of Anne was swayed over grand old Scotia. The command is explicit. Be given to hospitality, for thereby some have unawares entertained angels. This happened to Abraham under the Hebron oak; and Martha and Mary made welcome to Bethany the Lord of angels. We may not be so highly honored; but suppose a Brainerd, Henry Martyn, or Morrison, should come along, are they not aspiring to a niche among the principalities of heaven, and to enrol their names among gal-

leries which line the walls of the New Jerusalem? There are a good many people who travel over Scotland even in the circle of a year; some on their way to Corra Linn, and some to John O' Groat's House. The Trossachs, the cave of Rob Roy McGregor, and Loch Katrine, have become objects of curiosity to pedestrian pilgrims. In 1774, Dr. Johnson went to the Hebrides, but called at some of the manses on his way. Boswell, in his truly interesting account of that tour, says that the moralist sat in the boat like a magnificent Triton. His taste always lay in the direction of the rugged as contradistinguished from the soft; and he probably preferred Perthshire to Lanark; the sound of Mull to the Loch of Ken; the rapid Spey to the silver Teviot; and stern Ben Ledi to the braes of Yarrow. The Bolt Court traveller was incapable of appreciating the simplicity of Scottish manses. He was an intolerant bigot. In speaking of Knox, it is clear that he made the ruins of architecture to outweigh the liberties of the people. He forgot the plundered abbeys of England, but growled over those which had fallen beneath the hammers of exasperated Iconoclasts. Presbyterians want no prelatial palaces, no Litchfield cathedrals, no tautological prayers, no glittering vestments, no papal mitres, no ostentatious crosses, and none of the paraphernalia of the middle ages. Our religion is moral, spiritual, scriptural, and primitive. Its charm to us consists in its simplicity. That man has forfeited all claim to Presbyterianism, who can see more attraction in Rome than in the Lusatian Herrnhut. One Moravian hymn is worth all the chantings on the Tiber; and one religious principle all the gewgaws in the curiosity shops of St. Peter's. We want no kirk finer than a synagogue; no manse beyond the measure of a convenient cottage; no bell so loud as the Lincoln Tom; no greenhouse from which to ornament the cups, in the drinking of which we muse on that decease which was accomplished at Jerusalem. We are emphatical a missionary church, and as willing to preach from an Indian canoe as from Cleopatra's barge; and in the vale of Chamouni as on the summit of Mont Blanc; or beneath a scanty larch as soon as a banyan tree. Our divine Master preached by a well. We cannot go wrong in making

him our model. Many persons, especially ritualists, have expressed surprise at the undying attachment of Presbyterians to their religion. We are called narrow bigots in our views. A mistake. Perfect love for our own system is not inconsistent with perfect charity for all who are aliens to that system. Ours is an unadorned religion, and we regard it as an internal, increasing, and indestructible well of water springing up unto everlasting life. Our attachment is largely based on the associative faculty, and we couple it with holy men who have lived in all ages. We connect it far more with the shamrock of Ireland, the thistle of Scotland, the lily of France, than with the rose of England. The last proved a soil propitious to the growth of a feverish Puritanism, but not of a thoroughly scriptural Presbyterianism; and yet, for the want of more correct information, the Presbyterians of the Middle and Southern States are constantly blended with the original settlers of New England. President Jefferson lay under this mistake during all his life. We cannot possibly disown our ecclesiastical descent. We look to Scotland as the home of the Culdees; where for eight and twenty years Covenanters endured the bitterest persecutions; where our sires contended for the rights of conscience; where Knox and his associates outbraved the Pope; where God avenged the slaughter of Wishart, his Pittlessie martyr; and where the General Assembly of 1638 defied the scowl of power. Very pleasing are our associations as connected with severer times, when the Jed and the Yarrow could wind by the manse in peace; when the psalm of praise succeeded to the din of war; and when neither gowan, or the slight harebell, felt the impression of a hostile foot; when the heather bloomed by Gala water, and the hawthorn blossomed on Branksome grounds, and in the cemeteries of a thousand kirks.

Divines are not slow to confess that a good deal of theological literature has been produced in the manses. It is true that Lockhart, in "Peter's Letters to his Kinsfolk," has spoken rather disparagingly of the Scotch in comparison with the English theologians. It is probable however that the editor of the *Quarterly* was descended from some nonjuring Churchman, and

this fact may have biased his judgment. It must be borne in mind that the duties of Scotch pastors are of the most active kind. They are repeatedly brought into contact with the people, and in this way much of their time is absorbed. Church courts meet with great frequency, and parishes mingle when sacraments are dispensed. Young and old must be catechised, and yet even in the Establishment the incumbent seldom receives more than a bare subsistence. If he can supply his ingle and feed his cow all winter, he is happy as was Jenner when he leaned on the bars of the inclosure to watch the Gloucester milkmaids. The production of critical works and profound dissertations in theology requires leisure. We freely grant that South British divines have published able works, nor are such works few in number. We believe, however, that the Roanoke orator [was about the last reader of Tillotson's Discourses, whilst Barrow's Sermons are still in vogue among lawyers. The Irenicum of Stillingfleet is popular with Presbyterians; but the Eirenicon of Pusey is a dissertation on puerilities. The wilderness of learning in which his paradox was dressed out by Warburton, so far as readers are concerned, has become lonely as the desert of Sahara, and my Lord of Gloucester was a paragon of *ferociousness* to all who failed to admire his dogmatism. But our present space forbids an entrance into a Cretan labyrinth of learning. It might call for a safer clue than any which the writer could command in making good his return to the picturesque Caledonia. We are more concerned about manses than rectories. The stone kirk is more congenial to our natural taste, and we trust to our more serious feelings, than St. Paul's in London. Verily the Scotch Church is not destitute of a theological literature. We could find a few scraps, perhaps, among the Orkneys, the Shetlands, or the Hebrides by a careful search. A multitude of sermons have been delivered in the Gaelic tongue, and some have doubtless been given to the public. We have read books from the celebrated island of Iona. Small is that plat of earth, and yet it was a kind of goal to no less a pilgrim than Johnson, and Boswell his satellite in the race of travel. Its literature is somewhat debased by superstition, but the *cultores Dei* were luminaries

in an age of moral and intellectual darkness. It is well known that theological, like every other species of literature, seems to select the spots in which it may choose to flourish. Let us glance a moment at Aberdeen, in the University of which George Campbell was a professor. Was he not a man of great critical acuteness? His reputation as a scholar and logician rests on his *Philosophy of Rhetoric*, his *Essay on Miracles*, and his *Preliminary Dissertations*. We say nothing of Gerard and Beattie, as their writings were not theological. Beattie was a far better poet than philosopher. His poems deserve a place on the shelf held out to aspirants by the *Scottish Muse*. The *Minstrel* no doubt was projected at Lawrence kirk; for the scenery of Kincardine is wild and dreary, whilst that of Forfar presents points from which the prospect rolls itself off in green undulations. But the Muses must not tempt us from something more substantial. Macknight, the commentator on the *Epistles of Paul*, resided in the shire of Perth. We do not agree with him in all his views any more than with those of Locke; but we are one with Leighton in his exposition of the *First Epistle of Peter*, and he officiated at Dumblane in the same shire, and the Bishop was to all intents and purposes a Presbyterian. He believed the primitive Church to have been constituted on the platform laid down by Lord King. And this was his own discovery. Ebenezer Erskine of Stirling and Ralph of Dunfermline published various discourses; and they were not essays holding the attention of the reader for twenty minutes, but discussions weighty and scriptural. They were earnest men, like Brown of Haddington and Boston of Ettrick, both of whom were profound in theology, though never schooled to a belles lettres standard of composition; and we need writers of the same stamp at present. The Church may well mourn over milk-and-water productions. They are a fluid which neither feeds nor refreshes hearers of deep religious experience. Will our readers believe that in New York sermons are preached on the "English Language," "Italian Poetry," and "Decisions of the Supreme Court!" Did Livingstone preach in this way at the Kirk of Shotts, or Knox before a Popish Queen, or Chalmers before the nobility of London? We need

not dwell on the works of Chalmers, for they have met with an extensive circulation. And it gives us pleasure to say that Rutherford's Letters have recently appeared in a new American edition. With what a heavenly unction are these Letters imbued. They are an orchard of pomegranates, with pleasant fruits; camphire, with spikenard and saffron; calamus and cinnamon, with all trees of frankincense; myrrh and aloes, with all the chief spices; a fountain of gardens, a well of living waters, and streams from Lebanon. What a blessing must Rutherford have been to the Shire of Kirkcudbright. The tendencies of Scotch theology have been doctrinal, largely interspersed with Scripture proofs, enlivened by Christian experience, resolving the doubts of faith; or it has taken the form of catechisms, sacramental meditations, replies to Arminians, Church history, Church biography, with occasional satire directed against the Moderates, a good specimen of which came forth from the manse of Paisley. We need not enter into the theology of the four Universities. Such an entrance, before an egress could be effected, might prove tedious to the reader.

A few words of reply to Howitt touching the Scottish manses. He is a follower of George Fox, and we rejoice that Wiffen, Tupper, Barton, and Whittier, of the same creed, have taken to pencraft. During our late war Whittier was in a bad fix. He was obliged to lay a tight rein on his Muse to keep him away from fields of carnage and sights unbecoming the eye of even a Hickory Quaker. He dreamed, perhaps, that Harper's Ferry, Fortress Monroe, and Gosport Navy Yard belonged to Massachusetts, without even Nahant belonging to Virginia as an equivalent. But when his eye was rolling in the phrensy of inspiration, had he but looked at the deeds in which the sites were conveyed, he would have found ample provision made for their return in certain emergencies. Our business, however, is to settle with Howitt. He wrote a book called the "Homes and Haunts of the Poets." When looking after some traditions about Thomson, he enters into a tirade against the kirk and manse of Ednam, and extends his vituperation to all the manses from Pentland Firth to Teviotdale, and then from Berwick to



the Butt of Lewis. No literature, no taste, no philosophy. We will meet this charge by a simple statement of facts. Reid was translated from the manse which he occupied as a pastor to the chair of Mental Philosophy in the University of Glasgow. Dugald Stewart was reared from boyhood in Roseneath Parish, Dumbarton, of which his father was minister. Under like circumstances, Brown became professor in Edinburgh, a city which the Scotch call the Athens of the world. The same may be said of Professor Robertson, who was the historian of Scotland, India and Charles V., and of Dr. Hugh Blair, Professor of the Belles Lettres. Howitt was now at Ednam, in the manse of which the Bard of the Seasons was born, but transferred to that of Kelso, renowned in the Border wars. The poetical talents of Thomson were remarkable, though his dramatic pieces were tame and his Seasons laden with superfluous verbiage. The Quaker gentleman had only to look around him in the local position which he had assumed to find himself at a confluence of literary associations. He was near to Abbotsford, Kelso, Melrose and Jedburgh Abbeys, St. Mary's Loch, and the haunts of Falconer and Leyden, and in sight of the Lammermoors. If he had gone to Langholm on the Esk, he might have seen the manse in which Meikle, the translator of the *Lusiad*, first saw the light, and quite near it on the Liddel the one in which Armstrong was born, who through the medium of blank verse taught us the art of health. If he had gone to the village of Bothwell in Lanark, he might have seen the ministerial abode in which Joanna Baillie was reared; or to Haddington, the one in which Robert Blair wrote his "Grave;" or to Cupar in Fife, the one in which Wilkie first set in motion his magic pencil, so true to nature and the manners of his country. Or had he gone to South Leith, he might have stopped at the manse in which Logan penned his inspiring hymns; or to Laggan, in the rugged Shire of Inverness, the one in which Mrs. Grant sent forth her "Letters from the Mountains." But Burns does not appear to have been conversant with ministerial dwellings. We wish he had been; for it might have introduced into his too broad humor a spice of refinement, nor would it have lessened the tenderness with which he

mourns the Earl of Glencairn, nor erased one tint from the "Cotter's Saturday Night." It is vain to deny that Scotland is the land of song. The mercurial imagination of its people has been at work among its dark mountains, its deep ravines, its towering hills, and wherever nature presents even one of its beautiful objects. Her monarchs have handled lutes, and the reeds of shepherds have responded from the banks of the Dee and the Tweed. Grahame has depicted the plumage of its birds and the repose of its Sabbaths, the Ettrick Shepherd its wakes, Ferguson its firesides, Sir David Lindsay its palaces, Ramsay its hawthorn nooks, Scott its abbeys, and Pollok, looking down through the vista of ages, has descried events which are to take place in the millennial evening of our world. Kirk and manse will ever constitute the glory of Scotland. That Church has baffled the wiles of papistry, the snares of prelacy, the avarice of nobles, and the hatred of kings. It has been subject to spiritual declension. But a genial season has more than once succeeded the winter of such declensions. God has reared up such men as Witherspoon, Walker, Andrew Thompson, and Sir Harry Moncreiff, to restore the bloom which had been partially lost. Resting on a scriptural basis, instructed by enlightened pastors, governed by impartial judicatories, simple in its rights and by no means exclusive in its spirit, that Church defies its enemies, unfolds her gates to all who prefer her sacred courts. Light from kirk and manse has colored the whole map of Scotland.

In reflecting on this subject the question has occurred, whether the Presbyterian Church of the South will ever provide a competent number of ministerial homes. We are aware of the serious difficulties which we would be called on to surmount in carrying out such a scheme. We know full well that the support of their church operations by our people has been provided under peculiar circumstances, involving all the distress, deprivations, destruction of churches, acts of sacrilege, and wanton deeds created by the war. Our vine has been bleeding under the tusks of Syrian boars, and our sheepfolds have been assailed by Suabian wolves; and yet God has not forsaken the vineyard which his right hand has planted. It is productive still in the

grapes of Sibmah, and the purple clusters of Engedi. We would not lay on our Southern Zion more than we are able to bear; but might not each individual church provide its own manse? Might not our General Assembly recommend ministerial abodes as the peculiar work of our church sessions and congregations without encumbering our people with more general schemes than they can bear? There is no royal purse like that of Queen Anne's to which we can look for the supply of our wants; but the Free Kirk of Scotland relinquished its hold on that purse, and yet manses rose under the hands of greywacke quarriers. They were the gifts of the people. In early life the writer was pastor of two congregations, and neither possessed a ministerial abode, but at present both are furnished with those commodities by the bequests of elders. Several contiguous churches have since been supplied by private munificence. We contend for nothing, but that the subject ought to be kept in view through the medium of our periodicals. Ere long the people will act. They will not longer permit their pastors to remain without a sheeling, which may afford protection from the rays of a southern sun. And we want those abodes to take the Scottish name, and not that of parsonages. Presbyterians ignore the title of parson as a designation to any one of their ministers. We want among us no deans, rectors, or vicars, being satisfied with that rich cluster of titles bestowed on us in the New Testament, because they place us at a measureless distance from any Jewish or Roman priesthood. Among ourselves we are at peace, and unity pervades our Southern Church. Irregular structures are common in mineralogy; but we do not like even angular grains of difference in our views of divine revelation. And yet against others we bring no railing accusation. May the Southern Church keep its eye on the dignity of Michael, manifested in the lowly vale which skirted the foot of Mt. Pisgah. The King of kings and Lord of lords has assigned us a work to perform, and our task is one so pleasing that we ought to run to it with alacrity. It is to multiply our churches, to defend revealed truth, to contend earnestly but not furiously for the support of the gospel ministry, to evangelize neighborhoods, to

enlighten the wigwams of our Indians, and to plant the banner of foreign and domestic missions wherever divine providence shall give us access. If under our efforts any foreign wilderness should become a fruitful field, we may be sure that our domestic heritage, so far from running to waste, will borrow the fresh moral tints which have been thrown over distant lands. We are few in numbers as compared with Northern Presbyterians, but we must call to mind our early history. A century and a half ago the Presbyterian Church was planted in an obscure corner of Maryland, by the Rev. Francis Makemie, an emigrant to Virginia from the North of Ireland. From 1620 New England had been preoccupied by Congregationalism, but our system took root in the middle Colonies and has extended itself to all points of the compass. Despondency is an ingredient which must not enter into the creed of any Southern Presbyterian.

These suggestions have been thrown out in a way perfectly unpretending. The writer wishes to enforce his views on no one, but believes that manses would give an impulse to a Church which he cherishes with fond affection without impinging on that charity which ought to be felt for all men. May all our things be done in charity. And may ministerial homes be reared in the tide-water country, and among the blue mountains of Virginia—in sight of the noble bays of North Carolina, that ancient but modest commonwealth—among the sturdy Scotch-Irish of South Carolina, whose sires wore the red tints of persecution; along the fertile banks of the Tombigbee; and, in short, to the Gulf of Mexico.

But some may ask, what magic charm can be  
In a stone manse; or in some select tree  
Or hawthorn hedge? And can enchantment dwell  
In sounds sent forth by simple Sabbath-bell?  
To which ten thousand tongues at once respond:  
There is a charm in each lov'd pastor's wand—  
When, as a steward, he comes to feed  
On the rich manna suited to their need.

## ARTICLE V.

## THE DEALINGS OF CHRIST WITH THE CHINESE NATION.

In order that the glory connected with any mission work may be fully appreciated, it is generally necessary to consider the past dealings of God with the people to whom the gospel is sent. Take, for example, the work of the apostles, who were called to lay the offers of the ascended Redeemer before the people of the Jews. Under any circumstances it was glorious that Christ, through his ambassadors, should stoop to entreat sinful man to be reconciled to God—to accept of a blessed and eternal deliverance from death and hell. But, if our minds stopped here, we should still come far short of a just estimate of the full glory of this work. In order that we may come near beholding its full lustre, we must take in the past. We remember how God, long before in his tender pity to this people, delivered them from wretched bondage, bore them on eagles' wings, fed them and gave them his commandments of life. We remember how, when they rebelled against him and vexed his Holy Spirit, he would not forsake them. Through long centuries he continued to bear with them, to counsel them, to beseech them, to correct them. Of his messengers they beat some, and killed others, and stoned others: yet his pity towards them did not fail. He sent at last his own Son, that they might behold in him all majesty and meekness, and wisdom and love, saying, They will reverence my Son. But they killed him. Who would not have thought his forbearance would cease? But no: the Son of God, risen from the grave, still bore first on his heart the ungrateful children; and as he sent forth his prophets and wise men and scribes for the teaching of the nations, he laid on them the injunction, "Beginning at Jerusalem." What incomparable love! which many waters could not quench. As those heralds of the Redeemer went forth to their work, it was in sorrow of heart they found that they stretched forth their hands to a disobedient and gain-saying people; but, as they considered the past, how glorious

must the mission have seemed in their eyes; and amidst all discouragements and trials and griefs, as they fixed their eyes on him whom they served, the exultant thought must have swelled in their hearts, "Though Israel be not gathered, yet is our Lord glorious."

Our own Church has been called at this time to engage in a mission to the people of China. That they cannot be faithful in the execution of this work except at the expense of toil, of suffering, of wealth, no one can doubt who considers the vastness of the field, and the nature of the obstacles to be overcome. In order, then, that they may acquit themselves aright in the great undertaking to which they have been called, it becomes them to furnish themselves with every consideration which will tend to infuse zeal and resolution in the conduct of the work. Among these considerations, it has seemed to us that one peculiarly fitted to inspire this constancy, may be drawn from a review of the past dealings of God with this nation. By beholding his patience and lovingkindness towards this people we may be led to arm ourselves likewise with the same mind. We propose, therefore, in this paper to review briefly the dealings of Christ with the people of China. The historical materials which we shall use are many of them familiar to the students of Mosheim's history; for others we are indebted to various sources, but principally to a collection of facts bearing on early missions to this land, published in the *North-China Daily News*, from the pen of the Rev. M. J. Knowlton, Baptist missionary at Ningpo.

Our Lord and Saviour, before he left the world, gave his disciples no indistinct intimation that he intended to signalise his glorious ascension far above all principalities and powers by renewing at once his offers of salvation to all the dwellers on earth. In speaking of the close of the Jewish Commonwealth, which was soon to take place, he told them that the gospel of the kingdom should first be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations, and then should the end come. The promise which he gave the eleven that they should be witnesses unto him unto the uttermost part of the earth, was addressed to them personally, as well as in view of their being representatives

of the Church. In what manner they executed the commission which they thus received, it was not the object of Scripture to inform us. The book known as the Acts of the Apostles—an uninspired title—contains but a partial account of the labors of any of the apostles, while the missionary operations of most of them are passed over almost in silence. Yet, that the disciples of that day did carry out this commission in all its fulness is more than once asserted by Paul in his epistles. In urging upon the Roman Christians the truth that the nations of the earth can only be saved by hearing the gospel, he raises the question, "But I say, have they not heard?" He replies by referring to the sublime passage in the 19th Psalm, where the free and universal influences of the heavenly bodies are celebrated as showing forth the glory of God. As God had sent down these benign influences upon every kindred and tongue and people and nation, so says the apostle it was with the gospel—their sound went into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the world. In writing to the Colossians, he tells them in the 6th verse of the 1st chapter, that as the gospel had come to them, so it was now in all the world; and again in the 23d verse, as if to impress on their minds so interesting and important a fact, and, perhaps, foreseeing that his former expression might be interpreted by some as referring only to the Roman world, he uses language if possible still more explicit than that of the gospel commission, and declares that as the Colossians had heard this gospel, so it had now been preached to every creature which is under heaven. Taking, then, the plain and obvious meaning of these passages of Scripture, it only remains to inquire what historical evidence we possess of the gospel being preached at this time to the people of China.

We observe, in the first place, that the commercial intercourse which is known to have existed at the beginning of the Christian era between China and the countries of Europe and Asia, afforded a ready means for bringing the gospel to this land. Chinese silk was already at this time a favorite at Rome. Pliny, Horace, and Tacitus, all mention the Seric curtains and garments—Seres, meaning silk-worms, being the name given to

China by the Greek historians. Dr. Morrison informs us that Chinese history also evinces the existence of the traffic carried on at this time between China and the far-off nations of the West. Such being the case, we can hardly doubt that the advantage was not overlooked by those who were called to go into all the world. If in our own day we find that the enterprise of missions has not only been prompt to "follow in the wake of trade," but in many instances, contrary to Lord Clarendon's advice, has been seen in advance, we may well believe that the Apostles of the Lamb, with the inspiring words of their Master still sounding in their ears, did not fail to avail themselves of every opportunity offered by the commerce of their day, to carry the gospel into the regions beyond. We find it, accordingly, the uniform tradition among the Syrian Christians on the coast of Malabar, India, that the gospel was brought to China by the Apostle Thomas. When the Portuguese first landed on the Malabar coast, in the beginning of the sixteenth century, they found, to their surprise, upwards of a hundred Christian churches in existence there. The ancient origin of these churches was attested by the fact that they knew nothing of the Pope of Rome, while they themselves traced their history back to the Apostle Thomas, whom they revered as their founder. They held also that this apostle had crossed over from their country to China, and founded the early churches which existed here; and the Primate of these Syrian churches, accordingly, subscribed himself "Metropolitan of India and China"—the most ancient title, says the historian Trigaut, of the bishops of this Church. In the ritual used in these churches there is more than one allusion to these deeds attributed to the Apostle Thomas. In a certain antiphony occurs the following passage: "The Hindoos, the Chinese, the Persians, and the inhabitants of the isles, and they who dwell in Syria, Armenia, Greece, and Romania, now on the commemoration of St. Thomas, offer adoration to thy holy name." Again, in one of the lessons occur these words: "It was through St. Thomas that the Chinese and Ethiopians were converted to the truth; it was through St. Thomas that they received the sacrament of baptism and the



adoption of sons; it was through St. Thomas that they believed and confessed the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; it was through St. Thomas that they received the faith of one God, which they have kept; it was through St. Thomas that the rays of the life-giving doctrine beamed upon all India; it was through St. Thomas that the kingdom of heaven sped onward and reached the Chinese." This tradition, so far as it concerns the labors of the apostle in India, is supported by the allusions made to it in the writings of Jerome, Ambrose, and others of the early fathers. The latter part of the tradition is maintained by a learned Syrian historian of the name of Assemanus, who at the beginning of the eighteenth century was appointed librarian of the Vatican at Rome. He states that the Apostle Thomas "passed over to a country on the east of India, where he preached the gospel and founded a church in the city of Cambalu (Pekin), after which he returned to Malabar." We can only say, then, with reference to the tradition, that it seems to accord with all the known facts of the case; and it may readily occur to some that the work of bearing the gospel to these distant regions, amid the perilous navigation of those days, was one peculiarly suited to that bold and devoted spirit, who at an early stage of his Christian career had said, "Let us also go, that we may die with him." That the name of Christ was proclaimed at a very early day in this land, admits of no doubt. No later than A. D. 300, the labors of his servants here were already known in history. Arnobius, of Africa, writing at this time, speaks of the "Christian deeds done in India and among the Seres" (Chinese). Nor is Chinese history itself, according to Du Halde, altogether silent in regard to these deeply interesting events. That the testimony from this source should be meagre, is only what we might expect. "Chinese history," says Du Halde, "seldom speaks of any events but those which concern civil government." Yet, says this writer, "The famous Quan-Yun-Chang," (a Chinese historian,) "who lived in the beginning of the second century, certainly had a knowledge of Jesus Christ; as the monuments written by his hand, and afterwards engraven upon stones, plainly prove. This may be gathered from copies found almost

every where, of which nothing can be made unless he speaks of Christianity; because he mentions the birth of the Saviour in a grotto exposed to all the winds; his death; his resurrection; his ascension, and the impression of his holy feet: mysteries which are so many riddles to the infidel Chinese." And it is further stated by this historian that from other parts of the Chinese records it appears "that about that time," (*i. e.*, the first century,) "an extraordinary person arrived in China, who taught a doctrine purely spiritual, and drew the admiration of the world upon him, by the fame of the virtues he possessed, by the sanctity of the life he led, and by the number of the miracles he wrought." We thus find all the lines of historical evidence converging to one point, in accordance with the declarations of Scripture, which we have already noticed; and we therefore do not feel that we would be justified in entertaining a doubt that the gospel was preached to this nation in the days of the apostles.

We pause, then, to consider the spectacle of Christ coming forth at this time to offer to the people of China the words of life. For more than twelve hundred years he had manifested a peculiar regard to this nation. While in other parts of the earth he had raised up and cast down kingdoms and authorities, this people he had upheld with a uniform hand. The Assyrian, the Medo-Persian, the Macedonian empires, had all risen to the highest pitch of pride and power, and had then been dashed in pieces like the potter's vessel. But, amidst all these shocks and changes he had been longsuffering towards China; and for what reason we know. It was because he was not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance. And so, when the time had arrived that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, this nation, preserved by his singular care, was also tendered these blessings at his hands. In what manner the offers of salvation were received in this land, we are but little able to say. We know the apathy, the indifference, and in many cases, the open contempt and hatred with which these offers were met in other parts of the world, causing the angels in heaven, no doubt, who looked

down on the amazing spectacle, to take a new lesson in the awfulness and deformity of sin. Such, it is more than probable, was the case also in China. Yet, as the gospel in other parts of the world every where brought forth fruit, so, no doubt, it had its fruit here. Those who rejoice in heaven over every sinner that repenteth were able now to take up the words of Isaiah's prophecy. (See Alexander on Isaiah xlv. 12.) As they cast their eyes over the world, and beheld those whom Christ was drawing unto himself, they exclaimed, "Behold, these shall come from far: and, lo, these from the north and from the west;" and then as they looked down also on the new-born Christians of this land, they added with a rapture which we can scarcely conceive, "And these for the land of Sinim (China)." The tribute paid by Arnobius to the Christian deeds done among the Seres, whether it refers to native or to foreign Christians, would lead us to hope that the work was wrought in the presence of this people with glory and with power; that those whose Christian fame was reported on the coasts of Africa had indeed shown forth the praises of him who called them, and in the conflict of the ages had proved themselves, on this soil, worthy to stand among those who overcome by the blood of the Lamb and by the word of their testimony, and who love not their lives unto the death.

But, whatever impression was at first made on this land by the gospel, it was not to be left unsustained. Only a few centuries had elapsed when we find the Chinese again the objects of missionary work. The Lord of the harvest again sent forth laborers to this field. The missionaries now were from the Nestorian and Syrian Christians. About the middle of the fifth century, Barsumas, one of the most distinguished of the Nestorian fathers, established a theological school at Nisibis, in Persia. He, with his contemporary Nestorius, had been driven by persecution to form a separate communion. The teachers in this Church professed to derive their doctrines immediately from the apostles. They discarded images, and were simple in their worship. How far they succeeded in the theological school at Nisibis in teaching the doctrines of the apostles in their purity,

we are unable to say; but the school did not fail in one evidence of a true and vigorous life—it sent forth its sons into all the world. “From this school,” says Mosheim, “issued those who in the fifth and following century carried the Nestorian doctrines into Egypt, Syria, Arabia, India, Tartary, and even China.” At what time precisely these missionaries arrived in China, or what reception they met from the people to whom they were sent, we are not informed. That they succeeded in securing a foothold here is evident from a circumstance mentioned by Gibbon. “In the year 552,” he states, “two Persian monks brought the eggs of silkworms from China to Constantinople,” and thus commenced the cultivation of silk in the west; and these monks, he further informs us, “had long resided in China.” Yet, while the operations of the earlier missionaries of this Church are involved in obscurity, some remarkable facts in connexion with the labors of those who came later to China have been brought to light. These missionaries, who preached the gospel in China during the seventh and eighth centuries, were from Syria; and the manner in which their labors have become known to us deserves our notice.

In the province of Shensi, one of the interior provinces of China, is the city of Sigan, lying in the fertile valley of the River Wei. This city is now only the provincial capital of Shensi, but in the seventh century it possessed the eminence of being the capital of the empire. Here the Tang dynasty held its court; and here it was the imperial rulers received glad tidings of the kingdom which is not of this world. The record of these events has come down to us in stone. In the year 1625, a marble tablet, long covered with rubbish, was discovered and dug up by some Chinese workmen at Sigan. The tablet, which is ten feet long and five broad, is surmounted by a cross, resembling that used by the Syrians in Malabar. It was erected A. D. 781. The inscriptions which it bears are in Syriac and in Chinese. The Chinese inscription states that it was “written by Lu-Siu-Yen, court councillor, formerly holding high military command in Taichow.” It is headed, “A tablet commemorating the diffusion of the illustrious religion of Ta-tsin (Syria) in

China." The chief points of this inscription we shall here give.

The inscription opens with a statement of the unity and character of God, whom it describes as the Eternal Cause of causes, the far-seeing and purely spiritual, the never-ending and incomprehensible Being, one mysterious Trinity, the true eternal Lord Jehovah. It next states briefly the creation and the fall of man. God moved the primeval Spirit, it says, and produced all things visible and invisible. Man is described as perfect, till Satan, by exercising dissimulation, brought in evil and darkness. The various devices of man to rise from this sad estate are next pointed out—his "wearing legal nets," his sacrifices and prayers, his vain show of goodness, the laborious strivings of his wisdom, all ending in disappointment and anguish, all showing that man was "irrecoverably lost. Thereupon," it proceeds, "our Trinity set apart the illustrious and adorable Messiah, who, laying aside his true dignity, came into the world as man." The work of Christ is hastily sketched. He fulfilled the ancient laws of the Scriptures. He perfected the truth. He revealed life and destroyed death. "His mighty work thus finished, at mid-day he ascended to his true estate. Twenty-seven books (the Scriptures) remained. He set forth original conversion for the soul's deliverance. And he instituted the baptism of water and of the Spirit to wash away the vanity of life, and to cleanse and purify the heart." The going forth of the disciples to preach to all nations is next stated; and then after a brief dissertation on the character of their doctrine, the writer proceeds in the Oriental style which distinguishes his whole production, to describe the arrival of the Syrian missionaries in China. "In the reign of the civil emperor, Taitsung, the illustrious and holy enlarger of the Tang dynasty, there was in Judea a man of superior virtue, called Olopun, who, guided by the azure clouds, bearing the true Scriptures, and observing the laws of the winds, made his way through dangers and difficulties. In the year A. D. 636, he arrived at Chang-ngan (Sigan). The emperor instructed his minister, Duke Tang Hiuenling, to take the imperial sceptre, and go out to the western suburbs, receive the guest, and conduct him into

the palace. The Scriptures were translated in the library of the palace. The emperor, in his private apartments, made inquiry concerning the religion; and fully satisfied that it was correct and true, he gave special commands for its promulgation." Then follows the imperial edict, bearing date of August, A. D. 639. The emperor declares that on examining the doctrine of Olopun, it is found to be pure, mysterious, and separate from the world. "Its language is simple, its reasonings attractive, and to the human race it is beneficial. As is right, let it be promulgated throughout the empire. Let the appropriate Board build a Judean Church in the Righteous and Holy street of the Capital, and appoint thereto twenty-one priests." Such were the auspices under which the Syrian missionaries began their labors in China. The rulers of the house of Tang—the most celebrated line of princes, perhaps, that has ever sat on the throne of China—continued to give their support to the new religion. Kautsung, the son and successor of Taitung, "honored and perpetuated," says the inscription, "the memory of his ancestors. He supported the truth they inculcated, and built churches in all the departments of the empire. He raised Olopun to the rank of high-priest and national protector. The law (*i. e.* the new religion) spread in every direction. The wealth of the state was boundless. Churches filled all the cities; and the families were rich, illustrious, and happy." This success of the Christian religion gave rise to opposition. In the year A. D. 699, the inscription states, the followers of Buddha raised a persecution; and afterwards, at the close of the year A. D. 713, some from the literary classes "raised ridicule and spread abroad slanderous reports." It is worthy of note that the chief opposition at this time came from the same class, and was exhibited in the same way, as we have found it in China in our own day. The attack, however, proved unavailing. "The honorable descendants of those from the West," says the writer, "distinguished and elevated in character, maintained the original doctrines and prevented their subversion." Subsequently, we find many of the highest officials of the land, some of them connected with the palace, giving ardent support to the new faith, among whom

special mention is made of the secretary to the Emperor Sui-tsung, about the year 760, who, possessed of great influence, was very active in advancing the cause of the Church. The remainder of the inscription is chiefly taken up with grandiloquent tributes to the various emperors who gave their countenance to the Christian cause, mingled with highly rhetorical statements of the blessings of the true faith. On the margin of the tablet, written in Syriac, are the names of ninety-two of the most prominent leaders in the Nestorian mission and churches in China; and it appears that, altogether, between the years 636 and 781, the period embraced in the record, about one hundred Nestorian missionaries, whose names are preserved, labored in the empire.

Such are the main points of this remarkable record. From them it appears that He who is the light of the world, was pleased, at this time, to shine forth, and scatter many beams among the darkness of this land. That the worship taught by the Syrian missionaries was encumbered with more or less of superstition is evident; yet it was probably the purest that the Church in the 7th century any where possessed. The Scriptures, it is plain, formed the basis of their instruction, and their first work was to undertake their translation. The statement of Christian doctrine, given by the author of the inscription, is logical in its order and correct throughout; and while the terms used in stating the cardinal truth of the atonement are less explicit than could be desired; yet, with regard to the truths which point unerringly to the necessity of an atonement, there is no uncertain voice. Man, by the fall, is declared to be irrecoverably lost; and a theology which starts on this basis, declaring that human wisdom, human virtue, human sacrifices and prayers, are all in vain; that they can end only in disappointment and anguish, is not likely to go far wrong in determining what is the one only way of salvation. When men believe the truth concerning earthly things, it is an easy step to believe heavenly things. Such was the religion which at this time spread abroad in the empire, and was embraced by men from every class. Were we able accurately to compare China at this time with the other nations of the earth of the same day, it would

perhaps present a striking view. Says the judicious author of the "Middle Kingdom," in speaking of the Tang dynasty, "During the 287 years this line of princes held the throne, China was probably the most civilised country on earth; and the darkest days of the West, when Europe was wrapped in the ignorance and degradation of the Middle Ages, formed the brightest era of the East." And if it is not unlikely that China was then the most favored nation of the earth in regard to civilisation, it is not improbable also that she was favored above all others in the possession of the knowledge of the true and living God; that, compared with the so-called Christian nations of the earth, she was in truth the most truly Christian.

What causes, then, we may ask, combined to extinguish the light which then shone in this land? They are easy to trace. The form of worship introduced by these Syrian Christians was, as we have just remarked, overlaid in a degree with superstitious ritual; and no one at all acquainted with the history of the Church need be told how rapidly a ritualism, when once admitted, grows and strengthens, and how fatally it encroaches on the true life of the Church. We observe, too, that the difficulties which the Chinese language presents to a foreigner, no doubt, then as now, proved a constant embarrassment to the missionaries in their efforts to make known the truth; while the Scriptures, so far as they were translated, could have had but a very limited circulation. It was not till three centuries after this time that printing was first known in the empire, and the number of persons able to read and write was of course small. Under these circumstances, it is not difficult to see how a rapid decline would almost certainly take place in the life of the Chinese Church. If the parent Nestorian churches in Persia and Turkey, as we know, sank to such a state of death and corruption, that they became themselves the objects of missionary effort, and evangelists from the Church in America were sent to the Koordish mountains and the plain of Oroomiah, we can readily imagine the state to which the Chinese Church was reduced; and when once the spiritual life of the Church is departed, her enemies may have power over her according to their will. Such, in



truth, was the case here. Sixty-four years after the erection of the tablet, the Emperor Wu-tsung, influenced, perhaps, by the old enemies of the Church, the literati, commanded all the priests belonging to the Christian sect to retire to private life. Multitudes yielded to the power. Three thousand priests, according to Du Halde, were thus summarily deposed; yet such were the dimensions which the Church had by this time reached, that it was not entirely crushed even by this heavy blow. The famous Venetian, Marco Polo, who travelled through China in the 10th century, informs us that numerous Nestorian churches still existed at that time in the empire; and, in the 15th century, they still possessed an existence, though in a feeble and dying state. "So late as this century," says Mosheim, "the Nestorian patriarch in Chaldea sent certain men to China, to preside as bishops over the churches existing, or rather lying concealed in the more remote provinces of that country. At the opening of the next century, the Nestorians seem to have made a special effort to revive their mission in this land, and, according to the Jesuit missionaries, who made careful inquiries on this point, the effort met with some success. This, however, roused the Mohammedans of the empire, who incited the mandarins to a persecution against the Christians unto death. The Church was not possessed of the vitality which alone could withstand such an assault. Those bearing the Christian name were scattered in every direction. Some declared themselves Mohammedans, others Jews, while the greater part of them turned to idolatry, and their houses of worship were changed into heathen temples. "From that time," says Trigaut, "the persecuted fugitives were so full of fear, that there was nothing they took such pains to conceal as their descent from a Christian race;" and thus the last remains of this Christian Church disappeared from the land.

Here we might pause, and simply declare that, from this time till our own century, He who sitteth on the throne suffered the people of China to walk in their own ways. Viewed as a nation, this assertion is undoubtedly true; yet, we would not doubt also that He who knew how to select one widow from among the

starving multitudes of Sidon, and one leper from among the diseased of Syria, was pleased also by other means than those we have mentioned, to draw a few unto himself from among the millions of China. In speaking thus, we have in view the missions of the Church of Rome. The great efforts which have been made by Rome to extend her power over this empire are well known. In the 13th century, previous to the Reformation, and again in the 16th century, she sent her agents to this land, and by every art and wile sought to bring the nation to her feet. Of the great body of her missionaries we have here nothing to say. They are no doubt well represented by the adroit and versatile Matteo Ricci, the leader of her missions in the 16th century, who, according to a writer of his own church, indulged his converts in bowing down to any idol, provided a cross was secretly hung among the candles which burnt upon the shrine. Such men, active as they were in compassing sea and land, could only make their proselytes twofold more the children of hell than themselves. Yet, among those sent out by Rome, we find exceptional cases, whom we love to single out as preachers in truth of Christ crucified. Such, we think, was John de Monte Corvino of Apulia, who came to China in 1292. For years he labored at Peking without success, but in the end many were added to his church. The short record preserved of him leads us to believe that he held the testimony of Jesus. No one can read his words without a thrill of sympathy, mingled with admiration. "It is now twelve years," he says, "since I have heard any news from the West. I am become old and grey-headed, but it is rather through labors and tribulations than through age, for I am only fifty-eight years old. I have learned the Tartar language and literature, into which I have translated the whole New Testament and the Psalms of David, and have caused them to be transcribed with the utmost care. I write and read, and preach openly and freely the testimony of the law of Christ." It is evident that the careful translation of the Scriptures into a heathen tongue is the work, not of one who seeks the aggrandizement of the Roman See, but of one who aims to bring men to God; and we may well hope, that among

the 6,000 persons baptized by Corvino, not a few believed to the saving of the soul. Among those who succeeded Ricci in this land, we also discover a few, whose lives and words, so far as we can judge, bore witness for the truth. Such, we trust, were Dufresse and Gagelin, who were both martyred on heathen soil for the faith they preached. It is said by those who have read their letters in the "Annales," that it is hardly possible to doubt that they sincerely loved and trusted in the Saviour whom they proclaimed. Many of their Chinese converts also exhibited the greatest constancy in their profession. Here and there, we would hope, such true lights were set up in China, and a few were found to rejoice in the light: but even these gleams amid the darkness, so few and uncertain, were doomed to disappear. In 1724, the imperial government, which had been growing more and more hostile to this mission, issued an edict, ordering all missionaries to leave the country, and strictly prohibiting the promulgation of the religion of Rome. From this time every public token of the name of Christ was taken away; his name, if ever mentioned, was spoken only with bated breath; the prince of this world held his own in peace; and his symbol, the dragon, was flaunted on the imperial standard, in the idol processions, on the temple walls. Darkness covered the land, and gross darkness the people.

Thus the people of China had cast away every offer of salvation. Thus they refused to hear Him who speaketh from heaven. Yet they were not destroyed. He who doeth according to his will among the inhabitants of the earth, still upheld and cherished this people, as though to show forth in them all longsuffering and grace; and when nearly a century had elapsed since they publicly forbade the very mention of his name among them, he again sent forth his messengers to entreat them not to destroy themselves, but to repent and believe. The history of missions of the present century in China is so well known that we need not dwell on it here. We know how he who was chosen to be the pioneer in this movement, Robert Morrison, landed in 1807 at the gates of Canton; how for years he was engaged here in studying the language, translating the Scrip-

tures, and in preaching the gospel to the little group he gathered about him; while among the Chinese emigrants in the Malayan Archipelago, a handful of missionaries labored as they could, hoping for the day when the gates of the empire should be opened up, and they might enter in. We know how the wrath of man was at last used to burst open these gates which had been so long closed, and in the year 1842 five ports of the empire received the heralds of the cross. We know how, since that time, still by the same means, the barriers which shut in the nation have been yet further broken down, till in our own day we see the whole land, in name at least, open to all those who would go forth bearing precious seed; we see more than 120 ordained missionaries, together with double that number of native preachers, engaged in declaring the name of Christ; while our own Church has received the honor of planting the gospel far back in the empire, not less than 300 miles, according to the lines of travel, from the coast. Thus, the cloud of mercy, which in 1807 rose no bigger than a man's hand, continues to grow and advance.

All who know anything of the Chinese people, are aware of their great hardness of heart. Du Halde well calls them the "infidel Chinese." And we know that God, when dealing in mercy with a people of this kind, is pleased to vary his means—if one course fail, to adopt another, if peradventure they may be led to repentance. Such is his desire to draw men into affectionate sympathy with himself, that if he mourn unto them and they will not lament, he is willing to pipe unto them, if perchance they will dance. We have seen how all his past endeavors to bring the Chinese nation to himself failed; and we may therefore expect to find that his present dealings towards them are attended with some circumstances, which render them peculiarly suited to attain his end. What features, then, we may ask, distinguish the present missions in China from all those which have gone before?

They may be stated, we think, under three heads. First, the printed word now accompanies every where the word that is preached. If there be one thing for which the people of China

have an unaffected regard, it is their written character; and it has pleased God to lay before them his word in a form which of itself commands their respect. No Chinaman will venture to abuse paper on which are printed the letters invented, as he thinks, by sages, whom he regards as gods; and while we have heard of cases at the treaty ports where Chinamen were known to turn over their Bibles to the societies whose business it is to collect and burn scraps of lettered paper that they may be saved from abuse, yet we have never heard of any one mutilating or defacing the book. Thus, the very superstition of the people is turned to their good.

That the distribution of the Bible is an important auxiliary to mission work, we need hardly remark. At the same time it is of importance that the Church should guard herself against assigning it an improper place in the evangelisation of the world. The great Bible societies of England and America now send out the Scriptures to the principal heathen nations of the earth, printed in their own tongue; and it might seem to some that this free circulation of the Bible, especially in a land such as China, where many persons are able to read, would supersede in a measure the necessity of sending out men to preach. Such an error would be serious indeed. This word is, we know, the sword of the Spirit; but as we have it in the Scriptures, the sword is, so to speak, in the scabbard, and it needs the living arm to draw it forth and wield it in the face of the foe, before, on a heathen field, it will pierce to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit. No one can consider the structure of the Bible without perceiving that it was not designed to make known the gospel to those who have not so much as heard the name of God. The heathen man who reads it, like the keeper of the royal treasures of Ethiopia, is sure to say, How can I understand except some man should guide me? Were we called on to select between the New Testament and a well-written tract to be given to a man who had never heard the gospel, we should certainly choose the tract; not that we do not esteem the pure word of God as precious above all rubies, but because we know that it is by the foolishness of preaching God is pleased to save those

who believe; and the tract is nearest akin to preaching of anything we can have in print. In China the Bible has been sown broadcast. Before the country was opened up, missionaries coasted along the shore, handing out Bibles to all who were willing to receive. The American house of Olyphant & Co., with their accustomed liberality, purchased and sent out the brig *Himmaleh* for the express purpose of engaging in this work. Since foreigners have entered the land, the same work has been carried on extensively in the interior. We have no disposition to criticise any labors of this kind: yet, at the same time, we are compelled to recognise the fact that from many testimonies gathered on this point, there has not appeared one instance, so far as we know, in which any heathen man has been converted, or even so much as had his interest excited by reading these books. Indeed, it is to be feared that in many instances the only impression made has been that the doctrines of the new religion are exceedingly obscure. Where the glories of the word are opened up by the living voice, the effect is widely different; and it is after the gospel has been heard, that we find the heathen man sitting down before his Bible, feeding on the word, and gathering strength, that he may himself go forth and preach. This is the blessing which in our day has been bestowed on this land.

The next feature which distinguishes missions of the present day among the Chinese, is found in the large emigration from this land to the United States. Christian men and women now make known the gospel to them in America as well as in the Flowery Land. It is easy to perceive that this emigration tends to set in motion a current of returning influence, which, indeed, we already see setting in towards the empire, calculated to remove the exclusiveness of the nation, and to liberalize their habits of thought. It may not be amiss, however, here also to guard ourselves against mistaken views. We remember to have heard the opinion expressed by a distinguished minister of our own Church, that the great means for the conversion of China would be found in preaching the gospel among those who come to our own shores. We would be far from assenting to such a

view. The emigrants from China, like emigrants in general from old and overcrowded empires, are mostly from a low class of the people; they are uneducated, and they go abroad with no other view but to seek wealth. As a body, therefore, they are evidently the least likely to be influenced by the truths of the gospel; and even where impressions are made among them, they are not the persons best fitted to make known the gospel in their own land. We have already referred to the missionary labors among the emigrants in the Malayan Archipelago. In Malacca, Penang, Singapore, Rhio, Borneo, and Batavia, the gospel was preached among them, and schools were established in which large numbers of children were trained. It was hoped that the Chinese thus enlightened would bear back the light with them to their own land. The results of these missions were enough to show those who had toiled in the field that their labors had not been in vain; yet, the reflex influence that was hoped for did not take place. Says the author of the "Middle Kingdom," writing in 1847, "The idea entertained that the colonists would react upon their countrymen has proved illusive;" and this he ascribes partly to their ignorance and unsettled habits, and partly to the difficulties of acquiring their tongue. While we recognise, therefore, the good hand of God in causing a multitude from this people to seek a Christian land, and doubt not that the movement is an important means in his purposes of grace towards the nation at large, yet we do not regard missionary efforts among the emigrants as the chief means for bringing China to Christ. The chief means, so clearly pointed out by Christ, is to *go* to China and preach.

The last feature which we mention as distinguishing the present missions to China is seen in the colonies of foreigners planted on Chinese soil, and the improved means of communication with the other nations of the earth. Previous to this century, a foreigner residing in China held his place here by a very precarious tenure—subject to the caprice of a jealous and overweening central power. Missionaries, especially, were the objects of dislike, as the government knew no distinction between the emissaries of Rome and missionaries of another kind. In our day,

however, foreigners have established themselves on Chinese soil independent of Chinese control. The foreign powers have not only forced China to open her gates, but they have compelled her to make concessions of land on which foreign communities are settled subject to foreign laws. At Tientsin, Hankou, Shanghai, Foochow, and other ports, communities of this kind now exist. As to the justice or injustice of the measures by which this state of things has been brought about, this is not the place to speak; but we cannot fail to see the hand of God in preparing the way for this people. The line of treaty ports, extending the whole length of the coast, forms the base of operations from which missionaries may go forth to invade these strongholds of Satan. It is a base of operations likely to be enduring. Large commercial interests have been created. The English trade at Shanghai is said to be larger than any east of the Cape, save at Bombay and Calcutta. We see no likelihood that China will ever again be closed to the heralds of the cross; while the foreign power throws the same shield around the missionary that is thrown around the merchant and the official. As this firm basis is provided for missionary labor, so God has been pleased to bring all his people practically nearer to the mission field. What was formerly a voyage of months, attended with much hardship and peril, is now an easy journey of a few weeks. Corvino was for twelve years without hearing from the West; but now, not a month passes that the missionary does not receive words of cheer from the Church which sent him forth. And since the days of the apostles, the Church has never enjoyed such advantages for preaching the gospel to every creature as she possesses now.

We are far from any intention of painting the mission work in China in roseate hues. The land has been well called the Sebastopol of heathendom. Satan appears here to have exhausted all his ingenuity and expended every resource for intrenching and defending his own. No advantage has yet been gained from him except by slow and laborious approaches, and it is always found that the strong man armed does not relinquish his goods till he has struck a counter-blow, which is felt by all



engaged. The heel of the woman's seed is bruised. Our own Church has been honored with a call to take part in the struggle. Were it her purpose merely to maintain a small handful of men at this point, only enough to save her the discredit of abandoning entirely the field, she might, indeed, be at ease for a season, though at the expense of honor. But, if it be her purpose to come up in truth to the help of the Lord, to the help of the Lord against the mighty, if it be indeed her resolve to devote herself and all that is hers to her great Captain, that she may execute his high command to go into all the world, then she may be assured that she cannot do her duty in China save by the sacrifice of her silver and her gold, as well as of those whom she holds dearer than her wealth. The path of glory is always the path marked out by her leader—the way of humiliation, suffering, and death.

It is because we believe that the mission to China calls for peculiar sacrifices, that we have endeavored to draw attention to the dealings of Christ with the land. The wonderful manner in which he has sustained the nation awakens the strongest hope that great purposes of grace are yet to be revealed to her; while no Christian can behold his zeal and patience and love manifested to the people, without feeling that there is a joy and a reward in being a co-worker with him, which is independent of results. It has sometimes been said that of all the nations of the earth the Chinese are the most uninteresting as the objects of mission work. In some respects this may be true. We see in this land but few of those deep workings of the human soul, which on the banks of the Ganges have made the painful devotions of the Hindoo an object of wonder to the careless European, himself without God in the world. We see none of that childlike readiness to receive the improvements of Western nations, which has lately given such attraction to Japan. The land is invested with none of the sparkle and romance which is associated with the very mention of the "islands of the sea." It is here, in truth, a dull, heavy, unvarying expanse. And yet, we now ask, is there not an interest, a deep interest connected with this land peculiar to itself? A traveller who

has been spending months in the lively cities of France and Italy, if brought out suddenly to a desolate point on the Mediterranean coast, may feel at first that there is nothing there to excite his interest. But, as he stands looking out on the great waste of waters before him, he begins to call up the past. He remembers the fleets that in ages gone by have swept over its bosom, now perished forever. He calls up the teeming nations which once peopled its shores, now passed away; the splendor of the cities in which they dwelt, long since faded and gone. He thinks of the rich galleons which have sunk in its waters, whose treasures now lie buried deep down in watery caves. All around changed, yet this great sea remaining the same! The noise of its surges fills his ear, and the sight of its waters spreads before his view, just as they seemed to the mariners of Tyre, to the armies of Hannibal, to the hosts of the Crusades. Its very monotony suggests humbling thoughts of the fleeting condition of all around. Its vastness compels an awe of Him who upholds all things by the word of his power; and as the traveller stands at the spot which at first seemed to him so uninteresting, he finds that it has brought to his mind solemn and tender thoughts such as in the crowded cities of Europe he never knew. And so, if there be any who have thought this land uninteresting as a mission field, we only say, let them consider the past. Do not the vast multitudes of China stand before us this day to compel us to reflect on the power of God to uphold those whom he will, though all around pass away? Are they not here to teach us the depth of the riches of his longsuffering grace? Of all the nations upon whom Paul looked, as he stood on Mars' Hill, declaring that the times of their ignorance God had overlooked, this nation alone remains to the present day. Upon every other nation, to whom the ascended Redeemer first sent his offers of mercy, the wrath of God has been revealed from heaven, either sweeping it away, or changing its face so that men no longer recognise it as the same. All around has changed, yet this people continues the same. In all essential features they present the same aspect to us that they did to the heralds of the cross who first landed on their shores. They read the same books,

quote the same maxims, follow the same customs and laws. God has not only sustained them amid the wreck of all around, but, as we have seen, he has dealt with them in mercy. He has sent them his messengers, rising up early and sending them, again and again beseeching them to be reconciled to him. Again and again have they cast away the great salvation; yet his patience has been unwearied, the riches of his mercy towards them have not failed; and in this our day and generation we again behold him coming forth to entreat the people of China to accept of life and peace. On all the earth, where is there another spectacle like this? Of all the lands under the sun, where is there another land on which the light of the glory of the longsuffering of God so beams as it does here? And the Christian, who delights himself in his Redeemer, cannot fail to say, Though this people be not gathered, yet is my Lord glorious. What though the prayers, the self-denial, the labor, the tears of his people should yield no fruit; what though we have to say in the end, we have labored in vain, and have spent our strength for nought and in vain, yet surely we may add, our reward is WITH OUR GOD. Our reward is to have been associated with him in his dealings of mercy and truth towards this poor people; and so, in the day of his appearing, his glory will be our glory, and his joy our joy.

May these truths so inspire our people, that in all the difficulties of the China mission, they may go from strength to strength, and by all patience and fortitude and zeal show forth the same mind which is in him who calls them to the work.

## ARTICLE VI.

## THE CHURCH.

The Greek word translated *Church*, is used in three different senses in the New Testament Scriptures. This word, literally and primarily, signifies an assembly or collection of people. It is derived from *καλέω*, to call, and *ἐκ*, from or out. An assembly consists of persons called out and meeting together for a specified purpose. In this sense it is used in the following passages: Acts xix. 32—"Some therefore cried one thing, and some another; for the *assembly* was confused, and the more part knew not wherefore they were come together." Acts xix. 39—"But if ye inquire any thing concerning other matters, it shall be determined in a lawful *assembly*."

The other two senses are the following: first, a particular worshipping congregation of believers; second, the whole body of Christ's followers throughout the world.

In the former sense it is used in the following passages: Acts xiv. 23—"And when they had ordained them elders in every *church*;" 1 Peter v. 13—"The *church* that is at Babylon elected together with you;" Acts ix. 31—"Then had the *churches* rest throughout all Judea."

In the following passages, the word *church* is used to signify the whole body of Christ's followers: Matt. xvi. 18—"Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my *church*; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it;" Col. i. 18—"And he is the head of the body, the *church*."

These are a few examples of the many passages in which the word is used in both these senses. The word is used in both senses at the present day, as it was in apostolic times. It appears to be used in the more general sense in the language of Paul to Timothy (1 Tim. iii. 15): "That thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth." To maintain the truth, to be its *stay* and *support*,

is the great purpose for which Christ has organised his Church. The word translated *ground*, in the passage just above quoted, literally signifies *stay* or *support*. It is not expected that the whole body of the followers of Christ are to come together into one assembly. This could not be done except through their representatives, yet the great duty rests upon the Church, as such, both the general Church and each particular congregation of worshippers, to be the *pillar* and *support* of God's truth. Whether acting as national churches or in great denominational capacities, or in a particular assembly of believers worshipping in one house, their imperative duty is to maintain and defend the truth. Witness-bearing for God's truth ever has been and ever must be the great duty of the Church. God's truth, as revealed in the sacred word, is the great instrument by which men are converted, sanctified, and saved; by which God is glorified; by which Christ is honored, and the great purposes of his mission to earth fulfilled. The Church is the organism by which these ends are to be accomplished.

To the Church, in its organised capacity, are given laws for its government. Officers are appointed in the Church. The duties of these officers are laid down, their qualifications, and the manner of inducting them into office. Ordinances are to be observed, the object and manner of their observance unfolded. Zion's King has not left these things to chance or caprice. His was the wisdom that was fully competent to select the best means and make all the necessary appointments to accomplish the objects proposed. It were a specimen of arrogance for human wisdom to imagine that it could improve on his appointments; equally reprehensible to suppose that he left out any appointments that could impart efficiency.

As it was the charge to Moses to *see that he made all things according to the pattern that was furnished him in the Mount*, this language being used in reference to the temple or tabernacle and the instruments of its worship, so the charge is fully reiterated in the New Testament, having the same general meaning in these examples: "If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues written in this book; if any

man shall take away from the words of the prophecy of this book, God shall take away his part out of the book of life and from the things written in this book." "In vain do ye worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." If it was an offence for which the wrath of God broke loose upon the perpetrators, *to offer strange incense before the Lord* under the Old Testament economy, shall it not be an impertinence to presume that divine wisdom could not foresee and provide for all the exigencies of his Church for all time? If whatever was *not* commanded was forbidden in the Jewish temple worship, who shall dare to presume that he can improve on Christ's appointments in the New Testament Church?

The inference here would seem to be that the Church, as organised by its great Head, was fully equipped for its work; that whatever is to be observed in the Church is *jure divino*—by divine law; that there must be a *jure divino* government, *jure divino* institutions only, none but *jure divino* appointments.

By attending closely to what is revealed, we have a sufficient guide. In circumstantial details we must necessarily use our discretion. How often we shall meet together on the Sabbath for purposes of public worship, whether we shall have two or a larger number of presbyters or deacons in a particular church—such circumstantial details as these must be determined by the circumstances in each particular case; details of this sort must be determined by human discretion. But to change or modify the rites of the Church, to appoint a form of government not enjoined, to add new kinds of officers, to worship in a manner forbidden or not prescribed, savors of an attempt to improve on Christ's appointments. The doctrine is therefore maintained that the Church, as organised by its great Head, is fully equipped, has all necessary appointments—no other machinery is necessary to accomplish the Church's work.

So far, then, as any voluntary societies—societies invented among men—have undertaken to accomplish the Church's work, in that degree have the divine appointments been departed from. The allegation that these inventions of men have been useful, have had a good effect, is the same argument that has been

urged for inventing new rites for the Church. It was useful, had a good effect, it was supposed, to sign with the sign of the cross the newly baptized convert; useful to put salt in his mouth and clothe him with a white robe in token of his innocence; useful to pronounce a form of words over him in order to exorcise the devil out of him. These inventions of men were judged to have a good effect. For similar reasons a great many other uncommanded observances have been practised in the Church.

It was thought to be useful, calculated to keep down contentions among Church officers, to depart from the divinely instituted principle that all Church rulers should belong to the same official rank, and therefore prelatie bishops, with power to rule over inferior bishops, were introduced. It is well attested by history that this was the very reason given among the early Christians for foisting in this innovation. The new invention, once having been initiated, went on culminating. Human estimates of what was useful and calculated to have a good effect went on step by step, and brought in the officers, archbishop, metropolitan, primate, patriarch, and finally resulted in seating the Pope in a one-man power over the whole Church. Thus, instead of the representative republican form of government established in the Church by its Great Head, the Church came to be one of the most gigantic and fierce despotisms the world has ever seen—a despotism that has shed more Christian blood, perhaps, than any other government that has ever existed.

Mischief and disaster are always the result when there is a departure from the divine appointments. God, in his providence, has been giving the world some severe lessons as to the evil effects of presuming to improve on his institutions.

A distinguishing peculiarity of the present day is to commit to the hands of voluntary societies, in great part, the very work which the Church was appointed to do. We have Sunday-school societies, publishing societies, missionary societies, both for the home and foreign field: these societies working outside of the Church and attempting to do the Church's work. We have orphans' homes and widows' homes working on the same principles, to say nothing of the Young Men's Christian Associa-

tions, elders' conventions, Masonic and Odd Fellowship fraternities. We do not mean to allege that these societies have done no good. They are accomplishing things which imperatively need to be accomplished. Not one word would we say to abate any one's interest in these great charities. We would rather, if we could, intensify the interest felt in these things a hundred fold. The man or the individual whose heart does not respond to these charities deserves the execration of his fellows. But the question is, whether the Church should be content to allow this outside machinery to do the work especially committed to it by its Great Head. True, if the Church fail to appreciate its functions and duties, it is apprehended that it is far better that these charities should be attended to by outsiders than to be neglected altogether. Here the question comes up conspicuously, What are the functions and duties, in detail, committed to the Church by its Divine Founder?

First, it is recognised, fully recognised, at the present day, that after fully providing each particular church for itself, it should do what it can to extend the gospel to others. It is recognised that piety in the heart must be expansive. He who experiences in his own heart the consolations, comforts, and hopes of the gospel, must not be content to monopolise these precious blessings to himself. The time has been, even since the Reformation begun, that the Church was not fully awake to her high functions in this respect. For the last seventy years the Church has been putting on a new vigor in the work of extending itself. Before that time it was too much overlooked that the very nature of the Church was to be missionary in its operations; that the Great Head of the Church himself was a missionary from the court of heaven to spread the knowledge of divine truth, and that he expected of his people to reflect the rays of that divine light over the earth; that they were not to hide their light under a bushel, but to put it upon a candlestick that it might give forth its light. It is within the last threescore years and ten that the missionary enterprise has assumed its present phase. Within the same time the Sabbath-school work has assumed its present shape. Education, publication, and susten-



tation schemes have been initiated. So that in these respects the Church has been considerably awakened to an appreciation of her high duties and responsibilities. Much of this work, it is true, has been intrusted by the Church to the machinery of voluntary societies working outside of the Church; but an advance has been made, even in this respect, and the principle is coming to be more and more fully recognised that these great interests constitute, in part, the proper work of the Church, as such, and that in her organised capacity she should take them in charge. So far at least as our own Church is concerned, she is fully awake on these points, and is determined no longer to intrust these interests to the management of outsiders.

Again. By the law given to the Church certain persons are to be set apart to the work of preaching the gospel and looking after all the spiritual interests of the congregation. They are to give themselves wholly to the work, and the law requires that they should be wholly provided for in temporal things. 1 Cor. ix. 14—"Even so hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the gospel shall live of the gospel." This is not a recommendation but a law. It is a law given by Christ to his Church. It is then the duty of the Church, and she may of right enforce this law. All who come within the pale of Christ's Church subject themselves to this law as fully as to any other law of his kingdom. Each one, by the law of Christ, is bound to do his part as fully as he is bound to provide for his own household or to obey any command of the decalogue. Is it not too evident that the Church has failed to require her members to come up to this standard of duty. In practice the voice of the Church to her members is, that the matter of giving to the support of the gospel in your own Church is to be wholly a voluntary matter. We advise you to give liberally, as it is a matter of great importance to you and your family to have the candlestick among you. We do not say you *must* give according to your means or else forfeit your privileges in the Church. We do not propose to visit you with any penalty if you only give the hundredth or the thousandth part of what you might give. You may even subscribe or promise to give a small por-

tion of your income, and if at the end of the year, when your preacher has performed all the labor you expected of him, it be inconvenient for you to pay what you have promised, you need not pay it for fear of any disciplinary process against you, as the matter of paying the preacher must be voluntary. Is not this the practical teaching of the Church on this subject?

It is most astounding that the idea should ever be entertained that a government of any kind can efficiently maintain itself by voluntary contributions of its citizens or subjects. The fact is established by all the history of the past that a government *must enforce* the collection of the necessary amount of revenue to carry itself on. Even voluntary societies of every kind require, by law, the payment of certain specified sums on pain of forfeiting membership. It was this felt necessity which gave birth to the Constitution of the United States instead of the old Articles of Confederation. By the old Articles of Confederation Congress apportioned to the several States the amount to be paid by each. But as the States were sovereign, and paid the amounts, if at all, as a voluntary act, the amounts failed to be paid. The wheels of government were therefore stopped, and our forefathers were driven to the conclusion that the General Government must act directly upon the citizens and enforce the collection of the taxes, or the government must fail. Is not the same true in the Church as long as man is what he is and not wholly sanctified?

The human race are prone to run into extremes. The Reformers found the revenues of the Church collected by means of civil pains and penalties. This was an extreme. The Reformers have been gradually forced to the conclusion that the principle was wrong. But they swung off to the opposite extreme, and *voluntaryism* became the popular cry. This cry has not ceased to be sounded in certain quarters even yet. The consequence has been that the Church is without a revenue that can be relied upon. Many particular churches have died out when there was ample means to sustain the gospel had these means been brought out. Hundreds of them are this very day lingering along a sickly existence. If they have any regular ministrations of the gospel, it is mainly at the expense of the preachers. The preachers in

not a few instances actually give more from their private resources to sustain the gospel for these churches than is contributed by all their hearers put together. The preachers are struggling with poverty, and driven very frequently into secular business, or else absolutely suffer want. Their libraries are scanty, and they have little time for studying what few books they have. We speak that which we do know and testify that which we have seen. The picture, at this writing, which the Church presents to the writer's mind in this respect is gloomy indeed. Nor are we at a loss to point to the main cause of it all. A great hue and cry would probably be raised by some against the principle of compelling a church member to pay for the support of the gospel according to the church's estimate of what he ought to pay, under spiritual pains and penalties that might work his exclusion from the Church. But why should not a church member be disciplined for disobeying the law of Christ in this respect as well as for disobeying the law "*Thou shalt not steal?*" Is not the general principle fully recognised by the whole Church that church officers should require obedience in all cases when they can find a clear "*Thus saith the Lord*" requiring the duty or forbidding the sinful act?

The idea is sometimes advanced that the preacher should give himself wholly to the work and trust in the Lord to provide for his temporal wants. On this point it may be justly remarked that it is presumption to trust in the Lord to provide for us unless we use appropriate means. The agriculturist who should profess to trust in the Lord to feed him, when at the same time instead of planting and cultivating his grounds at the proper season, he spends his time in idleness, is guilty of sinful presumption. Just so in any calling of life. It is every one's duty to make use of such means as in the judgment of a wise foresight will fairly promise a livelihood. This is a duty no less incumbent upon the preacher than upon any one else. The actual experience of preachers is that it is only in certain conditions of the case that they can depend upon their calling for a living. They are compelled, in duty to themselves and families, in the exercise of their discretion, to determine when it is that these

conditions of the case are met. To do otherwise would be to act an insane part as well as to be guilty of presumption.

In the large city churches, where the pew-system is adopted, the matter of supporting the gospel is by the pew-system reduced to the basis of a business transaction. The consequence generally is that the gospel is efficiently maintained. The pew-system, however, is not adapted to feeble churches in the country. We believe it ought to be the established law of the Church to authorise the deacons to assess upon the members, *pro rata*, according to each one's ability to pay, the amounts necessary to be raised for the different objects requiring money. And that the deacons, if it be necessary, might go so far as to assess upon each one to the extent of a tithe of his gross income, and the collection of these assessments should be enforced by regular enactments. Let it be distinctly understood that we want no members in the Church who are unwilling to do their whole duty as appointed by Christ.

Again. It is to be observed that the officers of the Church, to whom its government is committed, are called *pastors*, this term being constantly used in the New Testament as a convertible term with bishop and presbyter. These officers are under-shepherds, Christ himself being the great Shepherd of his people. Here is a figure of speech very expressive. It is not only the duty of a shepherd to protect his flock from every sort of enemy and restrain them from that which is hurtful or dangerous, but also to provide for all their wants. So it is in the Church. Faithful pastors must protect from harm, restrain from danger, and attend to all the wants of their flock.

Again. The language of Paul to Timothy is, 1 Tim. iii. 4-5—  
 “A bishop must be, . . . one that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity. For if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the Church of God?”

Then the government of the Church is represented to be *paternal*. The duties of a parent to his household will answer for an illustration of the duties of church-rulers towards the Church. Is a parent's duty fully accomplished if he allows his

children to be thrown upon the cold charities of the outside world? Suppose the outside world do proffer to take charge of them, do proffer to educate them, feed them, clothe them, and teach them religion. Is not the parent God's vicegerent to whom he has committed these very things in charge? Is not the parent solemnly bound to see to it not only that his children do not suffer want, but that they shall not be led astray by false teaching? How is he to discharge these duties if he commit their management to outsiders? Does it not appear to be manifest, then, that every Church is solemnly bound to take care of its own orphans and poor? Does not every Church solemnly covenant before God in every case of infant baptism to see to it that the child shall be taught the truth and trained up "in the nurture and admonition of the Lord?" How can this be accomplished if the physical wants of the child are unprovided for? The parent, it is true, covenants as the immediate instrument by which these things are to be accomplished, and the Church covenants to see that the parent's engagement is carried out. But if the child is orphaned at an early age, must not the Church provide some other means of accomplishing the same ends?

As it regards the adult poor of a church—to whom may such look for assistance, unless to those who are one with them in Christ? The tie which binds Christian people together, especially those of the same Church, is close and intimate. "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: but ye are all one in Christ Jesus." Gal. iii. 28. If we are all one in Christ Jesus, shall any of such be permitted to suffer want, even in temporal necessities? The deacons were appointed, at first, specially to distribute the charities to the poor. Acts vi.

We need not discuss the point that the Church must look after the spiritual interests of all its members. This, in a general point of view, is conceded. But how can even this be accomplished, so far as its orphans and poor are concerned, if we hand over all their temporal interests to the charities of outsiders? Suppose we send our orphans to some asylum, conducted by persons of another creed, or of different creeds, or of no par-

particular creed at all, can we in such cases overlook their spiritual interests?

We heard it said, with special emphasis, by an agent of one of these outside societies, that if *our* children should become destitute orphans, *they* would take them, and do the same part by them that they were doing for other orphans. The reply might be given, and ought to be given, by a church that understands its duty in the premises—something like this: Thank you, sir; but we prefer to attend to our own business; we prefer to train our children according to our own views of truth; we do not choose to have you fill their minds with prejudices against what we believe to be Christ's important truth. Ought not something like this to be the answer of a parent, so far as his own offspring are concerned? And if the government of the Church is *parental*, shall she not act upon the same principle in reference to her children? We knew the case of an orphans' home, established and conducted by the Baptist denomination. Now we have no objection to the Baptists adopting their own plan of taking care of their own orphans. We commend them for all the zeal they may manifest in this behalf. The charter of said asylum gave to the Baptist association the appointment of all the trustees. Because the association chose to elect one Methodist, and one Presbyterian on the board of trustees—a minority which could always be overruled by the Baptist majority—it was proclaimed all over the country, by their agents, that it was an asylum conducted by all denominations; and on this ground, charities were solicited from all denominations—the orphan children of all denominations were invited to be sent in; and, as a great concession, Pedobaptist ministers were invited to come in and baptize the orphans of Pedobaptist parents.

The answer in such a case might be, and should be, that the baptism of children, in one important respect, is unmeaning, unless those who have the oversight and training of them are bound by covenant obligations to train them up in what a Pedobaptist conceives to be the truth of God. Give to persons the training of a child, and it matters not what external rites may be performed by others for his benefit—he is almost sure to imbibe

the principles of those by whom he is kindly trained. This case is merely mentioned for illustration. If witness-bearing for the truth is one of the great duties laid upon the Church by its great Founder, shall she agree to compromise, and cover up, any part of God's truth?

It seems to have come to be the case, that it is regarded as the chief business of the Church to enroll the friends of Christ, in order to draw a line of demarkation between the friends and the foes of Christ, and to hold over his friends the rod of discipline in case they become scandalous offenders; that when the Church has done this, she has done her whole duty. If the foregoing views are correct, this constitutes the smallest fraction of the great work which she was organised to perform. So, too, we apprehend the idea in the mind of many church members, is, that the chief reason why by the appointment of Christ they are to be church members, is to secure their own salvation. But if they were truly to become new creatures in Christ Jesus, they might, did Christ permit, secure their own salvation out of the Church. But if this were to become any thing like general, the main work which was committed to the Church must remain undone. Why does not Christ take us to heaven at once as soon as we are converted? Is it not because he has a work for us to do for him, for the temporal and eternal good of others? It is every one's "*chief end*" to glorify God. To work for the Church, is to work for him and glorify him. Let this be done by his people, and the means of accomplishing the Church's work would be easily forthcoming. Let it be represented, in any case, by the deacons to the body of church members, that certain individuals—members of the church either by profession or baptism—are likely to suffer temporal want; and that they—the deacons—need so much money to provide for the cases on hand; and there would be little risk in insuring that the needed amount would be at once forthcoming. God's people may overlook their duties sometimes; in the whirl of business engagements they may lose sight of some things. But let the matter be brought fairly to their attention in a case like this, and we have too much faith in the power of divine grace upon

the hearts of God's people to suppose they would be wanting to their duty. Not that opposition is here made to extending charities to outsiders; but let our own people be first provided for, and then, if we have any surplus, contribute for the benefit of others.

Let it be observed, that faithfulness in these matters is the surest road even to temporal prosperity. "Honor the Lord with thy substance, and with the first fruits of thine increase, so shall thy barns be filled with plenty, and thy presses shall burst out with new wine." "He that giveth to the poor, lendeth to the Lord, and that which he hath given, will he repay him again, full measure, pressed down, and running over." "Whoso stoppeth his ears at the cry of the poor, he also shall cry himself, and shall not be heard." "Bring ye all the tithes into the storehouse, and prove me now, saith the Lord of hosts, if I will not open you the windows of heaven, and pour you out a blessing that there shall not be room enough to receive it." What sort of a blessing? Why, a temporal blessing. "And I will rebuke the devourer for your sake, and he shall not destroy the *fruits of your ground*; neither shall your vine cast her fruit before the time, in the field, saith the Lord." Here, then, are the promises of a faithful God. No reliance is more certain than that based upon such promises.

Could there be any lever more powerful, under God, than faithfulness in these matters to build up and strengthen the Church itself? Would it not be one of the strongest incentives to a connexion with the Church, to have the assurance in the mind, that in case dear ones should be brought to want, that want would be promptly supplied by the Church. In case the Church properly appreciated and performed her duties in this behalf, would we need any other, and could we have any better life insurance policies?

It is not a wise charity, except in the case of absolutely helpless persons, to provide wholly for their wants. A wise charity is to help the beneficiary to provide for himself. Self-reliance ought to be inculcated; self-respect imparted. This is what a wise parent endeavors to accomplish for his own offspring; and it



is precisely what the Church should endeavor to accomplish for her people.

Is it not too generally regarded more in the light of a duty than a privilege to belong to the Church? If we mistake not, it is regarded as more of a privilege than a duty to belong to the Masons, or to the Odd Fellows, or to have a life insurance policy. Why is this? Ought it not to be regarded as the greatest of all privileges to have a name and a place in the Church of God? Would it not be so regarded, by believers in the Bible at least, if the Church fully appreciated and acted up to her duties, as herein set forth?

The office of deacon is almost a useless office—an office with very little to do, except on the supposition that the duties of the Church are herein rightly set forth. There was a felt necessity for this officer in the Church as administered by the apostles. There are frequent hints in the New Testament, that it was commonly practised to make collections in the churches for the “*poor saints*.” Great prominence is given to the duty of almsgiving. The wicked are represented as being condemned solely for the neglect of this duty. “For I was an hungered, and ye gave me no meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me no drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me not in: naked, and ye clothed me not: sick, and in prison, and ye visited me not. Then shall they also answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungered, or athirst, or a stranger, or naked, or sick, or in prison, and did not minister unto thee? Then shall he answer them, saying, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not to me.” The injunction is, “See that ye abound in this grace also,” viz., the grace of almsgiving. To pay the preacher is not of the nature of alms; this is rather of the nature of an ordinary debt. “Now upon the first day of the week, let every one of you lay by him in store, as God has prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come.” Here it is enjoined to give statedly and systematically. The whole amount of Old Testament and New Testament injunctions on this subject, is to this effect—give, give, give—give alms—give constantly—give statedly—give systematically—

give, as an act of worship and means of grace. And this last feature of the subject has but recently begun to be recognised in the Church. The Church is but just waking up to this great principle; and that it is as fatal to a Christian profession that one does not practise almsgiving, as it is that he does not habitually pray. We need to advance a step further, and more fully recognise the objects and purposes for which the Church is called upon by its great Head to give so frequently.

By allowing outsiders to usurp her prerogatives, she is like Samson, shorn of the locks of her strength. She would be irresistible in the strength of her King, in standing fully up to her high prerogatives. Whenever she does this, and not until she does, may she expect, in the strength of an omnipotent arm, *to lengthen her cords, and strengthen her stakes; and break forth, on the right hand and on the left, with the praises of God; her light being come, and the glory of the Lord being risen upon her.*

---

ARTICLE VII.

OUR CHURCH—ITS CONDITION, WANTS, AND PROSPECTS.

We are greatly mistaken if the Southern Presbyterian Church is not regarded with a peculiarly tender interest by the great mass of its membership. Nor is it surprising that such should be the case. Its prostration and impoverishment consequent upon the late war, after long years of quiet and peaceful prosperity; the struggle it has maintained to preserve its existence as an independent branch of the Church of the Lord Jesus Christ; its steadiness in walking in the good old paths trod by our fathers, and its comparative freedom from all those radical and semi-infidel agitations which are threatening the peace and purity of other branches of the Church: the obloquy and mis-

representation that have been persistently heaped upon it from the very beginning of its career as a separate Church; the steadiness and singleness of purpose with which it has gone forward in the discharge of its duties, notwithstanding all this abuse and misrepresentation; the respect it is beginning to command, even with those who formerly took pleasure in maligning it; the quiet harmony and decorum which have heretofore characterised all its public proceedings; the deep, pervading, and almost universal impression among our people, that God has appointed this beloved Church to be a faithful witness for the truth and simplicity of the gospel in these times of defection and threatened apostasy; and, above all, perhaps, the many and varied tokens of favor bestowed upon it by the great Head of the Church—these are considerations well calculated not only to endear it to the hearts of God's people, but show likewise that it is destined by the providence of God to take a high and honorable place among the other branches of the evangelical Church, and exert a commanding agency in spreading the knowledge of the gospel throughout the whole world. A Church endeared by so many tender associations, and having the prospect of such distinguished usefulness in the future, ought to occupy a place very near to the heart of God's people. Notwithstanding all these favorable considerations, however, there are difficulties and embarrassments surrounding our Church at the present moment which deserve patient and careful consideration by us all, some of which we propose to point out in connexion with the means necessary for their removal.

The sparse and widely scattered elements of the Southern Presbyterian Church, present a very serious difficulty in the way of its efficiency and usefulness. When we speak of our fourteen hundred separate church organisations, our ninety thousand church members, and our eight hundred and fifty ministers of the gospel, it makes a formidable array of statistical facts; and these undoubtedly would constitute a very strong and effective Christian body, if its elements were not scattered over such a vast extent of territory. The Free Church of Scotland, with something like the same number of ministers, but with a much

larger communion, does not cover one-tenth part of the territory that ours does. The consequences are, that their congregations are much larger, they need fewer ministers to break to them the bread of life, and those ministers of course are better supported than ours can be. Our churches, because of their smaller size and greater number, as well as the wide distances intervening between them, not only need a greater number of ministers, but their capacity to support them is diminished in the inverse proportion. Out of this state of things arises the necessity of grouping two or more churches under the same pastorate, which greatly increases the labors of ministers, but lessens at the same time the opportunities of the people to hear the gospel. A large proportion of our people, therefore, do not receive one-half of the instruction they would, if the country was more densely populated and the congregations were larger. Nor is this the only disadvantage connected with this state of things. Much of the energy, life, and efficiency, which always spring from frequent contact between church and church and particularly from frequent ministerial intercourse, is almost entirely lost in consequence of the existing state of things. We must not overlook, however, certain ulterior advantages that will arise out of these present inconveniences. When the country is filled up with a larger population than it has at present, (which will undoubtedly be the case in a few years,) these smaller churches will become the centres around which will be gathered much larger and more effective ones; and, with this expectation in view, too much care cannot be exercised to preserve the life and efficiency of those already called into existence.

The weakened condition of a large number of our churches, and the want of proper training on the part of a still greater number, present another very formidable difficulty to the full efficiency of our Church as a whole. The feeble and weakened condition of many of our churches may be ascribed to a variety of causes. The loss of personal property, as the direct and indirect consequence of the war, have reduced many of the supporters of religion from affluence to downright poverty. The removal of influential members of the Church from one part of

the country to another, the unsettled state of the labor system, and other causes of a like nature, have all operated more or less to weaken our churches, and prevent them from doing as much for the upbuilding of the Redeemer's kingdom as they might otherwise have done. Still, however, no one of these causes, nor all of them combined, perhaps, have operated so injuriously to the cause of benevolence as the want of proper training on the part of a great many of our people. The duties and obligations of Christian benevolence have neither been properly inculcated from the pulpit, nor fully understood by the great mass of our people; and the necessary consequences are that they neither contribute for the support of the gospel among themselves, nor for the extension of its blessings to others, as they should. According to the report submitted to the last General Assembly by the Secretary of Sustentation, it would appear that at least half of our churches contributed nothing at all last year to that, and probably nothing to any of the other schemes of benevolence; and no doubt, if the inquiry was carried a little farther back, it would be seen that all such churches had contributed very meagrely to the support of the gospel for their own benefit. But to what is this delinquency to be attributed? Not to the want of means, in the great majority of cases at least, but to the want of proper instruction in relation to the claims of Christian benevolence. The people have not been made to understand that Christian benevolence and true godliness are inseparable. They look upon what they do for the upholding of the gospel, not as a matter of Christian obligation, but purely as a matter of charity, which they may give or withhold as they choose. Ministers are mainly accountable for the prevalence of such views among their people. From indolence, indifference, want of moral courage, inappreciation on their own part of the nature of these claims, misapprehensions of the views and feelings of their people, or some other cause of like nature, they have not trained their people to those habits of giving that fit them for active coöperation in the great work of building up and extending the Redeemer's kingdom. No doubt the people, in many cases at least, are ahead of ministers, and

would contribute largely and freely to all our schemes of benevolence if they were only instructed in relation to their claims. No church, however poor or obscure, ought be left uninstructed or uninterested in these schemes. Life and efficiency can be imparted to such only calling their benevolence into exercise. The great Head of the Church looks at the motive, not at the amount given. One single dollar given by a poor church, if it proceeds from right motives and is accompanied by sincere prayer, will be as acceptable in his sight, and, under his control, will be made as effectual in advancing the interests of his kingdom, as hundreds or thousands of dollars given by wealthier churches, especially if they are wanting in those elements which render the smaller gifts so acceptable. It is earnestly hoped that presbyteries, whose special province it is to look after all defaulting churches, will adopt the necessary measures, and follow them up until every church within our whole bounds is brought into hearty and active coöperation in promoting the great ends for which the Church itself was instituted—the upbuilding and extending of the Redeemer's kingdom throughout the whole world.

Another great want of our Church at the present moment is more ministers—and, we may add with propriety, ministers who will be able and disposed to devote the whole of their time to the interests of the Church. It is a fact calling for serious and prayerful thought, that the number of deaths that have occurred in our ministry for several years past, is greater than the accessions that have been made to it in the same time. Most of those of the former class, it is true, were men of feeble health, or of advanced years, whilst the additions have been men of youthful vigor. Our working, effective ministerial force may not therefore have been actually diminished; but the number on our list is becoming smaller year by year, and must continue to decrease until a much larger number of our young men will feel called upon to devote themselves to the work of the ministry. The whole number of ministers on our list, according to the minutes of the last Assembly, is eight hundred and forty. But when we strike from the roll such as are infirm and aged, those engaged

in the foreign missionary work, such as are engaged in teaching schools or in some other secular calling, and the very large number who are reported without charges, it will be found that the number actually engaged in preaching the gospel and otherwise laboring for the interests of the Church probably does not exceed six hundred. This would show an average of something like two-and-a-third churches to each laboring minister. When we take into account the further fact, however, that about two hundred of these churches have each a minister to itself, then there remains an average of something more than three churches to each of the remaining four hundred ministers. But these churches are not grouped according to any regular order. Whilst a large number of these four hundred ministers have not more than two churches each, others have three, four and five, and sometimes as many as ten or twelve. In order to meet this great deficiency in the number of ministers, almost every Presbytery in our bounds has resorted to the expedient of appointing evangelists to take the oversight of all their feeble and vacant churches. But this process has already been carried as far as is compatible with the welfare, if not the very existence, of many of these churches. It is gratifying to know that the number of students in our Theological Seminaries is gradually increasing; but up to the present time that increase falls very far short of the demands of the case. Churches can not be in a very healthful condition, where they are not assembled more than once or twice a month for religious worship and instruction; and if ever there was occasion for a people to cry earnestly to the Lord of the harvest to send forth more laborers, it is the present.

But a more serious embarrassment to the prosperity and welfare of our Church, perhaps, than either of those already mentioned, is the want of *proper ministerial support*. This charge is not of course preferred against all our churches, (for many of them have been very exemplary in this particular), but against a very large proportion of them. Without pretending to give precise statistics, we can say with a good deal of confidence, that outside of our large towns and cities, the average salary of the great body of our ministers does not exceed \$600, even if it

amounts to as much as that. To argue the insufficiency of such a salary, is simply to waste words. But what are the consequences of this state of things? Ministers are compelled, as a matter of dire necessity, to betake themselves to school-keeping, to farming, or to some other secular employment, in order to provide the means of support for themselves and their families. The further consequences are, that ministers soon become secularized in their feelings and habits, have little or no time left for study and for preparation for the pulpit; and their people, as a matter of course, have not that kind of instruction which will be promotive of either their intellectual or spiritual improvement. This course is mutually injurious to pastor and people; and without an immediate and thorough reformation, our Church can never attain to that high and honorable position which would seem to have been assigned her by her great Head, nor can she ever become very useful or effective in extending the blessing of the gospel among mankind. At the same time, it is poor policy, to say the least, for the Church at large to educate ministers at heavy expense, then have them spend the greater part of their time at the plough-handle, or in the school-room. How will the wants of the churches ever be fully met, when the ministers we send forth will not be allowed to devote more than one-fifth or one-sixth of their time to their spiritual improvement? It is just here that the great strain rests upon our Church. If all our ministers could at once receive the support they need, and such as we feel assured the churches could give, if they fully understood their obligations—such as would relieve them from the necessity of continuing their secular pursuits—it would be equivalent to adding three or four hundred ministers at once to our present preaching force. But can our people be thoroughly aroused to the demands of the case? Can they be made to feel and act up to the full extent of their obligations? We think there is no doubt of it, if wise and judicious measures are adopted and patiently carried out. They need instruction on the subject. They ought to be made to understand, that true piety and liberal giving always go hand in hand; that God does not require gifts at the hands of his people because he needs



their money; but because he would repress their selfishness, the great master sin of the human heart, on the one hand; and, on the other, develop their benevolence, which assimilates them to his own moral image. The wrong impressions of former years, as to having the gospel preached without charge, must be entirely effaced from their minds. They must be made to understand that the great end of their conversion as individuals, as well as their organisation into churches, was that they might have the honor, as well as the duty, of being co-workers with the Lord Jesus himself in building up that great spiritual kingdom which is ultimately to swallow up all other kingdoms and exercise universal sway and power over all this sin-ruined world. Churches thoroughly aroused to their high calling, and made sensible of the solemn responsibilities that have been devolved upon them, will not long be tardy or slack in the performance of the duties assigned them by the providence of God.

The Synod of South Carolina, at its meeting before the last, inaugurated measures, which, if faithfully carried out by the presbyteries under its care, cannot fail to bring about the most important results in the condition of the great majority of its churches. Those measures have for their object the securing of a more hearty consecration of ministers to their peculiar calling as preachers of the gospel, on the one hand; and, on the other, such support on the part of the churches as will free them from the necessity of following secular pursuits for the means of subsistence. It will be a bright and happy day for our Church at large, when these two objects are fully realised; and it is earnestly hoped that presbyteries will have the grace, the patience, and perseverance to carry them into full effect. The Sustentation scheme is also exerting, in an indirect way, a very considerable influence in preparing the churches for these important and necessary changes. In disbursing the general fund committed to its care, it can make no appropriation to aid a church in the support of its pastor, unless the Presbyterial Committee, in whose bounds it is located, and through whom the application must come, can certify that the said church, or union of churches, cannot itself provide his support. This requires the Presbyterial

Committee to look carefully into the true condition of all such churches. If the Church is really able, but not disposed to make the necessary effort to raise the pastor's salary, they are promptly denied all assistance from the common fund; and they must therefore discharge their duty in full, or fall under condemnation of their own consciences, as well as the censure of their brethren in the Lord. The injunction laid upon the presbyterial committees and the Executive Committee of Sustentation, by the two last Assemblies, to make the effort to raise the salary of every laboring minister to \$750 as the *minimum*, is also exerting a powerful influence in the same direction. This likewise imposes the duty on the presbyterial committees of looking very narrowly into the condition of all their churches. If some of them are found able, but not disposed, to give their pastors a competent support—especially such as is proposed by the above-mentioned injunction—it becomes the duty of the Committee to report such cases to the Presbytery for its consideration and action, and not come to the Central Committee for assistance. On the other hand, if they find churches utterly incapable of supporting their ministers, it becomes their duty to seek for them such supplemental aid as will relieve their pastors from the necessity of continuing their secular pursuits, and devote themselves wholly to the work of the ministry.

Having considered, in a brief manner, some of the difficulties and discouragements which surround our Church, we propose now to point out some of the means and agencies by which they are to be removed.

The first suggestion we would offer is, that presbyteries (not to mention other church courts) must hold the reins of government with a firmer and steadier hand. Theoretically we are Presbyterians, but practically, in many respects at least, we are Independents. This is manifested but too often in the language and conduct both of ministers and people. Presbyterianism, rightly understood, is a system of government. It is the form of government, as we profess to believe, that was instituted by the Lord Jesus Christ for the government of his spiritual kingdom on earth; and we know from experience and history alike,

that wherever its principles have had full play, they have been found preëminently suited to promote that kingdom. A Presbytery consists of ministers and of elders designated by the churches to coöperate with them in the administration of government. A minister, when received into a Presbytery, comes under its authority, and agrees to abide by the counsel and advice of his brethren in the Lord. And a church, when taken under the care of Presbytery, comes under similar obligations. Ministers and churches, therefore, are alike amenable to the authority of the Presbytery; and the Presbytery, on the other hand, is bound to look after the good name of its ministers and the spiritual welfare of all the churches under its care. Whilst each minister has a special relationship to the particular church of which he is the pastor, he has also an *ecclesiastical* relationship to all the other churches of the same Presbytery, and is bound to do what he can to promote their spiritual welfare. No minister can be installed over a church without the consent of Presbytery; and no pastoral relationship, after it has been established, can be dissolved without the same consent. Presbytery, nevertheless, has the right to dissolve any existing relationship, (of course having due regard to the views and wishes of the church at the same time,) if it is found to be injurious or unprofitable. It has the further right, and is solemnly bound, to see that churches and ministers discharge their mutual duties and obligations to each other. These are simple and obvious principles that will be admitted on all hands. Yet there is a lamentable deficiency in almost all our presbyteries, so far as their practical enforcement is concerned. How many churches are there in almost every Presbytery that utterly fail to support their pastors, even after having given the most solemn pledges to do so; and yet how seldom are churches called to account for such neglect of duty? On the other hand, how often do ministers, after having taken the most solemn obligations to devote themselves wholly to the work of the ministry, either give it up altogether, or allow themselves to be so completely entangled with the cares of the world as to lose all interest in the *spiritual* improvement of their people; and yet how tardy presbyteries

frequently are in rebuking such delinquencies. Again, it is no uncommon thing to see a minister holding on to a charge, not only long after he has ceased to be acceptable as preacher, but when it has become obvious to almost every body but himself, that his continued connection with that church is alike unprofitable and injurious. Now, in these, and in all similar cases, it is undoubtedly the duty of the Presbytery to interpose and rectify such irregularities. All false delicacy should be set aside, and brethren should deal with each other in frankness and fidelity. And until all such irregularities and abuses are corrected, we cannot expect our Church to take the high rank she ought, or exert a very powerful influence in extending the knowledge of salvation among men.

Another matter of no less importance is the careful cultivation in all our churches of an energetic, self-reliant, and benevolent spirit. The time for complaint and despondency is gone by. What we need now, and what must be put forth, if we would save our beloved Church from utter prostration and helplessness, is a spirit of energy, self-denial, and self-reliance. If we have been brought low in our outward circumstances, the undoubted *object of it was* to give scope to the growth and development to these sturdy Christian virtues. Every thing like a complaining, dependent, eleemosynary spirit should be banished from the heart of our people. The Macedonian churches, in the times of their poverty, did more for the cause of Christ than in any other periods of their history, and, so far as we know, more than was done by any of the sister churches of the same period. And their spirit of benevolence and self-reliance is just what we need to arouse our churches to the highest degree of energy and efficiency. If our people generally were imbued with this spirit, there would be comparatively few calls for aid in supporting the preaching of the gospel, in erecting church edifices, and for objects of like nature. In the great majority of cases, Christian people really do not know how much they can do until they set about it in an earnest manner and on a systematic plan. Two churches, contiguous to each other, and connected with the same Presbytery with the writer, thought for several years past,

that they could not, even by their united efforts, raise more than \$250 or \$300 for the support of their pastor, and they came year after year to the Sustentation Committee for assistance, representing themselves as very poor, and their circumstances as very urgent. Last year most of the leading members of these churches determined to cultivate as much as a half acre of cotton for every horse used on the farm, and the result is, that they can, on this plan, pay their pastor as much as \$800 or \$1,000; whereas they formerly thought they could not possibly give more than \$300; and yet this amount is not more than one-fifteenth or twentieth of their regular income, or about one-half of the Jewish tithe. Similar efforts in most of our churches, we have no doubt, would bring about similar results. But the history of modern missions furnishes the most remarkable illustrations of what may be done by throwing churches upon their own resources for self-support, as well as for the development of the true spirit of benevolence.

The great missionary associations, both of this country and Europe, conducted their foreign missionary operations for nearly fifty years, on what are now very generally acknowledged, in many respects at least, to be erroneous principles. The missionary, when he gathered a church out of a heathen community, almost always became its permanent pastor. In consequence of his superior knowledge, he directed and controlled all its affairs; administered discipline; received and dismissed members from its communion; and, indeed, embodied the whole government in himself, the native members being regarded as too ignorant to take part in it. At the same time the missionary received his support almost entirely from the churches in his native land, the members of his own church contributing little or nothing to it. The consequences of this course were, that the native members of such churches were left without the training necessary to fit them for self-government, their benevolence was left in a great measure undeveloped, and they made little or no progress in those great elements of character that would fit them for usefulness and efficiency in their day and generation. Fifteen or twenty years ago this line of policy was superseded by a better and more scriptural one.

Missionaries now, as a general thing, act in the capacity of evangelists, and follow as closely as possible in the footsteps of the great Apostle to the Gentiles. When they organise churches now, they appoint pastors and rulers over them, (of course selecting the best and most promising materials that can be found among these new churches), and go on forming others, but exercising, for the time being, a general supervision over the whole. The results of this change of policy are already very decided and marked. Native converts have made much better pastors than they were thought capable of making; native churches are beginning to have clearer ideas of the nature and obligations of church government; congregations that once thought themselves incapable of supporting the preaching of the gospel for their own benefit, have now found that they can not only support their own religious teachers, but they can do and are doing a great deal to extend the blessings of the gospel to their more benighted fellow-men. It is really surprising to know what results have been brought about by simply throwing these native congregations on their own resources. Take the churches of the Sandwich Islands, of which there are not more than fifty, as an illustration of this great principle. It is less than fifty years since they were redeemed from the very lowest depths of heathenism. And already they not only support their own pastors, maintain their effective systems of education for their children, but they contributed the last year for the spread of the gospel in neighboring islands more than \$30,000 in gold. Surely, if a similar spirit of benevolence and self-reliance could be aroused in our churches, we would soon witness results that would greatly transcend any thing that has been brought forth in the heathen world. What we need, therefore, is the cultivation of this spirit of benevolence and self-reliance on the part of our people and churches. Presbyterial committees, we sometimes fear, do the churches they represent a serious injury by seeking aid for them from the Sustentation fund, instead of stirring up their own energies and self-denial. Nothing does a church more good, on the one hand, than to have its benevolence and self-denial exercised; or harm, on the other, than to allow all its energies to

lie dormant. But can we expect to see our numerous and widely scattered churches thoroughly aroused to their obligations in these great matters? No doubt of it, if the necessary means are diligently employed. Let that dependent, eleemosynary spirit which has been sapping the foundation of many of our churches for some time past, be superseded by a manly, self-reliant, and benevolent spirit; let our people be thoroughly convinced of the force and truth of the scripture adage, that "it is more blessed to give than to receive;" let our ministers who have heretofore stood in the back-ground, so far as all our great schemes of benevolence are concerned, come forward and do their utmost in arousing their people to a full sense of their responsibilities; and it will not only inaugurate a new epoch in the history and condition of our beloved Church, but will start it forward with new and resistless vigor in the discharge of all those high and responsible duties that have been devolved upon it by the providence of God.

But another matter equally essential to the growth and efficiency of the Church, is the maintenance of the bonds of unity and common brotherhood. It is scarcely possible to attach too much importance to this. It is this that has sustained and strengthened us amid all the trials and difficulties through which we have already passed, and upon this alone, with the blessing of Almighty God, can we rely to uphold us in the trials which manifestly lie before us in the future. Had not our whole body stood firmly together immediately after the terrible disasters of the late war, the stronger portions of the Church sustaining the weaker, and the wealthier helping the poorer, it is highly probable that a very large number of our church organisations would have become extinct. At the same time every careful observer of the signs of the times must feel convinced that there are to be severer tests of our faith and steadiness in the future than any we have yet experienced; and, consequently, there are the strongest and most urgent reasons for maintaining this unity of feeling and action. But not only have these bonds of unity and brotherhood upheld us in the times of calamity and distress, but they have proved the special means in the

hands of providence of arresting that tendency to isolation and disintegration which was rapidly hurrying us as a people and church into the broad ocean of independence, and ultimately into infidelity. But notwithstanding the manifest importance of this great principle of Christian unity, we regret to know that there is a strong tendency, in some portions of the Church at least, to fly off in the opposite direction. This is inferred from the fact, that it has been proposed in several cases to take the work of Sustentation and Education out of the hands of the General Assembly, and place them under the care of the synods. And what is this in fact but erecting synods, so far as these enterprises are concerned, into General Assemblies? and thus we shall have ten or a dozen instead of one common bond of union. Besides, if the work is remanded back from the Assembly to the synods, are we sure that it will stop there? Will not presbyteries, strengthened by the example of the synods, demand that the work be turned over to them? And is it presumable that the churches will be entirely silent under such circumstances? But what advantages can be gained by the proposed change? Can it be supposed that the churches will act more freely or contribute more largely of their substance from having their views and aims circumscribed within narrower boundaries? A number of presbyteries, immediately after the inauguration of our general systems of benevolence, acted upon this principle. It was thought that their churches would contribute more liberally by having the claims of their immediate neighborhood pressed upon their attention; but all such presbyteries, with perhaps two exceptions, have found out that they were mistaken, and have had the candor and magnanimity to confess their error and change their course. And, now, shall the same thing be reënacted on a larger scale, only to illustrate and confirm the same general principle? We do not see how synods could inaugurate any agency for stirring up the churches to greater liberality than that of presbyterial committees, which is now in almost universal use. And if those who are in favor of change know of any such agency, why not bring it forward and let it be applied in full force to the present general scheme? The Central Com-



mittee of Sustentation, as we understand, has never yet refused to grant any presbyterial committee, when asked to do so, fully as large an amount of funds for local purposes as has been contributed by their churches, and if this rule is substantially carried out from year to year, we do not see how there can be any just ground for complaint. If larger amounts are needed, then the churches are to be stimulated to greater liberality, which every presbytery can effect by giving its presbyterial committee the necessary instructions.

The success of the Kentucky Synod, in raising the salary of its ministers at once to \$1,000 as *the minimum*, has been quoted against the Assembly's plan. But it should be borne in mind, that the people in Kentucky have never been stripped of their property, as the great mass of the Southern people have. There is probably at the present time as much wealth in the single Synod of Kentucky as in any four other synods in the whole Church, so that what was practicable and comparatively easy for them, was an impossibility, for the time being at least, with us. More than this, the Synod of Kentucky, in carrying out their plan, have been so severely taxed that they can do little or nothing for the general cause of Sustentation. Far be it from us to find fault with our brethren in Kentucky for doing just as they have done. We entertain too fresh and too deep a sense of their great kindness to us in the time of our extremity, to feel like finding fault with them, especially for achieving the very same thing that we are striving to accomplish ourselves. But suppose all our stronger and more prosperous synods had acted on the exclusive principle of attending to their own wants, what would have become of all our weaker presbyteries and churches in the mean time? And if this practice is introduced to any considerable extent in our Church, then our missionary operations cease, and Texas and other portions of the southwestern country will inevitably pass into other hands.

We conclude this article, by stating the deep conviction upon our mind that the great and urgent want of our Church at the present moment, is *the thorough waking up of our ministry to the demands of the crisis*. If there was the life, the energy, the

self-denial, and the activity on their part that the circumstances of the Church demand, we should have very little anxiety about the future. Few as we are, compared with the actual wants of the Church, our power and influence, with the blessing of Almighty God, would not only be felt in all our churches, but even to the remotest extremities of the earth.



## ARTICLE VIII.

PAUL, THE CHURCH AT ROME, AND THE EPISTLE  
TO THE ROMANS.

Commentary on Paul's Epistle to the Romans. With an Introduction on the Life, Times, Writings, and Character of Paul. By WILLIAM S. PLUMER, D. D., LL. D., Author of "Studies in the Book of Psalms," etc., etc., etc. Pp. 646. Large 8vo. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co., 770 Broadway, corner of 9th street. 1870.

When we take in hand any valuable book, like the one whose title is given above, which proposes to treat of such a portion of Scripture as the Epistle to the Romans, a multitude of thoughts and memories crowd upon the mind, touching the providence of God as to the writings of the New Testament; as to the author of this Epistle in particular; as to its importance, the people to whom it was sent, and the manner in which it should be studied and expounded. To some of these we propose to devote a portion of the following pages, having it in view also to introduce the book itself to the acquaintance of our readers.

There is no one who values the Scriptures, and rejoices in the inspiring truths they disclose, who would not feel it an irreparable loss if the fourteen epistles of Paul were by any inconceivable calamity abstracted from the sacred volume. Every portion of God's word, even the smallest, is of priceless value. To David, when he had before him only the Pentateuch, Joshua,

Judges, Samuel, and Job, the law was more to be desired than gold, yea, than much fine gold. But how increasingly precious does the word of God become as it progressively unfolds his plan of salvation, and as each inspired writer sets forth, with new power and clearness, those grand truths which our understandings crave and our hearts long for. These writings of Paul constitute almost a third part of the New Testament. Next to his in extent, are those of Luke, then those of John, Matthew, Mark, Peter, James, and Jude, the last and in extent the least of them all. Not that we can estimate the importance of any portion of the Old Testament, or the New, by the pages which it covers. But the great central truths of theology most deeply involved in man's salvation received their fullest unfolding by the pen of this last of the apostles, who speaks of himself with unfeigned humility "as one born out of due time," as "the least of the apostles," and "not meet to be called" one, because he had "persecuted the Church of God."

Wonderful has been the providence of God in his revelation of himself to offending and fallen man. Twice did the race begin its career, in the family of Adam first, and in that of Noah next, with the full blaze of truth shining upon it. And twice did our apostate race stand aloof from God, change his "truth into a lie, and worship and serve the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed forever." A few only, as Melchisedec, king of Salem, and the patriarch Job, if he were of that period to which he has been currently assigned, adhered to the primeval faith. One idolater out of many, God selected, that in him he might illustrate the scheme of redemption, his sovereign mercy, and the power of that religion which gave to Abel, Seth, Enoch and Noah, those antediluvian saints, their good report. And anew to him, our father Abraham and his descendants, did God reveal the truth; and their noble language in which Jehovah had in former days been worshipped, in its engaging simplicity, noble vehemence, pictorial beauty, living movement, power in expressing the deepest, most tender, and warmest emotions, and of rising to the sublimest heights of prophetic ecstasy, became the vehicle, not of philosophy and science, not of commerce and

the arts, but of religion as it was revealed from heaven, as it was uttered from Sinai, abode in the hearts of the lowly, gushed forth in plaint, in prayer, in song of praise and triumph, or mournful dirge, or in heroic and defiant taunt of the enemies of God. None other could so well describe Jehovah sitting on his throne, now in serene majesty, now seating his coequal Son at his right hand, now laughing those who would not have that man to rule over *them* to scorn; or that Son seated all gloriously on a throne whose pavement was the azure firmament, itself sustained by mysterious cherubim, borne on a wondrous and living chariot, whose wheels rolling high and fearful, were full of eyes, like the cherubic wings, gathering knowledge as they moved, from all parts of the universe, whithersoever the great King, whose spirit controlled them, chose to be present with the manifestation of his power. This language was further ennobled as prophet after prophet wrote or spake under the impulses of the Spirit. For fifteen or sixteen centuries the written revelation was made in the ancient Hebrew tongue, which the tribes of Canaan, the Phœnician, and Carthaginian also, for substance, spake. Meanwhile "when the Most High divided to the nations their inheritance, when he separated the sons of Adam, and set the bounds of the people according to the number of the children of Israel," long before the beginnings of profane history, he brought the Pelasgi from Asia into Greece, whom the Hellenes in process of time followed. To them the Semitic race gave a knowledge of letters; and how they availed themselves of this boon, let the priceless treasures of the Greek literature which have contributed so much to our own present culture at once testify. Far more suited is the Greek tongue to express accurately the results of mental analysis, far more fitted to note the subtleties of philosophical research and scientific exposition, than the more emotional and sacred language of the ancient Hebrews. Under the superintending providence of God was all this wrought out by Homer, Plato, Aristotle, and Demosthenes, by the poets, philosophers, dialecticians, and orators of Greece, making their language more rich, ample, and delicate than the world had yet seen.

Behold again the providence of God in the conquests of Alexander of Macedon, carrying this cultivated tongue into Asia and Egypt, over all the countries in which the Jewish people dwelt, compelling them to learn it in order to carry forward with success the ordinary business of life, making them a bilingual people, using their ancient language, though with some dialectic changes, around their hearthstones, and the Greek, changed by an infusion of their own idioms, in the marts of business and places of public resort. At length their ancient Scriptures were translated into the more modern tongue, warming the colder dialect into new life, and imparting to it greater tenderness and a more glowing vigor, as the translation of the same Scriptures has done almost beyond measure to our native English tongue and the language of the Germans alike, modifying the meaning of words first used by heathen men, to express, by analogy, other thoughts and more saving truths than the heathen mind had ever conceived. This reached its perfection when the apostles, inspired by the Holy Ghost, spake and wrote in Greek words the new revelation, which God hath spoken to us in these last days by his Son. It "became to the Christian more than it had been to the Roman or the Jew," "a theological language, rich in the phrases of various schools," and suited to convey with greater exactness than any other, Christian ideas to all the world.

The providence of God was not less manifest in raising up the Apostle Paul. In his own view, he was *born* that he might be an apostle. "When it pleased God," says he, "who separated me from my mother's womb, and called me by his grace, to reveal his Son in me, that I might preach him among the heathen." These purposes of the eternal God have no beginning in time. In heaven's eternal plan was his lot in life marked out, and his birth, of Jewish parents, in the city of Tarsus. Whether they were carried thither as slaves in the civil wars, as Wieseler supposes, and there manumitted, so that with due formalities his father became a Roman citizen, or whether they reached the chief city of Cilicia by voluntary expatriation, and the privileges of citizenship were conferred by services rendered to the State, we are not informed. Whichever it was, Paul tells us he

was "free born," and he sought protection in the hour of danger under the proud name of a citizen of Rome. His home education, though conducted in a Grecian city, was Jewish, and of the strictest and most orthodox sect. His parents were in circumstances to give him the best advantages their nation afforded. He was early sent to Jerusalem, and was taught by Gamaliel, who was called "the beauty of the law," and "was had in reputation by all the people." Here he "profited in the Jews' religion above many his equals," "being more exceedingly zealous of the traditions of his fathers." Under this able teacher, he was educated after the system of the Jewish schools, the text of the Scriptures being the basis, and the method that of scriptural exegesis, in which the meaning of the sacred word was brought forth and discussed with the utmost freedom. The teacher gave his opinion, the disciples "were both hearing them and asking them questions," as Jesus did at twelve years of age among the doctors in the temple, perhaps in the same room where Saul sat afterwards at the feet of Gamaliel. The students were thus thoroughly trained in dialectics, learned to express themselves in a quick sententious style, and became well versed at least in the *language* of the Scriptures. The traces of this method may perhaps be detected in the objection and reply, almost in the form of dialogue, in some portions of the Epistle to the Romans. This Gamaliel was far more free from Jewish exclusiveness than most of their teachers. He did not despise the learning of the Greeks; and the future apostle, who had heard this language and spoke it himself in his native Tarsus, which, according to Strabo, at that time surpassed Athens and Alexandria in philosophy and learning, could hardly have wholly neglected the rich literature of that nation, whose poets Aratus, Menander, and Epimenides, he quotes; and perhaps Kleantes also. It is true the first was a native of Tarsus, B. C. 270, an astronomer and poet, and the last, of Assos, B. C. 300; Epimenides was of Crete, (according to some, one of the seven wise men of the Greeks,) who lived some 600 years B. C.; all, except Menander, of the Asiatic Hellenes. Menander was of the more decent comic poets of Athens, B. C. 300. The quotations in

question are introduced by him spontaneously as impromptu references, and may have been caught up by the ear from casual discourse, but more probably show a measure of acquaintance with the literature of Greece. At Tarsus, before his conversion or possibly in Arabia, after it, he may have studied the writings of Philo and other Hellenistic Jews, which would account for those remarkable coincidences of expression which are found in his epistles, especially in that to the Hebrews.

It is a matter of thankfulness, rather than of regret, that the style of this man was not formed after the classic model of the Greeks. In every nation under heaven where he went, he had first and chiefly to do with Jews. He sought them out in their synagogues, where the diction of Plato and Xenophon was at a discount, where in matters of religion the language of religion was demanded, and the methods of inculcation, the sources of proof, and the metaphors and imagery, must be such as were found in their ancient Scriptures, and were embalmed with the memories of their childhood. In these synagogues, and in the houses of the Jews, the apostles often met with heathen who were weary with the worn-out fables of their own people, whose hearts longed for a purer and nobler faith; like the ruler at Capernaum, for whom the Jewish presbyters pleaded with Jesus, saying "that he was worthy," "for he loveth our nation, and he hath built us a synagogue;" or Cornelius, at Cæsarea, centurion of the Italian cohort, "who feared God with all his house;" or Fulvia, a noble and wealthy lady of Rome, of whom Josephus speaks. In the Pisidian Antioch, "Paul stood up" in the synagogue on the invitation of the rulers, "and, beckoning with his hand," addressed both classes of hearers, the Jew and the believing Gentile—"Men of Israel, and ye that fear God, give audience."

For sixteen years from his conversion did this apostle pursue his missionary labors, chiefly in Syria, and what since the fourth century has been known as lesser Asia, making, during five of these years, his headquarters at Tarsus, his native city. There it was that his plans were interrupted and changed by the Holy Spirit. Proposing to preach the gospel in proconsular Asia,

was forbidden of the Spirit, and assaying then to proceed to Bythia with his companions, the Spirit suffered them not. At Troas he saw the vision of the man of Macedonia praying him, "Come over into Macedonia and help us." The gathering of the church at Philippi, Thessalonica, Berea, and Corinth, soon followed in that same year, A. D. 52. Before the close of this year, he probably commenced those matchless epistles to which we have alluded. The first was written to the newly gathered church at Thessalonica. He seems to have spent the following year in the same city in abundant labors, in the midst of which his Second Epistle to the Thessalonians was written. In the spring of A. D. 54, he leaves Corinth, reaches Jerusalem at Pentecost, thence to Antioch. In the autumn he arrived at Ephesus, where he remains through the years 55, 56, and the spring of 57, in which he writes the First Epistle to the Corinthians. In the summer he leaves Ephesus for Macedonia, where, in the autumn, he writes the Second to the Corinthians. The winter he spends at Corinth, where he pens his Epistle to the Galatians. His Epistle to the Romans follows in the spring of 58, after which he leaves Corinth, and goes by the way of Philippi and Miletus to Jerusalem, in the summer, to Pentecost. There he is arrested and sent to Cæsarea, which Herod the Great had built with much beauty and splendor, and at immense cost, creating a safe harbor on an inhospitable coast by a breakwater or mole, which was one of the most stupendous works of antiquity. It became the civil and military capital of Judea, was the birthplace of Procopius, and Eusebius, the father of Church history, who was Bishop of Cæsarea in the early part of the 4th century. Here Paul was held a prisoner by the dilatoriness of the Roman Procurators for two years, a long period to be taken from the most important part of the life of so eminent an apostle.

The wise superintendence of Christ over his apostle may be manifest in this. Both mind and body may have needed rest from his exhaustive labors. And as visions of unspeakable glory were vouchsafed to his toil-worn spirit, when he was caught up to the third heaven and heard unspeakable words which it is not lawful for a man to utter; so here, a season of comparative quiet



was afforded him, when, if his energies were in some sort repressed, his inward man might be renewed day by day. Some have supposed that he wrote here the Epistles to Philemon, Colossians, and Ephesians, which Conybeare and Howson think were written at Rome in 62. The conjecture is not improbable that Luke's Gospel was here written under his superintendence. The spring of 61 the same authors fix for his arrival at Rome, where, the next year, he wrote the Epistles just mentioned, and that to the Philippians. They suppose him to have been released from the imprisonment in the spring of 63, to have visited Macedonia and Asia Minor that year, to have gone to Spain in 64, and to have remained there till the summer of 66; to have written the First to Timothy from Macedonia in the summer of 67, and in the autumn the Epistle to Titus from Ephesus; and that he was executed, if their conjectures are right, at Rome in May or June of 68, shortly before Nero's death, outside the city walls, on the road to Ostia, the port of Rome. The supposition of his journey to Spain rests upon the declarations of his own intention mentioned, Rom. xv. 24-28, the testimony of Clement, his own disciple, that he had gone to the extremity of the West, and had instructed the whole world (*i. e.* the Roman empire) in righteousness. The testimony of an unknown writer of about the year 170, quoted by Muratori, and that of Eusebius, Chrysostom, and Jerome to the same effect, which was the current opinion of antiquity, have a seeming support from allusions in his latest epistles, and has only been called in question in modern times.

The noble bearing of Paul, the sublime truths he uttered, the solemn beauty and lofty eloquence of his language on Mars Hill at Athens; the tenderness of his address to the Ephesian elders at Miletus; his speech to the people from the stairs at Jerusalem; his speeches before Felix and Agrippa, and the tact and skill displayed in them all, place him among the first of men renowned for effective eloquence. Still higher is our opinion of him raised in this merely human point of view as we read, and especially as we *study*, his epistles. Among the Greeks, who surpassed all others in eloquence, Longinus names "Demosthenes,

Lysias, Æschines, Isocrates, and some others, to whom," he says, "may be added Saul of Tarsus." "When I read Paul," says Jerome, "I seem to myself not to hear words, but thunders." His simple and guileless words he compares to the lightning's flash, shedding its effulgence on every side. "His serious and impassioned mind," says Tholuck, "shows itself in a forcible, brief and rapid style, in which he seems to be laboring for some new expression stronger than the preceding, and the words press like waves upon each other." "Like a wall of adamant," says Chrysostom, "his writings form a bulwark around all the churches of the world, while he himself, like some mighty champion, stands in the midst, casting down every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ."

There is a negligent greatness in all he says. Inspired by the grandeur of his theme, his eloquent words flow often like an impetuous torrent, bearing every thing before it, not arranged in rounded periods, nor at once reaching the grand conclusion which is yet before him. For he pursues ever and anon some side thought which might branch off into error, until the fallacy is annihilated, and yet so pursues it as to be advancing the while in his main argument, to which he returns with accumulated power of conviction, establishing the truth, and leaving every specious cavil and glozing falsehood prostrate in the dust.

Whether these epistles of Paul should be read and studied in the order in which they were composed, that is, in the order of time, or in the order in which they are found arranged in our copies of the New Testament, there are different opinions. In favor of the chronological order it has been contended that God has bestowed upon his Church an Apostolic History as well as Apostolic Epistles, and that the one should be studied in connection with the other, and that if so studied, the Acts of the Apostles will be a kind of inspired comment on the Epistles. If the student does not read them in this order, he will come upon the most difficult of all, the Epistle to the Romans first, before he is familiarized with the thoughts and diction of the Apostle, which, if he knew through the earlier epistles, would materially

assist him in the study of this. It is further argued that God is a God of order; and that the Apostle, as a wise master-builder, under the influences of the Spirit, put not forth disjointed and fugitive essays, but epistles, which though addressed to individual churches, were designed for the universal Church of every age and country. In the Epistle to the Thessalonians he lays the foundations, in the first principles of the doctrine of Christ, in the doctrines of repentance, faith, and of the resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment. See Heb. vi. 1, 2. In the Epistle to the Galatians he vindicates his apostolic commission, and in this, in a briefer form, and in the Epistle to the Romans in a form more methodical and complete, has he set forth the great doctrine of the justification and sanctification of sinful men.

In the Epistles to the Corinthians he exhibits to us the picture of a Christian Church, in its sacred worship, its holy communion, its difficulties arising from the proximity of heathen immorality and from party factions; he inculcates the duty of forbearance, and in language of peculiar beauty sets forth the superior excellence of Christian love over its sister graces of faith and hope.

In the twin Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians, he shows this Church to be founded in the will of the Father, by the satisfaction of the Son, and the vivifying and strengthening power of the Holy Spirit. In the Epistle to Philemon, he tells us how Christianity can mediate between the master and his slave, honoring the Christian character, and pointing out the Christian duties of both. In the Epistle to the Hebrews he completes the Apostolic Trilogy begun in the Epistle to the Galatians, carried out methodically in that to the Romans as to justification through Christ, releasing his brethren according to the flesh from the false Judaism which was pressing around them in the land of their nativity, and showing them that Christ is above angels and Moses, the celestial and earthly ministers by whom the law was given; above Aaron and all his sons, even as the true tabernacle in which he ministers is above that earthly one which Moses framed according to the pattern showed him in the mount; that

the faith which fastens upon this High Priest, who, passing through the heavens, now officiates within the veil, will be to their souls an anchor sure and steadfast, which though unseen by the mariner, enables him to outride the storm; and that they will join, in their due order, those elders who obtained a good report; whose muster-roll he calls from Abel to Noah, and from Noah to Joseph; from Moses to Joshua, and from Joshua to the Maccabees. And so he proceeds till he finishes the sacred structure by those pastoral Epistles written when he was ready to be offered, that the ministers that were to succeed him might know how they "ought to behave themselves in the house of God, which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth."

It is well known that in the early Church, there were two collections of the New Testament scriptures, the one called "The Gospel" (τὸ εὐαγγέλιον), the other "The Apostle" (ὁ ἀπόστολος), because, in all probability, it embraced at first only the writings of Paul, known in Europe, by way of eminence, as "The Apostle." Had the last been formed from the first beginning by gradual accretion, it would have contained at first but the Epistles to the Thessalonians, to which as a nucleus the others would have been added as they were written one after another. That a different order has been handed down to us is due either to the prevailing influence of the Church of Rome, by its important position in the imperial city; or by the fact that the Epistle to the Romans was regarded as the great and leading one of the Apostle, as it truly is, and, for this reason, was placed in front of them all. When Peter wrote his Second Epistle, the writings of Paul were already a well known collection. "Even as our beloved brother Paul also, according to the wisdom given unto him, hath written unto you; as in all his epistles, (ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς,) speaking in them of these things; in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, (distort, or wrench,) "as also the other scriptures, unto their own destruction," 2 Pet. iii. 15, 16. These other scriptures may be those of the Old Testament, but are more likely to be those of the New, writings of recent or living

men, the sacred quaternion, known as "The Gospel," which, because inspired, are referred to for confirmation. The conjecture is not destitute of probability, that Paul himself, during his second imprisonment at Rome, among his first acts, collected the ten epistles he had already written, that he might bequeath them as a legacy to the Church; and that he afterwards wrote the pastoral letters, which in due time were added to the collection by others. This conjecture, which is that of Olshausen, would locate the First Epistle to Timothy later than our preceding pages have placed it, and does not include the Epistle to the Hebrews, which he regards as Pauline, though written for Paul by some disciple or faithful friend, like Apollos. It is a circumstance of weighty import, that so early as from A. D. 64 to 68, thirty or thirty-four years after our Lord's crucifixion, the Apostle Peter, to whom he had shown that "shortly he must put off his tabernacle," placed the Epistles of Paul in the rank of "the other scriptures."

The intellectual life of the Apostle John was one of contemplation. He loved to meditate and gaze intently upon truth as it is eternal, but especially as his loving heart found it embodied in the person, shining in the acts, or dropping like refreshing dew from the lips, or proceeding as a sharp two-edged sword from the mouth of him who was "fairer than the children of men," on whose bosom he had "leaned," there resting his head, and around whom his fondest memories lingered. The heart of Paul also felt most deeply. As a man he felt for his fellow man, and as a patriot for his people and his country. He looked with adoring love upon Christ as the Son of God, the express image of the Father, and as Jesus whom he persecuted. But his powerful intellect clothed in definite shape the impressions made upon his heart. He wrought them out into distinct conceptions, expressed them in well defined doctrinal terms, and sustained them by argumentative discussion, so that the Christian doctrine as handled by him, especially in the Epistle to the Romans, approached the form of theological science.

If we ask the question, By whom was the church at Rome founded? the supporters of the Papacy answer, by the Apostle

Peter. And truly wonderful are the romances which have been written respecting him. He came, says the romancer, by the way of Troy, crossed over to Corinth, where he met Paul and Silas. Thence he came to Syracuse, thence to Naples, where he offered a *mass* for his safe progress. He then touched at Liburnum—the Livorno of the Italians, the Leghorn of the English—driven thither by stress of weather; thence to Pisa, where he offered another *mass*. His companions were Mark, Apollinaris, Martial, Rufus, Pancratius, and Marcian, whom he appointed bishops, or employed as missionaries. Baronius, I., 322, 358, 359. The motives for this journey are stated by some to be, that he might escape the persecutions of Herod Agrippa; by others, that he might preach the gospel in the capital of the Roman world; by others, and they the most numerous, that he might meet the arch impostor Simon Magus, who is fabled to have gone to Rome, to have resumed his magic arts, and to have been ranked among the gods. Him he easily exposed and vanquished. He then visited his own countrymen in the Jews' quarter, beyond the Tiber, and preached the gospel with great success. The fame of the mighty preacher spread over the seven hills of Rome, even into the lordly halls of the Patricians. One of these, Pudens, a senator, who believed in Christ, received him into his own house on the Viminal Mount, where a monument was afterwards erected, called "the shepherd's," which identifies the place to the modern Romans. Baronius, I., 332. Laboring now among the Jews and Gentiles both, he founded *the Church of Rome* on the 15th of February, A. D. 43, being the third year of the reign of Claudius. Of this church the Roman authorities say he was the first bishop, and the wooden chair on which he sat in his episcopal character, "Peter's chair," is still kept in the Vatican, covered with a linen veil, and a vast number of miracles are said to have been wrought by it, even as true miracles were wrought in the streets of Jerusalem by the shadow of Peter passing by. Here, say they, in the first year of his episcopate, he wrote his First Epistle to the churches in Lesser Asia, which professed to be dated from Babylon, a figurative name, they claim, for the Roman capital. He established bishoprics in many cities of Italy and Sicily,

in Gaul also, and in Spain and Germany. After about seven years from his arrival at Rome, occurred the edict of Claudius banishing the Jews from the imperial city, when Peter went to Carthage in Africa, and established Crescens, one of his converts at Rome, as bishop; he then passes on to Alexandria and appoints the Evangelist Mark in that ancient episcopate. He ascends the Nile to Thebes, of which he constitutes Rufus the bishop. He then arrives at Jerusalem, and that he *was there*, we have far better ground for believing, than for the stories which have preceded. He was present at the Council, of which we have a narrative in Acts xv. He also visited Antioch, where he was reproved by the Apostle Paul, who was much the younger of the two, and was withstood to his very face for his temporizing policy, as to the distinction of food. Chrysostom, Theodoret, and, at one time, Jerome, moved by their reverence for Peter, maintained that this was *but in appearance only*, κατὰ πρόσωπον, merely for effect. And not the Romanists only, but some Protestants have supposed that Peter could have said much in self-justification, and that Paul was not wholly without blame. But the Romish fabulists make him to have been seven years bishop of Antioch. The scripture history is thenceforth silent respecting this apostle; but it is the prevailing belief that he resided in Babylon till near the close of his life, where he wrote the epistles that bear his name, in a season when Christians were suffering bitter persecution, and shortly before his own death. But to make out their story the papal romancers are willing, as we have seen, that Babylon named (in the subscription to these epistles, 1 Peter v. 14; 2 Peter iii. 18, found in many copies,) as the place whence the epistles were sent, should be understood as used spiritually, or figuratively, for Rome.

There is nothing further in the inspired scriptures respecting Peter's subsequent life, except his own declaration, 2 Peter i. 14; "Knowing that shortly I must put off this my tabernacle, even as the Lord Jesus Christ hath showed me;" or, as the passage might be translated, "Knowing" (as I do) "that rapid is the putting off of my tabernacle, even as the Lord Jesus Christ declared to me." Thus there is no need of supposing that any

new revelation had been made to him. He alludes probably to the annunciation by our risen Lord, John xxi. 18, 19, that "when he should be old, he should stretch forth his hands, and another should gird him and carry him whither he would not." He was now aged, the time had come of which the Saviour had spoke, he could not expect immunity amid the persecutions that were raging abroad, a swift and sharp death he must know was at hand.

But the legendary story of the Papal Church is, that he had returned to Rome in the days of Nero; and so they make him apostolic bishop of that city for twenty-five years, dating from the period of his first arrival. He there again encountered Simon Magus, and, at their first interview, at which Nero was present, Simon, aided by the devil, flew up into the air in the presence of Nero and the whole city; but the devil, who had raised him to this height, struck with terror at the name of Jesus, whom Peter invoked, let him fall to the ground, by which fall his legs were dreadfully broken. Baronius, I., 648. To remove all doubts, they will show you at Rome the print of Peter's knees on the stone on which he kneeled as he offered his prayer, and on another stone the stain of blood as it gushed from the body of the discomfited magician. Nero, offended at the disgrace and death of his favorite, sought to lay hands on Peter. He began, in the darkness of the night to remove to some place of safety, and was just passing out of the gate of the city when he met with Jesus coming to Rome. The surprised apostle accosted him with the words *Domine quo vadis?* "Lord! whither are you going?" "I am coming to Rome," was the reply, "to be crucified again." On this the apostle returned joyfully, and met his martyrdom with heroic fortitude. This, which Stanley calls "the most beautiful of the ecclesiastical legends," is commemorated by the Church of "*Domine quo vadis*" on the Appian way; and the stone, which is said to contain the impression of the Saviour's feet, where Jesus met him, is shown in the Basilica of St. Sebastian. The pillar to which he was bound is exhibited in the Mamertine prison, and the fountain which miraculously sprang up that he might be able to baptize his jailers, Processus and Martinian. He was crucified, the story



says, being bound, not nailed to the cross, with his head downward, at his own request, because he felt himself unworthy to be crucified as his Master was; a temple is built on the spot; and his body is buried in a subterranean chapel beneath the dome of St. Peter's, the most majestic temple, as a work of man's device, in the whole Christian world.

We have gone through with this, to us, somewhat tedious detail, to revive among our readers the recollection of the fables on which so much of the pretensions of the Papacy rest. Much more summarily than we, has Dr. Plumer touched on the Prolegomena to the Epistle to the Romans, as was meet in a work designed for general circulation among our people. But we claim that few of these stories which we have detailed rest on any scriptural, or even solid extra-scriptural testimony.

In the first place, the Church of Rome cannot have been founded by an apostle. It was a principle with Paul not to "build on another man's foundation." Chap. xv. 20. Nor would he in that case, perhaps, have addressed them by letter. 2 Cor. x. 14-16; Gal. ii. 8. They were a church before he wrote to them, and "their faith was already spoken of throughout the whole (Roman) world." Above all, it was not founded by Peter. No mention is made in the book of Acts of any apostle's having been in Rome till Paul was carried there as a prisoner. He was not bishop of that city, as Rome pretends, from the second year of Claudius, for twenty-four or five years. He was residing in Jerusalem A. D. 44, when imprisoned by Agrippa, and in 51 when the Council was held at that city. It was after this that he dissembled at Antioch. He was not in Rome when Paul wrote his Epistle in 59. (Baronius pretends that he was absent then in Britain!!) In the salutation in Chap. xvi., in which some thirty persons male and female are mentioned, Peter's name is not alluded to, nor that of Linus and Cletus, named as bishops in the Roman calendar. Three years after this epistle was written, A. D. 61, Paul having spent seven days at Puteoli with the brethren at that city, whence the news of his arrival preceded him to Rome, the brethren went twenty miles to meet him and escort him thither. Three days after his arrival he called the chief of

the Jews together, who were so ignorant of the Christian "sect," which was "every where spoken against," that they desired to hear from the apostle what he thought respecting them. They appointed him a day, when they all assembled, and he addressed them "from morning till evening." In all this Peter's name is never mentioned. How is this at all consistent with the pretensions of the present Romish Church, that Peter was bishop there, with a sub-bishop, Linus or Cletus?

The basis of all this plainly is the mistake of Justin Martyr, the first of the philosophers converted to Christ of whom history speaks. When a new convert, he visited Rome, being at the time but little acquainted probably either with its ancient history or the Latin tongue. He speaks of a statue erected to Simon Magus, which stood in the midst of the Tiber between two bridges, bearing the inscription, SIMONI DEO SANCTO. He mixed the story in Acts viii. and various traditions together. Him, according to the book of Acts, Peter had confronted. His statue was erected, as Justin made it out, at Rome, and was saluted with divine honors. Peter then must have followed Simon thither. As to the second rencontre, it is but a reminiscence of an incident recorded by Suetonius, of a person in the public sports, some acrobat or æronaut of that day, who attempted to fly in the air in the presence of Nero. He was precipitated to the earth, as the historian records, and his blood spurted out with such violence as to reach the canopy under which Nero was sheltered. Sueton. Nero, chap. 12.

In 1574 an excavation was made for some purpose on the island in the Tiber, so particularly described by Justin, on which the abutments of two bridges rested, when the workmen dug up the pedestal and part of a statue which once occupied that spot. On the pedestal was an inscription which began, SEMONI SANGO DEO FIDIO SACRUM, the same, we have no doubt, which Justin saw and misunderstood. A *Semo* was a kind of demi-god among the ancient Sabines. One of them was named *Sangus* or *Sancus*, and received honors and worship. As the inscription proceeds to show, it was a votive monument erected by Sextus Pompey to *Sangus* the *Semo*.

By this accidental discovery the whole story of Justin, whom the fathers incontinently followed, is exploded. About twenty years after Justin Martyr, Irenæus, bishop of Lyons, speaks of the Church "founded at Rome, by the two most glorious apostles, Peter and Paul." He tells us that Matthew wrote his Gospel while Peter and Paul were preaching and founding the Church at Rome. Similar is the statement of Dionysius, bishop of Corinth. Clement of Alexandria about A. D. 200, reports it as a tradition that "Mark wrote his Gospel at Rome while Peter was preaching there." Tertullian A. D. 207, speaks of "the Romans, to whom Peter and Paul imparted the gospel sealed with their own blood," speaks of Peter baptizing in the Tiber as John did in the Jordan, as ordaining Clement bishop of Rome, and as suffering in the days of Nero. Cyprian of Carthage, A. D. 250, speaks of Rome "as the principal church" where "Peter's chair was." Lactantius speaks of Peter and Paul as working miracles at Rome, and of Peter's coming to Rome in the days of Nero. Eusebius A. D. 325, represents Peter as having gone to Rome in the reign of Claudius to oppose Simon Magus, but does not make him bishop of that city. The testimony of these fathers rests on their credulous and unhistoric deductions from the assertion of Justin. Peter could not have been there previous to the arrival of Paul as a prisoner in the year 64. Though Spanheim and many Protestants deny that he ever visited Rome at all, we have no interest in resisting the testimony of antiquity, that he came to Rome in the closing period of his life and suffered there under Nero. We are not quite ready to adopt the contemptuous language of Milton, who ridicules those who cannot think any doubt resolved, "unless they run to that undigested heap and fry of authors, which they call antiquity;" and who adds, "Whatsoever time, or the heedless hand of blind chance, hath drawn down from of old to this present, in her huge drag-net, whether fish or sea-weed, shells or shrubs, unpicked, unchosen, *those are the fathers.*"

Equally ridiculous with the legend about Simon the sorcerer, much of which is imitated from that partly philosophical and partly religious romance known as "the Recognitions of Cle-

ment," by some author it is supposed who lived in the second or third century, is that famous relic, "the chair of St. Peter." In 1662 the said chair was sent to be cleaned, when the twelve labors of Hercules were found to be engraved on it! showing it to be an old heathen relic which the votaries of Rome had been worshipping.

The Church at Rome may have arisen in part from the knowledge of Christ brought by Jewish residents at Rome, who heard Peter's sermon on the day of Pentecost, and only thus could Peter have had any hand in founding it; in part by Hebrew Christians scattered abroad after the martyrdom of Stephen; in part by the concourse of strangers ever coming to Rome from the provinces. But the greetings of Paul in Chap. xvi. show that the leading members of the Church were largely his own disciples. There are many evidences that the Jews were numerous at Rome; many also that numbers of the Gentiles were proselyted to their faith, and there were many more who, in these early times, embraced Christianity directly, without passing through the gate of the synagogue. Judging from the contents of the Epistle, the Gentile element predominated greatly over the Jewish. These statements can be substantiated by consulting Josephus Antiqu., l. XVII., c. 11, § 1, and XVIII., c. 3, § 5; Philo. Legat. ad Caium, p. 697, ed. Turneb., Seneca, as quoted by Augustine de Civ. Dei, l. VI., c. 11; Juvenal Sat. 14, v. 100; Tacitus Annal., l. XIV. c. 15; Ovid Ars Am., l. 76.

In these passages we see the hand of that special providence which brought Joseph and Mary to Bethlehem, through a decree of Cæsar Augustus, that prophecy might be fulfilled in the birth of our Redeemer, and by the "star of the wise men," brought *them* to the manger where he was cradled, that they might worship him; thoughts, which on this Christmas morning of the year 1870, however *wrongly it may be set in the calendar*, we love to remember. They teach us to admire that all-reaching wisdom and control which united the Greek-speaking nations, whether Latins or Hebrews, under one powerful government, before Christ came; which by the hand of Pompey brought a multitude of Jews to Rome as captives and bondsmen, whose

religious scruples and conscientious observance of their Sabbaths, were so inconvenient to their heathen masters, that in disgust they gave them their freedom; who were so numerous at Rome that 8,000 of them joined the embassy sent from Jerusalem to protest against the government of Archelaus; that they so far attracted the attention of the Romans to their sabbatic assemblies that Ovid advises the young nobles of his day to visit them too, if they wished to see the beauties of Rome assembled together; that they had so far won upon the more virtuous of the citizens that many embraced their faith, so that "*victi victoribus leges dederunt*;" that Juvenal could make Judaizing Romans the objects of his satire; and that Tacitus, not distinguishing the followers of Christ from those of the Synagogue, but embracing both as an *exitiabilis superstitio*, says that *erumpebat, non modo per Judeam, sed per urbem etiam*.

The Epistle to the Romans has been the subject of commentary more than any other of the epistolary portions of the New Testament, from Origen, who died in 253, down to the present time.

Commentaries on this, as on all other portions of Scripture, may be divided into two kinds as to their method and design, viz., the *critical* and the *popular*.

The first indicates, and, at the same time, accelerates the progress made in true biblical learning. The first resort, in this method, is to the grammatical principles of the language we interpret. If the Scriptures are divinely inspired, then he who conscientiously studies them, and attempts their explanation for the benefit of others, will, in proportion to the reverence he has for them, scrutinize the words the Spirit has caused to be written, and the laws and usages of the language through which God has chosen to reveal his will. If the New Testament has its own peculiar idioms; if the Greek words have shades of meaning, which, while analogous to their classic use, varies from it, to express new truths unknown to the heathen, the attention will be turned to these matters in all the methods of scholarly investigation. The prepositions which indicate the direct or indirect object of the verb, or the relation of noun to noun, or

are compounded with verbs; the particles causal, illative, or adversative, which show the transition from one thought to another, or give peculiar senses to the modes of verbs; and the whole doctrine of moods and tenses—will be topics of close and careful study, with the view of arriving at and explaining the sense of Scripture. Some of the helps at the student's hand in this department, besides the concordances, are the lexicons of Bretschneider, Wahl, and Robinson, (which is based upon Wahl,) for the New Testament Greek; and that of Passow, as edited by Palm and Rost, or as set before us by Liddell & Scott in the American reprint, for that of the Classics, the New Testament usage and the ecclesiastic being also briefly given. In the grammar of the New Testament we have Winer, a work of great ability, (of which we have the American translation by Agnew & Ebbecke; and the English by Masson, from a later edition,) and a smaller but able grammar of Green. The Syntax of Bernhardt, and the Doctrine of the Particles, by Hartung, both German works, the treatise on Greek prepositions and nouns by Prof. Gessner Harrison of Virginia; and for grammar, though not for theology, the German commentaries of Fritsche and Meyer. Nor must we forget to speak of the commentaries of Addison Alexander, nor of those of Alford and Ellicott, as examples in this kind. If to these are added the commentaries of the Greek fathers, Origen, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Œcumenius, and Theophylact, so far as they relate to grammatical exposition, and (if one can intelligently add to these) an acquaintance with the old Latin, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Gothic, Coptic, Ethiopic, and the old Armenian versions, we will have gone the round of strictly grammatical research, by which, connected with a true adjustment of the text, which, however first in order, may be the last with certainty to settle, and a consideration of the scope and context, the strictly grammatical commentary is to be constructed. To this can be added the outward helps drawn from the history, laws, and usages of the times, and the general analogy of scripture doctrine, as the writer has himself discovered it, or as aided by the labors of others. We are persuaded that all true advances in biblical

commentary in the New Testament Scriptures, of which only we are now speaking, though the principles apply also to the Old Testament and the Hebrew in which it is written, must certainly be made in this direction. It is a life-long labor to acquire the requisite knowledge and skill; and where, we ask, are the men in our now distracted Southern land, and how few are there elsewhere on this side the Atlantic, who are devoting their days and nights to these labors? When will our academic, collegiate, and professional education, be accurate and thorough enough to carry forward, if not all, at least the select and untiring few, who have the high honor of advancing biblical knowledge beyond the limits it has reached by the labors of others?

But besides the *critical*, there is the *popular* commentary, which avoids all that show of erudition which is beyond the comprehension of the plain and common mind; which aims by easy and clear methods to unfold the sense of the inspired writer, and, while it explains difficult phraseology or briefly illustrates it, to bring forth in a clear and vivid form the doctrines of the Scriptures, or to enforce the practical duties which these doctrines imply.

To an unlettered person, who yet wishes to know more of God's word, and even to many who boast what is called a liberal education, pages bristling with Greek quotations, or with illustrations from the Hebrew, Syriac, Coptic, Ethiopic, Arabic, or Gothic, in the alphabetic character belonging to these tongues, would be uninviting, or positively forbidding, however satisfactory to the advanced scholar. Yet the two methods are often more or less united. And the actual character of these writings varies with the tastes and studies of their authors. One lays stress on philological, another, on antiquarian research, to explain the Scriptures; another comments as a theologian, having doctrine ever in his eye; another, as a philosophic moralist, dwells on the ethics of Christianity; another is smitten with the beauties of the sacred writings, is enchanted with their poetry, or held spell-bound by their eloquence; and some strive to combine all these ends in their due proportions, aiming through all to inform the understanding and touch the heart, which is the great

end which every reverent writer upon the Sacred Scriptures will strive to reach.

The Commentary of Dr. Plumer on the Romans—to which, after this prolonged, and perhaps tedious introduction, we will now briefly direct the reader's attention—addresses itself, not exclusively to the scholar, but more widely, to all readers of the Bible. It proceeds not from the chair of the professed exegete, but from that of the theologian, whose life-labors have also been devoted in the pastoral office, and in wide discursive religious effort, to the enforcement of the doctrines and ethics of revealed religion upon the understandings and hearts of men, and to the widening, in various directions, of Christ's visible kingdom. One would suppose that after the labors of so many expositors in different generations and different periods of the Church; after Calvin had spoken to us in our own tongue, into which most of his expositions have been translated; after Tholuck, learned, pious, but yet by our theological standard unsafe, had spoken; and Prof. Stuart, erst the enthusiastic Coryphæus of biblical learning in this country and generation of ours, who worshipped free thought, and made as if that which was long regarded as settled in the Calvinistic school, needed amendment, had written on this epistle; when the elder Haldane, who, though but a military officer in the British service, had expounded the same to a band of students at Geneva, whose hearts the Spirit of God through him powerfully moved, and who became the germ of that theological school out of which came Cæsar Malan and Adolph Monod, and over which D'Aubigné and Gausson presided; after he had wrought up his expositions into a portly commentary, sound and exceedingly able, but strongly controversial; and after Dr. Hodge had written, and in many respects excelled them all—one would suppose, we say, that after all this, nothing more could be said on the Epistle to the Romans.

But every age has its wants and its tastes, every mind has its own way of conceiving and expressing truth; and there is a quaint and proverbial philosophy as far removed as possible from the dialectics of Aristotle, or the reasonings of Sir William Hamilton, which, if not continuous like theirs, may reach the



heart of the people as really and as quickly as do the proverbs of Solomon.

The method of Dr. Plumer in his Commentary on the Romans, resembles that of his "Studies on the Book of Psalms." Its tenor is equally practical, but, as the nature of the Epistle would lead us to expect, more eminently theological. The text on which he comments is that of the English version of 1611, known as "King James's." In illustration of its terms, he is fond of quoting the older translations of Wiclif, Anno 1380; Tyndale, 1534; Cranmer, 1539; Geneva, 1557; Rheims, 1583; the Romish version of Douay—all but the last, brought conveniently together in Bagster's English Hexapla of the New Testament. These are supplemented by the Peshito Syriac version as translated by Murdock; and occasionally by those of the Arabic and Ethiopic as exhibited in the translations of the same in Walton's Polyglott, and these still by various translations of different scholars. Another process is by means of the Englishman's Greek Concordance, which exhibits every text in which the word in the original Greek answering to the word in the translation occurs, so that the senses which the word bore in the judgment of the translators is seen at once, and can be easily enumerated. This, it is true, is not settling the meaning of words by Greek usage exactly ascertained, but by the opinion of the translators as to what meaning the word bore in each given case. Their translation, however, if judged to be wrong, is corrected by the author. These methods afford various comparisons by which the sense of words is determined, furnish varied information to those who have but few books, and save the trouble of consultation to those who have many. The teacher and the learner may well be grateful to those indefatigable men who have made for us these labor-saving books, and have more recently furnished them to our hand, both for the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures so convenient to use. After these materials are produced, the meaning of the text is discussed often in few words, or the folly of the sin denounced shown by some brief but pointed *reductio ad absurdum*, as *e. g.* on i. 23, "They changed the glory," etc., "The likeness of

man or angel, of the sun or moon, no more adequately or justly shows forth the true nature of God than does the similitude of an ox, or ass, an owl, a bat, a toad, a lizard, or an anaconda." C. ii. 19, 20, "And art confident that thou thyself art a guide," etc. Remark 12, p. 107—"If the best a man can say is: 'I am of my own choice and by public consent a Christian, I rest in the gospel, I make my boast of God, I know his will, I approve the most excellent things, I am instructed out of the gospel, I am capable of teaching others the way of salvation, *I instruct a Bible-class*, I am a communicant or a minister in the church;' if this is all, it is nothing, nothing to the purpose of salvation."

There are numerous sentences far more striking than these, which are set down here because first meeting our eye as we recur to the book. They occur sometimes in the commentary proper, but more often in the Doctrinal and Practical Remarks which follow after the comment on each paragraph of the text is complete, and occasionally cause a pleasant surprise by the quaintness, and humor almost, with which they are expressed.

On the chief doctrinal passages in the Epistle, the theological discussions are, as we would expect, more ample and elaborate. We had marked several of these which we had intended to quote in these pages, but the extent to which our introductory remarks have reached will now prevent their insertion, except to a very limited extent. The passage in which the parallel is run by Paul, between the first and second Adam, in Rom. v. 13-21, is like many other passages, satisfactorily and ably handled. It has been the *cruz interpretum* to all divines of the Pelagian or Semipelagian school, on which they have writhed with painful contortions. We are sorry that Prof. Stuart should have permitted himself to be drawn into such proximity to them as to have shared in their sufferings. "That this is one of the most difficult passages in all the New Testament," says he, "will be conceded, I believe, by all sober and reflecting critics." It is always difficult to unlock any thing with a wrong key. Either it will not move freely in the wards, or if it skips over them and seemingly completes its revolution, the bolt remains unmoved, and the entrance to the hidden treasure is unclosed. The

Augustinian and Calvinist has found the postulates of his faith in this very passage, the representative character of the first and second Adam, and the key he holds unlocks this rich cabinet without any wrenching or violence, and lays open its rich and shining treasures to his admiring eyes. And so in the treatment of this passage in the book before us, its seeming difficulties are all resolved, when it is shown that the Apostle's purpose was to illustrate, *i. e.* to shed light upon, the divine method of our justification, by showing that it is paralleled by the way in which we came under condemnation; that as the disobedience of the first Adam was reckoned or imputed to us so that we fell under condemnation, so is the obedience of the second Adam, to those given to him in the covenant of redemption, and who were to be his spiritual children, and through him the sons and daughters of God Almighty. And the side-thoughts of the Apostle, which branch off from the main one in the parenthesis from vs. 13-17, for the purpose of proof and explanation, as is his wont, are seen to chime in harmoniously with the grand current of argument and thought, which becomes, in the 8th chapter, at once an anthem of praise and a pæan of victory. The doctrine of imputation is well handled in the Doctrinal and Practical Remarks on this passage, and on Chap. iv. 3-11, he says:

“Let men, especially those who bear the Christian name, cease to oppose and oppugn the blessed doctrine of the *imputation* of Christ's righteousness, seeing it is so clearly taught in many scriptures, vs. 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11. The violence and ingenuity manifested against the doctrine of imputation have often been amazing, sometimes blasphemous, and sometimes scornful, sometimes claiming great love for the truth, sometimes promising to remove difficulties, but always involving us in uncertainty. The latest form of opposition claims to be very mild and gentle. But there is no yielding of the disputed point. A living writer says, ‘It is not uncommon to say, that Christ's righteousness is imputed to us, or that it becomes ours.’ He then adds, that ‘this language to many minds does not convey a very definite conception,’ and that ‘on other minds it conveys erroneous impressions, and seems to be irreconcilable with the common notions of men about moral character.’ These term

are mild compared with those used by Socinus on the same subject, but they are not a whit less insidious or dangerous. Here is an absolute refusal to employ terms used by David and Paul, by the greatest reformers, by the most glorious martyrs, and by the Church of God for long ages; and all under the plea that they are not definite, that they may mislead, and that they do not tally with men's notions. One may search the Christian world through and through, and he will find no terms touching the mystery of salvation better understood for centuries past by the learned and by the common people, or better defined in massive treatises or in concise formulas of doctrine than *imputed righteousness*. Yet we read some modern treatises, avowedly on justification, and never meet these terms except to find some slighting remark, some cavil respecting them. When men shall succeed in excluding imputation from the terms of theology, it will not be long till they will be found disusing or even opposing the word righteousness. The two must stand or fall together. And what will the preaching of the gospel be, when no righteousness remains to be offered to the penitent? No mortal has ever suggested any possible way, in which the believing sinner may avail himself of the righteousness of Christ, if the Lord shall not freely impute it to him. The great objection, flipperantly urged, is that imputation involves a transfer of moral character. But who has ever taught that absurdity? What respectable man has ever held such an opinion? Surely the Christian world never taught it. Christ in his own character was truly, wholly, personally innocent; but when our sins were laid on him he was in the eye of the law, and as our substitute, by imputation guilty, under the curse; yet our moral character was not transferred to him. It would be blasphemy to say that his holy soul was defiled. And yet God so laid on him the iniquities of us all, that he was made sin for us. So we are truly, wholly, personally vile, and when Christ's righteousness is imputed to us, it does not make us personally pure or worthy, but it gives us a title good in the eyes of the law to all the blessings of the covenant of grace. Hodge truly says: 'It never was the doctrine of the Reformation, or of the Lutheran or Calvinistic divines, that the imputation of righteousness affected the moral character of those concerned. It is true, whom God justifies he also sanctifies, but justification is not sanctification, and the imputation of righteousness is not the infusion of righteousness.' Nor has the Church of God ever taught otherwise. Justin Martyr: 'God gave his Son a ransom for us; the holy for transgressors; the innocent for the evil; the just for the

unjust; the incorruptible for the corrupt; the immortal for mortals. For what else could hide or cover our sins but his righteousness? In whom else could we wicked and ungodly ones be justified, but in the Son of God alone? O precious permutation. O unsearchable operation. O beneficence surpassing all expectation! that the sin of many should be hid in one just person, and the righteousness of one should justify many transgressors.'

"There is a class of writers, not very numerous, nor respectable, but confident and pushing, who to avoid the doctrine of the imputation of the righteousness of God our Saviour, declare that our faith itself is accepted by God as righteousness; that faith itself is reckoned as righteousness. If our faith were perfect, this would be accepting one perfect act instead of the perfect obedience due all our lives. But every man's faith, especially as he first lays hold of the gospel, is imperfect, and the best men are the most conscious of such imperfection, Mark ix. 24. One of the best prayers ever offered by the disciples was, Lord, increase our faith. If God should accept any one act of faith, or all acts of faith as the meritorious ground of our acceptance, it would be admitting that his law had been too strict, that an imperfect obedience was all he now required, and that Jesus Christ had lived and died in vain; at least, that he satisfied not the demands of the law or justice, that he brought in no righteousness, and that believing sinners were saved in derogation of perfect righteousness. The same class of writers often urge that God merely treats the sinner as just, and that this is the mercy of God in Christ. But if any one is not righteous, how can God treat him, as if he were righteous? The Bible never speaks of men as *quasi* just, but it often speaks of the just, the righteous. If God acquits as just those who in every sense in the eye of justice are guilty and have no righteousness, what hinders him from saving unbelievers as well as believers? Such a view utterly confounds the distinction made by the apostle between faith and works, the righteousness of God and the deeds of the law. Guyse: 'The act of faith itself is as much a *work*, as any other commanded duty, and were that to be reckoned to us for righteousness, the reward in justifying us would be a debt, due to us, on account of our having performed that work.' Pool: 'Remission of sins presupposeth imputation of righteousness; and he that hath his sins remitted, hath Christ's righteousness first imputed, that so they may be remitted and forgiven to sinners.' It is therefore but a miserable mockery of the sad state of men to represent

justification in any case, as Macknight has done: 'In judging Abraham, God will place on the one side of the account his *duties*, and on the other his *performances*. And on the side of his performances he will place his faith, and by mere favor will value it as equal to a complete performance of his duties, and reward him as if he were a righteous man.' Can it be wondered at that when such sentiments are presented to men, every pious and intelligent Christian is shocked, and every penitent sinner asks, Am I after all left without hope, except that God will save me by my own merits, or at least without any righteousness commensurate to his law? It is impossible ever to quiet an enlightened and tender conscience in man, until you can show him such a righteousness, meeting all the demands of God's law, and let him see how he may make it his own to all the ends of a complete justification, vs. 3, 5, 6, 7, 8."

He resumes the same subject on p. 259, meeting the objections urged against this doctrine step by step. We content ourselves by quoting his reply to one touching the destiny of those who die in infancy:

"Perhaps the most popular and wide-spread objection to the doctrine of the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity is one that is stated with various degrees of coarseness and harshness, holding up the friends of truth as maintaining the doctrine that infants dying in infancy are eternally lost. On this objection the changes are rung with great dexterity, and often with deep malignity. I may say with boldness that in the reading of my lifetime I have found nothing to justify such a charge, but a great deal to the contrary. Hear the Synod of Dort: 'Seeing that we are to judge of the will of God by his word, which testifies that the children of believers are holy, not indeed by nature, but by the benefit of the gracious covenant, in which they are comprehended along with their parents; pious parents ought not to doubt of the election and salvation of their children, whom God hath called in infancy out of this life.' On this article the judicious Thomas Scott of the Church of England, in a note to his translation of the Acts of the Synod of Dort, says: 'The salvation of the offspring of believers, dying in infancy, is here scripturally stated, and not limited to such as are baptized. Nothing is said of the children of unbelievers dying in infancy; and the scripture says nothing. But why might not these Calvinists have as favorable a hope of all infants

dying before actual sin, as anti-Calvinists can have?' Surely this is sound speech that cannot be condemned. Guyse: 'How far the righteousness of the second Adam may extend to them that die in infancy, to prevent an execution of the curse in the future miseries of another world, is not for us to determine; we may quietly leave them in the hands of a merciful God, who we are sure can do them no wrong. And believing parents may with great satisfaction hope well concerning the eternal happiness of their dying infants; since they never lived to cast off God's gracious covenant, into which he has taken believers and their seed, under that better Head, *in whom all nations are blessed*. But then it should be remembered that infants needing Christ's redemption supposes them to have been under a charge of guilt; otherwise there would have been no occasion for any redemption of them; and if they have not the benefit of redemption in the other world, they have none at all, since they are afflicted and die in this.' Chalmers: 'For anything we know, the mediation of Christ may have affected, in a most essential way, the general state of humanity; and, by some mode unexplained and inexplicable, may it have bettered the condition of those who die in infancy.' Hodge: 'If without personal participation in the sin of Adam, all men are subject to death, may we not hope that, without personal acceptance of the righteousness of Christ, all who die in infancy are saved?' In his beautiful poem 'The Work and Contention of Heaven,' the pious Ralph Erskine, to the joy of saints, thus opens the scene:

'Babes thither caught from womb and breast  
Claim right to sing above the rest;  
Because they found the happy shore,  
They never knew nor sought before.'

Wardlaw: 'This I believe and delight in believing, that to whatever extent the curse may reach them, they are all included in the efficacy of the redemption, amongst the objects of saving mercy.' Their salvation is entirely on the ground of Christ's mediation.' Vol. II., p. 269. Dr. Archibald Alexander uses language very strong on this subject. See his *Life*, p. 455: 'It can do harm to hope as much as we can respecting the dead. Let us be as rigid as we please in regard to the living; but it is no dishonor to God, nor disparagement of his truth, to entertain enlarged views of his mercy.' A reason why God may in mercy have said no more on this subject, is that wicked parents may be restrained from infanticide. As it is, many a child is murdered by the parent, to put it out of misery. Wardlaw goes

too far—goes beyond what is revealed—when he says: ‘I believe that even in heathen lands, Christ makes his great adversary outwit himself. The amount of infanticides, produced by ruthless and unnatural superstition, has been fearfully great. But the Redeemer, without its in the least mitigating the atrocious guilt of the perpetrators, has thus, by means of idolatry itself, been multiplying the number of his subjects and peopling heaven.’ We must not be wise above what is written. We must not lay before ungodly men an inducement to murder their own offspring that they may put them forever beyond the reach of misery. The Lord will do right. Let us leave all in his hands. Let us trust him for ever. He has revealed all that faith requires. Thus we see it is not true that the friends of sound doctrine are chargeable with holding any gloomy or unscriptural views on the subject of infant salvation. They hold not a principle which forbids them to entertain as cheerful and enlarged views on the subject as any other persons who believe the Bible. But they do contend, and justly too, that whoever of our race is saved at all, is saved entirely by Christ, and not by native innocence. The pious parent, whose infant offspring has preceded him, exults in the thought that he and they shall sing the same song unto him that loved them, and washed them in his blood.”

Dr. Plumer is fond of enriching his pages and reinforcing his own views by numerous references to, and quotations from, the choicest theological and practical writers who have gone before him. Omitting the versions, there are references to no less than eighty different authors, or quotations from them, in the comments on Rom., chap. v. 1–21. These are so interwoven with his own expository and practical remarks, as not often to break the continuity of his style, but, on the contrary, to add a pleasing variety to his discourse.

The work, too, is eminently practical, and it is in this practical application of biblical doctrine and precept that Dr. Plumer so greatly excels—a gift indeed much to be desired and earnestly to be sought for by every minister of Christ. It is a book which will be acceptable at the fireside of the believing man or woman that desires to know more of the treasures of God’s blessed word; while it is not without its important uses to the student of theology and the minister of the gospel. Its intro-



duction, too, or prolegomena, though not occupied by extended discussion, is appropriate, sufficiently full to furnish all needful preliminary information, and is felicitously expressed; while the fine open page, the paper, printing, and whole "getting up" of the book, is far in advance of what is usual in the religious literature of our country, and is a credit to the printers and publishers by whom it is issued. It is written of the righteous, that "they shall bring forth fruit in old age." This is fulfilled in the case of the author who has furnished in this volume the best book which has of late proceeded from his pen.

## CRITICAL NOTICES.

*Sacred Rhetoric, or a Course of Lectures on Preaching.* Delivered in the Union Theological Seminary of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, in Prince Edward Co., Va. By ROBERT L. DABNEY, D. D., Professor of Systematic and Pastoral Divinity. Richmond: Presbyterian Committee of Publication. 1870.

It was our purpose, in the last number of this journal, to notice with marks of unaffected approval this valuable little treatise. It is not, however, too late to atone for the seeming neglect.

The twenty-four lectures in which the author unfolds his theme are comprised within 350 duodecimo pages; so that each lecture is contained in about fourteen and a half of these. Although, however, the volume is so small, and the lectures are so brief, there is no lack of fulness in the matter. Room has been found for a richly suggestive treatment of the principal topics usually embraced in a Seminary course of Sacred Rhetoric. The whole subject is divided into fourteen subordinate heads of discourse: nine having reference to homiletical matter, and two to homiletical manner; the remaining three being devoted to the "preacher's character with his hearers," to "modes of preparation," and to "public prayer." In their treatment Dr. Dabney has not, of course, laid claim to the impossible merit of originality; but he is certainly entitled to the praise which is due to the man who knows how to clothe old and important thoughts in a new garb, and who has succeeded in presenting them in a series of striking and often unexpected views.

As a sample of the author's way of "putting things," we take the liberty of quoting a passage from his second lecture, entitled "The Preacher's Commission." He is animadverting upon a

sad tendency which has, in late days, been so commonly exhibited in certain quarters to political haranguing from the sacred desk :

“The topics of redemption are dry and repulsive to the great world; and especially, when the public mind is absorbed by agitating questions of social interest. Hence, the minister’s self-love and vanity feel the itching to enjoy some of the *colat* of the exciting discussion; to see his ideas reflected from the faces of sympathising crowds, and to hear the applause of approving supporters. This, to the casual mind, is much more attractive and easy, than the holy, but difficult task, of recalling the hearts jaded and debauched by the engrossing passions of the world, to peaceful and heavenly themes. If the political preacher will candidly examine his own breast, he will surely detect this unworthy and pitiful motive, under his zeal for social reform. This abuse of the pulpit tends directly to produce in the hearers, uncharitableness, spiritual pride, censoriousness, contempt of opponents, and violence; instead of humility, penitence, holy love, and holy living. . . . . Weak defences of this abuse have been attempted. It is asked, ‘Is not the minister also a citizen?’ The answer is, ‘He is a citizen only at the hustings and on a secular day; in the pulpit he is only the ambassador of Christ.’ It is urged again, that Peter, Paul, and the Lord Jesus Christ, taught political duties. We reply: Would that these pests of modern Christianity had truly imitated them; had taken not only their texts, but their discourses, from them, instead of deriving the latter from the newspapers. Let them do as the sacred writers do—teach the duties of allegiance from the Christian side and motive only, ‘that the word of God and his gospel be not blasphemed.’ Another plea is, that Christianity is designed to produce important collateral results in the social order of nations, as that social order reacts on Christianity. The answer is twofold: that these secular results are the minor, the eternal redemption of souls is the chief end of God in his gospel. Second, the only innocent way (as the most efficient) in which the minister of religion can further these secular results, is so to preach each man’s own sins and redemption to him as to make him personally a holy man. When society is thus purified, by cleansing the integral individuals who compose it, then, and then only, will the social corruptions of commonwealths be effectually purged away.”

We would like to continue these quotations, did our limits

allow us the pleasing indulgence. Dr. Dabney's book is well worth a careful perusal on the part of those who are already in the ministry, and will be found by the young and inexperienced preacher a most valuable guide.

We cannot refrain from adding a word of commendation with respect to the manner in which the Presbyterian Committee of Publication at Richmond has given this work to the public. It is elegantly printed, on fine white paper, with good large type, by the use of the best of ink, and is singularly free from typographical errors. The eye rests on the page with real pleasure.

*Manual of Hermeneutics for the Writings of the New Testament.*

By J. J. DOEDES, D. D., Professor of Theology in the University of Utrecht. Translated from the Dutch by G. W. STEGMANN, Jr. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. Pp. 134, 12mo.

This little manual has been some time in our hands, but it has not been convenient to notice it before. It is full of suggestive hints on the subject of interpretation and of references to the literature of this department. In the struggle between Rationalism and the Orthodox faith, which has distracted Holland, the author has been an able champion on the side of truth. In a few expressions of his we would not be willing wholly to concur. He divides the interpreters of the New Testament into three different exegetical schools: The Unrestrainedly Arbitrary, the Slavishly Fettered, and the Legally Free. The last of these is the school to which he belongs. In defining his views he says, "The inspiration theory of the older Lutheran and Reformed systems of doctrine made no small inroads on the liberty of the interpreter. Scripture was considered to be so entirely inspired by the Holy Ghost that the supposition of actual variance between two passages was no where permissible. That one Gospel could have recorded anything with which the account of another could not be reconciled; that in one of the epistles of one apostle anything could be taught at variance with the contents of the epistle of another apostle; that an apostle could have taught something in one epistle, with which it was impossible to reconcile something out of another of his epistles—all that had to be

rejected *a priori* by the interpreter. A lawful and necessarily free research with regard to the sense of what was written, was *entirely* out of the question in this method. Happily," he says, "Protestantism presents something better also to our view in the province of exegesis."

After reading this passage we were led anxiously to inquire what this something better is. And we find that it is, to refer all such things to the department of comparative biblical theology. "The interpreter must needs be blind," he adds, "did he not notice any difference whatever between the Epistle of James and that of Paul to the Romans; between the synoptical Gospels and that of St. John; blind, were he not to notice any difference between the type of doctrine of James, of Peter, of John, of Paul." "In the *historical* portions, he must simply examine what the narratives wish to be taken for, not whether what is there represented as having really occurred, actually took place. This last indeed belongs to the province of historical criticism, which ought to be well distinguished from that of exegesis." "In the so-called *doctrinal* portions of the books of the New Testament, the interpreter is not called to examine whether that which is there taught is truth."

The author is evidently aiming in all this at what is right and true. The interpreter is not responsible for what the New Testament teaches, but only for truly interpreting its meaning. "Let the New Testament," he says, "teach what it teaches; and if men do not agree with it, let them have the courage to say so." "Let the New Testament have its own views."

And yet the New Testament, if inspired, has but one real author. It can never be inconsistent with itself. If the interpreter has drawn forth by his exegetical process a meaning which plainly contradicts what is elsewhere said, there is as really a fault in his process as there is in the mathematician's when he has reached a result which is contrary and subversive of what has been proved before. He should know and realise that there can be no contradictions in scripture, and that truth, though it has many aspects, abides ever essentially the same.

Happily with us the departments of interpretation, theology,

and logic are not thrust so widely apart, that the interpreter may not inquire whether there is not some common principle underlying the direction "Answer a fool according to his folly," and "Answer not a fool according to his folly." "Be not righteous overmuch" and "Be not overmuch wicked." "By grace are ye saved and not by works," and "What doth it profit, though a man say he hath faith and have not works? Can faith save him?" A mere translator can do no more than render words faithfully from one language into another. An expositor is bound to do more, to set forth in true harmony and force the meaning of Scripture, without addition, subtraction, or perversion. The book, however, is worthy of its author, well-intentioned, and in most of its counsels and cautions eminently wise.

*The Old World. Palestine, Syria, and Asia Minor—Travel, Incident, Description, and History.* By JACOB R. FREESE, M. D., United States Commissioner to Paris Exposition, 1867. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1869.

This volume, by one who is unacquainted with Palestine and other countries it speaks of, may be read as a pleasant recreation, not unaccompanied with valuable information as to the land which was trodden by the feet of our Redeemer, and was the scene of his labors and his sufferings. To ourselves, sated as we were by the travels of many tourists, and by the elaborate works of scholars who have traversed its hills and valleys with curious eyes, and with minds prepared for antiquarian researches by previous study; or others, much of whose life has been spent among these scenes, and who could speak with authority, the book has brought to us little that was remarkable or new as to Palestine. We have been far more interested in that portion of it which takes us among the Druses of Mount Lebanon, the "Sights of Damascus," the ruins of Baalbec, the Maronites of Lebanon and Anti-lebanon, the city of Beyrout, the coast towns of Syria, and the city of Constantine the Great, the queen city of two quarters of the world over so much of which her power was felt in "the olden time." If we ever make the tour of Palestine ourselves, which we shall never do unless the doctrine

of metempsychosis proves true, we shall commence our pilgrimage at Beyrout, where nearly all travellers close theirs, and where this author wishes he had begun his. We shall not then have the enchantment which hangs over the "goodly land" once "flowing with milk and honey," so cruelly dispelled, as it seems to have been with him, when, landing at Jaffa, he travelled wearily over rocks and valleys of barrenness, dry beds of brooks, by "wells without water," and beheld in the distance, from a barren summit of rock, "Jerusalem the holy," "the city of the great King," with its rough, old, jagged, uninviting walls, with here and there a convent, and a few straggling houses on the outside, and his heart sank in disappointment within him. We will reverse the route. We will start at Beyrout, visit Baalbec and Damascus; we will visit Nazareth, Cana of Galilee, and Nain; we will approach Jerusalem by the Damascus road; we will survey it from Mount Scopus, where we shall have a complete panorama of the city before us, with the Mount of Olives, and the valley of Jehoshaphat, to add to its picturesque beauty.

Dr. Freese tells us that more than two hundred Americans visited Syria in 1867, the year of his own travels, to say nothing of other tourists; and that on the ship that bore him from Beyrout, there were eight hundred Russians returning from their pilgrimage to Jerusalem and the Jordan, to their homes on the plains and steppes of their native land. Not in their names, but in those of the future travellers of our own country, do we thank him for the practical advice he gives respecting travel in these Eastern lands in his closing chapter, which we commend to the attention of all such.

*A Critical Greek and English Concordance of the New Testament.* Prepared by CHARLES F. HUDSON, under the direction of HORACE L. HASTINGS, Editor of "*The Christian*;" Revised and completed by EZRA ABBOT, LL. D., Assistant Librarian of Harvard University. Boston, Mass. 1870. Pp. 510. 16mo.

We are not certain (*ex qua officina*) from what workshop this book proceeds. The (*opifex*) workman is Charles F. Hudson, a graduate of the Western Reserve College, the foremost man in

his class; who received his education at Lane Seminary under Drs. Beecher, Stowe, and D. H. Allen; was congregational minister at Sycamore, Illinois; and after some years changed his views as to the nature and destiny of man, and was released from pastoral responsibilities. He wrote books, "Debt and Grace, as related to the Doctrine of a Future Life;" "Christ our Life: The Scriptural Argument for Immortality through Christ Alone;" "Human Destiny, a Critique on Universalism," etc., the titles good enough, though we are ignorant and somewhat doubtful of the contents. The book before us is an effort to reduce to the size of a *vade mecum*, which can be snugly deposited in one's pocket, the substance of THE ENGLISHMAN'S CONCORDANCE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, prepared under the direction and at the munificent expense of Mr. George V. Wagram of London. Mr. Hastings is the inventor and projector, who was sitting one drizzly day in October "beneath the Bethel Tent near Eaton Corners, in East Canada," pulling from his pocket Bagster's Pocket Edition of Schmidius, he felt bitterly the want of his "Englishman's Greek Concordance," which, being heavy, like the Dutchman's anchor, was unfortunately left at home. Whereupon, the idea occurred to him that the Englishman's Concordance could be abridged, as Cruden's is in Bagster's pocket edition, by classifying the meanings of the Greek words as translated, and referring to the chapter and verse without quoting the texts. And so meeting with this same Mr. Hudson and Dr. Abbot of Cambridge, and they approving the plan, the laboring oar was put into Mr. Hudson's hand, and after long and weary days this book was produced. Not that the book was written with an oar, but with a "stick;" or rather it was never written at all. It was just printed. It was indeed "composed," but not inscribed either on paper, vellum, or parchment, but just sent to the press so. Mr. Hudson had learned the printer's *art* in his early days. Bruder's Concordance, and the most important critical editions of the New Testament, were procured; the various readings which were to be incorporated in the text were written on the margin of the Englishman's Concordance; and the references of that and of Bruder's were verified by Mr.



Hudson and Miss Elizabeth A. Annable. A miniature printing office was fitted up within a few rods of Harvard University, and Mr. Hudson, having prepared a "printer's stick" containing several partitions, with the Concordances, and the editions of Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles, open before him—selecting a Greek word from the Englishman's Greek Concordance, and that translation nearest to its primary sense—set the translation in bold faced type under the word, and then references to all the passages in the English version where it was so translated. Then placing the nearest secondary sense in another compartment of the "stick," he followed it by references to the places where it was so translated, and so on, till the different translations were exhausted, inserting with each reference any various reading which occurred in the four above-mentioned editions of the Greek Testament. Mr. Hudson pursued this labor of love for nearly three years; but he was cut off by disease and death ere the few last pages were completed. These were added by Dr. Abbot, under the superintendence of Mr. Hastings, who has borne the pecuniary responsibility of the whole.

Such is the *genesis* of this little volume. Besides the index at the end, of the words of the English version, which answer to the words of the original Greek, there is a condensed Appendix of various readings in larger clauses, in which the evidence for and against the more noted doubtful passages is briefly given; and a Supplement is added embracing those readings of Tischendorf's 8th edition, which vary from those of his 7th edition, as far as Luke xxi. 21. The rest will be completed when the 8th edition of Tischendorf is finished. The new readings will be furnished in a separate form, if desired, to those who have it here incomplete.

It is a useful little manual, in that it arranges the meanings of the Greek words as given in the English version, and refers to the texts where these meanings are found, as they belong under each. In the Englishman's Greek Concordance, the texts are *presented to the eye* in the order in which the Greek word occurs from the first of Matthew to the last of Revelation.

Here the text is not presented to the eye, but is referred to by chapter and verse only, under each specific meaning. There is the trouble, therefore, of finding the text before you can judge whether the meaning is rightly given. The book is compendious. The original from which it is made, in Harper's edition, is a large octavo of 882 pages. More perfect than either, and far more convenient to use, would be the Englishman's Greek Concordance, with the texts printed sufficiently full to show the connection of sense, but arranged by a competent person under the classified meanings of the Greek words as here, accompanied with the variations which the most ancient MSS. and best critical editions give. The object is a good one. It gives and could give no new rendering of texts, for the version of King James's is the basis of the whole. Whether they were rightly rendered or not by the English translators, the scholar must determine for himself; though such books of reference as the one we suggest would save him no small amount of labor, and be so far exceedingly useful.

*A Manual of Composition—a Text Book for Schools and Colleges.* By JOHN S. HART, LL.D., Principal of the New Jersey State Normal School. Philadelphia: Eldredge & Bro.

This volume is deserving of notice as being an exhaustive compend of the rules which commonly come within the rhetorical studies of the higher schools. It is not philosophical, like Campbell's great work, nor, like Whately's greater, is it scientifically confined to the strict limits of the subject. It probably includes too much; but is on the whole well adapted to the class-room, where the teacher is desirous of grounding his pupils in the practical truths of this branch of belles-lettres scholarship. Such indeed is its design, and the author has judiciously accomplished his part of it.

*The Duty and the Discipline of Extemporary Preaching.* By F. BARHAM ZINCKE, Vicar of Wherstead, and Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen. New York: Chas. Scribner & Co. 1867.

We take sincere pleasure in calling the attention of our clerical readers to this little volume. It delightfully describes the expe-

rience of a minister of the gospel, who, after being confined slavishly to his manuscript sermons for a number of years, succeeded by slow degrees in becoming an unusually good extemporaneous preacher. The method he adopted is applicable to all, who, although of moderate talents, are desirous of elevating the standard and increasing the interest of their pulpit performances, and who are willing to expend their industry in this most desirable direction.

*The First Six Books of Virgil's Æneid, with Explanatory Notes, a Lexicon and Map, &c., &c.* By EDWARD SEARING, A. M., Professor of Latin in Milton College, Wisconsin. A. S. Barnes & Co., New York and Chicago; Woolworth, Ainsworth & Co., Boston.

This volume was published in 1868. It is an elegant edition of Virgil as to that portion which is generally read in schools. We can confidently commend it to teachers and pupils every where; and also to the lover of the Latin classics who wishes again to enjoy the luxury of a brief stay amid the beauties of the Æneid. When we received this book, so taking did we find its clear, well-printed, illuminated, octavo page, that we at once commenced its perusal, and having read it with care to the end, we feel at liberty to express our gratification at the manner in which the whole has been presented. The notes are discriminating, although not very full when compared with Cooper's edition, or Anthon's, and we prefer it to either. The lexicon is excellent. The pictorial illustrations are very pleasing.

*Old Song and New.* By MARGARET J. PRESTON. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1870. 312 pages.

A genial reviewer of the works of others and a warm appreciator of all that is beautiful in both past and present literature, Mrs. Preston is entitled to gentle treatment in her own person, even were her poems far less worthy creations of art than they are. But, as it is, she deserves more than the simple courtesy which her kindly spirit of criticism would enforce from any just mind. Noble thoughts expressed in rich and luminous words, touching utterances of the heart, something of the sinewy

strength of man's genius, tempered and softened by that grace which belongs to the woman's soul, fill these pages with their sweet light, and draw us on to delighted sympathy with every mood to which she strings her lyre. While there is an occasional mannerism here and there, which unpleasantly reminds us of Mrs. Browning, (for all obvious imitation, even though it be unconscious,) is unpleasant), there is so large a body of song clearly her own in every sense, that we hail her with glad recognition as a true poet in her own right and one of whom the South may well be proud. The chords she strikes are few; but the subjects of her songs are sufficiently varied to prevent monotony. They are all suffused with that love-light of the soul which converts the simplest things that concern human life into lovely kinship with the things that belong to the life in the home beyond. Feeling, so much more the familiar spirit of the sweetest song than thought, claims its high prerogative and breathes its loving wisdom into every note of hers. The tenderest and sweetest of her poems are those that come from the mother-heart, Christian yearnings, full of faith and hope, after the child that has gone before to the bosom of the Father. Such are *The Grief of Bathsheba*, *The Baby's Message*, *Little Jeanie's Sleep*, *Out of the Shadow*, *The Open Gate*, *Alone*, and *The Vision of the Snow*. One of these we give entire, feeling that such of our readers as have not seen the book will thank us for refreshing them with so glad a strain of faith overmastering grief as is

## THE BABY'S MESSAGE.

- "O, it is beautiful!—Lifted so high,—  
Up where the stars are,—into the sky,—  
Out of the fierce, dark grasp of pain,  
Into the rapturous light again!
- "Whence do ye bear me, shining ones,  
Over the dazzling paths of suns?  
Wherefore am I thus caught away  
Out of my mother's arms to-day?
- "Never before have I left her breast,—  
Never been elsewhere rocked to rest:  
Yet,—I am wrapt in a maze of bliss,  
Tell me what the mystery is!"

—“Baby-spirit, whose wondering eyes  
Kindle, ecstatic with surprise,  
This is the ending of earthly breath,—  
This is what mortals mean by death.

“Far in the silences of the blue,  
See where the splendor pulses through;  
Thither, released from a world of sin,  
Thither we come to guide thee in:

“In through each seven-fold, circling band,—  
In where the white child-angels stand,—  
Up to the throne, that thou mayest see  
Him who was once a babe like thee.”

—“O ye seraphs of love and light!  
Stay for a little your lofty flight:  
Stay, and adown the star-sown track,  
Haste to my weeper—haste ye back!

“Tell her how filled and thrilled I am,—  
Tell her how wrapt in boundless calm:  
Tell her I soar, I sing, I shine,—  
Tell her the heaven of heaven's is mine!”

—“Tenderest comforter,—Faith's own word,  
Sweeter than ours, her heart hath heard:  
Softly her solac'd tears now fall;  
Christ's one whisper hath told her all!”

The poems in this volume are divided into five separate classes, entitled respectively: From Hebrew Story, From Greek Story, Ballad and Other Verse, Sonnets, and Religious Pieces. The pieces from Hebrew story, and some of the scattered strains of the ballad order, seem to us the best. The conception of character and situation in the semi-dramatic pieces is very fine; and the language is often exquisite. How richly descriptive is this painting to the soul, of how David played before the king troubled with the evil spirit!

“Would that thy listening ear, three days agone,  
Had heard the Virgin-song,—‘the Alamothe,’  
Whose fluty richness ravishes the sense  
Like quick, thick bird-notes dropt straight out of heaven!”

How beautiful Saul's expression of relief after the singing!

"Hath the boy magic hidden in his touch?  
 Abner, the reaching voice, like a cool hand,  
 Gropes through the smothering darkness,—feels for mine,  
 And leads me back,—back to the bleat of lambs,  
 And lowing herds among the thymy hills;  
 The beautiful hills from whence doth come mine aid!"

But it would take up more space than is at our disposal, to note all the beauties which are strewn through these pleasant pages; and we will only name a few of the pieces which we venture to call our favorites. These are the charming lyric *Saint Cecilia*, so airily rhythmical that the words seem to dance to a fine invisible music they bring with them,—invisible as far as any notes are concerned: we do not choose to say inaudible, because we think we hear it as we read; and then *The Rain-drop's Fate*, *Artist-Work*, *The Complaint of Santa Claus*, *Poor Carlotta*, and *The By-Gone* (*A Southern Christmas Carol*), a few lines of which we must quote:

"Let us tell to our children the story,  
 With earnest and tremulous mouth,  
 Of the sweetness, the grace, and the glory  
 That hallowed the Homes of the South.

. . . . .  
 The eyes of our children will glisten,  
 Half tearful, half doubtful, perchance;  
 And they'll think that it sounds, as they listen,  
 Like the page of a feudal romance."

That admirable critic, Mr. Wm. Hand Browne of Baltimore, while warmly commending their noble tone, has condemned the form into which our author has chosen to cast her *sonnets*. We concur with him in this judgment, and cannot help feeling that they have lost much, both in melody and point, by their ill-chosen structure. The finish of these little pieces,—in which the brilliance of the gem depends so much upon the style of the setting,—would certainly have been more exquisite, had she chosen the simpler forms, in which the thoughts of Sir Philip Sidney and

of Shakspeare glided with easy grace. It is true that she may cite such exemplars as Petrarca himself, and Uhland, and Mrs. Browning, among others, for this mode of fashioning the framework of her thought; but it is none the less artificial, and tends to mar the sweetness of the strain. But the beauty of thought and the serene stateliness of soul which fills these sonnets will not let us note long in a carping spirit the faultiness of their structure. The Christian will find in many of them refreshing utterances of faith in Him who died for us, and in the ever bounteous mercies of God, and will set these precious clusters plucked from the Vine of the garden of God side by side with such closet treasures as George Herbert's holy breathings, and the best of Keble's. We give one of the sonnets as a fitting close to our meagre notice:

## OURS.

“ Most perfect attribute of love, that knows  
 No separate self,—no conscious *mine* nor *thine*;  
 But mystic union, closer, more divine  
 Than wedded soul and body can disclose.  
 No flush of pleasure on thy forehead glows,  
 No mist of feeling in thine eyes can shine,  
 No faintest pain surprise thee, but there goes  
 The lightning-spark along love's viewless line,  
 Bearing with instant message to my heart,  
 Responsive recognition. Suns or showers  
 May come between as; silences may part;  
 The rushing world know not, nor care to know;—  
 Yet back and forth the flashing secrets go,  
 Whose sacred, only sesame is,—*ours!* ”

*Faith's Battles and Victories; or, Thoughts for Troublous Times.* Rev. JOHN S. GRASTY. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co., 770 Broadway, Corner 9th Street. 1870. Pp. 285. 16mo.

This is one of the very best popular religious volumes which ever came into our hands. The author says it is his purpose to “verify the opinion, that in every leading event and character of the Bible a lesson is inculcated, both specific and distinctive,”

and that his study of the Oracles has showed him "unity in diversity in the great purposes of God throughout centuries of time, and in countries the most remote." Accordingly he aims to illustrate the great lesson of faith in God's grace and God's providence, from a great variety of histories of the worthies in the gallery of Scripture. It is not generally the *whole* history, but special parts of the history of each, that Mr. Grasty discusses. And so Abraham, Lot, Jacob, Job, Balaam, Moses, Mordecai, Samson, Nehemiah, Paul and Silas, and Stephen, etc., are made to teach us on whom the ends of the world are come.

It is not a critical, but a practical work, and it is calculated to be very popular. The author has fine descriptive powers, but he never loses sight for a moment of his main point. Many of his views are original, and all appear to be sound. We could only regret that some of his chapters, as for example, that on Job, are too short to be thoroughly complete in the discussion.

As samples of the style and manner of the author, we quote a few paragraphs :

"What a singular history is this! What a medley of virtue and vice! And yet the name of Samson is enrolled among the worthies. For the time would fail me, says the Apostle, to tell of Gideon and of Barak and of Samson, etc., who through faith subdued kingdoms, etc. Nor was this information imparted without merciful design. A variety of examples are furnished in the Scriptures, not only for warning and reproof, but encouragement and consolation. The substantial identity of human experience in every generation is clearly revealed. Many uninspired biographies are not well calculated to comfort the feeble-minded and support the weak. A good man dies, and a too partial friend, gathers up all favorable incidents and sends these forth to mankind as a veritable 'Memoir.' Every deed of charity, every noble act of self-denial, all the painstaking of life is recorded. But seasons of shortcoming, periods of wavering and doubt, grievous falls and days of unfaithfulness, these derelictions are carefully withheld.

"The humble but conscientious reader is pointed to a model which discourages rather than inspires. For the reflection is irresistible, that if such biography be reliable, then true piety is attainable only by the few, and the soul that opened the 'Memoir' for solace and consolation goes away discomfited, if not in



despair. The bruised reed is broken, and the smoking flax is quenched. But can that be a true history which develops the life under phases the most favorable? For, does not the soul need to know, for admonition and instruction, not only the good, but also the evil? Nothing short of this is unsuspecting and edifying biography. For the chart of a journey that includes smooth places exclusively, and leaves out the rough, is not only imperfect in outline, but may prove fatally deceptive. If gulfs are to be crossed, if defiles are to be passed, and if here and there the foregoing pilgrim has fallen and been wounded, the whole truth must be told. A map that comprehends meadow and pasture ground, and omits wilderness and sterile waste, is no inapt illustration of those uninspired biographies, which depict most gloriously the triumphs of grace and pass over in silence the ever-recurring declensions. The Scriptures are honest, and therefore comfort while they warn. The inspired penman tells the whole story. When Abraham obeys God and lays Isaac his only son on the altar, the allegiance is credited, and patriarchal example held up for imitation. But when the father of the faithful prevaricates and deals unfairly with Abimelech, then this transaction, too, is also minutely recorded. On one page we have Jacob wrestling with an angel, and as a prince prevailing with God; but the faithful historian on another faithfully depicts Israel's complaints, when blinded by sorrow, he exclaimed, Joseph is not and Simeon is not, and ye will take Benjamin away; all these things are against me. Lot is counted among the worthies, but how particularly and graphically are described all his melancholy defections and backslidings! At one moment David's fidelity, courage, and magnanimity, are the subjects of comment; but a faithful revelation does not hesitate, on the other hand, to make bare his occasional impurity and blood-guiltiness. Jehovah himself is the witness for Job that he was a just man that feared God and eschewed evil; but when an hour of unwonted agony and temptation arrived, there are registered intimations of frailty and imperfection even in the righteous man of Uz. For Job in his disquietude cursed the day wherein he was born. The Master makes the inquiry, Whom do men say that I the Son of man am? And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona, for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven; and I say also unto thee that thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. But it is recorded of

this same disciple, that afterward he denied bitterly, with an oath, the blessed Saviour whom he had so nobly confessed.

“And hence the erring but penitent soul feels disburdened when it turns to the sure word of prophecy, from those exaggerated, not to say romantic, accounts of “apples of gold in pictures of silver,” histories of a struggle without weariness, battles without scars, and a pilgrimage through pitch and defilement, with garments all white and unsullied. The reader feels that between himself and those heroes of uninspired story there is an impassable gulf; but when the divine record is searched, the personages there are one’s own kindred and blood, the veritable descendants of the same common father. And as page after page is perused, the hopes of the believer revive, and ‘the head is lifted up’ at the thought, that saints of all ages endured identical temptation, and stemmed the same floods through which he now passes. Pp. 146–150.

“There is, however, in every community a particular class, the severity of whose judgments are in exact disproportion to the intrinsic excellence of their own gracious attainment. Nor are these censors to be found always among the impious and sceptical. For it was a member of the church who strained at a gnat and swallowed a camel; who devoured widows’ houses, and for a pretence made long prayers; while he thanked God publicly that he was not as other men are. It was the Scribe and the Pharisee who built the tombs of the prophets and garnished the sepulchres of the righteous, whilst, as yet, their own garments were reeking with all the martyred blood from Abel to Zacharias. It was the professedly righteous man who paid tithes of anise, mint, and cummin; while the weightier matters of law, judgment, mercy, and faith, were forgotten. It was an ecclesiastical ruler who flaunted his own righteousness in the face of the Almighty, and at the very foot of the mercy seat vilified the publican. Pp. 154, 155.

“Governments are changed, ecclesiastical forms can be altered, centuries may pass, but the generation of Pharisees never perishes. Wherever society exists the same plausible sect can be found. Cold, money-loving, with a nature too passionless to be overborne by fiery temptation, and a soul too avaricious and sordid to gratify craving, the sleek conventionalist boasts of ostensible well-doing, while inside the heart there are rottenness and corruption. This man is regularly at church, sanctimonious in manner, and in the performance of certain outward obligations rigidly punctilious. Secret sins are atoned for by external conformity. But if a brother is tempted and openly stumbles,

the ceremonial professor grows bitter and indignant. Against the dram-drinker, the swearer, the devotee of pleasure, the zeal of this Jehu is preëminently directed. Ought not mankind to be sanctified? This man pays promptly his pew rents, patronizes the preacher, speaks well of religion, casts a mite into the treasury, sits down at the Lord's table, and holds in utter detestation those frailties and blackslidings of the passionate and daring which are patent to the world, and yield no percentage. The sepulchre is well garnished and multitudes are deceived. But must not the patience of every good man be tried when the mask is removed, and the hypocrite appears in his nakedness, oppressing the hireling, and despoiling the poor, heaping up riches by usury, and extorting without scruple gains that are unlawful from the straits of the unfortunate? Noah and Lot were overtaken by drunkenness; David was guilty even of adultery and murder; while a disciple of Jesus denied him with an oath; but these men afterwards repented and were saved. But it is a solemn and significant saying of the Master, 'Children, how hard is it for them that trust in riches to enter into the kingdom of God? It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God.' Achan, Balaam, Elisha's servant, Dives, Ananias, Sapphira, and Judas, these are the unequivocal beacons which indicate inevitably the doom of the covetous." Pp. 156-158.







# THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW

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

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

✎ All Communications should be addressed to the Editors, 1215 Woodrow, Columbia, S. C. No subscription discontinued unless a special order is given, and all arrearages are paid, or the first number of a volume is published.

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

✎ Ministers of the Gospel, and others, who shall obtain new subscribers, and remit the regular price, (Three Dollars each,) will be entitled to a copy of the REVIEW for one year; if they so prefer, one dollar for each new subscriber.

✎ Subscribers changing their Post Office are requested to give immediate notice of the same to the Publisher, and the REVIEW will be sent to their former office.

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

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

THE SOUTHERN  
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW,

CONDUCTED BY

AN ASSOCIATION OF MINISTERS

IN

COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA.

Vol. XXII.

APRIL, MDCCCLXXI.

No. 2.

COLUMBIA, S. C.

PRINTED AT THE PRESBYTERIAN PUBLISHING HOUSE.

1871.



## CONTENTS.

ARTICLES	PAGE
I. The Doctrinal Various Readings of the Greek New Testament, . . . . .	191
II. Memoir of the Rev. Samuel B. McPheeters, D. D.,	235
III. The Church and the World, . . . . .	255
IV. Ulster. By the Rev. T. B. BALCH, Prince William Co., Va., . . . . .	270
V. The Life of Christ, . . . . .	282
IX. CRITICAL NOTICES :	
1. Parker's <i>Ad Clerum</i> . Advices to a Young Preacher, 311. 2. Anderson's History of the Evangelisation of the Sandwich Islands, 312. 3. Plumer's Short Sermons for the People, 316. 4. Gilfillan's Martyrs, Heroes, and Bards of the Scottish Covenant, 318. 5. Epistle to the Hebrews compared with the Old Testament. 319.	

# THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXII.—NO. 2.

---

APRIL, MDCCCLXXI.

---

## ARTICLE I.

### THE DOCTRINAL VARIOUS READINGS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT GREEK.

*Novum Testamentum* Græce et Latine. CAROLUS LACHMANNUS.  
Berlin: 1832, 1842.

TREGELLES on the Printed Text of the Greek New Testament.  
London: Bagster. 1854.

*Novum Testamentum* Græce. Edited by CONSTANTINE TISCHENDORF.  
Leipsic: 1862.

*Authorised English Version of the New Testament, with Introduction and Various Readings from the three most celebrated Manuscripts of the Original Greek Text.* By C. TISCHENDORF. Tauchnitz Edition. Leipsic: 1869.

*Biblorum Codex Sinait. Petropolitanus, Fac Simile.* By CONSTANTINE TISCHENDORF. (Imperial Edition, Folio.) St. Petersburg. A. D. 1862.

The magnificent work, whose name stands last in this list, may be said to complete a marked stage in the progress, or at least in the rotation, of the art of *biblical criticism*. It very properly suggests, not only some inquiry into the value and authority of the Sinai manuscript introduced to the learned world by Dr. Constantine Tischendorf, but a review and comparison of the

VOL. XXII., NO. 2.—1.

present and fashionable opinions of biblical critics. We call these the opinions now fashionable; for those who watch the course of this art, are aware that there is as truly a fashion in it—infesting its votaries—as in ladies' bonnets, medicines, or cravats.

We will premise by stating a few conclusions, in which all schools of learned critics may be said to agree with the enlightened friends of the Bible. First: No one claims for the *Textus Receptus*, or common Greek Text of the New Testament, any sacred right, as though it represented the *ipsissima verba*, written by the inspired men in every case. It is admitted on all hands that it is but a reprint, substantially, of Erasmus's Fifth Basle Edition of the New Testament, which that eminent scholar edited from a few manuscripts, for none of which an eminent antiquity was claimed, and belonging, in the main, to the Κοινή Ἐκδοσις, or Constantinopolitan family; and that it is just as it has been transmitted from his day, through the presses of Robert Stephens in Paris, and the Elzevirs of Holland. It is therefore not asserted to be above emendation. But, second: This received text contains undoubtedly all the essential facts and doctrines intended to be set down by the inspired writers; for if it were corrected with the severest hand, by the light of the most divergent various readings found in any ancient MS. or version, not a single doctrine of Christianity, nor a single cardinal fact, would be thereby expunged. Third: As more numerous collations of ancient documents are made, the number of various readings is, of course, greatly increased; but yet the effect of these comparisons is, on the whole, to confirm the substantial correctness of the received text more and more. This is because these various readings (which are now counted by the hundred thousand) are nearly all exceedingly minute and trivial; and chiefly because, while they diverge, on the one side and the other, from the received text, the divergence is always within these minute bounds; which proves that text to be always within a very slight distance, if at all removed, from the infallible autographs. It is as though an engineer were attempting to fix the exact line of some ancient road. The common tradition points

to an existing road as being the same. Some attempts to verify its site, by the *data* given by ancient mathematicians and geographers, show that the ancient track probably varied a foot or two here and there. This discovery greatly excites the engineer's curiosity; he ransacks the ancient writers, and finds a great many other *data*. These, upon the severest application, show a multitude of other points where the modern road probably varied a minute space from the original. But they all concur in greatly increasing the evidence, that the ancient track was, with these minute exceptions, just where it now is; and even if all the variations of site were introduced, the road would still lie upon the same bed substantially. The wayfarer may then be fully re-assured; and leaving the antiquaries to fatigue themselves with their squabbles, whether at this valley or that rivulet the ancient thoroughfare lay a foot more to the right or a foot to the left, he would joyfully proceed, confident that the existing one was still the "King's ancient highway of holiness," and that it would lead him to the city of the apostles and martyrs. Such is the resultant total of this criticism, with all its variations; and this is gladly admitted by all right-minded critics, from the pious Bengel to this day. Fourth: The admitted result of more extensive and thorough collations of the received text with ancient documents is to retrieve its credit, even as to the slight degree in which earlier criticism seemed to impugn it. No respectable critic would now hazard his credit by proposing as many emendations as Griesbach; and it is said that Tischendorf, in his latest edition, restores a number of the received readings which he had himself criticised in his earlier ones.

It may also be premised, that since critical investigations have reached the results admitted above, and since the most laborious research seems to give so small a promise of a definite end of debate on the remaining and unessential variations, one is not surprised to find that this branch of study has lost its interest with the more practical and vigorous judgments. Such men feel that they have something better to do with their time and energies. The minds for which criticism retains its fascination are usually of that peculiar and "crotchety" type found among

antiquarians. The intelligent reader is therefore not surprised to find, along with much labor and learning, a "plentiful lack" of sober and convincing common sense.

In confirmation of this, let us review the different codes of judicial canons which the critics of the text have constructed. We shall find them continually varying, each one obnoxious to grave objections, and the question still unsettled. We find, then, that Bentley, the great English critic, proposed to discard the use of "*conjecture*," and to reform the text by the supposed agreement of the oldest Greek and the oldest Latin MS. The celebrated Bengel proposed to consider the *recensions* or families of extant MSS., as divided into the Egyptian and the Asiatic; and to give to the former, as represented by the Alexandrine MS., the decided preference. His critical canon for deciding between competing readings was: "*Proclivi scriptioni prestat ardua*"—the difficult reading has the preference over the easy one. The learned Arminian, Wetstein, in his critical edition of the New Testament, discarded all distribution of the ancient MSS. into families or recensions. He differed diametrically from Bentley, in using "*conjecture*" freely to determine the true reading, and in condemning the oldest Greek *codices* which showed the nearest resemblance to the oldest MS. of Jerome's Latin version (the ones which both Bentley and Bengel chiefly valued) as having been interpolated from the Latin, and so of little authority. He determined the weight of competing *codices* as witnesses for or against a given reading chiefly by their number. The majority ruled with him. The celebrated Griesbach, who may be said to have first constructed a critical text of the New Testament, departed again from these doctrines of Wetstein. He distributed the ancient *codices* into three families or recensions, (not absolutely, but generally distinguished by the character of their variations): a western family, originally used by the churches of West Africa, Italy, Spain, and Gaul; an Alexandrine recension and a Byzantine. The first he considered the oldest; the last the most recent and mixed, and therefore of least authority. This family he found nearest to the received text, and the individual MSS. in it strictly

resembling each other. Such was also substantially the view of Michaelis. Griesbach's fundamental canon was, that each of these families or recensions constituted an independent witness for or against a reading. That reading was entitled usually to stand, which was supported by two out of the three families. He made use of "conjecture," but did not claim for it the right to introduce a reading, unless it was supported also by some ancient evidence, either of MS., or patristic citation. When it seemed doubtful for which of two readings the ancient witnesses bore strongest testimony, he gave the preference to that which was unusual, over that which was usual; to the shorter over the longer; to the unintelligible one over the clear; and to the harsh over the smooth.

The next critic was Hug, who overthrew Griesbach's system of recensions utterly. He distributes the ancient *codices* into three recensions: that of Origen, in Palestine; of Hesychius, in Alexandria; and of Lucian, in Antioch and Byzantium. The acute and learned Irish divine, Nolan, in his "Inquiry into the Integrity of the Greek Vulgate," (a work which defends the received text with matchless ingenuity and profound learning,) also demolished Griesbach's system. Nolan's object is to prove the Byzantine family of *codices*, which approaches most nearly to the commonly received text, the oldest and purest. This recension he considers to be represented in the Moscow MS., whose authority had been so ably advocated by Matthiæ, on grounds similar to Dr. Nolan's. He also shows that Griesbach's preference for the Alexandrine *codices*, and for Origen their supposed editor, was utterly wrong; there being no evidence that Origen's authority ever affected the text of the *codices* used in Alexandria, and that father being moreover utterly untrustworthy as a witness to the state of the text. Dr. Nolan substantiates his valuation of the three recensions which he recognises, chiefly by a comparison with the Latin versions. He regards Jerome's version as representative of the *codices* current in Palestine in the fourth century; and the old Italic as representing that text originally current in Asia Minor and Byzantium. To this fact, his chief witness is the splendid Brescia

MS. of the Latin version, which he believes to be unquestionably the uncorrupted old Italic, and which corresponds remarkably with the Moscow and other Byzantine codices.

The system afterwards adopted (1836) in Scholz' New Testament was substantially similar. He found two prevalent recensions or families of manuscripts, the Alexandrine and the Byzantine. The latter contains many MS., the former few. He gives many strong arguments to show, from the scenes of the apostles' and evangelists' labors, from the ascendancy of the Patriarch of Constantinople, and from the early conquest of Palestine and Egypt by the Saracens, that the most numerous and the most correct MSS. would be preserved in the Constantinopolitan churches and monasteries. He also argues from internal marks, that the few *codices* of the Alexandrine family were not copied for the purposes of Church use, and did not, at the early date when they were transcribed, represent the *κοινή ἑκδοσις*. Dr. Scholz devoted the best years of his life exclusively to travels, collation of MSS., and similar critical labors, in the course of which he examined and compared six hundred and thirty MSS. The result of this immense labor was to reinstate the credit of the received text in a multitude of places where Griesbach had assailed it, and to show that it presents the most trustworthy text extant.

We now reach what may be called the recent school of biblical critics, represented by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Alford. Their common traits may be said to be an almost contemptuous dismissal of the received text, as unworthy not only of confidence, but almost of notice; the rejection of the great mass of the *codices* of the *κοινή ἑκδοσις* as recent and devoid of nearly all authority; and the settlement of the text by the testimony of a very few MSS. for which they claim a superior antiquity, with the support of a few fathers and versions, whom they are pleased to regard as judicious and trustworthy.

Lachmann (whose critical edition of the Greek New Testament was published in Berlin in 1832 and 1850,) professes to reject conjecture utterly, as a basis for the introduction of a reading; and boasts that there is not an emendation in his whole

edition which rests on that foundation. His system of judicial canons may be said to be summed up in this maxim: that those are the true readings of the inspired writers which are supported by the *testes vetustissimi et longinqui*. That is, if he finds a given reading sustained by very old MSS., versions, and fathers, from very remote quarters of Christendom, this is the reading which was originally written. And there are, in his eyes, very few of either which are safe witnesses. Among the fathers, he relies chiefly upon the quotations of Irenæus, Origen, and Cyprian; among the versions, upon the pure *codices* (as he supposes them) of Jerome, and among the Greek MSS. upon the Vatican, Alexandrine, Codex Ephremi, and a few others. The Latin *Brescia Codex*, which Nolan regarded as so evidently a precious and uncorrupted exemplar of the Old Italic, he deems worthless, as being interpolated from the Greek of the *κοινὴ ἐκδοσις*.

The system of Tischendorf is very simple, consisting in the adoption of what he supposes to be the oldest Greek Codices as his guides, the Sinaitic, discovered and edited by himself, the Vatican, the Alexandrine; with the assistance of a few of the more ancient fragments, and of the Latin, Syriac, and Sahidic versions.

Tregelles proposes as an unfailing means for discriminating the authoritative *codices* from the incorrect, the following, which he vaunts as his canon of "comparative criticism." Select a father of the second or third century who is trustworthy, and who appears to quote *verbatim*. If he quotes such readings, in a number of cases, as are characteristic of a given *codex* or version now existing, we are authorised to conclude that this *codex* or version is, in general, a correct example of the actual Bible which that father used; that is, of the recognised text of the second or third century. Tregelles especially lauds Lachmann, because he first introduced the fashion distinctively, of ignoring the Greek vulgate or received text as simply naught, and of constructing his supposed original text wholly from other testimonies. This method, substantially adopted by Tischendorf, and by Alford, no longer retains the received text as a common basis



for emendation, or standard of comparison, or even as a mere cord upon which to string the proposed corrections, but proceeds to construct a text just as though it never existed.

It is this objectionable and mischievous feature of the later criticism, which, as we believe, especially demands the notice of biblical scholars at this time. Its natural result will be, that the Church of God will finally have no New Testament at all. It should be remembered that the received text is that which is now actually in the hands of the laity, in the popular versions of King James, of Luther, the Douay, the Genevan, Diodati's, and the other European languages. Does any one suppose that the labors of any learned critic will persuade either of these nations to surrender its version for a new one? It is very clear that, practically, the people must either trust the Bibles they have, or believe in none. *For there is no practicable substitute.* This appears from the fact that no two of the critics are agreed; no one of them is willing to adopt the text as settled by any other; their art has not found, and probably never will find, an authoritative umpire, to end their differences. Tregelles has published a vast list, covering ninety-four 8vo. pages, of the departures of the four leading editors whom he admires, Griesbach, Scholz, Lachmann, and Tischendorf, from the received text. Their number is more than nine thousand. That is, there are so many places in which one or more of these critics differs from the received text. But the same tables evince that *the critics differ among each other in more than nine thousand places!* A notable proof this, that the work of either one of them is still farther from being supported by the common consent, than the much abused received text. Hence, it appears manifestly, that if the latter is expelled from the use and confidence of the Church, it will practically be left with no New Testament.

But it may be asked, if the received text was confessedly printed from a few MSS. and versions, of inferior authority and age; if it is confessedly erroneous in some places, and probably so in many; if the absurd ground is relinquished on which its advocates once presumed to sanctify its very errors: why shall it claim the retention of its place? We reply, *because it is the*

*received text.* Some possible rival text may be better entitled to that place, *but it does not hold it, and cannot win it.* There cannot be in Christendom any common tribunal of criticism, by which the most meritorious text can now be installed in that place. Let it be, that the received text has usurped the position by accident, or been assigned to it by providence, the all-important fact is, that *it holds it.* It is far better for the interests of truth, that Christendom should recognise, as a commonly received Bible, a less accurate text, than that it should recognise none. Are then the fruits of biblical criticism to remain unemployed, and admitted errors in the received text uncorrected? We reply, not at all. Let all real emendations be made, but in the more modest method of our fathers. The received text should still be retained by all, not as a standard of absolute accuracy, but as a common standard of reference; and the proposed changes of the reading should be appended, and left each to stand upon its own evidences. The received text would then be expounded to the Church according to the convictions of the teachers in each instance. Such only would be the result upon the more audacious plan of our recent critics; for of course each teacher will exercise the same liberty and discretion in amending or retrenching their emendations which they have exercised upon the received text. The practical difference then, which would result from the method which we resist, would be only this, that the Church would no longer have a *Bible in common*; and would have nothing whatever to compensate for this immense loss. And inasmuch as the most dissatisfied of these critics confesses that the received text still presents every fact and doctrine of the Christian system uncorrupted, we cannot but regard it as a most unwarrantable exaggeration of their own results, to aim, for the sake of them, at the suppression of our common edition.

We proceed next to substantiate the assertion that the judicial canons by which these critics attempt to discriminate the true readings are not only still unsettled, and in part contradictory, but obnoxious to grave objections. The brief summary which we have given above, of the statement of those supposed principles by different critics, is sufficient proof of the first part. Let us now

bring those canons in which the recent school are most nearly agreed, to the test of reason. In attempting this, we assume that although altogether inferior to these professional experts in the knowledge of details and antiquarian facts, we are entitled to employ our humble common sense upon those deductions from their details, which they themselves offer to the common sense of Christians. Their labor with musty old parchments, and their familiarity with them we do not propose to contest. In these particulars we are to them, of course, as children to Anakim. But they propound to us, in their own way, the *data* which they say are collected from these their eminent researches. They invite us to consider the reasonableness of the conclusions they wish to draw therefrom. Then, say we, those conclusions must be considered by us in the light of our own reason. We presume that the antiquaries have no such monopoly of common sense as that which we have conceded them of their critical lore. We shall therefore venture to apply that common sense to their own showing of their *data* and facts; not having before our eyes any terror of the odious charge of intrusion into things too high for us.

Let us, as a preliminary task, test the soundness of that boast which the recent critics usually echo from Lachmann; that they discard *conjecture* as a guide to correct readings, and rely in preference upon the *testimony* of competent ancient witnesses. Do they really discard conjecture? And is it proper to do so? By a conjectural reading they mean one which is supported chiefly by its internal evidences. Now the earlier German critics used inferences from internal evidences with such preposterous license, and with such results, as might well give pause to any cautious or fair mind. But to discard internal evidence from criticism is the other extreme; and it may be equally reckless. Who would dispute that an undeniable anachronism, for instance, in a work to which infallibility was conceded, must be the result of a spurious reading? But the ground of the conclusion is internal evidence, *i. e.*, *conjecture*, a *laying together* of contradictories, demonstrating the inferential (but indisputable) truth, that the pen of the infallible writer did not write that statement,

impossible to be true, which we now read in the distant copy of his book. The obvious rule on this point, then, is that internal evidence is to be used, but with caution. Again, Lachmann plumes himself that there is not a single reading in his critical edition which rests on conjecture; all are supported by the testimony of the *testes vetustissimi et longinqui*. But when we come to his selection of the witnesses, he gives us nothing but "conjecture." No particular reading rests upon conjecture; but the grand foundation of the whole is a bundle of conjectures; that is, upon Lachmann's inferences from internal marks about the writings which he selects as ancient and competent. Why does he choose to believe that among the fathers of the third century, Origen cites (and cites literally) the *codices* of the New Testament of best authority in that age; while Julius Africanus and Dionysius the Great may not be trusted as doing so? Why does he rely on Cyprian rather than Minutius Felix or Arnobius? Why does he conclude that the Vatican, the Alexandrine, the Cambridge, the *codex Ephremi*, are ancient MSS., while none of the Byzantine are? Why, that the splendid and venerable Latin *codex of Brescia* was interpolated from the (worthless) Byzantine Greek, while the *codex of Vercelli* is more trustworthy? None of these *codices* have a continuous, authentic, known history. He proceeds only upon internal evidence. It is not now to our purpose to inquire whether Lachmann conjectures right or wrong: his ground of selection is but conjecture. This charge is eminently true concerning the age which they are pleased to assign to those Greek MSS. which they recommend to us as most venerable: the Vatican, the Alexandrine, and now the Sinai. It is expressly admitted that neither of these has an extant history. No documentary external evidence exists as to the names of the copyists who transcribed them, the date, or the place of their writing. Nobody knows whence the Vatican MS. came to the Pope's library, or how long it has been there. Nobody ventures to affirm, whether Cyril Lucaris brought the so-called Alexandrine MS. to London from Alexandria, or from the monasteries of Mt. Athos. Tischendorf himself was unable to trace the presence of his favorite *codex*, in the monastery of

St. Catharine on Mt. Horeb, by external witnesses higher than the 12th century. Their early date is confessedly assigned them by conjecture (*conjectura*: a casting together) of internal marks. It may be rightly assigned; yet, by conjecture. Why, then, may not the antiquity of some single readings be correctly assigned by similar evidence?

We shall next attempt to show that several of the critical canons retained by our recent editors, are, in their application, of a conjectural nature; and unsafe conjecture at that. Let the reader take first, that rule which is in full force from Bengel to Tischendorf: "*Scriptioni proclivi præstat ardua.*" Is not the "difficulty" or "facility" of the reading an internal mark? But we demur to the justice of the rule, as a general one. It is grounded on the supposition, that a copyist is far more likely to take the liberty of changing a phrase, in order to make it easier, or more intelligible, or more euphonious, or more credible, than to change it into something more difficult, or harsh, or unpopular. But we reply: Is it at all certain that the majority of copyists were competent to judge what reading would be more grammatical, more easy, more credible? Is it certain that if they did exercise a license of changing the readings for the purpose of gaining these advantages, their standard of taste and judgment was identical with that of these European gentlemen of the 19th century? We have but to remember who and what were the probable copyists of our oldest *codices*; that the most of them were drowsy and ignorant monks, or the merest mechanical drudges; just as in classic MSS., we know the most of this work was done by slaves; that the process of transcription was, while intended to be servilely faithful, most unintelligent and humdrum; that a copyist, who supposed himself more intelligent, and more capable of useful emendation, was very likely to choose precisely that reading as most consonant to his ideas of propriety which seems to our modern notions most a solecism; and we must admit that it is extremely likely, the very readings which our critics prefer, because they think them too difficult to be introduced as emendations, were thus introduced because they were supposed to be easier; and that the very readings which

they suppose to be easy, and therefore suspicious, would have struck those copyists, from their point of view, as very great solecisms. For, the least acquaintance with the loose grammar, the superstitious exegesis, the strange prescriptive notions, of the Christians of the 4th and 5th centuries, now exploded, will convince a fair mind how much more probable our hypothesis is than the other. Doubtless, where our modern critics find a reading so difficult or ungrammatical that they conclude it never could have gotten into the text had not the original author put it there, the more natural solution is this: if the *codices* show any ground to suspect a various reading, it was the difficult one which arose from the mere mechanical inattention of the copyist, or from his ignorance of the idiom of his own language, or from the prompting of some queer theory of his day, which is now exploded and forgotten. Surely a mere hypothesis, when so fairly counterpoised by another, cannot be accepted as a general rule of internal evidence.

A second critical canon much employed, is this: Where any ground exists for suspecting a various reading in any passage which has a parallel in another gospel, that reading shall be condemned as spurious which would harmonise the two parallel places most; and that reading shall be held the original one which most tends to make them contradict each other. The argument for this astonishing canon is, that, since the change was made by somebody, in one way or the other, it is presumable it was made by the over-zeal of the copyists, in order to hide the supposed evidence of contradiction between two inspired men. Again we ask: How much evidence have we that these copyists were either over-zealous or knavish? Do we know that the pair of sleepy monks who were droning over a given place in Mark, knew anything, or remembered anything, or cared anything, at the time, for the parallel place in Matthew? But the chief objection to this canon, is, that like some others which evangelical critics have adopted from the mint of infidel Rationalism, its sole probability is grounded in the assumption that the evangelists and apostles were not guided by inspiration. Let us adopt the Christian hypothesis, that the scenes of our Saviour's

life were enacted, and his words spoken, in a given way, and that the several evangelists were inspired of God to record them infallibly; and the most harmonising readings will obviously appear to us the most probable readings.

We next consider that method of "comparative criticism" stated on our 197th page, in which Tregelles confides so much. A given MS. is characterised, in the main, by a given school of variations from the received text. We consult an ancient father, who, we have reason to believe, quotes his Greek or Latin Testament literally—say Irenæus. We find that, in perhaps a score of places or more, his quotations from Scripture are *verbatim*, according to the various readings in the old MS. in hand. This authorises him, Tregelles thinks, to conclude that this MS. corresponded *verbatim* throughout, with the very Testament which lay on the study-table of old Irenæus, (at the beginning of the 3rd century); that we have in it an exact representation of the text which that father used as the authentic one. Now, a moment's reflection will convince the reader, that unless we believe that the existing MSS. at that date were very strictly conformed to some distinct "*recensions*," or families, the inference is worthless. For else, it is not safe to conclude on the old premise of "*ex pede Herculem*;" it is not safe to assume that the occurrence of a few of the same readings in Irenæus' Testament proves that it contained the whole list of the thousands of peculiar readings contained in the old MS. before us. Let us explain by a supposed case: Let it be supposed, that among editions of Shakspeare printed in the 19th century, there were clearly observable two *schools* of typographical errors, counting some thousands; that the literary *quidnuncs* had ascertained that this curious fact arose thus, viz., that in the 17th century there existed two (and only two current) printed editions of Shakspeare, and these two sets of typographical errors existed in the two old editions, respectively, distinguishing them from each other; and that all the very numerous recent editions, whether printed by a Murray, a Harper, or a Putnam, were but faithful reprints of the one or the other of the two old editions. All that is very intelligible. Now let us suppose further, that in

turning over the poet Waller, we found, in some twenty or fifty cases, that his citations from Shakspeare regularly contained the typographical errors (if errors they were) found at the places cited, in the one school of our printed editions. Then we might very safely conclude, that the copy of Shakspeare which Waller used was *of that old edition* of which this school is the progeny. This seems to be precisely Tregelles' inference. And one might possibly go further, and assume that possibly the poet Waller believed the copy of Shakspeare he used the more authentic of the two editions current in his day. But now, to illustrate the fatal vice of Tregelles' argument, let us suppose that he himself denied the whole explanation of the two schools of modern editions; that he disbelieved the whole theory of a family relationship between the two schools, and two current old editions distinguished from each other in the 17th century; it is exceedingly plain that he has uprooted the basis of his own argument. Now this is just what Tregelles and his friends do: they discard the whole theory of distinct ancient "*recensions*," whether distributed into two or three; they recognise no distinguishing character by which the MSS. and versions are classed in families, save the old and the new. The old, they believe to be correct; and the new, incorrect. If this is true, then obviously their "comparative criticism" is baseless. It may be correctly inferred that the Greek Testament which lay on Irenæus study-table corresponded in its readings with the various readings of the old MS. we are examining, in twenty or fifty cases; and yet it may be just as likely as not, that these were all the peculiar readings that corresponded, and that this amount of correspondence was accidental.

Let us now look a little more closely at the fundamental maxim of our recent critics—that the oldest are most trustworthy, and the more recent comparatively worthless. In their eyes the testimony of one MS. of the fourth century is worth more than that of a whole family of agreeing MSS. of the ninth century, though counted by the hundred. The reason assigned for this maxim is popular and plausible—that the older must of course be more accurate, because separated by fewest transcriptions



from the original autographs of the inspired men. Let us search and see whether this is so clear. First: It might very well be that a copy transcribed in the ninth century might be separated by fewer transcriptions from the original inspired autographs than another copy written in the fourth century. How? Thus: that this copyist of the ninth century may have copied direct from an old copy of the second century, separated by only two removes from the autograph left by St. John at Ephesus; whereas the fourth century copyist may have borrowed for transcription the MS. of a friend written a few months before from a MS. of the latter part of the third century, which, in turn, was copied from a MS. of the middle of that century, which, in turn, was copied from one of the beginning of that century, which again was separated by three or four transcriptions from the old second century MS. so nearly related to St. John's. Dr. Tischendorf claims that he has effected the exact parallel of what we have supposed. He has published in A. D. 1862 a *fac simile* edition of the Sinai *codex*. Let it be supposed that we have in our library a copy of Robert Stephens' great edition of the (despised) *κοινή έκδοσις*, of the year 1550 A. D. We, proceeding upon the argument of Tischendorf and the recent critics, that the oldest are nearest the autographs, claim that the Folio of Stephens is as much more correct than the Imperial folio of Tischendorf, as A. D. 1550 is earlier than A. D. 1862. From this Dr. Tischendorf would demur energetically. But on what grounds? He would claim that although his edition is three hundred years later, it is separated from the apostles by far fewer transcriptions. He would affirm that his St. Petersburg Folio is a *fac simile* of the Sinai MS.; that this is of the fourth century; that it is most probably one of the veritable fifty of Eusebius Cæsariensis, transcribed by order of the Emperor Constantine; that the copy which was immediate parent to that was most probably of Origen's editing; and that this was separated by very few transcriptions from the apostles. Whereas he objects, Stephens's folio, though printed in 1550, was copied from the Erasmian and Aldine editions, but a little older than itself; they in turn from recent MSS.; and these separated by many transcriptions from the

apostles. Just so, we reply, *the date is worth but little*, to determine the number of removes at which a given copy is related to the apostolic autographs.

Second. If the maxim were true that the most ancient *codices* are the most trustworthy, then the most ancient ought to differ least *inter se*. As we approach so nearly to the common fountain-head, the streams ought to approach more and to unity. Is this so? Now, according to the showing of the critics themselves, the case seems to be thus: that the three oldest *codices*, the Sinaitic, Vatican, and Alexandrine, have what we shall find to be a very significant (not to say suspicious) resemblance, in their common omission of *a few* readings, to which a peculiar interest attaches. But in other respects they do not seem to approximate identity. Tischendorf has himself given us a very striking proof of this in his Tauchnitz edition of the authorised English version. He has given us there, at the bottom of the page, a great many various readings, *as between his three favorites*, and not merely as between them on the one side and the received text on the other. It is only necessary to run the eye over these foot notes, to see that while the variations from the received text are very numerous, the instances in which the Sinaitic, Vatican, and Alexandrine MSS. agree among themselves are comparatively rare. The disagreements of the three (among themselves) which are of sufficient magnitude to be represented in the English language, are, upon an approximate estimate, not less than five thousand; and this, of course, excludes the minuter variations of spelling and arrangement, which disappear in translation. This is a larger number of various readings than Augustus Hahn has collected, as worthy of notice, from all the critical labors of Griesbach's, Knapp's, Scholz's, and Lachmann's New Testaments. Thus it appears that the plan of our critics, when executed by their own hands, seems to yield very poor results. The three "faithful witnesses" harmonise less with each other than the digests made from the diversified testimony of the despised!

Third. The oldest existing MS. is not claimed to possess an antiquity earlier than the fourth century. The interval between

that date and the apostles is abundantly wide to make corruptions of the text in that oldest MS. both by accident and design, both possible and probable. That is to say, no MS. is ancient enough to lead us above the first source of the stream of errors. Now then, what is the state of the facts? On one side there are a very few MSS. for which very great age is claimed; on the other side (the Byzantine or Constantinopolitan), there is a numerous family of MSS., of which nearly seven hundred have been collated in whole or in part, which have a great uniformity in their readings, but they are admitted to be, mostly, subsequent to the ninth century. The few for which extreme antiquity is claimed do not, in fact, agree closely, but they do agree in a small number of very significant differences (chiefly omissions), by which they are very distinctly characterised as against the Constantinopolitan school of MSS. Now shall these few, which are claimed to be old, discredit the many more recent? We reply, No. And in addition to the reasons disclosed already we urge this: This Constantinopolitan family must have had a parentage from some MS. older than themselves. Although this their ancient parent is now lost, yet their existence proves that it once existed and had the features which they now possess in common. So that the actual (former) existence and character of that original is as perfectly demonstrated to the reason as the existence and character of the Sinaitic MS. is to the senses. Now whence that original? From authentic or from corrupt sources? It is no reasoning to say, on grounds of conjecture, that it was from a corrupt source; for it is equally possible to conjecture that the Sinai or the Vatican MS. arose out of corrupt sources. Has it not been shown that the fourth century is not early enough to ascend above the sources of possible corruptions? If then we and our rivals proceed to reasons, in order to substantiate our conjectures, we urge that one *codex* is much more liable to corruption than a whole family. One dishonest hand is enough to do the former; there must be a concert of many to do the latter. The one was a *codex* made and preserved for private uses, the others were for public church uses. There were therefore a thousand jealous guardians, bishops, clergy, intelligent

laymen, to watch against the corruption of the many; but there was only one mind, or at most a few, interested in the purity of the single *codex*.

And this leads us to consider, fourth, the critical value of scripture MSS. made for liturgical purposes, as compared with those made for scholastic private use. The Constantinopolitan family of existing MSS. evidently belong to the former sort; because this appears from their general conformity with existing lectionaries, from their so often containing the calendar of the Greek Church, and from their careful and ornamental execution. But the few old MSS. of the greatest supposed antiquity, were not made for liturgical use, but for scholastic and private preservation. Now our modern critics admit, yea, claim, both these facts, and assert that the liturgical MSS. are least to be relied upon. We ask, why? Is not this conclusion exactly against common sense? Are not our pulpit bibles now most carefully printed of all? Does not church history teach us, that both the pride and the principle of the bishops and other clergy led them to use great care in the accuracy of their church MSS., and especially under the patriarchate of Constantinople? But, say our opponents, the liturgical use of a MS. would compel it to be conformed, at all hazards, to the *κοινή έκδοσις*, because the ear of the people accustomed to this would require such agreement. We reply: very well; and was not that very necessity wholly favorable to the perpetuation of accuracy? To deny it, is to assume that the *κοινή έκδοσις* was at first inaccurate. Such indeed is the vicious circle in which the argument of these critics moves. The amount of it is: the Constantinopolitan family of existing MSS. must be very corrupt, because they agree with the *κοινή έκδοσις*; and the *κοινή έκδοσις* must be very faulty, because it agrees with them! But now grant, (what is not an assumption, but history,) that the church teachers were at first very scrupulous, especially in that part of Christendom, to give their churches a correct Bible, and that thus there was at first a received text which was correct; then the necessity of conforming the new liturgical copies to the established habitudes of the people was a safeguard for accuracy, not a source of corruption. In this

connexion let us notice the reproach, that no old MS. of the Constantinopolitan family survives, to warrant the fidelity of its progeny. The probable reason is, that those *codices* were worn out by the popular use for which they were designed; or being in weekly use in the churches, fell victims to the persecuting fury of Diocletian and his successors, more easily than the scholastic copies hidden away in the monasteries and hermitages.

Fifth. Everything in the historical position of those churches, which afterwards formed the patriarchate of Constantinople, marks them as the most likely places in which to look for correct copies of the New Testament. There was the native home of the Greek language, with the truest Grecian culture. To them nearly all the New Testament was at first addressed. There were the churches for whose use Luke (with St. Paul's guidance) and Mark (with Peter's guidance) and John the beloved apostle, prepared three out of the four Gospels. It was at *Ephesus* that the Apostle John, in his last days, recognised and codified the four Gospels, including Matthew's. There chiefly labored nearly all the apostles who have wielded the pen of inspiration. To those churches, or among them, nearly all the Epistles were written: the Romans, and John 1st, 2d, and 3d, *among them*; the Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Thessalonians, Philemon, Timothy, and Titus, *to them*. There was the canon closed, by the Apocalypse of John, first published in the home of his old age, Ephesus. In a word, the soil of the Greek Church is the native birthplace of the New Testament canon. Facts are also much obscured by representing Alexandria as the metropolis of Greek learning after the Christian era, and directing us to look thither for the most intelligent and earliest sources of Christian Greek. Alexandria was, in those ages, a large, an assuming, a bristling, a heterogeneous commercial city. But it is very erroneous to represent it as the acknowledged queen of the Greek civilisation. Antioch was still its equal. Iconium was for Asia Minor a far more influential centre. Ephesus was still the queen of the Ægean. And, above all, the old ascendancy of Athens, with her younger rival, Corinth, was still supreme, even down to the days of Constan-

tine; and, beside her acknowledged classic culture, the pretensions of Alexandria were but semi-barbaric. It is not a historical fact, that Greek Christianity drew its knowledge prevalently from Alexandria.

The last great persecution seems to have raged equally over the whole eastern empire; and, if we may credit the Christian writers, was everywhere attended with a great destruction of the sacred books. But those writers tell us also of the many pious expedients by which the faithful preserved a part of them. It is reasonable to think that as large a portion of them were saved by the numerous churches of Asia Minor, and Greece, as elsewhere; and that, when the days of peace returned, these were again multiplied, with the pristine care and accuracy for the supply of the churches. But in the 7th and 8th centuries, a great historic change occurred, which established a grand difference in favor of the Constantinopolitan churches—the Saracen conquests. Syria, Palestine, Mesopotamia, Egypt, and Africa, were then utterly subdued by the Moslems; and in these countries Christianity was everywhere suppressed and almost exterminated. But, until the middle of the 15th century, Constantinople still stood, sorely pressed indeed by the Moslems, but still independent; a Christian Greek kingdom, retaining the ecclesiastical literature, the language, and the church usages of the 3rd and 4th centuries, with a singular and stereotyped tenacity. Then came the final overthrow and dispersion of 1453. The Greek scholars and ecclesiastics who then filled Europe with the news of their calamity, became the channels for transmitting to all the west the precious remains of early Christianity; and Providence prepared the Church with the new art of printing to preserve and diffuse them. It was thus that the Constantinopolitan MSS., the representatives of the *κοινὴ ἐκδοσις* of former ages, became the parents of our received text.

We have hitherto seemed to admit the full claims of the Sinaitic, Vatican, and Alexandrine MSS., to a great antiquity. But let us now advert to the grounds on which the experts rest those claims; we shall find them, according to their own showing, far from conclusive. As we remarked, none of these *codices* have

an authentic external history; their antiquity is inferred wholly from internal marks. Those marks are so nearly common to them all, that we may, with sufficient correctness, take that statement of them made by Tischendorf for his Sinai MS. in his *Prolegomena* to the imperial edition, as an example of all.

The monastery of St. Catharine on Mt. Horeb, is supposed to have been founded by the Emperor Justinian, A. D. 530; and Tischendorf would fain persuade himself that this venerable MS. was a part of the endowment originally bestowed upon it by its royal founder; and that it was one of the fifty MSS. provided by Eusebius of Cæsarea for the Emperor Constantine. There is no external mark of its age save that it was there, and was handled by some of the monks in the 12th century. Its internal marks of age are the following: It is written, not only in uncial Greek characters, but in that species of uncials found in the Vatican MS., and in some classical MSS. on *papyrus* found in Herculaneum. It has scarcely any marks of punctuation. It has four columns on each page, (the largest folios next to it, having but three,) and Tischendorf thinks, with Hug, that this marks such MSS. as belonging to the age when the old rolled parchments were just going out of fashion; because it is supposed the copyists who were adopting the new fashion would seek to propitiate the reader's eye, by making as many columns as possible present themselves *ad aperturam* on the two faces of the two contiguous leaves. It resembles the oldest biblical MSS. in their antiquated spelling, inflection of words, and order of several books. It has the Ammonian chapters, and the Eusebian canons; yet it is conceded they may have been added by another hand than the copyist's. It contains the *Epistle of Barnabas* (so called), and the *Pastor Hermæ*, from which it is inferred that the copyist regarded these two spurious pieces as belonging to the canon of Scripture. Now it is supposed that their claim to that place was exploded before the end of the 4th century, because the Council of Laodicea in A. D. 364, and Carthage in 297, condemned them as spurious. Yet Eusebius expressly places these pieces, with the "Acts of Paul," among the ἀπὸ ἀποστόλων: a sufficiently clear proof, one would think, in

this copy was not one of his fifty. Tischendorf thinks that, inasmuch as the two pieces were not *universally* rejected, the politic Eusebius would be more likely to retain them, than to make the *general* suspicion of them a ground for their exclusion. Another sign of antiquity for the Sinai MS. is, that the numerous marginal corrections, which are supposed to be later than the writing itself, are also in uncials. Last, its omissions (such as those in Mark xvi. 8 to end; Matt. xiii. 35,) are such as to associate it with the Vatican, and the very oldest fragments. Such is the editor's argument.

These marks we cannot but regard as very far short of a demonstration that the MS. was the work of either the 4th or 5th century. We have no disposition to contest its possession of an equal antiquity to that of the Vatican and Alexandrine MSS. But one obvious remark is, that several of these arguments depend wholly upon the assumed antiquity of the latter; whereas the evidences of their age are not different from these. Such arguing amounts to no more than this—that the Sinaitic MS. is as old as the Vatican; and how old is the Vatican? Why, as old as the Sinaitic. Second—all the internal marks of great antiquity, as the character in which it is written, the spelling, the inflections, the arrangement, are made invalid by this consideration: that so many reasons existed to prompt the copyist to retain those peculiarities from the older copy before him. A temper of monkish conservatism, superstitious veneration for the forms of the past, the wish to perpetuate a pious fraud, or incompetency to change the antiquated features intelligently, may have caused, and doubtless often did cause, copyists after copyists still to reproduce these peculiarities, even ages after they had become generally antiquated. Let it be remembered, on the last point, that multitudes of *codices* were transcribed in the monasteries by men whose grammatical knowledge was wholly insufficient to construe what they were writing. They employed the hours of a superfluous leisure, which had no value, in imitating mechanically, letter by letter, the copy before them, much as a Chinaman paints the name of his English customer on a sign-board, while he knows not a letter of the English alphabet. It is



obvious that such transcribers could not venture to change anything intentionally, (however liable to change many things unconsciously;) they could not change uncials into cursive letters, or old inflections into contemporary ones; they must imitate precisely what was before them, or else not copy at all.

Moreover, in the third place, it is exceedingly erroneous to suppose that the uncial and the cursive writing succeeded each other at a given date; they were contemporary for centuries. The cursives are known to have been in use as early as Trajan, and the uncials are known to have remained in use until the 8th century. The one set of characters were used for certain species of writing; the other for more serious kinds. A maker of grave-stones in our day carves the inscription on his marble in uncials, and then goes to his ledger and enters his bill in cursives, for the cost of the carving. It would be very unsafe reasoning, which should afterwards conclude that the marble must have been inscribed many ages after the ledger. To the practical mind it will appear very obvious (however provoking to the romantic temper of the antiquary) that the transcription of copies in large uncials may be accounted for by the very prosaic fact, that *spectacles were not yet invented*. The only expedient for assisting the failing eyesight of the aged, was to enlarge the size of the letters.

Fourth. The presence of the two apocryphal pieces is very far from a demonstration that the whole writing was older than the councils of Laodicea and Carthage. When the piety of the monkish ages inscribed works of human, but revered, origin on the same parchment with its bibles, this was very far from showing that it assigned it a formal place in the canon. How obvious is this, when we remember that the Anglican Church, in imitation of the patristic ages, is doing the very thing now! She prints and binds up into the same volume the Apocrypha and the Scriptures, while she declares that the former are not canonical. Again, Tischendorf places the Alexandrine MS. only in the 5th century; but it contains the Epistle of Clement. Again, Eusebius places the Acts of Paul, the Epistle of Barnabas, and the Pastor of Hermas, not among the *ἀντιλεγόμενα*, as Tischendorf sup-

poses; but among the *N<sup>o</sup>ta*. (See his Ecclesiastical History, B. III., Ch. 25). Let the reader accept this as one among several proofs, that the affectation of superior accuracy of research over those grand and honest old English scholars, whose critical opinions they would supersede, has but little ground. Once more—Athanasius gave (A. D. 315) a list of the New Testament books esteemed genuine, which agrees exactly with ours in omitting these spurious pieces. And the earlier fathers, up to Irenæus and Tertullian, while not giving, like Eusebius, professed lists of the canon, yet quote just the same books as genuine as now compose our New Testament. We have then the lists of Caius the Presbyter, A. D. 200, and of Origen, as preserved in the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius, B. VI., ch. 25. These also exclude the two pieces from among the genuine. Now then, if Tischendorf's inference were valid, the presence of this spurious Epistle of Barnabas, and of the Pastor of Hermas, in his Sinai MS., must elevate its antiquity, not to the 4th century, but to the 2d century. The argument is therefore worthless. This feature of his MS. on the contrary, in the eyes of every sober critic, must depreciate its value, and make it probable that it was the work of monkish superstition, rather than of sound biblical scholarship, and the production of a place and an age which give but a feeble guarantee of honesty or accuracy.

This inquiry into the credit of these so-called oldest *codices* is preliminary to another, which is of more practical interest to the Christian. While the various readings are, as we have seen, almost numberless, there are but a few which implicate in any degree, any fact, usage, or doctrine of our religion. The singular thing is, that the modern critics claim the three *codices* on almost every one of these important variations, as against the received text. The following list of them is not presented as complete, but as containing the most notable of these points.

As affecting facts and usages, the Sinai and the Vatican MSS. concur in omitting, in Matt. vi. 13, the closing doxology of our Lord's prayer. In John viii. 1 to 11, they and the Alexandrine omit the whole narrative of Christ's interview with the woman taken in adultery, and her accusers. The first two also omit the

whole of Mark xvi., from the 9th verse to the end. Acts viii. 37, is omitted by all three, in which Philip is represented as propounding to the eunuch faith as the qualification for baptism.

As affecting doctrine, the only omissions of practical importance are the following, in which there is also a general agreement between the (supposed) old *codices*. In Acts ix. 5 and 6, the received text reads, that Paul, when struck to the earth by the light from heaven, said, "Who art thou, Lord? And the Lord said, I am Jesus whom thou persecutest: it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks. And he, trembling and astonished, said, Lord what wilt thou have me to do? And the Lord said unto him, arise," etc. Now the Sinai, Vatican, and Alexandrine MSS. all concur in making such omissions, as to leave the passage thus: "I am Jesus (of Naz. Alexandrine) whom thou persecutest; but arise, and go into," etc.

In Acts xx. 28, the received text makes St. Paul say to the Ephesine elders: "to feed the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood." The Alexandrine *codex* here makes him say: "to feed the Church of the Lord, which he hath purchased with his own blood;" and so read the *Codices Ephræmi and Beza*.

In 1 Tim. iii. 16, the received text represents St. Paul as saying: "Great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh," etc. The Vatican here supports the received text; but the Sinai, the *Codex Ephræmi*, and probably the Alexandrine read: "Great is the mystery of godliness, who was manifest in the flesh," etc. It is true that the editors say the reading of the Alexandrine MS. is here uncertain. Certain pen marks have been either changed or rewritten (it cannot be ascertained which) by a later hand, which, if genuine, would make it read, with the received text, θεός, instead of ὁς.

In 1 John v. 7, the received text represents St. John as saying: "There are three that bear record in heaven: the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one." All the old MSS. concur in omitting the heavenly witnesses; so that it shall read: "For there are three that bear

record: the Spirit, the water, and the blood; and these three agree in one."

In Jude 4, the received text represents the heresiarchs whom Jude rebukes, as "denying the only Master, the God and Lord of us, Jesus Christ." (*καὶ τὸν μόνον δεσπότην Θεὸν καὶ Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἀρνούμενοι.* The authorised English version mistranslates.) The MSS. omit *Θεόν*.

In Rev. i. 11, the received text represents the glorified Messiah as declaring to John in Patmos, "Saying, I am Alpha and Omega, the First and the Last; and what thou seest write in a book," etc. All the three MSS. under remark, concur in omitting the Messiah's eternal titles, so as to read thus: "heard behind me a great voice as of a trumpet, saying, What thou seest write," etc.

If now the reader will glance back upon this latter list of variations, he will find that in every case, the doctrinal effect of the departure from the received text is to obscure or suppress some testimony for the divinity of the Saviour. In the first, Acts ix. 5, 6, the received text teaches us that Saul's resistance to the cause of Jesus was an impracticable resistance to divine monitions. This the so-called older MSS. suppress. In Acts xx. 28, if the Church which is bought with blood, is *God's*, and bought with "*his own blood*," then Christ, who confessedly bought it, is very God. This striking proof is adroitly suppressed by the suppression or change of a word. In 1 Tim. iii. 16, the only God ever manifest in the flesh, is obviously our Lord Jesus Christ. If then the received text stands, He is categorically called God. Here again, the adroit change of a letter, and a dash of the pen, expunges the testimony, by reading *ὅς* for *θεός*; "who," for "God." In 1 John v. 7, 8, the received text presents us two sets, or triads, of witnesses, one in heaven, the other on earth, and asserts the unity of the first triad in one. All this is omitted, and thus all reference to a trinity is obliterated. In Jude, verse 4th, a correct rendering of the received text calls our Lord Jesus Christ the only Master and God, thus asserting his proper divinity in exclusive terms. The MSS. by leaving out the word God, greatly weaken, though,

even then, they do not destroy this testimony for Christ's divinity. And last, in Rev. i. 11, they all concur in omitting those assertions of divine eternity which the received text ascribes to the Messiah, which in the 8th verse are ascribed to "the Almighty."

Now it should be remarked, that were all these readings of the received text expunged as spurious, many other clear testimonies for Christ's divinity would remain unquestioned by any critical authority, and abundantly sufficient to establish the doctrine on an impregnable basis. But the significant fact, to which we wish especially to call attention is this: that all the variations proposed on the faith of these MSS. which have any doctrinal importance, *should attack the one doctrine of the Trinity; nay, we may say even more specifically, the one doctrine of Christ's deity.* The various readings taken from the various MSS. and versions are counted by the hundred thousands; but the vast majority of them are utterly insignificant; and among the few which remain, after deducting these, all which bear on doctrine bear on one doctrine; and that, a doctrine which was keenly debated just before the times when, it is claimed, these three old *codices* were copied. Their admirers claim for them an origin in the 4th or 5th century. The Sabellian and Arian controversies raged in the 3rd and 4th. Is there no coincidence here? Things do not happen again and again regularly, without a cause! Why is it that some other doctrines of Christianity do not happen to be assailed by these variations, if indeed their occurrence is fortuitous? The curious coincidence, we repeat, that only one vital doctrine should be touched in any of its supposed testimonies, by all the myriads of variations, almost irresistibly impels the mind to the conclusion, that not the chance errors of transcribers, but some deliberate hand has been at work in these instances. And when we remember the date of the great Trinitarian contests, and compare it with the supposed date of these exemplars of the sacred text, the ground of suspicion becomes violent. Now did the party of Athanasius introduce spurious testimonies into the sacred text in support of the ὑποστάσιον; or did the party of Arius expunge

authentic testimonies from the sacred text, in order to obscure that doctrine? The question seems to lie most probably between these limits. It may never admit of solution; but a moment's reflection will convince the reader that the credit and value of these so-called oldest *codices* are complicated with that question. This stands out as one of their most prominent characteristics, viz., that they agree with each other in omitting these striking testimonies to the divinity of Christ: and that they also agree, in the main, in all the other extensive omissions, implicating matters of gospel fact and practice. Now, without deciding whether the Athanasians or the Arians were in fact the corrupters, we must decide that the three ancient *codices* represent the views of persons who regarded the Athanasians as in these passages the corrupters. If this latter charge can be proved, then the credit of the three old *codices* is thereby greatly strengthened; if the opposite charge can be established (that the Arian party sought fraudulently to expunge these valuable testimonies against them) then the credit of the three old *codices*, as against the rival *κοινή* *ἐκδοσις*, is weakened.

Can any evidence be found in our day substantiating the one charge and refuting the other? It appears to an impartial view that such evidence must be, if it exists at all, of the following kinds: First, the MS. and internal evidence for or against the genuineness of the first class of passages omitted, namely, the historical, such as Mark xvi. 9 to end; Jno. viii. 1-11. It is true that the Arian strife is not implicated in these places, but their extent and historical importance is so marked that if their genuineness be demonstrated, then their absence from the three old *codices* characterises them very strongly as mutilated copies. For it is no slight thing for copies obviously professing so much completeness to omit whole blocks of ten or twelve verses, containing substantive and important incidents in our Saviour's life and teachings. But if the character of mutilated copies is fixed on them, then the reader is prepared, by probable evidence, to suspect them of error in the other, the very marked doctrinal omissions. Second, the evidence in the case must consist of the MS. and internal evidences against or for the readings which sustain the

divinity of Christ. If these readings can be sustained on critical grounds purely, to that extent the three old *codices* are convicted of complicity with Arian mutilations of the genuine text. And third, the question may be decided in part by external testimony and inference as to the existence and the justice of such charges against the Athanasians of interpolating, or against the Arians of expunging, readings favorable or adverse to their distinctive dogmas. For, in fine, we return to the proposition with which we set out, that the existing variations in these doctrinal readings raise a violent probability of the fact that *somebody's hands* have been at work on the ancient text, with malice prepense, to do the one or the other thing.

Under the first head it is not our purpose to oppress our readers with a long detail of the suffrages of MSS. versions, and editors, for or against the first class of passages. We shall satisfy ourselves with presenting the probability which appears from the conclusions of the modern critics, including the "votaries" of the "old codices." All of them, then, are against the genuineness of the doxology in Matt. vi. 13. All of them except Lachmann are in favor of the genuineness of Mark xvi. 9 to end. Even that most unsparing amputator of the received text, Tregelles, dares not insert his knife here. When we come to John viii. 1-11, we find Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles against its genuineness, but all the others admit it, as does Bishop Ellicot, substantially. Against the genuineness of Acts viii. 37 they all concur. We thus see that these critics are compelled themselves to admit the genuineness of a large part of these omissions against the authority of the old *codices*. Whatever of probability this carries, is therefore rather against their credit than in favor of it.

When we come to the second class of evidences, that from the MSS. and internal proofs for or against the doctrinal various readings, we find a very similar showing of the critics, save as to the most explicit one of all, 1 Jno. v. 7. This all concur in condemning. As to the rest, they differ more or less, while the majority of them admit such a show of ancient and of internal authority for them as would satisfy most minds, even from their

point of view, that they have a fair claim to stand as authentic. Dismissing them with this remark, we proceed to consider 1 John v. 7 a little more in detail. This reading Tregelles considers so obviously spurious that he disdains to discuss it. All the critics vote against it. But let us see whether the case is as clear as they would have it. When we raise this inquiry, let it be understood that we do not undertake the hopeless task of satisfying the biblical critics of its certain genuineness. Our object is to keep it an open question, and to preserve that amount of probability which appears fairly to attach to the common reading. The reader will then, by a plain *a fortiori* argument, conclude as to the other doctrinal readings, which these scholars attack with so much less confidence, that the probabilities are altogether in their favor. The often contested text in 1 John v. 7 also furnishes us a good instance of the value of that internal evidence which the recent critics profess to discard.

The critics all agree in excising from the common reading, the words which we include within parenthesis. "Ὅτι τρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες [ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, ὁ Πατήρ, ὁ Λόγος, καὶ τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα· καὶ οὗτοι οἱ τρεῖς ἐν εἰσι. Καὶ τρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες ἐν τῇ γῆ,] τὸ Πνεῦμα, καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ, καὶ τὸ αἷμα· καὶ οἱ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἐν εἰσιν. The internal evidence against this excision then, is in the following strong points. First, if it be made, the masculine article, numeral, and participle, οἱ τρεῖς μαρτυροῦντες, are made to agree directly with three neuters; an insuperable, and very bald grammatical difficulty. But if the disputed words are allowed to stand, they agree directly with two masculines, and one neuter noun, ὁ Πατήρ, ὁ Λόγος, καὶ τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα; where, according to a well known rule of syntax, the masculines among the group control the gender over a neuter connected with them. Then the occurrence of the masculines τρεῖς μαρτυροῦντες in the 8th verse agreeing with the neuters, Πνεῦμα, ὕδωρ and αἷμα, may be accounted for by the power of attraction, so well known in Greek syntax, and by the fact, that the Πνεῦμα, the leading noun of this second group, and next to the adjectives, has just had a species of masculineness superinduced upon it by its previous position in the masculine group. Second, if the excision is made, the 8th verse coming next to



the 6th, gives us a very bald and awkward, and apparently meaningless repetition of the Spirit's witness, twice in immediate succession. Third, if the excision is made, then the proposition at the end of the 8th verse, *καὶ οἱ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἓν εἰσιν*, contains an unintelligible reference. The insuperable awkwardness of this chasm in the meaning is obscured in the authorised English version; "and these three agree in one." Let a version be given, which shall do fair justice to the force of the definite article here, as established by the Greek idiom, and of the whole construction, thus: "and these three agree to that (aforesaid) One," the argument appears. What is that aforesaid unity, to which these three agree? If the 7th verse is excised, there is none: the *τὸ ἓν* so clearly designated by the definite article, as an object to which the reader has already been introduced, has no antecedent presence in the passage. Let the 7th verse stand, and all is clear: the three earthly witnesses testify to that aforementioned unity, which the Father, Word, and Spirit constitute.

But fourth, the internal evidence from the apostle's scope is, if possible, still more conclusive. He had just asserted (verse 1 to 6) the essential importance of *faith* as the instrumental bond of our spiritual life, and the only victory over the world. To exert such energy, faith must have a solid warrant. And the thing of which faith must be assured, is *the true sonship* and *proper divinity* of Christ. See emphatically verse 5, with verses 11, 12, 20. The only faith that quickens the soul, and overcomes the world, is the belief (verse 5) that Jesus is God's Son, that God has appointed him our Life, (compare John's Gospel v. 21 and 26), and that this Life is *true* or *veritable God*. Now, then, the apostle's scope is to answer this question: *On what warrant* shall our faith accept these wondrous propositions about Jesus? The 9th verse gives us the key-note of his answer: *On God's warrant*. This divine warrant (nothing less would answer) comes to us first, verse 6, in the words of the Holy Ghost speaking by his inspired men. (See John's Gospel xvi. 8, etc.) It comes to us, second, (verse 7,) in the words of the Father, the Word, and the Spirit, asserting and confirming by miracles, the sonship and unity of Jesus Christ with the

Father, (as in Matt. iii. 16, 17; John v. 37; Matt. xii. 28; John viii. 18; xv. 26; and such like places.) It comes to us, third, (verse 8), in the work of the Holy Ghost, applying the blood and water from Christ's pierced side for our cleansing, in accordance with ancient types and modern sacraments, which concur in the doctrine of Christ's divinity. It comes to us, fourth, (verse 10), in the spiritual consciousness of the believer himself, certifying to him that he feels within a divine change. How consistent, how accordant with St. John's modes of teaching, how harmonious is all this, if we accept the 7th verse as genuine? But, if we excise it, the very keystone of the arch of evidence is wanting; the crowning proof that the *warrant of our faith is DIVINE* (verse 9) is struck out.

The probability in favor of the reading which thus arises, is confirmed when we remember the circumstances in view of which the Apostle John undoubtedly wrote this passage. Authentic tradition teaches us that St. John spent his latest years at and near Ephesus. Internal marks evince what that tradition testifies, that this Epistle was written in those latter years, and for his own spiritual children in those regions. He tells them that the purpose of his writing was to warn them against seducers, (ii. 26,) whose heresy, long predicted, was now developed; and was characterised by a denial of the proper sonship (ii. 26) and incarnation (iv. 2) of Jesus Christ. Now we know that these heretics were Ebionites, and chiefly Cerinthians and Nicolaitanes. Irenæus, Epiphanius, and other fathers, tell us that they all vitiated the doctrine of the Trinity. Cerinthus taught that Jesus was not miraculously born of a virgin, and that the "Word" Christ was not truly and eternally divine, but a sort of angelic *Aion*, associated with the natural man Jesus up to his crucifixion. The sect of Nicolaitanes is most probably identified with the Gnostic Docetæ, who denied that the *Aion* Christ had a real body, ascribing to him only a seeming or phantasmal body and blood. It can scarcely be doubted that these are the errors against which St. John is here fortifying the faith of his "children." Then, the very point of the 7th verse in the disputed passage was obtruded upon the apostle's attention when

he was writing it. Is it not hard to believe that he should, under the circumstances, write anything but what the received text ascribes to him? If we let the seventh verse stand, then the whole passage is framed, with apostolic wisdom, to exclude at once both heresies. In verse 7th, he refutes the Cerinthian, declaring the unity of the Father, Word, and Spirit; and with the strictest accuracy, employing the *neuter*, *ἐν εἰσιν*, to fix the very point which Cerinthus denied, the unity of the three persons in one common substance. He then refutes the Nicolaitanes, declaring the proper humanity of Jesus, and the actual shedding and application of the Spirit, of that water and blood, of whose effusion he was himself eye-witness, and to which he testifies in his Gospel, so emphatically, in chapter xix. 34, 35. We agree here with Calvin, in regarding "the water and the blood" as not a direct reference to the sacraments of baptism and the supper; but to that blood and water which came from the Redeemer's side, of which our two sacraments are emblems. The shedding of that water and blood, witnessed by the apostle himself, evinced that Jesus was the true antitype to the Hebrew laver and altar, and to all the ritual of both, in all ages; that water and blood, applied by the Holy Ghost, cleansing believers from depravity and guilt, mark Christ as the "Lamb slain from the foundation of the world," the promised Jehovah-Christ, Emmanuel, of both dispensations. Now, when we hear the apostle tell his "children," in the chapter above cited from his own Epistle, that the two heresies, against whose seductions he designed by this writing to guard them, were these: the denial of Christ's sonship to God, and the denial of his incarnation; and when we see him in his closing testimony exclude precisely these two errors, there is a coherency in the whole, which presents a very strong internal evidence for the genuineness of the received text. It is, moreover, very interesting to notice the common circumstances connecting this with the two other great Trinitarian readings, which the old MSS. (so-called) concur in excluding, Acts xx. 28; 1 Tim. iii. 16. St. Paul uttered the discourse of Acts 20th to the elders of this same Ephesine Church, in which St. John almost certainly wrote this Epistle.

The former there forewarns the elders of the coming Cerinthians and Nicolaitanes, under the name of "grievous wolves." St. Paul wrote the First Epistle to Timothy when he placed him as evangelist in this same Ephesine Church; and he advertises him in it, of the presence of this "*Gnosis*." We are thus led to see how St. Paul and St. John make common cause against these hated errors. We see with what object they shaped their declarations, so as to leave the most distinct testimony on the disputed points. Paul takes occasion to say that the Church was ransomed with divine blood, and to tell Timothy that the very God was manifest in the flesh. John testifies that the Father, the Word, and the Spirit are one, and that the humanity was as real as the divinity.

But it is clearly admitted that for the genuineness of the 7th verse, there is very little authority from Greek MSS. It has, thus far, been found in only two of the many hundreds which have been collated—the Montfort MS. in the University Library of Dublin, which is supposed by some to be of little authority, because suspected of having been conformed to the Latin; and in the *Codex Wizanburgensis*, which Lachmann reckons of the 8th century. But a more faithful examination of the Montfort MS. shows that the suspicion of its being a modern forgery is certainly unfounded; and that, on the contrary, this *codex* so much spoken against has several peculiar marks of antiquity and interest, besides this disputed verse. The chief MS. authority which can be cited for it is that of the Latin versions. It is found in all the *codices* of these, with a few exceptions; and not only in those representing the Latin Vulgate, but those which preserve to us the *Vetus Itala*. So, likewise, the patristic authority for this reading is confined to Latin fathers; but among these, it is cited as genuine Scripture by several, among whom may be mentioned Tertullian and Cyprian, as both early and well-informed, and the Council of Carthage, and a multitude of others in the later ages. In a word, it seems that this reading, omitted almost unanimously by the Greek MSS., is asserted as genuine Scripture with almost equal unanimity by Latin Christendom; and that, from the earliest ages. In favor of this

testimony of the West are these considerations: That the *Vetus Italica* was confessedly translated from the Greek Scriptures at a very early age, certainly within a century from the death of the apostles; that in the great persecutions, the Western, and especially the African churches, (in which we find the earliest citations of the passage,) did not lose their sacred books to so great an extent as the Greek churches; that the ancient Latin churches were comparatively untainted with Arianism, the suspected source of corruptions; and that in the contests with the Arians, the Council of Carthage, as well as many other fathers, appeal with unquestioning confidence to this very verse as a decisive testimony against them.

This, then, seems to be the sum of the matter. As to 1 John v. 7, the Latin Church stands opposed to the Greek. As to the other various readings affecting the doctrine of Christ's divinity, the body of the Greek MSS. representing the *κοινή ἔκδοσις* stands, in the main, opposed to the three, so-called, oldest *codices*. These variations are too numerous, and too significant in their effect upon the one doctrine, to be ascribed to chance. We seem then to be reduced by a strong probability to the adoption of one of these conclusions: Either that the received readings are corrupt interpolations of the Trinitarians; or that the omissions of them were dishonest mutilations of the Arians, and other Anti-Trinitarians. Which of these conclusions shall we adopt? The answer seems to be in substance this: The date is so remote, and so many of the records of that age have perished, that no decisive settlement of the question is now possible; yet the probabilities strongly tend to fix the blame upon the Anti-Trinitarians.

In support of this conclusion, we remark, first, that there are strong probable grounds to conclude, that the text of the Scriptures current in the East received a mischievous modification at the hands of the famous *Origen*, which has not been usually appreciated. The learned reader needs only to be reminded of his transcendent reputation and influence as a critic and expositor, especially over Pamphilus, Eusebius Pamphili, and the monkish theologians of the 4th and 5th centuries. The chief

critical labor of Origen, which is usually mentioned, is his *Hexapla* of the Old Testament Scriptures. But it is known that he was an indefatigable collector of New Testament MSS., and a voluminous expositor; and that while no *edition* of the New Testament Scriptures is traced directly to his editorial labors, like the *Hexapla*, the readings which he adopted in his *scholia* and commentaries were, unquestionably, much followed by his admirers in transcribing the New Testament. In a word, Origen was, during the times of the Sabellian and Arian controversies, the *Magnus Apollo* of oriental biblical scholars; and his critical opinions were regarded by them as almost infallible. Now, what manner of man was Origen? He is described by Mosheim (in his *Com. de Rebus Christ.*, vol. 2, p. 144) as "a compound of contraries, wise and unwise, acute and stupid, judicious and injudicious; the enemy of superstition, and its patron; a strenuous defender of Christianity, and its corruptor; energetic and irresolute; one to whom the Bible owes much, *and from whom it has suffered much.*" While he gained, amidst the superstitious contemporaries who then gave character to Eastern Christianity, a splendid reputation for sanctity, as well as learning, his character was evidently dishonest and tricky, and his judgment most erratic. The disgraceful story that his condemnation by his bishop, Demetrius, and his flight from Alexandria, were caused by his apostasy to Paganism under the impulse of fear, is not only detailed by Epiphanius, the great enemy of Origenism, but by Cedremus and Suidas. As a controversialist, he was wholly unscrupulous. His reputation as the great introducer of mysticism, allegory, and Neo-Platonism into the Christian Church, is too well known to need recital. Those who are best acquainted with the history of Christian opinion know best, that Origen was the great corruptor, and the source, or at least earliest channel, of nearly all the speculative errors which plagued the Church in after ages. This general character, coupled with his influence as autocrat among the biblical critics, is enough to excite well-grounded suspicion.

But these suspicions are confirmed, when we examine the particular traits of his system. He was strictly a *Rationalist*. No

wonder that modern Rationalistic critics should manifest an instinctive sympathy with him, which gives weight to his critical testimony! He disbelieved the full inspiration and infallibility of the Scriptures, holding that the inspired men apprehended and stated many things obscurely. His philosophy was that of Ammonius, who asserted a common religion in all the schemes of philosophy, *including the Bible*, which only needed the excision of the excrescences and misconceptions added by poets and priests, to make their universal harmony appear; and the key-note of all Origen's labors was the effort to reconcile Christianity and this eclectic Pagan philosophy into a substantial unity. He held, as his theory of exposition, that there are three senses of Scripture—the grammatical or literal, the spiritual, and the anagogical; that the first sense does not exist at all in many places, but only the second or third; that the attempt to impose a literal grammatical sense on those places would lead us to absolute falsehood and nonsense; and that the mere words are, accordingly, of no importance. His opinions on the Trinity veered between Sabellianism and Arianism. He expressly denied the consubstantial unity of the Persons, and the proper incarnation of the Godhead—the very propositions most clearly asserted in the doctrinal various readings we have under review. His theory was, that the objections of the philosophers, and of the Marcionites and Valentinians, to many supposed facts and dogmas which seem to be contained in the grammatical sense of the Bible, would be unanswerable if that sense is asserted; and that the only solution was to discard that sense, and advance allegorical meanings instead. Nolan charges that his method of citing the Scriptures is inconsistent and vacillating; that he often cites from heretical *codices* and readings; that he often proposes to correct the text of the New Testament by the supposed indications of the Septuagint, and even of heretical comments, upon the most reckless and licentious critical principles. "As he had labored to supersede the authorised version of the Old Testament, he contributed to weaken the authority of the received text of the New. In the course of his commentaries he cited the versions of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion,

on the former part of the canon; he appealed to the authority of Valentinus and Heracleon, on the latter. While he thus raised the credit of these revisals which had been made by the heretics, he detracted from the authority of that text which had been received by the orthodox. Some difficulties which he found himself unable to solve in the evangelists, he undertook to remove, by expressing his doubts of the integrity of the text. In some instances, he ventured to impeach the reading of the New Testament on the testimony of the Old, and to convict the copies of one Gospel on the evidence of another." (Nolan, pp. 432, 433.) Such are the charges which this learned writer finds on a laborious review of Origen's critical efforts. This acute critic also charges that a number of the most characteristic discrepancies between the Greek Vulgate or Constantinopolitan text, and the texts current from Origen's day in Palestine and Egypt, are distinctly traceable to a Marcionite or Valentinian source; and that Origen's was demonstrably the mediating hand for introducing those corruptions into the latter texts. See his work, pp. 470 to 509, where he traces the readings from the Apocryphal Gospels of those Gnostics, through Origen's comments. We especially commend to the admirers of the Oriental and Egyptian *codices* these concluding words of Nolan: "Through various channels those readings might have crept into the edition of Eusebius. The Scripture text of Tatian, which most probably conformed in many respects to the Gospel and Apostolicum of Marcion, the text of Ilesychius," (the Alexandrian,) "which was compiled from various apocryphal works, and the commentaries of Origen, which abounded in quotations drawn from heretical revisals of Scripture, opened a prolific source, whence they directly passed into the Palestine edition. The facilities of correcting this text from Origen's writings, and the blind reverence in which that ancient father was held in the school of Cæsarea, seem to have rendered the corruption of this text unavoidable; short annotations, or *scholia*, had been inserted by Origen in the margin of his copies of Scripture; and the number of these had been considerably augmented by Eusebius, most probably by extracts taken from Origen's commentaries.



A comparison between the text and comment constantly pointed out variations in the reading; and Origen's authority being definitive on subjects of sacred criticism, the inspired text was amended by the comments. Had we no other proof of this assertion than the feasibility of the matter, and the internal evidence of the Greek MSS., we might thence assume the truth of the fact, without much danger of erring. But this point is placed beyond conjecture by the most unquestionable documents. In some MSS. containing the Palestine text, it is recorded that they were transcribed from copies the originals of which had been 'corrected by Eusebius.' In the celebrated *Codex Marchalianus*, the whole process observed in correcting the text, is openly avowed. The reviser there candidly states that, 'having procured the explanatory tomes of Origen, he accurately investigated the sense in which he explained every word, as far as was possible, and corrected everything ambiguous according to his notion.' After this explicit acknowledgment, it seems unnecessary further to prolong this discussion."

Thus far "Nolan's Inquiry." Now it is worthy of notice that these Trinitarian proof-texts, which appear in the Greek and Latin Vulgate, but are wanting in the old *codices* of the Palestine and Egyptian, were aimed by the apostles who wrote them precisely against Ebionite and Gnostic heresies. How natural that when, through the ill-starred manipulation of Origen, the text was infected from those heretical sources, these very readings should disappear? There appears a strong probability then that "the learned Origen" is least of all entitled to that authority which the recent critics claim for him as a witness to the state of the genuine readings: but that, if the whole truth could be recovered, he would be found the original corrupter of the text. We would particularly invoke the reader's attention to these admitted facts. This overweening confidence in the literary autocrat of Cæsarea did not much extend to the Latin churches or to Byzantium and Greece. It chiefly affected the East. The Western churches were never infected with the Origenist controversies which convulsed the churches of the East during the fourth and fifth centuries. Again. The admiration

of Origen's learning and opinions was chiefly limited to the monasteries. ' The fanatical monks generally swore by him almost as their God, because his self-emasculation, asceticism, mysticism, self-righteousness, and superstition, exactly favored monkery. The secular clergy usually condemned his sentiments and influence; and it was by a Byzantine council of such clergy that his name was finally fixed (where it belongs) in the list of *heretics*. Couple now with this the fact asserted by our recent critics in favor of their preferred *codices*, that they were obviously copied for monastic libraries, and not for liturgical use in churches. We conclude that there is so much the more probability they embody the Origenist corruptions. And the judgment which depreciates the liturgical *codices* as compared with the monastic will be reversed: we shall conclude that the Church MSS. were originally the truest. Once more. We shall be prepared to believe that the Western early version, where Origenism had then no currency, reflects the original purity of the text, even more truly than the Greek MSS. prevalent after Origen's day in Palestine and Egypt. The testimony of the old Italic in favor of 1 John v. 7 is therefore more weighty than at first appeared.

Let us descend now to the epoch of the Arian heresy, and we shall find in Eusebius of Cæsarea another probable source of mutilation of the original text. His also was a *clarum et venerabile nomen*, with the corrupt and fantastical religionism of the day. He was a blind admirer of Origen and constantly made tacit pretensions of being (through Pamphilus) the lineal successor to his fame and influence. He was in theology a semi-Arian; in church-politics, tricky and time-serving; to the pretentious tyrant, Constantine the Great, a truckling sycophant. Whatever proof exists that Origen and his school deteriorated the correctness of the text, it is to the same extent clear that Eusebius accepted and perpetuated that injury. His employment by the Emperor Constantine to edit fifty complete *codices* of the Scriptures, as detailed in his life of that prince, may be received as being as authentic as any part of the history. Theodoret (Eccles. Hist., Bk. I., Ch. 16,) professes to give the

very words of this command. The emperor does not assign the destruction of the sacred books in the last persecution, or any resulting scarcity as the cause of the want; but only the prosperity and rapid advancement of Christianity, requiring more ample appliances. This transaction, therefore, gives no support to the statement which some have insinuated, that the original *ἔκδοσις* current in the Greek regions had been obliterated by persecution. And it is certain that the recension which finally prevailed in the patriarchate of Constantinople (the *κοινὴ ἔκδοσις*), is very far from being this Eusebian edition. Yet the reputation of the editor, and the force of royal favor must have given it some currency and some influence over the received text. Tischendorf, as we have seen, surmises that the Sinaitic *Codex* is one of these veritable Eusebian MSS. presented to the Monastery of St. Catharine by Justinian, the successor of Constantine. Now we are not left wholly in the dark as to the character of this edition. The "Eusebian Canons," as they are called, a species of table by which the parallel passages might be found in the four Gospels, have come down to us; and they disclose the fact that this father excluded Mark xvi. 9 to end, and John vii. 53 to viii. 11, from the text. For the canons contain a complete enumeration of all the chapters and sections, or *στίχοι*, which he recognised, not only arranging those which he considered as parallel against each other, but those places which he considered as unique (but genuine) by themselves. These canons for finding the parallel passages seem to have had a wide currency after Eusebius' day, as they are attached to many Greek MSS. and even to some MSS. of versions. Now the amount of the evidence from them is the following: If it is proved that the two important passages omitted were genuine parts of the Gospels before his day, then it is clear that he endeavored to excise them, and their absence from so many MSS. and versions is very naturally accounted for by his dishonest example. But the evidences of their claim to a place in the Gospels are conclusive, especially the internal. Nor are Eusebius' works lacking in intimations, at least as to the history of the woman taken in adultery, that he was disposed to excise it upon the ground of

a misunderstanding of its true scope. So, the supposed contradiction between Mark's account of our Saviour's acts after his resurrection and that of the other evangelists, was, as we know, regarded as a great difficulty in the way of its admission. But if there is any case where Bengel's rule, that the harder reading is to be preferred over the easier, is applicable, it is here where the apparent collision lies so on the surface, that it must almost necessarily have deterred the copyists of that day from interpolating it had it not been already a part of the text. We conclude then, on the whole, that the connexion of Eusebius with the text is suspicious, and that there is a strong probability it suffered again from his hands.

To estimate the probability that the Arian party also injured the integrity of the Trinitarian readings in some places, we must remember their temporary triumph in the East under Constantine's successors; their reckless and unprincipled persecuting spirit; the villainous means to which they are known to have resorted to gain their ends, fraud, lying, subornation, (as in the case of the venerable Bishop Athanasius and Eustathius of Antioch,) and violence, and the charges of mutilating the sacred books made against them by the orthodox. Athanasius, for instance, in his first Encyclical Letter against the Arians to the bishops of Egypt and Lybia, charges it upon them, as one of their customary tricks to deceive the unwary, that they advanced deceitful readings of the Scriptures. (Vol. I., p. 287, A.) The fact which Nolan cites is also full of significance, that the Constantinopolitan *εκδοσις* is found to contain all the readings which we know from their extant writings the Arians were wont to urge against the proper divinity of Christ. It appears also that there is no evidence the Arians ever had to complain of their orthodox opponents for tampering with the integrity of the text in order to refute them. Here then were the facts. The Arians were notoriously unscrupulous. They were openly charged with corrupting the text for polemical purposes. They could not bring any such charge against the orthodox. The *codices* which their orthodox adversaries used, honestly retained all the readings which the Arians supposed damaging to orthodoxy. But

here is a class of *codices* which present a very singular and suspicious resemblance in omitting certain readings particularly damaging to Arianism. This dogma is, as it happens, the only important one involved in the various readings. The coincidences are too regular to be accounted for by fortuitous influences—somebody has played the knave with the text, either the so-called orthodox by corruptly interpolating, or some anti-Trinitarians by dishonestly mutilating. The alternative is between the two hypotheses. Let the candid reader choose between them in the light of these facts. We think that he will conclude with us that the weight of probability is greatly in favor of this theory, viz., *That the anti-Trinitarians, finding certain codices in which these doctrinal readings had been already lost through the licentious criticism of Origen and his school, industriously diffused them, while they also did what they dared to add to the omissions of similar readings.*

Let us then briefly sum up the results attempted in this discussion. If all the debated readings were surrendered by us, no fact or doctrine of Christianity would thereby be invalidated, and least of all would the doctrine of Christ's proper divinity be deprived of adequate scriptural support. Hence the interests of orthodoxy are entirely secure from and above the reach of all movements of modern criticism of the text, whether made in a correct or incorrect method, and all such discussions in future are, to the Church, of subordinate importance. Yet they have their interest, and should receive the intelligent watch of the teachers of the Church. Absolute historical certainty of results is not to be expected, since so many of the documents of the primitive Church are gone forever; but probable conclusions are all which are to be expected. But, after all, the weight of that probability brings back the critical conclusions to the theory of Nolan and Scholz, restoring the claims of the *Κουη' Ἐκδοσις*, or received text, to be a faithful one, and invalidating the claims of exclusive accuracy made by our recent critics in favor of the so-called oldest *codices*.

## ARTICLE II.

## MEMOIR OF THE REV. SAMUEL B. MCPHEETERS, D. D.

*Memoir of the Rev. Samuel B. McPheeters, D. D.* By the Rev. JOHN S. GRASTY, Author of "Faith's Battles and Victories." With an Introduction by the Rev. STUART ROBINSON, D. D. Pp. 384, 12mo. St. Louis and Louisville. 1871.

This memoir, expected with so much interest, has now been some time before the Southern public. The history which it embodies is most noteworthy, and should not be allowed to sink into forgetfulness among Presbyterians. Our chief design is to attempt an estimate of those facts and principles which are illustrated in it. The character of the subject might indeed be selected as a topic of pleasing contemplation. He seems to have been a man singularly guileless, engaging and amiable in his temper, sparkling in his wit, and devout and sincere in his piety, as well as greatly honored by his divine Master and all his true people in his pastoral labors. The story, which would not be devoid of a romantic interest had it occurred in any other than our startling times, is told by Mr. Grasty with equal modesty and propriety. The volume is moreover enriched with much documentary material, for the collection of which in a permanent form the author deserves the thanks of every student of our late glorious history. But for the narrative we must refer our readers to the *Memoir* itself. We shall simply premise by recalling the salient points of the case as they were noted at the time of their occurrence by all our people.

At the beginning of the war for Southern independence, Dr. McPheeters, a native of Raleigh, North Carolina, and *alumnus* of Princeton Theological Seminary, was pastor of the Pine Street church, St. Louis, Missouri; but he was absent on a long tour for his health in New Mexico. Before his return he wrote a species of pastoral letter to his charge, announcing his purpose of standing wholly aloof from the strife, not only in his ministerial, but his private and civic character, and of devoting him-

self exclusively to the spiritual welfare of his people. On his return to St. Louis in the first year of the war he took an oath of allegiance to the United States, and also to the usurping government of the State, established by the bayonet upon the forcible expulsion of the legal governor, Mr. Jackson, and his legislature. Dr. McPheeters continued very faithfully to redeem the pledge of his pastoral letter, excluding political and military topics wholly from his prayers and sermons. Being a commissioner to the General Assembly of May, 1862, in Columbus, Ohio, he, with a few others, dissented from the action of that body, when, under the lead of Dr. Robert J. Breckinridge, it rushed into political deliverances and into religious persecution. After his return, a minute fraction of his hitherto peaceful charge, headed by one George P. Strong, a member of his session, (a man whose otherwise insignificant name is forever doomed to a "bad eminence" of infamy by his pertinacious connexion with this history,) demanded of Dr. McPheeters in writing that he should, as a pastor, show his hand concerning the war and politics. He calmly but firmly declined to do so, on the ground that the requirement was an unwarrantable intrusion into his spiritual independence, to which he could not accede consistently with principle. To this position he held throughout. The result of this and other persecutions on the part of Strong and his faction was that on the 19th of December one F. A. Dick, Military Provost Marshal of St. Louis, moved thereto undoubtedly by Strong, issued an order of ejection from his pulpit, and banishment within ten days from the State of Missouri against Dr. McPheeters and his wife, on the sole ground of *suspicion of disloyalty*. On the 28th of December the order of immediate banishment was withdrawn, leaving him strictly inhibited by military authority from all ministerial acts whatsoever. Strong and his party were also appointed by the same authority to the possession of the house of worship and the pastoral care of the Pine Street flock. Dr. McPheeters appealed in person to Lincoln, who, while disclaiming persecuting intentions, made only an ambiguous promise of redress at that time. He, however, was better than his promise; for in January of 1863 he sent to Gen.

Curtis, commanding in Missouri, a general order not to attempt to "run the churches," under which all Dr. McPheeters's disabilities should have been removed. His enemies, however, countenanced by Curtis, managed to deprive him of all knowledge and advantage of this order until the end of the year 1863, when, through the activity of some friends, Lincoln's attention was again called to the case and the military persecution arrested.

But, meantime, the Radical fragment of the Presbytery of St. Louis, sitting when all presbyters who were true to their principles were excluded from its meetings by the infamous "Rosecrans Order," dissolved Dr. McPheeters's pastoral relation, against the repeated protest of the church, and forbade his performing any ministerial act in that congregation, even by temporary invitation of the session. Against these decisions Dr. McPheeters appealed to the Synod of Missouri, and to the General Assembly. The latter court took up his case first, and in Newark, New Jersey, May, 1864, issued it by confirming all the acts of the "Rump" Presbytery against Dr. McPheeters and his church, by a vote of one hundred and seventeen against forty-seven. Geo. P. Strong, the zealous "familiar" of this Presbyterian Inquisition, pursued his meek pastor to Newark, and was allowed to pour forth, in the Assembly, seven hours' of vituperations, suspicions, and slanders against him.

Dr. McPheeters, now fatally broken in health, submitting to the decision of the Assembly, removed to a country charge in Shelby County, Kentucky, where he resumed his pastoral labors, for a time, as a member of Louisville Presbytery. Here he coöperated with Drs. Wilson and Robinson, and their friends, in issuing the "Declaration and Testimony." He was, with them, expelled from the Northern Presbyterian Church, by the Assembly of 1866; and, in March, 1870, finished his course by a peaceful death.

Our business with this touching narrative now is, to learn from its facts, what is the position which the Northern Presbyterian Church has deliberately taken and now holds, touching



the rights of conscience, the spiritual independence of Christ's Church, and his headship over it.

And the most obvious remark to be made is, that Dr. McPheeters's position happened to be one which perfectly eliminated every question, and every pretext of a question, save the naked right of conscience; so that in persecuting him, his brethren expressly assailed that right in its clearest phase. Dr. McPheeters had gone every possible length in propitiating their enmity. Many will still think that it would at least have been no crime in him to declare his just sympathy, as a man and citizen, with the men of his native State and kindred, in their struggle to defend, as citizens, those same sacred rights which he claimed as a Christian; but that sympathy he suppressed, in his care to give no offence. Many will still deem that he might have reasoned thus as a Christian minister: That neither the constitution of Christ's Church, nor of a Christian State, requires the Christian man to cease totally to be a citizen because he has become a pastor; that he, as still a citizen and patriot, had duties to perform, in the assertion of truth, and right, and justice, and public covenants, and the defence of invaded and essential liberties, which, although less important and sacred than his ministerial duties, were as clearly incumbent in their lower sphere; that while it would be sin for him to mingle these secular duties with his sacred functions by seeking to pervert his spiritual powers to secular ends, it was an equal confusion of the same diverse elements to make his sacred obligations the pretext for inhibiting his performance of his secular duties in his lawful secular sphere; that "duties never clash;" and if unreasonable or perverse men made his righteous performance of his civic duties a pretext to obstruct his pastoral usefulness, and thus to injure the precious Church of Christ, the guilt of that injury must rest on the heads of the assailants, and not on his. But he did not claim this right. He absolutely waived any secular responsibilities in order to run no risk of obstructing his spiritual duties. He took all their oaths; obeyed all their orders, civil and military. When unlawfully forbidden to

preach his divine Master's message, he did not say: "Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye. For we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard." But he remained silent in obedience to their requirement. So scrupulously did he abstain from all assertion of Southern rights, that the inquisition, which his enemies tyrannically and impiously made into his private sympathies, could find nothing for pretexts, save the frivolous fact that he had baptized an infant, at the request of the parents, with the honored name of Sterling Price; and an indelicate and cowardly intrusion into the private sentiments of a female member of his family. There was absolutely no overt act to charge, even by the usurping standard of his enemies. But for the suspicion of private sentiments adverse to those usurpations, he was, by a military provost marshal, visited with a heavy ecclesiastical penalty, as well as with the temporal penalty of banishment. And the former punishment was continued indefinitely by Gen. Curtis, (at the cost of insubordination,) solely because Dr. McPheeters refused to surrender his liberty of conscience. (See Memoir, pp. 187 to 189). Two things are worthy of note here, by every lover of human rights: First, the utter confusion of ecclesiastical with civil matters, the full union of Church and State, and express denial of religious liberty to Dr. McPheeters and his charge. Second, the intensely tyrannical usurpation made in assuming to *punish his thoughts*. This is the last extreme to which the most ruthless despotism has ever gone. The genius of American liberty had long before swept away the whole doctrine of constructive treason as the blackest engine of despotism. It was, indeed, the crowning sin of inquisitorial despotism. Every American constitution had forbidden the civil magistrate to elevate any opinions and feelings, however erroneous and sinful, into secular crimes or misdemeanors while not attended with illegal acts. But Dr. McPheeters was virtually convicted of treason for suspected opinions and feelings only. The saddest thing in this whole transaction is the ground on which all the professed Northern conservatives place Dr. McPheeters's defence. All of them, so far as we can find, the

provisional governor, Gamble, the St. Louis "Unionists" petitioning for the pastor's restoration, the conservative members of the Newark Assembly, as Dr. Geo. Junkin, in his speech for Dr. McPheeters, tacitly admit the odious tyranny. They plead that Southern thoughts had not been *proved on* Dr. McPheeters; that the baptism of the infant in the name of Sterling Price did not *prove* he admired that noble patriot; thus making the clear admission, that, had these thoughts been proved, the penalty would have been just. Whereas, the only ground which a worthy freeman should have deigned to take was this: that no secular authority under heaven had any right to call Dr. McPheeters to any account for Southern opinions and feelings, even on the hypothesis that the ultra federal theory of the powers of the United States were true; that, so far as their authority went, Dr. McPheeters had a perfect right to admire Sterling Price if he chose, no matter how perverse that admiration might in fact be; so long as he did not perform overt acts of force against the United States. Hence, it appears to be conceded by the most conservative minds of the North, that the doctrine of constructive treason is restored, and that freedom of thought no longer exists for American citizens; at least during any times whenever the violence or usurpations of the Government may have provoked any domestic or foreign disturbance.

But, to proceed to specific points of the history, we note second, that Dr. McPheeters's first unpardonable offence against radical Presbyterians, was his exercising his right, May, 1862, in the Columbus Assembly, of dissenting from its violating its own constitution by "handling and concluding things not ecclesiastical." The exercise of this right in a very modest form came nigh unto causing his arrest by the military authorities in St. Louis. It did open upon him the vials of wrath of the radical Presbyterians there. The enactment passed by the Columbus Assembly, involved the same fatal heresy with the "Spring Resolutions" of 1861. It differed from these only in carrying the usurpation of church power farther, and in its excessive vituperation. Nor is there a vital difference between these acts and the subsequent ones passed on the same subject

in 1863, 1864, and 1865, by both the Assemblies composing the Northern Presbyterian Church, and now held as its recorded doctrine by that large body. We are in no danger of error in our construction of the usurpation here resisted by Dr. McPheeters and the whole Southern Church, because it had been correctly defined for us in 1861 by the protest of Dr. Hodge himself. The point, then, was simply this: Collision having arisen between certain State Governments and the Federal, the Christian citizens in those States found it incumbent on them to exercise their conscientious discretion, in deciding whether their allegiance was primarily due to their State, or to the Federal Government. These usurping Assemblies pretended to think that those Southern Christians, who presumed to decide that question by the light of their own consciences, thereby committed the *ecclesiastical offence* involved in the "*sin of rebellion.*" Such was, and is, their pretension. Now, we do not stop with asserting simply that this pretension was unscriptural, and against the constitution of our Church: we assert moreover, that it is impossible those Assemblies could have really supposed their pretension scriptural; and that it was therefore only a conscious pretext for seizing upon the spiritual powers of Christ's Church to wield them for enforcing a factious secular end.

It is impossible that any of those Assemblies really believed a Southern Christian committed *the sin of rebellion* in deciding that his primary allegiance was due to his State; because this was clearly a question of secular rights, affecting the distribution of powers made by a merely human instrument of writing between certain contracting parties, and in no sense a question of the interpretation of God's revealed precepts; because nearly every State Government in the United States had formally decided it the very way the Southern Christians did, and most notably, the Northern States; because the decision claimed by these Assemblies as the only one not criminal, had never been conceded as a settled point among American statesmen; but an Attorney-General of the United States for instance, (Mr. Wirt), and a Northern statesman now at the head of the supreme judiciary of the United States, had decided it just as the South-

ern Christians decided it; because these very ministers and elders had already been extending to a multitude of Southern Christians (as Dr. Thornwell) who held the Southern opinion firmly, not only full ecclesiastical communion, but especial professions of Christian love and honor; and inasmuch as the spiritual jurisdiction of the Church does rightfully reach to opinions before they are carried out in overt act, if the decision afterwards made by us was criminal, then the express avowal of that political doctrine before made by Dr. Thornwell and others was disciplinable; because common sense shows that it is simply preposterous to represent the Christian conscience otherwise pure, (as in such a case as that of Robert E. Lee,) as defiled by making that decision, and it is what no sane man believes; and because these Northern ministers and elders have since offered Christian communion to us, who committed that offence (if it were an offence) and who avow no repentance. He who, in the face of these well known considerations, can believe that those Assemblies really deemed themselves authorised by God's word, and our Constitution, to decide as they did, must have a capacious credulity indeed. Why, the Northern coercionist politicians and generals did not then presume to call the action of the Southern States "*rebellion*:" the current term was "*secessionists*." Nor did they apply the former epithet, until taught to do so by the ecclesiastical usurpers. And were it necessary for Southern Christians further to defend their liberty of conscience in entertaining and deciding that question of allegiance as they did, they might now find abundant justification in subsequent events. They might point to the fact that subsequent infringements of their rights have been so clear and so vital, that many of their enemies have since declared their resistance would have been righteous had it been made only after these later developments of tyranny; among whom may be enumerated many Northern journals, a president of the United States, great constitutional lawyers, as R. J. Walker, and the supreme judicial authority of the country. Southern Christians, we repeat, in the face of such admissions, may surely argue that they cannot be convicted of sin in resisting when they did, because the whole extent of

their offending then was, that they estimated the true *animus* of their assailants correctly. But this defence may be omitted as superfluous.

The acts of these Assemblies, then, were not honest blunders, as to the extent of their scriptural powers; they were conscious attempts to wield the spiritual powers of Christ's kingdom to further secular purposes in which they felt an overweening concern. The gravity of the usurpation, then, could not be exaggerated. It contained in it the whole poison of the union between Church and State. It was most cruel towards its intended victims. It was profane towards Christ, their professed Head, in that it sought to misapply his blood-bought spiritual power over his elect, delegated to these Church courts for edification only, to the furtherance of a project then avowedly secular and political, and since characterised by its developments before the whole Christian world, as radical, disorganising, cruel, and mischievous. As to resistance to such ecclesiastical usurpation, no good man like Dr. McPheeters could hesitate. He felt that he could "give place by subjection, no, not for an hour," and signed his solemn protest. Southern Presbyterians had no other alternative than separation; and the whole guilt of the schism rested with those who necessitated the outward severance.

The great purpose of Southern Church courts then, in withdrawing from their aggressors, was defensive: it was to protect the spiritual liberty of their people. In asserting this liberty of conscience for them our Assemblies do not by any means decide the question of civic allegiance, nor even indicate how they think individuals should have decided it. They merely vindicate for individuals the inalienable right of deciding it in the light of their own consciences, without dictation from pretended spiritual authorities. For, we repeat, when the awful and immense powers of the spiritual sphere over the soul are successfully wielded to obstruct the exercise of secular rights by Christian citizens, then we have the most portentous enginery of despotism which oppressed the Dark Ages. Once persuade any man that he can only exercise temporal franchises at the cost of

his soul's everlasting damnation, and he is a slave thrice bound, helpless in the hands of those who apply this ghostly power and of the despots who use them as their tools. For "what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?" The distinction is thus very clear between the action of the Southern and the Northern Assemblies. The one was designed to defend, the other to invade.

The charge has been often made that the Southern Assemblies have implicated themselves as clearly in political usurpations as the Northern. Some have even been shallow enough to argue that if the Radical Assemblies were guilty of making a political deliverance when they denied to private Christians the right of choosing between the State and Federal allegiance, our Assemblies were equally guilty in claiming that right for them. This is excessively foolish, and appears so from the facts last argued. Had the Southern Assemblies employed their spiritual power to coerce Christians to give their allegiance to the Southern Confederacy, (and had the latter been as despotic and usurping as the Federal authorities,) then this charge would have been true. But no Southern church court ever presumed to commit such an inconsistency. There is, however, another truth to be pointed out, to which many, even of our own people, seem to be partially blind. The conditions of the argument are totally different for the aggressors and the defendants in such a controversy. If a Northern Assembly goes out of its proper jurisdiction *for the purpose of invading* the reserved rights of Christian people, then their action makes it right and proper for a Southern Assembly to follow them into that foreign sphere for the praiseworthy purpose of defending the rights of Christians. The sin of intrusion belongs wholly to the aggressors. Their commission of that sin justifies and even necessitates defensive legislation on this foreign topic, where, otherwise, a consistent church court would have felt no mission to legislate. An actual historical illustration is at hand, which is perfect. At an Assembly at Indianapolis, a short time before the war, the overweening friends of total abstinence moved the Assembly to make their rule as to alcoholic beverages binding on the consciences of our people. Dr. Thornwell prop-

erly met them by arguing that the Assembly had no scriptural authority to bind the liberty of the people in this thing, that the Bible prohibited excess only, and not the use of strong drinks. The Assembly so enacted. What now would have been the absurdity if some advocate of the "Delavan theory" had arisen and charged the Assembly with going out of its sphere to authorise a particular sensual indulgence and to administer at least tacit encouragement to the manufacture and tipping of this national curse? The answer would have been very plain. Had not the scriptural liberty of its people been assailed, the Assembly would have found no mission to say one word for the manufacture and use of strong drinks. And now, that word was said, not for the encouragement of those acts in themselves, (they are merely secular, even where not sinful,) but for the protection of Christian liberty. And this object is strictly ecclesiastical.

Just so, the Southern church courts were, to a certain extent, properly dragged into the field of politics by the aggressions against the Christian liberty of the people; not for the sake of political objects, but for the sake of ecclesiastical rights. If, in such case, any of these courts had gone so far as to enact that their people *might conscientiously give their allegiance to the Southern Confederacy*, their act would have been, from its circumstances, totally different from the act of the Radical Assemblies in enacting that they might not. The one act was designed to defend ecclesiastical rights, the other to invade them. The one was justified by the other. Had there been such a church court in the South, it could have justified itself by the example of Dr. Thornwell, who, when the liberty of Christians was assailed, taught the Assembly to enact that Christians might drink *temperately*, and this, not for the sake of the manufacturer of drinks, but for the sake of rights. The language of the Assembly of 1864, at Charlotte, North Carolina, concerning slavery, (about which many unnecessary and some unmanly apologies have been made) receives the same explanation. The first Southern Assembly said that it assumed no mission either to preserve or to abolish slavery. The Assembly at Charlotte said that the



Christian people of the South recognised it as their mission (not their only one of course) to "conserve domestic slavery." The two declarations are perfectly consistent. Primarily the Church of Christ has no vocation to advocate any one organisation of labor as against another; for these are all secular, political concerns. But when once a particular organisation of labor which our Commonwealths had lawfully and righteously instituted for the people, was unscrupulously assailed by usurping ecclesiastics, with the weapons of wrested scriptures and perverted spiritual powers, *that assault created a vocation, a scriptural vocation, to defend the right of slaveholding in so far as it became a matter of Christian liberty, that is to say, of ecclesiastical concernment.* Such was precisely the case with the two Southern Assemblies. In 1861 the war was, in pretense, only for "restoring national unity;" and our ecclesiastical persecutors, (our late Presbyterian brethren,) professed to seek only that object (unlawful for them to seek). Accordingly the Assembly of 1861 met only that aggression. By 1864 the war had unmasked itself as a war of plunder, abolition, and the disorganisation of society, and our usurping ecclesiastics had begun to wield the powers of Christ's Church to effect that iniquity. The Assembly of 1864 therefore properly recognised its mission to meet that invasion of the ecclesiastical rights of its people. When it is added that the only "conservation" of domestic slavery intended was that of uttering the scriptural testimony for its lawfulness and the pious injunction of their relative duties on masters and slaves—that the Assembly never dreamed of meddling with any political or economical aspect of the institution—the defence is complete. In a word, the Charlotte Assembly asserted its vocation to "conserve slavery" precisely in the sense and manner in which the Apostle Paul does it in 1 Tim. vi. 1 to 5.

Dr. McPheeters's firm but temperate dissent from the spiritual usurpations we have discussed came near, as we have seen, provoking his immediate arrest. It was doubtless the signal for the assault of his domestic foes in his own charge. We are now introduced to the counterpart scene of the drama. Hitherto we

have witnessed the Church's assumption of secular powers. We shall now see the State's assumption of spiritual powers. The one naturally produces the other. Dr. McPheeters, indeed, in defending his appeal before the Newark Assembly, very clearly pointed out this sequence, "If Church courts 'will handle and conclude civil affairs which concern the commonwealth,' then an inexorable logic compels me to admit that the commonwealth has a right to know what they are handling, and how they conclude them." This is unanswerable. If the Church may direct its members, as citizens, in their political action, (and its powers over the conscience being spiritual, once heartily admitted, are irresistible), and if the Church is irresponsible to the State in giving that direction, then the Church is practically supreme over the State. For let the reader remember that if the private citizen, a Church member, may be thus directed, the magistrate, a Church member, may be equally, yea, even the chief magistrate. The regular result is the theory of Hildebrand, which taught that Pope to tread on the necks of kings. There cannot be two coördinate, supreme, and independent authorities, rightfully claiming the allegiance of the same people in the same sphere. The one must bow to the other; we must have the result either of Gregory VII. or of Erastus. The Church must dominate the State or the State the Church. The only escape from these conclusions, both monstrous, is the separation of the secular and spiritual spheres, as provided for in the Scriptures, and in the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church and of the United States.

In this case, as the temper of the Federalist party was not ripe for submission to the Hildebrand theory, the result was a flagrant Erastianism. The next things we hear of are the "Dix order," and the "Rosecrans order:" the one deposing Dr. McPheeters from his pastoral charge on the suspicion of certain political opinions; the other undertaking to enforce a secular qualification for spiritual rule in the Church, by exacting an oath of full support to all Federal usurpations. The intelligent Presbyterian needs no comments on these acts to show him that they invaded the very citadel of Christ's rights over his kingdom. It

is impossible that anything could be more inconsistent with religious liberty and the headship of the Lord. Both these acts were brought distinctly before the Old School General Assembly; the one by Dr. McPheeters, in 1864; the other by Dr. Farris, in 1865. *The Assembly deliberately approved the former, and allowed the latter.* Every element concurs to mark this as the most shocking defection which has occurred in modern times in any Protestant Church.

All moderate, secular men could see the enormity of them, although the church courts of Radicalism could not. The Radical President could at least see their impolicy from their utter opposition to every former idea of American liberty. The secular papers which retained any moderation, cried out in shame and astonishment against the enormity of the acts. Such was the language of the *New York Express*, of the *Journal of Commerce*, of the *Canadian Leader*, a journal which, although issued under a monarchy, could still judge this tyrannical policy from a dispassionate and Protestant point of view. Decent Union men in St. Louis itself, the *focus* of the excitement, were ashamed of the usurpations, and protested and petitioned against them. But the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, God's appointed guardian of spiritual rights and of Christ's headship, saw no wrong in them.

Another element of aggravation was, that the military were, in both cases, egged on and prompted to these usurpations, not by secular zealots, but by professed Presbyterians and brethren. It is obvious that Geo. P. Strong was the prime procurer of all Dr. McPheeters's troubles; and that he persecuted him under the mask of religious and patriotic zeal, but really at the prompting of revenge for Dr. McPheeters's act in refusing to prostitute his pastoral and spiritual influence to have him (Strong) appointed to a secular office of emolument. (Memoir, p. 276). It is the emphatic testimony of Dr. S. J. P. Anderson, (p. 292, 3), and of Dr. McPheeters, (p. 272), that there would have been no trouble about the military interference with the churches, had not the officers been persuaded and prompted by pretended Christians to intermeddle. Such was also the emphatic testi-

mony of those persons in Baltimore who were attempting to defend the independence of the Christian people: their trouble did not come from the military rulers themselves, but from brethren, falsely so-called, playing the *role* of delators and instigators. It is testified also, (Memoir, pp. 147, 148,) that in the attempt to make a show of dissatisfaction against Dr. McPheeters among his own charge, the most cruel, cowardly, and unjust means were employed by these religious persecutors to terrorize dissentients. Now these facts laid the Assembly under a solemn obligation to arrest the persecution and the whole career of usurpation, because all really sprung from men who were under its own spiritual jurisdiction. These facts should also have reminded the Assembly (as if they will teach us we are wise) of the especial malignity of religious tyranny, as contrasted with secular; because the sacred mask is always assumed by envy, malice, and bigotry, to work their foulest ends under the pretence of zeal for God.

Once more. It was a peculiarity of this case, that when it reached the Assembly, Dr. McPheeters's enemies had so juggled matters throughout, that *he had never once had a hearing in his own defence*, before he was condemned. In the case of Dix's ukase, of Gen. Curtis's, of the decisions of the "Rump Presbytery" against him, he had been uniformly condemned without having an opportunity to appear, on mere suspicion and the illegal allegations of persecutors. It was when he stood at last before the General Assembly of Newark, that he had the first (and that a bootless) opportunity to confront his accusers. Now had there been a particle of that natural fairness or sense of justice, which characterised the pagan Roman, or the burly John Bull, (or even John Bull's brute mastiff, which disdains to worry a dog when it is down,) the Assembly must have arrested the pursuit of McPheeters at his first appeal. They were bound to reverse every step, on the ground that however worthy he might prove to be of condemnation, he could not be condemned unheard.

Such was the enormity of the case in which the legitimate intervention of the supreme court of the Presbyterian Church

was solemnly invoked. It involved the most precious and sacred rights, secular and spiritual. It involved the most flagrant possible assault upon the blood-bought crown-rights of Jesus Christ. It was marked by every accessory of startling injustice. Had this Assembly been actuated by any sincere love of liberty, or clear and conscientious view of principles, it must have paused at this case. It must have said, in substance: "Here now is an attack upon everything dear to American Christians than which none can be graver." The pretensions of the Southern secessionists, even judged from our point of view, are a trifle in their results compared with these. They jeopardize a certain theory of centralisation which Northern power and ambition judges important. They threaten certain commercial advantages and gains attendant upon our ascendancy in the Federal Union. They, if successful, will impose certain political and public expenditures and inconveniences. They assail no spiritual right, no municipal right, no franchise of State or citizen, which enlightened liberty has ever regarded as fundamental. They merely propose a new relation of States *inter se*, disadvantageous to our interests as we conceive them. But here is an assault on the very corner-stone of all liberty; on all man's rights and interests for time and eternity. True, it has thus far been made to touch but a few humble fellow-citizens and brethren; but its principle is here openly asserted; and it must be here met. This does indeed touch the "life of the nation." Let this prevail, and we bid farewell to Republicanism, to Protestantism, to gospel, to liberty, and set out on that road to ruin, which conducts to the condition of a modern Rome under Cardinal Antonelli. Here, then, is a new issue, whose gravity supersedes all others. Until this is saved, we have no time, no thought, for "sustaining the Government," or "making Southern treason odious." The one duty is that of "self-preservation." Such must have been the answer of the Assembly, had it possessed any of the principles of Knox, of Melville, of Gillespie, of the Erskines, of Chalmers. "But it cared for none of these things." It had already yielded up to prostitution the bride of Christ, and had of course no zeal for her rescue. It is but too

manifest, that the Assembly cared for only one end—the success of the coercionist faction. Here, then, is confirmation of the charge, that the measures of 1861, 1862, and 1863, were not honest blunders, but conscious attempts to wield the spiritual powers of the Church for secular advantages.

There was, indeed, a little minority of forty-seven against this crime. A few voices were raised in argument against it; but on premises which made success impossible. They asserted informalities in the action of the Presbytery, they claimed the lawful operation of appeal in staying a decision; and in this they argued correctly enough. They also pointed out the Erastianism of the whole proceeding. But they made the fatal admission of a theory of despotism (the theory upon which the United States was then acting) in politics, which renders any plea for spiritual independence preposterous. All history proves that secular and religious liberty stand or fall together. There can be no free Church in an enslaved State. The natural attitude of the bride of Christ under the empire of a Nero is that of the martyr, protesting, suffering, but bound. If, as Dr. Junkin conceded, the *man* is a slave, it is vain to claim that the minister shall be free. If the citizen is subject of his own servant (the executive officer), instead of being sovereign; if he is rightfully subject as a man to an inquisitorial rule which deprives him of his personal independence of opinion, which subjects him rightfully to arbitrary arrest because he claims that independence, then it is absurd to demand for him spiritual independence. It is seeking harvests in the Zahara. Dr. Junkin complained that many doctors of divinity, of his brethren, could not see how he could concede the one and yet demand the other. To us their slavish premises seem to make their incompetency very natural. Their maxim, (not the maxim of the equitable and benevolent laws of Southern commonwealths, which secured to their slaves many rights,) is that "*The slave has no rights.*" After pronouncing themselves slaves, it is too late to claim spiritual rights.

Such are the principles involved in the "McPheeters case." We would remind our readers, as we intimated in the outset,

that we single this history out from among the thousands of glorious "martyrs and confessors" who suffered in the same cause, not because Dr. McPheeters suffered any more, or as much, nor because his sufferings were more meritorious than theirs, but simply because providential circumstances have made his peculiarly a test case for unmasking the real principles of Northern Presbyterianism. Many are the thousands of Southern Christians, as firm, as intelligent, as true to these sacred principles as he; who braved for them not only religious disfranchisement, but cold, and hunger, and sleet, and nakedness, and watchings, and the ghastly military prison, and death; who strove to defend "Christ's crown and covenant" not only by eloquent protest, but by "not loving their own lives unto the death." They will sleep in nameless graves, without eloquent biographers; but our right hands must forget their cunning and our tongues cleave to the roofs of our mouths before we can forget their heroic sacrifices for the truth.

Some may ask, why should the friends of Dr. McPheeters, why should we, write to perpetuate these unhappy events? They may say that years have passed since they occurred; that the passions of those sad days are passing away; that our conquerors have returned to their equanimity, are no longer raging against us, and even offer us their kindness. They may advise that all these memories be consigned to oblivion as speedily as may be. The answer to these sayings, (so astonishing from those who profess to uphold right views), is in the simple question: If the passions of 1864 are passing away, are the principles of that day passing away? Or was all the principle of these pretended advocates of fraternity but passion, in those days that tried men's souls when they professed to uphold God's cause with us? Was this the only grievance they had against Radical Presbyterianism—that *it had fretted them*? Then verily are they of wholly another mind from us! We have held all along that it was the least of our charges against that party in the Church that it had angered *us*, that it had assisted and approved the spoiling of *our* goods, that it had maligned *our* good name, even that it had "hounded on the dogs of war" which drank the blood of *our*

loved ones. The chief *gravamen* was that they assailed and betrayed the rights of Christ and his Church: rights committed to us as sacred trusts, to be defended to the end at the peril of our souls. Now then, if they cease to rage, and even fawn; if they no longer malign, or plunder, or kill; so far well. But if they still betray the sacred rights of the Church, it is our duty still to protest; and the solemn injunction of our Master, "From such withdraw thyself," must keep us firm to our places in the watchtower.

What, then, of the question whether only passions or also principles have changed among these men. Have they truly repented and denounced the sins they committed against their divine Head? Now, one who was familiar with their almost unanimous profession of adherence to right principles in 1845, who witnessed the seeming fidelity to the truth up to almost the beginning of the strife, and who then beheld the sudden, violent, persistent desertion of their own professions, which began as soon as the temptation occurred, might well be pardoned for viewing with mistrust the most earnest avowals of penitence or change which they could now utter, and for insisting on many "fruits meet for repentance" before his confidence was restored. But when there has been no admission of error, and on the contrary, in their very last Assembly, a contemptuous refusal of it; when we have seen the persecutions in 1866 set on foot and pursued in Kentucky and Missouri up to this hour; when we see not only the same men, but in many cases their church courts applauding the tyranny of their secular government over their conquered victims, tyranny more ruthless and cruel than any of the violences of the conquest itself; when we hear them explain their own advances of friendship, not as acts of righteous reparation, but as projects for consolidating party power, and that prominently secular power—we must be simply fools to misunderstand their present attitude. Not only is there no overt avowal of error, such as false pride might make even a generous mind slow to publish, after the sincere consciousness of error was admitted; but, on the contrary, there is unquestionably the firm, deliberate, determined retention of those Erastian principles for future use.



Who can doubt it? Their complacency is simply the satisfaction of triumphant, irresistible success. If there were any longer a successful resistance afoot, we should behold precisely the old fury. And whenever the time comes, (as come it will,) that they shall persuade themselves their interests require of us the surrender of any of the poor remains of rights left us, if we have then any effective means and will to resist, we shall see them resort to the same spiritual usurpation and to the same anger to carry those ends. In estimating their future proceedings and principles, we must not forget that since their fusion, Northern Presbyterianism is virtually New School, Abolition, Radical Presbyterianism. That union was plainly an absorption of the Old School by the New. If, then, we would know its present complexion, we must acquaint ourselves with the action of the New School Assemblies. We shall find, indeed, no McPheeters case, no excision of whole Synods without trial, because their tyranny had long before driven off all their conservative members, and they simply had none left to persecute. But we shall see the most determined fanaticism, Erastianism, and confusion of things secular and spiritual, before, during, and since the war. These, coupled with a clearly pronounced "Broad-churchism," are the ascertained characteristics of Northern Presbyterianism.

In conclusion, we may remark that the career of Dr. McPheeters illustrates very sufficiently that unhallowed confusion which some in our day seek to effect between Christian charity and adherence to principle. Of the former he had the fullest measure. He may indeed be pronounced another Moses, the "meekest of men." But when the question of principle was once clear to his apprehension, he was as uncompromising as the sourest of the "rebels." His meekness did not prevent his active coöperation with that "mighty man of war," Dr. S. R. Wilson of Louisville, in constructing the famous "Declaration and Testimony." Its testimonies against wrong were not too strong for the gentle McPheeters. May we not surmise that when some profess to find it "too bitter," it is partly because they sympathise with the sins which it exposes?

## ARTICLE III.

## THE CHURCH AND THE WORLD.

In ecclesiastical discussions, it is sometimes a debated question, whether the Church may rightfully engage in secular affairs. Such discussions are apt to take a wide range, and are generally barren of results on account of the vague manner in which they are conducted. It is impossible to encounter such a subject in the field of debate with any prospect of success, without previous consideration, a lucid arrangement of our thoughts, and a skilful discrimination in the use of language. The contest degenerates into a simple logomachy. One party, misapprehending the views and intentions of another, assails its own man of straw, and triumphs over an imaginary antagonist. Much vigor and valor of a forensic kind have been vainly expended in these fruitless conflicts, and much dialectic wit has been wantonly shed in support of theories which have never been satisfactorily unfolded.

This is unquestionably true in its application to the functions of the Church. To trace the boundaries of its power is, indeed, a task that remains to be accomplished. But, so far as we can see, there has been very little progress in the pursuit. In almost all countries nominally Christian, the Church and the State have grown up in a mutual embrace, like forest oaks, whose roots and limbs have been intertwined in hopeless complexity by the hand of time. On this continent, the experiment of a wholesome separation has been attempted by the founders of our institutions. But even here, in consequence of the continual operation of national and traditional influences, the practical disjunction has been difficult, intricate, and uncertain. Habits of thought, which belonged to colonial times, or to transatlantic conditions of society, have been naturalised amongst us, and have impeded the progress of reforms long since happily inaugurated. Among European nations, the Church and the State, like intersecting

circles, include a common domain. And whilst, in theory, this joint tenancy has in this country been abandoned, our history abounds in exceptional examples of mutual intrusion on the part of these powers—so reluctant have both of them appeared to confine themselves within the prescribed limits.

When the late civil convulsion rendered for a time many important principles inoperative, an occasion was of course furnished for gross violations of ecclesiastical propriety. In the dominant section of the country, party feeling, in the name of patriotism, led to a cordial understanding, and even a formal correspondence, between the Government and some of the churches; and all are familiar with the political action adopted by them, in which they freely entertained, discussed, and decided certain open questions upon which the public mind had been long divided, and definitely condemned, as political heresies, principles which were dear to many of our purest statesmen. Nor did the Church content itself with a mere assertion of its political views, but proceeded to apply them to partisan purposes, by enacting certain extraordinary terms of communion, which, had they been carried out to their ultimate consequences, would have excluded from Christian privileges a large number of God's children throughout the Southern States.

These deplorable abuses of power, especially in the Northern Presbyterian Church, have been followed by efforts, not yet perfectly successful, to restrict ecclesiastical action to its proper limits; and the Southern Church, through stress of circumstances, finds herself charged with the special duty to ascertain, define, and determine these limits by her venerable standards and the word of God. In the midst of the horrors of a disastrous war, and the more depressing influences of subsequent humiliation, we have sought to explore and bring distinctly to view the lawful boundaries of church authority. And, as frequently happens in periods of attempted reform, many collateral subjects have demanded inquiry, the solution of which depends upon the general principles under discussion. Most of the practical questions that spring up in our church courts would be easily disposed of, could we first satisfactorily lay down upon

our chart those leading landmarks which circumstances do not change.

The most general of these inquiries now challenging our attention, is that here introduced as relating to *secular* affairs. Can the Church lawfully engage in such pursuits; and, if so, to what extent, and in what manner? These are points of immense importance, not only in view of political complications, but as they may affect the future purity and energy of the Church. For it is obvious that there is danger in both directions. Such latitude may be allowed in ecclesiastical action, as may involve the Church in fatal alliances with a wicked world. And, on the other hand, we may tie her hands so effectually by unreasonable restrictions, as, in a great measure, to paralyse her influence, and impair her vitality. Hence the importance of clear definitions in such an investigation. Errors of policy originate in differences of opinion, and these differences are produced by the various lights in which the same truths are regarded. The survey of objects and scenes in the moral, like that of the physical world, can only be effected by changing our points of observation, and accurately determining the relative bearing of the principles to which our attention is directed. In the present case, we have first to ascertain the verbal distinctions between the spiritual and the carnal, the eternal and the temporal, the ecclesiastical and the secular, relations in which the Church is placed. Our Lord has positively said, "My kingdom is not of this world." But the fact is patent, that this kingdom exists *in* the world; and, in its visible form, is brought constantly into association with it. Before we undertake to determine the nature of this connexion, we must be sure of the terms in which we express our thoughts. The ecclesiastical and the spiritual functions of the Church must not be confounded; nor should we confuse ourselves by imagining that all material objects are necessarily carnal, and incompatible with the heavenly aims which the Church must ever entertain.

What, then, do we mean by secular affairs and interests, as distinguished from those that are spiritual or ecclesiastical? The inquiry relates to the moral rather than to the material world.

We are understood to have in view those pursuits and enterprises to which the world devotes its energies for the accomplishment of purposes purely temporal. Men have certain interests in the present life, which are impaired or promoted according to the use that is made of providential instrumentalities and natural laws. It is to these aims and interests that we allude, when we compare secular with spiritual concerns. For the latter are, by contrast, permanently associated with a state of existence beyond the grave. We are not, therefore, inquiring whether the Church may acquire property, or use human learning for the promotion of its purposes; but whether she may engage in occupations or pursuits, the primary design of which is to secure a merely temporal good. May she, in her organic capacity, found hospitals, establish colleges, charter lines of steamers, and traffic in books or other merchandise, with the ultimate view of thereby promoting the great end of her divine commission—the salvation of souls?

We limit the question to the organised and corporate Church, because no doubt will be entertained that the individual Christian may engage in secular business, as a steward of God. Nor do we now consider the propriety of the minister of the gospel devoting some portion of his time, like Paul the tent-maker, to the ordinary means of securing a livelihood. A much narrower question is before us. We refer to the *courts* of the Church exclusively, as the channels of her policy and the guardians of her principles.

Our object is to ascertain the limits of their authority, as her administrative organs, in the direction indicated by the terms of the present inquiry. According to one class of thinkers, they can do nothing that is not clearly allowed in terms by the Bible or the standards of the Church. According to others, they may do all that is dictated by a liberal discretion, if not positively forbidden by the supreme law. And these opposite views may yet result in the development of antagonistic parties.

Men of the world engage in the pursuits we have mentioned, not only in their individual character, but as members of society. The State and those organised associations which it allows by

law, operate continually, in their respective spheres, with the view of advancing the cause of human prosperity. But whether we consider the individual or the corporation as an active agent earnestly prosecuting certain definite ends, in all cases where the religious principle is wanting, the purpose that impels them is bounded by the present scene, and has reference to the life of man in his present mode of existence. In other words, these are secular concerns, clearly distinguished from those spiritual activities to which the Christian is called in that new mode of existence upon which he has entered. For, "if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new!" And not only is it true that the personal religion of the Christian is distinguished from the spirit of the world, by his active pursuit of heavenly and eternal interests; but the Church, as it is organised, must be expected to administer the benefits of her commission on the same principle. Her supreme aim must be to advance the interests of mankind in that higher sphere which faith alone reveals. The Church is militant on earth that she may enjoy her triumph in heaven. And "the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds." No one, we suppose, will question the truth which we now advance, as one of cardinal importance, that the direct aim of the legitimate policy of the Church must ever be, to make known to the minds and impress upon the hearts of sinners that gospel which "is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth."

It clearly follows, therefore, that the Church may not adopt ordinary avocations, except as a means *necessary* to the success of her ultimate object. In every scheme of her activity, whatever agencies she may employ, her supreme regard belongs to the grand purpose of redemption. And in this obvious view, we may well doubt the propriety of designating her enterprises as "secular pursuits." Her instruments may be material, the laws of nature may subserve her heavenly designs, but to call her associated exertions in the cause of religion by the name peculiar to worldly business, is nothing better than a misapplication of

language. For, as we before intimated, this phraseology is derived from the temporal character of the ordinary avocations of men, and cannot properly express the nature of actions performed on another principle and for altogether different ends. It would be prudent, therefore, and conducive to the success of our investigations, to exclude such terms from our vocabulary, on account of the confusion to which they lead.

In point of fact then, all ecclesiastical power, if legitimately exercised, must be regarded as operating in a *spiritual* channel. Its ends are necessarily spiritual, and the means it employs for their accomplishment must correspond with them. Whatever subordinate agencies it adopts for this purpose, obtain a new character from the uses to which they are devoted. Printing, for example, is ordinarily a secular occupation, pursued with the view of securing temporal interests; but when employed by ecclesiastical authority in multiplying copies of the Sacred Scriptures, it becomes, as it were, a spiritual instrumentality of inestimable value.

The principal inquiry that remains, is simply this: *How far* may the Church properly avail herself of agencies, in themselves indifferent, for the promotion of the spiritual welfare of mankind? May she, like Papal Rome, invest herself with all the attributes of a temporal sovereignty, make war and peace, conclude treaties, legislate for a subject population, and administer civil government in the ordinary forms? Or must she confine herself with a rigorous austerity to the use of means solely adapted to evangelical results, and not liable to be perverted to secular purposes? If neither of these extremes is admissible, then where shall we locate the line of sound and prudent policy, in pursuing which the greatest spiritual good may be accomplished, with the least hazard of corruption or offence? The difficulty of the investigation is thus exposed by the very care we have taken to reduce it within the bounds of a clear and accurate definition.

So far as the conduct of the individual Christian is concerned, the Scriptures leave a wide field of undetermined truth, in which the judgment and conscience must be exercised. A wise discre-

tion is the daily task of our spiritual powers. We are often compelled to stop in the path of active duty, and ponder difficult questions which must be solved, before we can proceed. Nor is it hard to discern the wisdom of God in imposing such embarrassments upon us. We are indeed sanctified through the truth; but this truth is not immediately obvious in all cases. It is kept concealed, in order to call into active employment our various faculties, and thus contribute to their education and discipline. Reason discharges for mankind many of the functions which in the lower animals belong to instinct, and is required to grope its way in comparative darkness in order to reach satisfactory results. The dignity of our nature is displayed, and the glory of the Creator promoted, by these conditions, more conspicuously than could be done by a shorter process. For the triumphs of human energy, patience, and genius, illustrate the perfections of Deity with far greater force than inferior races ever exhibit. And when this faculty of reason is engaged in the pursuit of spiritual truth, and in the discovery of personal duty, superintended by conscience, and animated by love to God, the sphere of its exercise is yet more elevated, and its success more glorious. But all this would be impossible, if truth were always clearly revealed, and no effort were necessary to discover it.

But if these conditions belong to the spiritual life of each individual believer, we may fairly presume, in advance, that similar discretion pertains to the organised Church. Her offices will of course require the exercise of the highest and purest reason. Certain great principles are clearly laid down for her guidance; but it belongs to her to apply them to the ever-varying emergencies that arise in her career, and are infinitely modified by the circumstances of the times. She cannot be restricted by absolute prohibitions, or, like the work of a statuary, be cast into an unchangeable mould.

The history of ecclesiastical affairs confirms the presumption of reason. For, in all ages of the Church, principles apparently conflicting have been inscribed upon the banners of contending parties. Her policy has fluctuated from one extreme to another, not for want of landmarks to limit her action, but on



account of the misapplication of general truths. Innumerable practical difficulties have presented themselves, which seemed to defy the utmost sagacity to overcome them, in the absence of all specific instruction from the word of God. That this is a part of his grand design in the training of his people, is a conclusion to which we are driven by the accumulated experience of the past, as well as by those *a priori* considerations to which reference has already been made.

But what, it will be asked, shall be done in such emergencies? Must the Church pause in her career of usefulness, paralysed by hopeless embarrassment? We answer, no. The spiritual judgment is not confined to pure reason. The good man who has shouldered the Cross, abandoned home and friends, and devoted his life to missionary labor on some savage shore, is not necessarily impeded by the new and strange circumstances by which he is surrounded. He does not feel called upon each day to subject the demands of Christian duty to the gauge and plumb of the logician. Another element comes in to aid the suggestions of reason—a spiritual instinct, so to speak, which enables the pious mind to discern the right path among the mazes through which it lies. The same is true of the Church itself. The correctness of her decisions depends not alone upon the intelligence and power displayed in her deliberations. The living aptitudes of an educated conscience common to the whole body, efficiently promote the progress of her cause. Hence the importance of maintaining a high degree of spiritual vitality. Human reason, unassociated with an elevated religious sentiment, wanders blindly through the darkness of spiritual desolation, and stumbles among the obstacles which faith would easily surmount.

But whilst a vast field of inquiry has been left by the divine wisdom for the exercise of the graces of the Church, it does not follow that this field has no definite boundaries. The line of duty may be difficult to trace by the light of ordinary reason; but it has its general principles deeply graven in nature, or written in revelation by the finger of God. The compass and the chart are ever at hand to direct our passage through a trackless sea. We are carefully guarded against many practical

errors, by the general spirit of the gospel, and the numerous illustrations it affords. Great truths are established which time and circumstances cannot alter. We may not be able to answer the question, *How far* the Church may avail herself of secular agencies for the accomplishment of her ultimate purpose? but it is quite possible, on the other hand, to point out some of the limits within which she is confined.

When our Lord declared with emphasis, "My kingdom is not of this world," a principle was announced which he evidently intended as a practical guide for the use of his disciples. It is obvious to all that the Church is not prohibited by it to handle and employ the material objects with which the earth is furnished; for the head of the Church himself made use of such instruments, even at the moment when his miraculous power was most conspicuously displayed. The resources of the mineral and vegetable world were called into requisition for the purposes of benevolence or instruction. But still more extensively were human agencies employed for the same ends. The peculiar endowments of Simon Peter and Saul of Tarsus, were not overlooked in the selection of leaders for the infant Church.

Here, then, is an interesting inquiry bearing directly upon the point before us. How far did Christ himself proceed in this use of ordinary instrumentalities? and what are the limits which he imposed by his example upon his followers? "For he has left us an example, that we should follow his steps." If we can throw any light upon this question, we shall the more easily answer the others. And we are in possession of numerous incidents of our Saviour's life from which the most impressive and satisfactory information can be obtained.

The silence of our Lord on many subjects, is almost as significant as his utterances. The restrictions he imposed upon himself, both in doctrine and in action, yield valuable information in regard to the nature of his spiritual kingdom. Although omniscient, he habitually abstained from correcting the scientific errors of his times. He left the world as ignorant as he found it of all those truths which are the glory of modern discovery. Competent and ready, by a word, to remove the most malignant

and distressing maladies that invade the human frame, he did not drop a word of information as to their nature, or a suggestion as to the means by which they might be relieved. A King and a Lawgiver, he uttered not a syllable that could directly aid mankind in determining the principles of a sound jurisprudence, or contribute to the improvement of the art of government. Men have often expressed their curiosity as to his personal appearance. But a curiosity equally reasonable might be indulged in reference to his judgments on human affairs. Here all is silent as the grave: He stands before the world as he did before Pilate, resolute in his refusal to comply with its demands.

But what does all this teach us? Does it not furnish us with a key with which to interpret the spiritual character of the Church? When our Lord so significantly asked the Jews, "Who made me a judge or a divider over you?" and, with wonderful self-control, replied, in reference to the question of tribute, "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's; and unto God the things that are God's," he clearly indicated his determination to abstain from all entangling connexion with social institutions and political concerns. He left them untouched, and confined his precepts and commands to objects purely spiritual and divine. And all this was done in his character as Head of the Church. We are therefore warranted in concluding that the latter is expected by him to pursue a similar course: to limit the sphere of its activity to those interests of the race which belong to our spiritual nature, and to refrain from all *unnecessary* association with the ordinary avocations of men.

It is sometimes urged that all agencies must be lawful for the Church which tend to enhance her influence upon society; that she is bound, like her Lord, to mingle with the world in order to secure its salvation. And, under cover of this general proposition, it is sought to turn ecclesiastical energy into those channels through which the material interests of men are secured. The diffusion of general intelligence by the press, the education of youth in the whole circle of letters and science, the foundation of hospitals and asylums for the relief of misery or the

support of indigence, and a number of other objects that commend themselves by their obvious utility, are all classed as legitimate offices of the Church, because they *may* promote the success of her efforts to evangelize the world. But before such a policy can be justified, we must be able to show the direct *necessity* of such means in the performance of her spiritual duty. It is not true that all good offices in society pertain to the Church in its organic character. If this were so, much more might we expect to learn from the life of Jesus Christ, that he gave instruction in every useful art. But he confined himself to matters purely spiritual. For even his miracles of healing were performed with a spiritual design. And his association with publicans and sinners, was in his character as a preacher of righteousness and a minister of salvation.

The Church cannot without widely departing from the example of Christ, adopt a circuitous policy in her dealing with the world. She cannot, without contamination, mingle in the common stream of human affairs. Whilst visiting "the fatherless and widows in their affliction," she must keep herself "unspotted from the world."

Various practical questions spring up in this investigation, by which the principle may be illustrated. If we may suppose the Church to be authorised to establish, endow, and conduct institutions for the cure of disease; it is plain that, in some communities, she must first determine the medical system to be employed. The rival claims of various schools must come under review, and be subjected to comparison and selection. The Head of the Church, when on earth, would have refused to decide, but, in the case supposed, the decision must be made, and the Church committed to one or another of the sects into which the medical world is divided.

Again, if it may be supposed that the Church can lawfully undertake the general education of youth, then must she provide for their instruction in various branches of knowledge, determine their relative importance, and select the teachers with a view to their expertness in the different departments. She must invest and disburse the funds, frame a system of discipline, and super-

intend the administration of the entire system. Once more, if the Church may lawfully engage in the publication of books and newspapers of a miscellaneous character, for the sake of the religious influence which may thus be exerted, then it follows that she may adopt any indifferent means or engage in any unforbidden employment for the same end. She may enter upon the enterprises of commerce in order to promote Christian civilisation, and charter her navies that the gospel may be diffused. And lastly, if the Church may direct her energies to the political improvement of mankind, she may decide questions of State, render aid to favorite parties, and condemn as errors those principles for which patriots have nobly died.

The fallacy of all these examples lies in a single point. It is assumed, that one chief aim of ecclesiastical action is to promote man's temporal welfare. But this is not the principle presented in the word of God. We must here distinguish between personal Christian conduct, and the exercise of authority through official agents. Religion is intended to influence all human affairs, and to ameliorate all human suffering. It is the greatest of all reformers, educators, and liberators. But this has nothing to do with the present subject. The Church is invested with its organic forms for definite purposes; and surely it is incumbent upon her to operate within the prescribed limits. Were it completely in her power to redress all the political grievances of every nation under heaven, she would have no authority to undertake the task. Her peculiar office is altogether spiritual, not humanitarian; to publish the gospel and persuade men to accept it, not to heal the diseases or break the bondage of mankind. It is not her province to do all the temporal good that may be suggested, but to accomplish as directly as possible the higher and holier duty of converting the world to God.

Here, then, are the limits of that discretion which has been committed to the Church. Whenever a practical question arises, the first inquiry as to the means proposed is simply this: Will the glory of God, in the salvation of souls, be directly promoted thereby? It will not suffice to show that a temporal benefit may result, which may or may not prove instrumental in spirit-

ual good. Such assurances are too vague and general. The influence of the measure proposed ought to be obviously religious and clearly conducive to the success of the gospel. It is not sufficient to employ a secular agency as the *vehicle* of religious truth. We are not authorised to adulterate the seed of the word. It is not to be prescribed as a disagreeable medicine, requiring dilution or concealment, but as a sweetly sovereign remedy for the cure of sin.

It by no means follows from the views now advanced, that the Church would be cramped by their adoption. A Christian people would not be debarred from any sphere of usefulness. The disciple of Christ is a member of civil society, and is required to discharge the duties of that relation in the light of the new principles which he has embraced. His religion does not unfit him for the offices of good neighborhood or patriotism. He is simply inhibited from mingling civil or social questions with ecclesiastical affairs. Nor is the Church itself confined to narrow bounds. Her domain comprises the highest interests of the whole family of man. When called upon to deliberate or resolve, there is no deficiency of matter for discussion, no want of a field in which to labor. Her field is the world; her appropriate work is the diffusion of gospel truth. It is a mistake to suppose that a strict construction of the charter of the Church has a tendency to repress its energies. Unity of spirit is essential to spiritual progress. But this unity cannot be expected when the policy of the Church is vague and undefined. Nothing would operate more happily in preventing the formation of parties in the Church, than a settled conviction of those limits which should restrict the exercise of ecclesiastical power. And besides all this, a frequent introduction into her councils of opinions and plans that originate in the surrounding world and are deeply tinged with its prejudices and passions, necessarily exerts a deplorable influence upon its religious spirit. We cannot lose sight of recent illustrations. The Presbyterian Church has suffered incalculably, not only in its repose, but in its vital interests, from controversies of this kind. We cannot measure the injury thus sustained. Who does not know that in every such

period of acrimonious strife, religious sentiment declines in the Church as certainly as the mercury goes down in a storm?

The Southern Church, warned by bitter experience, is endeavoring to guard herself from the errors of the past. It is our cherished purpose to exclude all political influence from our courts. No one in our body, of respectable intelligence, would now contend that the Church may properly determine questions of that character. The point is settled for generations to come. But it is highly desirable to extend the same cautious reserve to other matters of debate. We are liable to frequent efforts to secure the support or favor of the Church for objects not immediately within its jurisdiction. One institution or enterprise after another comes forward as a candidate for ecclesiastical endorsement, and, in many cases, but a few hours of consideration are allowed. The Church is thus often committed to action which its deliberate wisdom would condemn, and precedents are established which carry many deplorable consequences in their train.

Among the practical questions lately introduced, is that of the establishment of an institution of learning for the whole Church in the Southern States. It would mar the unity of the present paper to discuss the propriety of this effort at any length. But it is quite appropriate to say that such a design does not accord with the principles we have sought to elucidate. An establishment of the character proposed would embrace a vast variety of means and appliances, many of which would bear very remote relation to the gospel of Christ. Some of the departments must of course be purely scientific, and others designed for instruction in the useful arts. That such a seat of learning might be made conducive to spiritual religion cannot be denied. But a banking-house, or a type-foundry, might subserve the same end. The difficulty is, that such agencies are *extra-ecclesiastical* in their nature. The design may be ever so commendable; but the authority appealed to cannot be found in the Church. Astronomy, chemistry, and physiology are important sciences; but observatories, laboratories, and museums, are not appropriate objects to be superintended by Synods and Councils. There is nothing in

the life of Christ or his apostles, nothing in the commission given to them by inspiration, nothing in the nature of the case, that indicates the possession of such a function by the Church. And that nice delicacy of judgment which we have ventured to call spiritual instinct, or which we might perhaps more happily denominate a *sanctified common sense*, seems to us to revolt at such measures as incompatible with the sacred offices of the Church.

In conclusion, we insist that, if there be doubt in ecclesiastical as in state affairs, a close adherence to the written law in its spirit and letter is the *safest* policy to pursue. Latitude of interpretation is more prolific of danger than of advantage, under any covenant whatever. A sanguine spirit of progress may chafe under such restrictions; but they are salutary restraints, and important bulwarks against the inroads of reckless innovation. Most of the great calamities that overtake nations, are induced by gross departures from the compacts by which they are governed. And, in the history of the Church, examples without number could be found of instances in which, becoming weary of her appropriate work, she has formed disastrous connexions with the world. Never has she thus deviated from rectitude without experiencing a corrupting influence from the contact. Efforts to increase her power and enlarge her possessions, by too freely using agencies borrowed from civil society, have resulted in nothing but a rapid decline of the evangelical spirit, and the loss of that *prestige* which her spiritual isolation had given her. The declaration, "My kingdom is not of this world," is not a vague generality. It means far more than men generally suppose. It condemns not only the papal pretensions to a temporal power, but the various alliances of Protestant churches with the human institutions by which they are surrounded. It seems to us to forbid even an assimilation of the Church to the world, and to require of her, as well as of individual believers, to maintain a separate existence independent and uncompromising.



## ARTICLE IV.

## ULSTER.

The area of this province is quite equal to the fourth of Ireland. It consists of nine counties, some of which present a rugged appearance to the eye of the observer. Its loughs, rivers, and towns, bear names so uncouth as to make them difficult to be pronounced. This northern part of the Emerald Isle has no city equal in population to Dublin, no scenery to be compared with that which embellishes the vale of Wicklow, and no lakes so picturesque as those of Killarney. But it has a basaltic curiosity, specimens of which have been widely dispersed, castles in which nobles like Lord Massereene have lived, seats occupied by Irish gentlemen—industrious merchants—useful artisans, a peasantry tenacious of their rights, an eloquent ministry, deeds of valor which have quickened the pen of Macaulay, and a religious record worthy a niche in the galleries of martyrdom. We propose to give an outline of this religious history so far as Presbyterians may be concerned; for our gratitude is due to Ulster. We shall find, whilst the bush was burning in the furnace of persecution, that a spark was transmitted to this wilderness of ours, which has kindled thousands of Presbyterian altars, never we trust to be extinguished. Two centuries ago an Irish shepherd turned aside from the crags of Donegal, and crossed the Atlantic that he might ransom multitudes from the house of spiritual bondage. Makemie is fast becoming *clarum et venerabile nomen*. Firm of purpose, not given to change, a diligent minister, a true missionary, an ardent pioneer, under the guidance of the great Husbandman he brought a vine, not out of Egypt, but from abroad, the curves of which cannot be followed. The vintage of the Rhine is scanty in comparison with the moral products which are dangling on its winding branches. It has encircled a larger number of homes filled with distinct classes of society than we care to mention.

Adrian IV., the Pope of Rome, made a present of Ireland to Henry II., then king of England. The people of Hibernia had no right to complain of the donation, for they had all been constituted ceremonial saints by the manipulations of the Tiber, and believed the Pope to be infallible. This is a new article in the creed of Bishop Purcell. He has succumbed to the dogma; but when leaving Rome, he made himself merry at Adrian's infallibility in his maltreatment of Erin-go-bragh. His quietus has been achieved by the chloroform of the Vatican, and having fallen asleep is muttering out his reverence for the pontifical slipper. But Henry VIII. quarrelled with the popes of his time, and the successors of Peter could not dissolve his marriage with Catharine of Arragon, from an apprehension that Charles V., Emperor of Germany, might capture the city of their mock solemnities. And lo! the English king becomes supreme head of the Church, instead of announcing himself as joint custodian of London Tower, and grand executioner on Tower Hill. Bishop Brown is sent to Armagh, not in the spirit of Elias, or like John to manifest the true Messiah, but to proclaim the news that the Pope of Rome was supplanted in his office as pontiff. What a comedy! Edward VI. bloomed a while; but disappeared in the nightfall of a mysterious providence, for the reign of Mary was a dismal period in the annals of England. And in that of Elizabeth the island of saints was not in a placid condition. War and crime prevailed. The Earl of Essex could not marry England to that tumultuous sea of passion which agitated Ireland. He was no doge of Venice, though furnished with a ring by his queen. Poor Spenser! Elizabeth gave him an Irish estate which lay along the banks of the Mulla, where, among looming prospects, merry pixies, and the ruby blossoms of the shamrock, he might have dreamed away his enchanted life; but incendiarism was the order of the night, and his poetical lodge was reduced to ashes. One of his children perished in the flames, and that catastrophe inserted a cypress leaf which was never detached from the chaplet he had won. But Presbyterianism did not appear in Ulster till James I. ascended the English throne, from which elevation he descried a

charm in tasselled mitres, Canterbury muslin, and prelatical crosiers, which had escaped his vision among the lowly gowans of Scotland. This change, if change it were, introduced many troubles, all of which might have been warded off by a little common sense.

King James was insincere, disingenuous, preëminently selfish, and a constant spouter of Latin, which he had learned from Buchanan. He was rife in promises which he never intended to fulfil. Before leaving Scotland, in consequence of a hurt which he had received in the chase, the General Assembly agreed to meet in Fifeshire that they might be contiguous to the Falkland palace. His words were smooth, flowing as they did from an oily tongue. He pronounced the Presbyterian to be the purest Church in Christendom, and reminded them, that not content with lopping off some of its branches, their axes had gone down to the roots of the papal upas tree. He limped away, but not without leaving the impression that he had been to Blarney Castle. But his bearing was quite different when, in 1603, he reached Whitehall. The conceit became inseparable to his mind that his triple kingdom could not be governed without the help of prelates, and he concerned himself in the conferences held between puritans and churchmen. Bishops flattered; but they might have been satisfied with the fact that the *three orders* were safe enough in England without forcing the same on a sister kingdom. All civil and religious government requires the assent and consent of the governed. Papists have given an erroneous assent to an erroneous system, but even they are responsible not to kings, but to a perverted Bible, and to Him by whom that Bible was inspired. We omit the wrongs of Presbyterianism enacted in the time of James, for the hierarchy was uncongenial to the Scotch. Prelacy could not cross the Tweed. The Mellvilles, Rutherfords, and Pedens, proved too strong for its advocatés. Half the people of England looked upon the incubus as a playful fairy from the woods of Devon; but the Scotch regarded it as an expensive monster to devour the tenths of their industry, especially should the Church fall asleep. But the Scotch king was not totally devoid of all merit in his admin-

istration. In his reign, Norman knights and Anglo-Saxons stood on the lowlands of Virginia; and Virginia has been the mother of illustrious men. He took an interest in the colonisation of Ulster; and that province is our present subject.

Presbyterianism obtained a footing among the people of Ulster, in the following way: There were waste lands in Ireland, and large tracts of soil which had been forfeited to the crown in consequence of rebellion. The penalties of rebellion are severe in *monarchical* governments; but rebellion in a confederacy of coëqual States would be a misnomer. Byron says we live in an age of cant. Especially had the earls of Tyrone and Tyrconnel, who escaped to the continent, left immense possessions in Ulster. War, insurrection, and incendiarism, had devastated large portions of the island; and the English Government was anxious to retrieve the ruin. Polished gentlemen, as well as cultivators of the soil, went to Ireland. The desert began to smile; and, except for the mismanagement of agents, and the blunders of statesmen, and the interposition of papistry and prelacy, Erin would soon have recovered the green hue it had lost. Viceroy, agents, and every kind of subordinates, violated the terms of settlement, and came between the colonists and the London Government. Cultivate, they said; but, if the land be improved, the rent must be increased. There is an easy way to escape the increase. How? Give up your solemn league and covenant, surrender your Presbyterianism, and succumb to Episcopacy. There must be but one Church for the three realms. Diocesans are more than pillars to the throne. They are Egyptian pyramids. This is but a sample of the audacious talk, in which agents indulged. In what light would Joseph, prime minister of Pharaoh, have held such dispensers of a public trust! But the followers of Calvin and Knox have never been lukewarm, either about the independence of the kirk, or the rights of man. What said Grattan, at a later date, when pouring forth his manly eloquence in the Irish Parliament? "The British constitution owes all its freedom to the struggles of Presbyterians." They went on protesting and sending commissioners to London, bearing all things, and hoping all things;

but how often were their hopes defeated! Could they have believed in prelacy, how soon might their prospects have brightened, and their comforts been increased! But they who sincerely profess our holy religion, must cherish a conscience void of offence towards God and man. And these Caledonian settlers steadily improved their lands, though Mrs. Hemans had not then written her song of emigration. There were gleams of prosperity under adverse circumstances—as the weights on the lower limbs of the palm tree are said to increase the luxuriance of the summit. A Scotchman makes out to live, whether on the sods of Ireland, or among the mosses of the Orkneys. Whether in the east or west, he labors as it were in sight of the heather in which he was cradled. Leyden went to India in quest of pecuniary means, but they were means to be expended in Teviot dale; where the Yarrow joins the Teviot, and the Tweed winds onward to the sea. It was an easy task for the clergy and laymen of Scotland to cross from the Mull of Cantyre to the Irish coast, that Ulster might be evangelised.

Among the large number who crossed, were the Rev. Robert Blair and John Livingstone, both of whom had been present at that great display of power and grace, which occurred about 1630 at the Kirk of Shotts, in the Shire of Lanark. They were earnest men, and honest in the sacred cause. Blair was the pastor of Hollywood. Like all the rest of his brethren, he encountered various trials. He had to contend with the power of the State, combined with that of the Church. Livingstone must have been active. He crossed and recrossed. We meet with him in Stranraer, in the south of Scotland, and at Rotterdam. In the reigns of the First and Second Charles, the annoyances of the Presbyterian clergy were most excessive; for those reckless monarchs were determined to brave popular opinion both in Scotland and Ulster. The Scotch looked askance at the prelates who passed over the Cheviots in their gaudy coaches. They did not fancy such excrescences in a Church they were anxious to make primitive, as it was in the time of Hippolytus. Chevalier Bunsen says that *Rome* was Presbyterian down to the third century; and so say Jerome and Chrysostom. The

golden mouth of the last never uttered a more self-evident truth.

'Tis strange that Irish Presbyterians should have been persecuted; for loyalty to their kings was their watchword. It was, on their part, a condescension to ask for an Act of *Toleration*, when they might have petitioned for equal rights. But for a long time not even this poor favor was granted. Both the English and Irish Parliament were adverse to their claims. Black oaths were in vogue, the Headship of our Lord over his Church was subverted by kings, the *regium donum* stopped, ministers suspended, congregations disturbed, the laity imprisoned, sacraments interrupted, and other grievances which may be omitted for the sake of brevity. Wentworth was in Ulster preparing his neck for the block by his acts of tyranny; and Laud, at Lambeth, working hard to ambrotype the churches of three kingdoms into a resemblance to papistry; but had he manipulated from the Sun of Righteousness, he might have caught simple reflections, instead of theatrical novelties introduced by Constantine, Pepin, and the popes of Rome. The so-called Archbishop of Canterbury was a superstitious devotee; and yet, in his Book of the Church, Southey has tried to write him into that niche which is filled by the noble army of martyrs. There have been good prelates, even though their office be a gross usurpation. Such was the Bedell, Bishop of Kilmore. In the massacre of 1641, no papist would have touched one hair on his head. And such was Usher; but he finally left Ulster for Surrey in 1640, and died in 1650 deeply lamented by Cromwell. We wish that other bishops had cultivated the same liberal views by which Usher and Bedell were distinguished. But Echlin, Leslie, King, and Bramhall, were of the High Church party, and each of them became a clerical despot. The Presbyterians were hedged in on all sides. No flower of hope appeared on the hedge, and there seemed to be no wicket-gate by which they could find an egress. The ministry might have returned to Scotland, but this would have exposed to dispersion the numerous flocks which had been collected. The persecuted thought seriously of emigrating to New England; and some of them

embarked, but, by adverse incidents, were driven back to Carrickfergus, the town where the first Ulster Presbytery had been organised. Bramhall satirised the expedition; but he who makes himself merry at the perils of the sea shall not go unpunished. Had this mitred churchman forgotten that Paul encountered the Euroclydon? The fact is, that the bishop feared their return. There had been frequent assaults made with the pen on the Presbyterian clergy, but the prelates found them more than competent to the defence of their principles. They had ably exposed the oppressive law that loyal men, if Presbyterians, should not be eligible to any office. They were kept down by *disabilities*. We regret that Jeremy Taylor, Bishop of Connor and Down, should have added any thing to this tale of woe. He possessed a creative imagination and a cornucopian eloquence; but he too was dazzled into moral blindness by the sunshine of power. He locked up six and twenty churches in his diocese, claiming the right of interdict, and the power of the *keys*. This was a papal act on a reduced scale. But the presbyters of Ulster derived their commission from a Master who preached alike in the temple or a synagogue, from the slope of a hill, the brow of a mountain, or on the shore of the sea. He had the same truths to make known, whether he stood in the vale of Sharon, or on the heights of Carmel or Olivet. And, following his example, the clergy of Ulster were willing to preach the gospel on the margin of the Bann, at the foot of Agnew Hill, or by Loughs Derg, Foyle or Neagh. Even the gentry were not fastidious about Byzantine architecture. They did not care for St. Mark's in Venice, or St. Sophia in Constantinople. They wanted the bread, the water, the wine, the oil, the milk, and manna of the gospel, with which the hungry soul was satisfied.

The protectorate of Cromwell came in between the sad fate of Charles I., and the restoration of Charles II. The Presbyterians of Ulster denounced the taking off of the king and proclaimed the protector to be a usurper. Their language, indeed, was unguarded and singularly indiscreet, when we consider the circumstances in which they were placed. Their vituperations aroused the ire of Milton, who in controversy was always

abusive. His pen moved among nettles; but the rose was absent. His prose style was obscure, circumlocutory; consisting of long involved sentences and indirect statements, with an occasional majesty which would have suited his *Paradise Lost*. But circumlocutory as they certainly were, his terrible denunciations must have brought the Presbyterians of Ulster to reflection. The writer cannot call to mind that any reply was ever attempted to the immortal bard of England. Perhaps for the same reason that Junius would not answer Dr. Johnson—he held him in too much reverence. We agree with Macaulay, that Charles I. had violated the solemn oath he took at his coronation, and that his brother had filled all England with immorality; but when he eulogises papistry in his review of Ranke, he must have forgotten that popes have been unparalleled tyrants. He says that Pius VI. crowned Napoleon. A mistake—for the Corsican crowned both himself and Josephine; whilst the Pope stood by trembling like the leaf of an aspen. It is surprising, however, that Ulster Presbyterians should have been so hostile to Cromwell. He was a natural product arising from a kingdom wantonly convulsed by the folly of its rulers. He was competent to his station. He fought battles, scattered armies, won victories, dissolved Parliaments, vindicated the naval honor of England, encouraged morality, made popes to tremble, shielded the Waldenses, and, in a word, wild uproar stood ruled. Had his counsels prevailed touching the settlement of the three Romish provinces of Ireland, papistry would not now have been the predominant religion. Had Henry, the son of Cromwell, instead of Richard, been successor to his father, all the duplicity of monks, and the wire-workings of prelates, could not have restored the monarchy; for most wisely did he govern Ireland. During his administration the Presbyterians of Ulster were unmolested. They enjoyed repose. Absent ministers returned, churches were reopened, congregations reorganised, sacraments dispensed, dilapidated buildings repaired, and new Presbyteries formed. Bishops decamped to Breda, or grew courteous in their sees. The doctrine of non-resistance, even to kings who surpass their constitutional rights, was hushed to silence. Cromwell



laid down the pavement on which the Prince of Orange rode to the English throne; and the battle of the Boyne quieted the Shamrock Isle. Surely the rights of Presbyterians are at last secured. They were not troubled, perhaps through the feverish reign of James II., for their aid was invoked even by the non-juring Sancroft against the inroads of papistry. Nor in the reign of Anne, so long as Lord Wharton ruled in Ulster; when the mild and grateful Addison sat in the Irish Parliament. But the Tory interest, during a part of her reign, prevailed over that of the Whigs. High Churchism revived. There were conspiracies to bring in the Pretender; but the Bishop of Rochester absconded, Bolingbroke fell, and, after a temporary imprisonment, Prior went off to Down Hall in Essex, where he died in 1721. The house of Hanover triumphed after the demise of Anne, but in her time the hateful test oath was enforced in Ulster. Presbyterians were compelled to say that they had taken the sacrament at least three times in each year, not in their own, but Episcopal churches. Jonathan Swift scribbled out a defence of this detestable law. He had been a Whig, but became a Tory, hoping that the change might secure for him the Diocese of Hereford. In 1695 he was presented to the Rectory of Killroot, but left it in a hurry that he might talk politics with Sir Wm. Temple of Moor Park in Surrey. He represented papistry under the symbol of a cat, and Presbyterianism under that of a lion. 'Tis wonderful that he thought so well of Presbyterianism, for the lion is said to be the king of the forest. Inferior creatures have been used more than once to represent churches. Dryden portrayed Romanism as a graceful hind, and Protestantism as a panther; but on St. Bartholomew's night, in the Irish massacre, and among the valleys of Piedmont, the hind must have been metamorphosed into a panther. Montague and Prior, in the "City and Country Mouse," turned the satire of Dryden into ridicule. His poem appeared in 1787, when the church feeling had reached its culmination. But De Foe wrote on the sacramental oath, which caused such excitement in Ulster; and he was a great controversialist. He was self-possessed in the pillory, as in the gardens of Kensington; and, like his name-

sake of old, would have preserved his composure even in a den of lion. This great man sleeps in Bunhill fields, the Westminster Abbey of Dissenters, and his dust is mingling with that of Milton, Watts, Bunyan, and a host of other worthies.

To record human suffering is an irksome task. But it is right that our Southern Church should know the penalties, arrests, and imprisonments to which our Ulster sires were subjected for the sake of opinions which they held as sacred. It was a portentous sign, and historically true, that the aid of our General Government was called for to force our independent Church into a union with the North. Nor was this done by the Bramhalls of Ulster, but by men with whom we once went in company to the house of God, and mused in the groves of learning. The writer has lived to see the time when ministers could not reach their congregations without a permit from subalterns. There are several approaches to the renowned vale of Cashmere, where men are stationed to give out passes. We could have denied ourselves access to the green vales, or the blue mountains of Virginia; but there are sights more pleasing than the Hindoo Cashmere. "How goodly are thy tents, O Jacob, and thy tabernacles, O Israel! As the valleys are they spread forth, as gardens by the river's side, as the trees of lign aloes, which the Lord hath planted, and as cedar trees beside the waters." "Beautiful for situation, the joy of the whole earth, is mount Zion, on the sides of the north, the city of the great King." But we will turn to more pleasing themes. We rejoice in the disestablishment of the Irish Church, the cause of so much tribulation to the Ulsterites. But Gladstone seems inclined to become nurse to the stricken Pope, which is rather an undignified position for an English Premier. For nearly a century had the Presbyterians, except at intervals, been under the frowns of power. Notwithstanding their undisputed loyalty, some of their ministers were most unjustly suspected in the insurrection of 1798. But still they had increased in numbers and influence. This result was owing to ministerial fervor, pastoral diligence, untiring efforts, preaching in the fields, and the administration of sacraments even at the midnight hour.

After the Hanoverian succession, which took place on the decease of Anne, the Church enjoyed rest. The hand of Herod was no longer stretched forth to vex the mountain partridges. They could whirl at leisure from heath to heath, ascend the hills and perch at will from Lough Larne over to Donegal Bay, or from Tory Island to Dunmore Head. The Presbyterians in the long persecution had settled pastors in the chief towns of Ulster, and in many of its retired villages. Crowds attended on their services. The General Synod could meet in peace and students repair to their Divinity Hall. Among later events are the organisation of the General Assembly, the separation between the Arians and Trinitarians—for how can two walk together except they be agreed? the licensure of young men thoroughly educated, revivals of religion, a desire for missions, able authorship, the union of burghers and anti-burghers, and their coalition with the leading Church. What a lesson ought our Southern Church to learn from the sufferings and courage of our fathers who patiently waited till the Master showed them the way out of their difficulties! There are two counties in Ireland divided by the Slievh Bloom mountains with one, and but one, path by which to cross. So it is in providence. We must travel on till we come to a way which the vulture's eye has not discovered.

As Presbyterians we feel grateful for any accessions we may have obtained from abroad. Our Secretary of State published his card of thanks to the many nations of Europe for helping him to achieve in the South what could never have been done by an indigenous population. He should have included the prelates of the Prince of Peace, who accepted the odious commission. But we want Christian soldiers to evangelise our land. The lunar stripe of Presbyterianism which first became visible in the lowly hamlet of Rehoboth has not yet waxed into that circle of brightness for which it was designed. It will not return to its first impression on the firmament of the Church, but realise the vision of the woman clothed with the sun and the moon at her feet, and around her head a crown of twelve apostolic stars. We are under obligations to Wales, Holland, and to polished Huguenots exiled from the vineyards, the stately lilies, and

sylvan chateaus of France. But Dr. Howe no doubt has done them justice in his admired History of Presbyterianism in South Carolina. We are indebted to Scotland for her Witherspoons and Nesbits, and to impulsive Ireland for her Tennents, Blairs, Smiths, and Lattas, who scorned political notoriety, but sought a true clerical distinction. But be assured, if no stranger had ever touched our shores, Presbyterianism would have existed. It was essential to the cause of learning and religion. It is suited to the poor of this world, to the rich, to professional men, to planters, merchants, artisans, and rulers. It is often whispered in the galleries of the aspiring and the upper stories of prelacy that it is not adapted to people of rank. A slander invented for the purpose of making even one proselyte to Phariseism! To what sacrament did Ladies Yester, Glenorchy, Colquhoun, and that noble band of women who signed the League and Covenant resort? To what Church did the Queen of Navarre and the Baroness De Stael belong? We have had lords and sirs acting as elders and deacons. The letter of Col. Stevens, sent in 1680 to the Presbytery of Laggan is laid up among our archives, and we trust in the chest of the Covenant, for it brought over a crosier of parity which has borne pure blossoms and nutritious fruits. We have not sufficient data on which to attempt any sketch of Makemie. He was probably a native of Rothmelton, a town that lies between Lough Swilly and Milford Glen in the County of Donegal. In 1675 he entered the University of Glasgow, and 1681 was introduced to his Presbytery for licensure by the pastor of Rothmelton, whose name was Drummond. He seems to have reached Virginia in 1682, but subsequently left Elizabeth City for Accomac. We suppose he must have been a man of Irish warmth and genial manners, or he never could have pleased Marylanders of the Eastern Shore. It is a conjecture of ours that his taste inclined him to the upper classes of society. In this we may possibly do him a wrong, but we are not without reasons for the suspicion. He was an Hibernian gentleman. That activity was a quality in his character is undoubted. Proofs might be stated, but it is not necessary. His talent was versatile. He could write sermons or extemporize,

send out vessels to Barbadoes, purchase lots, take care of his property, build churches, and confront Lord Cornbury on points of law. That lord speaks of him as preacher and lawyer in one of his letters. He was sound in his Calvinistic principles, but abundant in good works, like Howard the Philanthropist, who professed the same creed. In short, this evangelist from Erin was a very remarkable man.

Presbyterians can never wish any harm to Ireland. In America we are not without clustered towns bearing Irish names spread over our limestone valleys. We have our Belfasts, Derrys, Donegals, Cavans, and Monaghans in a rich abundance. But three-fourths of this gem of the ocean are kept in beggary by the craft of priests; yet we hope that some system purer than Papistry may yet prevail from Rathlin Isle to the extreme of Kerry and from the noble Shannon to the Vale of Arklow. Ireland may well rejoice in her Burkes and Wellingtons, her Currans and Grattans, her Goldsmiths and Edgeworths, and in her Edgars and Cookes. The eloquence of Curran was suited to the torrid zone, but in Grattan we admire an orator who to a dispassionate judgment united an ardent imagination and a well attempered patriotism.



## ARTICLE V.

## THE LIFE OF CHRIST.

*The Life of Christ.* By the Rev. WILLIAM HANNA, D. D., LL.D. New York: Robt. Carter & Brothers. 1871. 6 vols. in 3. 12mo.

*Jesus: His Life and Works as Narrated by the Four Evangelists.* By HOWARD CROSBY. New York: University Publishing Company. 1871. 1 vol., 8vo., Pp. 551.

In all externals the two works above mentioned are deserving of high commendation. The work of Dr. Hanna, from the press of the Carters, is presented in very attractive form, printed in

clear and beautiful type, with wide margins, is neatly bound, and even in the double volumes is of convenient size. The other is more expensively adorned, abounds in handsome illustrations, and is objectionable only in the size of the volume, which, however, might not be noticed but for the contrast with the more portable work of Dr. Hanna. As they both treat substantially of the same topics, they will be reviewed together in this article, and their points of resemblance and some contrasts examined. The present design, however, is rather to discuss the question touching the intrinsic value of any or all of the Lives of the Saviour that have been added to the Gospels. In these introductory remarks it may not be amiss to say a word in explanation of the status of the University Publishing Company, as this is the first time any work from their press has been formally noticed in this REVIEW. With one or two exceptions, the whole of their publications consist of text-books for the use of schools and colleges; and these are written by Southern authors, many of whom are professors in the University of Virginia. Aside from the undoubted scholarship of the authors, which would be a sufficient commendation of their works, these text-books are entirely free from sectional references, and are therefore safely recommended to all Southern institutions of learning. It would be difficult to estimate the influence exerted, especially upon the minds of the young, by adroit allusions to sectional prejudices, or by formal announcement of political dogmas under the guise of scholastic instruction. But it would not be difficult to point out these very defects in nearly all the publications of school literature at the North.

Both Dr. Hanna and Dr. Crosby have been travellers in the Holy Land; and while the former rarely refers to the scenes of the Lord's personal ministry, as connected with the story of his life, or as illustrating any of his teachings, the latter very frequently pauses in his didactic deliverances to give descriptions of oriental scenery and customs. The same general train of discussion is observable in both, beginning with the earliest events recorded in the gospels, and ending with the ascension of the Lord. Touching the numerous and beautiful illustrations in

Dr. Crosby's work, it is said that the artist spent several years in Palestine, becoming entirely familiar with the habits of the present inhabitants, and of course thoroughly familiar with all the scenes he so graphically presents. The pictures are all new and prepared especially for this work.

It is the design of these frequent interruptions of Dr. Crosby's didactic discourse on the life of our Lord by accounts of oriental scenery and manners, and also of these many and expensive illustrations, to gratify and instruct the reader and to add to the value of the work. The actual effect of these outside *additamenta* is, however, anything but agreeable. Dr. Crosby, the interpreter of the sacred history, undertaking to treat of the life and work of Jesus, it is an impertinence for Dr. Crosby, the oriental traveller, to thrust himself in with sketches of Eastern manners or pictures of oriental scenery. For example, in the last conversations of Jesus with his disciples, where he describes himself as the vine and his disciples as the branches, and calls on them to be fruitful, just there the artist must needs cut across two pages of our Saviour's words with flaring pictures of scenes in a modern oriental vineyard! And again, when the story reaches the point of the seizure of our Lord by the band in the garden and the eleven have fled in terror, just there more than half a page is filled with a picture of flowers from Palestine! There is no propriety in the introduction of such things in such places, for the only end they can serve is to distract the attention of the reader.

But there is one class of the pictures devised to embellish this book which must be offensive not only in point of good taste but of sound principle. It can be, in no respect, proper to attempt a picture of the God-man. The image-worshippers of the ninth century insisted that it was not only admissible but needful and right to make resemblances of Christ, because the error of the Docetists, who denied the reality of Christ's body, ought to be opposed in every way, and so it was a Christian duty to hold forth by the worship of Christ's image our belief of the reality of his bodily presence. It was a poor excuse for what helped greatly to develop the idolatry of the Greek and Latin churches.

We are weak creatures, and are safe only in the ways of the written word. It is a dangerous thing to make pictures of Him whom we adore. And it is also a presumptuous exercise of our imagination to figure the person of Him who sits on the eternal throne. How the almighty Saviour looks in his garment of flesh is not "written," and we should not be wise above what is written. It is a beautiful and majestic countenance which the artist places, of course for that of our Lord, in the frontispiece of Dr. Crosby's book; but to look at it should excite painful feelings. So also there can be no satisfaction to a thoughtful mind in the picture of the infant Jesus and his mother and Joseph in Egypt, p. 39, or of Jesus as a young carpenter in his father's shop at Nazareth, p. 56. A veil is drawn over that part of his life by inspiration which profane apocryphal writers have sought to lift. It is to be wished that Dr. Crosby had made less effort to lift this veil.

According to the general preface, the "Life of Christ is the substance of lectures written in the course of weekly preparation for the pulpit, and are given as they were delivered Sunday after Sunday," by Dr. Hanna in his own church. It is therefore not a formal biography, but a collection of separate and independent discourses, with a necessary sequence it is true, but which would perhaps be more accurately entitled "Lectures upon the recorded events of the Saviour's Life."

Dr. Hanna is a scholar and also a sound Presbyterian, and these lectures generally are worthy of the highest admiration. They are calculated to edify and instruct the Church. They will be read with intense satisfaction, and for the most part with unmixed delight. But there are minds jealous of all human biographies of Christ, and also jealous of all works which aim to hold up very prominently our Lord and Saviour as the *exemplar of man*. And whilst it would be very unjust to put Dr. Hanna's work upon the same low level in this respect with that of Dr. Crosby, still it cannot be said that he is free from all liability to censure. Dr. Crosby distinctly undertakes to rationalize the temptation of our Lord. Just there in a peculiar sense our Redeemer underwent the test, and the triumph of the Second



Adam in that conflict was essential in order to secure the believer's righteousness. Dr. Hanna's observations on the temptation are generally very admirable, but he no where refers to Christ as being a public person in this conflict, and accordingly the only use he makes of the history, as it concerns us, is to exhort us to imitate our Saviour's example. Here are the two passages:

"But how are we to look upon this mysterious passage in the life of Christ? Are we to read the record of it as we would the story of a duel between two great chiefs under neither of whom we shall ever have to serve, in the mode and tactics of whose warfare we have, consequently, but little interest? The very reverse." Here the Presbyterian reader is prepared to have an account in full of our Redeemer's relation to us in his mighty conflict then with our great adversary. But he is disappointed. Dr. Hanna proceeds: "He who appeared that day in the wilderness before Jesus, and by so many wily acts strove to rob him of his integrity as the Son of the Father, goeth about still as the archenemy of our souls seeking whom he may devour. His power over us is not weakened, though it failed on Christ. [Here Dr. Hanna almost denies that our Redeemer's victory was won for us.] His malice against us is not lessened, though it was impotent when tried on him. The time, the person, the circumstances, all bestowed an undoubted peculiarity upon these temptations of the wilderness, the temple, and the mountain-top. We may be very sure that, by temptations the very same in outward form, no other human being shall ever be assailed. But setting aside all that was special in them, let us lay our hand on the radical and essential principle of each of these three temptations, that we may see whether each of us is not still personally exposed to it." And then Dr. Hanna goes on to describe the temptations we are exposed to of stealing or other dishonesty to get bread; or of presumptuously plunging into moral dangers which are too strong for our principles; or of giving up our God, for the world, and its ease, and wealth, and rank, and power! See Vol. I., pp. 202, 204.

Now is not this a low view to take of the temptation of the

God-man? But Dr. Hanna still proceeds with his idea that Christ was tempted chiefly to be our exemplar in the following paragraph:

“But if it be to the very same temptations as those which beset our divine Lord and Master, that we are still exposed, let us be grateful to him for teaching us how to overcome them. He used throughout a single weapon. He had the whole armory of heaven at his command; but he chose only one instrument of defence—the Word, the written Word, that sword of the Spirit. It was it that he so successfully employed. Why this exclusive use of an old weapon? He did not need to have recourse to it. A word of his own spoken would have had as much power as a written one quoted; but then the lesson of his example had been lost to us—the evidence that he himself has left behind of the power over temptation that lies in the written word. Knowing, then, that you wrestle not with the flesh and blood alone, but with angels, and principalities, and powers, and with him the head of all, of whose devices it becomes you not to be ignorant, take unto you the whole armor of God, for all is needed; but remember, of all the pieces of which that panoply is composed, the last that is put into the hand of the Christian soldier by the great Captain of his salvation—put into his hand as the one that he himself on the great occasion of his conflict with the devil, used—put into his hand as the most effective, and the only one that serves at once for defence and for assault—is the sword of the Spirit, and the Word of God. By it all other parts of the armor are guarded. The helmet might be shattered on the brow, the shield wrenched from the arm, did it not protect; for hope and faith, that helmet and shield, on what do they rest, but upon the word of the living God? When the tempter comes, then, and plies you with his manifold and strong solicitations, be ready to meet him as Jesus met him in the wilderness, and you shall thus come to know how true is that saying of David: ‘By the words of thy lips I have kept me from the path of the destroyer.’” Vol. I., pp. 204, 205.

It is apparent from this quotation, that Dr. Hanna considers the victory of the Lord under temptation, particularly valuable to his followers as an example: whereas the whole transaction is farther out of the reach of humanity than the original test in Eden. That is, it were easier for fallen man to encounter and resist the temptation addressed to the first Adam, than to emu-

late the example of the Second Adam in his struggle with Satan. The plain inference from the Bible account is, that Satan sought to induce Christ to use his divine power for his own benefit. "If thou be the Son of God," do this or that. The great mystery of the third temptation is not one whit dispelled by Dr. Hanna's commentary. Speaking of the kingdoms of the world, spread out in panoramic display, he says: "The eye of Jesus may for a moment have been dazzled by the offer made, and this implied neither imperfection nor sin, but it refused to rest upon the seducing spectacle. It turned quickly and resolutely away. No sooner is the bribe offered than it is repelled. In haste, as if that magnificent panorama was not one on which even his pure eye should be suffered to repose; as if this temptation were one *which even he could not afford to dally with*; in anger, too, at the base condition, coupled with the bribe, and as if he who offered it could no longer be suffered to remain in his presence, he calls the devil by his name, and says: 'Get thee hence, Satan; for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.' Satan had wanted Jesus to give him some proof of his divine power; and now he gets it; gets it as that command is given, which he must instantly obey." Vol. 1, p. 199. Dr. Crosby has a far readier way of egress from the difficulty, although he also mounts the "example" hobby. Before leaving Dr. Hanna, however, it is worth while to examine his estimate of the relative value of the Christian armor. The "shield of faith," which the apostle recommends so highly, Dr. Hanna thinks inferior to the "sword of the Spirit" in conflicts with Satan. But Paul says it is this shield which quenches the adversaries darts. The quotation of every separate text in the Bible would be utterly without result, in the absence of faith; and whatsoever is not of faith is sin. This little lapse of the Doctor's is the legitimate effect of running the example theory too far. And now for Dr. Crosby. The quotation is from the beginning of the 5th chapter, "On the Temptation," p. 77:

"We have seen that the entire forty days of fasting were days of temptation. The very object of the Spirit in leading

Jesus into the solitude of the desert was that Satan might ply his resources to best advantage, and that, by victory there and then, he might be established against all that the great adversary could do thereafter. But while the entire forty days had this character, we are only admitted to a particular view of the last vain attempts of the arch fiend. In these three instances Satan appears to Jesus in form, probably as a holy man, who had been waiting for the Coming One, saluting Jesus with a gracious greeting, to throw him off his guard. He hails him as the Son of God, the Messiah, to the full consciousness of which office Jesus had now reached, and begs him, as holding this sublime position, to use its power in satisfying his great hunger, by turning the stones about him into bread. These are words of kind concern apparently. The new companion is touched with interest in the condition of Jesus, and would suggest an immediate relief to his suffering. However Jesus may have been pleased with this sympathy, his soul rejects the proposition as an error. The wonderful works which the Messiah was to perform were not to be for his personal human comfort, but for the truth's confirmation; and in all his work he was to perform only what God gave him to do. He was no more to originate a miraculous action, than was Elijah in his day to do so. Elijah was, by God's express command, sent to the widow of Zarephath, and there cause the miraculous continuance of the meal and oil for his own sustenance, as well as the widow's. The same Spirit filled Jesus that filled Elijah; and if He had bidden him to turn the stones to bread, the miracle would have had a righteous origin, and would have been wrought; and so in the present instance Jesus must look to the word proceeding out of the mouth of God, and not to his physical need of bread. Resting his decision on the scripture, and thus acknowledging the written word as the ultimate arbiter, he rejects the advice and cheerfully continues to suffer the distress of hunger. No further assault upon the integrity of his soul was offered at once. Any such would have laid the motives of the tempter open to suspicion. But as a friend and well-wisher, he accompanies Jesus on his journey back from the desert, and establishes relations of intimacy and confidence on the lengthy way to Jerusalem. Long before reaching Jerusalem the hunger of Jesus has been appeased at the villages upon the road through the cultivated land, so that the circumstances of the first temptation are altered. On arriving at the holy city, the two proceed to the Temple, and mount the roof of the long portico, which extended like a wing of the main edifice along the southern wall of the great enclosure

to its southeastern extremity. Here it overhung the deep ravine of the Kedron, where the head would grow dizzy at the sight. As they gaze from this lofty out-look, his companion again seizes the opportunity, after so long an interval from the last, and proposes his leap from the giddy height. It would establish his Messiahship in the minds and hearts of all the crowds who thronged that promenade. It would be a fitting beginning to his career, and shut the mouth and palsy the hand of opposition. And if any thought of physical risk should enter his mind, the Scripture, on which he rightly leaned, had declared regarding the Messiah, that the angels were commissioned to preserve him from injury in just such an emergency. The quotation from the 91st Psalm was exactly in point, and the kind urging of a friend ought not to be withstood. Jesus listens to the tempting appeal, but immediately rejects it. He uses the same argument as before, when his new-found companion had sought to relieve him of his hunger; but he quotes a different passage from Moses: 'Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God,' as indicating the same necessity of following God's guidance, and not vainly and without permission calling on the exercise of the divine power. The adroit tempter is foiled again, but not discouraged. He gathers himself for a final effort. He continues with Jesus as his companion down to the Jordan valley, and crosses the river with him to join the Baptist whom Jesus had left in order to go into the desert under the Spirit's guidance. He induces him, before rejoining John, to ascend one of the high Peræan mountains, perhaps the very Nebo, from which Moses had gazed upon the promised land. Perhaps he suggested a season of prayer on that mountain-top as appropriate before again mingling with his friends and countrymen. Whatever the argument he used, Jesus found a righteous reason in following his companion's lead. Now the tempter throws off the mask. In his zeal he loses his prudence. He uses his mighty power as a prince of the power of the air, and, whether by refraction or other methods beyond the knowledge of men, causes all the great kingdoms of the world to appear before Jesus, with their vast wealth of cities, announces his ownership of all, and promises all to Jesus if he would only fall down and do him homage. In an instant Jesus understands the true character of his professed friend. It is the great adversary of God and man himself. 'Get thee behind me, Satan,' drives the monster to his den; the order being accompanied by its vindication in the quotation from Deuteronomy vi. 13: 'Thou shalt worship Jehovah thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.' That

temptation which the devil had intended to be his strongest was his weakest. Where he displayed the greatest power he was most completely discomfited, so that he had only fortified, instead of weakening the soul of Jesus. The plan which Satan had adopted of deceiving Jesus by personal approach in human form had utterly failed, and he withdrew for the present from active assault upon the Messiah's integrity, to prepare new plans or wait for new opportunities. He had exhausted his strategy, and must abandon his enterprise, at least for the time. No sooner had the person of Satan been removed, than holy angels surrounded Jesus on that mountain-peak, and encouraged him with their counsel and their commendation, fulfilling the 91st Psalm in its true meaning, which the devil had literally and falsely quoted on the portico at Jerusalem: 'He shall give his angels charge concerning thee, and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone.' Before Jesus had entered upon his desert experience he had been strengthened by the heavenly voice, and the appearance of the Spirit as a dove; and now that the long loneliness was over, with its perils, heaven again grants him the reassuring comforts of the supernatural. Such disclosures of the unseen were occasional to the Son of Man, and not continual. The ordinary supports of his way were those vouchsafed to every believing heart; and the prayer of faith brought down for him the power of God. Where he had extraordinary burdens to bear, extraordinary help was furnished; but in the ordinary experiences of life he was left to the ordinary means which infinite love has provided for our race. We find the same system of divine superintendence and care in his case that we find in the case of the prophets and apostles, where the supernatural interference, *ab extra*, was the exception and not the rule."

Now, there are very serious objections to this whole representation. Dr. Crosby rejects, indeed, the rationalistic idea that the temptation was a mere mental phenomenon, and holds that the account is clearly a history of facts that actually occurred. But he certainly makes a serious mistake, in the first place; as to the *object* of the temptation. He says (p. 77), "it was that Satan might ply his resources to best advantage and that by victory there and then, he [Jesus] might be established against all that the great adversary could do thereafter." "This," says Dr. Crosby, "was the *very* object." Now, this was by no means, according to the Scriptures, the very object of this conflict.

But it is evident that Dr. Crosby has not the remotest idea that our Lord was here the Second Adam, vindicating the Covenant of Works, standing where the First Adam should not have fallen, and so working out, or beginning to work out, the redemption of those whom he represented. According to Dr. Crosby, our Lord, "like Moses and Elijah," simply goes down to the wilderness to fast forty days in order to "collect himself for the strife and suffering that were before him." There was before him now, after his thirty years upon the earth, "the severer task of a public manifestation in the presence of envenomed hostility," and he "needed this isolation from man and anomalous communion with God that he might obtain strength adequate to the emergency." It was "the steeping process of his soul in faith, by which it was made invulnerable and the resolute master of its mighty work." (Pp. 74, 75.) Thus, according to Dr. Crosby, the temptation had a subjective rather than an objective bearing, and was a part of Christ's training rather than of his work for us! And this is asserted, notwithstanding we read expressly that Jesus was already "full of the Holy Ghost" before he was led up into the wilderness to be tempted!

Another, though perhaps no more serious error, is involved in Dr. Crosby's representations of the person and natures of Christ. He distinctly declares (Note, page 82) that he "can see no force or meaning in the temptation, if there was anything but the human nature of Christ to resist it—of course in dependence upon God." And so, in the passage quoted above, he represents our Lord as ignorant, for a long time, of the true character of the tempter, who comes to him in the guise of a lowly man, and deceives the Saviour in the first and second temptations. He only finds out upon the third temptation who this deceiver is, and then bids Satan begone! Our Lord was able to search men's hearts and read their very thoughts, but here he is deceived by the Devil. The Scriptures tell us that "being full of the Holy Ghost he was led up of the Spirit into the wilderness," and that it was for the purpose of being "tempted of the Devil," but it seems now that Jesus did not know it! Had he known, says Dr. Crosby, that it was the Devil, "Get thee behind me, Satan,"

would have been uttered first. Thus Dr. Crosby insists that there was not "anything but the human nature of Christ to resist" the temptations of Satan here. And so he also says that after the temptation "Heaven again grants him the reassuring comforts of the supernatural." But "such disclosures of the unseen were occasional," not "continual." "The ordinary supports of his way were those vouchsafed to every believing heart." "In the ordinary experiences of life he was left to the ordinary means" "provided for our race!"

These statements are all very extraordinary, as coming from a Presbyterian minister. That the reader may judge if there can have been any misapprehension of Dr. Crosby, let the following passages testify, taken from an essay recently put forth by him in the *Baptist Quarterly* for July, 1870, published in Philadelphia:

"We can also go with our Lord to the wilderness, and feel the full force of his example in resisting temptation, which it is utterly impossible to do if a Deity, active and efficient in Christ, is imagined. It was faith that sustained our Lord in that trial, and hence he is our beautiful and perfect pattern. As soon as he knew it was Satan, and not a friend seeking his good with mistaken judgment, who was his companion, he indignantly orders him away. Would he have allowed him to stay and tempt him further had he known before that it was Satan? Would not such tampering with Satan have been sin?"

"The whole life of Jesus becomes luminous with a new glory when we behold him, while Deity, yet a very man by the dormancy or quiescence of his divine nature during his humiliation. He is brought very near to us in his sympathy and love. While mystery remains connected with his person (as mystery must be always connected with the incarnate God), yet that mystery is not now where mystery repels comfort and faith. The mystery is now in the dormancy or quiescence of the Godhead, and not in the confusing presence of Godhood and manhood together in their conscious acting.

"In thus regarding our Saviour's humiliation there is nothing derogatory to his sacred character any more than there is in his sighing, weeping, groaning, bleeding, and dying. Nor is there anything which supports Socinianism. On the contrary, this view presents the only solid arguments against the errors of Arius and Socinus, by acknowledging the true and unmysterious man-



hood of Jesus Christ as the temporary humiliation of the God from eternity and to eternity, showing that there is not and ought not to be a vestige of Deity in his conscious life till after the resurrection, and that therefore the passages of Scripture so constantly quoted by the Unitarians are nothing to the point. By our false method of defending ourselves against their attacks we only confirm them in error, and shake the weak souls who are on the truth's side."

It is evident, therefore, that this author really means to teach that "no Deity active and efficient" was in the man Jesus when tempted of the Devil! Had he allowed the Devil to tempt him, knowing that it was the Devil, "such tampering with Satan would have been sin!" His divine nature is "dormant or quiescent during his humiliation!" There is "no confusing presence of Godhead and manhood together in their conscious acting." And this, forsooth, is the only way to meet Socinians and Arians! We must acknowledge "not a vestige of Deity in Christ's conscious life till after the resurrection!"

Now, if anything can be known of the force of words, here is the denial at once of any true and proper divinity in him that was crucified, and of any true and proper atonement made by him for man. No wonder that Dr. Crosby represented Christ, not as the Second Adam, meeting and overthrowing Satan in the wilderness, but simply going there to fast and pray for his own strengthening to do his own work. And no wonder that throughout the whole book our Saviour should be held forth so much as our exemplar and so little as our Redeemer. The idea of this being the true ground on which to meet Arians and Socinians would be amusing if the case were not so serious and so sorrowful. Here is a minister, standing in the front rank of Presbyterian divines in the great city of New York, and in the great Presbyterian Assembly of the North, and he not only makes Christ a mere man in the temptation, but a mere man also all through his life and in his very death! Of course, if Christ made no true and proper atonement in his death, there is nothing better to be said or thought about his death than that he died as well as lived to be our exemplar. The Christian public must wait with some interest to see if the Church that has agreed

to make nothing of the errors of Barnes and Beman will suffer these of Dr. Crosby to pass unchallenged.

That there was "nothing but the human nature of Christ to resist" the temptation, is the statement. What could any mere *nature* not instinct with personality, resist or suffer or perceive or accomplish? The doctrine of Christianity is, that the Son of God took to himself a true body and a reasonable soul, and so became man as well as God. To his one person were united two natures, but not mixed nor blended. The attributes of each nature remained separate and peculiar, so that his humanity had no part of divinity compounded with it, but was still capable of suffering and humiliation. So too his divinity received no touch of infirmity from his human nature. The point of union was his *person*. Thus the Scriptures freely ascribe to our Lord everything God-like in the most absolute sense, and yet, with the same unqualified absoluteness, ascribe to him everything human except sin. He was God and he was man. There are two sides from which he is approachable. And so his doings and sufferings as man were actually and truly, in the fullest sense, God's doings and God's sufferings. God cannot suffer as divine; but in the humanity he had assumed to himself, God did suffer and die. Death accomplished in full upon God's Son all that it accomplishes upon any one of his believing people—it divided temporarily his human spirit from his human body, but neither body nor spirit from his divine personality. It may therefore be said unqualifiedly that the Son of God suffered, bled, and died, and that the blood of the atonement was divine, and that God purchased his flock with his own blood. If God *died not* for us, there was no atonement worth the name.

But Dr. Crosby vacates the whole work of redemption, by declaring there was nothing but human nature to resist the temptation and no conscious acting of Deity in Christ till after the resurrection. "Nothing but human nature and no conscious acting of Deity in Christ"? Why, the Scriptures tell us that "in him dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." Though a complete man when tempted, yet was he then "full of the Holy Ghost." And when Satan assailed him, then, on his human

side, the reason why he could not but be foiled was because that weak nature was instinct then, not with a human but a divine personality.

There is a peculiarity about Dr. Crosby's style which claims some notice. In all his quotations from the Lord's discourses, he changes the phraseology of the common version wherever a change is possible. These are not intended as amendments of the translation in all the instances, for the words he substitutes have very nearly the same meaning; but the effect is to reduce the consecrated words of our translators to commonplace terms. As a rule, *any* change from the ordinary version is objectionable, except in cases of glaring inaccuracy, which are happily very infrequent. The most disagreeable of these paraphrases, is Dr. Crosby's rendering of the 17th chapter of John, where he manages, without altering the sense, to transform the solemn and majestic prayer of the Lord into a collection of familiar colloquial phrases, which no Bible student can read without a shock. The men who translated the Bible into English were scholars, and gave very diligent attention to their work, and there can be no satisfactory reason for "offering amendments," except where it can be shown that they committed decided blunders.

As an offset to the monstrous errors of Dr. Crosby, may be quoted a statement made by one of the clearest thinkers in our Church. It is taken by permission from an unpublished argument upon the contrasts and resemblances between the "moral law and the two covenants." In examining the conditions of the first covenant, the writer argues that Adam was subjected to a *test* by a method entirely outside of natural law. All the surroundings were *ab extra*. God *planted* the garden, put the man into it; and the forbidden fruit, but *for the prohibition*, was "good for food, and a tree to be desired."

"As man fell federally, he may be restored federally. The parallelism (Rom. v. 18, 19,) between man's condemnation in Adam, and justification in Christ, is thus held forth: 'Therefore, as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.' God was

therefore pleased to enter into the covenant of grace with the Second Adam, that, out of the ruins brought on the race of Adam, he might rescue and prepare a people 'to the praise of the glory of his grace in Christ Jesus our Lord.' This covenant was made between the Father and the Son. Its conditions were that the Son should make atonement for the guilt of the human family, incurred by their first head, by enduring their penalty; and also should work out for them a righteousness of infinite merit, by a perfect obedience to this second covenant for a limited time. There is in the covenant of redemption the same necessity for obedience to the moral law, as there was in the covenant of works; for the supernatural and gracious is inconceivable, except on the background of the natural and righteous. The natural and involuntary is always the foundation of the extra-natural and voluntary. The Second Adam, precisely as the first, was bound to obey the moral law as the indispensable prerequisite and foundation of his covenant work; but also like his type, he was bound to do more than obey the pure law of nature: he was under the special and peculiar obligations of the covenant; and this required obedience, which was the subject matter of his vicarious righteousness, was likewise a test of pure fidelity to a voluntary covenant, requiring something more than the moral law.

"Now in order to perform the stipulations of the covenant of grace, the Son of God must become incarnate; for the Redeemer and the redeemed must be of one nature. (Heb. ii. 10-18.) The incarnation of the Son of God, his necessary preparation for the work of the covenant, secured for him what the tree of life was designed to secure for Adam—immunity from sinning against the law of nature. The indissoluble union of the human nature with the divine person of the Son, necessarily and naturally upheld his humanity, notwithstanding the infirmities of its condition, in the image of God in knowledge and righteousness and true holiness. Besides sin under pure moral law is only possible to a *person*, which Christ's human nature was not. But Christ's peculiar positive righteousness, that which makes him 'the Lord our righteousness,' and is imputed to the believer for justification, was not simply or mainly his obedience to the covenant of works. There was a positive test here, like the prohibition in the covenant of works, in reference to some course of conduct, which, but for that covenant it would not have been wrong for Christ to have pursued. We know not what it was precisely, but neither do we know what the tree of knowledge was. This much seems plain: it was a most wonderful voluntary

self-restraint for the sake of winning that divine and everlasting righteousness for the justification of God's people, which the covenant of grace proposed to bring in. There is nothing in the history of the God-man which so overpowers the reader of the gospels as this constant amazing self-restraint. There was some tree that was indeed according to nature 'good for food and pleasant to the eyes,' of which even he did not dare to eat except at the price of losing all 'the joy that was set before him,' and turning the new covenant, as Adam did the old, into an instrument of woe to humanity, though it was designed to be the medium of the highest excellence and happiness to which the nature of the creature could be advanced. This self-restraint of Christ appears everywhere in his life in the strangest contrast with his unbounded power. Possessed and conscious of all power in heaven and earth, wielding with omnipotent hand every force of nature and providence and of the soul of man, lavishly using all this power for the benefit of men, yet never once exercising it in his own behalf! His weariness and hunger and thirst and pain he endured alone. Not one application did he make of his boundless resources for his own relief, even where relief otherwise would have been not only right but obligatory. The more profoundly we study the history of Christ the more astonishing does this self-restraint appear. Surely the Christ of history must be a divine fact, for no human genius could rise to such a conception. 'He saved others, himself he *could* not save' is true of all his life.

"Now the whole object of this argument is gained in placing before the reader this single point, to wit, that the crown and glory and infinite merit of that 'one righteousness,' which the gospel preaches, the righteousness which purchases for the believer a far higher life than the righteousness of the moral law or the righteousness of the covenant of works could have secured, lies in the Saviour's obedience, not to the moral law, but to the covenant of grace. He did indeed perfectly keep the moral law. He was holy, harmless, and undefiled, a lamb without spot or blemish; but this righteousness was rather the necessary prerequisite of the other, indissolubly united to it, as the tree is rooted in the earth, but not the very golden fruit which is the bread of *life*. Let no one say that this statement denies that Christ obeyed *all* law in our stead and in our behalf. All that He did in the way either of suffering or of active obedience, is vicarious. The whole Christ—all that he is, and all that he did, and all that he suffered—is imputed to the believer for righteousness. *He* is the Lord *our* righteousness.

But as under the covenant of works, if Adam had kept it, the special righteousness which would have purchased for the race the benefits proposed, would have been Adam's obedience to the prohibition of that covenant; so under the covenant of grace which the Redeemer kept, the special righteousness which purchases eternal life for *his* spiritual seed, is his obedience to the terms of this covenant."

It is now proposed to enter somewhat formally into the question respecting all human Lives of Jesus. Probably every intelligent believer, who has been for years under the tutelage of the Divine Spirit, and who has been blessed with some experimental communion with his Lord, looks with instinctive distrust upon each new "Life of Christ," as it is presented to the Church or the world. The record contained in the Gospels must needs be the solitary foundation upon which all these modern histories are based, and this record has sufficed for twenty centuries. There are no additions to the stories of the evangelists, drawn from contemporaneous profane annals—such would be instantly rejected, without debate, by the man who is jealous for the reputation of his King. The mere historical fact that Jesus of Nazareth lived and died about two thousand years ago, is, of course authenticated, outside of Holy Writ; and the world no more doubts or denies this fact, than it doubts or denies the existence of Julius Cæsar. And, with this admission, the Church is content.

The case is peculiar and striking. This man, during a very short public life, founded a "sect" which, without force or violence, has spread all over the civilised world. It has been decidedly aggressive since the very days of its founder. It has refused to make alliances with any other religion, and has steadfastly claimed to speak and to teach by the awful authority of God. If you take away from this sect the briefly recorded history of its founder, who lived some thirty years upon the earth, you abolish the sect, although its members confidently assert their individual interest in all the events of an eternity past, and of an eternity to come! Never has humanity witnessed a similar exhibition of sublime effrontery if the creed be false, or of sublimer faith if the creed be true. But, as a general rule,

all expansions of the events recorded in the Gospels, which are few and simple, only weaken the foundations upon which the Christian creed is raised.

The question under consideration relates to the limits of inference and implication. How much that is not explicitly stated may be *imagined* respecting the early life of the Lord Jesus? And the instructive answer of every believer must be "Not a solitary word." Nothing but dishonor have all such attempts to describe what is not written ever brought upon the Incarnation. From the nature of the case the experiment must be dangerous. Dr. Crosby seems to find it very difficult to refrain from handling fully such a tempting topic. He is fain to portray what he says he "can imagine—the boy Jesus playing amid the shavings of the carpentry, or joining the children of the village in driving the cattle to pasture, or watching with the sheep upon the hillside;" and when his pen is restrained, he gives us a gross and offensive picture of a young carpenter in the workshop! Precisely in this way the Apocryphal Gospels were produced. Dr. Crosby holds our Lord to have been just a human boy favored specially with "supernatural visions, significant dreams, angelic visitations and inward inspirations"—"these favors being graduated according to his years and the demands of his approaching ministry." Pp. 47, 55, 56. But all this is unwarrantable, because it is making too free with matters concealed from us, and sacred. The point to be established and enforced is, that any human biography of Christ, if undertaken at all, must be undertaken, not in this presumptuous way, but in the spirit of cautious humility, and that for the reason that our Lord did not come into this world primarily to set us an example, but rather to obey and suffer in our stead.

I. It might be sufficient to rest the argument upon the naked fact, that God has not seen fit to furnish a foundation for any of these *addenda*. The Bible tells of the birth of the Lord; and while this wonderful truth is revealed with great distinctness, it remains among the inscrutable mysteries which no mortal intelligence can penetrate or unravel. Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judea in fulfilment of prophecy. He was born of

a virgin in fulfilment of prophecy. He was formally dedicated to God, and admitted to the membership of his elect household, by the administration of the rite which God himself had prescribed; and there the history terminates for twelve years. Only one of the evangelists speaks of the life of the Saviour, from infancy to mature manhood; and he relates in a few, brief sentences, the story of his visit to Jerusalem. Upon this short passage, in the Gospel by Luke, all the imaginary histories of these thirty years are erected. In all the record there is not a single word that refers to this long interval, excepting the last ten verses in the second chapter of Luke. From this point human fancy tracks back through twelve years, and forward through eighteen years of unwritten history, and vainly essays to fill the vacuum. As there is no similar case among the personal histories in which the Bible abounds, this omission is marvellous. Is it credible that the omission is accidental? Is it credible that the history was really written and lost? Rejecting both of these suppositions, the conclusion is reached that God has purposely withheld the knowledge from the Church and the world. In all the discourses of the Lord himself, while he frequently refers to his own future history, he never once alludes to the first thirty years of his life.

. It is not possible to evade inquiry as to the reason for this remarkable reticence. One would imagine that no story of human life could command equal interest. It is certain that every act and word of the Lord Jesus illustrated the law in its precept. He was free from the smallest taint of sin. The commands of this law, touching the thoughts and intents of the heart, and certainly reaching to every outward act of the life, found no lapse, no resistance, no rebellion, in the man Christ Jesus. So, if the theory so common in the world is true, that Christ is the great example for human imitation, then nothing can compensate humanity for the loss of this history. No human life was ever so blameless, and no model equal to this could possibly be set before the race. But Christ did not come into the world for this purpose. He was not the exemplar but the Redeemer of men.



The obedience he rendered whereby was wrought out that immaculate righteousness which covers all human deformities, was more than the mere avoidance of wrong. In the main the law says, "Thou shalt not!" And as the fulfilment of the prohibitory precept involved the performance of the opposite positive duty, the holy, harmless, and undefiled man constantly loved God supremely and constantly loved the whole family of Adam with the true love of his human brotherhood. The world has never witnessed a similar example of perfect conformity to the law. Imagine an entire life of thirty-three years, unstained by a single transgression, and adorned by a ceaseless exhibition of active beneficence! If the design of God was to give his Church a perfect example in the life of his only begotten Son, he would doubtless have had all the events of this life recorded, and preserved with the lively oracles which are that Church's inheritance. But all that we know of his walk and conversation refers to his *official* life, which is simply inimitable. He went about doing good, but not as our example. Try to conceive of him as going about and *failing* to do good, as being indifferent to the woes of humanity, as heedless of the plaintive appeal of the leper, as deaf to the agonised cry of Bartimæus, as blind to the tears of the widow of Nain! No Christian heart can possibly entertain such a conception for a moment. Yet each of these examples of beneficence was an exhibition of divine power and divine love, fulfilling a covenant between Divine persons.

Let it be observed here that our opposition to the "example" theory is induced by the persistent effort of Unitarian heretics to confine the work of Christ to this one object. As no man ever lived whose life compared with that of the God-man, the design of his incarnation was not attained, if setting a godly example was any part of this design. It is true that his life was a model, a motive, an incentive to holiness, but this was because it could not be otherwise. It was an incidental necessity of his being. "I am holy," says God, "therefore be ye holy." No higher standard can be imagined; no lower standard would challenge the attention of immortals. Yet God is infinite, eternal, and unchangeable in *his* holiness. It is his essential attribute

and inimitable by the creature. Therefore we are driven to the conclusion that the teaching is: "Be ye holy, *inasmuch* as I am holy." So in the exhortation in 1 Peter ii. 21, where Christ is said to "leave us an example that we should follow his steps," the true meaning of the Apostle appears to be precisely in the teeth of the Unitarian model theory.

This passage occurs in the midst of an exhortation to slaves, in which the Apostle enjoins obedience under all circumstances. The character or conduct of the master does not change the obligation, but the sum of the exhortation seems to be this: the fact of ownership involves certain rights, and the fact of bondage involves certain invariable duties. Therefore subjection is due alike to the just and the froward. If buffeted wrongfully, the Christian servant is instructed to endure patiently because precisely this is the end of his calling; and then the startling illustration is presented: the Lord Christ, guileless, without sin, endured suffering wrongfully, forbearing threats and revilings, committing himself or his cause to him that judgeth righteously. If the enforcement of duty from this example of Christ had been the Apostle's object, the exhortation would have terminated here; but he immediately adds the clearest announcement of the vicarious work of the Lord that can be found in the New Testament—"who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness: by whose stripes ye were healed." This is the sentence, set like a precious stone in the chapter, illuminating every part of it, and describing a work which no creature in heaven or earth can ever pretend to imitate. As an example, therefore, it is utterly without force. But the plain inference from the whole chapter is this: If the immaculate Redeemer could afford to endure suffering wrongfully, surely the *best* of his followers might do the same.

Another scripture, which still more distinctly brings out this idea, is Hebrews xii. 3: "For consider him that endured such contradiction of sinners against himself, lest ye be wearied and faint in your minds." This quotation is from the conclusion of Paul's enumeration of the ancient heroes of faith, all of whom are

set before the Hebrews as examples of endurance and courage; and the final exhortation to run with patience the race set before them, is enforced by the consideration that Jesus endured such contradiction of sinners against himself. Yet in the same sentence his divine power, as the author and finisher of the faith which the Apostle commends, is distinctly asserted. So the exhortation means, if Jesus, the divine beginner and finisher of the faith, endured the Cross, how much more should the Christian wage a good warfare and run a good race, especially as he is surrounded with so great a cloud of witnesses who have contended for and won the same prize.

It is said that the planet Mercury has seven times more light and heat than we enjoy. If this little orb is inhabited, nothing can seem more reasonable to the dwellers on its surface than that the sun was made for the express purpose of furnishing them with this light and heat. But we know better. We know that the inhabitants of earth have been elevated into kinship with the Creator of the sun, whose chief use, so to speak, is to hold in their mighty orbits those ponderous globes, compared with which Mercury is but a speck. Nevertheless, Mercury is constantly bathed in the sunlight, and believers are perpetually enlightened by the rays of the sun of righteousness. Nothing can be hidden from the heat thereof. As the earthly history of the Lord is the record of a life of perfect purity, so far as we have any record, it is not possible to escape the influence of his illustrious example. And, gazing upon this true light, believers are changed into the same image, from glory to glory. And, finally, in the culmination, "we shall be like him, because we shall see him as he is." Nevertheless, nine-tenths of this holy life has been hidden from human scrutiny, and human imagination may not innocently essay to uplift that veil. He is Prophet, Priest, and King; and in none of these offices does he present any example for our imitation, at least not until the revelation of the general assembly and Church of the first-born in a different dispensation.

II. That the Lord was fully inducted into all these offices while he dwelt upon the earth, will not be questioned. In his discourses, both to his chosen disciples and to the multitudes

who heard his voice, he discharged the functions of the prophet. None that went before him, and none that came after him, taught as he taught. Never man spake like this man. The old prophets authenticated all their deliverances by the unfailing "Thus saith Jehovah!" The true Prophet, of whom these were types, taught as one having authority; "Verily, verily, I say unto you!" Those that succeeded him claimed authority to teach because they claimed to "have the mind of Christ." "For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you." So he stands alone, this sublime Teacher, uttering words of heavenly wisdom, with all the authority of God. Sometimes he announces an astounding doctrine with as astounding simplicity. "Ye must be born again!" and he gives no explanation to relieve the torturing perplexity of the inquirer. Sometimes, but less frequently, he argues in this wise: "If a son ask for bread, will ye give him a stone?" Sometimes he speaks in parables, those wonderful compositions of which all the literature of all time has produced no counterparts. It was he who talked with Abraham in the plains of Mamre. It was he who encountered Jacob at Peniel. He met Joshua in the plains of Jericho, announcing himself as the Captain of the Lord's host. It was he who ascended in the flame of Manoah's altar, in all those instances withholding his wonderful name. As some one has said, "he tried on his humanity, before the fulness of time." These various examples are quoted merely to fix the fact that his method of teaching was unique and inimitable. The Christian is *never* called upon to decide questions of personal duty by asking himself "What would the Saviour have done, under similar circumstances?" but always asks "What has the Lord *commanded*, touching this thing?" He says not, "A new example I set before you," but he *does* say, "A new commandment I give unto you." If it were possible for a solitary Christian to monopolise all the holiness and all the wisdom in the world, he would still be very unlike the holy Prophet whom God ordained. When the three apostles upon Mount Tabor proposed to build three tabernacles, two for the two foremost prophets of the old dispensation, and the third for Christ, there came a voice out of the excellent

glory, saying, "This is my beloved Son: hear him!" For a little time, he was even made lower than the angels, in order that God might be just, and yet a justifying God; but the highest of these heavenly intelligences is fain to veil his face with his wings when he comes before the Prophet Jesus.

III. Advancing a step, and considering the Lord in his sacerdotal office, there is no room for argument upon this point. He is the one Priest interceding and atoning. Here again, his disciples may be said to follow his example, as they are instructed to bear one another's burdens, and to pray one for another. Indeed, by virtue of their union with him, they are "made priests," but their official work does not resemble his. By one offering he hath forever perfected them that are sanctified, but they are never called upon to make an expiatory offering at all. No man taketh this honor upon himself, only he that is called of God, as was Aaron. One of the distinguishing enormities of Popery is the assumption of priestly functions by those children of the devil who, of logical necessity, are compelled to make the body, blood, soul and divinity of the Lord in their idolatrous service of the mass. The inevitable drift into one extreme of heresy or another, whenever there is a departure from God's sufficient revelation, is one remarkable proof of its authenticity. On the one hand the Unitarian heretic, stripping the glorious Priest of his essential divinity, reduces him to the status of a mere man whose spotless life was only an example. On the other the misguided Papist, holding a heresy only a little less damnable, deifies a human sinner with the title of Vice-Christ, who professes to discharge functions that demand the "power of an endless life" for their performance.

In the Epistle to the Hebrews, where the priestly office is so thoroughly examined and defined, the apostle begins the argument with the clearest declaration of the Lord's divinity. By inheritance he hath obtained a more excellent name than the angels. By him God made the worlds, and to him are inscribed divine titles. "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever." No part of the old economy was so jealously guarded as that which pertained to the Aaronic priesthood, and as this epistle is ad

dressed to the Hebrews, the traditions which had been accumulating for fifteen hundred years, are all suddenly annihilated by the statement in the opening chapters. And at the end of the book and of its majestic argument, the author concludes by pointing to "Jesus Christ—the same, yesterday, to-day, and forever;" that is, "Jesus Christ, Jehovah." Well may he call upon them to consider this High Priest, not to emulate his example, but to repose in the security which his divine power gives to the believer.

While the entire public life of the Lord was marked by the exercise of his sacerdotal office, in some aspects of it, the great work of expiation was undoubtedly wrought upon Calvary. It is to this one act that the writer to the Hebrews constantly refers, and, in fact, the object of the incarnation, and of the whole earthly history of Jesus, was the vicarious sacrifice upon the cross. He came into the world to save sinners, and this salvation was purchased by his death. But that terrible drama was not enacted in order to teach men how to die. It was not an exhibition of heroism under suffering. It was not the endurance of martyrdom for the sake of truth. It was the outpouring of the wrath of God upon sin. It was the infliction of the curse of God upon the sinner. It was the true solution of the inexplicable problem, how God could be a just God and a Saviour. This finished his special work of redemption, though he shall come again in his glorious humanity. But in that second coming "to those that look unto him," he shall appear the second time "without a sin-offering," and perfect the salvation wrought out in his death.

The point of the argument here is patent. It was not only the holy man Jesus who suffered vicariously for sinners of Adam's race, but it was the divine Christ. Nothing short of pure manhood could meet the conditions of the covenant and exhaust the penalty. Nothing short of supreme divinity could endure the test and give value to that sacrifice. And it were just as reasonable to quote God as an example to man in the work of creation, as to quote Christ as an example in the more glorious work of redemption.

IV. But there is one other office to notice. Christ is King' also. The Roman procurator wrote his title, "This is Jesus, king of the Jews," forced into so much acknowledgment of his regal status by the majesty of his person. But he had a higher rank than this, overriding all the royalties of earth, and all the principalities and powers in heavenly places—"King of kings." There is precisely the same foundation here for the example theory, as in the other cases already examined, because the Lord makes his people kings as well as priests. They are called a royal priesthood. There are not wanting many types and shadows of this regal authority in the scripture record. Man was originally made holy and upright, and invested with "dominion over the creatures." The only form of civil government recognised in Scripture is monarchical and absolute. The authority of heads of tribes and families is very much like kingly authority; but in none of these cases is there the slightest approach to the irresponsible dominion of King Jesus. "By him princes reign," but not by his example, because the Judge of all the earth *must needs* do right and righteously, by the very necessity of his nature. The sceptre of his kingdom is a *right* sceptre.

There is a grand chapter, in the terrestrial history of the Lord, which is not yet written, albeit the promise of it is all over the Revelation. It is formally announced that he shall come again to be admired in all that believe, and to set up his kingdom upon the ruins of all earthly dynasties. There are those among his saints who have this reign in view whenever they utter the petition he taught them—"Thy kingdom come!"

Concerning this kingdom, it is worthy of notice, that the terms employed in its description excel any specimen of word-painting in possession of humanity. No where else in the world's literature is there so profuse an expenditure of gorgeous images as in the Apocalypse. The wall of the royal city garnished with precious stones, its golden streets and pearly gates, if merely figurative expressions, have at least exhausted the powers of human imagination. And if it should happen that these glowing words find a literal fulfilment in the establishment of the

final Monarchy upon our planet, it may be safely asserted that all the dreams and fairy visions of mankind will be found to have fallen far short of this sober reality.

Concerning the person of the King who shall reign in that better dispensation, it is not easy for uninspired pens to enlarge upon the description furnished by the seer of Patmos. The grandeur and dignity of the Lord Christ, the rider upon the white horse, the occupant of the great white throne, are set forth in terms that will endure no human amplification. And whether or not the grand events that are described by John shall occur upon this planet, it is certain that "this same Jesus" shall be Lord of that kingdom, wherever it may be established. There is not in all the Bible the most obscure hint touching the personal appearance of the Redeemer, except those mysterious descriptions in the Apocalypse; and it is not possible for man to decide any question relating to his form or features. But there are some things absolutely necessary to identify the great King, which may be inferred with infallible certainty. He must needs be free from any deformity as a man, because the *perfectness* of the typical sacrifices of the old law is insisted upon with the most stringent reiteration. Some fanciful writers, arguing upon the passage in Isaiah, "His visage was so marred more than any man's;" and the passage in the Gospel, "Thou art not yet fifty years old," have concluded that the Saviour manifested in youth all the decrepitude of age, and that his form was attenuated by fasts and vigils, and bent under the burden of imputed guilt. But it is safer to trust the instinctive conviction of the saint, that his Lord, in the splendor of his perfect manhood, was far more beautiful than Absalom, "chiefest among ten thousand, and altogether lovely." When Adam, the progenitor of the race was created, God made him in his own image. It is not probable that any of his natural posterity have possessed superior personal attractions. And it is not probable that the Second Adam was inferior to the first in any regard, and not possible that he lacked any of the essential attributes of perfect humanity.

Here then is presented the sublime object of Christian worship. Christ, the Prophet, Priest and King! Very God; very



man. He has revealed himself to the Church in his written word so fully that none of his saints can follow any false Christs. They know in whom they believe. You cannot strengthen their faith by addenda to this revelation. He has not omitted a solitary word, nor has he suffered a solitary word to be lost of all his inspired record. And while it is true that this priceless treasure is wasted upon an unbelieving world, it is also true that it is always wasted for weary years upon his own chosen people. How long do they disregard the awful fact that the word wherein he is described is *his* word! How long do they heedlessly stumble in the dark pathways of sin, while the light of the world is in their hands and the voice of God sounding in their ears! But they hear it not, albeit it is as the sound of many waters, until there comes a day, to every one of them, in which he calls them by *name*. He uses no argument, he presents no motive, he makes no appeal; he only calls them by *name*. And the response is uniform and invariable, the recognition perfect and certain, as they fall at his feet and answer, "Rabboni!"

## CRITICAL NOTICES.

*Ad Clerum. Advices to a Young Preacher.* By JOSEPH PARKER, D. D., author of *Ecce Deus*. Boston. (Reprint.) Roberts Brothers. 1871. 12mo., pp. 266. ●

This book is evidently designed by the reverend author to be "telling." The cultivated reader will be inclined to deem it rather deserving of the slang term "slashing." It is a discussion of several of the commonplaces of pastoral theology and pulpit rhetoric, from the point of view of a British Congregationalist. Many of the author's conclusions are judicious; we do not see any that are new, save those which are untrue. The discussions have the flavor of fugitive essays written for some journal; and this, we have no doubt, is their real origin. They are, accordingly, sprightly, amusing, and sometimes even racy. The characteristics which impress the reader most are the prevalence of sarcasm and ridicule, a queer compound of cynicism with professed evangelical warmth and love, the sharpness and discourtesy with which the author deals with his own ministerial brethren, an exceedingly "progressive" and innovating vocabulary and idiom, and an evident hostility to the doctrines of grace as taught by the great fathers of the Reformed Churches. An example of the author's inroads into the "Queen's English" is even seen in the title page, where he uses the word "Advices," not in its classic sense of items of intelligence communicated by writing, but in the sense of *counsels*. On page 11 the different types of ministerial earnestness are classified as the "Dental, the Porous, and the Cordial." On page 104 the young preacher is taught to pray, *not from "an external centre, but a spiritual."* And the author seems to have in his possession a perfect mint-machinery (propelled by steam) for the coinage of new words.

The reader will derive from this little book several very distinct impressions. One is that British Congregationalism is as far gone in its admiration of Henry Ward Beecher and the pulpit

demagogues of that sort as its Yankee sister. Another is, that plagiarising sermons and briefs of sermons seems to be as fully established in the British chapel as a legitimate usage, as it has long been in the British Church. Another is, that Independency there, as in New England, must be a marvellously ill-mannered religion. And still another is, that the Rev. Mr. Parker finds that grade of the English people which his denomination doth chiefly affect, very much given to snobbery.

*A Heathen Nation Evangelised: History of the Sandwich Islands Mission.* By RUFUS ANDERSON, D. D., LL.D., late Foreign Secretary of the Board, Boston: Congregational Publishing Society. 1870. Pp. 408. 8vo.

This book is another of the excellent fruits of Dr. Anderson's labors with his pen since his retirement from the post of Foreign Secretary to the American Board. "It was objected to Neander," says Dr. A. in his preface, "that he wrote with too much reference to influencing the opinions and conduct of his own and succeeding ages. The author confesses to the same desire and aim. Missions are a science in the progress of development. Their history is, from the beginning, a lesson for those now engaged in the missionary work." *Our Church* is aspiring to some share in Foreign Missions, without which, indeed, no Church deserves the name. It would be well for us all to study Dr. Anderson's book. Not only might we learn from it facts to interest our people in the propagation of the faith, but also most valuable lessons regarding the methods of carrying on the Foreign Missionary work.

What a most remarkable beginning the Sandwich Islands Mission had! On the death of king Kamehameha, on the 8th May, 1819, the people of these Islands, by a strange impulse, renounced their false system, threw their gods into the sea or burned them, and demolished their temples. "This strange event resulted from no religious motive whatever, much less from the influence of Christianity, but from a desire to be more free in the indulgence of the baser appetites and passions." Yet,

strange to say, missionaries of the Cross were on their way even then to preach the gospel to these islanders, and arrived there, not to encounter the jealousies of a system of idolatry and its priests, but to find a people ready to be instructed in the gospel! The missionaries had no anticipation of such an occurrence when they sailed, and the islanders knew nothing of their coming till they reached Hawaii! Upon their arrival, March 30, 1820, expecting "to be shocked by day with the sight of human sacrifices, and alarmed at night by the cries of devoted victims," their first news from the shore was of the overthrow of idolatry, the abolition of the priesthood, the suppression of human sacrifices, and that "the nation, without a religion, was waiting for the law of Jehovah!" Pp. 7, 8, 18, 19.

When the mission commenced fifty years ago, this people were degraded in the extreme. A mat of rushes, a few folds of native cloth for a covering at night, a few calabashes for water and *po-i*, was all their furniture; and their houses were a few upright poles covered with leaves or grass. The family, almost naked, crowded round the one calabash and from it drew with their fingers their favorite *po-i*. They had also sweet potatoes and fish for ordinary food. A few bread-fruit trees grew here and there. Their animal food was the flesh of swine and dogs. They got drunk upon a narcotic root called *awa*. Their licentiousness was indescribable. Children were oftentimes given away as soon as born, or strangled, or buried alive. At least two-thirds of those born perished thus. Many other illustrations might be mentioned of their being, as Paul described the ancient heathen, "without natural affection." They were perishing rapidly from off the face of the earth. When the Islands were first discovered, the population were reckoned to be 400,000; but when the missionaries arrived they could not have been more than 130,000. Wars had helped to depopulate them, but still more, a disease introduced by the seamen of Capt. Cook's ships. So poisoned was the physical constitution of the whole nation, that not even the gospel has been able to do more than greatly retard its destructive influence. But if it had not been for its introduction staying the destructive tide, this people had been

by this time reduced to a few fragments in the mountain recesses. Pp. 9, 27-31.

Let us pass over the intermediate half century and tell how there are now (or were in 1870) fifty-eight churches on these islands, with fourteen thousand eight hundred and fifty members, thirty-nine native ordained ministers, (all but three of whom are *pastors of churches*,) and five licentiates. Besides these there are nine ordained native ministers, and seven licentiates, employed in Foreign Missions from these Sandwich Islands churches to Micronesia and the Marquesas Islands. And all this native ministry is supported by the Hawaiians. Discipline is also faithfully administered in most of the churches. And the givings of these native churches for Christian objects, in the year ending May, 1870, were thirty-one thousand and seventy dollars in gold, averaging upwards of two dollars for every church member on the Islands.

If the members of *our* Church would contribute like these *quondam* heathen—and, poor as we are, our poverty is not greater than theirs—there would be means in the treasury of our Church abundant for all her enterprises of zeal and benevolence. But not to dwell on this comparison, what a monument to the power of the gospel is this charity of the Hawaiian Church! But fifty years old, born in pagan darkness, lifted up so lately from the lowest depths of social and moral degradation, and now clad in such beautiful robes, and diffusing such a clear light amongst surrounding heathen tribes!

But, by what array of forces, and by what expense of money, have these glorious results been accomplished in a single half century? The whole number of ordained missionaries employed on these Islands from the beginning has been fifty-two; of lay teachers and helpers twenty-one; of female missionaries, chiefly married, eighty-three—making a total of one hundred and fifty-six. And the whole cost of the Sandwich Islands Mission, up to the year 1869, was one million two hundred and twenty thousand dollars! It may be said, therefore, that this glorious work has cost a contribution every year for fifty years of three Christian laborers—a missionary, his wife, and one lay helper—and

of twenty-four thousand four hundred dollars in money to support these missionaries, their schools, and their presses, and other operations. This is what American Christians have had to give in order to raise up from the dead this Hawaiian Church—every year twenty-four thousand four hundred dollars, and three sons and daughters. Compare the cost in money of all these Christian results, with any railroad one hundred miles long, with any line of steamships kept up for a half century, or with a single week of active operations in our late civil war! Or compare the results of the labors of these fifty missionaries, covering a half century, with the results of ministerial labors at home by any similar number of ministers. Where is the Presbytery among us—nay, perhaps it might be asked, where is the whole Synod among us—that can rejoice in greater results from all its operations during the last fifty years? It is not a rare thing to hear it said by persons, who do not know the facts of modern missionary history, that time, and life, and money, are prodigally wasted in vain efforts to convert savages, and that more good could be done at home by the same means. But one may point to Dr. Anderson's work for the means of triumphantly refuting such ignorant statements. And it may be safely asserted, that it has pleased God to bless the labors of foreign missionaries, during this century, more in proportion, than of ministers in the bosom of the Christian Church.

It would be vain to attempt in these few pages to present any adequate view of the lessons of missionary instruction which this volume contains. In some future number of this journal it is expected to make such an attempt. In closing this brief notice, the significant yet melancholy statement may be quoted from p. 342, concerning these rescued Islanders: "The nation may, and probably will, fade away." The white man will supplant the Sandwich Islander in those fairy islands which lie right on one track of the world's commerce. But, although they probably are thus a doomed race, the fact will remain forever, that the gospel could and did redeem them from barbarism, idolatry, and vice. It will be forever true that Christianity was a blessing, greater than all the curses brought to them from

abroad. Hundreds and thousands of ungodly European and American sailors, and travellers, and traders, carried the blight of their teachings and example to those poor savages. And Rome sent her missionaries there to counterwork the gospel in its effort for their rescue; as did also the allies of Rome in the Anglican Church; yet the simple truth of Christ in the hands of a few humble missionaries prevailed over every obstacle, and these Islands were won for Christ, and gems of beauty and price found there, will sparkle forever in our Redeemer's crown of glory. And not only is this true of the Sandwich Islands, but in more than three hundred islands of eastern and southern Polynesia the gospel has swept heathenism entirely away. The missionaries of four evangelical societies have gathered four hundred thousand people under Christian influences, of whom a quarter million are living still, and fifty thousand sit down at the communion table of the Lord Jesus. P. 342.

*Short Sermons for the People.* By Rev. WM. S. PLUMER, D. D.  
Published by the American Tract Society, 150 Nassau Street,  
New York.

These sermons are thirty-five in number, each one exactly 12 pages long, making when put together a volume of 420 duodecimo pages.

The subjects are such as—The Holy Scriptures; The Good Angels; We all Belong to God; The Heart of Man is all Wrong; Sin Will Come to Light; The Saviour is a Wonder; Our Guilt and Christ's Righteousness; The New Birth; Who is a Christian?; Secret Sins; What shall we do with our Burdens?; The Duties of Husbands and Wives; Early Piety.

These discourses are admirably adapted to the instruction of plain Christian people, or persons beginning to inquire after the way of life. And we trust they may prove to be among the most useful of all their author's productions. We do not consider, however, that the style can be said to be very simple, although the sentences are short and the words also short. It is true there are no waste words, nor are the sentences in general tied together by any connecting words. They are accord-

ingly as far as possible removed from being involved or obscure. And yet we hold that they cannot be said to be simple either in thought or diction; nor are we sure that they will prove generally attractive to ignorant persons. In many instances they appear to presuppose considerable knowledge in the reader, as well as a lively interest on his part in the subject. We repeat, however, that plain Christians, and also earnest inquirers of that class, will like them.

Following our vocation of critics, we must question the use made in the third sermon of Eph. i. 10, to prove that the angels are "wonderfully related to Christ," being not at all sure that the apostle refers there to any but the redeemed of the Lord—to those who have gone before to heaven, and those who yet remain on the earth.

Again, the statement may be dissented from in Sermon I. that "for one unadvised speech God would not permit Moses to enter the land of Canaan." The sin of Moses in that case may not have been simply that he spake unadvisedly, nor yet that he lost his temper. Both these were ordinary sins; but the whole bearing of the Almighty towards his erring servant would seem to show that Moses' sin was extraordinary. It has been maintained that it was his striking the rock, when he should have simply spoken to it. That rock was a type of Christ, and having already been once smitten, as he was to be once smitten, now it only remained for Moses to speak to the rock (as Christ must now be spoken to) and the water would flow forth. His sin then was, that he, the prophet and the teacher of Israel, violated the type, and God must needs repair it by an extraordinary manifestation of his displeasure.

There is ground for objection also to the statement in Sermon III. that the contention of the devil about the body of Moses was with an angel sent to *bury* him. The contention would appear, on the contrary, to have occurred when the body of Moses was to be *raised* in honor of our Lord's transfiguration. The devil was contending against the *invasion* of his kingdom over death and the grave. The archangel Michael, on that occasion, must not bring a railing accusation against this king of death;



but his answer, as became a creature and a subject of **Messiah**, was, "The Lord," (that is, the Lord Christ,) "rebuke thee!" **Messiah** had not yet, through his dying, destroyed the devil's kingdom, nor abolished death, but he was about to do so.

Viewed in this its true light, as we suppose, Dr. Plumer's point would have been still better illustrated by the passage.

*The Martyrs, Heroes, and Bards of the Scottish Covenant.*

By GEORGE GILFILLAN, M. A. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 580 Broadway. 1869. Pp. 264. 12mo.

The purpose of this volume is, as its author says, to present a succinct and impartial account of the history of the **Scottish Covenant**, an unbiassed estimate of its principal actors, and some general deductions applicable to the great question of the present day. He has clothed the oft-told story of our **Scottish** ancestors, and of their awful sufferings, during the twenty-eight years when it was sought to force prelacy upon them, with new interest. In those days of terror, when they were hunted like partridges upon the mountains, nearly twenty thousand appear to have perished by fire, or sword, or water, or the scaffold, or to have been banished abroad, or to the northern islands. In addition to these, numbers without number expired of cold or hunger among the morasses of the country. Excepting that of the **Waldenses**, who had dyed the mountain snows with their blood, there had been no persecutions in Europe, so inveterate, so fierce, and so long continued. Whatever were the faults of these men, they were terribly in earnest for the truth which God had revealed. Some of them were banished to this soil, and not a few of their names have been perpetuated among us. The treatment they received has left a fretting sore in the memory of our Church, in all the branches into which it is now divided, which, God forgive us, refuses to be healed. The author of these pages is no indiscriminating eulogist of these heroic martyrs. Their faults and mistakes are by no means concealed. As illustrations, we had marked a number of passages which we would gladly have transferred to these pages, but which we are com-

pelled to omit. The author's poetic pen describes the scenes it attempts with great vividness, and his pictorial style is well suited to set forth the facts of history, better far than it is, perhaps, for the more staid and judicial statements of philosophy. He complains that the historians of the Covenant, Calderwood, Shields, and Wodrow, while they were honest and faithful scribes, wanted every element of the historian, except bare literal truth; that they had no imagination, no style, and little pictorial power, and of philosophic generalisation were entirely destitute. It fared far otherwise with the great English rebellion. The history of the cavaliers, at least, had more than full justice done to it in that exquisite and seductive book of pictures, called Clarendon's History. The eighth chapter, in detailing the causes which have combined to make the memory of the Covenanters unpopular, gives a critical estimate of the three most popular Scottish poets of the 18th century, Allan Ramsay, Robert Ferguson, and Robert Burns; of the speculative school of philosophy at Edinburgh; of Sir Walter Scott, Robert Pollock, Edward Irving, Professor Aytoun, etc.; the influence of all of whom, excepting Pollock and Irving, has done great injustice to the principles and character of those heroes of Scotland, to whose principles we of America, in our views of civil liberty, are so much indebted. The deductions from this history, set forth in the closing chapter are: The folly of persecution, the power of deep religious belief, the rich influences of adversity, the tendencies of dominant Churches, Erastianism and priestly domination, the impossibility of adjusting by alliance the claims of Church and State—all addressing themselves with new and augmented power to the minds of thinking men in Britain and elsewhere.

*The Epistle to the Hebrews compared with the Old Testament.*

By the Author of "The Song of Solomon compared with other parts of Scripture." Fifth Edition. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 530 Broadway. 1867. Pp. 305. 12mo.

This is the work of a Christian woman, who had proceeded as far in writing it as the end of the tenth chapter, when she was

VOL. XXII., NO. 2.—9.

called away from earth to her eternal reward. A portion of it was composed under much physical infirmity and suffering. It is therefore the testimony of a dying saint to the preciousness of this portion of God's word, as setting forth the finished work of Christ as the repose of the believing soul. Elaborate discussions, whether of matters critical or theological, will not be expected in such a book. There is an occasional Hebrew word introduced from the Old Testament, the orthography of which is at fault, doubtless more from the error of the corrector of the press, than of herself. Her reliance has been upon Owen and Bonar, where she has sought aid from other sources than the Scriptures, and in this she was safe. There have been many Marys who have sat at the feet of Jesus, many that would have washed them with their tears and dried them with the hairs of their head, or broken the alabaster vase of precious ointment and poured it on him, or have come early on the first day of the week to the sepulchre with Mary of Magdala, Mary the mother of James, and Salome, with sweet spices. And when they pour the wealth of their affections on him in the printed page, it is right to be stimulated by their example and fervor, to look to Him who is "the chiefest among ten thousand." The book has found readers already, and has reached its fifth edition.







# THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW

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

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

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

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

✎ Ministers of the Gospel, and others, who shall obtain three new subscribers, and remit the regular price, (Three Dollars each,) will be entitled to a copy of the REVIEW for one year, or if they so prefer, one dollar for each new subscriber.

✎ Subscribers changing their Post Office are requested to give immediate notice of the same to the Publisher, or their REVIEW will be sent to their former office.

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

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

THE SOUTHERN

PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW,

CONDUCTED BY

AN ASSOCIATION OF MINISTERS

IN

COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA.

Vol. XXII.

---

JULY, MDCCCLXXI.

---

No. 3.

COLUMBIA, S. C.

PRINTED AT THE PRESBYTERIAN PUBLISHING HOUSE.

1871.



## CONTENTS.

---

ARTICLE	PAGE
I. Testimony and Faith, . . . . .	321
II. Pastors and Evangelists <i>versus</i> Stated Supplies, . . . . .	341
III. The Religious Principle the Life of the Nation. By Judge WM. ARCHER COCKE, Monticello, Fla., . . . . .	349
IV. The Presbyterian Reunion, North, . . . . .	379
V. What is Truth? By the Rev. J. S. GRASTY, D. D., Shelbyville, Ky., . . . . .	406
VI. Inauguration of the Rev. Dr. Wilson, . . . . .	413
VII. CRITICAL NOTICES : . . . . .	429
1. Martin on the Atonement, 429. 2. Quirinus's Letters on the Council, 434. 3. Anderson on Regeneration, 440: 4. Barnes's Prayers for Families, 445. 5. Geer's Conver- sion of St. Paul, 448. 6. Life of Rev. Dr. George Junkin, 449.	

# THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXII.—NO. 3.

---

JULY, MDCCCLXXI.

---

## ARTICLE I.

### TESTIMONY AND FAITH.

In most of the discourses upon faith, the credence yielded to ordinary testimony, founded upon the competence and credibility of the witness, is presented as a complete analogy to the heavenly grace. So that the faith of the believer is reduced to the acceptance of the balance of probabilities. This form of statement is the more taking, because the testimony upon which the Christian relies is the testimony of God, who is infinite in knowledge and in truth. As God knows all things, he cannot be mistaken concerning the facts revealed. As it is impossible for God to lie, the revelation stands upon an impregnable foundation. Therefore, the popular definition of faith is, the act of "taking God at his word."

Testimony presented by God himself concerning things relating primarily to God, and things that belong to his kingdom, is necessarily the highest form of witness-bearing of which the human mind can conceive. But the inevitable objection of unbelievers demands the proof that God has spoken at all, and then an accurate statement of his utterances upon each separate doctrine of the saints. Nor does this demand appear unreasonable; for each believer has his doubts upon these two points

VOL. XXII., NO. 3.—1.

entirely satisfied before he attains that peace in believing which the word promises. But the evidence upon which he relies, is not like the proofs furnished to satisfy ordinary doubts, or to terminate ordinary disputes. Because the *complete* answer to his own soul is something in this wise: "One thing I know, that, whereas I *was* blind, now I see." It is manifest that this entirely satisfactory statement, is nothing worth to the man who doubts both the past blindness and the present vision. Indeed, the fact of the universal prevalence of the blindness, and the facts relating to its cure, comprise the great bulk of the teachings of divine revelation. How far these are regarded in the light of testimony may be seen, when it is remembered that the trite sarcasm of the world concerning the numerous sects of Christendom is endorsed by the easy conclusion that all creeds are alike based upon a delusion called revelation. So the difference between the sacramental host and the great army of unbelievers, is in the recognition and *experience* of realities on one hand, that are wholly unseen and wholly unknown on the other. The testimony of the believer counts for nothing to the doubter. It is like the assertion of the ghost-seer, whose word would be taken in all ordinary matters of disputation, but which commands no credence from the multitudes who have *never* seen. If a second witness affirm the same thing, it only adds to the mystery, while the non-seeing sceptic still denies the very existence of visible ghosts. Now, according to all rule, the concurrent testimony of two such eye-witnesses, is better than the testimony of ten thousand unbelievers who have not seen, and, in point of fact, an argument similar to this is common in the pulpit. Whereas, the true difficulty is behind and beyond all sorts of testimony, and consists in the almost universal conviction, that the fact asserted is a natural impossibility. If the character of the ghost-seer forbids a doubt of his veracity, the almost unanimous verdict of humanity pronounces him the victim of a delusion.

It is not possible to doubt that the truths of revelation are honestly rejected by many who have been surrounded, followed, overwhelmed by the most positive form of testimony furnished

by those who have experimental knowledge. Says one, "I *know* in whom I have believed;" but his interlocutor cannot know the same truth, upon his testimony, after years of laborious diligence in reiterated assertion. It is not a matter of testimony at all, in the ordinary sense of that word. The witness is credible, it may be, but not competent, in the judgment of the doubter, who thinks his teacher is the victim of superstition.

It may be said here, that faith is based upon the testimony of the Holy Ghost, who reveals to the soul the things of Christ. But the communion here meant, is the intercourse betwixt the Divine Spirit and the regenerated soul, who receives the testimony by the faith which accompanied the past act of regeneration. Besides, the testimony of Scripture, which falls unheeded upon millions of ears, is the same testimony; for all Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is the writing of those who wrote under the direct and special influence of the same Spirit. The inward teachings of the Comforter always precisely accord with the written revelation, and no new truth is revealed in this secret intercourse. As will be seen presently, the evidence of the Spirit in faith-working lies farther back, and is not of the nature of witness-bearing.

Didactic theology is dissimilar from any other science, and from all others, in that it asserts foundation principles upon the awful authority of God. If it could be imagined possible to construct a scheme of theology independently of revelation, no such scheme could endure the criticism of scholars for a day. Practically, God is, and God is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him; while infidelity—unfaith—precisely denies both of these propositions. And the most elaborate and accurate statement of Christian logic accomplishes nothing, except when addressed to the faith of the believer. So undeniable is this statement, that the unregenerate millions in Christian lands, absolutely refuse to listen to arguments, motives, and appeals, based upon or drawn from Holy Writ.

A pure science, based upon self-evident truths, must ever command the credence of humanity; and if humanity were pure, the science of theology would be of this sort. The two truths

just suggested, to wit, That God is, and that God is beneficent, lie at the foundation of all Christian creeds; but the fool hath said in his heart, "no God." It is not only his deliberate judgment, but his desire as well. Yet it is frequently asserted that these foundation principles are among the native intuitions of the race, which no member of the race is able to contradict. It is exactly at this point that the mistake occurs. God made man upright, and while in his normal condition his aspirations were Godward. But man fell under the dominion of sin, and in his abnormal condition his proclivities are hellward. So, when he says, "no God," he cuts up by the root all possible systems of theology. The combined and cumulative testimony of the entire Christian world cannot create the grace of faith.

This last statement naturally introduces the second topic: What is faith?

It is already apparent, that the present discussion does not proceed upon established scholastic rules. The solitary object is to present some sides of this inexhaustible subject in a plain and popular form. Perhaps, there is a certain haziness of apprehension among gospel-hearers—hearers, but not doers,—concerning this grace, which may be cleared up in some degree by this simple, and, it may be, erratic mode of argumentation.

Whatever the thing is—confining attention of course to the saving faith of the gospel—it certainly is not of spontaneous production. A new-born infant does not have it in embryo to be developed as his mind expands under tutelage. It is not akin to the credence yielded to convincing argument or self-evident propositions. It is no necessary part of mortal or immortal faculties or attributes. As there was a time, in the history of the saint, when he had it not; so there shall come a time in his history when he shall once more have it not. It is never predicated of angelic intelligences, holy or wicked; and multitudes of men have been born and have perished without it.

Next, as it is not inherent in humanity, neither is it inherited by humanity. It comes not to the son from his pious father, albeit God does in a certain sense convey the blessings of the new covenant to the children of the righteous. This is one of

the shadows of his substantial fatherhood—the most enduring type of the eternal antitype. “The promise is to you and your children.” But the special grace under examination is a part of *another* inheritance to which the saint is *joint* heir with Christ, and this differs from all others in that it is incorruptible, undefiled and unfading. It is not the best part of this inheritance either. The title-deeds are not so valuable as the property they describe.

Next, it is not the product of laborious research; it is not the reward of diligent application to the fountain of knowledge. Because the true knowledge is possible only to the believer. No amount of cultivation of natural powers affects it one way or the other. It is equally splendid in its manifestations in the unlettered rustic and in John Milton. One of the most baseless of pious delusions is the notion that poverty of circumstances and poverty of mind are specially favorable to the product or growth of saving faith. It is true that God sometimes—perhaps many times—brings the sinner into the kingdom through losses and tribulations, and he has announced the logical sequence, from tribulation through patience, experience, and hope, to the possession of the ineffable love of God. But all these disciplinary experiences and exercises belong to the believer. The tribulation of tares brings out no golden grains. The man without faith passes under a different rod, and endures the prescribed stripes which are for “the backs of fools.” None of these fall upon the saint, because Another has endured the stripes whereby *he is healed*. However, neither tribulations nor comforts make faith. No cudgelling of the mind, no cultivation of the affections, no study of the word itself, no fastings or watchings or prayers, can bring the soul into the possession of it, because it necessarily precedes all other exercises of the renewed nature.

Lastly, in this list of negations, faith is not inculcated by gospel ministrations. Of course, it cannot be inculcated by any other system of philosophy. The wisest among the sages of antiquity, uttered no sentence resembling the curt command, “Believe.” And the wise expounder of the gospel, while he

proclaims this divine command, carefully distinguishes the saving faith from the mere credence of historical facts. Vast multitudes in Christian lands believe implicitly that Jesus was born; that he lived, suffered, died, and rose again; that he ascended into heaven, whence he shall come again to judge the world; and yet these multitudes perish for lack of faith. And thus brought to the original proposition, once more, testimony the most faithful, full, and explicit, is nothing worth to the non-believer, who must be reborn, not of blood, not of the will of the flesh, not of the will of man, but of God.

Therefore, the distinct declaration of Scripture is, that faith is the gift of God. It is divine grace that brings salvation through faith, *sine qua non*, and the Lord Christ is the author and finisher of it. No doctrine of the gospel is more clearly revealed, or more frequently stated or implied. Regarding the phenomenon of salvation disinterestedly, as the angels might regard it, nothing could be more inherently probable, than that God should retain all the work in his own hands. There had been a covenant in which faith had no place, and in which the highest powers of unfallen humanity were engaged to accomplish the human side of it. And after the woful lapse of the race, it was simply incredible that God should require man to gather up the shattered fragments of these powers, and, with them, essay the accomplishment of a more impossible salvation. By the weakness of the flesh man fell. He can be restored only by the power of God. The requisite righteousness must exceed the righteousness of scribes and Pharisees; and man cannot work it out. The penalty of the violated law must be exhausted, and the first touch of this penalty stamps eternal death upon the soul of the sinner. In the nature of the case, God *must work* in the man to will and to do. As the man who is "just by faith" is the only man who shall live, so justification is the sovereign act of the sovereign God.

This much admitted, it is not difficult to apprehend the truth, that faith in Christ, the fulfiller and the substitute, must needs be the "condition precedent" to salvation. Yet it is not the condition in the popular apprehension of it, that God gives sal-

vation as a reward to the sinner who pumps up faith from the depths of his own nature. It is inaccurate to say that there is nothing good in fallen humanity. There is much that is left of that wonderful creation which the Maker pronounced very good, albeit stained and marred; and much capacity for good in contradistinction from the neutrality of the brutes, and also from the positive damnation of the fallen angels; but there is the same baleful shadow of the evil tree upon every part of humanity. No such product as the faith of the gospel can come spontaneously from such soil. No such exercise as the faith of the gospel is possible to this nature. It is only the man who is in Christ that believes—and he that is in Christ is a “NEW creation.”

What, then, is the *thing* faith, which renders it dissimilar from all other acts and emotions? Why should it be so distinguished in that wonderful inventory of Christian armor which the Apostle recommends to the Ephesian believers, where he likens it to the shield, over all the defensive panoply?

I. It is the link that binds the redeemed to the Redeemer, and, if this link holds, renders the security of the redeemed absolute. It places him beyond the reach of contingencies. No power in earth or hell can separate him from his stronghold. And that this link will prove indestructible is certain, because Christ himself is the beginner and the finisher of it. If he began the work, and then left it, there would be little hope for poor humanity. But he is pledged, having begun, to *finish*. So much for the security of the link. Of course, this general statement is trite enough, and the purpose in this discussion is not to present new and startling propositions; because the solitary fountain of knowledge is accessible to all. But in this objective examination of the topic, the mind inevitably turns to its subjective side, for confirmation or refutation; and the believer approves or rejects the theory, according as it coincides with or contradicts his experience. From a thousand pulpits the urgent exhortation to exercise faith in the Redeemer is heard; but from a far smaller number is taught the true nature of this exercise, and its true place in the developments of the Christian life.



Objectively considered, nothing could be more logically probable than that God should place this grace of faith in the forefront, and should make it infallibly secure. Because if a small part of the foregoing is true, it is incredible that God should hang the ponderous interests of our human soul upon a chain of contingencies. So we find the Bible command abrupt and absolute: "Believe and live." There is no place here for argumentation. But in exhortations to other exercises of the new man, (all proceeding upon this foundation grace, by-the-by,) arguments are abundant. Pray—because the law of Heaven is that every one that asketh, receiveth; every one that seeketh, findeth, and so on. And again, arguing upon the Fatherhood of God, he reasons thus: "If ye, being evil, heed the prayers of your children, how much more shall God, being good, heed the cries of his elect?" This is unanswerable argument. In the matter of faith, however, there is no room for debate. In the nature of the case, faith must be the hand that grasps salvation. In the nature of the case, salvation for sinners could be secured no otherwise. And, in the nature of the case, this salvation must be eternal. Anything short of this is the drivelling of human folly. It is God's announcement, distinct, dogmatical, and final.

In some sort, faith is also the present possession of apparently future good. Paradoxical as the assertion may appear, it is still true. Nor is this possession merely the earnest of better things to come; but the believer is actual owner of substantial realities, which, for him, would have no existence, but for faith. "He that believeth hath eternal life," and the unbeliever has it not. It is true that the latter is made a partaker of an everlasting life, perhaps by the incarnation of the Second Adam, whereby immortality was *entailed* upon the race. But the life of which the saint partakes is the life of Christ, which is not only everlasting, but eternal as well. Notice that no such mode of existence was possible to the first Adam, even if he had maintained his integrity; and if he had kept his first estate, the saving faith of the gospel would never have been preached. There would have been no place for it, under a covenant of

works. He and his posterity could never have exchanged the stream of time for the ocean of eternity. But in Christ is life, eternal life; and they that are in Christ by faith, are engrafted upon the life that is not only endless, but which had never beginning. And the "life they now live in the flesh" differs from the ordinary life of the race, in that they live it "by the faith of the Son of God." This faith is not founded upon testimony, but is itself "the evidence of things unseen." It is not a belief in the existence and beneficence of God that is based upon the numberless manifestations of his power and Godhead; but by faith they "*see him who is invisible.*" So this second point is made, to wit: that faith presently places the saint in possession of his inheritance. In one aspect of it, the hope of the gospel is the vision of Christ. Abraham was as really a possessor of this vision, as Paul was. Howbeit, there are other objects of faith promised to both Abraham and Paul, which neither of them have yet attained. But this one thing they had, and all possessors of like precious faith have it, namely, the vision of Him who cannot be seen.

It is worthy of notice that in the famous enumeration in the 11th chapter of Hebrews, there are several distinct references to this power of faith to project itself, or rather its possessor, upon the limitless future, and to take into actual ownership substantial realities, by the "power of an endless life." Albeit separated by weary centuries of time from the grand culmination, although dying "not having received the promises," yet these heroes of the olden time were able to overleap the vast interval and embrace the accurate fulfilment, which is still future to us, upon whom the ends of the dispensation have come. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, dwelling in unstable tabernacles, could yet see the city which hath foundations; and we, who are heirs with them of the same promise, *by faith*, see the same city descending out of heaven from God! It is clearly, by the power of an eternal vitality, that past and future are thus made present to him who is in union with Christ by faith. It is clearly the same life-principle wrought in Abraham, and to be wrought in the latest subject of the new birth, by the one Begin-

ner and Finisher. And the comprehensive statement of the Lord himself, referring to the faith of his disciples, exhausts the subject. God in Christ, Christ in us, and we in Christ, are made possessors of eternal life; which life is "to know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent!" No less glorious grace could thus exalt the royal God-man Mediator.

As the safety of the believer is secured by his union with Christ, and as faith is the bond of union, it precisely corresponds with that other link, the sovereign election of God. And here the difficulty presented by the Arminian expounder is met and dissipated. God does not deal with us as with machines, or with inert matter. He requires of us the exercise of high faculties. We must believe. So this heavenly link of divine election stretches down from the eternal ages and encloses the lost sinner. The found saint stretches out the other link, the faith, born in time, and encloses therein the divine Saviour, and these two are welded into one. Piercing through the mists of an eternity past, the hand of divine electing love takes hold of the perishing son of the first Adam; and groping amidst the darkness of human blindness and sin, the feeble hand of the new-born faith reaches to the summit of Calvary and grasps the wounded hand of the Second Adam who suffers there. No force in heaven, earth, or hell, can sever that bond. Nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor life, nor death, nor any other creature, can overcome the election of God, and the consequent "faith of God" wrought in the soul of the believer.

As a matter of mere human logic, one must be struck with the fitness of this divine arrangement. The first covenant collapsed, and the race was involved in remediless ruin. It was obviously remediless, because the *fact* of sin could not be annihilated, and the connexion betwixt sin and the penalty was as unalterable as the nature of God. The shallow sinner cannot see how God can be just, and yet *fail* to justify. But the angels and the saints know better, and adore the matchless wisdom of the just God, who is yet a Saviour. In the second covenant, the Second Adam, by specific agreement, undertook

the redemption of a chosen people, peculiar, purchased, accurately numbered, and their ultimate security *must* be the sovereign election of God. It is not possible for God to deny himself, and it was not possible for God to utilize the fragments of the broken compact, therefore no place could be found for meritorious *doing* on the part of the ransomed race. And so the condition, including all other conditions, such as repentance, love, obedience and the like, is faith—the hand that receives and appropriates the inexhaustible merit of Christ the substitute and surety. No lapse could occur in this second covenant. It was ordered and sure. Divine sovereignty made the plan and the conditions, and the uniform attitude of faith is an attitude of recumbency. It is marvellous that even the devil could invent the delusion which affixes human merit to human faith.

II. It will already have occurred to the Christian reader, that faith is also the act of appropriation. Not only the hand stretched out, but the stretching out of the hand as well. The man with his hand hopelessly withered, “stretched it forth, whole as the other,” at the command of Christ. The impotent man by the margin of the pool became potent on the instant, and put forth the energies of perfect manhood. And these two cases perfectly illustrate the doctrine that God works in the believer both to will and to do. The simple narrative of the Gospels cannot be tortured out of the obvious meaning. If the man had innate power to put forth his hand, there was no miracle in the cure. If the other was really able to plunge into the troubled waters, and had been the victim of a mere delusion for thirty-eight years, the story has no possible application. And as the only other hypothesis refers the acts of both to divine power, all the conditions before stated are met. As the electing love of God produces the corresponding faith in its object; so the mighty purpose of God produces the corresponding *act* of faith. The magnet infuses life into the dead metal. No greater mystery invests the relation between the “determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God” and the free choice of the sinner, than the inscrutable mystery of magnetic attraction. And no more accurate illustration of the power and influence of God’s pur-

pose and compassion could be found in the material universe. Ten thousand articles may be severally applied to the steel needle without producing motion. No life-principle is communicated, no life phenomena manifested, under ten thousand manipulations. But at the approach of the magnet, the needle, suddenly vitalized, leaps to the resistless attraction, as the soul of the new-born saint leaps to the bosom of its God. This is the *act* of faith; and the word probably has this signification throughout the 11th chapter of Hebrews, which begins with the description of the objective thing, and then describes its *acts* or manifestations.

III. As this grace is uniform in its origin and uniform in its acts, that is, in the law of its manifestation, so is it invariable in its object. It terminates no where short of God. The sum of scripture teaching is, "what man is to believe concerning God," because the "duties which God requires of man" can only be performed by the believer. He who apprehends this momentous truth has taken a long stride from darkness towards light. "All things are possible to him that believeth," and nothing is possible to him that doubts or denies. Thus does the inspired word blankly exclude from its treasure-house all men who are devoid of faith. It does not condescend to argue as to the fitness or equity of this arrangement, but states the bald fact without comment. If the objector should say, "I cannot accept salvation upon terms that are repulsive to all my native instincts," the inflexible answer is, "No other name under heaven is given among men;" that is, no other method than that provided by God will ever be tried. No salvation is possible without a Saviour. No Saviour is possible but Jehovah Jesus. Yet it is a grand mistake to suppose that the Christian system is illogical. On the contrary, the stern requirements of the believer's logic accepts nothing without rigid scrutiny. Inferences, which would be forcible and admissible in any other field of human investigation, are met with the inevitable question: "What hath God spoken?" whenever they are employed to establish or assault a doctrine of Christian faith. And no answer save the quotation of God's own words will meet the case. Underlying this logic, is

the *knowledge* of God's truth, which is an attribute of that new life belonging to the inheritance of faith.

Adopting the simplest method of analysis, look at the objects of faith in detail. It may appear that the doctrine of the Bible will sometimes run upon the same plane with human reason ; but it will also appear that the want of coincidence, or rather, the apparent want of coincidence, at other times, is caused only by the inability of finite reason to measure the infinite truths of God.

1. He that cometh to God, must believe that He is. It is assumed that man must needs come to God, and that this is true the whole experience of the whole race testifies. The apprehension of existent divinity is as inevitable a part of human experience, as any known attribute of mind. In the absence of revelation, man, of necessity, groped in the dark, but he always has groped after a God of some sort—always a divinity to be dreaded, sometimes and generally a divinity to be propitiated, but never a divinity to be loved, except as revealed in Christ. It is not in the power of the highest intelligence to contradict a patent fact, and this fact is established by the totality of human history. Wise sceptics have borrowed a part of divine truth and argued that God's power and beneficence were revealed in nature, if God existed at all—and therefore no other revelation was needed. It is true that divine power and Godhead are made known by God's orderly creation, and the child of faith can find abundant tokens of divine goodness on the same fair pages; but the first heathen has yet to be found who was *attracted* to God by these outward manifestations.

It will not be denied that the gods which the grotesque imaginations of untaught humanity have presented to the world are far inferior to civilised ideas of even human excellence. The most polished of the ancient heathen peopled the heavens with deified lusts; and not one of the numberless gods of the world's worship has ever been invested with attributes that appealed to human love or reverence. In all the mythology of the world nothing can be found that embodies the solitary idea contained in the first two words of the Lord's prayer. The grand concep-

tion of the universal fatherhood of God, involving the care, love, beneficence, longsuffering, and forbearance of "Our Father," was never mortal conception. Yet, when this effulgent truth is brought down to the level, and subjected to the tests, of mortal logic, it is not possible to detect a flaw in the system or to conceive of an improvement upon it. Even in the idolatrous dreams of the sages who recognised the essential unity of the Godhead, and which terminated upon a solitary divinity, no trace is discovered of the glorious God of revelation.

Here, then, is the starting point of human faith—God is. And in his being he is infinite, eternal, and unchangeable. He who apprehends this tremendous reality has passed the wicket gate and entered upon the road that leads to the inheritance of the saints in light. So irresistibly does this majestic announcement appeal to human souls that the inventor of such a superstition, if it *were* a superstition, would challenge the homage due from creature to Creator! God is, and is a rewarder of them that seek him! He who believes so much, believes it with undying tenacity, because it is the exercise of that faith which is the attribute of *eternal* life.

2. The recognition of the true God infallibly leads to the recognition of the true sinner. All that the word denounces against the transgressor finds an infallible echo in the soul thus far enlightened. Says one: "I have heard of thee by the hearing of the ear: but now mine eye seeth thee; wherefore, I abhor myself and repent in dust and ashes." And this self-aborrence is as true an act of faith as any other. Only the man who sees the holiness of God can see the hideous deformity of sin. So the future steps of faith, in accurate sequence, starting from this "pit of noises," at length reach the climax when the self-aborrence can say, "It is no longer I, but sin that dwelleth in me." Human wisdom would doubtless extricate the ransomed victim at once from the clog and hindrance, and cleanse his person from the stain of the miry clay of that pit whence he was digged. But God is wiser.

As the burden of sin grows more and more intolerable, in proportion as the sinner sees more and more of God, the method of

deliverance comes next under the scrutiny of the troubled soul. Here again, human wisdom is prolific of expedients to "break off sin by righteousness" and win the favor of God by a life of morality. But this will not erase those clay-stains. Well, to go a little further, and in addition to full obedience, work some works of supererogation—large alms-giving; tithings of mint, anise, and cummin. But these big alms and these little seeds are alike inefficient. The stains abide. Now, say the philosophers, humanity makes the supreme effort, and the universal expedient is substitution in some form—gifts, sacrifices, offerings, the fruit of the body for the sin of the soul, it may be—but always substitution. It is therefore not of faith, but of nature. Wherever you go, amid the darkness of heathendom, if you find this conscience of sin, of ill-desert, you also find the inevitable last refuge—substitution. So the gospel-makers have engrafted this principle upon their system of recovery in order to meet the irrepressible demand of the conscience-stricken offender. But the thinker cannot be caught in the meshes of logic of this sort.

Notice the order herein suggested. Faith apprehends the being of God, his goodness, his holiness, and consequently his hatred of sin. Then the believer apprehends the necessity of extrication for himself and also the woful insufficiency of tithes and offerings. From the old tradition of the man who offered up his son upon Mount Moriah, down to the latest propitiatory effort of the frantic Hindu mother, who cast her infant beneath the car of the idol-god, the believer's soul can gather no grains of comfort. "By faith Abraham, when he was tried, offered up Isaac." And he finds the essence of the patriarch's faith in his sublime declaration, "My son, God will provide himself a lamb." All the substitutes that nature found were of human provision. But the substitute upon which faith relies and reposes is the one Substitute provided by God.

3. Now, what is man to believe concerning this Substitute? The mightiest powers of human reason are needed to investigate this inscrutable mystery of godliness. Enveloped in the dense mists of human ignorance—prostrate under the curse of a broken law—the sinner hears the astounding announcement, "God



manifested in the flesh!" It is a grand advance beyond all former propositions. The power of faith is here challenged and exhausted. To this focus all prophecies converge. From it streams forth in brilliant radiance the true light that enlighteneth all the race. The whole of human history, nay, the whole history of this planet upon whose surface His feet have trod, mainly revolves around this central truth. And when the day arrives for him to scrutinise the earth's completed records, the purpose of its creation will have been accomplished, and the earth and the heavens shall flee away, and no place be found for them. In the meantime, each one of the myriad children of time is confronted with this inexplicable problem, and the life of each human soul hangs upon its solution: "If ye believe not that I AM, ye shall die in your sins!" Look a little more closely at some of the things which faith must apprehend, in connexion with this doctrine. It is still "concerning God"—God the Law-maker; God the Law-fulfiller; God the Substitute and Saviour. Because the supreme divinity of the Lord Christ is just as essential a condition of salvation as the existence of God.

The Unitarian philosophers, who in common with the devils "believe there is one God," have abundant testimony in support of their creed. The unity of the Godhead is a cardinal doctrine. There is one only, the living and the true. So different is this self-evident proposition from the propositions addressed to faith that the apostle expressly classes the apprehension of this necessary truth with all the facts that devils know. Therefore the belief in the unity of the Godhead cannot be the saving faith of the gospel, which cannot be predicated of devils. And if you investigate the Unitarian creed to the bottom you will find nothing beyond a system of morality which would inevitably follow, if there had been no Christ. Consequently, the natural drift of this theology is towards Universalism, and thence into all the forms of heresy possible to deniers of God's revelation. Look at the latitude where Unitarianism is indigenious, and you will find more shades and varieties of infidelity than could be collected from all the rest of the civilised

world. Yet the foundation doctrine is true: "Hear, O Israel, Jehovah thy God is one Jehovah!" And the believer, cleaving to this glorious truth, recognises in Jesus this one God manifested in the flesh, and finds him the satisfying portion of his soul. Any other than a Divine Saviour would perish under the load of a solitary sinner's guilt. In Unitarian theology, there is no place for substitution; and he who dies in this belief—or rather, this unbelief—had better have been born a dog than meet the dread retributions of eternity. Better the atrocious lies of the Man of Sin, better the idolatrous worship of Baal, better blank atheism, yea, better the remediless ruin of the devils who cried out, "We know thee who thou art!" than the condition of the man who denies the supreme divinity of Christ!

This sounds harsh and sweeping; yet what less can be said? If less than this is true, surely God's method of salvation was an awful waste of agonies and blood. If the Son of God died not in the stead of the sinner, this terrible catastrophe teaches no lesson that humanity can learn. If the angels who kept not their first estate were cast out, and are now reserved under chains of darkness unto the judgment of the great day; if the entire race of Adam were made inheritors of death for one offence of their progenitor—of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who deliberately denies and rejects the only Lord God who bought him, by the most offensive possible form of denial and rejection?

All the historical facts relating to the life and death of Jesus of Nazareth, are as well authenticated as any other historical facts of the same epoch. Even those miraculous manifestations of divine power recorded in the Gospels, are supported by far stronger testimony than many universally accepted facts of contemporaneous history. It is far more incredible, humanly speaking, that such events should have been mere inventions, than that the events were true as recorded. So the acceptance of these facts, and even the admission of the logical sequence from them, that Jesus is divine, is not the saving faith of the gospel. It is not the faith in the divinity of the Substitute which is set over against the Unitarian denial of it. The denial

of Jesus' supreme Godhead ensures damnation; but the opposite belief alone does not ensure salvation. Because this God cannot be a true substitute for the sinner, unless he is something more than God.

Here, then, is the second subject of saving faith—the Man Christ Jesus. Of course, the “needs must be” of this proposition is familiar to all hearers of the gospel. As the divinity of the Substitute was essential, because the “offering cannot sanctify the altar, but the altar sanctifieth the offering;” so the true humanity of the Substitute was offered upon that altar. Except as he became incarnate, it is not possible to conceive of a suffering, dying God. In the nature of the case, divine life is indestructible; yet the Son of God, who is now the centre and source of radiant glory, on the topmost throne in heaven, was laid in the tomb of Joseph of Arimathea. The God-man died, or the death was unreal and nugatory. The substitution of the spotless man could alone accomplish nothing for human redemption. The fire of God's wrath against sin was like the fire in Elijah's sacrifice, and consumed both altar and offering, and the God-man passed through that devouring flame and

“perished—but for Godhead!”

In faith's apprehension of that vicarious death, therefore, there is no oblivion of either one of the two natures. The paradox is an everlasting one that the Source of Life himself was made subject unto death. But faith is not staggered by the astounding proposition. While every native faculty of the mind is baffled, and human reason shrinks back appalled from the dread survey, this new life-principle enables the believer to learn the lessons of Calvary; and this is the sum of them—if the divine Christ died there for him, then *he* died. His present life is hidden with Christ in God, and all its native manifestations must needs be for the glory of Christ, who died *in his stead*, and rose again. Among the thinkers of this world, many of those who have ranked with the Titans have most earnestly contended for these astounding doctrines, and have most cordially followed the drift of this sublime logic. Nothing like it has ever been found

in terrestrial schools of philosophy. Nothing beyond it has ever been suggested in all the revelation of God!

All Christians are more or less familiar with those patent arguments touching the importance of the Lord's veritable humanity: the sympathy of the brother, man, who is also invested with divine power and authority to apply the benefits of this sympathy to its objects; the ability to suffer and die, which could not be predicated of pure Godhead; the human obedience to the letter and spirit of the law in its precept, for the provision of a righteousness that would avail the sinner. "If any man sin, he hath an Advocate, Jesus Christ, who hath not sinned,"—all of these, and kindred doctrines, are common in evangelical pulpits. But there are other reasons not so universally proclaimed, though indicated plainly enough in Holy Writ. Indeed, the initial sentence of the New Testament brings prominently into view one of these considerations. The first words of Matthew's Gospel assert that the book treats of the history of a man who was "the son of David, the son of Abraham." It was not by accident that these two worthy names are here presented together, passing over fourteen generations which are afterwards enumerated. And as the God-man-Mediator was the seed promised to the Patriarch, "in whom all the nations of the earth should be blessed," as expounded in the third chapter of Galatians; so is this same God-man the inheritor of special promises and prerogatives, through his royal progenitor David. Christ the Prophet, Christ the Priest, the Teacher, the Atoner, is duly preached all over Christendom. But Christ the King is not so prominently presented, and it only remains for us to invite the believer to look a little at the highest attainment of faith: the full recognition of the royal Son of David.

4. The regal authority of the absolute God is not necessarily recognised by faith alone. It is not possible for man to conceive of the divine existence, separately from the divine kingship. The very idea of God involves the idea of overwhelming majesty and resistless power. But the Saviour has been so industriously presented to the lost race as humiliated, stricken, smitten of God and afflicted, crushed under the load of imputed

guilt, crying out in dire agony in the very act of expiation, that the glorious side of his history has been much neglected. The object of appeals drawn from the sufferings of Christ, is to awaken or beget faith in the sinner. Now let the sinner, transformed into the saint by the contemplation of these sufferings, turn the eyes of his faith upon "the glory that shall follow." The picture is not left to be sketched by human fancy. "I saw one like unto the Son of man, clothed with a garment down to the foot, and girt about the paps with a golden girdle. His head and hairs white like wool, as white as snow, and his eyes as a flame of fire, and his feet like unto fine brass, as if they burned in a furnace; and his voice as the sound of many waters. And he had in his right hand seven stars; and out of his mouth went a sharp two-edged sword; and his countenance as the sun shineth in his strength." The glorious personage thus described announces himself: "I am the first and the last: he that liveth, and was dead; and, behold, I am alive for evermore, Amen, and have the keys of hell and of death." The object of faith here presented, is not a suffering, but a reigning Saviour.

There is nothing beyond this revelation for faith to fasten upon. Because the actual vision of these tremendous realities will be the destruction of faith. What a man seeth, he can no longer hope for. The expectation perishes in the possession. At the opening of the first seal, at the very beginning of the world's history, doubtless, one is seen mounted upon a white horse, armed with a bow, crowned with a single diadem, and going forth conquering and to conquer. Through long ages his chosen ones have longed and looked for him; sometimes peering through the darkness of forty future centuries, but always claiming him for their only Lord, and ever and anon hearing the voice, inaudible to all the world besides, but to them as the sound of many waters. Once, in his victorious career, this royal personage dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth. And when he departed, he left the promise—"This same Jesus shall so come again like manner." And so at the end of the

Revelation we find this same rider upon the white horse—now, with blood-stained vesture, but with regal titles. He is called “Faithful and True,” “the Word of God.” His head is adorned with *many* crowns, and he hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, KING OF KINGS AND LORD OF LORDS!

Amen! Even so, come, Lord Jesus!

---

ARTICLE II.

PASTORS AND EVANGELISTS VERSUS STATED  
SUPPLIES.

We rejoice that the employment of evangelists on the part of our presbyteries is becoming the rule; and the omission, the exception. We are fully persuaded this is as it should be. But we are likewise fully persuaded that the views of the majority of our people, and of elders and ministers as well, are yet very crude upon this whole subject. An earnest discussion of a matter of so much importance is greatly needed. Great good must follow the adoption of clear and definite views. The views presented on this subject several years since by that beloved and venerated man of God, James H. Thornwell, did much to awaken attention. The writer of these lines must at all events testify that the first ideas, having any definiteness in them as to the true position and work of the evangelist in the Church at the present day, were obtained from him. But these views have been of slow growth in the Church. The idea in its scriptural simplicity and force has taken root, however; and is now, year by year, growing with more and more rapidity. Our prayer is, that it may continue to grow until the evangelist occupies a clear, distinct, and well defined place in our ecclesiastical system.

It has been obvious for many years that something was wanting to give proper efficiency to our presbyterial system. It has been plain that there was a screw loose some where—not of course in the system, but in our notion and application of it. There is plainly a failure in nurturing feeble churches and carrying

the gospel to destitute neighborhoods within the limits of organised presbyteries. In foreign countries, amongst the heathen, and in regions in this country beyond organised churches, missionaries have been sent who are true evangelists. But, within the territorial limits of a regularly organised Church, with its presbyteries, synods, etc., an anomalous system has grown up—a sort of hybrid—neither fish, flesh, nor fowl—we might almost say a “*monstrum horrendum.*” What it is, no one seems able to tell; and what it is not, seems equally difficult to tell. It is however *a something*, and as such it must have a designation; and by a sort of tacit consent, it has come to be known as “*stated supply.*” By some, war has been declared upon it. They have determined to kill it, if possible. If they could have their way, it would at once be hanged up by the neck until it was dead. On the other hand, some have regarded it as greatly persecuted, and hence have rallied to its defence. This is in accordance with one of the amiable and redeeming qualities of human nature, which always has its sympathies awakened for the persecuted, if not belonging to the number of the persecutors.

In truth, much can be said in defence of “*stated supply.*” It has not been an unmitigated evil. It has not been ONLY evil, and that continually. But yet, with whatever of good, it has been a continued evil, and is rapidly becoming a greater one, inasmuch as it is rapidly superseding the pastoral relation on the one hand, and the true evangelist on the other. It is neither one nor the other of these, and hence has no place in our system, or in the divine plan. The attempt has been made to defend the “*stated supply*” as virtually the evangelist. But is this notion correct? We shall inquire as to this presently.

Our system gives great prominence to the pastoral relation, and it does so wisely. It contemplates the settlement of a minister over a particular congregation to continue for life, or at least for a long period of time. This is certainly contemplated in all the forms that are required before the relation is consummated. Time is required, so that deliberation may be had. Opportunity is given for a most deliberate selection of a suitable

minister for the particular field. Not only the congregation and minister must agree, but the presbytery must agree likewise, that the proposed connection is wise and likely to be for the good of the Church and the promotion of God's glory.

The Presbyterian system evidently presupposes that every organised congregation should have its own pastor to devote himself exclusively to its spiritual interests. This is not only desirable, but necessary to proper Christian growth. Almost invariably as soon as a congregation loses its undershepherd, the flock begins to wander. Those congregations which have never enjoyed the labors of a faithful pastor, *as a pastor*, are generally marked with great inefficiency in some directions, if not in every direction. Then, without going more into detail, we say emphatically, that our system gives, and rightly gives, the first place to the pastoral relation.

But, while the obvious and right theory of our system is for every congregation to have its own pastor, this has been found in practical working to be an impossibility. Some may be disposed to question this admission; for we have heard it contended, that if each congregation *ought* to have a pastor, then this *ought* could surely be carried out. If there is only a will, there will be a way. But we shall not pause to discuss this further, except to remark, that with a great many congregations the excuse "*can not*" is not true. The real difficulty is "*will not.*" But candor must admit, that not a few of our congregations are so weak in numbers, and so limited in means, that we cannot but excuse them for not attempting to support a pastor. In such cases, two or more congregations should unite in a joint pastorate. This is plainly recognised and contemplated in our system in the case of very small congregations. If so small, one pastor might attend to two or more by diligence.

It was just here that the seed of "stated supply" was deposited; and, verily, it has taken root and grown and become a great tree, and the branches thereof well nigh overshadow our beloved Zion. Here began the anomaly of a class of ministers, *neither pastors nor evangelists*, but nondescripts. These "*stated supplies*" are now perhaps the majority of our ministers, out-



numbering pastors, evangelists proper, foreign missionaries, and those in institutions of learning, placed there by the Church itself to train our youth.

Here, then, are a majority of our ministers occupying a position unknown to our standards. Is it not time, then, for us to pause and consider? And the evil we fear is still on the increase. At all events, the causes out of which this anomalous state of things arose are still in full force. It is easy to see what they were and are. The fault is partly with the ministers, and partly with the churches. As to the minister, he finds himself in a field of labor too extensive to permit of the proper discharge of pastoral duties, and hence he feels a natural and perhaps proper unwillingness to engage to perform them; and also his salary is inadequate, and he cannot give all his time to the work. In such a state of things he naturally wishes to be as free as possible to take another field if offered, or to engage in such other employment as his necessities may require. Hence it is no wonder that he prefers to remain a stated supply. And then as to the churches, the fault is, they find by experience that a stated supply can be obtained at less cost than a pastor, and also that it is so much easier to make a change whenever desired. Our system contemplates permanency between minister and people, and wisely endeavors to restrain "*itching ears*" or the love of change. The stated supply system *encourages* this.

We have said that one ground of defence of the stated supply is, that he is virtually an evangelist; and if so, what is the use of stickling about a name? But is it true? It might with equal truth be said, the stated supply is virtually a pastor, and if so, what is the use of contending for a name and a form? The truth is obvious. They are neither pastors nor evangelists. Here and there one may be found who approaches very near to the one or the other. But yet they are neither. We submit that a large number of stated supplies are nearer being pastors than evangelists. They labor for years in the same prescribed field, and perform the identical work they would do if pastors, and yet they are not pastors in fact. If "*virtually*" is just as good, and the very same as "*in fact*," then let us at once amend our

Book and our ways, and dispense with all the forms of a *call*, installation, etc. Let us at once proclaim the broadest independency, and tell our ministers one and all, Go where you please, and when you please; and to the congregations, Get any one you can, and do with him as seems good in your own eyes, and ask no odds of Presbytery or any one else.

The stated supply system is taking the whole control of the connections and relations of ministers and congregations out of the hands of the Presbytery. It is true, that sometimes a congregation asks permission of Presbytery to employ a certain minister or some one else; and a minister asks to be permitted to supply a certain field or any place he may find. But even these forms are frequently omitted, and sometimes declared to be meaningless and useless. If Presbytery rightly and wisely should have control in these matters, let it be maintained. If not, let it be abandoned. We do not like *shams*, about such things at least. We do not like “*virtually*” any more than we like “*ipso facto*.”

Let us then dispense with stated supplies; and let us, in accordance with our system, which is, as we hold, by divine right, require of every one of our ministers who is able to work, that he work under the immediate direction and control of the Church. Let such as are necessary to instruct in theology, and to conduct the great schemes of the Church, be appointed to their positions, and then controlled by the Church; and let us require all others to be either pastors or evangelists; not neither one nor the other, but *one* or the *other*. When the pastoral relation is practicable, let it be required; when it is not, let the *Presbytery* appoint evangelists and control them as such.

Here let us notice one of the common errors associated with the term *evangelist*. The common notion has been that an evangelist is a minister who wanders about hither and thither, yonder and every where, preaching the gospel, and whose sole object and business is to wake up sleepy Christians and convert sinners. A glorious work, you will say; and so it is—a most glorious work. We make no objection to this work, but we do object to limiting the term *evangelist* to such only. An evangelist is one commis-

sioned and sent forth into a small or a large field to do any *ministerial* work which cannot be done by him in that field as a pastor. The work assigned him may be just that indicated above. All ministerial work has and must have those great ends in view. But the immediate work assigned him may be more limited. He may be sent forth to gather up the scattered ones and organise them into congregations, or to urge "stated supply" churches to seek the pastoral relation, or to urge them and instruct them in some great Christian duty which has fallen into neglect. Or he may be sent to a definite and limited field to perform all the duties of a pastor to certain feeble flocks. A minister sent forth by the authority of the Church to do all these, or more specifically any one of them, or perhaps other like work, is an evangelist as distinguished from the settled pastor.

Now, it has happened that some of our presbyteries have commissioned a minister and called him an *evangelist* and sent him forth to do just one or more of the things above specified. As he was called an *evangelist*, the people have expected that he would come and preach to them some great rousing sermons, and "get up a revival." They did not want to hear anything about foreign or domestic missions, or education for the ministry, or any thing else that hinted at money. An evangelist should say nothing about covetousness, drunkenness, Sabbath-breaking, and the like. A pastor might do so, but an evangelist never. If he does, they are offended and cry him down. Now all will admit that a pastor ought to preach about these things when there is good cause; and why not an evangelist? To be more specific, ought not a pastor to instruct his flock in the great Christian duty of entire personal consecration to the Lord Jesus, and this to include the unreserved consecration of their property? Surely none will object. Now it too often happens that the very reason why certain congregations have no pastor, and hence the necessity of sending them an evangelist, is the fact that they are utterly deficient in the grace of giving; and hence here is the strongest of reasons for pressing this very duty upon them. But these very people will cry out, An evangelist should not handle

such subjects. Our position, then, is this: that the whole work of gathering into and building up the kingdom of Christ here on earth, so far as preaching is concerned, (and this is the chief instrumentality,) falls under the duties of a pastor or an evangelist, and hence there is no place for stated supplies, either in our received system, or the word of God on which we found it. Stated supply can be (may we not say *is*, at least sometimes?) made a cloak by both ministers and congregations to try to get rid of responsibility and shirk duty.

In view, then, of these things, it would seem that every Presbytery ought to lay hold of and set to work every one of its ministers able to work, who is not already in a field assigned him by the Church; and also lay hold of every congregation under its care and require such as can to seek for a pastor, and not permit them to have stated supplies. Such churches as cannot, it should group in proper fields and send them an evangelist. If so sent to do the work of a minister, he will be an evangelist, whether his field is large or small.

The question will at once be asked, How are these evangelists to be supported? We answer: If presbyteries will be in earnest, most of the support can be obtained from the fields occupied; as to the remainder, we refer to the able articles of J. O. L., in the *Southern Presbyterian and Index*, entitled "Preaching the Gospel to the Poor," in which is set forth the duty of the stronger to help the weaker. Let the true idea of the evangelist be received, and let the presbyteries not only appoint them, but see by a strict oversight that they do the work assigned them, and one great difficulty in the way of inducing the larger congregations to help will be removed. Let it be seen that presbyteries are determined to require full work of their ministers, or call them to account, and let it also be seen that the fields into which they are sent are not able to afford a support, and we believe help will be given.

The writer has had some little experience in the Domestic Missionary cause, and he has found one of the great difficulties in getting hold of the hearts and reaching down into the pockets of Christian people, to be this: That some of those who are Do-

mestic Missionaries are not fit for the work. They lack zeal, or energy, or something, and, in one word, are *inefficient*. No wonder objection is made to contributing for the support of such. We have known of cases just like this: a minister has tried several fields and failed in every one—failed, too, just where efficiency on his part would have secured a support. But he has failed in his work, and hence the people have failed to sustain him. By-and-by, out of employment, he makes application to some missionary committee for employment. They need men to do the work which they have been appointed to supervise. The right sort of men are hard to be found, yet they hesitate. They fear the appointment will not be for good, but they deeply sympathise with the brother in his need. There is also outside pressure brought to bear upon them thus: Do give him a place if you can. The appointment is reluctantly made, and proves a failure; and much injury to the cause in several ways is the inevitable result. Hence we say again, that every Presbytery should take a firm stand and *require* of each of its ministers faithful work—should make it its business to see that every minister has a fair field and a fair support, and is earnestly doing the work assigned him. If presbyteries will take control and see to the work, as to both quantity and quality, we do not think they will find the item of support so very difficult. It will need careful and earnest attention, but will not be found so utterly unmanageable as now.

In our judgment the most pressing necessity in many of our presbyteries, is to select one of their very best men and send him throughout their bounds for the specific purpose of stirring up the weaker churches, and especially the *stated supply* ones, to a much more earnest effort to help themselves, and also the stronger ones to aid the weaker in cases of plain need. This one thing wisely and efficiently done would add much to immediate prosperity, and in the future its results would be incalculable. We would commend to the reader the views and facts presented in the pages of this REVIEW on the conduct of Domestic Missions in the number for January, 1870.

## ARTICLE III.

## THE RELIGIOUS PRINCIPLE THE LIFE OF THE NATION.

This subject, embracing principles of great and practical utility, addresses itself more urgently every day to the attention of the wise-hearted of the land.

That we may escape the common vagaries which so often, and with so much danger to the moral and political welfare of the nation, accompany the excited passions engendered by the discussion of politico-religious principles, it is proper that we define the sense in which the word religion is used in this paper.

We do not confine ourselves to the philological meaning given by Cicero, from *relego*, to read again; nor of Lactantius, from *religo*, to bind back; but we take the lexicographical, and the clearly defined ecclesiastical meaning, which is: "An acknowledgment of our obligation to God as our Creator, with a feeling of reverence and love, and consequent obedience to him." Such religion will engender piety, and embrace a faith, which, like a thread of gold, will be worked into the web of life, and bind together the entire moral, social, and civil fabric. "The most profound political speculations, however, the most refined theories of government, though they establish the fame of their authors, will be found perhaps to have had very little influence on the happiness of nations. As the art of criticism never made an orator or a poet—though it enables us to judge of their merits—so the comprehensive speculation of modern times, which has reviewed and compared the manners and institutions of every age and country, has never formed a wise government or a happy people. It arrives too late for that purpose, since it owes its existence to an extensive survey of mankind, under a vast variety of forms, though all those periods of national improvement and decay in which the happiest efforts of wisdom and policy have been already made. The welfare of a nation depends much less on the refined wisdom of the few, than on the manners and character of the many; and as moral and religious-

principles have the chief influence in forming that character, so an acknowledgment of the hand of God, a deep sense of his dominion, is among the first of those principles. While we attend to the operation of second causes, let us never forget that there is a Being placed above them who can move and arrange them at pleasure, and in whose hands they never fail to accomplish the purposes of his unerring counsel."\*

The spirit of the law is all equity and justice; it is the sovereign of the nation; its eye is always on every subject and every interest; but in its entire scope—in its legislative, executive, and judicial functions—it owes its every excellence to the principles of the Christian religion; and government can effect but little good unless administered by those with pure hearts and cultivated minds.

In the material world there is a harmony amidst all its antagonisms which prevents any conflict of laws. In the moral world, amidst all apparent antagonisms, there is no conflict of duty. Religion should permeate the social organisation; and as we sustain civil and political relations which are unavoidable in the affairs of the world, such religion as ought to exist in the citizen, should also appear in the political and civil affairs of the country.

We repudiate all alliance between Church and State; yet the virtue which should govern the State, ought to be reflected from the religion of the citizen. In the language of the eloquent Irish barrister Philips, "I would have her pure, unpensioned, unstipendiary; I would have her, in a word, like the bow of the firmament: her summit should be the sky; her boundaries the horizon; but the only color that adorned her should be caught from the tear of earth, as it exhaled, and glowed, and glittered in the sunbeams of the heavens."

Pure religion never sighed for a union of Church and State, nor sanctioned the murdering of the martyrs, nor introduced the fagot and the fire. And were these principles understood

---

\*Robert Hall's Sermon "On the Present Crisis;" delivered in England in 1803.

by the nominal Christians of Europe, it would sweep away their ecclesiastical establishments, and give many of the churches there a power and a spirituality they have never known.

In discussing the great principle, that religion is the life of a nation, we would most unequivocally say, the politician should be merged, and forever lost, in the Christian statesman, and not the Christian in the politician. Love of country is a sacrifice, not always an enjoyment. Patriotism is a Christian virtue, often sustained by the severest self-denial. Our own once model government, as it was generally esteemed, has fully confirmed the history of the world, that the very best forms of government are vain without public virtue. Let us inquire what is public virtue. Is it not the sum of private virtue? And what is private virtue, but the golden fruit of true and efficient religion? Then, can any one doubt, that just in proportion to the religion and virtue of the people, will be that vital national principle which will sustain them in every public trial; be their handmaid in every vicissitude of fortune; strengthen every department of State, and stand amidst the severest storms, the immovable bulwark of liberty? Virtue is the strength of a nation. The moral excellence of all nations should, and does, constitute their power. This is evident from the fact, that the boundaries of Christianity are not only the landmarks of civilisation, but beyond them dwell, without exception, the ignorant and vicious.

Mankind, if properly instructed, instead of being mobilised under hostile banners, and drilled for the slaughter of the battlefield, would prefer the workshop, the forum, the desk, the market, the library, the pulpit, where his moral and physical nature would develop, and his intellectual and spiritual capacity, under the genius of Christianity, would expand to the highest dignity of man.

We are taught by history, as well as common sense, that nations work out, by vice, their own destruction; and we learn from the Bible, that God designed that the religious principle, as we have defined it, should be the life of a nation.

Egypt would take no admonition from on high. And after several plagues had fallen upon this wicked people, Pharaoh's



servants, anxious that the Israelites should depart, said unto him, "Knowest thou not yet that Egypt is destroyed?" And why? On account of the sins of the nation they were subjected to a "darkness which may be felt."

To the Israelites God offered every blessing if they would keep the commandments. "And I will give peace in the land, and ye shall lie down, and none shall make you afraid." But what an awful, soul-sickening curse did God inflict upon them that despised his statutes. "And I will set my face against you, and ye shall be slain before your enemies." The face of God set against a nation! This is no sketch of the imagination; man's imagination can never realise its awfulness; only its dread reality can be felt; and we know that it is true, it is the hand of God in history.

Religion takes hold of a man morally, socially, and politically. The early constitution of society was formed before the state had any existence. To the family the state is indebted for its origin, and civil society reaches its highest end as a more extended family bound together by domestic ties. From the union of the first couple beneath the shades of Paradise, to the time of the moveable habitations of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, domestic society is every where seen; it arose to the social and civil state, and the grand old patriarchs were alike the head of the family circle, and of the social and the civil government.

An immense error has been imbibed from our early studies of Grecian and Roman philosophy, as well as from their jurisprudence, in supposing that the state or commonwealth existed before the family government; and that the state received from civil society its constitution. This vast error has corrupted the tone of modern as well as ancient political philosophy, as to the priority of the origin of the two societies, domestic and civil; for historically and logically the former is not only older, but the true source and fountain-head of the latter. We rest this statement on the authority of the Bible, which is in truth the book of humanity. Open at its beginning. We read nothing of affairs of state; of empires, or of monarchy; not a syllable is

whispered of politics; but the pure and peaceful breath of domestic society animates the family circle, and kindles into a brighter blaze the light of civil liberty, as it burns with reflected purity and lustre from its native hearthstone. Here religion was the master spirit. From the necessity of protection to the family sprang the state, and the power of civil society. This may not be the theory of the political philosophy of Europe from which much that is scholastic in America was borrowed; which maintains the doctrine of what is denominated "the social compact," and the falsity that civil society is the arbitrary work of man. From what has been already said, we hope there is but little difficulty in arriving at the conclusion that the civil power is the immediate offspring of the family power; and this is the explanation of the text, "For there is no power but of God."

This brings us to the only philosophical theory in reference to the origin of civil power, which is, that it springs from the union of families, for the mutual exercise of rights, which, if necessary, must be protected by force. That this system is unchangeable is not pretended; for, from the earliest days of history, rights have been overthrown, and sometimes irremediably prostrated by force. But recognising as we do the truth of the premises laid down, it must seem clear to the understanding of all who will reason fairly and logically upon this subject, that the religious principle implanted by Deity, and nurtured in the bosom of domestic society, should naturally expand and be conducted with a kind and genial current into the great heart of civil society, whose function it is to regulate the action of the multiplied and ever increasing domestic circles which make the nation.

This does not recognise the interference on the part of the state with the forms or creeds of religion; nor the recognition of any Church by the laws; but simply that the principle of religion, carried from the domestic circle, and intermingled with the pure and lofty ideas which give life and dignity to civil society, ought, and for the well-being of the nation, must direct and regulate the machinery of state along the paths of virtue. Then we shall see that the strength of a nation is in the recipro-

cal influence of the principle of moral excellence in the domestic circles, (the aggregate of which makes the body politic,) and in the state, which is the ruling power of the people in a different and representative form. We shall see, as history teaches—both sacred and profane—that when the fountain is corrupt, the stream will be so; and when we read of the very many instances of civil society being undermined, and proud fabrics of state being overthrown, it has always been made patent by the historic pen, that virtue had departed from its people; and the principle of religion—that “righteousness which exalteth a nation”—had ceased to be felt in the spirit of the laws, and the hearts of the law-makers. The history of civilisation has been written more in blood and crime, than in commemoration of virtue and moral and religious principle.

In contemplating the influence of this principle, as it affects the prosperity of a people, its working among the Jews is most striking as an epitome of the history of moral power, and as an element of strength in a nation.

How far their history is typical of Christianity we cannot decide; but it is evident, when they acted in obedience to the moral law, they were strong as a people and prospered as a nation. When they were right, God was with them, and they succeeded, fortune smiled, and happiness was theirs; when they were wrong, God withdrew his protection from them, and they were overwhelmed by disaster.

We present no new doctrine; for such we endeavor always to handle with careful scrutiny, if not to avoid. *Periculosum est res novas et inusitatas inducere.* But, that the religious principle should be the life of a nation, we think fully and clearly established by the words of the Jewish prophet, as he was being prepared to be laid away by angel hands “on Nebo’s lonely mountain.” The blessings of obedience, or the curses of disobedience, marked the weal or woe of this great nation. It was by the will of God that the law fell from the lips of the prophet,

And never earth’s philosopher  
Traced with his golden pen  
On the deathless page, truth half so sage,  
As he laid down for men.

It cannot be denied, that nations have acquired vast strength by the exercise of wicked means. The history of the past presents to our view the pathway of national power strewn with every species of crime; but when their giddy heights were reached, how suddenly they fell, as the sun of their glory went down in clouds of darkness!

Greece, and then Rome, followed the downward path that the Jewish nation had trod, and with more melancholy reflections; for, while Jerusalem may be rebuilt from the broken fragments of her scattered and yet ungathered nationality, there will be none to claim a parentage from the heights of Attica, nor the seven hilled city of the Cæsars; for as their glory was extinguished in a night of dark and stormy wickedness, there was no promise that the light of a bright and beauteous morn should ever dawn to them.

Many wise and good men hailed the French Revolution of 1789 as shadowing forth an event productive of extensive benefit. Who now will deny that the leaders of this revolution committed every species of crime, from the absence of something higher than political principles to control their action?

Why is this dark side of the historic page so frightfully true? Statesmen, who should be moral philosophers, with that wisdom which is graced by every Christian virtue, can well direct their investigations to the answer of this question, and can determine also what the government has to do with the destruction of a people's nationality? We know why Israel fell; why Greece, and Rome; and what induced the dark ages. Would not the proper development of the religious principle have averted these world-wide wars? Would not nations under the influence of this principle, like the sculptured marble beneath a dry and pure atmosphere, and a clear, constant sunshine, but harden and endure through countless ages?

This last question has never been answered by the history of the past; patriotism, religion would fain answer it, in the effort to prove the abiding necessity of an alliance between the religious and national sentiment, which would sustain that indissoluble tie, which would bind the two circles of society—the civil and the

domestic—in a common bond. But with all the light of sacred and profane history before us, how can it be denied that nations fall because they lack the vital force of the religious principle, and have a mere temporal existence, with their rewards and punishments? The evil passions which belong to man he mingles with the principles, and carries into the administration of government, which, unrestrained by virtue, ever destroys the entire civil fabric; this is the *Vox Dei*, else the interpretations of the dreams of Nebuchadnezzar, and the vision of the trembling Belshazzar, are alike inexplicable; and the calamities of the five cities of the Canaanites, over which for many centuries the bitter waters of the Dead Sea have rosted, while around its shores bituminous vapors are ever floating, to no purpose “are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire.”\*

Let us discuss this question a little more, and ascertain, if possible, whether the moral principle as derived from, and illustrated by, the Christian religion is not the true and only basis of civil order.

In the violation of the moral law the punishments were extended to the Jews in their national character: their sins were national, their punishments were national. To man it was given to govern the earth in equity and in righteousness. “For God has formed man in his wisdom to have dominion over the creation which he had made, and order the earth in equity and righteousness.”† This, it is true, is an apocryphal authority, and only to be treated as other human writings; yet it is replete with truth, and forms a just commentary on the subject we have under discussion. That such a point has yet been reached, none will assert; yet how beautifully does it accord with the inspired book, which says: “Behold the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and he shall be with them, and be their God.”‡ And how delight-

---

\*Jude vii.

†Wisdom ix. 2, 3.

‡Rev. xxi. 2, 3.

ful the thought—the holy city which John saw descending from heaven each day and hour the hand of man is building on earth!

This discussion, thus far presented as it has been upon suggestions derived from the Scriptures, as well as examples from profane history, leads us along those walks from which a practical philosophy should draw such lessons as will instruct men in their duty to themselves, their country, and their God.

The religious principle is to the nation, what the blood is to the human system: the one sustains the health of the body politic, as the other does the strength of the man. But the most impressive lesson taught from the trials and the experience of the world is, that religion—religion in that sense in which we have defined it, and used it in this article—is the only conservative force in human society; notwithstanding the many fearful and destructive misapplications under its name, of principles which were alone from Satan.

We are far from an attempt to degrade the religious principle by bringing it to a level with politics, but would always endeavor to elevate principles of state to the pure and sublime standard of religion; not by uniting into a common organisation the institutions of Church and State; nor by the slightest intermingling of a jurisprudence which should be separate and distinct one from the other. But, is it not the beauty and force of a practical religion that it can infuse its principles into the moral character of the state, and be the means of urging it on to purity of action without the slightest compromise of its distinctive functions and purposes?

It was not religion that forced the French towards the close of the 18th century to get drunk on blood that the nation might vomit crime. The Church was corrupt; the religious tone of the nation was vitiated; those sweet and sacred bonds which unite the civil and the domestic societies were severed; the fountain from which should have flowed streams of living water fertilizing the land had lost its power for good. "Spiritual wickedness in high places" had produced unbelief in the nation. If the Church of France ever had a perfect organisation, (which few will admit,) then might every Christian in the land dread the

realisation of the ancient maxim: *Optimi cujusque pessima corruptio*.

The history of every age assures us that nations have been drawn into the vortex of ruin whenever they have departed from the religious principle; and whenever it ceased to act as their chart and compass, the ship of state tossed and broken by angry winds has foundered and gone down as it were like the Spanish Armada, between the storms of two mighty oceans—the ocean of air above, and of the waters beneath.

The industry and the wealth of a nation constitute the great forces which impel it along the highway of civilisation; but along this pathway lies an awful gulf, into which experience teaches us, every nation that has fallen has been precipitated by the abuse of wealth, misapplied knowledge, and a disregard of the laws of God; and nothing but an energetic and sustained effort against the natural tendency of man to wickedness can restrain this proclivity of nations to ruin. And here we are tempted by the beauty of the Christian philosophy of Père Hyacinthe, to make the following quotation: “That civilisation, which is founded on self-denial and renunciation of the world, has achieved the highest success in private and public fortune. It is by seeking first the kingdom of God and his righteousness that man has been brought into the possession of the world.”

Is not God’s absolute power shown under the type of a potter? “O house of Israel, cannot I do with you as the potter? saith the Lord. Behold as the clay is in the potter’s hands, so are ye in my hands, O house of Israel.” Nor can it be said that this threatening was exclusively against Israel; the ensuing verse is full and explicit as to God’s dealing with wicked nations.

“At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation and concerning a kingdom, to pluck up, and to pull down, and to destroy it: if that nation against whom I have pronounced turn from their evil, I will repent of the evil that I thought to do unto them. And at what instant I shall speak concerning a nation and concerning a kingdom to build and to plant it.”\* In the

---

\*Jeremiah xviii. 6, 7, 8, 9.

experience of the world the desolation of the Jews is not by many instances the only evidence of God's hand being upon wicked nations; but history, strengthened by the word of God as written in the Scriptures, plainly indicates that nations are planted and destroyed according to the will of the Maker of heaven and earth.

Israel suffered a desolating plague because of the sin of David, who was the head of the body politic. Upon the same principle the posterity of Saul were executed on account of his sins towards the Gibeonites.

The sins of many generations are visited upon one when the cup of their iniquity is full; for Christ speaking to the Jews said, "That upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth; from the blood of righteous Abel, unto the blood of Zecharias, son of Barachias, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar. Verily I say unto you, all these things shall come upon this generation."\*

The deductions of philosophy ought always to be made practical, by showing an application of its principles to existing circumstances, either as they affect the social, the civil, or religious elements of society.

The religious principle has not existed in the domestic and civil orders in the United States with that purity which makes it the life of the nation. In this part of our article we are not driven to search among the records of history, nor to draw conclusions from the views of writers; but living among the people, enjoying a knowledge of their virtues, and being capable of seeing an accurate delineation of their views constantly before us, we speak with that conviction which is but the result of daily observation.

Indeed, it is not going out of the record of history to say, we doubt if the religious principle ever existed to much extent among the people of the United States as a body politic.

It was right in the States to reject the connexion between Church and State as it existed in England.

---

\*Matt. xiii. 35, 36.



It was impossible to maintain under the republican forms of government that were established in the United States any political connexion between Church and State. How, then, it will be asked, can this vital principle ever enter into the life of the nation so as to maintain civil purity—a purity which shall be reflected from every branch of the government? Our answer to this question is, it must start from the domestic circle—the very cradle of its nationality; there it must germinate, and spread from family to family until it pervades the entire community. And as we have endeavored to illustrate that from the domestic order arose the state, that is, the government or the civil order, so must its principles be derived from its original source. Was this done in the United States? A glance at its history will answer the question in the negative. There was a reason for all this, the Established Church being left without the support of the state, and having little or no piety soon began to seek strength and court popularity by seeking the favor of the rich. It was a well known fact that the cavalier who settled to so large an extent the Southern States cared but little for religion; and the Established Church relied for support upon those who cared but little for it. The other denominations, though unitedly the majority, were individually small, and their influence unfelt beyond the domestic circle. At the North the different denominations began to struggle for supremacy; and their pulpits became quite too often rostrums for political harangues. They never rightly understood the theory of our government, and the application of the religious principle to the civil order; but mixing religion and politics, instead of influencing the politics of the nation by moral and religious principles, they prostrated what should have been the principle of religion at the footstool of party, and made party questions a religious test, until the distinctive bearings of religion were merged into political questions; and what there was of religion, lost sight of in the race for office and the contest for political success. This in a great measure brought on the civil war; this led the North and West into a practical infidelity, which took pride and pleasure in denouncing, and, finally, in breaking down the Bible-

sustained institution of slavery. Infidelity in all classes leads to corruption, first in the domestic circle. That it is spreading fearfully and destructively at the North is not denied. From the domestic circle, it extends to the civil order. That it has reached this point at the North and West, we need no stronger evidence than the unblushing exhibition of the many crimes that disgrace the legislation of the nation, as well as that of the States overrun by the Federal armies. This is the result of political and social depravity, and has been produced by the corruptions alike of the Church and the State—the one adopting a time-serving policy; the other forgetting or circumventing those national covenants which secure our liberties.

The Church can ride in safety through the deluge of crime, but only in her own ark—not in the ark of the State. It is one of the fatal errors of our Northern brethren that they used the influence of the Church to overthrow the constitution of the United States and the existing order of society. This subversion was accomplished in placing in a civil capacity the ignorance and the degraded vice of the negro on a level with the intelligence and virtue of the white citizen; and we regret to say it has degraded the white man, rather than elevated the negro in any moral sense. It was a matter the Church should have had nothing to do with.

The relation of the Church to civil government is not one *de jure*, but purely and simply *de facto*.

In regard to conflicts between existing governments, or as respects movements in society to effect political changes, a sound scriptural doctrine will ever proclaim an entire absence of all control; not even the slightest desire to interfere on the part of ecclesiastical bodies. It is this unwarranted usurpation by the Churches North and West that has so impaired the dignity, and cast such indelible stains upon their piety. Not only has the Church suffered, but civil society has been disorganised by its malicious interference.

A church organisation, like the interest of the body politic, should be homogeneous; but can any one fail to observe that, by the action of the Northern and Western Churches they have not

only destroyed all homogeneity among themselves, but by carrying their vain and wicked philosophy as far as they could into the councils of the nation, they have produced an antagonism in the elements of civil society which they can never allay?

The very measure the Churches North and West forced upon the nation as a feature of religion—the abolition of slavery—has enhanced the antagonism of Northern and Southern society morally, socially, and civilly. Emancipation was a wicked and unscriptural act; made in part by the interference of the Church with civil affairs; but the crowning sin of the entire scheme was the effort to enfranchise the negro; this was against human reason, as well as human right, by forcing into a higher and purer system of civilisation the vice and ignorance of the negro, who as a class has been separated by the hand of God from the white race. Human rights are not fixed, nor can they ever be; but as God has made them variable and uncertain in all that pertains to human life, so will they remain throughout all time. The interference of the churches in civil affairs destroyed whatever there was of the religious principle that should bind a nation in concord, by inducing the government to adopt sectional legislation; oppressive to one party, and pandering to the interests as well as feeding the wicked passions of the others.

If that religious principle, which we have been endeavoring to show was the vital element of a nation had existed in the domestic circle and continued as a family link to bind society together in bonds of a true charity, until enlarging itself into every fibre of civil society—which, as we have shown, is the offspring of the domestic circle—their purity would have illustrated the jurisprudence of our national government, justice shone from every legislative hall, and this country been spared the horrors of a dreadful, devastating, and bloody civil war—the evil effects of which were increased by the increase of every wicked passion known to man, after it was supposed the banner of peace had been again unfurled over the entire land.

The power of the throne is often the reflection of the moral sentiment of the nation, which will never be restrained by justice so long as mankind are devoted to every selfish interest, and con-

tinue to repudiate the principle of religion in their civil administration.

The footprints of history since the Advent are marked with blood; and many a page is stained with crime on account of the evil principles which have worked themselves into the Church, and become prominent in the world by infusing their poison into the political elements of nations. Europe has proved the truth of this remark from one end of the continent to the other by more than a thousand battle-fields and centuries of protracted war. Alas! the lust of money entering the temples of God will ever explain the cause of so many direful calamities which have cursed the nations of the earth, and from which we fear the ecclesiastic bodies of the United States are receiving the same destructive taint, many of whose preachers, of various hues and dogmas, become politicians and seek to convert the pulpit into a rostrum; and instead of serving God at home, but illy serve their country in State Legislatures, and in the halls of Congress.

The essential nature of the Church is a sublime theme; and while the politician and the state-craftsman, with all the devices of political subtlety, may often in a public sense throw clouds over its pure purposes and prevent its mission from its true object, yet this nature is to be fully exercised and developed. God has established a Church on earth; and as the mother is older than the child, the Church is older than Christianity, if by this is meant the last form in which the true religion is set forth; but the Church of God, dating from the fall of man, is now the Church of Christ. Pious people before the Advent was actuated by the same principles as the followers of Christ now are. The old and the new dispensations must be in spirit the same. Christ came not to annul the law, but to fulfil it.

We believe Christ established his Church on earth. It has a corporate body, a corporate life, and a constantly increasing numerical existence. Its corporate body is known by its doctrines and its forms of worship; and men have given to this corporate body names by which its component parts are designated until they have become denominational; and fraught with sectarianism until they are often disturbed by unchristian bitterness.

It will ever be admitted, however, that among all these orthodox churches are many lovely and pious Christians, who have been made so by "the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God," notwithstanding differences on doctrinal points.

But it is a source of immense grief to reflect that denominations are so sectarian, so fully indicating the meaning of the word *seco* from which the term is derived, that in their unholy temper they would sever the body of Christ; showing too plainly in this country that their sentiments as well as their piety are shaped by sectional or distinct territorial lines, as well as by denominational creeds; and instead of being bound together by cords of brotherly love, they exhibit the excitement, the spleen, the passion, and often the venom of the politician and the avaricious extortioner in their reach after place or pelf, as they mingle the character of the professing Christian with the worst representatives of the publican and the sinner.

Let it be granted that in many instances tenets are dogmas which serve but to indicate the names of churches. But if we consider the nature of Christianity, we feel that it is necessarily pervaded by a spirituality which does not originate with man; nor could it have sprung from a race so benighted. Upon doctrinal points let the theologian discuss and dissent; the true Christian will ever have the consolation of the evangelist: "If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God."

The visible Church can only judge of the character of its members by their works and their conversation, and this is the test which, when it points in the right way, we all honor and appreciate.

With the mind we give our adhesion to the doctrines of the visible Church, and we are imbued with what appears to each the beautiful and scriptural theology of the respective denominations. They are each to a certain extent in a practical sense true, for the mind makes them so; but does the mind respond to those principles of which man can never judge? those principles on which the spirituality of the Church is built; principles which had a beginning before denominations were thought

of, and which will live after the pages on which creeds are printed shall be lost, and their dogmas remembered no more forever.

But let the denominations adhere to their respective creeds; let the different Christian Churches open wide their doors to the entrance of sinners—for such are the places God has appointed for them—and after having entered these Churches, let them continue to believe, and pray God to give them the faith to feel that among true Christians of all denominations there is the unification, not of sectional Churches, but of principle and of piety, which places them all in a common Church. This is the spiritual Church, and here Christians are one; here they have a common succession which makes them all heirs of Christ; here they have a common baptism which purifies them all with the same faith; here they have a common communion which illustrates the beautiful truth of free grace and the sovereignty of God, which will make sure the calling and election of every true and pious Christian.

In the numerous discussions which in every age have agitated the political and moral world, we have seen from the days of the earliest philosophers theories rise and pass away with passing generations like the tide of the ocean. And, alas! how fleeting have been the forms of government, which it seems the world has rather considered a curse than a benefit. All the skill and refinement of science, bearing the majestic impress of human intellect, have failed to stamp either immutability or purity on any thing produced by the hand or mind of man. Small communities bind themselves together, and as the circle increases they become a powerful nation. This assemblage of communities are united under the immutability of law; but the ages of the past have witnessed the death and extinction of many nations also under the immutability of law. And why? The stern language of St. Paul, "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin," extends from the individual to the community, and from the community to the nation, and answers at once the question, why so many nations apparently strong and prosperous have been swept from the face of the earth. And what is that answer? Sin. God has given us ensamples which

extend through the entire history of the Jews; and we doubt not that this is an epitome of the history of the world. As the smiles of heaven were upon this chosen nation when they obeyed the law, so was the frown of the Creator upon it when it disobeyed; and to the present day has the historic page been repeating the immutability of the law, that the religious principle is the life of the nation.

Among all nations there is, if properly understood, a community of interest. Solidarity expresses the true idea, not in the sense of the French Communists, from whom we take the word; but in a Christian sense, in which, as a people, we share what there is of honor or dishonor, what there is of sin or of righteousness. The unity of mankind, alike in the apostasy, as of the people of God in the atonement, is the great Bible doctrine that none dare dispute. On this point a distinguished modern author and eloquent divine has justly said: "There is something more than the man—there is humanity; humanity which falls as one in Adam, and in every one of the sons of Adam; humanity that is lifted up as one in Jesus Christ, and in every one of the brethren of Jesus Christ. Wheresoever falls the stroke of supreme justice, what individual, or what country soever it may smite, it punishes and redeems at once the whole race of man in each one of its victims—each a victim of wrath marked beforehand for punishment, if he be more guilty; each a victim of propitiation, offering himself for expiation, if he be more innocent, or rather, if he be less impure;"\* or as we would say, if he has laid hold by faith on the hope set before him in the gospel.

There are individual sins; and yet the word of God speaks of sin as the one sin of the world: "Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world." Is it not a fair and reasonable doctrine to construe the meaning of this sentence to be, that, in addition to our separate sins, there are great national and inseparable ones that connect us with the transgressions of the race, by which the collective weight lies not alone upon the

---

\*Discourse of Pere Hyacinthe on the South American earthquakes.

individual, but is visited indiscriminately upon entire communities, and even the most powerful nations?

If, then, there be an aggregation of sin which draws down upon nations the vengeance of the Almighty as temporal punishments—the truth of which cannot be denied by those who have traced the hand of God in sacred and profane history—then we have reason to believe that those nations which, as nations, serve God, by cultivating the religious principle, will be saved from the violent and destructive moral and political storms which have so often overtaken those whose career and ultimate death, as they have been swept down the tide of time, have tinged every current they touched with crimes of the darkest hue. How pleasant and delightful to think, while passing along this earthly pathway, as the domestic circles enlarge and expand with the growth of society, until they form what is known to civilisation as the body politic, that the same religious principle which should actuate and enliven the homestead and the social and civil circles, should also give life to the nation; and the God of the family altar be alike recognised as the presiding genius of the political and civil temple.

It cannot be denied that, by the introduction of sin, a change passed upon the entire world; and as it extended from the individual to the domestic circle, so it reached to the uttermost branches of civil society. Sin has been multiplying from the beginning of the world; and as it increases in extent, so does it in intensity.

St. Paul in the 1st chapter of Romans discusses the principle, that sin, little by little, reached its height among heathen nations, until its ravages were appalling. There is the deterioration of individual character under the influence of sin which exhibits itself to our daily observation; and wherever we look on the boundless historic field, we see that the ruin it brings to individuals is but illustrative of its greater devastation on nations. Its great volume is constantly swelling as age after age gives in its contributions, and the confluence of many streams makes the mighty current of corruption that washes away the foundations of national virtue, and sooner or later the nation itself.



Where is the remedy? Under the sovereignty of God and man's free agency, there is one. Patriotism is a great national principle and acquires strength in its exercise; and its untold sacrifices are demanded, and as freely given. When a country is invaded, how often is every thing of value thrown upon its altars, and then thereon the living body laid as a burning sacrifice.

It is this pervading love of country divested of all selfishness which urges a nation to its defence; and it is patriotism as a principle, not a passion, that saves, and protects, and preserves it.

But there is a more destructive foe to nations than foreign armies: it is the devil; and when he unfurls his blackened and pestilential banner over nations, and seeks, as he always does, conquest on an extensive scale—though he never overlooks the smallest gain—then, like patriotism when aroused against a human foe, let the religious principle extend with the same infectious sympathy from heart to heart, and the life of the nation will be preserved.

The devil, notwithstanding his sly insinuating address, his assumed boldness and braggart manner, and his frequent and alarming success, is a most arrant coward; he is afraid of one ray of moral light; of one little glittering gem of truth; of even a single pulsation of a Christian heart; and whoever has the boldness to oppose him can always force him to retreat; for we are assured by the authority of the Bible, "Resist the devil and he will flee from thee."

Life presents a constant warfare against hunger, nakedness, cold, heat, the destruction of nations, the damnation of souls; and for every ill, under the providence of God, there is a remedy; but, strange to say, the one most rejected is the one which is applicable to the preservation of the life of a nation. From weak and small origins we have read of many nations which, by toil and bloodshed, by every mental and physical exertion, have attained great power, and have presented a dazzling appearance among the governments of the world; and it is unfortunately true, as soon as the germ of nationality begins to develop, there is a constant war against self-destruction; and as it acquires

strength apparently for resistance to external as well as internal foes; it has by its very strength but developed the principles of disease which have destroyed its very vitality. No remedy has been applied; men are unappalled by the sentinels of death, which hang like skeletons from the earliest days of history to the present time. And Christians have forgotten that, to maintain a nationality for any length of time, or with any purity, the religious principle must influence every department of society, commercially, socially, civilly.

It is not denied, and therefore let it be remembered, that the broad hand of an overruling Providence has ever been, as it is now, imposing with an unerring justice the penalty of national crimes. The hope of the Christian is kindled to a perpetual blaze, by feeling that, for the failings of the individual there is mercy; but to the patriot and philanthropist it is ceaseless regret that nations have been, and are yet, bringing upon themselves the curse of the temporal punishment of decay and extermination; for, alas! there is no mediation for the crimes of society. But there is an inflexible recompense of good for good, and evil for evil.

We see no reason why the admonition of Paul to the Colossians is not as applicable in a national as in an individual sense, "Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ."\* Indeed, we think the above text full of sound political morality which cannot be rejected, nor ignored by any Christian people who would preserve their nationality upon the religious principle; for a few lines below the above quotation, the same author, confirming a principle he often refers to, in speaking of Christ, says: "And ye are complete in him, which is the head of all principality and power."†

No language could be plainer and more explicit; nor is there any work deserving such weight and authority even upon political ethics as the writings of Paul; and when in the fervor of his

---

\*Colossians ii. 8.

†Colossians ii. 10.

eloquence he advises the Corinthians, "that your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God,"\* he is still illustrating the truth so uniformly maintained by Scripture, and exhibited in all history, that by the wisdom of men nations are destroyed. And as Christ is the head of all principality, it should be indelibly stamped upon the great popular mind, and interwoven with every fibre of the heart, the universal truth, reaching from the individual to the community, and extending its mighty force to the nations of the earth: "For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ."†

European and American history but too frightfully attest the truth, that, in a national sense, religion is degraded from its true preëminence into a mere handmaid of social morality; social morality, into an instrument for advancing the material development of society. Profane history holds out to us the beacon-lights, in the form of national wrecks strewn along its pathway, to warn us from the danger; and sacred history has announced the cause—*vice*; *vice* everywhere; *vice* among high and low; *vice* in public and in private station.

In announcing that sacred history proclaimed the cause, it is yet a constant source of consolation that the word of God, as it points out the way to individual salvation, has also held up to nations a chart and compass, by the watchful observance of which they might be saved from temporal wreck and destruction. Whenever moral and political philosophy are based upon Christianity, and the religious principle derived therefrom permeates the body politic, by running from domestic circle to domestic circle, until its light shall reach the mind and heart of the great working majority of the people, then will purity and stability mark the life of the nation: and this must be the great educational mission of society in which every member should be trained to perform his duty from early childhood to old age all along every department of life.

---

\*1 Corinthians ii. 5.

†1 Corinthians iii. 11.

How true is it that "legal restraints and obligations are indeed within the reach of human governments and constitute their most important office. But these checks are only one part, and a small part of that vast and complicated system of control, which holds the malignity of human nature under a pressure strong enough to save society from utter dissolution. The external checks of law, moreover, useful as they are, not only constitute a small part of the system of coercion under which we live, but are themselves dependent for their whole effect upon the moral bonds and ligaments of which no laws take cognisance, and which are utterly beyond the reach of all municipal provision. They are in the hands of God, and he relaxes or contracts them at his pleasure."\*

After examining all systems of moral and political philosophy, there is no safe conclusion but this. It is man's relations to God in an individual as well as national sense that must adjust and determine his private as well as public duties; and when man is right with God, he will certainly be right with all men.

Can it be denied that there is a temporal perdition awaiting a nation which has to its other sins added a rejection of God? Let the Scriptures answer: "The nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish." Let the people of every land study their national character, and compare their history with nations which have gone before them and have passed away. Let America ponder well the sublime but awful truth, that God is in history.

What shall be the future of America with its busy millions? Will they continue free? All the political philosophy of the world is unable to sustain a nation, unless actuated by the religious principle. Look over this land, the appalling vice, selfishness, and the love of money, which made Judas sell his Lord and Master for less than twenty dollars, is the sin that is now undermining the virtue and the religion of this nation; for, alas! who can deny that the lust for office, and the venality of every class of officials, like malignant and epidemic fevers, are

---

\*J. A. Alexander's Sermons, Vol I., p. 77.

now raging over the length and breadth of this land? The temptations are great, and men every where are being caught by the tempter.

People of America! Look back upon the pages of history; look upon the pages of your Bible and beware how you trifle with sin; how you make light of God's authority and revel in iniquity! The vast plains of America are as prolific in lessons of fearful warning as other parts of the world. In ages long past there flourished on this continent a rich and powerful race of people, who are now remembered only by the desolating track of the hand of providence. At a later day came the Indian tribes, who less than two centuries ago were counted by millions, now dwindled to a few thousands. And unless that power which exalteth a nation is exerted over the millions that now occupy the land, they will but follow in the footsteps of these old transgressors, and fade away under the desolating power of public and private, official, and national depravity.

How is this to be prevented?

“Aggregated masses are the sum of the good or evil interwoven into the character of their component parts. The union of good men is right, and it is strength. Let every man rule his own heart. He is the best patriot who walks most according to the moral law and the example of Christ, and who most fervently implores the blessing of heaven on his people and country.”\*

“Blessed is that nation whose God is the Lord.”

We learn from the Bible more of moral as well as of political philosophy than has ever been taught or admitted by schoolmen or statesmen. The Bible is the only basis of moral philosophy, as it is of the principles of all good government.

We see in behalf of this truth many practical illustrations; and how fearfully true is it that God often places wicked rulers over nations as a just rebuke and punishment for their national sins. It can be traced in the legislation as in the administration of the laws of the country—how step by step a people in their collective character have passed from crime to crime, until all

---

\*Plumer's *Jehovah Jireh*, p. 231.

civil order has been destroyed, the government overthrown, and the liberties of the nation lost, and lost forever. Human learning and human philosophy have ever failed to appreciate the cause, and consequently will ever fail to apply the remedy.

This principle is so beautifully illustrated by Calvin, we prefer adopting his language without the slightest alteration, as the truth, theologically and politically; and if this truth had long years ago prevailed in courts and cabinets, many streams of blood would have never flowed, and virtue and true piety would have been vastly more exalted and prevalent:

“In the first place I request my readers to observe and consider with attention what is so frequently and justly mentioned in the Scriptures: the providence and peculiar dispensation of God in distributing kingdoms and appointing whom he pleases to be kings. Daniel says: ‘God changeth the times and the seasons; he removeth kings and setteth up kings.’ Again: ‘That the living may know that the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will!’ Passages of this kind abound throughout the Scriptures, but particularly in this prophecy. Now, the character of Nebuchadnezzar, who conquered Jerusalem is sufficiently known, that he was an invader and depopulator of the territories of others. Yet, by the mouth of Ezekiel, the Lord declares that he had given him the land of Egypt as a reward for the service which he had performed in devastating Tyre. And Daniel said to him: ‘Thou, O king, art a king of kings; for the God of heaven hath given thee a kingdom, power, and strength, and glory; and wheresoever the children of men dwell, the beasts of the field, and the fowls of the heaven hath he given into thine hand, and hath made thee ruler over all.’ Again: to his grandson Belshazzar, Daniel said: ‘The Most High God gave Nebuchadnezzar thy father a kingdom, and majesty, and glory, and honor; and for the majesty that he gave him, all people, nations, and languages, trembled and feared before him.’”\*

Yet what scourges were this king, and his son, and his son’s son, to the nations that served them, while the curse on those that refused was still more severe!

Again the same author, speaking of the power of God as manifested in the history of nations, says:

---

\*Institutes, B. IV., Chap. XX., §XXVI.

“And here is displayed his wonderful goodness, and power, and providence; for sometimes he raises up some of his servants as public avengers, and arms them with his commission to punish unrighteous domination, and to deliver from their distressing calamities a people who have been unjustly oppressed; sometimes he accomplishes this end by the fury of men who meditate and attempt something altogether different. Thus he liberated the people of Israel from the tyranny of Pharaoh by Moses; from oppression of Chusan by Othniel; and from other yokes by other kings and judges. Thus he subdued the pride of Tyre by the Egyptians; the insolence of the Egyptians by the Assyrians; the haughtiness of the Assyrians by the Chaldeans; the confidence of Babylon by the Medes and Persians, after Cyrus had subjugated the Medes. The ingratitude of the kings of Israel and Judah, and their impious rebellion, notwithstanding his numerous favors, he repressed and punished, sometimes by the Assyrians, sometimes by the Babylonians. These were all the executioners of his vengeance, but not all in the same manner. The former, when they were called forth to the performance of such acts by a legitimate commission from God, in taking arms against kings, were not chargeable with the least violation of that majesty with which kings are invested by the ordination of God; but, being armed with authority from heaven, they punished an inferior power by a superior one, as it is lawful for kings to punish their inferior officers. The latter, though they were guided by the hand of God in such directions as he pleased, and performed his work without being conscious of it, nevertheless contemplated in their hearts nothing but evil.”\*

With equal beauty and force does this peerless philosopher and theologian illustrate the moral government of God, in what in recognised parlance is the political philosophy of a nation:

“But whatever opinion be formed of the acts of men, yet the Lord equally executed his work by them, when he broke the sanguinary sceptres of insolent kings, and overturned tyrannical governments. Let the princes hear and fear. But in the meanwhile it behoves us to use the greatest caution, that we do not despise or violate that authority of magistrates which is

---

\*Institutes, B. IV., Chap. XX., §XXX.

entitled to the greatest veneration which God has established by the most solemn commands, even though it reside in those who are most unworthy of it, and who as far as in them lies pollute it by their iniquity. For though the correction of tyrannical domination is the vengeance of God, we are not therefore to conclude that it is committed to us, who have received no other command than to obey and suffer. This observation I always apply to private persons. For if there be in the present day any magistrates appointed for the protection of the people, and the moderation of the power of kings, such as were in ancient times, the Ephori, who were a check upon the kings among the Lacedæmonians, or the popular tribunes upon the consuls among the Romans, or the Demarchi upon the Senate among the Athenians; or with power such as perhaps is now possessed by the three estates in every kingdom when they are assembled; I am so far from prohibiting them in the discharge of their duty, to oppose the violence or cruelty of kings, that I affirm that if they connive at kings in their oppression of their people, such forbearance involves the most nefarious perfidy, because they fraudulently betray the liberties of the people, of which they know that they have been appointed protectors by the ordination of God.

“But in the obedience which we have shown to be due to the authority of governors, it is always necessary to make one exception, and that is entitled to our first attention—that it do not seduce us from obedience to him, to whose will the desires of all kings ought to be subject, to whose decrees all their commands ought to yield, to whose majesty all their sceptres ought to submit. And, indeed, how preposterous it would be for us, with a view to satisfy men, to incur the displeasure of him on whose account we yield obedience to men! The Lord, therefore, is the King of kings; who, when he has opened his sacred mouth, is to be heard alone, above all, for all, and before all; in the next place, we are subject to those men who preside over us; but no otherwise than in Him. If they command any thing against Him, it ought not to have the least attention; nor, in this case, ought we to pay any regard to all that dignity attached to magistrates; to which no injury is done when it is subjected to the unrivalled and supreme power of God. On this principle Daniel denied that he had committed any crime against the king in disobeying his impious decree; because the king had exceeded the limits of his office, and had not only done an injury to men, but, by raising his arm against God, had degraded his own authority. On the other hand, the Israelites are condemned



for having been too submissive to the impious edict of their king."\*

It is of vast importance that this question should be accurately understood in its political, as in its theological bearings. The connexion of Church and State, and the mingling of political and religious questions, have corrupted beyond estimation the European nations. In the United States, the state and federal constitutions, most happily, say nothing about questions of religion. It was discovered for the first time in laying the foundations of our duplex system of government in the United States that they ought not to be mixed with religion. The statesmen who modelled these governments, were too well versed in human history not to see and avoid such folly.

Wise men will look with great abhorrence and disgust at the efforts frequently made at the North by religious societies to incorporate the religious principle in the Constitution of the United States. In a religious sense, it is sophistical as well as fanatical.†

In defending the principle that Christianity should be the basis of all human government, we ought also to defend the position that it is a destructive error to incorporate it in constitutions or laws; but to illustrate the beautiful, brilliant, and ever abiding truth, that the religious principle is the life of the nation, when it moves the moral faculties of the people to regulate the political machinery, not by mere codes of policy, but by the precepts and principles which true religion establish for the regulation of human conduct. It must be the united action of a people speaking from the heart which will govern the administration of the laws, and not the edicts incorporated in forms of government, which, under the taint of human wickedness, is always swayed by human interest and human passion.

The effort to legislate a nation by human means into Christianity will always legislate them into the doctrines and the do-

---

\*Institutes, B. IV., Chap. XX., §§ XXXI, XXXII.

† *Vide* proceedings of a religious Convention held in Philadelphia, January 18th, 1871.—*N. Y. Tribune, January 25th, 1871.*

minion of the devil. But as we have often seen the energy, and the success of the individual man against the many trials of life when the heart was sustained by the power of religion; as the piety of the martyr has assuaged the pains of the liquid flames as they leaped around the quivering flesh; as Christian sects, and even entire Christian communities, have triumphed over the rack and the fagot, and handed down to succeeding generations the only living principle of the social organisation, true piety—so must we believe that this principle, communicated from man to man, until it pervades communities, will, under a proper ministration, animate the great heart of the nation by a common pulsation that will establish the truth that the religious principle, and that alone, is the life of the nation. God grant that we may see the majority of nations thus actuated, thus united morally and socially to the service of Christianity; and depend upon it, the minor interest, reflected by the public administration of human affairs, will work in perfect harmony with the higher interest and nobler end of man—his true happiness on earth, his salvation in heaven.

In illustrating the constant unceasing effort of civilised man to establish liberty and maintain human right, we close this essay with a quotation from the gifted and pious Bickersteth:

“To fallen man the pressure downwards of things seen and temporal is constant; the pressure upwards must be constant too. This can only be by the Holy Spirit sustaining communion with God. And the promise is, ‘He shall abide with you forever;’ not in hours of private or public worship only, but in the workshop, and in the field; in the busy market, and in the perplexities of professional life; in all the pursuits of learning; on the quiet and thoughtful seats of justice; amidst the turmoil and excitement of the halls of legislation; with right and justice, even when there is the clash of arms; and in bearing an allotted part in the splendors of rank or royalty; wherever his servants are, there is he.”

An active principle of the Reformation was the undivided control of the will of God as revealed to us in the Holy Scriptures. We do not say that political freedom is a chimera; but

we affirm that no nation can enjoy the condition of liberty until the authority of the law of God is paramount among the people. There must be some counterpoise necessary to freedom; men cannot make a proper use of civil liberty unless they are inwardly influenced by the word of God.

How wrong it is to allow the security of the public welfare to be alleged as a motive in justification of proceedings hostile to religious liberty! This has been the great poison in the Roman Catholic religion, as well as in its political philosophy. Look to the Roman Catholic countries of Spain, Portugal, Italy, France, and South America. See how constantly they are a prey to revolution, while Protestant nations possess stability, united with freedom, and a comparative public tranquility which approximates success, and commands our confidence in proportion as it is based upon the teachings of the word of God; but it is the authority of the Bible, as acknowledged by Protestants, with an inward power acting upon the affections, the will, and the intellect; but, above all, the indispensable influence of the Holy Spirit which alone can sustain the sublime truth here again repeated, that *the religious principle is the life of the nation.*

D'Aubigné says: "Men cannot make a proper use of civil liberty, except they are inwardly influenced by the word of God." It is an historical, and a religious truth. And for all the ills and deep festering wounds which afflict the body politic, and sicken nations almost unto death, there is but one remedy. Let us look to the tree of life: "And the leaves of the tree were for the healing of the nations."

## ARTICLE IV.

## THE PRESBYTERIAN REUNION, NORTH.

*Presbyterian Reunion: A Memorial Volume. 1837-1871.*  
 Ὅτι εἰς ἄρτος, ἐν σῶμα οἱ πολλοὶ ἴσμεν· οἱ γὰρ πάντες ἐκ τοῦ ἑνὸς ἄρτου  
 μετέχομεν.—1 Cor. x. 17. New York: De Witt C. Lent & Com-  
 pany, 451 Broome Street. 1870. pp. 564. 8vo.

It is reasonable to suppose that the volume which furnishes a title to this article must needs contain the fullest and most flattering history of the Presbyterian Reunion consummated in Philadelphia last year. The book consists of eight chapters and an appendix. No less than twelve distinguished authors, eleven of whom are Doctors of Divinity, have contributed to its pages. The first and second chapters are devoted to an historical review of the two branches, from 1837 to the date of Reunion, the one by an Old School and the other by a New School writer, and two more to biographical sketches of ministers in both branches who have departed this life since the separation thirty-four years ago. The rest of the volume, excepting the final chapter, professes to review the entire history of the Reunion, and is of course the most important part of the work, unless the closing chapter which treats of the Future of the Unified Church, may claim preëminence. The style in which the work is put forth is, in most respects, worthy of high commendation. Good paper, plain type, broad margins, and well-executed illustrations, are among the externals; and the orderly arrangement of topics, as well as the general *animus* manifested in their treatment, are certainly praiseworthy.

The exceptions taken relate to certain exhibitions of the *sensational* which appear in various portions of the volume. The book smacks not a little of the *spread-eagle* spirit. Some indefinite, yet not extremely faint, indications would suggest to any British or any Southern reader that the work emanates from the same section which produces *Harper's Weekly*. Our fathers of the old Synod could not possibly have got up a production with

such *tone and air*. The Presbyterian Church before 1837 was not up to such sort of finish as this memorial wears. It is a clear and strong sign of the kind and degree of the progress made since that now-to-be-forgotten period. Of course, however, this is all as it must be, and must be expected to be. Our period is that of American Presbyterianism as it stands distinguished from the Scotch or Scotch-Irish, or it might be better said, from that of Gillespie and Rutherford. The volume is altogether characteristic of the reunited Church. It suits that body every way. Admitting the reunion itself to be a good thing, it might safely be said that this memorial volume was a good work well done. On the other hand, if the repudiation of the testimony of 1837, which was the precise thing effected by the Reunion, was an act of questionable propriety—then it may be said that the work now under examination contains about all that can be said in its defence.

Proceeding upon this last-mentioned ground, it is proper to observe that our attitude regarding the question is peculiar. We do not occupy precisely the position of any other outsiders. As an ecclesiastical organisation we have two experiences which belong to no other body of Christians. In the first place, we were compelled to go out from the pale of the big church, when it was smaller; and secondly, we were invited back since it attained its growth, and we declined the invitation. As we were once members of the family, but lost the relationship, and then refused to be endowed with it again, there must be some reasons why we stand just where and just as we are; but whatever these may be, the fact abides that we now form a different household.

Nevertheless, we may not deny the kinship subsisting betwixt us. It is not possible for the Northern Presbyterian Church to prosper without gladdening the hearts of all Christians in our separated body. It is not possible for that Church to go astray in any essential particular without inflicting a wound upon us. It were a great mistake on our side to harbor resentful feelings against them. It were a greater error on theirs to suspect us of such folly. While, therefore, we may use great plainness of speech in the review of their later history, we may not forget

the courtesy due to them and becoming in ourselves, nor the family relationship as betwixt Presbyterians, nor the brotherhood of the gospel.

I. The first point claiming attention has already been indicated, to wit, That the Reunion of the separated Churches is a precise denial of the testimony of 1837.

As this statement is in the very teeth of the initial chapter of the Reunion volume written by Rev. Samuel Miller, D. D., it will be necessary to refer for proofs to the official history of the event as recorded in chapters V., VI., and VII. The discrepancy between these affirming testimonies and the earnest denial of Dr. Miller, can be accounted for upon several grounds, of which it will be sufficient to refer to a single one, and that is the innate repugnance which every sound Old School theologian must feel at the *appearance* of retreat from the vantage ground held by this branch since 1837.

Let it be observed now that Dr. Miller says: "Some have supposed a relaxation of doctrinal strictness in the Old School body, of which, however, there has not been the slightest evidence. . . . The very reverse is too apparent to be questioned." Pp. 47, 48.

A beginning may be made of proof from this memorial volume of the painful fact which Dr. Miller would be glad to hide from his own eyes, by pointing to pp. 249-252, where are recorded the first references, so far as appears by the Old School body, to "the two General Assemblies," and "the two Branches." In 1837 these Synods and Presbyteries are *disowned*, but in 1866 they have come to be "the other Branch," and the Old School then formally expresses its "earnest desire for Reunion," and denounces "controversies and division and strife." Now, what controversy is signalized here except precisely that betwixt the Old and the New School? And what force has the whole deliverance of the Old School Assembly at St. Louis in 1866 except to cast a slur upon the testimony for sound doctrine and Presbyterian order made in 1837?

Proof the second will be found recorded on pp. 257-269, where appear the terms of Reunion as proposed by the Joint

Committee, and substantially adopted by the Old School as well as the New. In these terms the Old School are made to acknowledge that the New *had ever held* the system of doctrine and the Presbyterian order of the standards. Moreover, the ministers of the two Branches are acknowledged as all of the same standing, and the two are made to be historically one Church. What can be conceived of more precisely in denial of the testimony of 1837?

Upon this occasion a minority of 64 ask for more definite statements of the doctrinal basis for the Reunion, but a majority of 152 vote it down, and the terms are sent forth for the popular consideration and acceptance.

The history of the Smith and Gurley amendments are well told by Dr. Adams (pp. 265-269); the one intended (he says) as "a kind and suitable balance" to the other; the former from a New School man to satisfy the orthodox demands of the Old School; the latter from an Old School man, designed to secure the liberty contended for by the New School. As for the latter, that very liberty it gave was a dishonor to the glorious testimony of 1837. As for the former, Dr. Adams makes quite too much of it considered as an evidence of New School orthodoxy. Manifestly, as he says himself, the Convention was "taken by surprise" when Prof. Smith offered it, (p. 265,) and some wished him to withdraw it, yet when he refused, only two men voted against what a leader so much trusted had proposed and desired. And afterwards all were content to let it stand as arranged.

And yet these famous amendments, so nicely balancing each other, failed to satisfy the Old School. Dr. Jacobus describes, on pp. 325, 326, the effort "to break the force of this basis after it was passed upon." A declaration was, in fact, unanimously adopted "that the doctrinal article of the basis . . . is not to be interpreted as giving license to the propagation of doctrines which have been condemned by either Assembly, nor to permit any Presbytery in the United Church to license or ordain to the work of the ministry any candidate who maintains any form of doctrine condemned by either Assembly." And this declaration was telegraphed to the other Branch at Harris-

burg, and a special delegation sent on to request that both the Smith and Gurley amendments might be stricken out of the basis. It reached Harrisburg, however, too late. But it cannot be denied that at that stage of the affair the Old School held the Smith guaranty of New School orthodoxy as dearly bought with the Gurley license to New School heterodoxy. Not yet had the tide of popular feeling carried the old ship clean over all the break-waters set up in 1837.

Proof the third is written down on pp. 285-287. There was a protest in the Old School Assembly of 1868 against the plan of union, the protesters averring that the New School held certain Pelagian and Arminian tenets to be consistent with the Calvinism of the Confession of Faith—in other words, that the New School acknowledged the Westminster symbols, but yet held that these tenets did not contradict those symbols.

Now, the proof we seek is to be found in various parts of the answer to this protest. The first ground taken in the answer is, not as one would expect, a *denial* of the fact alleged, but the statement that such an allegation *could not be* correct, as it would be self-stultifying to the New School. There never was a case, the answer says, in which a Church adopted a symbol of faith, and at the same time claimed exactly the contrary type of doctrine to be compatible with that symbol. We read Church history with different spectacles from those here made use of by Prof. Shedd, the author of this statement. But the answer proceeds, in the second place, to give the denial of the fact. And let our readers observe the form of this denial. "These very errors . . . have already been distinctly repudiated by them." This is coming to the point. But when was the repudiation made? In the year 1837 at the Auburn Convention!! Here, then, is the proof of our position that the Reunion of 1869 is against the testimony of 1837. The Old School of 1837 did not accept the Convention at Auburn as justly representing the New School body, or their declaration as satisfactory evidence that New School theology repudiates all Arminian and Pelagian errors and interpretations. But the men who bring about the Reunion in 1869 are glad to accept



this Auburn declaration of 1837, because they could get no other; and so they plead that old document to show that New School theology does not allow Arminian or Pelagian interpretations of the standards! And now, why was there not some more recent manifesto of the New School body to appeal to? Because that body chose to stand upon its dignity, having no declaration to make, whilst the other body *dared not ask* for any manifesto lest it should give offence. Is any other proof requisite to show how different was the spirit of the Old School of 1869 from that of their fathers in 1837?

Let the readers of this volume turn to page 100 and see what Dr. Stearns, who writes the Historical Review for the New School, has to say of their theology. He claims, first, that they have always been orthodox and held the standards pure and simple. He adds: "If any ask for a more explicit exposition of the particular *phase* of Calvinistic doctrine which should be distinguished as 'NEW SCHOOL THEOLOGY,' they will find none so *likely* to be accepted as such by the *larger number*, as that" of the Auburn Convention. The italics and capitals are his, and he proceeds to say, "But, in truth, there is no such phase of theology," and to insist that they take the standards "just as they are." "Further than that," he adds, "they give and claim from others *no pledges*; they give and take reasonable *liberty*." Now, this was all the Old School of 1870 could get—this acceptance of the standards, *without a sense*, by their New School allies; and truly they appear to be "thankful," in the circumstances, "for small favors."

It is worthy to be noticed how this same answer to the protest disposes of the allegation therein made that the United Church would be responsible for the unsound and heretical publications of the New School Committee. The reply is that the United Church will only be responsible for the new catalogue of publications which itself shall issue! No matter, it would seem, what false doctrines have been published since 1837 by the New School, (and they are not a little or a few,) the Old School may ally herself with them for the future in all safety, seeing that the new Board of Publication would hereafter see to publishing

only sound doctrine! This from Old School Presbyterians of 1869 is certainly quite different language from what our fathers held in 1837. But, looking at the names of the Committee, we discover a sufficient explanation of the difference, in that three of the five names are of New England men who have come into the Old School Church, but surely were not of her.

Proof the fourth shall be taken from the plan of Reunion as it was actually adopted, (see pp. 310-313,) where "Each recognizing the other as a sound and orthodox body," was the final form rejoiced in, and glorified so much by both churches, in which, at last, the full and complete denial of the testimony of 1837 was made by the Old School of 1869. If any inquire on what new ground they acknowledge the other body as sound and orthodox, no answer whatever can be given. The New School body did nothing to authorise this change of attitude by the Old Church. Individual men of the New School said, "Our Church is sound;" but the Church herself was silent. Dr. Stearns officially set forth the position thus: "*We give no pledges, and we claim liberty.*" Thus, the Old School, in the end, got no pledges of any particular sense of the Confession; but the New School will of course have their darling liberty. Dr. Crosby, for example, who is one of them, exercises this liberty by vacating the Atonement and making the Divine Nature dormant in our Saviour. Who of his brethren in the United Church has lifted one earnest voice of remonstrance or of protest? Dr. Skinner's article in the *Princeton Repertory* cannot be said to be either a remonstrance or a protest, and, if either, was far from being *earnest*.

Proof the fifth is from Dr. Jacobus's official history of the Assemblies of 1869, p. 320, where he says: "According as acknowledged differences are maximized or minimized must be the judgment in the case before us." He insinuates that his Old School fathers in 1837 *maximized* the differences, but he does not and cannot deny that he and his brethren in 1869, on the contrary, have *minimized* them. The terms are happily chosen, and we accept them cordially—those differences between new and old theology, which 1837 held to be *very great*, 1869 has,

VOL. XXII., NO. 3.—5.

in its wisdom, construed as *exceedingly small*, and so our point is proved out of the mouth of Dr. Jacobus, Moderator of the Old School Assembly, himself.

A sixth proof may be brought from Dr. Jacobus's response to the New School delegates, recorded on page 345, where he officially calls those *branches of the same vine* whom the Old School in 1837 cut off as not such; and where, again, he officially calls those *twin brothers* whom the Old School then declared otherwise. Moreover, he speaks of that separation as based upon mere "alienation of feeling;" whereas the Old School testimony then based it, and truly based it, on differences of doctrine. Still further, he describes the New School claim to the birth-right as fully equal to that of the Old School, and says, with great significance, that he is unable to determine "which is Jacob and which is Esau." Again, on page 381, he describes the Old School during their separation from the New, and by reason of it, as resembling the man with the withered arm; and on page 386 he compares the influences which were separating Old and New School as symbolised in the Monongahela River, which means the *river of crumbling banks*. It was "the crumbling banks of prejudice and alienation and suspicion and strife *on both sides* which muddied the current," but this muddy river and the Alleghany, or *river of clear morning waters*, should soon join and flow together. Now, the men of 1837, and their testimony, are grievously dishonored by this language.

The seventh proof is in Dr. Musgrave's address at the consummation of the Reunion, recorded on page 388. He contrasted distinctly 1869 with 1837, ascribing the separation of the one to God's "permissive will," but the Reunion of the other to his "gracious and efficacious will!" The implication is evidently that the separation was evil and wicked and God had no direct hand in it. Thus is the point in hand directly established by this witness.

And then we find an eighth proof on pp. 397-400, in what fell from the lips of the Honorables William Strong and Charles D. Drake and William E. Dodge, (two of them eminent ruling elders of the New School,) whose names and deeds are well known in the

South, but not alike unfavorably. The first said: "No man can any more say of himself 'I am an Old School Presbyterian,'" which means, of course, that the testimony of 1837 is dead and buried. And no doubt what Judge Strong said is literally true so far as this reunion can make it so. The second said, somewhat in the spread-eagle vein: "In a little time this Reunited Church . . . will be the grand time-piece of the Christian religion in the whole world," with more of the same sort which suits the Reunited Church, but would never have been accepted by the Old School Church of 1837. And then good Mr. Dodge, for whom we have a sincere respect, said: "We must forget Old School and New School." With this quotation we close our proofs that the Reunion of 1869 is in precise denial of the testimony of 1837. That which our fathers held up as a testimony for the truth of God worthy to be held in everlasting remembrance, that the Reunited Church of 1869 treads under foot as fit only to be forgotten.

Recurring again to Dr. Miller's denial of what it has now been attempted to prove, it is worthy of notice how feebly he maintains his ground. He bears a very honored name, and we feel sure that he inherits from both parents a fair and candid mind. The moderation of his representations in proof of his denial makes this manifest. All he pretends to make good is, that no Assembly and no considerable number of the Presbyteries formally *proposed* or *designed* a relaxation of doctrinal strictness! Then, as to the supposed return of the New School back to the old paths, mark the faintness of Dr. Miller's assertions: "From every quarter had come to the Old School multiplied assurances, in most influential forms, that the New School, not as to every individual, but as a Church, had become, and were becoming, *more orthodox than formerly*; nay, were now as strictly conformed to the Confession of Faith and Catechisms as the Old School themselves. Such assurances were given *in the Joint Committee* to the Old School members." The italics are ours. He gives as a specimen of all the assurances what Dr. Henry B. Smith, of the New York Seminary, rather indefinitely says of their once erroneous doctrines: "Certain objectionable forms

of doctrine and practice are no more taught in its pulpits and seminaries." This is the kind of declarations which, as Dr. Miller tells us, "the Old School, after long doubt, indeed, yet at length confidently received and believed." "May its confidence (he devoutly adds) never be shaken."

II. The second point which claims attention is, that the Reunion came not from principle but feeling. It was not the result of calm, careful, sober, and grave examination of the case by ministers and elders, a deliberate act of church rulers; but it was the offspring of feeling. The solemn, the weighty, the glorious testimony by which, under God, the General Assembly saved a Church from direful peril thirty years ago has been set aside in an outburst of *feeling*, and that mere *popular* feeling.

This popular impulse was twofold. In the first place, it was political. Reunion grew out of political sympathies betwixt the Old and the New School, engendered by the war. Such is the direct testimony of Dr. Adams, on pp. 247-249.

"Then came the memorable struggle for national integrity and life. Before the mighty enthusiasm and inflexible purpose of the nation to save itself from dismemberment and to preserve its Constitution, all subordinate distinctions in Church and State instantly disappeared. In large cities, in towns, villages and scattered settlements, there was one and the same high-wrought patriotism, drawing men together in the closest and firmest unity. Both Assemblies, though with different degrees of unanimity, took the same position in relation to the duty of the Church in the fiery trial to which our national life was subjected. As the conflict proceeded, it became apparent that the continued existence of slavery was involved in its issue. As this was the cause of the war, so had it much to do with the separation of the Presbyterian Church. It was not generally recognised as such in public debate. But large ships are turned about by that plank which is out of sight and under water. The New School Assembly, at the time of the disruption, had but few churches and ministers who endorsed slavery by theory and practice. All these withdrew and founded a separate organisation of their own in the South before the war, and before negotiations between Old School and New School were opened for reunion. The General Assembly, Old School, had a large slaveholding constituency, for which it always manifested in debate and legisla-

tion the utmost tenderness and caution. The time came when it was evident that slavery was to go down forever before the well-nigh unanimous purpose to maintain the national existence. This cause removed, there went with it what had long tended, in church judicatories, to produce irritation, repulsion, and strife. Much has not been said or written in the discussions of the last few years upon this subject; but all who are personally acquainted with the affairs of the Presbyterian Church in this country, for the last thirty-five years, will, in all candor, be prompt to admit that the existence of slavery had more to do with the division of the Church than has generally been supposed, and that its entire extinction has been among the many causes which have made the reunion of the two Northern Assemblies more easy and more certain.

“In view of all these circumstances, it was inevitable that the subject of Reunion should become a matter of discussion.”

Now, there is a portion of this testimony not to be accepted as well founded. Dr. Adams writes like a New School man, when he says that slavery was the plank under the water and out of sight which turned the Church about in 1837. Dr. Miller is undoubtedly better informed respecting the motives of the Old School. He ought to be, as born in that Church, (which Dr. Adams was not,) and as doubtless having often heard his own father, a leading man in it, speak of the real causes of the excision of 1837. And he says, (page 23):

“Sometimes it has been intimated that pro-slavery tendencies on the part of the Old School were among the most influential causes of the division of 1838. No allegation could be more entirely opposed to historical truth. A careful reading of all the official documents of that time, when, too, crimination and recrimination were loosely prevalent, will not disclose the slightest hint of such a charge from any quarter. Nay, the Assembly of 1835, in which there was a decided Old School majority, appointed a committee to report upon slavery; but the Assembly of 1836, in which the New School had altogether their own way, postponed the whole subject indefinitely by a vote of one hundred and fifty-four to eighty-seven!”

This testimony of Dr. Miller is precisely contrary to Dr. Adams's statements. We see not how any honest Old School man can patiently submit to such allegations by Dr. Adams

against his Church. She always averred that unsound theology and unpresbyterian church government led her to excise the New School. But, according to Dr. Adams, the real cause was something else which the Old School kept all the time hidden in the deep water. He charges that they always were very tender towards slavery, that sum of all villainies—in other words, they always were a *pro-slavery* Church. And he declares that when slavery went down, which the Old School had thus been secretly nurturing in their bosom so long, then, for the first time, was it possible for an end to come to the strife betwixt Old and New School. Thus all the glory Dr. Adams takes for the New and all the *shame* he gives to the Old School. But it never seems to enter the good man's mind to inquire how the New School, in their purity, could consent to join themselves to this impure pro-slavery Old School body. This Old School Church did not repent of their sin and put away slavery, but the war extinguished it. She held on to the Southern members year after year, though living in this dreadful iniquity, and never said aught about their being sinners until after the separation betwixt North and South. Yet the New School join themselves to them! And they would now, if possible, join us to them also, all reeking as our Church is with the guilt of slave-holding unrepented of! Where are the *principles* of these New School Presbyterians? Good Dr. Adams perhaps would answer, "Out of sight and under water."

But the other portion of Dr. Adams's testimony is not contradicted, but confirmed, by Dr. Miller. He says, (page 46,) concerning the warlike source whence issued the new-born love of Old and New School Presbyterians:

"The common, agitating excitements, alarms, perils and sufferings of a struggle for the nation's life, drew Old and New School men into closer and more frequent communion."

There is nothing strange, unnatural, or incredible in this. It may not be added there is nothing reprehensible. Because the truth of God is infinitely more precious than any earthly interests whatsoever. Old School men ought to have refused to begin

to ally themselves, as such, with a body excinded for New School heresy, no matter what worldly questions brought them upon a common worldly platform. What would be thought of Protestants making religious alliances with Papists, or of Trinitarians doing the same with Unitarians, because of common sympathies on any worldly question ?

1. But there is a confession here from both "branches," that what first began, to bring them together was the late war with the South. Not a word shall now be said by Southern Presbyterians to the New School of the North. Their Southern brethren had no peculiar claims whatever upon them. And very few words upon this point shall be said here to the Old School of the North. Let bygones be bygones. Only let history make record of it that the spring-head of this reunion was confessedly from no religious, but a political source. Whether the war waged by the North against the South—a war of invasion, a war to subjugate freemen to a government they rightfully wished to repudiate and to change, a war to take away from us what confessedly belonged to us, and to deny us not *their* rights, possessions, or privileges, (seeing we asked for none of these,) but *our own* rights, possessions, and privileges—whether this war, as waged by the North, was or was not a just and righteous war, still, this much is clear and confessed by both Old and New School Presbyterians of the North that *it was this war which first began to draw them into reunion!* It was, to say nothing about the character of the war, it was political impulses which brought forth this religious movement so much glorified in the volume before us. The people, not the rulers of the Church, and the people excited profoundly by political affairs, brought the Old and New School bodies into one.

In the second place, the popular impulse which led to this reunion was a social one. Consult Dr. Jacobus's account of the matter. Speaking (page 330) of the two Assemblies having met in 1856 in New York, he says: "No high public interest was then excited. There was then no drawing together of the parts, but a manifest distance. . . . The hour had not yet come. But now (1869) the city was moved. Entertainers



and outsiders were astir. The wires were at work to convey despatches to all quarters of the world. The leading daily journals, as the *Herald*, and the *Tribune*, and *Times*, and *Post*, were largely given up to the proceedings." Then he gives (pp. 332-333) an account of the joint prayer-meeting thus:

"It had been advised, as a prudential measure, that the exciting topic of reunion, in its delicate bearings at the moment, should not be introduced. But it was all in vain to set up barriers against the overflowing thought and emotion. You could as well shut out the morning from the day, or the spring-tide from the fields and gardens. The first prayer referred to it, and the first speaker plainly broached it, as the topic of the hour. Irresistibly, every exercise savored of this reunion sentiment, and it was seen to be the one great thought and feeling of the praying Assembly. . . . It was a first coming together of the brethren long time distant, and now met at the mercy seat. The ointment bewrayed itself. The atmosphere was redolent of it. Families of the city who had sought the spot as one of promised privilege, shared in the high enthusiasm."

Dr. Jacobus's history continues, (pp. 340-342, 370-372):

"On Monday evening a grand social reunion took place at the 'Apollo Rooms,' Broadway. It was a happy conception, admirably planned and carried out by the Rev. Drs. S. J. and E. D. G. Prime, of the *New York Observer*. The arrangements were magnificent and munificent, altogether worthy of the jubilant occasion, and of the great metropolis. Not only were the members of the two Assemblies thus brought into social contact, but the congregations of both branches were largely represented—the wives and sons and daughters added to the charm of the *soiree*. Ministers and laymen of other denominations evinced their interest by their cheering presence. Prominent civilians, from the city and from abroad; men of professional rank, and of military and political renown, gave zest to the occasion. Music was richly discoursed. Dr. Adams called the meeting to order, and announced the appropriate introductory of praise, "Blest be the tie that binds." This was sung with a will by the immense assemblage, variously estimated at 1,500 and 2,000. After an opening, in his own graceful style, upon the word 'RECEPTION,' which headed the cards of admission, saying that it was each receiving the other, he alluded to the *nuptials* in

prospect, and then, approaching the Moderator of the Old School Assembly, and seizing him by both hands, he led him to the front of the platform for an impromptu address. Dr. Jacobus responded to the graceful commitment, and followed up Dr. Adams's introductory by an allusion to Oriental nuptials, in which the bride is bargained for by father or brother, and when the groom is introduced to her by 'the friend of the bridegroom,' on the nuptial occasion, and the bride is then, perhaps, for the first time unveiled to his view, he is expected to make loud demonstration of joy; and the 'friend of the bridegroom, who standeth and heareth him, rejoiceth greatly because of the bridegroom's voice.' Here it was the Elder Brother who had bespoken the Bride, and had made the contract, and we could all rejoice.

"This was followed by Dr. Howard Crosby, and by the Moderator, (New School,) Dr. Fowler, in words of brief acknowledgment; also, by Dr. Ormiston, of Canada, and by the venerable Dr. Samuel Hanson Cox.

"The buzz of a score of hundreds of voices overwhelmed the loudest efforts of the platform beyond the circuit of a few feet, till the speeches and music gave way for the banquet room. Here was, indeed, a rich display of the elegant hospitality of New York Christians. The highest credit is due to the generous entertainers, and to those who, by dint of indefatigable industry, wrought out such a splendid success. It was, in effect, social reunion pleading for the ecclesiastical reunion of Presbyterians. So many old friends came pleasantly together, ministers and members, Old and New, that the occasion formed, altogether, a most significant index and appropriate prelude to the higher reunion of the week."

"The hospitalities of New York Christians had been displayed in the spirit of a large-hearted Christianity. And no pen can adequately detail the thousand pleasing incidents occurring daily at the tables of the generous entertainers. Besides, it was quite a specialty of the occasion that *soirees* were given at private houses, in which groups of a score or two from the two Assemblies were gathered round the table, with Christian cheer, followed by genial rounds of address and personal reminiscences of reunion movements. Who that had the happiness of being present at the *dejeuner* of Dr. Adams, or of Mr. Henry Day, will ever forget the graceful challenge and genial repartee, and the impromptu address and response all round the circle, that brought smiles and tears in quick succession—such brimming emotions, as at length broke the alabaster box and filled the room with the odor of the ointment? And, not to mention other names, it may be

allowed to refer to like Christian refreshings at Dr. E. P. Rogers', of the Reformed Church, and Henry M. Alexander and James Brown, Esqrs., where elegant hospitalities were lavished upon the guests of both branches.

"Members lingered as if reluctant to leave the spot consecrated by such thrice happy meetings. And they looked with confident forecast over the six months interval to the reassembling at Pittsburg, to receive from the Presbyteries the word of ratification. Already the marriage covenant was signed by the high contracting parties. It seemed only a signature of the witnesses and a marriage certificate that was further requisite. And Pittsburg was already looked to as the city which should be honored with celebrating the rare nuptials. . . . .

"The press, both secular and religious, was most active and decisive for the reunion. And this was by no means confined to the press of the denomination, but was most remarkably the voice of the leading journals in the land. Such an *Eirenicon* was hailed, on all hands, as a precious national boon."

Now, Dr. Jacobus had spoken (p. 329) of the "change which had come over the Church bringing about more mutual confidences." And what has been quoted seems to make it plain that this change was in the popular mind, and not amongst the rulers of the Church; that it was the result of social influences and feelings among the people, and not of grave deliberation by the rulers of the Church. It was the "*grand social reunion* at the Apollo Rooms," so admirably planned and executed by the Doctors Prime, (*par nobile fratrum,*) with the magnificence and the munificence of the jubilant occasion, where wives, sons, and daughters, added to the charms of the *soiree*, and where prominent civilians and men of military and political renown gave zest to the occasion; where music was richly discoursed, and where Drs. Adams and Jacobus, in their own graceful style, touched off the nuptials in prospect, followed by Dr. Howard Crosby, author of a recent heretical work, and by Dr. S. H. Cox, author of some old and forgotten heretical speeches and writings; where, however, the *buzz* of twenty hundred voices made graceful and heretical speeches alike unheard, except by a few, until supper time came, and then, amidst the elegant hospitality of New York Christians, social reunion got fair swing in pleading

effectually for the ecclesiastical; this "grand social reunion" it was which did the business, and brought the separated Churches together, being assisted and seconded in the gracious and glorious operation by various other minor *soirees* and *dejeuners* at private houses, where groups of a score or two from the two Assemblies were gathered round the table, with Christian cheer and genial rounds of address, until they broke the alabaster box with their brimming emotion, and filled the room with odors; being aided and seconded also by the press, both secular and religious, in fact all the leading journals of the land, *Herald* and *Tribune* included. How was it possible, under such a grand and powerful combination of influences, social, political, military, musical, oratorical, and editorial, the pious editors of the *New York Observer* in the van, and the pious editors of the *Herald* and *Tribune* bringing up the rear—how was it possible to keep the two Churches any longer apart?

Now, it is pertinent to remark that Church action from popular impulse suits very well the genius of Congregationalism, but does not comport with the Presbyterian system. Under it the Church is governed always by representative Assemblies, taking counsel of *principle, of right, and of truth*, and not of the *feelings of the people*. It follows that neither of the two Assemblies, and particularly not the Old School, acted like Presbyterians in all this matter, but like Congregationalists. Presbyterians hold with Calvin that *Incertum scindi studia in contraria vulgus*, and that such an *afflatus* as the popular breath, such an inspiration as public sentiment, is an exceedingly unsafe guide. Conceive of Dort, or of Westminster, swayed by popular excitement, and that at a tea party! What had been the weight of the testimony of 1837, if it could have been shown to be the result of mere clamor by a mob? Dr. Adams solemnly records (pp. 313, 314,) his "conviction that the whole movement has been under the guidance of the great Head of the Church." He pronounces this work of healing to be "divine." But he gives no proofs from Scripture or elsewhere for the opinion. Now, Scripture condemns some healings of hurts as not divine; some confederacies as not approved of God. And what Dr.

Adams takes for granted, or has impressed in a pious rhapsody upon his earnest heart, is just the question which must lie open for consideration and for decision hereafter. Was this, or was it not, a Divine movement? Was the *vox populi* in this case, or was it not, *vox Dei*?

III. Much as this sensational volume contains to offend good taste and good sense, there are many things in it which it were well for the Presbyterian Church of the South to observe and to consider.

One thing which it must serve to bring to our recollection, is the union betwixt our General Assembly and the United Synod, which is so often quoted in this volume as justifying the late reunion. But, in truth, the reference to Southern example is not warranted by the circumstances of the two cases. We happen to be of those who were not in any degree responsible for that union, and therefore the opinion about to be expressed is given with the greater freedom. It is, that in more than one essential particular the two cases are entirely different. But without entering on that question just now, it is enough to remark that the Assembly and the Synod never said that the war was what brought them together; nor does it appear that tea parties, social reunions, *soiree* or *dejeuners*, music, lemonade, cakes, good wine, elegant hospitality, Christian cheer, or genial rounds of address, had anything whatever to do in bringing that union to pass.

But a more important comparison which this volume must suggest to Southern Presbyterians, is that betwixt the New School separation from the Old School in 1837-1838, and our separation from the Northern Presbyterian Church, Old School, in 1861. We might well study the old division and see how it worked on both sides; albeit, our division from the North was so different in the nature and grounds of it. We, who are the weaker party so far as numbers and worldly wealth are concerned, might well also study the history and progress of the weaker body in that case, although in some respects our very opposites. One fact worthy of note here is, how, after the sep-

aration in 1837-1838, it was the New School who seemed for a while to feel less assured of their position and the more anxious for immediate reunion, (pp. 54, 55,) although in the end the Old School seemed to lose their moral force, and, as the superior *loyalty* of the New School body gave it brighter popular *eclat* during and after the war, lo! it is the Old School who manifest, in 1869, the most eagerness for reunion. Comparing the behavior of the parties to the separation of 1861, respectively, we see the Northern Church furious, for successive years, in its declarations against liberty of return for the "impenitent rebels," and then suddenly veering like the wind round to the opposite point of the compass and blowing as hot as it blew cold before! The Southern Church, on the contrary, has spent no breath in denouncing her Northern sister, but seems in no haste to patch up a fresh union with her. This calmness of the Southern demeanor is very significant.

But a still more interesting question for our study would be, What light is cast by this volume upon the prospect of a future reunion betwixt our Church and the Northern Presbyterians? Dr. Adams tells (p. 246) what the causes were which brought about the reunion, viz.: 1. The death of the old leaders on either side. 2. A new generation, having little information and less interest in the separation itself. 3. Social and ecclesiastical intercourse, obliterating former lines. 4. Exchanging of pulpits. 5. Dismission and reception of members mutually. 6. Coöperation in good causes in cities and towns. But of course the chief cause was the seventh in Dr. Adams's list, and the last, namely, The sympathy awakened during and by the "memorable struggle for national life."

Now, in our future, the two first named may of course be just as operative as they were in the case narrated in this volume; but the third, fourth, fifth, and sixth, may be expected naturally to be much less operative. The seventh and chief can have no place, of course, in this estimate. But it is to be observed that Dr. Adams makes no reference to doctrinal differences as operating to produce the old separation, or the removal of such doctrinal differences as tending to unite the parties. With Dr.

Adams it was the *large slaveholding constituency of the Old School Assembly*, for which it had "always manifested in debate and legislation the utmost tenderness and caution;" not the *heresy of the New School*, which had brought about the separation. Slavery removed, "there went with it what had long tended in Church judicatories to produce irritation, repulsion, and strife." This, according to Dr. Adams, was all the trouble between the two parties in 1837. "The New School, at the time of the disruption, had but few churches and ministers who endorsed slavery by theory and practice," (p. 248.) In other words, the New School were abolitionists. But the Old School were to a great extent at that time what was called *pro-slavery*. But slavery abolished, all ground of separation, he considers, was removed. And so, of course, it became easy for churches, the one of which was just as much Old School as the other, and the other just as much New School as the one, to come together in the fondest love so soon as they had gotten rid of the South with her odious system. Now, to dwell no longer upon this representation of the case made by one so much honored in the Reunited Church, there are evidently three principles for which the Southern Church is testifying in her separate life and action. They are very important principles, and we propose to state them distinctly, but not to dwell upon them at length.

*The first relates to slavery.* The position of our Church touching slavery or slaveholding is perfectly clear and definite. She stands on the ground of the Scriptures. Slavery is a form of government which the Bible does not condemn. The Southern Church did therefore not condemn it. She does not condemn it now. Her members who were slaveholders she would not discipline, for that was no sin according to the Word. Any man or any church who says it is sin takes some other rule of faith, and is so far infidel. The Old School Church was not willing to say anything like this before the war. But the war separated her from the South, and also fired her heart with hatred against the South, and she was led during the war and subsequently to declare slaveholding to be sinful in itself. She deliberately assumed the infidel ground. But not only did the war

fire her heart with hatred for the South, but, on the other hand, as this volume declares, it fired her heart with love for the New School, and blinded her eyes to those differences which Dr. Adams and his New School brethren will not admit to have existed, but which the Old School has always been so loud in declaring. Meantime, the Southern Church stands as the Old School Church stood before the war, upon the Bible ground regarding slaveholding. She has not changed her attitude in the least upon this point. Is it to be expected that she will change it in the future? A deliberate, cold-blooded change is plainly not supposable. A terrible civil war, making us hate somebody, and in the same proportion love this Reunited Old and New School Church, and then the requisite amount of social reunions and Christian cheer, might affect us as it affected our brethren at the North. Such influences, however, are not to be looked for. And then, while we plead guilty to the same human nature with our brethren, there is one little difference betwixt us and them which perhaps might save us even should this mighty influence of war and tea parties combined ever be brought to operate upon our Church. It is that the South has always been more disposed to stickle for principle than the North; while at the same time she never has been so impressible by social or public demonstrations, by shows and by shams. On the whole, no man can pretend to say what our Church may not be left to do or to accept. Human nature is very weak and wayward, and even the Church may err. But it certainly would be a dreadful fall should we ever give up the Word as the only and sufficient rule of our faith and practice, and accept the new moral dogma of the Northern Church.

*The second principle is that Christ's Church owes loyalty to no government on earth.* The volume under review is a semi-official record of the zeal of both the reuniting churches in proclaiming their devotion to the American Cæsar. The New School historian, Dr. Stearns, (chap. 2,) coolly, and no doubt justly, claims for his Church the preëminence in this regard. But Dr. Miller (chap. 1) does his best to make out a clear case of loyalty for the Old School likewise. And various parts of



the volume make it plain that the virtue of loyalty to the government, having come to be now decidedly *above par*, whilst orthodoxy of doctrine had got to be a little *below par*, the Old School body were conscious of being somewhat behind "the other branch" in this now chief excellence, and were influenced in desiring the reunion somewhat by the expectation of its improving their public reputation. Accordingly Dr. Miller is not ashamed to write down that "little incident of the year 1863," which we hope he may live to see in its true light, when the flag of the government was unfurled over the Kingdom of our Lord and Head, as represented in their General Assembly, which flag was subsequently voted by that Assembly to be "*their flag!*"

Now, as to the question whether the Presbyterian Church of the South is likely ever to abandon her high ground on this subject by consenting to a union with the Northern Presbyterians, who call Cæsar king as well as Christ, it seems reasonable to observe that that question is capable of being inverted, so that it shall be asked whether the Reunited Church is likely ever to abandon officially its declared position about loyalty. It does not appear reasonable to expect that the Northern Church ever will officially abandon this position. It is no more reasonable to expect that the Presbyterians of the South ever will abandon theirs. The question is of course a vital one, and never can be shelved as unimportant; and the attitude of the two bodies is singularly definite regarding it. And being, as it is, a matter so eminently concrete and practical, and so little abstract or speculative, it would seem that it must continue indefinitely to be what is called a *live* question, and so a barrier to union. It is not a question that will ever go to sleep, or that ever can go to sleep in this country.

The *third* principle for which the Southern Church, in her separate life and action, appears to be set apart in divine providence to contend, is the *permanent, abiding, and incalculable value of the testimony of our fathers in 1837.*

It has been intimated already that the charge of the Southern Church's having herself united with a New School body cannot be allowed. That action differed from the course of the Old

School Church in the late reunion in at least two essential particulars:

1. It never was believed by the Southern Church that the generality of the United Synod were unsound men. On the contrary, it was ever believed by the Old School at the North that the generality of the New School were unsound. It may be safely affirmed that not more than half a dozen ministers of the United Synod were judged to be other than thoroughly Presbyterian and Calvinistic. Whether this was or was not a correct opinion, it was certainly the belief which prevailed, and upon which the Assembly at Charlotte acted.

2. There was a precise statement of the interpretation put upon the standards, which was made to constitute the basis of the union at Charlotte. This statement was satisfactory to the Assembly, and has seemed to prove satisfactory to the Church.

Now, suppose that in the case of the Reunion it had been true that the thorough orthodoxy of nearly every minister of the whole New School had been believed by the Old School, and also that, by way of bringing together the two bodies, there had been accepted cordially by the New School a precise statement respecting the disputed doctrines which was entirely satisfactory to the Old School, who could ever say a word against their reunion? In fact, such circumstances as these being supposed, how could there ever have happened the disruption of 1837?

And let it be observed that the United Synod did not separate as an organised body from the Old School in 1837. Those who afterwards composed that body were certain Southern men, chiefly in Virginia, who were carried away from the Old School, not by doctrinal unsoundness, but by a certain sympathy with the New School, as having been dealt with severely by their brethren. The worst that could justly be said of them as a body, was, that their feelings misled their judgment. Subsequent developments of the radical spirit of the New School had brought them to a separation from that body. Here then was a certain sound and orthodox but separated portion of the New School finding itself surrounded by a Church with which it was in full sympathy. They were not the men whom the Old School

had excinded in 1837, but disapproving the excision of the four Northwestern Synods, they had cast in their lot with the excinded for a time. And they afterwards quit the New School, and then subsequently they come back and rejoin their Old School brethren of the South on the basis of a distinct statement of the sense in which the standards were mutually accepted and affirmed.

All this, therefore, does not constitute a very flagrant denial of the testimony of 1837, although by some objected to earnestly at the time upon this ground. But it cannot be said that the Southern Church would have accepted the action of their Assembly at Charlotte, had she viewed it as in any sense or degree a denial of that glorious testimony. Her idea was that she was not dealing with the New School body, but with a sound and orthodox fragment of it, separated from it for truth's sake. It was not the Southern Church that ever called the New School "the other branch," and denounced controversy with the New School as "strife." It was not she who ever acknowledged formally that the New School body had all along maintained the standards, and that Old and New School were to be viewed historically as one Church. It was not she who ever said formally and distinctly that the New School had repudiated, even in 1837 itself, all New School errors! It was not she who actually and formally and solemnly recognised the New School as a sound and orthodox body. It was not she, nor yet her acknowledged leaders, who ever said that New School errors need only be *minimized* a little and they would become Old School truths; or that the separation of 1837 sprang from mere alienated feeling; or that the Old and New School were the twins, Esau and Jacob, but that none could tell *which was which*; or that the Old School while separated from the New was like the man who had the withered arm; or that the waters of the separation were the muddy waters of suspicion and strife, but those of the reunion clear running waters; or that God permitted the separation as being wicked, but ordained the reunion as being holy. Never, either by word or deed has the Southern Church, as such, or any of those whom she trusts, cast a slur, in any form, upon the

testimony of our fathers of 1837. Now, is it to be expected that she may hereafter do this thing by a union with that reunited body whose most peculiar and characteristic feature is precisely this: that she has trampled and is trampling on that testimony?

This is a question to which, of course, there being now no prophets of the future amongst us, no answer can be given. Without hesitation, however, this may be said, that if a beacon of large and tall proportions, and in a commanding position, warning the Southern Church away from such a fatal course, can avail to save her, she has been granted such a safeguard in that which has been allowed to happen to her Northern Old School sister; and that if a story ever was suitable in style and manner and spirit to the events and transactions it records, the Southern Church may here read, in fit and becoming language, an account of the whole of this sad affair in this Reunion Memorial volume.

There are numerous references all through this volume to the Southern Church. They are generally rather unkind, and sometimes very much so. But this is not surprising in the circumstances. Very refreshing indeed it is, in the very midst of so much that seems unreal and affected, to read the simple, manly, honest reply of our Louisville Assembly to the overture for reunion from the Northern Assemblies. The reader may need a little of this refreshing influence after all that he has been conducted through in this paper; and for the purpose of so refreshing him, and also because the document deserves to be rendered as accessible and familiar to us all as possible, it is now here appended as copied from pp. 448-450:

REPLY FROM THE SOUTH TO OVERTURE FOR REUNION.

“LOUISVILLE, KY., May 28th, 1870.

*Rev. E. F. Hatfield, D. D., Stated Clerk of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America:*

“DEAR BROTHER: The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, in session at Louisville, has directed me to forward to you the following official document. It is a true extract from the minutes of Friday, May 27th.

“The Committee on Foreign Correspondence, to whom was 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 its 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 reconciliation 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 uttered 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 of 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, involved a total surrender of all the great testimonies 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 these falling testimonies we are 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 friendship 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 extended to us in this overture; if untrue, Christian manliness and truth require them to be openly and squarely withdrawn. So long as they remain on record they are an impassable barrier to official intercourse."

"Yours fraternally,

"JOSEPH R. WILSON,

"Stated Clerk of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States."

---

#### ARTICLE V.

### WHAT IS TRUTH?

While Jesus stood in the judgment hall, the Roman Governor put the question, "What is Truth?" Jesus did not refuse to answer, but "when Pilate said this he went out unto the Jews." Had he asked, and humbly waited, the Master, no doubt, would have responded. For to others, in unmistakable language, he had already unfolded the nature and uses of truth.

The Saviour, in his intercessory prayer for the disciples, said, "Sanctify them through the truth—thy word is truth." Again, "He that doeth the truth cometh to the light." "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free," "Ye seek to kill me, a man that told you the truth." "The Spirit of truth will guide you into all truth." "I AM THE WAY, AND THE TRUTH, AND THE LIFE."

Many things are true which, nevertheless, cannot be called the truth. Man lives, thinks, labors, suffers, and dies; this is

true, but it cannot be called the truth. Abraham believed God, Moses led the Israelites, Job was patient; these are truths, but not the truth to which the Son of God bare witness when he said, "I am the way, and THE TRUTH, and the life."

What, then, is Truth? The speculative mind of every age and country has busied itself about the problem. For the stubborn facts of sin, suffering, confusion, and death, obtrude themselves from generation to generation. Within are sore fightings; without are wrathful intimations. How came these here? Is there any insight into decay—any remedy for disorder? The race has roamed and struggled and fainted. From the very beginning, it is the same story over again—nations rising and falling, inequalities, injustice, crime, sorrow in the household, sorrow to the individual, might opposing right and apparently victorious, the fairest schemes blasted, hope deferred, the heart sick, and unavailing tears. At this point history and human consciousness terribly coincide. And amid this chaotic scene the Babel tongues of so-called prophets can be heard on every side saying, "This is the way, walk ye in it." Alas! as experience often shows, these are but "blind leaders of the blind." For nothing, in the highest sense, can be truth to a thoughtful, earnest soul that does not fairly meet, and expound most fully, the conditions of man's existence here, so as to satisfy law, vindicate the Lawgiver, and open up a way of safety to the condemned and guilty creature. Whatever answers this pressing need is, and must be, truth.

In this light, then, has the truth ever been manifested? The divine Law is holy, just, and good; but even this, apart, is not the Truth. For the law is a schoolmaster. It exacts obedience and imposes penalties. Its voice is ever the same—Do and live. Law is a terror to the guilty. It wields a vengeful sword. Written on the heart of man, as well as on the sacred page, are lines which terrify the conscience. There is no truth here to comfort—none to save. On the contrary, under the dispensation of law, both the creature and creation groan. Look whither we may, the curse is visible every where. Here, then, is not the truth to which Jesus bore witness. It is only when



we behold the God-man standing between the law, vengeance and the ruined soul, that truth appears. The truth is not the law, even in its fulness and perfection; but Jesus Christ, the Mediator between God and man, the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth, this is the truth. For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh, that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. The truth, then, is the life and doctrine of Jesus, in their merciful relations to the creature in respect to law. Christ testifies to man's guilt and inability on the one hand, but holds up, on the other, his own infinite sufficiency as a Redeemer and Mediator. The world's conscience finds peace at the cross. Man needs righteousness, and it is provided. To the trembling culprit, upon whose ear breaks the thunder of Sinai, the words of Pilate can every where be addressed, "Behold the man." For One, who was both divine and human, came not simply to vindicate God's broken law, but to bring in also a righteousness whereby a fallen creature can be saved. Christ stands between the parties, an offended Judge and a rebellious subject, and here is the great truth in our wicked, weary, groaning earth. True, Christ doing and dying was a tribute to law; for not one jot or tittle of this could fail. The moral government must be upheld, cost what it may. But this obedience, humiliation, and sacrifice of the King's Son, who was not, and could not be, under law for himself, not only satisfied and upheld a Sovereign's dignity, but the now pacified Lawgiver now sets down the mediatorial act to the credit of the genuine offender. Here, then, is the truth, "If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous." Humanity can lay its burdens upon his shoulders who "suffered the just for the unjust." That Paradise which was lost in Adam, is regained in Christ. The throbbing heart can find an answer to Pilate's question, if it will. And it is this: "Behold the man."

Take any doctrine of the Scriptures, and it arises to the dignity of the truth only when connected with Christ Jesus as its

divine Author. For while the Gospels are a "treatise of all that Jesus began to do and to teach," and the Epistles a progressive development of the truth spoken by the Master, the Old Testament itself draws its inspiration from the same super-human source, "for the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy." Consider repentance, for example. Every man that lives is conscious of shortcoming and ill-desert. And it is clearly the duty of wrong-doers to repent. This statement is experimentally correct. But when we appeal to consciousness and the history of human kind, what do men know of true repentance aside from the witness of Christ? True, there has ever existed, since the days of Cain, a worldly sorrow. Men have wept over sin because of its bitter fruits. But what unenlightened heart ever exercised godly penitence? Despots reign, tyrants and conquerors fill hecatombs with murdered victims, the individual yields to lust and hate; but who ever knew such criminals, or any criminal at all, in the light of nature, "out of the sight and sense, not only of the danger, but also of the filthiness and odiousness of sin, to hate and turn from it?" The law of God written on the heart does indeed smite the guilty soul, but the sorrow of the world works death, for its only source and end is self. Conscience paints a throne of judgment, and the carnal mind trembles at the thought of condemnation. Love for God, appreciative apprehension of a holy law, these do not enter into the account.

A repentance which needs not to be repented of is the truth that Jesus Christ came into the world to bear witness to. He came to open the blind eyes, and to turn them from the power of Satan unto God. "For him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance unto Israel." Hence the words of Ephraim, "Surely after that I was turned I repented, and after I was instructed I smote upon my thigh." When the guilty soul looks upon him "whom it has pierced, and mourns for him as one mourns for his only son, and shall be in bitterness for him as one that is in bitterness for his first-born," it is only then that the fountain of true repentance begins to flow. For Jesus Christ bore witness to the hol-

lowness and insincerity of Pharisaical profession, and pointed to that repentance which has God and truth for its source and object.

Ponder another fact. Man is born to trouble as the sparks fly upward. Not only the creature, but creation itself, travails in pain, and groans to be delivered. The world, in all its generations, has hungered and thirsted and toiled, while wretchedness, in every conceivable form, meets the eye from Adam's time down to the present. This is an amazing, stupendous, appalling record. But it is not the truth to which Jesus bore witness. Such statements are admitted, taken for granted, by the Master, when he says, "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest; learn of me, for my yoke is easy, and my burden is light." Human kind, bewildered by tribulation, are invited to One who bare our sins and carried our griefs. The way to peace and rest for the troubled soul is therefore the truth to which Jesus bore witness.

Once again. The question was asked ages ago, "If a man die, shall he live again?" With the fall came confusion in regard to the soul's immortality. The greatest intellects of the ancient world labored at this problem. Plato reasoned, Socrates half-believed, but after all there remained a doubt. Man's spirit, however, even in its ruins, longs for assurance. The very thought of death is horrible. "Skin for skin, all that a man hath will he give for his life." What a horror of great darkness is the grave, if its silence and gloom quench the light of the spirit forever! But even these wrestlings of awful import was not the truth to which Jesus testified. He came to dissipate the darkness, and to bring life and immortality to light. He preached to the spirits in prison, and said, "If any man keep my saying, he shall never taste death." The Son of Man did not lift some mysterious veil and say, "Yonder, in another world, the soul shall be assured of immortality;" but he said, "He that believeth on me HATH everlasting life." "This is the record that God hath given to us, eternal life, and this life is in his Son." "He that hath the Son hath life." And hence the life that was miserably lost in the first Adam is most gloriously

restored in the second. Federal relations between the first Head and his posterity are complete, and begin with existence. In Adam all died, and the curse is on the child from its very first and feeblest pulsations. But "if by one man's offence death reigned by one, much more they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ." If the curse was instant when disobedience began, surely life cannot be withheld when justification is pronounced. Man lived at the first because of God's favor; he shall live once again, and forever, when that lost favor is regained. Unbelief separated the creature, spiritually, from the great source of his being, and death was the result; faith restores the communion, and the dead soul is alive. Henceforth the believer can never die, for his life is hid with Christ in God, and while Christ lives he must live also. Here, then, is the truth to which the Lord of glory bore witness.

REDEMPTION, therefore, is the great truth of all the ages. Nothing is comparable to this. Jesus Christ is the central figure in the generations of this world. He did for man that which man could not do for himself; and the doing of which constitutes a condition indispensable to eternal life. Here is the leaven that leavens the whole lump; the little seed that groweth up and shooteth out great branches; the stone cut without hands out of the mountain, which is to fill the whole earth. How happy for Pilate, had he reverentially paused for an answer! Could fear and pride have been cast away, what gracious words of truth would have distilled from the Master's lips! But alas! Pilate had no sooner asked the question than he went out again unto the Jews. He stood in the very presence of truth; but the roar of the multitude without blinded the eye, even of a judge. How sad! All the vital truth in this sorrowing world comes through Christ. Search and see. Destroy all literature, but leave the words of Jesus, and no essential truth is lost; but destroy the record which God has given to us in his Son, and no great truth remains. Down, down, steadily down forever, would go the sinning, suffering, struggling soul of man. Poor Pilate! Never did judge enjoy such opportunities; never were they more

fatally and ignominiously thrown away. A Roman procurator was afraid! He said unto Christ, "Art thou a king, then?" Jesus answered, "Thou sayest that I am a king. To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness to the truth. Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice." I am a king, but my kingdom is not of this world; it is not built upon fears and falsehoods, but upon the truth. I came to bear witness to the truth even amid the noise and threats of the angry multitude. Oh, Pilate! with such courage before thee, why art thou a trembling coward! Yes! Christ's kingdom is not of this world. It owes the world nothing. Its agencies are from above. While Pilate speaks and hears, the excited mob without are clamorous. The chief priests and the people cry, "Crucify, crucify." Longer respite is impossible. Malice must be gratified. This man calls himself a king; yea, makes himself the Son of God; and the sentence cannot be delayed. At that saying Pilate is terrified the more. They therefore saith unto Jesus, "Whence art thou?" But the hour is passed, and Jesus gives no answer. Then saith Pilate unto him, "Speakest thou not unto me? Knowest thou not that I have power to crucify thee, and have power to release thee?" Jesus now replies, but his answer only vindicates his own kingly prerogatives. He is greater than a Roman monarch; "but the cup which the Father gave him to drink, shall he not drink it?" He came into the world to "finish the transgression, and to make an end of sin, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness." To this end was he born, and to this end has he lived. The work which the Father gave him to do has been done; and now, when one more great agony is over, redemption is "finished." Henceforth the world's Priest becomes its King. "In the ages to follow, he is to be head over all things to the Church. And he shall reign until he hath put all enemies under his feet." Human governments have their place, but these and all else are subordinate and subsidiary to the great spiritual kingdom. For Jesus Christ is King of kings. The kingdoms of this world are upheld, and move forward, until the elect are gathered and the

harvest of earth is ripe. Cæsar reigns by sufferance, but Jesus Christ by right. For the Lord's Anointed is that Nobleman to whom justly belong all the estates of this world. This shall be manifest when he returns. But in the meantime, and by authority, can every faithful subject say, "All things are mine."

Here, then, is the truth which man, in all ages, needed to know. The creature lost in sin, but Jesus Christ, "The Way, the Truth, and the Life;" a Prophet, Priest, and King; a Sovereign whose "kingdom is an everlasting kingdom," and all dominion shall serve him. This is enough. Pilgrim through this vale of sin, be thy burden what it may, "Behold the Man!" FOR HERE IS TRUTH.

#### ARTICLE VI.

### INAUGURATION OF THE REV. DR. WILSON.

[On the 23d of May, 1871, the Rev. Joseph R. Wilson, D. D., was duly inaugurated as Professor of Pastoral and Evangelistic Theology and Sacred Rhetoric in the Theological Seminary at Columbia, S. C., by the General Assembly in session at Huntsville, Alabama. The Moderator, the Rev. Wm. S. Plumer, D. D., LL. D., presided and conducted the exercises. Dr. Wilson read aloud and subscribed the covenant required by the Constitution of the Seminary. The Rev. Thomas E. Peck, D. D., Professor in Union Theological Seminary, gave the charge to the Professor; and Dr. Wilson then delivered his inaugural address.]

#### DR. PECK'S CHARGE.

I do not know of any reason, my dear brother, why the Assembly has appointed me to this service, when there are so many of its members by whom this office could have been better performed, except that I am connected with another Seminary under the care of the same Church. I have supposed that the Assembly were willing to recognise the very happy fact that these sister Seminaries are one in feeling, and heartily coöperating in the great work for which they were established. I trust it may never be otherwise, that these Seminaries will always

walk hand in hand in mutual love, that there may never be any provocation, but a provocation "unto love and good works"—never any strife but a "striving together for the faith and hope of the gospel."

It would ill become me to assume to instruct you in reference to the duties of your office. All that I can do, all that I ought to do, as it seems to me, is simply to remind you of some of the responsibilities which are now about to devolve upon you. In the first place, my brother, let me remind you that you are called to the great work of training the preachers of the gospel—to train those whose great business it is to be witnesses of Christ and the riches of his grace to lost men. You would scarcely be qualified for the duties of your office, if you had not a profound and abiding conviction that preaching is the ordinance of God; not merely that it is one of the means by which truth may be brought into contact with the minds, hearts, and consciences of men, but that all its real efficacy depends upon the fact that it is God's ordinance; that although it appears foolishness to men, it is "the wisdom of God and the power of God unto salvation;" and that because it is God's ordinance, you are entitled to expect that his blessing will continue to attend it, even to the end of the world; that as speaking was before writing, so this ordinance of preaching has the birthright, and is entitled to the blessing above all other means and agencies which the world or the Church has invented for the diffusion of the truth amongst men. Other departments of labor in the same general sphere are committed to your colleagues in the Seminary. It is the office of some to teach how to interpret the word of God, to open the fountain itself of eternal truth, and by the aids which God has furnished to their hands, to bring out the hidden meaning of the Spirit. It is the office of others to digest and arrange those great truths which are derived by interpretation from the word into a system, didactic and polemic—to teach how to explain and defend the great doctrines of the gospel. It is the office of others to show how this truth has come in conflict with error in the history of the Church, and how God, in spite of all the weakness and sins of his people, and the ministers of the

word, has never suffered the gates of hell to prevail against the Church. It is the office of others still, to show how the truth of God holds its own, and must continue to hold its own, against all the assaults of "science falsely so-called." But all the attainments of the young men in these different departments will avail them nothing, so far as the grand end of preaching is concerned, unless they learn also to *preach*—to communicate the truth they have learned to those to whom God may call them to proclaim the glad tidings of salvation. And it is a part of your office as Professor of this Chair to teach men *how to preach*, to impress upon them the conviction that the pulpit is the ordinance of God.

It is also a part of your office, as the name of your professorship implies, to impress upon them the great fact that all their attainments are nothing, unless they are accompanied with love to Jesus Christ and the souls of men. I understand by the term, "Professor of Evangelistic Theology," not only that you are to help them to prepare to preach the glad tidings of salvation, but to help them to obtain that love without which all attainments in science or theology, or any department, are utterly in vain. They may have all knowledge, they may understand all mysteries, and yet without love which will prompt them to devote themselves wholly to Christ's cause, they are but as sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal. It is a part of your high calling, therefore, to imbue them, so far as the instrumentality of poor mortal man can, with the spirit of missions, with that spirit which will prompt them to hold themselves always in readiness to preach the gospel, not only among the accomplishments and comforts of civilised life, but even to the most savage and degraded nations of the earth. And if you should never do anything more than this, if through the abounding grace of God you should succeed in inspiring the young men committed to your care with this spirit of love of Christ which will make them count their lives not dear unto them, so that they may finish their course with joy and testify the grace of God, you will certainly not have lived in vain.

And now I may ask, as you have been asked before, and have



often asked yourself since you have been in the ministry, "Who is sufficient for these things?" There is no sufficiency in yourself. It will therefore be a part of your duty, and a chief part, evermore to direct your eyes and your heart to "the Father of lights, from whom cometh down every good and perfect gift, with whom there is no variableness, neither the shadow of turning," "who is light, and in whom is no darkness at all," that you also may "walk in the light and have fellowship with him in the truth," that your own soul may be supported by that truth which you teach to others; and that while you are teaching them pastoral theology, giving them valuable hints and maxims for the regulation of their conduct in the ministry of the word, you may always feel that God has made you in part the pastor of their souls, so that you by precept and by example may be the means in the hand of God of "leading them in the green pastures and beside the still waters." May God give you abundant grace for the discharge of all your duties and for your support under all your trials, and bring you at last, with many whom he may make the seals of your ministry, to his heavenly kingdom through Jesus Christ our Lord!

---

DR. WILSON'S INAUGURAL.

*Moderator and Members of the General Assembly, and this Respected Audience:*

If any apology were needed for the perpetuation of the Professorship I have been elected to occupy in your Theological Seminary, it might be found alone in the *power of the pulpit*, and the corresponding necessity that must constantly exist for *training men to wield this power with all possible efficiency*. It would be strange, indeed—it would be criminal—it would be the crime of suicide—were the Church, into whose hands this great agency for good has been committed, to neglect its importance. It is her articulate breath. It constitutes, to an essential degree, her very life. Without it she can have no organisation, and therefore no proper recognition among men. She must main-

tain, she must cherish, she must *magnify*, the pulpit, if she would not jeopard her whole influence over the world, and deny her stewardship of the gospel mysteries.

1. I call attention, first of all, to the strongly suggestive fact that preaching is an institution ordained of *God*. The *Almighty* is its Author; its Author, however, not in the ordinary sense in which we style him the Author of *all* things, but in that higher and more special sense in which we distinctively denominate him the Author of *human redemption*. The pulpit occupies a conspicuous place in the plan of saving grace; *this* place, namely—it is the point where, under the direction of the Holy Ghost, the theology of the Scriptures is *applied* to the hearts and consciences of men. Redeeming love had two leading objects in view: 1st. The devising of a way for procuring the recovery of mankind from the ruin of the fall; and, 2d. The construction of a method for bringing the knowledge of that way home to the thoughts and desires of the race. In other words, it involved the necessity of sending a *Saviour* and required the *proclamation of his sufficiency* to a dying world; it demanded *the cross* and *heralds* of the cross; it saw the equal indispensableness of *Christ's death*, and of making *that death evermore available* to those for whom it was designed. It is true that the entire way of salvation is mapped out in the inspired Scriptures; and therein may thoughtful and prayerful men discover it to their joy. It is true, also, that the third person of the Trinity is he whose essential office it is to enlighten the souls of men in the pursuit and obtainment of Bible truth. But, unless God had determined to set apart persons whose duty it should be to *explain* the word of life, to keep its lessons always fresh before the attention of the world, and to enforce, by the living voice, its sanctions; unless, too, the Holy Ghost were enabled, himself unseen, to employ visible instruments for the discharge of his functions of entreaty, of illumination, and of actual regeneration—it is certain that the Scriptures themselves would soon have ceased to benefit sinners, and that the Spirit would soon have departed from the world with his work undone. Hence it pleased God “by the *foolishness of preaching* to save them that

VOL. XXII., NO. 3.—7.

believe"—a method, we are told, which his own *wisdom* devised for meeting all the exigencies of a case that was otherwise helpless. There was, among the ancient heathen—there is, among men everywhere now—a (*σοφία τῆς φύσεως*), wisdom about natural things, *i. e. philosophy*; but there is a wisdom quite different from this, and far above it—a (*σοφία τοῦ Θεοῦ*), wisdom about God, *i. e. divinity*; and it is *divinity* which God would have men learn, and which he would have them learn through the teachings of men like themselves—in the circumstances, the only available way, it would seem. The treasure must be deposited in "earthen vessels," and thence be drawn for the spiritual enrichment of mankind. It was not enough that *angels* occasionally spake for God; it was not enough that inspired *prophets* and *apostles* delivered the messages of divine mercy and its alternative wrath; it was not enough that *Jehovah himself* uttered his voice from the heavens at fitting times; it was not enough that the *incarnate Lord* preached the good news of eternal life during the period of his mission on earth; nor is it enough that the adorable Spirit has his abode in the Church for the guidance of bewildered souls into the ark of safety. Another agency was additionally demanded. Those *men*, who have themselves tasted of the powers of the world to come; who have themselves become partakers of the grace of pardon; who have themselves known what it is to have "Christ in them the hope of glory;" and who have themselves experienced the toils and trials and triumphs of a believer's good estate—a suitable and chosen number of *these* must be ordained to go through all the world, having their tongues fired with zeal, their hearts melted with sympathy, and their words winged by a love similar to God's own, to proclaim what even *angels* could not so well authenticate, and what spirits from the dead could not so effectively set forth.

In this fact, then, that *God* has selected men—weak, erring, *in themselves nothing*—for the work of the gospel ministry, we discover the fundamental ground of *pulpit power*. It is *his* power. It is, if I may speak so, a muscle in the arm of *Divine Omnipotence*. It is God's specifically chosen instrumentality for the

accomplishment of an end which is dearer to him than any other ; and, because it is so dear, an end for securing which he is employing the *best* (*i. e.* the most *effective*) method. Granted, that he might have used other and different means for obtaining the fruits of his Son's sacrificial atonement. We need not speculate about possibilities. This he *has* resolved to use ; and so, accepting it as a matter of indisputable *fact*, we are at liberty to conclude that it is mighty with the informed energy of *his* might. Hence, "no man taketh this honor unto himself, but be that is called of God, as was Aaron." That old and, in its time, indispensable priesthood, of which the great brother of the scarcely greater Moses was the official head, was unquestionably of divine ordination ; and, as such, was so interwoven with the history and the uses of the Old Testament dispensation, as to constitute its principle feature, its essential safeguard, and a large proportion of its crowning glory. I need not trace the proofs of this, seeing that they are open to any one who is willing to glance, ever so hastily, over the earlier Scriptures. Nor have we now to consider the *grounds* of the divine choice in the case of Aaron and his successors. Those grounds are, indeed, no where mentioned. God's own unexplained *election* contains the ultimate and only assignable reason for the conspicuous distinction conferred upon that illustrious family. But this consideration makes it the plainer that the Lord wished his people to regard *him*, and him *alone*, as the source of an office whose dignity should never be disputed, and whose functions could never be disallowed without entailing untold disaster upon the world. It was an office which, all were to *see*, partook of his *moral power* as truly as it shone with the exhibition of his *wisdom and grace*. Who, indeed, can avoid such a conclusion, when he reflects upon the posture of that by-gone priesthood, so central, so influential, so commanding, so divinely-guarded as it was, even typifying, as it did, the place which our Lord himself was to occupy as the High Priest over all at the very altar of human redemption !

That old dispensation has indeed, as to its *forms*, passed away, but its *principles* remain. There is a priesthood still, (not such

as the papists claim, nor such as formalists of other names count for,) but a *spiritual* priesthood, consisting of God's true people, who are specifically so entitled, and especially of those who, as the leading officers of the elect ones, are clothed with the duty of guiding their devotions, of instructing their faith, of tending their spiritual walk, and of speaking to the world at large the things of a common salvation. This ministering order of men *now* constitutes the most important external element in the religion which is from heaven, as did that ancient priesthood in *its* departed day, and is now even a more important element than then it was, inasmuch as it is the final development of the great idea of the ministerial office, the fruit, of which that was the imperfect flower. As in nature we have first the dawn, then the rising sun, and then the meridian effulgence, so, in the revelation of God's will touching the matter we have now in hand, first, the typical economy of Moses, then the more evangelical prophets, then the coming of the Lord himself in the bright day of gospel fulness; who, having taught the way of life in its clearness, and having finished the work he came to execute, went up to enter upon the glory which he had temporarily left; but who, before he ascended, gave an evangelical ministry to the Church—some to be prophets and apostles who have left no successors, and some to be evangelists, pastors, and teachers, who should remain to the end of time, for the perfecting of saints, and for the edifying of the body of Christ; upon whose hearts he dropped these potential and memorable words: "Go ye and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and lo! I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." Our gospel ministry is, then, of divine authority in the most emphatic meaning of that phrase. If it possess any power, it possesses his whose power is all-pervasive and irresistible.

2. In the second place, I remark that the *actual* power of the pulpit—its practical efficiency—is displayed in the *great themes* it is designed to impress upon the attention and urge upon the belief of mankind. What these themes are, I need

not stop to tell in exhaustive detail. The preacher is appointed to assert the helpless sinfulness of man, to proclaim that Christ's death upon the cross is the only satisfaction for man's sin, to unfold the doctrine of justification by faith in the Son of God; to explain the universal necessity of the heart's new creation by the Holy Ghost; to exhibit the connexion that subsists between true belief and personal holiness; to declare the Almighty's eternal hatred against all iniquity; his love towards the guilty, and the need of an ascended Saviour's constant intercession. Such is that familiar outline of truth which, when spread out, includes the entire scope of the preacher's charge as a herald of the gospel. There are many minor and subordinate topics which it is his office to unfold and to enforce. The whole range of *morality* comes under his purview; and each point of duty that pertains to the complete circle of men's relations and responsibility, he is to touch, to illumine, and to enjoin. But chiefly is it his business to direct souls, condemned to everlasting death, to Him who redeems them unto everlasting life; and having effectively done this, to exhibit to such as shall have been induced to embrace the offered salvation, the divine method which is furthermore ordained for their growth in grace, for their progressive walk in those up-leading paths of holiness that terminate amid the perfection and rewards of heaven. The pulpit deals with human *conscience*, and arouses it to healthy action; with human *will*, and fixes its purposes upon the highest ends of being; with human *motives*, and persuades these to do their noblest office; with human *wants*, and shows where alone they can be met; with human *bereavements*, and exhibits their only solace; with human *existence* altogether, both as it relates to time and eternity, and reveals its true worth, its real dignity, and its sublime meaning. In short, the preacher is the chosen instrument whose commission it is to bring human souls into direct contact with God, and kindle them with desires after the divine likeness whose surpassing beauty they shall have come to admire and to love.

Now, what a *tremendous power* rises to view out of all this! It was appointed to change the customs of the Jews; to bury

forever their ceremonial rites; and to lead them from their pride in Moses to the humility of Christ. And although it was no easy matter to divorce them from that worship upon which, as they fancied, were entailed all the things of dearest regard to mankind, yet the *preaching of the cross* was ordained to do even this, and measurably succeeded. It was appointed, also, to overturn the superstitions of the heathen, as well as to displace the ceremonial traditions of the Hebrews. The wisdom of the philosophic Greeks must cover its face before it; the idolatry of the common people must stoop to it; and the profane customs of men every where must yield under the weight of it. The preaching of gospel truth is ordained to despoil the race of whatsoever the natural affections are most set upon and glory in; to pull self up by the roots; to unman the carnal; to debase the principle of worldliness; and to make it appear that only the service of God is noble and brave; to rust the sword of war; to dispirit every false but specious virtue; and to annihilate whatsoever, independently of God's glory, is esteemed worthy and comely among mankind; to exchange conquest for suffering; the increase of reputation for self-sacrifice; and the natural sentiment of pleasure for the pursuit of true happiness. It is not, indeed, pretended that all this has been accomplished to its fullest extent, else would there be no need of preachers at present or in times to come; nor is it assumed that, to the degree it *has been* achieved, the success of preaching is due to the potency of *man's* efforts, however holy, and earnest, and eloquent he may have proved himself in handling his work. Here is manifestly *God's sufficiency* exerting itself, but exerting itself through the medium of *human agency*; and because it does so, here is an *agency* the most mighty that can be conceived—nothing in itself, but rendered resistless by reason of that informing, controlling, and directing omnipotence, which dwells in this, its *chosen* arm of power. This world is governed, men are potentially moved, not by mere machinery, whether you call it statesmanship, or conventional usage, or time-honored custom, or social fashion—but by *great thoughts*, by diffusing the knowledge of substantial and undying *truths*, by bringing to bear

upon the general mind the operation of *eternal principles of conduct*. To these men yield more promptly than many have been accustomed to suppose, who look only at the surface of the world's life. You have only to examine the causes which effectuated those upheavals of society that have occurred from time to time to be convinced of what I am saying. You have only to look (a familiar example) to the era of the Reformation, to be persuaded of the revolutionary, the transforming, efficacy of those gospel realities, which needed only to be brought to the view of mankind (in the publication of an almost-forgotten gospel) in order to produce an entire change in the current of human history. Those tremendous verities to which the Reformers pointed had been hidden, not lost; smothered, not destroyed; and when the superincumbent mass of superstition was lifted off, they sprang into a fresh life which hundreds of succeeding years have served only to render stronger and more energetic, until now they govern the best portion of the entire world. It has always been, it is at present, because the pulpit is the arena where *great thoughts* had and have their seat—thoughts that are big enough to fill the soul, that penetrate the innermost man, and that move the deepest passions—that it is seen to possess a power of the lordliest description. What is truer than the existence and prevalence of sin; than the condemnation which is imminent over the head of universal guilt; than the wrath of a justly-angry God; and what is better calculated to awaken, alarm, stir to resolution, lead to action? What, too, is truer than the need of repentance, the necessity for supernatural influence in the production of saving faith, the love of God in receiving the worst of men into his restored favor—the whole round of evangelistic doctrine, as it affects, in a hundred ways, the temporal and eternal welfare of mankind? Well, here is the arsenal of the preacher's weapons. Here he finds material for his holy warfare against every species of human woe, and for imparting triumph to every effort for obtaining the whole wealth of human weal! His power is in his *theme*. He is the instrument of *conversion*. Above all other moral agents who are appointed, in the providence of God, to control the hearts of men



he rises the highest, and achieves the most, who best understands how to wield "the truth as it is in Jesus." The able minister of the New Testament is the principal mover and moulder of the society amid which he dwells and labors.

3. A third illustration of the power of the gospel pulpit is found in the fact that it is *universally acknowledged* as a power. There was a day when the preaching of God's word was forced to fight its way into the ranks of those institutions which sway mankind. It still has to do so in countries where Christianity is being for the first time introduced. When the apostles, rising out of their obscure condition, left their nets to become religious leaders, and were themselves left by their Lord at his ascension, to proclaim his kingdom without visible help, they met with an opposition which would have appalled men less resolved to die for the faith that was in them. But that opposition was due to the very fact of their power as public witnesses for Christ. It was because their preaching was "turning the world upside down" that they were persecuted to death. So, indeed, ever since, the antagonism that, time and again, men have shown towards the pulpit, has been a far-sounding recognition of its claim to a place among the potencies of earth. Princes, communities, commonwealths, have dreaded it, because they felt that it was a power *to be* dreaded. Had the pulpit been *weak*, it would not have come under the frown, or been assailed by the sword, of angry authority. Its influence over the minds of men has been at once its source of danger and its source of triumph. In the present day, however, there is, in all civilised countries, a universal acknowledgment of preaching as a power, at the same time *beneficent* and *controlling*. Laws are enacted to protect its free exercise; millions voluntarily wait upon it to receive its instructions; and, over a large portion of the world, there is not a family—there is scarcely a heart—that does not confess its moral sovereignty. It has, under the directing hand of God, made all Protestant countries what they are. It has raised all civilisation to the position it now occupies. Whilst, indeed, it has not been enabled to lay an arresting hand upon all wickedness, it has lifted up a standard around which

all goodness has rallied, and (an all-surviving institution) it is destined to work many a righteous revolution in days to come, which shall more and more rapidly hasten the dawn of millennial glory. An *acknowledged* power like this is greater than it could be if it were yet to win its way into public favor. The preacher is patiently listened to as an *authoritative* herald of salvation, whose speech is weighty because it seems to proceed from a spiritual throne; and whose lessons are entertained because they come clothed with a species of divinity. And he has only to be true to his Master and to his message in order to be honored and followed. So true is this, that the preacher is now in danger from the very popularity of his calling. His pride is apt to be fired by witnessing the hundreds who wait upon his ministry; by beholding the effect of his public deliverances upon the general mind; and by seeing the fruits of converting grace as the result of his labors. He is constrained, almost more than ever, to keep himself in constant recollection of the fact that, after all, he is but the mouth-piece of Another—that other being the Lord of glory; that none of his sufficiency is of himself; and that whatsoever visible agency he exerts upon the hearts of his fellow-men for their temporal and eternal welfare, is an agency whose might resides in an invisible arm that is Almighty, and that graciously and mysteriously works through *his nothingness* to the pulling down of Satan's strongholds.

Accordingly, the companies of preachers who have gone forth, from time to time, from the schools of divinity have proved stronger than all military battalions which successful ambition has hurried from conquest to conquest. Had the apostles borne the doctrines they proclaimed upon the points of their swords, as Peter would have done, if permitted, and handed down both their spiritual doctrines and their carnal swords to those who have succeeded them, with the injunction to employ both with equal urgency—the world this day would have presented a far different scene from that which it actually presents. The design of the preacher is to change human hearts, not human governments; to bestow life, not to take it away; to ransom, not to enslave. They have a warfare to wage, not indeed with carnal

weapons, but with such as are mighty, through God, for the pulling down of strongholds. Their arms and their doctrine are the same. Others may extend opinion by the strength of human reason, and by the insinuating graces of mere eloquence. But true preaching, that which has always prevailed and still prevails, has derived, and can derive, no efficiency from the enticing words of man's wisdom. It conquers by carrying in its published truth, (a truth, too, distasteful to the world,) the demonstration of the Spirit. Its powers are those of the world to come—are supernatural. And no wonder its triumphs have been many, and constant, over all the force and wit of earth. I have not now time to record those triumphs. They are known to all. From the memorable hour when 3,000 hearts melted underneath the pervasive fire of Peter's plain declarations of gospel doctrine at Pentecost, until now, that doctrine has spread, from the lips of its heralds, over a large portion of the world, against all opposition, and despite all efforts to stay its progress. In less than twenty years after the ascension of our Lord, there was not a province of the Roman empire, and scarce any part of the known world, which the early preachers had not penetrated, and wherein they did not leave multitudes of professing believers. And ever since, by precisely the same methods, Christianity has gone from victory to victory upon the breath of pulpit proclamation; so that it has become that acknowledged power before which all other power is compelled to bow its head.

Proceeding, then, upon the idea that the preaching office is a special ordination of God, and presents itself to the world clothed with power derived immediately from its divine Author, it shall be my purpose to impress such of the rising ministry as it shall be my duty to assist in preparing for their great work, with the vast importance of the trust that is being committed into their hands; to instruct them as to the nature of the ministerial call; as to the distinguishing peculiarities of the ministerial character; as to the greatness of the ministerial obligations; to make them see the necessity for a warm and augmenting piety, livelier and loftier than that of other men; for a large, liberal, and exact scholarship of such a sort as shall give

the sacred desk a more commanding influence than press or platform, at the same time that it does not withdraw its occupants in the least from sympathy with the commonest or rudest of their fellow-men; for an acquaintance, above all, with *Scripture*, at once profoundly learned and deeply experimental; to show them, by calling upon the experience of the pulpit in all ages, how best they can learn to preach, to expound, to exhort, with God's word as the one source from which to draw the power of every argument, the lesson of every exercise, the urgency of every motive; to unfold to their view the kind and the degrees of that noble oratory which they will be expected to employ in exhibiting and enforcing the truths of revelation upon their hearers; to lead them into a discovery of the meaning and importance of the *pastoral* office as an indispensable auxiliary to the *preaching*; to explain the duty of catechetical and other methods of religious instruction intended especially for the young; to open up the department of casuistry, and conduct them to a knowledge of such cases of conscience as are most likely to fall to their professional treatment; to traverse with them the whole field of evangelistic labor, as distinguished from the locally ministerial, and embracing in its widest extent the entire scope of foreign missionary effort; and to do whatever else may serve to fit the successive classes of candidates for the sacred office they are seeking for a workmanship that shall neither make them ashamed, nor detract from the glory of that ever-blessed Master whose servants they are; nor give the Church reason for deploring the day when she founded the Theological School which I am at this moment representing.

Oh, may the time soon come, whose coming will show to the world many more of pulpits than now we have, occupied by "men of God" in the highest sense; of zeal, apostolic; of intelligence, the most masculine, transfused with a love and faith the most energetic and vital; fountains of light; centres of power; men whose speech, fired from heaven, shall be felt to be genuine, true, humane, suggestive, pregnant, creative of all good; men who, understanding at once their message and the advanced times for which they have been raised up to wield its

various power, shall so stimulate and guide human thought in matters of religion as to swell and direct the undergrowth of forces in the rising race in a manner which will rapidly prepare the way for those abounding future results which are to issue in the speedy dawn of that long-looked-for latter day glory which alone is able to satisfy the hopes of an expectant Church!

## CRITICAL NOTICES.

*The Atonement, in its Relations to the Covenant, the Priesthood, the Intercession of our Lord.* By the Rev. HUGH MARTIN, M. A., Member of the Mathematical Society of London. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co., No. 710, Arch Street. New York: J. Inglis & Co., 21 Clinton Place. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1871. 12 mo., pp. 288.

This work, as its title indicates, does not profess to be a systematic treatise on the great subject which it discusses. The atonement is viewed in certain of its aspects and relations. These, however, involve the elements which are most essential to it, and they are handled with a vigor of thought, an originality of conception, and a fervor of spirit, which entitle the work to be regarded as a positive accession to the literature of the subject. The book contains ten chapters. The first is occupied with a discussion of the relations of the atonement to the covenant of grace. The author takes the valid ground that it ought never to be viewed apart from these relations, that it belongs to the category of the covenant, and is conditioned and limited by the very nature of the arrangements which the covenant embraces. The chief purpose of this line of thought is to show that the Atonement must be definite in its design. It contemplates the case of those who are the beneficiaries of the covenant. He cordially commends the views of Principal Cunningham, and ably combats those of Dr. Ralph Wardlaw. In the second chapter, the writer pursues the discussion of the federal relations of the atonement; remarks upon the notorious fact that the writers of the present day who oppose the evangelical and catholic position invariably discount those relations; vindicates a federal theology; and proves the scripturalness and necessity of the doctrine of the covenant. The third chapter treats the Atonement as conditioned by the priestly office and work of Christ. The author contends—

and we concur with him—that among the mediatorial offices, that of priesthood is fundamental and paramount. He shows that the atonement ought never to be discussed apart from the sacerdotal office of Christ; expounds the doctrine of the intrinsic nature of priesthood; and then turns this scriptural idea of the atonement as having been offered by a priest acting officially and representatively with desolating edge against the old heresy of Socinus, and the new heresies of Jowett, Maurice, Young, Robertson, and Bushnell. The fourth chapter is directed to the proof of the priestly action of Christ as essential to the atonement. The author insists that no other view presents any true conception of the atoning work of the Saviour; shows the reasons why this truth has been overlooked; exhibits the scriptural evidence for it; and, in accordance with his plan, uses it as an aggressive weapon, and uses it with deadly effect against the theory of Socinianism, of self-sacrifice, of moral influence, and of governmental display. The fifth and sixth chapters discuss the intimate relation between atonement and intercession. The remarks of the author on this subject are frequently profound and suggestive. He shows the necessity of the view insisted on in the preceding chapters, that Christ was a priestly actor in his atoning sufferings, in order to a comprehension of his intercessory functions; and he finds in this fact the bond of unity between his atonement and his intercession. The priest offers the sacrifice in the earthly courts, and presents, in pursuance of his unbroken priestly action, the memorials of that sacrifice in the holy of holies on high. In this portion of the discussion he powerfully brings to bear against the theories of errorists, which assume the mere passivity of Christ in suffering, and the influence his exemplary heroism and love are suited to exert on men, the essential element of Christ's priestly functions that he acts for men in things pertaining to God. His priestly office looks Godward, and not merely manward. And accordingly he propitiates the Deity by the sacrifice which he offers to him for the sins of men. The author then employs the scriptural idea of priestly intercession to demolish the fancy that the work of Christ is intended chiefly to exert a moral influence. The inter-

cession, from its very nature, presents an objective plea grounded in the propitiatory facts of atonement. This must be admitted unless it be true that the priesthood of our Lord is not real but metaphorical. This hypothesis is dismissed as absurd, for the simple reason that a figure must be founded in reality, and there is no reality to ground the figure of Christ's priesthood but the literal priesthood of the ancient dispensation. But this would be to make a literal high-priest the type of a metaphorical high-priest—the real the type of the figurative, the substance the type of the shadow. This would be to invert the relation of the two Testaments with a vengeance. In the seventh and eighth chapters the author treats of the relation between atonement and the remission of sin. His purpose is to prove that the very end of atonement is to secure the remission of guilt; and that, whatever else it accomplishes, if this be wanting, it signally fails. There can neither be remission without atonement, nor atonement without remission. He takes the ground that whenever a valid atonement is offered, this end is infallibly reached. In proof of this position he cites the expiations of the Old Testament. Those for whom the priest officiated—and they were definite persons—received the actual remission of guilt. The conclusion he establishes is that a subjective influence on men is not the only result which the atonement of Christ secures. It directly affects their legal relations and standing. Thus, from another point of view, the false theories which he combats are shown to be without scriptural foundation.

The discussion in the eighth chapter, on "the counter-imputations of sin and righteousness," is a noble testimony to the old Calvinistic doctrine as to what has been called "the blessed exchange"—the imputation of his people's guilt to Christ, and the imputation of his vicarious righteousness to his people. He vindicates the position that he was made sin, and not a mere sin-offering. The ninth chapter contains a crushing review of the theory of the atonement advocated by Robertson of Brighton. That theory is that Christ acted in obedience to the natural, the universal law of vicarious sacrifice, in accordance with which one being suffers for the benefit of others. It denies that



He assumed legal liability for sinners, and scouted the notion as monstrous that he experienced the wrath of God in place of the guilty. He represented the love of God to men, and prompted by his own magnanimous spirit of self-sacrifice threw himself into connexion with the complicated evils of the world. But, alas! he ventured a little too far in the spirit of daring. "He approached the whirling wheel, and was torn in pieces!" He was thus at last helplessly victimized. The views which the author has previously maintained, especially that which regards Christ as having been a voluntary, cheerful, triumphant, priestly actor in his last sufferings, are thrown against this rhetorical jargon with annihilating effect. We cannot refrain from expressing, with the author, our astonishment at the admiration manifested by professedly evangelical writers for what he severely but justly characterises as "a lamentable compost of unintentional blasphemy and theological ignorance." The last chapter discusses the relation of the atonement to moral law. The author signalises the distinction between law as moral and as physical, as objective and authoritative, and as subjective and informal; and in the light of this determination overthrows the theories of Maurice and Robertson, which proceed on the supposition that the atonement of our Lord was not rendered in compliance with the demands of an external rule which had been violated, but flowed naturally from the subjective laws of being—the laws of love, sympathy, and self-sacrifice.

Having given this outline of the contents of the work, we are prepared to express our estimate of its merits. We regard it not only as eminently suited to the times, but as marked by profound thought and convincing logic, and as exhibiting a clear apprehension of the inner mysteries of redemption. It is by no means an ordinary production. We cordially commend it to the study of those who are young in the ministry, and those who are preparing to preach the gospel. There are two things which we especially admire in the book, and which chiefly lead us to recommend it thus warmly. The first is its earnest, able advocacy of a federal theology; the second is the prominence it gives to the great truth that Christ was as a priest an actor in

his death as well as his life. A federal theology, and the priestly activity of the Saviour in his sufferings, thoroughly held and thoroughly preached, would save our people from the danger of being beguiled by the humanitarian and degrading views of the atonement which, under the sanction of imposing names, are obtaining currency in the Protestant world. In the sphere of doctrine, the main assaults of infidels out of the Church and infidels in the Church are levelled against the plenary inspiration and external authority of the Scriptures, and against the atonement as the central and most vital fact of Christianity. It is just such views as are urged with so much ability in this work which are required to meet the latter of these dangers. We rejoice that Scotland is speaking out so clearly on these points. They are not altogether new to us, although "Abraham be ignorant of us, and Israel acknowledge us not." We have been accustomed to the preaching of them, and trust the day may never come when we shall be ashamed to testify for them in the face of a traitorous Rationalism—a Rationalism which conjures with the name of Jesus, but strips his person of its glory, and his cross of its power.

We have been so greatly delighted by the thorough-going views of the gospel which the author has presented in this volume, and the distinguished ability with which he has refuted popular heterodox theories in regard to the atonement, that we are reluctant to offer a single unfavorable criticism. Candor, however, constrains us to express a different opinion from that which he announces—on pages 31–33—in reference to the maintenance of doctrinal phraseology consecrated by immemorial usage. He regards it as of little consequence what terms be employed, so long as the substance of the truth is retained. We think he concedes too much to the popular demand for novelty and variety. The fact that certain terms are given us in the Scriptures, that they are inspired terms—God's own language—is enough to prove the wisdom of using them and the folly of departing from them. And if the allusion be to those phrases which the Church has employed to signalise truth in contrast with error, we still think that it would be a disastrous

policy to abandon them. They are the flags of the column by which it is discriminated from an opposing force. Nothing is ultimately gained by the suppression of objectionable terms for the purpose of conciliating opponents, provided they are true and are employed with scriptural sobriety. It is better to cling to the old landmarks. Remove them, and we shall not know our neighbor's ground from our own. "Hold fast the form of sound words."

*Letters from Rome on the Council by Quirinus.* Reprinted from the *Allgemeine Zeitung*. Authorised Translation, Rivingtons: London, Oxford, and Cambridge. Pott & Amery: New York. 1870. Pp. 856. 12 mo.

Three friends in Rome belonging to different nations and different classes in life, all familiar through long residence in Rome with persons and things there, and all in free daily intercourse with members of the Council, addressed these letters jointly to a fourth friend in Germany, who added historical explanations and then sent them forward to the *Allgemeine Zeitung*. Much of the materials of these letters were communicated by the bishops of the minority, who were desirous of securing publicity in this way for these materials. These letters, therefore, constitute a chronicle reflecting the opinions and feelings of this minority. Some articles from the *Allgemeine Zeitung* are prefixed to the letters, bearing on the previous history of the Council. Both the letters and the articles are exclusively the work of Catholics. The work has created the greatest sensation, both in and out of Germany.

No student of Church History can fail of being profoundly interested in this volume; and no Protestant theologian of being instructed by its perusal. Whoever its authors, and whatever is to be said of their views regarding the Papacy of to-day, their acquaintance with the history of that of the past is intimate and complete. Perhaps the strongest, amongst many deep impressions which the work has made upon our own minds, is that of wonder at the degree of prevalence which just and right views had amongst the minority in the Council. We own, all

Protestants as we are, to a powerful sympathy with Archbishop Kenrick, of St. Louis; with Strossmayer, Hefele, Dupanloup, Darboy, the late venerable Archbishop of Paris, victim of Communist brutality, Conolly, Schwarzenberg, and Rauscher, in their steadfast defence of the rights of the Bishops as against the Pope, and their demands for a free Council of the whole Church, which were all so vainly made. And so the authors of these letters attract us powerfully to themselves as advocates of what might be called a Reformed Popery. The work is no doubt, as it professes, written by Catholics, but we often rubbed our eyes as we read, and asked ourselves if they must not be Protestants in disguise.

Our notice of this remarkable book must be brief, and we proceed to tell what it says:

I. Of Pope Pius IX. Former Popes have had their hobbies; some to aggrandise their own families; some, like Sextus VI., for building; some, like Leo X., for fostering art; some, like Julius II., for waging war; some, like Benedict XIV., for composing long Bulls full of quotations. But Pius IX.'s hobby is to make dogmas—the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary some years back, and now the Infallibility of the Pope. All the more wonderful is this idiosyncrasy from his having hitherto kept aloof from theology, and, as one always hears, not being in the habit of ever reading theological books. It is the Jesuits who rule him, and they have created and fostered in him this passion for dogma-making. Pp. 157, 158. The Pope is seldom left alone lest he should fall under the influence of others who judge more correctly of the situation of the modern world, and the real wants of the Catholic Church. He lives in an artificial atmosphere of homage poured forth by the ultramontane journals. P. 19. The Jesuits expect to be driven from the helm after his death, and, therefore, with their overwhelming majority in the preparatory congregation, are pressing for infallibility, to make out of it capital for themselves. P. 18. Pius is persuaded that he is ordained by the special favor of God to be the most glorious of Popes. P. 300. He says, from a child, and still more as Pope, he has always placed his whole confidence in

the Mother of God, and is under her special guidance and grace, and stands in a peculiar mystical relation to her, and she guides the Council through him, and is to give, in this way, a fatal blow to the heresies of this day. Pp. 223, 224. It is notorious at Rome that Pius IX. is beneath comparison with any one of his predecessors at Rome for the last 350 years in theological knowledge and intellectual cultivation generally. Small as are the intellectual requisites for ordination in the Roman States, it was only out of special regard for his family that Giovanni Maria Mastai could get ordained priest. P. 502. Every one here would think it a joke to call Giovanni Maria Mastai a learned theologian. P. 687. He became Pope with the feeling of his entire deficiency in the necessary acquirements. This naturally produced the idea that his defects would be remedied by enlightenment from above. Accordingly, he now declares that he *feels* his infallibility, (pp. 132 and 565,) and speaks otherwise in the most emphatic terms. For example, he refers to his infallibility as "that pious doctrine which, for so many centuries, nobody questioned," and no doubt uses the expression in good faith. But he has not acquired this notion by any study of his own, but has been deluded by this monstrous lie, which a mere glance at the official Roman historians Baronius, Orsi, or Saccarelli will show to be such. P. 667.

II. Of the Council itself. It was not a free assembly like those of the ancient Church, but the mere painted corpse of a Council laid out on a bed of state. P. 273. Formerly theologians used to say that the voice of a General Council is the voice of the whole Church concentrated in one place; that each bishop was a witness to the traditional belief of his Church and of his predecessors; and that the harmony of these testimonies proved what was the universal belief. Now all is changed. The bishops came without knowing at what they were to vote about; long ready-made documents were laid before them on questions which most of them had never examined; and they were to vote decrees and pronounce anathemas because the Pope and the Jesuits willed it. P. 229. The Council of Trent arranged the order of business for itself. In this Council everything was

pre-arranged and imposed on the Council by the Pope. No initiative was allowed the bishops. The Commission for examining motions was formed of the hottest infallibilists and members of the *Curia*, and the final decision reserved for the Pope. Pp. 293, 294. For the first time since Councils came into being, the bishops have been robbed of their essential and inalienable right of free speech on questions of faith; compelled to vote, but not allowed to give reasons for their votes. They could hand in written observations, but only the commission of twenty-four would know anything about them. Then the work carefully matured by a bishop through weeks or months of severe study would be reported on in two or three words by this Committee—an hundred of these memorials summarily reported on together! P. 365. If a bishop is attacked or calumniated he cannot answer till his turn comes, which is not often for weeks—as was Archbishop Kenrick's case. But the members of the Deputation speak whenever they choose, and interrupt order at their pleasure. P. 577. This depriving the bishops of their right of speaking, and violently imposing silence upon them, overthrows the nature of a free Church Council. P. 685.

Again, the Council was forced to hold its meetings in a hall where no speaker could be heard, which, in a city abounding like Rome in churches and halls, seemed an act of caprice. P. 319. On the 2d of February the Pope was petitioned for a more suitable chamber, but the Papal officials answered, "We neither desire nor need discussion, but only voting." Whereupon Archbishop Darboy said, "We are called in to anathematise doctrines and persons; to pass sentence of spiritual death. But would any jury in the world pronounce capital sentence without having first heard the defence?" P. 226. The prelates are obliged to sit for hours in this comfortless chamber without understanding what is said. A sense of time unprofitably wasted is the only result of many a sitting for men to whom at home every hour is precious for the care of a large diocese. P. 362.

Again. Nine-tenths of the prelates were condemned to silence simply from being unable to speak Latin readily and coherently.

through want of regular practice; to which must be added the diversity of pronunciation. Frenchmen or Italians could not understand an Englishman's Latin, even for a minute. P. 63.

Again. Of some eight hundred members of the Council, the majority of six hundred were simply creatures of the Pope. P. 128. Three hundred of these were bound to him by a special tie, as the *Civiltà* of January 1st reminded them, *i. e.*, they depended on him for food and lodging. Many of the bishops, drawn to Rome from Asia, Africa, Australia, and even from Europe, that journal said, were "*poverissimi*." P. 125. Besides these three hundred, there were some one hundred titular bishops with no dioceses or flocks; and as many more vicars—apostolic or missionary bishops—equally representatives of nobody but themselves, and so having no testimony to give on the part of any Church, (p. 118); and as many more who said, "The *Curia* has us in its power, and we need it at every step; the Pope must be infallible, since he desires it." Thus, we have some five hundred and fifty born infallibilists. Pp. 320, 321. According to the official Roman register, fifty-one bishops *in partibus* were named between June, 1866, and August, 1869. By every one of these creations the Pope has neutralised, by his own plenary power, the vote of an Archbishop of Paris or Vienna—in other words, he has put some favorite Roman *monsignore* on an equality, as regards the decisions of the Council, with a venerable Church containing more than a million of souls. P. 335.

Again. The Catholics of North Germany had but one vote in the Council for every 810,000 souls, while those of the States of the Church had one for every 1,200; so that one Roman outweighs sixty Germans. P. 275. Thus the 700,000 inhabitants of the Roman States are represented by sixty-two bishops, and the Italians form half or two-thirds in every commission. It is true, the sixty-two bishops of this chosen land and people have not succeeded in restoring the most moderate standard of morality in their little towns and villages; there are still whole communities and districts notoriously in league with brigands. And it would seem a recognised principle, that the more ignorant a

people the greater the share which their hierarchy must have in the government of the Church! Here in Rome you may find a lottery dream-book in almost every house; but never a New Testament, and extremely seldom any religious book at all. It is difficult to form a notion of the ignorance of these Latins in all historical questions, and their entire want of that general cultivation which is assumed with us [in Germany] as a matter of course in a priest or bishop. There is not in all Italy one single real Theological Faculty, except in Rome. Spain gets on equally without any higher theological school, or any theology; yet here at the Council some hundreds of Italians and Spaniards are masters, and are appointed teachers of doctrine and dictators of faith for all nations belonging to the Church. Pp. 140, 141, 142.

Again. A very large portion of the Council itself were ignorant men. The Pope has one hundred theologians, chiefly monks; but if all were pounded together in a mortar into one theologian, even this one would find some difficulty in getting his claims recognised in Germany. These so-called theologians cannot even read the New Testament and the Greek Fathers and Councils in the original language. And as to the theology of many bishops, one is often reminded of the daughters of Phoreys, who had only one eye and one tooth which they lent to each other by turns to use. P. 95. Rome never was a favorable soil for serious study and true learning. Where are men of distinguished learning to be found amongst the Dominicans, Carmelites, Cistercians, and Franciscans of our own day? Among the forty-one Italian Cardinals, only two are named as theologians, the Thomist Guidi and the Barnabite Lulio. No less lamentable is the view presented by the philosophical, mathematical, and philological departments. There is here an intellectual sirocco; a deep decay, and an intellectual collapse. This does not trouble our Roman clergy of to-day. They institute no comparisons, and don't even know the names of the men who dwelt in the same spot a century ago. Pp. 231-238.

III. Want of space prevents our quoting the estimate given in full in these letters of the necessary consequences and effects



of the new dogma. Proclaimed without the moral unanimity always hitherto reckoned essential to the decree of a Council, as well as manufactured evidently by dishonorable means, it must fail of being accepted amongst Catholics themselves, and meanwhile it must tend to bring all decrees of all past Councils under suspicion. At the same time the effects of it upon the relations of the Romish Church to the various governments of the earth cannot but be very serious. In Russia, in Great Britain, in the United States and other countries, as many able speakers pointed out in the Council, there must be political jealousy excited; for the now infallible Pope claims to be Christ's vicegerent over the whole world, and all his now infallible decisions and claims must be heard and obeyed by Catholics as the voice of God.

*Treatise on Regeneration.* By WILLIAM ANDERSON, LL. D. Glasgow. Second Edition. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co. 1871. 300 pp.

“The substance of this treatise,” says our author in his preface, “was originally delivered in the form of discourses from the pulpit—a circumstance which accounts for the strain of personal address and appeal by which it is characterised;” and, we may add, renders the work eminently practical and suited to the general reader, as well as to theological students. It is evidently the result of profound metaphysical study, of thorough Biblical research, of extensive and careful observation, of deep experimental piety. The writer has the happy art of combining the abstract with the concrete. He conducts you into the tangled forests of metaphysics and psychology, from which you suddenly emerge into a landscape of striking illustrations. He is equally happy in uniting the practical with the speculative. You never lose sight of his fervent piety, which, like a refreshing stream, flows as deeply and as broadly through the dark recesses of philosophy, as in the open sunlight of practical discourse. The treatise is designed to be exhaustive, and we can conceive of no aspect of the subject which he has not thoroughly dis-

cussed. We can ask no question to which he does not return an answer, though we may not always regard it as scriptural.

In his introductory remarks, he observes that the doctrine of regeneration is more offensive to the natural heart than that of the atonement, inasmuch as it inculcates more forcibly the total depravity of man's nature, the necessity of holiness, and brings the soul into closer contact with God. In the chapter on the Nature of Regeneration, he shows that the change respects the person, not his relations; the mind, not the body, except as the renewed mind controls the body; the affections and passions of the will, not the understanding, except as the moral nature reacts upon the intellectual; and, finally, the qualities of the mind, not its substance. The change is *functional*, not organic, imparting a new *direction* to all the fallen powers. There is no mystery in the change itself, but only in the agency by which it is effected. He "protests against a mystical theology, which has a tendency to put men on the search when examining their spiritual condition for something mysteriously new imparted to the heart. The consequence is either fanaticism or disheartening perplexity."

He adopts the privative theory in relation to original sin. "In respect to the primogenitor of our race, there are three things distinguishable in his case at creation: first, his mind made fervent in its passions for wise ends of active exertion; second, his body made importunate in its appetites, for similar ends of activity, and the procreation of the species; and third, an annexed regulating influence of the Spirit of God, but so annexed as to be resistible, or rather rejectable, that he might have the character of an accountable agent." In consequence of the loss of the regulating influence of the Spirit, "the mind not only rushed into all disorder under the force of its own powers, like a machine deprived of its regulator; but became an enslaved victim of the flesh. This state is expressively denominated in the Scripture, *carnal-mindedness*; and if Adam was ever redeemed from it, it was only through the regulation of the Spirit having been recovered for him by the mediation of the promised seed."

“In respect of Adam’s *offspring*, the original law of the Creator was, that his *fiat*—his command for the formation of an accompanying soul—should constantly go forth on the occasion of every case of corporeal generation.” “And since all minds proceed directly from the formative hand of God, they are, in the first instance, pure and unperverted.” “Though the soul proceeds from God in a state of purity, yet the *fiat* for its formation, according to the original constitutional law, having been evoked by the act of a rebel, and for a rebel’s issue—as a judgment of righteous government on rebellion, there is no communication concurrently made of the regulating influence of the Spirit; the consequence of the withholdment or privation is, that the soul, even without the enticements of the flesh, would run into disorder; so that even the soul of a child, should it die in infancy, must obtain regeneration, which consists in the bestowment of the Spirit, before it be admitted into the kingdom of God.”

In discussing the instrumental agency of the truth in regeneration, he maintains that faith is a simple, not a complex act of the mind. The distinction between a speculative or historical belief of the understanding, and the cordial belief of the heart, between a theoretical and practical infidelity, he pronounces “vain and baseless.” He argues on scriptural and metaphysical grounds that the assent of the understanding always carries with it irresistibly the corresponding movement of the affections. It is impossible to believe a thing to be true without feeling its force, and practically acting upon it.

If, by simplicity of faith, be meant that in the case of a true believer, the convictions of the understanding carry with them the affiancement of the heart and the consent of the will, then it must be admitted that faith is simple. But this is only saying that in a renewed soul the faculties act in harmony, and that thought, feeling, and volition, while logically distinct, are chronologically one—to believe is to feel, and to feel is to act. Hence the Scriptures speak of the “desires of the mind” and an “understanding heart.”

But if by simplicity of faith we are to understand that the

faith which rests on external evidence and the testimony of consciousness is essentially practical and experimental, then we reply that the statement contradicts Scripture, metaphysics, and facts.

So far as the testimony of Scripture is concerned, it seems to us perfectly clear that they speak of a "dead faith," as well as a living faith; a "faith of devils," as well as the faith of God's elect.

Looking at the subject metaphysically, while it is true that, in a rightly constituted mind, the affections follow the judgment and knowledge produces love, it should be remembered that we are dealing with the soul under the power of the fall, which has disturbed its original harmony, divorcing the intellectual and moral faculties, by destroying the bond of holiness. It is one of the most fearful effects of sin that there is now no necessary connection between the intellectual and moral convictions. Hence we find a large class of intellectual believers in Christianity professing to accept it in its most orthodox form, who yet exhibit no corresponding moral character.

Now, the faith of the gospel heals the breach between the mental and moral nature, restoring their original harmony, uniting them, as it were, in the marriage bond of holiness, the fruit of which is love to God and man. It is also contrary to fact that faith is simple in this sense. Simon Magus believed while he was in the "gall of bitterness and bonds of iniquity." Dr. Scott preached for years with a bare intellectual faith.

We conclude, then, that there is a barren, dead, intellectual faith, independent of that saving faith which is the gift of God, imparting to the mind a spiritual discernment of the beauty and excellence of the truth. We admit, of course, that it does not deserve the name of faith. We repeat, it is one of the saddest results of the fall, that a rational immortal creature can look all the great facts and realities of revelation in the face, and experience no practical influence upon the heart and life other than a temporary joy or hopeless despair, an external morality or religious formalism.

Our author maintains, with great zeal and power, the direct

personal agency of the Spirit in regeneration. But the Spirit imparts no *force* to objective truth ; nor any supernatural power to discern the *meaning* of the truth ; nor a holy *disposition*, antecedently to the presentation of the word to the mind, so that it is prepared to *relish* its truth, and thereby be induced to believe them. He reprobates this error, he says, not only because it is unscriptural and unphilosophical, but because it "impugns his professional character ;" for if the disposition is already prepared for receiving the simple statement of the truth, where is the necessity of preaching, of argument, and appeal ?

This is evidently a misapprehension of the doctrine of the old divines, founded on isolated passages and expressions. Char-nock, Owen, Goodwin, and Bates, the Puritan divines of England, Calvin, Turretine, Spanheim, and Stapfer, the Reformed divines of Germany and Holland, never taught that a "holy disposition was produced by the Spirit, antecedently to the presentation of the truth." When they speak of a "holy habit, disposition, principle, spiritual sense," they mean nothing more than the restoration of the image of God to the love which essentially consists in *holiness*, which imparts to the understanding a spiritual discernment, to the heart holy desires and affections, to the will a holy inclination. In the Scriptures it is termed "life," and the old divines held that this new life was produced by and through the word, which lies as a lifeless "seed" in the mind, until "quickenened" by the Spirit. They held that faith was the act of a regenerated soul, but that revealed truth was the instrument of regeneration. There is no cordial acceptance of the truth until the soul perceives its excellence and beauty, which only a soul renewed in holiness is capable of perceiving. This is not unscriptural, for the Scriptures speak of holiness as a divine life, of which faith is a spiritual act. It is not unphilosophical, for as there is a principle of vegetable, animal, and intellectual life, why should there not be a principle of spiritual life ? And how can a soul, "dead in sin," exercise saving faith, or any spiritual act, until brought to life ?

Nor does this view of the doctrine preclude the agency of

preaching, for the Spirit operates only where the truth is presented and thus brought to bear upon the heart and conscience.

Dr. A. modestly suggests that there may be a sacred avenue, a *via sacra*, belonging to the original constitution of the mind, which the Creator reserves for his own sovereign use. In the phenomena of dreaming, of somnambulism, of febrile excitement, and of mesmerism, we have instances of mental faculty and susceptibility, which rebuke the vulgar limitation of its powers to what we perceive in its common and every-day exercises. "But," he concludes, "I affirm nothing further than the fact, revealed by the divine testimony, that there is a direct work of the Spirit on the mind in causing the belief of the word, without my having any understanding of the nature of the operation." We do not apprehend that any metaphysical theory will affect the practical force of this conviction. The writer also makes an important distinction between the *providence* of the Spirit and his *inspiration* work—the former ordering favorable circumstances for arresting attention, and disposing the mind to the reception of the truth; the latter producing and maintaining the life of faith.

We have not space to notice his admirable chapters on the necessity of regeneration: its characteristics, manifestations, and development. Every subject is treated in the same exhaustive, logical, and illustrative style. We regard the treatise as, on the whole, the best that has yet appeared, and especially commend it to the careful perusal of the young minister and student of theology.

*Prayers for the use of Families, chiefly selected from various Authors; with a Preliminary Essay, together with a Selection of Hymns.* By Rev. ALBERT BARNES. New revised edition. Philadelphia: Charles Descher, &c., &c., &c. 1871. Pp. 360. 12mo.

This selection of prayers and hymns for family use appeared first in 1850, and is now reissued in plain dress and designed, by a combination of numerous publishers, to be brought into exten-

sive use. The prayers appear to be very good ones, but we should say are rather long for the use of families, and there are altogether too many of them. So with the selection of hymns, it is entirely too full, and contains very many which never will be used at family worship. The sweetness and power of prayers, and of hymns too, so far as concerns the parties using them, depends very greatly upon sacred associations of thought and feeling; and therefore familiarity is one necessary element of their usefulness. It is the old oft-repeated prayer or psalm which is most affecting and edifying.

“To adapt these prayers” of Jay, Jenks, and others, “to our times,” the compiler has frequently inserted, as he tells us, a paragraph of his own. These refer frequently to Sunday-schools and other Christian efforts for spreading the kingdom of Christ. Mr. Barnes did not, however, believe much in Church action, and so it is “missionary, tract, Bible, and education societies” he would have our families to pray for. He has a preliminary essay on prayer, in which the family organisation is continually held up to view, but never, so far as we observe, in its relation to *the Church* with which it ought always to be viewed as so directly connected. Having been an earnest Abolitionist, we looked, of course, to see some reference to the wild ideas of that school respecting equal rights for all men to equal things, and were not disappointed.

At the time he first published this collection, Mr. Barnes was under condemnation amongst Old School Presbyterians as unsound upon some vital doctrines of the Christian scheme. He lived a score of years after this, but never cleared his name of this imputation, so far as we know, by any word spoken or written. He has since passed out of this world, and gone, as we trust and believe, to that world where all films are removed from the eyes of good men. His works which live after him are entitled, however, to no such charity as shall blind our eyes to their errors and defects. And we hold that when once a religious teacher publishes heresy over his own name, and especially when he refuses to disown it, he never ought to be read thereafter without due watchfulness. Mr. Barnes is precisely one of those

authors whom we never can venture to endorse without careful examination of every line and word.

His preliminary essay on prayer is a beautiful and touching expostulation with parents on the duty of family prayer. Mr. Barnes assumes only one thing which, as he justly says, is what "may commonly be assumed without danger of error"—the deep interest of parents in the welfare of their children. He proceeds on this assumption to urge the duty of family prayer—first, from the design of the family organisation; secondly, from family worship being one of the most direct and obvious means of meeting the evils to which the family is exposed; thirdly, from the *direct* influence of devotion in obtaining the ends of the family organisation; and fourthly, from the fact that without family prayer, there will be no religious teaching in a family that will be effectual. These points are all impressively and sometimes very eloquently handled. But it is painful to observe how entirely Mr. Barnes fails to conceive of the Being we worship in the true evangelistic light. He closes his essay with three stanzas from Burns's celebrated Cotter's Saturday Night. The poet makes "our *Creator's* praise" the end of family devotion, and Mr. Barnes reasons with parents throughout about the "worship of *God*." It is "the Most High," "Heaven's King," the "God of heaven," "Almighty God," "the great Father of all families," "the King of kings," "the Deity," "the Divinity;" or it is simply "God," the absolute God, whom he holds up to view as the supreme object of our adoration. The name of Christ and "the religion of the Son of God" is sometimes mentioned, but he is never held up, so far as we observe, as the object of worship by the family; nor is the Trinity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, ever alluded to. So far as we can see, a Unitarian, an unconverted man, an unbeliever in the scheme of redemption, a mere natural man—we might almost say a mere heathen—could read all, or very nearly all, of this preliminary essay with all the admiration we have expressed for it.

A criticism of the publishers shall close this notice. At the end of this book of prayer and praise, they give us fifty pages



of book advertisements adorned with wood-cuts—some military and warlike, some comical, some to illustrate oratory, and some natural philosophy, and some history. We protest that this is an unfair advantage taken.

*The Conversion of St. Paul. Three Discourses.* By GEORGE JARVIS GEER, D. D., Rector of St. Timothy's Church, New York. New York: Samuel R. Wells, 389 Broadway. 1871. Pp. 82. 12 mo.

This is rather an innocent little volume, not very good but not very bad. It is hard to conceive any reason for its being published, for both the error and the truth it contains are so diluted that neither of them can be supposed capable of having roused enough interest to call for the use of types. We never heard of Dr. Geer before, but as two saints figure on his title page, we cannot be in much danger of mistake if we set him down for an Episcopalian of the tolerably High Church class.

These sermons contain some things which are pretty good, but the author has evidently very little knowledge of theology, and is very deficient in discrimination of thought. Witness his account of the evils of indifference to truth, (pp. 23–27); and his disquisition on the resistibility of grace, (pp. 35–39); and his discussion of the sin of presumption which those commit who expect to be converted as Saul of Tarsus was, by “special, powerful, irresistible or overwhelming influence from heaven.” Pp. 44–57. Dr. Geer seems to have no confidence in God's power to convert sinners suddenly. The only true way of conversion, he says, is to “hope, and learn, and believe, and thenceforth go on to repentance, and so up to the gates of salvation.” P. 44. “The person who, when all is quiet around, comes to God's minister, seeks instruction and guidance, and goes on, by prayer and penitence, in faith to seek pardon and acceptance, and thus is brought into the ark of Christ's Church, or ratifies in confirmation the vows of baptism, is a true type of those of whom the sterling and reliable body of worshippers and communicants is composed.” P. 56. This sentence will do for a spe-

cimen of Dr. Geer's style of English, and also of his style of theological opinions.

The third sermon in this series is designed to set forth "the conversion of St. Paul in its relation to the Church." The idea is that Jesus Christ did not himself directly tell Saul what he would have him to do, but sends him into the city, and has him to wait there for the ministration of Ananias. Ananias here represents the visible Church. He was one of her ministers. The inference is that the Lord himself puts honor upon the Church visible, and that we should do the same. This is true, and sound, and good, and also timely, for the tendency of the times is rationalistic. And the view taken of our Lord's sending Saul to Ananias is no doubt the true one. Calvin points out also how the same course is pursued by the Lord in sending an angel, not to reveal the truth to Cornelius, but to tell him, "Send for Peter, and he will teach it thee." It was the ministry, the appointed means and ordinances of grace, which Christ designed to honor in both these cases. Dr. Geer's attempt to set forth this scriptural and Christian doctrine of the Church is worthy of commendation, and we observe very little to be discounted in any of his statements. At the same time we find very little to commend in the manner of setting forth this wholesome truth.

*The Rev. George Junkin, D. D., LL. D. A Historical Biography.* By D. X. JUNKIN, D. D. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1871. Pp. 609. Duodecimo.

There are very few persons in any one generation whose lives deserve to be perpetuated in the memory of mankind. There are fewer still who know how to present posterity with a fair representation of the characters of such as do deserve to be remembered. Eulogy is generally the staple out of which the very best of memoirs are produced, and nothing is so easy as the language of panegyric; at the same time, nothing is so insipid. We had expected, when first we opened the volume whose title we have cited, to find a very large sprinkling of the terms of laudation on the pages we were about to peruse; natural.

VOL. XXII., NO. 3.—9.

ally supposing that a warm-hearted and partial brother, in the endeavor to furnish his readers with a just portraiture of a kinsman whom he ardently loved and desired to have others admire, would find it hard to confine his pen to the style of sober description. We have been agreeably disappointed. The impartiality with which facts are, for the most part, left to speak for themselves in delineating the character of his distinguished brother, entitles the author to no mean praise. The book is valuable, however, not more for the fidelity of its memoir, than for that historical review of the period—some of it stirring and eventful—during which the subject of the memoir lived, and in much of which he was a prominent actor. The deceased was personally well known to us, and, in our judgment, his fraternal biographer has not done him more than justice. He was unquestionably a deeply pious man. His understanding was vigorous, cultivated, teeming, and original. He possessed a large share of that moral courage which causes men to adhere to what is right, regardless of personal consequences. He was capable, too, of unusual efforts of self-sacrifice for the sake of promoting what he regarded as an important public interest. Moreover, he was industrious, persevering, enterprising, and freshly vitalised whatsoever work engaged his energies. He did not always, indeed, adopt the most conciliatory method for gaining the object he regarded as valuable, but was accustomed to drive straight towards it, regardless alike of the law of tact and irrespective of the feelings of others, which, however, he never intentionally wounded. He had, with all his seeming brusqueness, a truly tender heart, and was endowed with sympathies that were easily touched and quickly awakened. There may have been some who disliked, but there was no one who refused to respect him. We are of the opinion that his life was deserving of the commemoration which the present volume will serve to give it.

Dr. Junkin was so well, so long, and so favorably known as an educator, at once wise and enthusiastic, that we need not dilate upon the lessons his career has taught us in this respect. In the South he is best known, and will be longest remembered, as the efficient President of Washington College, (now Wash-

ington and Lee,) situated at Lexington, Virginia, where, for more than twelve years, he occupied a conspicuous position.

With reference to the controversies in which he was variously engaged, especially those in connexion with the measures that resulted in the disruption of the Presbyterian Church, in 1838, we care not to enter into details. The history of that protracted scene of excitement is now familiar to the Christian world, and the men who were prominent during its continuance have all been weighed in the balances of public judgment. It has, we are aware, been thought by many that the course pursued by Dr. Junkin, in the matter of Mr. Barnes's memorable prosecution, in which he took the foremost part, was not throughout marked by the loveliest Christian temper, but was sometimes abrupt, harsh, uncompromising, and characterised by not a little of the *odium theologicum* which too often has exhibited itself in personal animosity. We are pleased to notice that the memoir before us, with its attendant historical record, is calculated to disabuse every mind on which this impression had been made. We have, indeed, the testimony of Mr. Barnes himself to the effect that his leading prosecutor was evidently animated, in all that he said and did, by a proper Christian spirit, and that he at least had no reason to complain of any part of his official conduct.

It was certainly a delicate task which the biographer had to perform, when he proceeded to present a clear and full view of the actors in those years of trouble which ended in the formation of the New School branch of the Old Church. He laid himself open to the hazard of offending those more prominent parties in this controversy who are now again connected with himself in the same ecclesiastical organisation; or, if but comparatively few of these are now living, of aggrieving the multitudes who then sympathised with them, and who still approve their conduct in the circumstances in which they were placed. But we have admired the skill with which our author has kept clear of the temptation to employ language which would have helped to open old sores and reawaken angry feelings which might mar the existing era of "union." Whatever we, from our point of view, may think of the manner in which the wounds

of past conflicts have been attempted to be healed on the part of the reunited Churches, certain it is that the narrator, whose able work we are noticing, has contrived to work his way through the dangers that beset him on both sides, with an adroitness which entitles him to be regarded by his brethren as a peace-maker. An exception to this remark may, perhaps, be found on those pages where the author does not mince matters in regard to the *Princeton* influence employed to retard the cause of purity at the opening of difficulties that issued in an effectual, if temporary, purgation of the Church of its discordant doctrinal elements.

As to certain other matters, we are at liberty to utter a word or two. Dr. Junkin was well known as a hearty opponent of abolitionism in its whole spirit, and yet as unfriendly to the institution of slavery; to which, however, he objected, not because it was a sin *per se*, (which by an appeal to the Scriptures he elaborately proved that it was not,) but for reasons of expediency. He stoutly and wisely opposed the introduction of this heating subject into the Church courts, and as clearly foresaw as he plainly pointed out the evils to which ecclesiastical legislation having reference to it must inevitably give rise. His prophecy became history. Said he, in a remarkable speech in the Synod of Cincinnati, in 1843: "Should the opposite doctrine prevail; should the holding of slaves be made a crime by the officers of the churches of the non-slaveholding States; should they break communion with their Southern brethren, and denounce them as guilty of damning sin, as kidnappers and menstealers worthy of the penitentiary, as has been done in this Synod at this time; should this doctrine and this practice prevail throughout the Northern States, can any man be so blind as not to see that a dissolution of the Union, a civil and perhaps a servile war, must be the consequence? Such a war as the world has never witnessed—of uncompromising extermination, that will lay waste this vast territory. All the elements are here—the physical, the intellectual, the moral—for a strife, different in the horribleness of its character from anything the world has ever witnessed. Let the spirits of these men be once aroused, let their feelings

be chafed up to the fighting point, let the irritation be kept up until the North and the South come to blows on the question of slavery, and their 'contentions will be as the bars of a castle,' broken only with the last pulsations of a nation's heart."

As to the motives which actuated Dr. Junkin in quitting Virginia at the time he did, and leaving his responsible post as the presiding officer of Washington College, we have nothing to say. We are willing to believe that he acted conscientiously. But that so soon afterwards he should have favored and defended the "Spring resolutions" of the Assembly of 1861; and that in the Assembly of 1862, of which he was a prominent member, he should have advocated the Breckinridge paper, so marked by virulence and hatred towards the South, must always excite the surprise of those who are acquainted with the sentiments of his Cincinnati speech, a sample of which is quoted above. We cannot but express our regret, too, that he should have deemed it necessary to assist, in the pulpit and out of it, in fanning the blaze of sectional war, the fury of which he was in a position to help to quench. We would have preferred the privilege of recording the pleasing fact of his silence at least, so becoming to him under all the circumstances of the case. It is, indeed, sufficiently surprising that he did not learn to respect a cause, even though it were the cause of secession, in which was engaged his own son-in-law, the heroic Jackson, who, with a piety as ardent as his own, and with a patriotism as undoubted, conspicuously upheld, because he loved it.

Notwithstanding, however, these reluctant animadversions upon the character of a man whom we, in the main, honestly approve and sincerely admire, we cheerfully commend this volume to our readers, and bespeak for it a wide circulation among those who desire to refresh their recollection in reference to the historical points referred to, and others beside; or who wish to trace the conduct of a good man amid many trying circumstances which put his mettle to the test, and out of which, in the judgment of most of his friends, he came with a reputation altogether unsullied.











# THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW

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

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

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

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

☞ Ministers of the Gospel, and others, who shall obtain three new subscribers, and remit the regular price, (Three Dollars each,) will be entitled to a copy of the REVIEW for one year, or, if they so prefer, one dollar for each new subscriber.

☞ Subscribers changing their Post Office are requested to give immediate notice of the same to the Publisher, or their REVIEW will be sent to their former office.

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

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

THE SOUTHERN  
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW,

CONDUCTED BY

AN ASSOCIATION OF MINISTERS

IN

COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA.

---

XXII. OCTOBER, MDCCCLXXI.

No. 4.

COLUMBIA, S. C.

PRINTED AT THE PRESBYTERIAN PUBLISHING HOUSE.

1871.

## CONTENTS.

ARTICLE	PAGE
I. The Reformation in the Sixteenth Century. By the Rev. THOMAS E. PECK, D. D., Union Theological Seminary, Va., . . . . .	455
II. Education and Christianity. By Rev. J. A. QUARLES, Missouri, . . . . .	474
III. The First and Highest Office in the Church, . . . . .	484
IV. Education. By the Rev. M. J. WALLACE, Marlbrook, Ark., . . . . .	496
V. Sustentation, . . . . .	524
VI. The General Assembly of 1871, . . . . .	538
VII. The Practical Efficiency of our Church. By the Rev. B. W. MOSELEY, New London, Va., . . . . .	584
VIII. CRITICAL NOTICES :	
1. Questions of Modern Thought; or, Lectures on the Bible, 600. 2. The Divine Human; or, Some Remarks on Inspiration and Atonement. 603. 3. Among my Books, 609.	

# THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXII.—NO. 4.

-----◆-----  
OCTOBER, MDCCCLXXI.  
-----◆-----

## ARTICLE I.

### THE REFORMATION IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY, CONTEMPLATED IN SOME OF ITS CAUSES AND RESULTS.

When we speak of second causes, it must never be forgotten that the concurrence of at least two of them is necessary to the production of an effect. Hence we speak of the *causes*, not the *cause* of the Reformation, because we are here concerned with secondary causation only. The first cause we of course acknowledge to be God. The Reformation was a great work of his holy spirit, a mighty revival of the work which he had been doing ever since the utterance of the first promise in the garden of Eden. It was a re-form-ation, a restoration of the Church to the word of God, which constitutes its form, as the Holy Ghost constitutes its life. But the work of God amongst men is performed under the conditions of time and place. And there are very many circumstances attending and concurring, in regard to some or all of which we might confidently affirm that they were causes *sine qua non*, conditions without which the great event would not have taken place, or if it had taken place, would not have been the same event, or been followed by the same results.

Our Saviour, in his parables, frequently likens the processes of the kingdom of heaven to the processes of vegetable and  
VOL. XXII., NO. 4.—1.

animal life. And it is not without authority, therefore, and that the highest, that scientific historians and writers on the philosophy of history have contemplated history under the notion of an organic development, in which the life, the form, and the external conditions, constitute the main subjects of consideration. We refer to this mode of contemplating history here only for the purpose of calling attention to that striking circumstance in the formation of organisms of which physiologists tell us, the circumstance of all its parts or organs being developed, each from its appropriate centre, and all growing *pari passu* to meet each other in the integrity of the organism as a whole. God builds the vegetable or animal in a way totally different from that in which the most skilful human artisan builds any of his works, because God alone has the prerogative of imparting life. Hence we are all familiar with such forms of expression as "events coming to the birth," "being *ripe* for execution," "the fulness of time," etc.

In "the fulness of time" God sent forth his Son. Christ came when the world was ripe for his advent, and the stupendous birth could be no longer delayed. The history of the world had been growing for ages towards this event from three distinct centres. Three distinct lines had been converging upon this great moment in the life of the human race—lines unconsciously recognised by the Roman Governor when he wrote the superscription over the cross in the three languages which represented them.

So also in the case of the Reformation. The world was long in gestation before that great birth took place. There were several lines of providence which converged to produce that great revolution. Sudden as its outbreak appeared to the Court of Rome, and even to some good men, almost despairing of the Church, it was not sudden, as we now clearly see.

Before we glance at some of the causes of the Reformation, let us hint at some of the limitations under which these causes must be considered. Each one of these causes is itself an effect, as the Reformation itself becomes in its turn a most fruitful cause. The view of the mind in all such enquiries is necessarily

artificial and arbitrary. Looking to the future, its point of departure seems a fixed base from which all that follows proceeds. Looking to the past, its present position seems but the result of what has gone before. Its present position is the juncture of two eternities, the child of the one, and the father of the other. In the ascending scale each cause becomes an effect; in the descending scale each effect becomes a cause. This view is the only one which can make history a rational study, a study adapted to the reason. The inquiry after causes (which includes the inquiry after results) is that which distinguishes reason in man from reason in brutes; and human reason can never be satisfied until it reaches a cause, which is not also an effect. This procedure of the reason is beautifully illustrated by Villars:\*

“A man entirely unacquainted with the course of a river, arriving upon its banks, and seeing it here flowing in an extensive plain, there confined in a narrow channel, in another place foaming at the leap of a cataract, such a man would regard the first turn of the stream where it might lie concealed by a gorge from his eye as the origin of the river; the cataract would produce a similar illusion. Having reached the source at last, he would consider the mountain from which it issued as the primary cause of the river. He would soon, however, reflect that the bowels of the mountain must soon be exhausted by so constant a stream. He will observe the accumulation of clouds, the rains, without which the drained mountain would furnish no source. Thus, then, the clouds become the primary cause; but it is the winds which, by sweeping the vast seas, produce the clouds, and it is the sun which draws them from the sea. But whence comes this power in the sun? Thus he is soon drawn into the inquiries of speculative physics, by his search after a cause, after an absolute principle from which he may deduce, in the last resort, the explication of so many phenomena.”

The like limitation must be laid down in reference to the *results* of this great revolution. The human reason, as it is never satisfied in the research of causes until it reaches a cause which is not in its turn also an effect; so in the research of results, it is never satisfied until it reaches an effect which is not also a cause.

---

\**Essai sur L'Esprit et l'Influence de La Reformation*, p. 1, §. 1.



It seeks an *end* as it seeks a *beginning*. But we must end very far short of the end, as we begun very far short of the beginning. "Art is long and time is fleeting."

Using the term cause in the wide sense as before defined, we notice as the first cause—

I. The universal corruption which had existed in the Church and in society for ages. This corruption was so enormous as to work its own cure.\* The issue was reformation or death. The Church, which was designed to be a wholesome leaven in the centre of the depraved mass of humanity, and, by its powerful though silent working, to transform the mass into the likeness of itself, became an evil leaven, and transformed the mass into the likeness of its own corruption. The opinion which some genteel and fashionable people, both in England and in this country, are so industriously propagating, and so many simpletons are believing, that the religion of the Middle Age was a simple, fervent, devout religion, worthy of the imitation of all ages, is a sheer

---

\*Bossuet, in his *Histoire des Variations, L. I.*, quotes Cardinal Julian as saying to Pope Eugene IV. that the disorders of the German clergy were so great as to stir up the hatred of the people against the whole ecclesiastical order; and that if these disorders were not corrected there was reason to fear that the laity would attack the clergy after the fashion of the Hussites, as they were already boldly threatening to do; that if the German clergy were not promptly reformed, that *another heresy would soon arise far more dangerous than that of Bohemia*; that men would begin to believe that they would be offering a sacrifice acceptable to God in abusing and plundering the ecclesiastics as a race odious to God and men, and sunk in the depths of wickedness; that this hatred of the people for the sacred order would extend itself to the Court of Rome, which would be regarded as the cause of all these evils, *because it neglected to apply the needful remedy*. "God," adds the Cardinal, "prevents us from seeing our perils, as he is accustomed to do to those whom he intends to punish. The fire is kindled before our eyes, and we run into it." This was Julian's idea of the manner in which the evil would work its own cure. The world was calling for a reformation of the Church "in *Head* and members;" but the blind guides would not reform the *Head*. Hence that "other heresy more dangerous than Hussiism" *did* arise, which proceeded upon the supposition that the See of Rome was the fountain of corruption, and must be either reformed or destroyed.

and mischievous delusion. The religion of that age is not to be estimated by a noble hymn here and there like the "Dies Iræ," or by an occasional excerpt from an Anselm, or a Bernard, or a Richard of St. Victor, breathing a true spirit of love and devotion to Christ. Nobody doubts that God had his chosen ones all through these ages of gross superstition, will-worship, and idolatry, who were sufficiently enlightened to weep in the solitude of their cells over the darkness and corruption of the times, and sufficiently bold to testify against it. But the tears and testimony of these good men are themselves proofs that the mighty current which they were endeavoring to stem was too strong for them; not to say that they were themselves so much infected with the prevailing errors as to render their testimony, in a great measure, nugatory and vain. Let us notice some of these testimonies in regard to the condition of the Court of Rome, the very head and centre of the Church.

These testimonies are so numerous that one scarcely knows where to begin or to end. We cite, however, two or three as they are given in the "Pope and Council," a work emanating from a Romanist source, and written in the interest of the "Liberal Catholic" party on the continent of Europe, the party represented by such names as those of Döllinger and Hyacinthe. We have not the means of verifying these testimonies, but we apprehend that no one who will compare the characters of the men whose names have just been mentioned with the characters of those who have set themselves for the defence of the late Council at Rome, will be at all troubled by any denial on the part of these last of the genuineness of the testimonies.

Among the bishops of the time of Innocent IV. (Pope), there was not one more highly honored than Grostête, Bishop of Lincoln, nor one for a long time more devoted to the Pope; indeed, so devoted that he acknowledged, in accordance with the Gratian and the Gregorian system, that he held his episcopal jurisdiction by delegation from the papal. This man, disgusted with the corruptions which, like a poisonous miasma, penetrated from the Roman Court into every portion of the Church, and especially with the hypocrisy exhibited in declaring the taking of interest

for money a mortal sin, while the papal usurers and brokers were exhausting the churches and corporations in all countries with usurious imposts, wrote a letter to the Pope shortly before his death, reproaching him with his tyranny and sharply warning him to repent.\*

Jacob of Vitry, (afterwards made a Cardinal,) after making some stay at the Court of Rome, wrote to a friend (1216) that "it had lost every vestige of real Church spirit," and that "its members were so busy with secular and temporal things, with kings and kingdoms, law-suits and quarrels, that they scarcely allowed a syllable to be spoken about spiritual things." Later, when Pope Nicholas III. wanted to make John of Parma, General of the Minorites, a Cardinal, he declined, saying, "The Roman Church hardly concerns itself with anything but wars and juggleries; *for the salvation of souls it takes no care.*"

St. Hildegard, that famous prophetess on the Rhine, highly honored by popes and emperors, prophesied of the popes as early as 1170—"They seize upon us like ravening beasts, with their power of binding and loosing, and through them the whole Church is withered. The pride of the popes, who no longer observe any religion, will be brought low." So St. Bridget, the northern prophetess, who lived in Rome some two centuries later, calls the Pope worse than Lucifer, "a murderer of the souls entrusted to him, who condemns the innocent and sells the elect for filthy lucre." Durandus (bishop) says "the Roman Court interprets 'omnia traham ad me ipsum,' (John xii. 32, in the Vulg.,) as authorising its appropriating the rights of all others exclusively to itself, and that the Roman Church is reviled in every country; that every one is ashamed of her, and charges her with corrupting the whole clergy, whose immorality has exposed them to universal hatred." Yet this Durandus maintained the "Donation of Constantine," and the rights which flowed from that stupendous fraud.

But we need make no more citations from Romanists to show

---

\*See, besides, the curious story of an old monastic chronicler touching a visit of Grostete to the Pope after his (G.'s) death, in "Pope and Council," and in Milman's History of Latin Christianity, VI., 293.

that even in their judgment the "head-centre" of the Church was wholly rotten in their day. The love of money was the master-lust of those who boasted of being the successors of Peter and Paul, the two apostles who have left the most solemn warnings on record against this very lust. But the infatuated people continued to believe that the popes were the successors of Peter and Paul, while their lives were the lives of Ananias and Sapphira, of Simon Magus, and Demas. Protestants have been unjustly charged with originating that interpretation of the Babylon of the Apocalypse which makes it the symbol of the Roman Church. Every reader of church history knows that this interpretation was very common among the Franciscans of the Middle Age. Even St. Bonaventura, whom the popes had loaded with honors, and who was bound by the closest ties to Rome as a cardinal and general of his order, did not hesitate, in his Commentary on the Apocalypse, to declare Rome to be the harlot who makes kings and nations drunk with the wine of her whoredoms. For in Rome, he said, the dignities of the Church were bought and sold; there did the princes and rulers of the Church assemble, dishonoring God by their incontinence, adherents of Satan, and plunderers of the flock of Christ. He adds that the prelates, corrupted by Rome, infect the clergy with their vices; and the clergy, by their evil example of avarice and profligacy, poison and lead to perdition the whole Christian people. It was not, therefore, from a blind Ghibelline party spirit that Dante too applied to the popes the Apocalyptic prophecy. He had read Bonaventura, and puts directly into his mouth in paradise the denunciation on the covetous policy of the Court of Rome.\* And to the same effect Petrarch is quoted, calling Rome "the impious Babylon, nest of treasons, in which all the poison of the world is cherished, in bondage to surfeit and drunkenness, an execrable harlot full of luxury and riot, an asylum of all heresies, a prison in which every good thing is extinguished, and every evil and abominable thing is nourished, a rebel against Christ and his apostles, in order to make divinities of Venus and

---

\*See "Pope and Council," pp. 227, 228.

Bacchus.”\* In unison with these invectives of the poets of the Renaissance in the 14th century, hear also the wailings of the Italian monk :

Quisquis opes sacras nummo reperire profano  
 Quærit, eat Roman, sacra sunt venalia Romæ,  
 Templâ, sacerdotes, altaria, sacra, coronæ,  
 Ignes, thura, preces, cælum est venale Deusque.

Compare Revelation xviii. 11–13. No wonder, when every thing was put up for sale in Rome, that men who had any fear of God or sense of decency should identify the Church in that city with the city described in this chapter of the Revelation.

We have dwelt upon this feature of the horrible wickedness of the Court of Rome, because the love of money, when it takes full possession of a man, or of a body of men, banishes every thing which is holy, just, and good. It is a demon whose name is legion. “They that will be rich,” says Paul, “fall into temptation and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts which drown men in destruction and perdition. For the love of money is the root of all evil, which, while some coveted after, they have erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows.” 1 Tim. vi. 9, 10. Hence there was no evil passion which did not run riot in Rome. Conspicuous among these was the lust of uncleanness, a lust associated in the Bible constantly with avarice, and in the Greek tongue expressed even by the same word “Sacerdotes, episcopi *avari*, *veneri ventrique* dediti ignominiâ notati tribuque moti sunt,” says a Council of Cologne.† The Council of Aix-la-Chapelle, A. D. 836, says of the nunneries, that “in some places they seemed to be rather brothels than monasteries.”‡ The nunneries generally became brothels, we imagine, when they became rich; and they generally became rich, though organised under the vow of poverty as

---

\*See Tur., vol. 4, p. 14.

†Cited by Brucker, Hist. Phil., 3, 602.

‡Harduin, Concilia, tom. 4, p. 1397, No. 7, 8, cited in Murdock's *Trans.* of Mosheim's Ch. Hist., Cant. IX.

well as under the vows of chastity.\* The history of the papacy, from 881–956, is called by modern historians the period of the “Papal Pornocracy,” because the popes, during this period, were generally governed by their mistresses or harlots, and are called by some of their own people “apostatic” instead of “apostolic.”†

The apostle mentions “erring from the faith” as another evil flowing from the love of money. The numberless illustrations of this connexion between the greed for money and heresy, which the history of mediæval Rome affords, may all be passed over except one, and that one is *instar omnium*, since it was the occasion of the outbreak of the Reformation. We allude, of course, to the sale of indulgences. Licenses to sin had been formally issued for ages, certainly since the time of the infamous Pope John XXII., who among all the Johns who sat in the Roman See, was, perhaps, the worst, with the exception of John XXIII. condemned and deposed by the Council of Constance, for simony, extortion, poisoning, adultery, incest, etc. This sale of indulgences was a monstrous and all-comprehending iniquity. 1. It involved, on the part of the Pope, a blasphemous usurpation of the prerogatives of God both as Lawgiver and Saviour.

---

\*For specimens of the Anacreontic songs of the holy monks, see Wright’s Early Mysteries, and other Latin Poems, cited by Milman in his Lat. Christianity. B. 14, c. 4.

†Baronius (Anno 900) acknowledges that the Holy Apostolic See suffered things “indigna, turpia, deformia, execranda, abominanda;” but ascribes them to the fact that the emperors elected the popes! The truth is, however, that the emperors in this very century, reformed the Popedom. See Prof. Bryce’s “Holy Roman Empire.” The history of the popes may well gravel the defenders of Papal Infallibility. One of the champions of Rome is said to have answered the objection to this dogma drawn from the notorious ignorance of theology which distinguished the clergy of the city of Rome, by alleging the case of God’s speaking through Balaam’s ass. But here is a case of abandoned wickedness, not of brutish ignorance, a far worse case. We suppose the answer may be found in the fact of God’s speaking through Balaam himself, in spite of his love of the wages of iniquity. What other view could Bossuet have had when he wrote the introduction to his *Histoire des Variations*? Surely, he must have forgotten that the first pope, St. Peter himself, said, that “*holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.*” 2 Pet. i. 21.

2. It abrogated the whole gospel of grace by making its privileges a matter of money. The affair with Tetzal in Germany, and with Samson in Switzerland, is sometimes represented as one of those small occasions upon which great revolutions begin (like Hampden's ship-money); but we cannot imagine a more appalling form in which the hatred of the Devil for both God and man could present itself in opposition to the gospel, than this pretended claim to remit all punishment of sin for money. It was nothing less than a dethroning of Him whom God had exalted a Prince and a Saviour, and an enthroning of him who was a liar and a murderer from the beginning. It was making a mock of sin, and a pouring of contempt upon the blood and agony of the Incarnate Son of God. The world could endure no more. Tetzal and Samson were the last drops of bitterness which made the cup run over. Men had for ages been gnawing their tongues for pain under the scorpion stings of papal and priestly tyranny; and they welcomed the testimony of Luther and Zwingle as the voice of messengers from the skies.\*

II. Another cause is to be found in the testimony of those bodies of Christians in the Middle Age known as "Witnesses for the Truth." The testimony of the more enlightened men in the

---

\*It is instructive to compare the effect of Luther's preaching in Wittenberg, with the effect of Savonarola's in Florence about twenty years before. They both preached against indulgences. The one was honored and applauded, the other burnt. They were so near together in time, that we can account for the difference in effect only by the difference in place and people. Luther preached to Germans living at a great distance from Rome. Savonarola to Italians. "Never," says Villars, "were there so many atheists as in the country and neighborhood of the sovereign pontiffs." "The nearer people are to Rome," says Machiavel, (quoted by Villars.) "the less religion they have. The scandalous example, and the crimes of the Court of Rome, have been the cause that Italy has lost entirely all the principles of piety and every sentiment of religion. We Italians, then, owe this obligation to the Church and to priests that we have become reprobates and villains." Discourse on the First Decade of Livy, B. 1, c. 12. Truly, "reprobates and villains" are terms not too harsh to be applied to men who could take part with such a man as Pope Alexander VI., against such a man as Savonarola!

Church of Rome, to which reference has already been made, had very little effect, because they not only continued in the communion of the Church, but upheld the supremacy and practical infallibility of the popes. As the papacy was the chief source and bulwark of corruption, there could be no chance for a reformation, while the reformers continued to revere and maintain their prerogatives. The Empire of Rome papal was mightier than the Empire of Rome pagan. The dominion of the latter was the dominion of the sword; the dominion of the former was the dominion of opinion. From the time that Charlemagne condescended to receive the name and crown of the Emperor of the West, until the time of Hildebrand, all Europe believed that the world had been subjected by God himself to the rule of pope and emperor as His vicars—the one in the spiritual, the other in the temporal sphere. From the time of Hildebrand to the reign of Boniface VIII. all Europe believed, with here and there a dissentient, that the two powers were not coördinate, but that the emperor was subordinate to the pope. Even the monarchs that resisted the execution of his decrees within their territories, with few exceptions acknowledged his supremacy. “They kissed the Pope’s feet”—to use Voltaire’s words—“while they tied up his hands.” One of the most impressive proofs of the power of this opinion is the extreme reluctance of Luther to break with the Pope. The Holy See laughed at all the testimonies while it continued to be adored by the witnesses. It was only the witnesses who denounced the papacy as anti-Christ that were dra-gooned and burnt.

But there were such witnesses. The Cathari, the Paulicians,\* the Waldenses, the Henricians, the Albigenses, and other bodies, contended with more or less purity and zeal, that God was greater than the Pope. The policy adopted towards these witnesses was that of the liar-murderer; first to slander, then to kill them. We know little about any of them, except the Waldenses, which is not derived from the indictments of their enemies. But as malice is blind, these indictments are not so skilfully drawn as to

---

\*On this body, see Faber’s “Waldenses and Albigenses,” and Elliott’s *Horæ Apocalypticeæ*.



hinder us from seeing that they had at least more truth than their enemies. The slanders are not only incredible, but monstrous.

The points in which their testimony was defective or erroneous, were chiefly those which concerned ordinances of worship which God had ordained and the papacy had grossly perverted and abused. As, for example, the papacy had made the whole of religion to consist in external rites, had substituted the tithing of mint, anise and cummin, for judgment, mercy and faith, had converted the Church, which Christ had designed to be his witness-bearer, and an institute for calling and training His elect into a vast sacramental machine for turning out Christians; they went sometimes to the other extreme of rejecting the sacraments altogether. As the baptism of infants was held to be their regeneration, some of them rejected infant baptism altogether. Countless thousands sealed their testimony with their lives, but their testimony was not lost. Whole bodies were exterminated, but others sprang up in their room. One of these bodies lived on in spite of fire and sword, and lives still; the inhabitants of those valleys in which the noble Claude of Turin, in the ninth century, had borne his faithful testimony against the idolatry of Rome. How does the providence of God encourage us to testify for the truth by this history of the Waldenses, and by the fact that these witnesses whom the relentless persecution of ages has not been able to destroy, are now, while we write, preaching the glad tidings under the very walls of the Vatican, from which issued so many cruel thunderbolts against them! Truly, as the apostle says, "we can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth." These witnesses did not reform the Church only because "the fulness of times" had not come. But when Luther appeared, they were ready with a hearty welcome to him as a new witness, (and in an unexpected quarter,) for truths for which they and their fathers had suffered the loss of all things.

III. The next cause we shall notice is that great movement of the human mind, which has been called the "Renaissance," or the "Revival of Letters." It is to be observed, in estimating the true force of this movement, that there is no necessary con-

nexion between the illumination of the mind which is merely natural and secular, and the reformation of the heart and life. The Romanists in nominal Christendom still greatly outnumber the Protestants, though the human mind, under the impetus it has received from the Protestant movement, has been intensely active, and has achieved marvellous victories in every department of science. Revealed religion is not subject to the law of progress in the same sense that other departments of knowledge are subject to it, and for this reason that it is revealed. "It matters not at all," says Macaulay, "that the compass, printing, gunpowder, steam, gas, vaccination, and a thousand other discoveries and inventions, which were unknown to the fifth century, are familiar to the nineteenth. None of these discoveries and inventions have the smallest bearing on the question, whether a man is justified by faith alone; or whether the invocation of saints is an orthodox practice. We have no security for the future against the prevalence of any theological error that has ever prevailed in time past among Christian men. We are confident that the world will never go back to the solar system of Ptolemy; nor is our confidence in the least shaken by the circumstance, that even so great a man as Bacon rejected the theory of Galileo with scorn; for Bacon had not all the means of arriving at a sound conclusion which are within our reach, and which secure people who would not have been worthy to mend his pens from falling into his mistakes. But we are very differently affected, when we reflect that Sir Thomas More was ready to die for the doctrine of transubstantiation. He was a man of eminent talents. He had all the information on the subject that we have, or that, while the world lasts, any human being will have. The absurdity of the literal interpretation was as great, and as obvious in the sixteenth century as it is now. No progress that science has made, or will make, can add to what seems to us the overwhelming force of the argument against the real presence. We are, therefore, unable to understand why, what Sir Thomas More believed respecting transubstantiation, may not be believed to the end of time by men of equal abilities and honesty. But, Sir Thomas More is one of the choice spe-

cimens of human wisdom and virtue; and the doctrine of transubstantiation is a kind of proof charge. A faith which stands that test will stand any test."\* At this very day, in sober Christian communities, and under the shadow of the halls of science, a band of strolling thieving gypsies will carry off no small amount of revenue derived from telling people's fortunes. People who can have their fortunes told are not proof against any superstition however absurd or pernicious. "A very common knowledge of history, a very little observation of life," says the brilliant essayist before cited, "will suffice to prove that no learning, no sagacity, affords a security against the greatest errors on subjects relating to the invisible world. Johnson, incredulous on all other points, was a ready believer in miracles and apparitions. He would not believe in Ossian; but he believed in second sight. He would not believe in the earthquake of Lisbon; but he believed in the Cock Lane ghost."

Another consideration of great importance not noticed by Macaulay is, that the heart has full as much to do with faith in God's truth as the head. The natural posture of man in regard to this kind of truth is one of hostility. The truth comes as a *conqueror*, and is therefore received as an *enemy*. Even Hobbes confessed that if it had been contrary to men's interest and lust of dominion, that the three angles of a triangle should be equal to two right angles; they would either have denied that truth, or burnt the books of mathematics.

When, therefore, we mention the Renaissance as one of the causes of the Reformation; we do not mean to assert any necessary connexion between the two, but only that, in the ordering of Divine Providence, the former was not merely a forerunner, but a powerful promoter of the latter. The Revival of Learning was in its own nature purely worldly and secular. The days and nights of the great majority of the scholars were given to the study of the pagan writers of Greece and Rome. Erasmus was, no doubt, to the end of his life, more of a pagan than a Protestant, in spite of his labors on the records of the Christian faith.

---

\*Essay on Ranke's History of the Popes.

Ulrich von Hutten, in the merciless sarcasms of the "Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum," had little zeal for the Gospel, and Luther declined his aid. "Non tali auxilio." Indeed the very name by which they were known indicates this view of the spirit of the revivalists. They were "humanists;" men cultivating a merely human literature, and cultivating it in the interests of humanity as contradistinguished from the interests of the Church, which had for ages controlled all thinking and enslaved it. The movement was a rebellion of the human mind against a tyranny which refused to acknowledge that God had presided over the mind of Greek and Roman pagan, as well as over the mind of Greek and Roman Christian. The Hebrew and Greek Scriptures were studied in the same spirit, for they too were practically proscribed, and in many places proscribed by statute.\*

Still the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures *were* studied. Whatever the *animus* of Erasmus, his Greek Testament was a powerful instrument in promoting the Reformation. As in the days

---

\*"Even the faculty of theology at Paris declared at this time, that religion was undone if the study of Greek and Hebrew were permitted. A monk in Hochstraten's army of ignoramuses said, 'They have invented a new language which they call Greek; you must be on your guard against it: it is the mother of all heresy.' I observe in the hands of many persons a book written in that language, and which they call the *New Testament*. It is a book full of daggers and poison. As to the Hebrew, my dear brethren, it is certain that all those who learn it become instantaneously Jews.'

"This is a sample," says the Prize Essayist of the French Academy, "of the papal spirit of that age."

For such a spirit as this the Renaissance had infinite contempt, as well as for the spirit of mediæval mysticism. Aristotle himself, though a Greek, was hurled from his throne, because his name was associated with the dismal quarrels of Scotists and Thomists. People were content to gratify their tastes and their senses, caring little for worship, and still less for doctrine. They did not revolt against the Church, but they had no enthusiasm for her; and they had enthusiasm for whatever was fresh and graceful and intelligible. See Bryce's *Holy Roman Empire*, p. 312. The literary clique of Weimar, with Gæthe at the head, a circle of polished scholars with no religion above the "elegant mythology" of Greece, will give us a good idea of the religious character of the leaders of the Renaissance. Gæthe professed his readiness to worship a model of Myron's statue of a cow and her sucking calf!

of good King Josiah; so now the discovery of the "book of the law" made a stir among the dry bones.

IV. The last cause we shall mention, is the political condition of Europe at the beginning of the 16th century. It would require more space than can be accorded to this article, to go into any thing like a full discussion of the causes which produced the political condition in which the Reformation found the nations of Europe. We beg leave to refer the reader who may wish to investigate this subject to the very interesting work of Professor Bryce of Oxford, on the Holy Roman Empire. All we can now attempt is a very rapid sketch.

The prime necessity of western Europe, after the fall of the western division of the old Roman Empire, was *unity*. Society had been thrown back into chaos by the invasions of the northern tribes, and the only law which was recognised was the law of the strongest. Wave after wave of violence and blood swept over the land from the north, and a fiercer deluge threatened to overwhelm it from the south, in a Saracen invasion. In the 8th century arose the first of the great Carlovingian line of princes, Charles Martel. In the battle of Poitiers he gave an effectual check to the Moslem power. But it was reserved for the genius of his grandson Charles the Great (Charlemagne) to conceive the idea of restoring the western empire, and so of restoring civil order. His comprehensive mind perceived that the scheme could not in any way be so speedily accomplished, if accomplished it could be at all, as by enlisting the aid of the Church in the west, and especially the aid of its leading bishop at Rome, the centre of the old empire. The Church was the only organisation that could pretend to any thing like extensive power combined with unity. It was the only body that could confront the violence of the times with the power of opinion. And Charlemagne had the sagacity to understand that the Empire of Rome could be restored, even in shadow, only by the force of opinion. When that colossal structure tumbled into ruin, it had done what no great Empire had ever done before, it had unified the races subjected to its sway. It had made what was, in the republic and in the earlier empire, a proud distinc-

tion, the common possession of all the natives of the Roman world. The working of the equalised and equalising Roman law contributed to bring about the same result, the assimilation of the races, and the merging of Greek, Jew, Scythian in Roman. The Greek and the Jew made the only successful resistance to this mighty process of fusion. Now, this tendency was precisely that which the Gospel itself fostered. It was a Catholic dispensation of the true religion; and the Church which it produced, unlike the Jewish Church of one nation, was the Church of all nations. It was not wonderful, therefore, that, on the one side, the Roman should be considered Catholic; and that, on the other side, the Catholic should be considered Roman. In short, Roman and Catholic meant the same thing, in different aspects. Considered as Roman, a man was the subject of the emperor; considered as a Catholic, he was the subject of the Roman bishop.

But these two dominions were only different sides of the same dominion. Ever since the time of Constantine the idea of a theocracy had been growing in the Church. Its first form was pagan, the form of the old Roman Republic, derived originally from the Tuscan lawyer-priests, the old Italian *Ulema*. This was the only form in which Constantine himself knew it. But after the establishment of the Christian religion, it took on a Jewish form, and the relation sustained by the emperor to the Church was like that of David and his successors to the priesthood in the Jewish theocracy. The kingly and priestly offices which were united in the invisible head of the theocracy reigning in heaven were separated in his representatives on earth. The kingly was given to the emperor; the priestly to the bishop of Rome. The Greek differed from this view only in challenging the priestly office for the bishop of new Rome, Constantinople.

This was the *theory* in the west after Charlemagne's time, and, as Prof. Bryce has shown, theory was more potent in the Middle Age perhaps than in any other period of the world's history. Hence the emperor was considered as a sort of head of the Church *in temporalibus*, as the Roman bishop was head of it in *spiritualibus*. The Church convicted of heresy, and the emperor

made the crusade with fire and sword. If this theory had been fully carried out, and the two heads of the Church, or ecclesiastical kingdom, had continued to coöperate as they did in the days of the great Charles himself, the bondage of Europe would have been, as far as we can see, perpetual and hopeless. But, happily for Europe and the world, Hildebrand arose, a pope of unbounded ambition as well as of surpassing ability, who could not endure *two* heads of the Church; and from his time down to the Reformation the theory which has been above expounded, while it continued to captivate the imaginations of solitary dreamers in their cells, was seldom respected in practice, respected by popes of the emperor's creation, and not always by these.

The empire fell with the fall of the Hohenstaufen. Founded or revived by Charlemagne as a universal monarchy in A. D. 800; again erected in A. D. 962, on the narrower but firmer basis of the German kingdom, by Otto the Great, its pretensions were maintained for several centuries by a line of monarchs of unrivalled vigor and abilities, against the rebels in Italy and the ecclesiastical power. But each successive emperor entered the strife with resources scantier than his predecessors, each had been more decisively vanquished by the pope, the cities and the princes. That it did not expire utterly with the fall of the Hohenstaufen, but lived on for six hundred years more, till it became a piece of antiquarianism hardly more venerable than ridiculous—till, as Voltaire said, all that could be said about it was that it was neither “holy,” nor “Roman,” nor “empire”—was owing partly to the belief, still unshaken, that it was a necessary part of the world's order, yet chiefly to the connexion, which was by this time indissoluble, with the German kingdom. But even as German king the power of the emperor was broken. He had been compelled, by his struggles in Italy, to relax the vigor of his resistance against the turbulent ambition of the nobles in Germany, to grant them privileges which they abused. So that at the era of the Reformation we find one of his electors able to bring so great an emperor as Charles V. to terms on the field of battle. His hereditary jealousy of the popes, combined with the independence of his own princes, humanly speaking, prevented

the Reformation from being extinguished in its very beginning. Nay, it does not seem paradoxical to assert that the hostility of Charles to the new movement, under all the complications of his position, was more favorable to that movement than a merely nominal patronage of it might have been.

The view we have presented will derive additional confirmation from a comparison of Germany with France at this period. Under Charlemagne these two countries were under the same government, or rather (as unwilling as the French are to acknowledge it) France was a part of the German Empire, and the great Charles was a German. The Franks were Germans, and conquered the Gauls, who had been conquered before by the great Caius Julius. Towards the close of the ninth century the Carolingian Empire was extinguished, and France began to assume the position of an independent State, under the genius of the House of Burgundy. By the year 1272, when the first of the House of Hapsburg was placed upon the throne of the empire, France was stronger than Germany. "Rudolf," says Bryce, "was as conspicuously a weaker sovereign than Philip III. of France, as the Franconian Emperor Henry III. had been stronger than the Capetian Philip I. In every other state of Europe the tendency of events had been to centralise the administration and increase the power of the monarch, even in England, not to diminish it; in Germany alone had political union become weaker, and the independence of the princes more confirmed."

The internal political weakness of Germany was the strength of the Reformation. The internal strength of France was the weakness of the Reformation in that country. In Germany it grew and became firmly established after many a storm of fire and blood; and now we behold a new German Empire strong enough to humble France in the very dust, erecting itself in the midst of Europe as a Protestant power; while France, which put out the light of the Gospel with blood, is becoming Ultramontane and surrendering those "liberties" which her kings and bishops defended for centuries against the ambition of popes and cardinals!

And here for the present we make an end.



## ARTICLE II.

## EDUCATION AND CHRISTIANITY.

In the January number of this REVIEW there was an able and interesting article, taking the true ground that the proper basis for Moral Science is the religion of the Bible. Upon this same solid and broad foundation we propose to rear another superstructure, of kindred character, while we maintain that CHRISTIANITY IS THE BASIS OF ALL REAL EDUCATION. This will appear

## I. From the CONSTITUTION OF MAN.

1. He is a double organism. Some philosophers have denied this, but they have mutually refuted each other. One class has asserted that there is no such thing as matter, everything of that nature existing only in the conceptions of the mind. Another class has as confidently taught that there was nothing but matter, thought, feeling, and volition, being properties of its higher grades.

Common sense (which, after all, is the best and truest philosophy,) has taught us that we have a material nature, a body, which is the home and organ of an inner, immaterial nature, which we call the soul.

Education is the *unfolding* and *pruning* of this duplex organism. A perfect education is that which develops and purifies fully the *entire* man, both soul and body.

2. Leaving the body, (whose training should not be neglected,) we turn our attention to the spiritual man. The soul is a *simple* substance. If any man doubts it, and thinks that his mind is a distinct essence from his soul, let him ask himself to which of the two his conscience belongs as a faculty. Conscience, as it distinguishes the right or wrong of an act, the truth or falsehood of an opinion, seems clearly a mental faculty. As it gives us an emotion of compunction or complacency, it seems as clearly a functionary of the soul.

3. Though the soul is one and indivisible, yet, in its activities, it manifests the possession of distinct faculties and classes of

faculties. Modern philosophy embraces these under the three well known heads: Understanding, Sensibilities, and Will. The soul has an intellectual nature, a moral nature, and a volitional nature.

4. Any system of education, therefore, must be defective which neglects any one of these. It is grossly defective, if it overlooks important faculties. If, therefore, any portion of the spiritual constitution of the embryonic man is to be slighted, let it be that which is of least importance. Surely that is not the moral or religious nature.

5. *The strengthening of one faculty or set of faculties is no help to those which are allowed to lie idle.* By the exclusive exercise of the muscles of the arm they may acquire the strength of a Hercules. If those of the leg, at the same time, are kept constantly still, they will shrivel away. The memory may be cultivated until its acts may partake of the marvellous; and, at the same time, the reason may be dwarfed almost to the undeveloped condition of infancy. The mental nature may be so assiduously nurtured that it will assume the proportions of intellectual gianthood; while the moral faculties, by neglect, may have the weakness of a pigmy.

6. *The moral nature will unfold itself, whether we wish so or not.* Our appetites, our propensities, our affections, all our desires will grow, whether we train them or not. We have already learned that education must do a two-fold work: 1. To unfold; and 2. To trim and prune. If man was in his normal condition, the first alone would be necessary. But he is not; and the fact is that the principal portion of his moral education is this very second work of training and pruning. The vine will grow, and grow luxuriantly, even without any care; but then it must be guided upward, and its dead and useless branches must be taken away. The nurture of the soul, therefore, cannot be delayed. It will grow. It must be made to grow aright.

7. The development of the mind, without a corresponding education of the heart, may make a man brilliant, learned, or profound; *but he will be, at best, but an accomplished villain.* Those who deny or do not see this, have forgotten or ignore the

fact of man's native and utter depravity. When this great truth is remembered, and taken in connexion with other facts which we have already stated, it is seen clearly that the natural effect of a godless education is only to increase man's power of evil, to give his depraved heart a keener weapon with which to accomplish its work of ruin. It may, therefore, be safely affirmed that a system of education, which ignores the training of the heart by the influences of the gospel, so far from being a blessing to the individual or the community, is a curse to both.

8. The true and only true plan of education, therefore, is that which takes into consideration the *whole* nature of the child, and strengthens each part simultaneously and symmetrically; restraining, developing, chastening each, as may be needed; and thus, by God's help, forming the soul into a perfect, divine character, "in knowledge, righteousness, and holiness."

II. The folly of banishing religion from the school-room is further manifest from the fact that many of the *sciences have a direct bearing upon religion*, and all of them may be profitably used as illustrative of it.

1. Dr. Hitchcock, in his Inaugural Address when assuming the presidency of Amherst, says that "the religious applications of learning are by far its most important use." This he makes the theme of his Inaugural; and there, as well as in his interesting work on the Religion of Geology, shows that every science, even mathematics, is full of beautiful illustrations of the essential truths of Christianity. Is it not important, then, that our teachers should be men of vital Christian experience, who shall thus be ever ready to make science tributary to the cause of Christ, by making it illustrate the truths and commend the precepts of our holy religion to our children?

2. But there is more here than this. Science not only illustrates religion, but exerts a more direct and positive influence upon it. Here we may find examples without number. Take *history*, if you please. It has its facts, and it has its philosophy. Its facts may be garbled, or distorted, or misstated. Its philosophy may be false. An instance of the former is seen in that assertion of the Romanists that Luther opposed the sale of indul-

gences because it was entrusted to the Dominican instead of the Augustinian monks. A noted case of the latter is the philosophy of Gibbon, in his *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. History is thus seen to bear immediately upon Christianity. Shall we not then have a Christian history? A history, true in its facts and true in its philosophy, and taught by men who can appreciate and defend both?

Take *metaphysical philosophy*. Taught more or less in all our schools and colleges, none can doubt its immediate connexion with religion. Can any intelligent man fail to see that the refined skepticism of Kant, the nihilism of Hume, the sublimated idealism of Fichte, the transcendentalism of Hegel, the pantheism of Spinoza, the utilitarianism of Paley, the sensational of John Stuart Mill, the materialism of Hobbes or Darwin, the atheistic rationalism of Strauss, the mysticism of Schleiermacher, the rationalistic and pantheistic eclecticism of Cousin, and the sensuous, humanitarian and positivism of Comte, are, each and all, inimical to true, spiritual Christianity? Shall we not have in all our colleges men who are able to grapple with these errors, and bring our young men to the common sense philosophy, which is consistent with the vital and humble godliness of Revelation? Though philosophy, as Dugald Stewart said, is "yet in expectation," it needs, on that account, the more closely to be watched.

As illustrative of the folly to which mere mental development will reduce men, and of the influence which speculative philosophy has upon men's religious views, let me refer to a couple of examples. Take a specimen of Hegel's transcendentalism. The fundamental proposition of his philosophy, that from which he logically, as he says, deduces his whole system, is the equation, "Sein = Nichts," *Being equals Nothing*. Then comes another equally intelligible, "Sein und Nichts = Dasein," *Being and Nothing = Existence*.

Take another instance of science run mad without the sobering influence of Christianity. Prof. Lorenz Oken, of Zurich, writes such wise things as these: "The highest mathematical idea, or the fundamental principle of all mathematics, is the

zero = 0. The Eternal is the nothing of nature. Man is God wholly manifested. God has become man; zero has become + —. Man is the whole of arithmetic. Animals are single accounts; man is the whole of mathematics. Theology is arithmetic personified. God is a rotating globe. Fire is the totality of ether; is God manifested in his totality. Every thing is only cooled, rigidified fire. Self-consciousness is a living ellipse. There are three virtues, but only one vice. The liver is the soul in a state of sleep; the brain is the soul active and awakening. Circum-spection and forethought appear to be the thoughts of the bivalve mollusca, and snails," etc., etc. These we have selected as specimens of pages of the same kind.

Surely God's word is true, when it says of such, "Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools."

Take the *natural sciences*. This is now the favorite battleground of infidelity. The effort was made, from the discoveries of modern astronomy, to throw discredit upon the Christian revelation. It proved abortive. The earth moved, but God's word did not. Chemistry's aid has been invoked for the same purpose. Now geology, zoölogy, and physiology, are being used in the interests of unbelief. In fact, to the popular mind, there is no attack upon Christianity so plausible and so effective as that which is made from the direction of the physical sciences. Because the facts there adduced are of such a character that the common people can see and appreciate them. Ought we not to be careful then that those who teach our children these interesting and important sciences, should be men having a reverence for our religion, so that they will not tell them (what is not true) that the Mosaic cosmogony is contrary to the facts of geology; nor that Nott and Gliddon, Dr. Van Evrie and Prof. Agassiz are correct in discrediting the common origin of the different races of men; nor will imbue their minds with the materialistic physiology, now taught in so many of our medical colleges? Shall we not have men who will throttle to their death the vagaries of Tindall, Huxley, and Darwin?

Take the *classics*. Even with our expurgated editions, do not their mythology and their morality, even from such men as

Cicero, and Seneca, and Pliny, need the presiding care of a Christian teacher, to correct their errors and to supply their deficiencies?

So we will find it with chronology, literature, antiquities, geography, and, in fact, almost every department of human knowledge.

The close, the intimate, the inseparable connexion between science and Christianity, demands that he, who teaches one, should teach the other also.

III. The teaching of *experience* on this subject is twofold.

1. The importance of combining the culture of the heart with the training of the mind, has, in theory at least, been almost universally recognised. This in every age, in every country, under almost every religion. In the earlier days of every people, education has been confided to the ministers of religion, who have been indeed the doctors and the lawyers as well. With the Jews, Egyptians, Persians, Greeks, Romans, Mohammedans, Chinese, Hindoos, with every people which has had a written history, this has been the case. Among Christian nations, there has not been, I believe, an exception.

2. But experience teaches us further that *where religious instruction has been neglected, though the mind was assiduously and successfully cultivated, the result has been an increase of crime*. This may be to some a startling statement, but it is a truthful one.

• Ovid, I know, wrote,

“*Ingenuas didicisse, fideliter artes,  
Emollit mores, nec sinit esse feros.*” *De Ponto*, 2; IX; 47.

This may be true in its literal rendering. Education in the liberal arts may soften the manners and remove boorishness; but it does not, because it cannot, make a depraved man a good man.

Let us look at a few *facts* bearing upon this point. It is really settled by what was said, under the first head, upon the very constitution of man. Does experience confirm the conclusions then reached?

In France, forty years ago, two-thirds of the inhabitants

could neither read nor write. In Prussia, at the same time, the government had made secular education almost universal, by compelling parents to send their children to school from 7 to 14 years of age. Statistics of the two countries show that *serious crime was, at that period, fourteen times as prevalent in intelligent Prussia as in ignorant France.* *Sir A. Alison's History of Europe, Vol. V., p. 15.*

Again, in the 86 departments of France, it has been ascertained, from official records, that the amount of crime has, without a single exception, been in proportion to the amount of scholastic instruction given in each. *Bulwer's France, Vol. I, pp. 127-138.*

Again, we are told that much the largest number of the lewd women of Paris come from those departments where there is most enlightenment. *Alison, as above.*

"No one ever yet pretended to say that in Italy, where there was the most civilisation during the middle ages, there was the least crime." *Bulwer, as above.*

In Scotland, the mentally educated criminals are to the uneducated as four and one-half to one; in England, they are nearly double; in Ireland, about equal.

In this country, from some past statistics, it was found that the educated criminals, in most of the States, are three times the uneducated; in others, double; in all, greatly superior in numbers.

"In Connecticut, where there is far more instruction than in New York, crime increases with a terrible rapidity. This is what Messrs. Beaumont and De Tocqueville say of the effects of instruction in general in America." *Bulwer, as above.*

It is said that in Paris and New York it is necessary that the detective police shall be men of the shrewdest order of mind and the best information, in order that they may successfully ferret out the rascality of a class of criminals, as shrewd and as well informed as themselves.

For the moral condition of Rome, during its Augustan age of literature, see Paul's horrible description in the first chapter of his epistle to the Christians of that city. The corresponding

state of the refined Grecian world is equally manifest from his letters to the Corinthians. Let other contemporaneous authorities be consulted, Thucydides, Seneca, Martial, Juvenal, and Philo Judæus, and the same revolting truths are plainly declared. With reference to these facts, an eminent scholar says: "The disclosures which have been made by the disinterment of Herculaneum and Pompeii are such as to confirm and illustrate fully all that the apostle says or hints on the tremendous abominations of even the *most civilised* nations of the ancient world. *Indeed the most civilised were plunged the deepest into the mire of pollution; the barbarians being comparatively virtuous.*"

These facts, and, we believe, universal experience, will demonstrate that secular education, unaccompanied with religious instruction and the sanctifying influences of God's Spirit, will not make men better, but rather worse; will only raise up a race of men whose illustrious representatives are found in Prof. Webster, the murderer of Dr. Parkman; and Aaron Burr, the brilliant profligate and libertine.

IV. Let us quote a few *authorities* on this subject.

Says Horace, "Unless your cask is perfectly clean, whatever you put into it turns sour."

Milton, "The end of learning is to repair the ruin of our first parents, by regaining to know God aright, and out of that knowledge to love him, to imitate him." *Letter to Samuel Hartlib.*

Locke, "It is virtue, then, direct virtue, which is the hard and valuable part to be aimed at in education." "If virtue and a well-tempered soul be not got and settled so as to keep out ill and vicious habits; languages and science, and all the other accomplishments of education, will be to no purpose, but *to make the worse or more dangerous man.*" *Thoughts concerning Education, §§70 and 177.*

Kames, "It appears unaccountable that our teachers generally have directed their instructions to the head, with very little attention to the heart."

Alison, "Education and civilisation, generally diffused . . . tend rather to increase than diminish the crimes of fraud and



gain. . . . There is no truth which is supported by a more widespread and unvarying mass of proofs, or which, when rightly considered, might more naturally have been anticipated from the structure of the human mind."

Daniel Webster, in his celebrated argument on the Girard will case, gave utterance to some of the soundest thoughts on this subject ever uttered by man. Says he: "In what age, by what sect, where, when, by whom, has religious truth been excluded from the education of youth? Nowhere; never. Everywhere, and at all times, it has been, and is, regarded as essential. It is of the essence, the vitality of useful instruction." "I maintain that neither by judicial decisions, nor by correct reasoning on general principles, can this devise or bequest be regarded as a charity. . . . It is no charity, because the plan of education is derogatory to the Christian religion; tends to weaken men's reverence for that religion, and their conviction of its authority and importance; and therefore, in its general character tends to mischievous, and not to useful ends."

Thus we see that this eminent statesman boldly took the ground that the infidel Frenchman's devise for the establishment of a college for orphans was not a charity, because he seemingly forbade the children to be taught the religion of Christ. Noble sentiment from a noble man!

Sir Henry Bulwer, "But should education add to human guilt more than it adds to human happiness—should this be the case, the fault is very much in ourselves, and very much owing, let me add, to all education being insufficient—to the absurd belief that to teach reading and writing is quite enough, and that there we may halt and rest satisfied with the good work that we have performed." "If we wish to make ourselves sure of its results—if we wish from afar to see, to regulate, and rejoice in its effects—we must not only fill the mind, we must form the character—we must not only give ideas, we must give habits, we must make education moral as well as intellectual." "I do not place much confidence in the philosopher, who pretends that the knowledge which develops the passions is an instrument for their suppression, or that where there are the most desires, there is

likely to be the most order and the most abstinence in their gratification."

Dr. F. Wayland, "But, intellectual cultivation may easily exist, without the existence of virtue or love of right. In this case, its only effect is to stimulate desire, and this, unrestrained by the love of right, must eventually overturn the social fabric which it at first erected."

V. There is one more consideration which we will present, that is sufficient of itself to settle this question in the mind of every thoughtful, converted man. It is the truth announced by the Apostle Paul, Col. iii. 11, "Christ is all and in all." We belong to him. Our time is his. Our wealth is his. Our influence is his. All our talents are his. *Our children are his.* He has commanded that they shall be taught his word from their youth. Deut. vi. 7; Ps. lxxviii. 5-7; Eph. vi. 4. He said, "Suffer little children to come unto me." In the light of this fact, can we justify ourselves in banishing Christ out of the schoolroom? In standing at the threshold, and saying to the blessed Master, "Here, where our children are kept during ten of the most important years of their life; here, where their minds are trained and stored with information; here, where their characters are being formed, where the earliest and strongest impressions are being made, Thou canst not come?" What a sacrilegious thought! No, let us rather say to the teacher or the trustee, who forbids the constant, controlling presence of Jesus in our halls of instruction; nay, who does not insist that He shall be there as the presiding genius, "Thou art wholly unworthy of thy position. We banish thee, as a foe to our children."

We leave it, for the present, to the thoughtful Christian reader to make an application of the principle here defended to the systems of education in vogue among us. If we of the South are not careful, before we are aware, the Grecian horse will be emptying its hostile forces within the very walls of our defence.

## ARTICLE III.

## THE FIRST AND HIGHEST OFFICE IN THE CHURCH.

The apostles were distinguished by five circumstances from all other Christian ministers, thus: *First*, they were chosen and peculiar witnesses—*eye witnesses* of the resurrection of Christ; *secondly*, they were inspired teachers and miracle-workers; *thirdly*, it was their calling to finish and close the canon of Scripture; *fourthly*, they were appointed to organise and set up the Christian Church; *fifthly*, they were commissioned to go and preach to all nations. Now manifestly there can be no proper successors to the apostles in the first three of these five callings; but just as manifestly, in the last two, all true ministers of the gospel are in a certain important sense proper successors to these original thirteen.

But Paul tells us that he not only held the extraordinary office of apostle, but was also a preacher. His language is “a preacher and an apostle and a teacher of the Gentiles.” And what is remarkable, he *twice uses these terms of himself*, once in the first, and once again in the second Epistle to Timothy. Now the preacher’s office is unquestionably set forth in scripture (see 1 Tim. v. 17) as one of the ordinary and perpetual offices of the Christian Church. And manifestly the apostolic office included and comprehended not only the teaching but also the ruling presbyterate, and not only the whole presbyterate but likewise the diaconate. And it may be asserted that this is true of every legitimate church office—the higher always necessarily includes the lower, so that if a man is ordained to the work of a Christian minister, he is *ipso facto* a ruling elder and deacon.

But the office of the preacher is nowhere articulately described in God’s word. There are two articulate descriptions of the presbyter, viz., 1 Tim. iii. 1-7, and Titus i. 5-9, but the preacher is more than the presbyter properly so called. Those two descriptions are specifically of the ruling elder, as any one may see for himself, for of the two or three and twenty features of

the picture drawn by the apostle, only two apply to the teaching elder, whilst both of these, but more especially all the remainder, apply manifestly to the office of the ruler. It is the ruling presbyter, then, who is the aboriginal presbyter. That was a lower gift, and as to the modern so to the primitive churches, a commoner gift than the noble function committed to the teaching elder. Paul and Barnabas ordained several Presbyteries in every little church which they organised, these could not have been all preachers, for God does not waste his grace. The earlier office filled then was the ruling elder's office, and afterwards slowly, and perhaps always sparingly, (even as it is down to our day,) the higher gift was bestowed. It is, therefore, not the teaching, but the ruling elder who is described in Timothy and Titus. The primary idea of the presbyterate is ruling, but it is preaching which constitutes its subsequent and higher development.

The Scriptures, then, no where articulately describe the preacher any more than the apostle. But Paul, in many of his epistles, especially in those to the Corinthians, gives an account of the manner in which he labored to discharge the preacher's duties; so that we behold the true nature of the office in his living example. Moreover, in his letters to Timothy and to Titus, he gives them such charges as to the manner in which they were to fulfil the office as serve to set fully before us its greatness and solemnity. See 1 Cor. i. 17, 18; ii. 1-5; 2 Cor. iv. 5-9; v. 20; vi. 4-10; 2 Tim. iv. 1-5.

Who can with uninspired pen adequately set forth the preacher of the gospel? A famous Christian poet says well:

"Would I describe a preacher, such as Paul,  
Were he on earth, would hear, approve and own,  
Paul should himself direct me. I would trace  
His master strokes and draw from his design."

How, then, does Paul describe the preacher? Consult the passages just referred to and it will be seen that he is one preaching to the blind and lost. Christ the image of God; and behold light shines by this preaching into their hearts—light from

heaven, even the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ; and with this light there comes also life—new life, divine life, the life of Jesus himself communicated to all who believe this preaching. Thus they become one with Christ as the Head and the members are one, and partake of his immortal life.

He is one who preaches the doctrine of the cross—foolishness to wise men, and an offence to self-righteous ones; but to all who believe it, the power of God and the wisdom of God—the most wondrous and the most glorious truth ever revealed to created minds; the truth of God made man, and suffering and dying, that man might partake of the divine nature; the truth of the Holy one made a sinner, that sinners who believe might be made to have God's own righteousness and be holy; the truth of the source of all life becoming subject to death, that the dead in sin might live forever!

The preacher of the gospel is a legate from the skies, he is an ambassador of God, and his mission is to beseech men, while the day of grace lasts, to be reconciled to God. He brings with him the powers of an ambassador, and has authority to settle with every man the terms of an everlasting peace between God and his guilty soul. Yes, he carries in his hand the key of the kingdom of heaven, and he can open the door and he can also shut it, because God has authorised him to speak in His name. He preaches to men the only terms of pardon, but they are terms of pardon which will bind the Almighty if accepted with all the heart. What an honorable office this! Paul says to preachers, that they must in all things approve themselves as the ministers of God, in much patience, in afflictions, in necessities, in distresses; but he adds, that it is theirs whilst sorrowful to be always rejoicing, and that, although poor, yet they may make many rich. The preacher is, of course, a mere earthen vessel, oftentimes troubled on every side, perplexed and cast down, having, it may be, but moderate endowments of mind, and not able to preach with wisdom of words, yet to him is committed the key of the kingdom, and power on earth to loose men from the guilt of sin, and they are loosed from it in heaven. And the

preacher carries that mighty key of *doctrine* single-handed. The key of *discipline*, that other key of the kingdom, is never borne by one man alone, but always by the rulers in a body. They exercise as a body what our Presbyterian fathers, after Calvin's teaching, called the *joint* power of rule; but the preacher has committed to him singly what they called the *several* power of publicly teaching the awful word of God. Alone he stands up, be it before few or be it before many, and on his single responsibility to the Church and to Christ, discharges the awful and commanding function assigned him.

But in many other places besides those referred to already, in fact all through the book of Acts and the Epistles of Paul, there is to be found a living picture of what the preacher of the gospel is to be. One of the most beautiful of these sketches is contained in the 2d chapter of 1 Thessalonians. The apostle, with graphic force, there presents one strong feature of the true preacher's picture in these words: "But even after that we had suffered before, and were shamefully entreated, as ye know, at Philippi, we were *bold* in our God to speak unto you the gospel of God with much contention." At Philippi Paul's clothes were torn off, many stripes laid on him; he was thrust into the inner prison, his feet were made fast in the stocks; all this was the prelude to the boldness of his speaking at Thessalonica, where at first the Jews debated and discussed with him, but afterwards moved with envy at his success, set the city in an uproar and assaulted him with violence. Another feature of the picture in this chapter is in these words: "But as we were allowed of God to be put in trust with the gospel, even so we speak." Along with his boldness here, is his sense of the honor put upon him in his being *allowed* to preach the gospel, and along with that sentiment this other, that the gospel was *a trust*; and so he declares that he aimed at pleasing God and not men in all his preaching, used no flattering words, was governed by no motive of covetousness, and sought no glory of human applause.

But a third and very touching feature of this picture, is his *gentleness* as a preacher. He was like a nurse dealing with children. They were dear to him; he was affectionately desirous

of them; he would impart to them not the gospel only, but his very soul. He exhorted and comforted and charged every one of them as a father doth his children. And now absent from them in the body, but not in heart, and writing to them in an epistle, he desires to see their face with great desire, because they are his hope, his glory, and his crown of rejoicing. Bold as a lion must the preacher of the gospel be, not fearing the face or the wrath of men; profoundly must he be impressed with the awful trust committed to him, and the transcendent honor of that trust; and yet he must be humble and gentle, loving and tender. He must have high courage and strong faith, but his affections must, like Paul's, be warm, and lively, and impressible.

And now we begin to understand how it happens that the description of the presbyter in 1 Tim., chapter iii., and in Titus, chapter i., should refer specifically to the ruling and not the teaching class. It was because the more important office of the preaching presbyter is set forth, not indeed articulately, yet with such graphic power, in nearly all the epistles of Paul, and because with consummate skill, as well as the most refined delicacy and the most unaffected modesty, he holds up to our view the true preacher of the gospel in himself.

Does not our Form of Government, then, well set forth the pastoral office, meaning that of the teaching elder, as the *first* in the Church both for dignity and usefulness? It is indeed immeasurably the first and the highest. What other can compare at all with this? The office of the deacon is far below it, because he only serves tables, while the pastor gives himself continually to prayer and the ministry of the word. The office of the ruling elder is far below it, because all his power is to apply to concrete cases the word which the preacher preaches; and this he can do, not alone, but always as associated with others, and by their counsel and authority. It is the preacher, the highest functionary of the Christian Church, who is commissioned to handle, and that with public and divine authority, and also alone, no other mortal taking any part with him of the responsibility—it is his, the preacher's, thus to handle the awful word, which is ever, as he handles it, a savor of life unto life, or else of death unto

death, which ever works, as it issues forth from his lips, either to save or to damn immortal souls.

What an office, then, is the preacher's! How grand, considered as an institute of the Son of God himself for the complete accomplishment by human agency of his own divine mission! What glory attaches to it, considered as the only succession of the apostolate! What a weight of solemnity goes with it, as it takes up the work of guiding, instructing, comforting, and saving men! What a terrific work it is, as it binds upon a poor feeble creature's shoulders the care of souls, and bids him get ready to render account for them at the last day to the Judge of all! And yet, along with all these awful features of this office, how attractive and joyful this highest of all callings, considered in relation to its ineffable rewards!

Now the preacher of the gospel is required to make full proof of his ministry; to be instant in season, out of season; to give himself wholly to his great work; and not to be entangled with the affairs of this life. Christ cannot be honored, nor the Church edified, by a secularised ministry. The Lord hath ordained that they who preach the gospel should *live of the gospel*—that is, be supported whilst preaching, and get their living by that business. Accordingly, every call to the pastorate of a Presbyterian church contains a specific engagement on the people's part to him of such provision for his wants as shall set him free from worldly cares and avocations. It is absolutely incongruous for one to mix up preaching with buying and selling. Any kind of secular pursuit, indeed, is incongruous with the care of souls. He who has that awful work bound upon his heart can have no time or strength for any temporal calling whatsoever. How could Timothy observe Paul's requirements, not to neglect the gift that was in him, but to give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine; to meditate upon these things, and give himself wholly to them that his profiting might appear unto all; to take heed to himself and unto the doctrine, (that is, the preaching,) and to continue in them (that is, persistently to follow his high and solemn calling,) so that he might both save himself and his hearers in the great day—how could Timothy observe such requirements, and



yet habitually devote himself to any worldly work? The churches do sometimes encourage their ministers to farm or to teach school by incompetent support, but it is bad policy as well as contrary to the Lord's ordinance on the subject. There is no surer way to make a church spiritually poor, but their minister pecuniarily rich, than to have him settled as pastor on an insufficient salary, with the understanding that he may make it up with the profits of his worldly labor. The man who is at liberty to farm all the week can afford to preach on Sunday for very small pay, but he will not be able very long to edify his church with nourishing and instructive doctrine; and they cannot afford to pay even a small price for profitless preaching, for mere unstudied rambling talk, without study and without prayer. The profiting of their souls demands the intense devotion of all his powers of intellect, and heart, and speech. A church will, ordinarily, wither away, whose minister does not bear them and their children continually on his soul. This is the very idea of the pastorate—it is *caring for* souls, feeding and watering the flock, looking after their spiritual interests, consulting for their growth and progress in the divine life; and this is a great work, what might fill an angel's heart, and what did fill a Saviour's hands; and it is a work not compatible with any secular calling whatsoever. But whilst no church can afford to starve itself to death on the husks which a preacher's mere Sunday morning studies shall produce for their spiritual sustenance, the preacher ordinarily will amass wealth who farms all the week and then gets a small salary, punctually paid him, for talking an hour or two on Sundays. It is no extravagance to say, that churches and preachers who enter into such engagements with each other are just encouraging one another to aim at getting rich in this world's goods. They are stimulating one another to run this kind of race; and the small salary paid the secular preacher for his Sunday's talk is just so much start which the church agrees to give him in their race together for wealth. Ordinarily, the preacher has as good judgment as his people as to the ways of prosperous farming; ordinarily, he knows as well as they do when to buy and when to sell, and how much to ask, and how

much to give; ordinarily, he is as good a judge of the points of a horse or a cow; and if he may but devote the powers of his mind to these matters all the week long, he can acquire property just as well as his people, and then whatever they pay to him as their minister he may put out at compound interest, and he will in the course of years as necessarily come to be rich pecuniarily, as they to be spiritually poor.

But if our Lord ordained that his word should be preached by a class of men set free from all worldly cares and avocations, he did not ordain that the government of his Church should be committed *solely* to such hands. It were incongruous to have all the delicate and difficult and complicated questions, all the practical affairs which the discipline of the Church must affect, regulated *solely* by a set of hermits, of men not of this world, and necessarily unacquainted, because devoted to their spiritual calling, with the things of this world. Accordingly the same Lord who ordained that preaching presbyters should live of the gospel and be free of worldly cares and avocations, has appointed another class of presbyters to be associated with the preaching ones in the rule and government of His Church. And these are to be men of worldly business, of worldly experience, and of worldly wisdom. The whole account of them in 1 Tim. iii., and in Titus i., shows that they are men found in the market-place and the haunts of trade, for they are described as occupying a position which exposes them to becoming covetous, given to wine, soon made angry, and even brawlers and strikers—all which are hardly supposable of the preacher free from worldly cares and avocations and encountering other men only in the religious sphere. It is to presbyters who pursue worldly callings, but are blameless in them; presbyters who have constant dealings with worldly men about worldly matters, but have a good report of them which are without; presbyters who are sober, just, holy, temperate, patient, vigilant, given to hospitality, husband of one wife, ruling well their own houses, and so knowing how to take care of the Church of God, holding fast the faithful word as they have heard it from the teaching presbyter in the pulpit and been taught by him, and being apt themselves to teach it

from house to house, and so able both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers—it is to such ruling presbyters, along with the teaching presbyters, that the work of discipline and government is committed. And surely, if we can see and admire the wisdom and the goodness of our Lord in ordaining that there should be a class of presbyters who to be preachers of his word, who shall not be in any sense *men of the world*, we can also see with equal clearness the same wisdom and goodness in his appointing a second class of presbyters to be joined with this first class in the delicate task of government and discipline. And if these things be so, then it is very easy to understand how the Church is not to be governed by *clergymen*, to employ that word which Calvin and Gillespie and all thorough and sound Presbyterians repudiate as a popish word, signifying the popish error that the heritage of God is a priesthood, and not his dear people—it is easy to understand how the Church is not governed by *clergy*, but by bodies of rulers freely chosen by the people, and that our ecclesiastical judicatories are all of them *representative* assemblies. And thus the Church is plainly seen to be a free Christian commonwealth—free by her Lord's appointment of the State; free of the one-man-power of diocesan bishops; free of all clerical rule as such whatsoever; enjoying the right of self-government as becomes the free people of God, and yet having a freedom regulated by his laws; enjoying a liberty which is far from being license, and constituting not a mere crowd, nor a mere mob, but *Christ own house* organised and governed according to his perfect will.

Let us recur again to the doctrine of our Form of Government, that the office of the preaching presbyter is the first in the Church both for dignity and usefulness. This is plainly the doctrine of the Scriptures. We have seen that in respect to two out of the five features which made up the apostolic office, the preacher is the true and only successor of the apostles; while in the other three features there is no successor of the apostles possible. As to the office of prophet and evangelist, the preacher is *both*, in the only sense in which these offices do now exist. The preacher, then, being in some sense apostle and prophet and

evangelist, there plainly can be no other office in the Church comparable with the preacher's. For as it includes those three highest functions, so far as they now exist in the Church, so also it includes necessarily every other which the Lord has instituted, down to the very lowest. The preacher includes the deacon, and with the deacon he has power over things; he includes the ruler, and with the ruler he has power over persons. Neither of these functions indeed forms any part of his preaching function; but he has them both because he is a preacher. The Scotch Church disfranchises every *preacher without charge*, by not allowing him to sit and vote in Presbytery—but this is to destroy parity. Every preacher in good standing must have the powers both of the ruler and the deacon. Indeed, who ever preaches may, in a sense, be said necessarily to rule; for the whole power of ruling is by the word which the preacher preaches. Standing there in that sacred desk and preaching, he is proclaiming the all-governing word; and having power to proclaim that word, he must needs have power in the proper place and in the proper manner, that is, *along with his brother presbyters*, to apply that word in the discipline and government. And thus it is indisputable that the preacher's office is the first in the Church, both for dignity and usefulness.

In view of all these principles, plainly derived from the Scriptures, it is evident—

1. That the diocesan episcopacy is not the form of government set forth therein. For that system glories in an officer higher than the highest in the Christian Church, and puts under him all the preaching presbyters.

Still further: Diocesan episcopacy is not only a one-man-power in the Church, where lawfully none may rule singly except Christ himself, but it is also a man-made-power in the Church, where lawfully man can make or appoint no power whatsoever.

And further still: Diocesan episcopacy is a complete reversal and transposition of the order and relation in which the Scriptures have placed the preaching and ruling presbyterates. The Scriptures give the especial and highest honor to the presbyter who labors in the word and doctrine. Diocesan episcopacy puts

a ruler—a single ruler over many preachers. The diocesan bishop is not ordinarily a preacher, though he may preach occasionally. But preaching is not his work and business. His business is to *regulate* the multiplied affairs of a diocese. His work is ruling, and that not one church, but many, and not only many churches, but many ministers—he rules on the largest scale. We can call him nothing else but a very exaggerated ruling elder. The power which the Scriptures set forth as joint power he singly exercises; but the several power of preaching he neglects, and disparages by neglecting. The order of Scripture, the order which Christ the King and Head ordained, he reverses; puts the first office below the second; and claims especial honor for himself, precisely for not laboring in the word, but simply ruling well; and yet all his ruling is unlawful, because the Scriptures require the Church to be ruled only by representative assemblies.

2. It is equally evident that Independency can not be the form of government set forth in the Scriptures. Two things lie plainly on the surface of the New Testament and cannot be denied. The first is, that the Church is one, and not broken up into fragments, separate and independent. The second is, that she is a representative republic, governed by her chosen rulers, and not governed directly by the crowd or the mob. One thing more may easily be found in Scripture, namely, that the representative assemblies of the Church stand in regular gradation, and that the whole must govern every part, because the body is one. There is but one body, as there is but one head. Christ has ordained rule and rulers for his Church. He set up his New Testament Church, by first calling the office-bearers, and afterwards the members. The New Testament Church began from its very beginning as one organised body governed by rulers.

3. It is equally evident that the form of government set up in the Scriptures is that one which makes much of the deacon, and much of the ruling elder, and especially much of the teaching elder; and that one which makes much of all these because Christ instituted them. It holds to a divine right for all these offices and their several functions, and therefore makes much of

them. But of course it does not confound them together. It does not, like episcopacy, reverse the order in which these functions stand, and put ruling over preaching; nor does it identify the presbyter with the preacher. All preachers must be presbyters, but all presbyters are not preachers. Nor is the presbyterate the same function as preaching; nor is the assembly of presbyters an assembly of preachers. There is an order of presbyters; but it is divided in the Scriptures into two classes. There is one class of presbyters that exercise only the ruling function; there is another and a higher class of presbyters, who, besides the ruling function, exercise one that is far higher, viz., the teaching function. This teaching function each of this class exercises severally, but the ruling function is to be exercised only by a body of presbyters. And every one of these presbyters is, as such, the peer of every other. The parity of all presbyters, as such, is fundamental in the scriptural system. We do not assert the parity of all preachers, as such; because no parity exists between preachers such as we care a button to assert. The preacher indeed cannot be said to be, as such, the peer of every other; for one has ten gifts of speech, and another five, and another only one. But the parity of all the presbyters and of both the classes of presbyters, as such, is a very different affair—a matter of the highest practical importance in church government, having bearings of vast consequence to the free Christian commonwealth. Right here prelacy and popery take their departure from the true scripture doctrine of presbytery. All the presbyters must have, as such, equal rights and powers, and ruling elders be considered, as such, the full equals on the floor of church courts, that is, the full equals, as presbyters, of the teaching elders, or we begin at once to travel Romewards.

Now all these distinctive principles of this system of Church polity are to be found in the Scriptures. The scriptural form of church government makes much of these distinctions. They are all divine. These are lines which the King himself has drawn. If Presbyterians would but carry out this system into full practice, and so honor him who gave it, his blessing might

be expected to descend. Church polity is, of course, of less consequence in some of its relations than the doctrines of grace. Yet, how great and precious, nevertheless, must be the laws and principles which the King reveals for the government of his kingdom. That kingdom he purchased with his own blood. His Church is as dear to him—it was dearer to him than his life. The least of his commandments respecting it if we break and teach men so, we shall be least; but if we do and teach them, we shall be great in that kingdom.

---

#### ARTICLE IV.

#### EDUCATION.

One of the excellences of our Shorter Catechism is seen in the first question and answer. The wisdom and piety, as well as the orthodoxy, of the framers of that best and most comprehensive summary of Bible truth which uninspired man has ever composed, is seen in the fact that the mind of the learner is directed to the great business for which every person is placed in this world; and, also, in the fact that the whole catechism hangs suspended from this first question and answer. Every one who learns the catechism is taught, in words at least, that his chief end, his main business, in this world, is to glorify God and be fitted to enjoy him forever. How beautiful! how grand! how sublime the idea that is attempted to be put into the mind and heart of the young as to the *great* end, and the *only true* end, of life! God could propose to himself no higher end in the creation, preservation, and government of all things than his own glory. And he requires man to do the same. The framers of our catechism, therefore, were not only right and wise in putting this question and answer in the catechism, but also in putting it in its proper place. It need not be proved to the readers of this article that this idea, this principle, is abundantly

taught in the word of God. We all acknowledge it, and would condemn for extreme heresy the man who should teach otherwise. "To glorify God and to enjoy him forever," is, then, the chief end for which every person is created, sent into this world, and continued here by the good hand of his God. The obligation rests not only on those who profess to acknowledge it and assent to it, but upon every soul of man. None are exempt, and no one can ever be freed from the obligation. And this obligation is coëxtensive with all the powers which God has given to every one. God demands that every power which he has given to every person (and he has given all we have) be brought into his service, and be made to glorify him. No man may serve God with a part, even the chief part of his powers, and be innocent. The *whole heart* must be given to God. Both body and soul, with all their powers, must be wholly consecrated to God, so as to obey the solemn injunction, "Whether therefore ye eat or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God." 1 Cor. x. 31.

Our Saviour taught this in the Sermon on the Mount, when he declared, that not only our religious services, alms, fasting, and prayer, must be done to God, but all other actions. The eye of the soul must be singly directed to God as the one only great object of worship and service, and the only source of happiness. Then, and then only, will the soul have light. It will see clearly the way to heaven, and have the assurance that it is in that way. It will see clearly what is right and what is wrong, and be disposed to do the right. It will see clearly what is truth and what is error, and will cleave to the truth. And it will be made to possess the enjoyments that come from the favor of God. But let it be otherwise—let the eye be directed to some other object out of God, as the great object and end—and there will be darkness in that soul.

Jesus taught the same truth in the parable of the talents. The servant with one talent was punished, not because he had abused or squandered his lord's money, but because he hid it; and hid it, not to cheat his lord out of it, not to appropriate it to his own use, but hid it to keep it entire and securely for his



lord, so as to deliver it all back when it was required. It was the least offence that servant could have committed. He was punished for not positively using the *one*, the *least* talent, for his lord. He taught the same in Matt. xii. 36, "But I say unto you, that every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment." There must be none of God's gifts to man remaining idle. Every person must bring every power into the service of God, and with it glorify God, or be guilty and held responsible, and called to account for idle time, idle talents, idle property, and whatever else he may have. Here, then, is the principle which is to guide us in the discussion of our subject.

If man's chief end is to glorify God and to enjoy him forever, most surely his education ought to be such as to fit him for the accomplishment of this end. This is the common-sense application of the principle, and so clearly true that it need not be argued. We are, then, to consider what is the education which will best fit man for his duties and his rewards.

First. *The knowledge of God must be taught directly from the word of God.*

In placing the knowledge of God *first* in education, we have but to do what God himself has done. "Thus saith the Lord, Let not the wise man glory in his wisdom, neither let the mighty man glory in his might, let not the rich man glory in his riches; but let him that glorieth, glory in this, that he understandeth and knoweth me, that I am the Lord which exercise lovingkindness, judgment, and righteousness in the earth; for in these things I delight, saith the Lord." Jer. ix. 23, 24. Here the knowledge of God is placed above all these things which man so highly esteems—worldly wisdom, power, and wealth; and this knowledge is in regard to what he *is*, and what he *does*, and *all* most excellent.

If the glory of God be man's chief end, man must *know* God in order to glorify him. Hence the framers of our catechism very wisely teach, in the second question and answer, that God himself *has given a rule* to direct us how we may glorify and enjoy him; and that this is the *only rule*; there is no other;

and that *this* rule, *this only* rule which God has given, is “the word of God which is contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments.”

Now, that word of God, this only rule, everywhere puts the knowledge of God, in the *first* place, as the most important to man. “Wisdom is the principal thing, therefore get wisdom; and with all thy gettings, get understanding.” Prov. iv. 7. This is not worldly wisdom, but the knowledge and fear of God. For God said to man, “Behold, the fear of the Lord, that is wisdom; and to depart from evil is understanding.” Job xxviii. 28. “The fear of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge.” Prov. i. 7. And Jesus declared, “And this is the life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.” John xvii. 3.

The knowledge of God is salvation. On the other hand, not to know God is eternal perdition. Some of the most fearful declarations of God in his word are against those who *know not* God, and who *forget God*. How terrible! “When the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that *know not God*, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ; who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power.” 2 Thess. i. 7-9. “Now consider this, ye that *forget God*, lest I tear you in pieces, and there be none to deliver.” Ps. l. 22. “The wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the nations that *forget God*.” Ps. ix. 17.

Again. The word of God shows, by contrast, the very great superiority of the knowledge of God over the highest worldly wisdom. “If any man among you seemeth to be wise in this world, let him become a fool, that he may be wise; for the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God.” 1 Cor. iii. 18, 19. Also in their effects and results, Paul told Timothy that the Holy Scriptures were able to make him wise unto salvation, 2 Tim. iii. 15; but warns him against profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so called. He tells the Corinthians that “knowledge puffeth up; but charity buildeth up.” 1 Cor. viii. 1. And also, that “not many wise men after the

flesh, not many mighty, not many noble are called; but God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise." 1 Cor. i. 26, 27.

Since, then, the knowledge of God is so important, far exceeding all other knowledge, and is eternal life, whilst the want of it is eternal death, most surely it should occupy the first and most important place in the education of those whose business is to glorify God, and whose chief happiness is to enjoy him forever. And since the word of God is the *first* and main source whence this knowledge is to be obtained, the Bible should have the first place in education.

In order to have the first place, the knowledge of God must be taught, not only at home, in the family, and in the house of God on the Sabbath; but also in the school, the academy, the college, and the university, wherever it is proposed to educate the children and youth of our Church, or country. Not otherwise can they be effectually and faithfully fitted to accomplish the great end of their existence.

In making this claim and asserting this duty, we do not forget that the design of education is not merely the attainment of knowledge, but also the training, the enlightening of the mind, and the development of all its powers, so as to promote the highest intellectual culture, and fit it for making the best use of all its attainments. We are willing to concede to the most extreme demands for mental training, and yet assert and show, that, in the process of obtaining the knowledge of God, the mind will receive the very highest intellectual culture which is attainable by man.

1. Every process of mental training is conducted by imparting some kind of knowledge. Not only so, but the attainment of that knowledge is the thing that is placed most prominently before the mind of the student, so that he almost forgets the mental training in present efforts to gain the knowledge. This is so in the study of the classics and mathematics, and in the arts and sciences. The student's progress and standing are estimated by his actual knowledge of these things; so that however any may plead for mere mental training, that training is, and

must be, obtained in the process of acquiring some branch of knowledge.

2. The knowledge of God who is infinite, being the highest of all knowledge, the mental training obtained in its acquisition must needs be the best and the highest, leading to the highest intellectual culture. How much superior to all those metaphysical and philosophical discussions of man's wisdom, much of which is uncertain, misty, false, and really about nothing and leading to worse than nothing—not far behind some of the nonsense of the schools of the Middle Ages, where were discussed such questions as, "How many angels could stand on the point of a needle?"

The subjects treated of in the Bible, are the highest, grandest, most substantial, and most sublime which can be proposed to the mind of man; so that, whilst it contains truths so simple that a child can understand them, it contains also those which the strongest intellects cannot lay hold of and fully comprehend, and which even "the angels desire to look into." 1 Peter i. 12. And all along, between these simple and highest truths, there are those of every grade, suited to every grade of intellect. It does seem that in this respect the word of God was designed, not merely to reveal God's will, but also to train and develop all his mental and moral faculties to the very highest degree attainable on earth, and then remove him to a higher sphere where this education will proceed to all eternity.

The being and character of God; his attributes; his laws; the revelation of things unseen, in the future; the purpose and mystery of redemption through the sacrifice of God's own Son; with all the precepts, promises, threats, warnings, consolations, doctrines, declarations, and all the high truths of God—*these* are the highest truths which can be placed before the mind of man. And if one object of education be to expand the mind, and lead it out to think clearly, accurately, largely, widely, and perseveringly, here is the best field for mental culture. In the words of another, "If truth have a tendency to quicken the soul, the truth of God must have this tendency in the highest degree. It does not, like the science of the mathematics, address

the intellect alone; it stirs the deepest feelings of the soul. Efforts of pure intellect, now, do not call forth the highest intellectual power. That is called forth when the highest intellectual effort is stimulated by intense feeling; this is the very condition of mind which the truth of God is adapted to produce."

These truths of God lie scattered throughout the whole Bible; not systematized, not brought all together and placed in a formal, logical series, but taught in the narratives, the poetry, the prophecies, the direct address, the songs of praise, the parables, the miracles, the epistles to particular churches in reference to peculiar circumstances and events. And yet, gathered up, one by one, out of all these different places, and put together, and compared, there appears a beautiful harmony, a sublime oneness in them all. Like the thousands of little streamlets which from thousands of places take their origin, and wind, and meet together, and flow on until they all unite and form the mighty river; so all these Bible truths all unite at last in one great harmonious whole, and thus declare that they all came from God, and unite to give him glory. He who will study God's word in the spirit of meekness, as a little child, with a single eye directed to God, will see this harmony and excellence, so as to feel and exclaim with David, that God's words are more to be desired than gold, yea, than much fine gold; sweeter also than honey and the honeycomb. Ps. xix. 10. The process of bringing these truths together into that harmony, and the effect on the mind which a view of this harmony produces, is one which will give the highest intellectual culture, and expand all the powers of the soul, as well as produce the more important result—bringing all to the praise and glory of God.

3. The means used to obtain this knowledge of God, may be made to coincide in great measure with the means already used and prized so highly for mental training. The study of the original languages in which the Bible was written, and the exegetical study of the Scriptures in these languages, will give at least as good mental training as the classics. But some will say, "The Greek of the New Testament is not classic Greek." True; but it is such Greek as the Holy Spirit chose to make

known to man the most important of all knowledge; and we may not despise what God's Spirit has selected as the best language to convey God's will to man. "The intrinsic reason," says Dr. J. Addison Alexander, "why this Greek was selected as the language of the Christian revelation, is, that it was also the most perfect language in itself, and therefore doubly suited to become the vehicle of such a revelation, especially after it had been in use for ages as the language of the oldest version of the Hebrew Scriptures." And he regards the Greek of the New Testament as being providentially prepared for the Christian revelation, and that the Greek of the classics was gradually matured to be used in the New Testament. *New Testament Literature*, pp. 64, 65. This testimony, the very best, places New Testament Greek *above* classic Greek—contrary to the opinion of many, and also his own "old childish prejudices against the Biblical Greek, as something illiterate and ungrammatical, a mere corruption and abuse of the first language in the world." *Life of J. A. A.*, pp. 218, 219. Then add to this the higher, nobler, sublime thoughts introduced into the mind of the student, in the study of these languages and the mental effort used in getting hold of these thoughts, and we have a better mental training than the classics could give.

4. There are important branches of knowledge which will be gained, we may say, incidentally, in the study of the Bible. Not to mention others, there are rhetoric and logic taught all through the word of God, not by propounding abstract rules which the student may never learn how to apply, but interwoven in the history, poetry, the prophecy, the didactic discourse, the parable, and the epistle; and the student of the Bible will unconsciously derive the very best lessons in these whilst engaged in the acquisition of the knowledge of God. Some of the best examples of the simple, tender, pathetic, beautiful, sublime, and forcible presentations of truth which the lips of man ever uttered are to be found in the Bible. It is the *best* rhetoric; for it is *God's* rhetoric. So also in regard to logic—it is *God's* logic. He says to man, "Come, and let us reason together." And the Bible is full of God's reasonings with man; and he always proves

conclusively whatever he attempts to prove. Let any one read carefully the prophecies and also the personal teachings of Jesus with this in view, and he will find it to be so. Jesus always silenced those who tried to entangle him or reason with him. For example: When the Pharisees (Matt. xii.) accused him of being in league with Satan in casting out devils, he not only proved himself clear and showed the absurdity of the charge, but turned the accusation upon themselves, and showed conclusively that they were on the devil's side in opposition to himself.

And where can we find, in uninspired writings, such logic as Paul uses in his epistles, especially in Romans and Hebrews? And these acquisitions are made incidentally, and in such a manner as to secure the most effective use of them. They are not unwieldy, as Saul's armor was to David, but natural, as the stone and sling in the hands of "the stripling," mighty in overcoming the giant.

5. But there is a moral training which is far more important than mere intellectual culture, however high; and this moral training can be obtained only from the Bible. Even the English sceptic Huxley "has lately come out very decidedly in favor of the reading of the Bible in the common schools" on the ground "that there must be a moral substratum to a child's education to make it valuable, and that there is no other source from which this can be obtained at all comparable with the Bible." Coming from such a source this testimony is valuable; and surely no Christian will disagree with the infidel in regard to this matter. But let us be careful that we agree not only in *theory*, but also in practice, or else we are worse than the sceptic. If this moral training is needed in the common school, is it not also needed in the higher school, the college, and the university? If not, why? Let Christian parents, and Christian teachers see to it that, whilst they are almost horrified at the exclusion of the Bible from the common schools in Cincinnati and other places by infidels, Jews, and Catholics, they themselves do not virtually and practically exclude it from the schools and colleges under their care and the care of the Church.

We are prepared to assert that the Bible, especially when

studied in the original languages, exegetically and practically, affords the very best means for the highest intellectual and moral culture. This may be contradicted; but it cannot be proved that it is not so. That it is so, and must be so, is argued, from the fact that the Bible is from God, is about God, and is designed as the *first* means to prepare man and direct him how to glorify God and enjoy him forever, which is his chief end. The Bible, then, should have the first place in the education of our children and youth, both for the superior knowledge it contains and the superior mental and moral training it will give. God knows what is best for man; and he has given man all he needs to develop all his powers in the best way, so as to glorify him with them all. *We plead for the Bible!*

Second. The great end of education is to be obtained also by a knowledge of God in *his works*, both of creation and providence. We are not advocating the study of the Bible to the exclusion of the studies usually taught in our schools. Whilst we cannot sanction any study which from its nature cannot be used for God, and which will not fit its possessor for glorifying God, yet we would not desire any limit to those studies which teach the knowledge of God in his works, except the limit which necessity imposes. We *cannot know* everything. We are not afraid of science taught as it should be taught. We are afraid of "science falsely so called," half-fledged speculations of vain men about the works of God. What is contended for is, that there be no divorce between God and his works; but that whilst the teacher unfolds to his pupils the wonders of the natural world and of the universe, he also show them the hand that made them all, and the infinite wisdom and power and goodness of God in the creation, the preservation, and the government of the universe. "The heavens declare the glory of God," and "all thy works shall praise thee, O Lord." And whoever proposes to teach the knowledge of the works of God should teach the knowledge of God in and by his works, and teach also that "his tender mercies are over all his works." The silent voice of these works of God should not only be permitted to gain entrance to the mind of the scholar; but the teacher should seek, as the great



end of these studies, to direct the minds and hearts of the pupils to what these works declare, and thus bring these *rational* beings to unite with the *irrational* creation in giving glory to God. How noble! how elevating! how healthful, to lead the inquiring minds of youth on through the vast fields of knowledge opening to their view, in geography, history, natural philosophy, astronomy, chemistry, botany, geology, and all others relating to the works of God, and to teach them to see God *in all things!* In this way they might learn to observe for themselves and see the wisdom, the goodness, the power, and the love of God in every leaf and flower and the smallest insect, as well as in the greater works of God. Let this be done, and we fear no disagreement between the works and word of God; but science will become "the handmaid of religion." If it be not done, we need not wonder if science arrays itself against religion, and the works of God be used to prove there is no God.

Third. The great end of education is to be promoted by constantly teaching the young that it is their *first duty*, as well as their *highest interest for time and eternity*, to bring all their talents and all their acquisitions into the service of God, and glorify him with them all; in other words, that the chief end of their existence in this world is to glorify God and to enjoy him forever. *It is so*, and all should be taught that it is so. It is the hardest lesson for man to learn, and the one he is most slow and averse to learn. For this very reason the lesson should be given early, constantly, and perseveringly; and as the framers of our catechism designed, it should be the first lesson upon which all other succeeding lessons should hang suspended, so that the whole course of education, the sum of all attainments, shall be made to subserve the one great end—as in the case of a converted astronomer, who, when asked what he would now do with his favorite science, replied, "I am now bound for heaven, and I take the stars in my way." Here is the true spirit of Christianity; and nothing short of this will stand the test in the last solemn day. He who does not make it his chief end to glorify God will not be prepared to enjoy him forever, and will most assuredly miss heaven and gain eternal perdition.

He who does not place Christ *first* in his heart's affections, so that the current of his life is controlled by love to Christ and a sincere desire to please him in opposition to the flesh or the dearest object in the world, cannot be a true disciple of Christ. "He that loveth father or mother more than me, is not worthy of me." No one has any good ground to hope that he is a Christian unless he has sincerely from the heart said to Jesus,

"Lord, I make a full surrender,  
Every power and thought be thine,  
Thine entirely,  
Through eternal ages thine."

This is implied in the profession of religion by every one; and he who does not mean it practises a deception on himself, or the Church, or both. Here is felt to be the great want of the Church at the present time—a want of this entire consecration to God, so as to bring "every power and thought" into the service of God. Here is the lesson we need to learn more than any other. If this could be effectually learned so as to be practised, all other difficulties would be removed. There would then be no want of men and means to support and spread the gospel, and the world would soon be converted to God. And how shall we learn the lesson? Some will say, "Only by an outpouring of the Spirit of God." True; but God's Spirit ordinarily works by means, and in the same direction with the diligent and sincere use of these means, especially his word, so that "whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap. For he that soweth to his flesh, shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the Spirit, shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting." Gal. vi. 7, 8. If we would have this consecration to God, our children must be taught it to be their duty from the first and at all times. It is a true proverb, and in accordance with the word of God, and common sense, "Whatever you would have appear in the life of a nation, you must put into her schools." If, then, we would have this consecration to God appear in the Church, we must put it into our schools, and teach children and youth, and *all*, at home, in the school, and in the Church, the first lesson in the catechism. If our youth are taught, by the motives placed

before them as inducements to diligence in study, to acquire knowledge and train their minds for the sake of literary honor or for selfish and worldly ends, most assuredly we shall see them pursue the course in which they have been led and taught.

It may be said that unconverted youth do not recognise this obligation, and therefore you cannot make the glory of God a ground of appeal to them with any hope of success. The answer is: For this very reason they should be taught that it *is* their duty. If you constantly appeal to selfish and worldly motives as incitements to action, they will never learn any thing better, never rise any higher; and when they "join the Church" you will have constantly to appeal to these same motives to get them to do any duty, or give *their* (?) money. But teach them constantly that the glory of God is their highest end and best interest, and there is hope that, by the blessing of God, they will rise to it, and feel that they, and all they have, belong to God.

We are aware that common opinion has virtually decided that the school and the college are not the places to teach the knowledge of God in his word, and in his works of creation and providence, and also the duty to glorify God; but these things are reserved for the parents at home, in the Sabbath-school, and in the church, and that on the Sabbath. But where is the authority for this common opinion? Not in the word of God, most assuredly, which is "the *only rule* which God hath given to direct us how we may glorify and enjoy him forever," and which teaches that the knowledge of God and his laws is the highest knowledge, and that it is the duty of all who have charge of children and youth, to teach this knowledge diligently, constantly, and perseveringly, making this the *first* and most important matter. See Deut. vi.

Supposing the great responsibility for their religious instruction does rest on parents primarily, that responsibility is assumed by those who come and say to these parents, "Send your sons and your daughters to us to obtain their education." And the parents are to see to it that their children have the same religious training which it is their duty to impart, and not

permit Satan to have some two or three or four years of the most critical part of their lives to sow his seeds of evil. This common opinion has prevailed, so as to root out almost all religion from the literary institutions of our country. So true is it that "an ounce of custom outweighs a ton of reason;" and we may add, even though that reason be drawn directly from the word of God. Common opinion and custom have their origin in the world, but glide into the Church, and lead it along, and by degrees crush out its vitality, and make it conform to the world, until nothing is left except the form of religion. This is a master device of Satan to preserve his reign, and overthrow the Church of God.

We have some notorious examples of this in the case of some of the colleges in our country. These colleges were founded by pious individuals "to furnish men for the ministry, and thus to mould the moral and religious character of the nation." Consecrated money was expended to found these institutions and carry out the design. But Satan laid his plan also. And now these powerful influences have been perverted from their original design, and turned against religion to promote infidelity and error. It would be interesting and profitable to trace all the steps throughout this great change. We may not do this. But we can see the main strategem practised by Satan to accomplish this result. This was by degrees, to press out whatever of true religion there was taught in these colleges, and engross the time and mind with secular studies for worldly ends, and to promote, under the guise of free inquiry, doubts, misgivings, scepticism, and open error and infidelity.

Pious John Newton said, "The best way to keep out chaff, is to fill your bushel with wheat." When once these colleges were emptied of their wheat, it was a natural consequence that they would be filled with chaff. Hence they have raised up a large army of soldiers, armed, trained, and equipped, to go forth openly to fight the devil's battles in opposition to Jesus. And these soldiers are among the most enlightened classes, leaders in literature, and the most efficient in Satan's army; the more so, because of their talents, learning, and respectability. So true

is it, that unsanctified learning is a curse both to the possessor and to all who come under his influence.

In a recent address delivered at Amherst, Massachusetts, the speaker noticed this perversion in some of the New England colleges, and endeavored to account for it by the predominance "given to scientific rather than philosophical or classical studies, since the former tended to weaken reliance on faith or intuition, and promote a demand for demonstration, and was hostile to the religious frame of mind." That reverend speaker might have found a better solution in the exclusion of the Bible from the school and college, and teaching science, or the works of God, without seeing or noticing God in his works. Is it any wonder that young men, puffed up with their little knowledge, should go forth with infidel tendencies, when for three or four years they are taught, in the regular college curriculum, nothing positively about the God of the Bible; and have heard their teachers talking and lecturing about the "forces of nature" and the "operation of natural laws," without ever saying one word about the God who made and who executes these laws, and who gives to nature all its forces every moment, or it would have none? No wonder men are atheists, when, for several years, they are taught constantly that "there is no God," and taught, too, by those to whom they look for instruction, and whom they are taught to reverence and believe! No wonder "there is an inherent tendency to rationalism in all scholastic institutions," when God and his word, and the knowledge of God, are either excluded altogether, or are made to take so low a place as to produce contempt for them all; when youth are taught to rely more on reason than on the word of God; when the head is cultivated to the almost entire neglect of the heart.

It becomes us seriously to consider what are the tendencies of our own institutions. The devices of Satan are so subtle that they are not easily seen. At the present time there is almost a *furor* in certain circles in regard to what is called secular education. And there is danger lest Satan take advantage of this and get the Church to work for him in building up his kingdom. Under the name and form of Christian education, the Church

may engage in training, arming, and equipping a numerous band of the most efficient soldiers for the devil, to do battle against Christ.

The best way to avoid this is to go sincerely to God's word and see what it teaches us to do, and then go and do what it directs. This we have endeavored in previous pages to show. And it remains for us to ask *sincerely* and *solemnly*—as in the presence of God to ask: Since the knowledge of God in his word and his works is the highest of all knowledge and the most important to man, and since the glory of God is to be the rule of all man's actions and the great end of all his aims, and since any soul that is destitute of this knowledge and not governed by this motive will most surely perish forever, and since all other attainments will avail nothing to that soul without the knowledge of God, are our schools and colleges aiming at *these* as their main design, and using the means to attain these ends?

We make this inquiry not of those institutions which are outside of our control, but of those established by Presbyterian people, with money professedly consecrated to God, and to educate and train our own children in the knowledge and fear of the Lord. We here do not presume to answer this inquiry positively and directly in regard to any of these institutions.

We are at liberty, however, to speak *what we do know* in regard to one college. In that college course proper, religion, the knowledge of God, had very little place compared with what was wholly secular of this world. The only lessons *about* religion, except moral philosophy, were given to be studied on the Sabbath and recited on Monday morning before breakfast, which to dignified juniors and "grave and reverend seniors" was an unpleasant condescension after they had escaped these morning recitations at the end of the sophomore year. The study of the Bible had no place in the regular recitations during the week. And in the study of the works of God—the sciences—God was not made known as the author of these works, nor his power, wisdom, and goodness shown in their formation, preservation, and government, except a few times by the Professor of Astronomy, enough to show how effectively all these sciences might be used

to impress the young with grand, reverential, and noble thoughts of God, *their* Creator and Preserver. In the classics was taught the knowledge of the gods of Greece and Rome, but never a word in regard to the only living and true God, where there was such a good opportunity of contrasting his character with that ascribed to these senseless vanities teeming with wickedness and licentiousness. Then, as to the motives presented before the mind to diligence in study, the prime motive constantly held up was literary honor. This powerful stimulant was administered at every recitation, in every exercise, and the performance of every college duty. So practised did the eye of some become that it could trace the motion of the professor's pencil as it marked the value of each recitation and tell that value. As well as can be remembered, the students were never told that it was their duty to bring all their attainments into the service of God and glorify him with their all, unless it were in a sermon on the Sabbath. Literary and scientific attainments were the almost sole objects of ardent pursuit, and "excelsior" was the motto that rang and reverberated through those halls of learning, whilst genius and talent were worshipped and crowned with the highest honors, although residing in minds and hearts which hated God and his word and teemed with wickedness and pollution.

Now is it any wonder that students, in a three or four years' course, learned to esteem secular knowledge for its own sake, or for selfish or worldly ends, far above the knowledge of God? Is it any wonder that the Bible and religion took a low place in their estimation when the lowest place was assigned to them in the regular course of studies, and by those who professed to be guided by the word of God? Is it any wonder that worldly literature took the highest place, when hour after hour was spent in lecturing on the beauties of Shakspeare and other similar authors, and scarcely a word uttered in regard to the beauties, the sublimities, and the value of the Bible? Recurring to the proverb, "Whatever you would have appear in the life of a nation, you must put into her schools," we can see its truth exemplified in our country and in the Church. We look abroad

every where, and we see worldliness in its various forms occupying a high and prominent position even in the Church. Worldly literature is placed above religious literature by a very large portion of those who profess to be the people of God. And a person is esteemed intelligent, not from his knowledge of God, but of secular learning and literature, and that too often the most light and trashy. From every quarter we hear the same complaint of worldliness and indifference to vital religion. If any one doubts the truth of these complaints let him look at the comparatively small amounts of money expended by professors of religion for their own religious privileges, or contributed for others, whilst large amounts, are freely expended for worldly show and sinful amusements and sensual gratifications. The body is pampered, whilst the soul is starved. There are many who expend far more for their tobacco or some other injurious indulgence than for the gospel at home or abroad. The case of one family which expended sixty dollars for tobacco and not a dollar to support their minister, though four or five of that family were members of the Church, is not a solitary case. Such facts tell the real state of things. Men ordinarily expend voluntarily the most money for what they esteem the most valuable. There are those who willingly expend hundreds of dollars for a mere worldly education with no religion in it, who have scarcely a dollar to spare for religious books or religious papers for these same children.

These are *facts*: and taking these facts and admitting the truth of the proverb above quoted, we may learn what things are being put into our schools without going to each one and making particular inquiries. May we not conclude that the college above mentioned is a fair sample of what is the case generally? That college was a Presbyterian institution, nine of whose teachers were Presbyterian ministers; and we write these things from a deep and abiding conviction that such teaching is wrong, and not at all from any unpleasant remembrance in regard to any one of them. From them all we received the kindest treatment.

From what we know of most of our institutions of learning,



we are led to believe that the regular course of instruction in that college is very much the same as in all our institutions. The superior place and the more abundant honors assigned to mere secular learning, put it far above the knowledge of God; whilst from the beginning to the end of the session and of the whole course, selfish ambition, worldly honor, literary distinction, and worldly ends, are the motives held constantly before the mind to induce diligence in study and to make superior attainments. We gather these facts from the printed catalogues of these various institutions, and from the reports of those who attend their examinations. These tell us of the various prizes awarded for literary distinction which had been held before the mind's eye during the whole session and made the grand motive to study, thus putting selfish and worldly ends far above the glory of God as the chief end of man. We need not wonder that we have in our country and in the Church a bountiful harvest of such worldly fruits, since there is such a bountiful sowing of the seeds of worldliness. We need not wonder that it is so difficult to get professors of religion to rise up to the Bible standard of religion and consecrate themselves and all they have to God, when they have been taught all their lives that some *worldly* end is the *chief* end of man.

Is there not much of what is termed secular learning which not only *is not*, but *cannot* be, consecrated to God? Witness the time, the money, and the labor expended in the attainment and practice of secular music, which Webster defines as "any music or songs not adapted to sacred uses;" whilst sacred music has scarcely a place in the school. And is not that definition correct? Just think of attempting to praise God, or in any way to glorify him, in the performance of a waltz! or of writing holiness to the Lord upon a book of secular music! How few persons bring their attainments in music into the service of God, or even design to do so! Some persons may be surprised that such a thing should be expected or required, and be ready to pronounce it as being righteous overmuch. But let us look at it in the light of God's word, *our only rule*. Is the injunction, "Whether therefore ye eat or drink, or *whatsoever* ye do, do all to the glory of God," a

mere play upon words? If "every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment," shall *idle songs* and *idle music* be exempt from that account? But much of secular music is not merely idle; it *works*; and since it does not work *for* Christ, it most surely work *against* him. Matt. xii. 30. Music, even without words, is not merely "a concord of sweet sounds." It expresses and conveys sentiment which is *felt* by every one who has any "music in his soul." And the sentiment expressed by secular music is wholly "of this world," and tends to promote worldliness. How is it that dancing has already gotten into the Church, and sits securely there with little fear of being turned out, especially those most objectionable forms of it so prevalent in the higher circles of society? Has not the constant practice of waltzes, polkas, gallopades, etc., for years had something to do with its introduction and popularity? Some one has said "Let me make the ballads of a nation, and I care not who makes its laws," thus asserting the power of music in forming the character and habits of a people. Under the guise of refinement and intelligence, and receiving the sanction of Christians as a part of Christian education, this worldly music has filled the youthful mind with its peculiar sentiments; so that the taste, the disposition, and the character, have been largely formed by them, and only want the opportunity or the occasion for their manifestation in the dance. This is a master device of Satan for the introduction of worldliness into the Church in such a form as to give it respectability and security there. With many no argument will avail to convince that there is wrong in it. Custom sways the sceptre, and *all*, even ministers of the gospel, must yield to its demands, or be counted as opposed to intelligence and refinement and entirely "behind the times." And this is done right in the face of these declarations of God's word: "The friendship (love) of the world is enmity against God;" "Ye cannot serve God and mammon;" and "That which is highly esteemed among men is abomination in the sight of God."

The conclusion to which we are forced is this: Secular learning, for its own sake, or for selfish and worldly ends, is exalted

far above the knowledge of God, and the glory of God as man's chief end. Our common education is far more for time than eternity; far more for the body than the soul. Worldly literature stands far above that which pertains to *vital, heart religion*. If any are disposed to deny this, we refer to the facts which abound every where. Our catechism is right, and our theology is scriptural, in teaching that "man's chief end is to glorify God, and to enjoy him forever." But let us remember that there is such a thing possible as for us to write "holiness to the Lord" on all our attainments and possessions, and then offer them all in sacrifice to the flesh, the world, and the devil. So deceitful is the human heart—"deceitful *above all things* and desperately wicked."

It remains to specify, more particularly, some of the evils resulting from the undue exaltation of secular over sacred learning; and this at the risk of being criticised for some repetition.

1. *The Bible is neglected.* A lower place is assigned to it than to the current literature of the day. It matters not that men *say* they esteem the Bible above all other books, whilst they read it, study it, and talk about its great truths less than they do secular literature. Their conduct contradicts their words and tells the truth. The result, the *fact*, is, there is much ignorance of Bible truth where there is much intelligence in regard to worldly literature; and this is shown by the ability and readiness of such persons to converse freely and fluently on the latter, whilst a very little time and few words are sufficient for religious conversation. The reason is obvious. There is a want of familiarity with Bible truth, and also a want of taste for such conversation. "For out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh." Matt. xii. 34. That which fills the mind and heart will find expression in words.

2. The undue exaltation of mere secular learning over the knowledge of God puts great difficulties in the way of the salvation of the soul. "Knowledge puffeth up." 1. Cor. viii. 1. And that conceit of wisdom and pride of intellect resulting from mere secular learning, must be brought down before the soul can be saved. "Let no man deceive himself. If any man

among you seemeth to be wise in this world, let him become a fool, that he may be wise. For the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God." 1 Cor. iii. 18. Such a spirit is in direct opposition to that spirit which is necessary to confess sin, repent of it, receive Christ, and live wholly for God. The highest, wisest, most honorable and powerful of this world, must come and take the same low place as the poorest and most ignorant. They must humble themselves and receive the kingdom of God as a little child, or they cannot enter therein. No one is so hard to approach on the subject of the soul's salvation as the worldly wise. He claims to be able to think for himself, and will permit no one to press on him his duty; and he is the most averse to the simplicity of the gospel method of salvation. It is hard for him to humble himself, so as sincerely to say, "I have sinned," and pray, "God be merciful to me a sinner." Hence God's word declares that "not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble are called." 1 Cor. i. 26. *Most fearful truth!*

Another obstacle to the conversion of the soul is placed, or at least cultivated, in the mind and heart of the unconverted by the motives presented before him to induce diligence and high attainments in learning. These are selfish and altogether worldly, leading to a desire for the praise of men more than the praise of God. Jesus asserts this difficulty in the strongest language—"How can ye believe which receive honor one of another, and seek not the honor that cometh from God only?" John v. 44. And this difficulty was exemplified in some of the chief rulers who professed to believe on Jesus, but "did not confess him, lest they should be put out of the synagogue; for they loved the praise of men more than the praise of God." John. xii. 43. And if we will observe closely, we shall see how many are hindered by it; and also see many professors of religion constantly displeasing God in order to please men and get glory from them. They are borne along by popular custom to conform to the world, and the most solemn declarations of God's word will not avail to turn them from their ways. They will seek the praise of men, even at the sacrifice of God's favor, the loss of heaven,

and the loss of the soul. They have been taught in the school and college that this worldly distinction is of the highest value; and in after life they show that the lesson has been well learned, for its fruit appears in all they do.

We read of the desolations caused by the ambition of Alexander or Napoleon, and see something of the magnitude of that sin. We hear of some professed ministers of the gospel, who, in order to be popular and get glory of men, depart from the truth and embrace gross error, and preach it; and we denounce both them and their sin; and yet in our schools and colleges we are cultivating in our children and youth the same disposition which led these men to such conduct. We call the germ "laudable emulation;" but when fully grown it is that selfish, cruel, insatiable ambition which would lay a world in ruins in order to rise on these ruins and be called great; or cause a minister of the gospel to destroy his own soul, and draw after him thousands of other souls down to eternal perdition.

3. Another evil resulting from putting secular learning above the knowledge of God, is seen in the too great respect paid to the persons and opinions of sceptics and infidels, because they are men of learning and science. They boldly demand that science teaches truth contrary to the Bible; and the friends of religion are ready to concede too much to their opinions, as if they were certainly true; and go to work to make a new translation, or give a new interpretation of some passage in the word of God which has been assailed, in order to make it agree with these often half-fledged opinions of men who *wish* to believe the Bible to be false. This gives them a standing and influence they otherwise would never have. Many infidel books would soon perish if the friends of religion, and the religious press, would pass them by unnoticed. These men want to be noticed, even if it be by the strongest opposition. It is on such food that they live. No man, who knows much of human nature, will stultify himself by supposing that sceptics have any design of good, or of knowing the truth. Literary honor, literary pleasure and vanity, are at the bottom of all their vain fancies; and this vanity is fed by the sensation produced by their theo-

ries. "A German has just given a catalogue of publications on the subject of Darwinism which takes up twelve closely-printed pages, and the list is necessarily very deficient." How gratifying this must be to the author of the theory! We should put the same value on these men and their wisdom which God puts on them. Their wisdom is foolishness with God, and they are fools in the sight of God. Lorenzo Dow said "that man, in regard to the blessings of God, was like the hog gathering up the acorns under the tree, but never looking up to see whence they came." David used the same illustration in regard to men who were destitute of the knowledge of God. "Man that is in honor, and understandeth not, is like the beasts that perish." Ps. xlix. 20. And God himself declared that such were more senseless than the dull ox or the stupid ass. Is. i. 3. And some of them show that this is true by endeavoring to prove their own origin, as not from God, but from a baboon, or some other more degraded animal. Let us esteem them and their theories accordingly. If we will put the Bible in its proper place, and teach the knowledge of God in his word and in his works, we need not fear much from infidelity. "Fill the bushel with wheat, and you will keep out the chaff." Satan is ever ready to enter into a truce with the presidents and professors of colleges, fully consenting to their going abroad to lecture against infidelity, provided they will keep the Bible out of the regular course of instruction at home, and give him full scope to sow his seeds in the minds of youth; for he knows that these lectures will not reach many outside of those who agree with the lecturer. "Error flies on wings, whilst truth crawls on the ground." We once listened to a lecture designed to refute the Nebular Hypothesis of La Place, which was better adapted to substantiate that theory, in the depraved human heart, than to refute it. There are many persons who would die in blissful ignorance of some of these infidel theories if they were not brought to their notice by the friends of religion and treated with so much respect because they are the deductions of science. We are at a loss to decide which appears the most foolish, those men who contend for man's origin in some of the lower creatures, or the friends of religion who,

with the Bible in their hands, pay so much respect to such absurdities. Geologists have demanded a new translation of the Bible to suit the discoveries of science. The friends of the Bible yielded so far as to render the fourth commandment an absurdity by substituting "seven thousand years" in the place of the word day, and instead of "six days shalt thou labor," read "forty-two thousand years shalt thou labor and do all thy work," etc., "for in forty-two thousand years the Lord made heaven and earth and rested seven thousand years." But just as this concession is made, another geologist dredges the ocean and finds deposits being made at the present time which have been assigned to several distinct periods millions of ages apart, and all in the same locality. The origin of this too great respect and these concessions is the higher place and higher value given to worldly wisdom above the wisdom of God. Infidelity, under the garb of science, is seeking to undermine the foundations of true religion and Christian revelation. The attacks of scepticism are not always against the whole Bible openly and avowedly, but parts of it; and this by insinuating that the discoveries of science reveal facts which are contrary to those facts asserted in the Bible to be true; as for example, the creation and the origin of man. With the most consummate boldness, sceptics demand, in the name of science, full assent to their theories as ascertained certainties, to which the teachings of the Bible must yield. And the friends of the Bible, out of their great respect for science, are ready to concede to these demands and seek to reconcile the Bible with these theories, and interpret its teaching so as to accommodate them to science. There is some word or passage that must be altered; some unsightly stone in the edifice which must be removed. Satan knows, and sceptics know, and the friends of the Bible ought to know, that this and that stone sought to be removed is the keystone of some arch, which being removed, the whole edifice will fall. Let us not aid in this ruinous work by excluding the Bible from our schools and conceding to every whim of "science falsely so called." True science in the sense of what is to be known of the works of God and of what is already certainly known never contradicts the word of God. But science,

in the sense of some men's imperfect knowledge of these works and their false theories, may, and often does, oppose itself to the teachings of the word of God.

4. The overvaluing of secular learning above the knowledge of God is tending towards rendering the preaching of the gospel of no effect. It does this by displacing the simple, plain, pointed, powerful truths of the gospel from the pulpit, and putting in their stead the devices of man's wisdom, both in regard to matter and manner. In some localities certain preachers have been accustomed to use the Bible merely to get a short text for a motto on which to found a philosophical essay, political harangue, or sensational discourse upon some passing event. Lately, however, we learn that some dispense with even the text. We may look with indifference on such a perversion of the work of the ministry, or denounce it with the feeling that we are in no danger of doing the same; but the same influences are at work amongst us to produce the same results. Under the pretext of literary taste the world demands sermons learned, eloquent, ornate, beautifully hovering around and over the truths of religion; not such as will make them feel uneasy in their sins, but such as will permit them to pass a pleasant hour in the house of God on the Sabbath. The Church requires her ministers to yield to this demand in order to *draw a congregation*. And that minister who yields and succeeds in wreathing the sword of the Spirit with flowers, so as to deprive it of both edge and point, is made to hear shouts of applause to which he is not altogether indifferent; for he has been taught that literary honor is of the very highest value, and it is hard, very hard, for him to unlearn the lessons so long and so deeply impressed on his mind. There are some ministers who have to be chastised severely and constantly, and that for years, by the Master, in order to keep down this unholy ambition, this seeking to please men rather than God; and they almost despair of ever being permitted to do any good, because whenever God makes use of them to do a little service they are ready to take the glory all to self and give little or none to God. Thus the gospel becomes of no effect. The solemn truths of the gospel are preached and heard as if they were merely themes for the



display of the preacher's talents and the pleasure of his hearers. From these very sources we are in danger of "dying of respectability." Our undue devotion to secular learning is crushing out the very life of religion, whilst in both the learned and the unlearned there is a sad want of the knowledge of God in his word and his works. One of England's best preachers has made this strong declaration, "Let knowledge be generally diffused, and the fear of God be kept in the background, and you have done the same for a country as if you had laid the gunpowder under its every institution; there needs only the igniting of a match, and the land shall be strewed with the fragments of all that is glorious and venerable." (Melville.) This language is not too strong. We can see it verified in regard to true religion in some parts of our country, where nothing is left of religion except the outward form, made beautiful and respectable to suit a progressive age in its taste and high esteem for mere secular learning and literature. We are in danger from the same cause. Most certainly there is danger of our spiritual death when *that* is called Christian education which has nothing of religion in it, except that it is imparted by Christian men and women. And when we are dead, God will write of us, as he did of Israel, "My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge." Hosea iv. 6. The highest intellectual culture, not consecrated to God, increases the responsibility of the possessor, and his power for evil; and also renders that person all the more sensitive to the miseries of the world of woe, if he be finally lost, as well as increases those miseries. There are but two classes of men in the sight of God: his friends and his enemies; those who are gathering for Christ, and those who are scattering abroad. The training of youth in the school, is training each class for the part he is to take in the great contest, either for or against Christ. That teaching which does not seek to impart the knowledge of God and does not teach the duty of serving God with all the attainments made, is not merely deficient—it is wrong; for it is training and arming Christ's enemies for a more efficient opposition to his kingdom, and renders them more powerful in aiding Satan in his work. The man who makes and sells arms to the enemies of his country

in time of war, for the sake of gain, is himself counted an enemy and is esteemed and treated accordingly, for he most effectually aids the enemies of his country. There is then a fearful responsibility resting on those who teach in our schools when the most numerous class in these schools may be the enemies of Christ. They may be doing fearful work *against* the kingdom of Christ, and *for* that of Satan.

In view of these solemn truths, we repeat that we plead that the knowledge of God in his word and in his works may have a higher place in all our institutions of learning; and that all our youth may be taught their duty to make the glory of God their chief end in all their attainments. If "true education is not merely the acquisition of knowledge, but learning how to use it," we ask what higher, nobler, more important use can be made of it than to glorify God with it all and thus be fitted to enjoy him forever? And what better rule to direct us how to glorify and enjoy him than that rule, that *only* rule, which God himself has given for this very purpose? If the knowledge of God be eternal life, whilst the want of it is eternal death, most surely it is the duty of Christians to make it their chief aim to impart that knowledge to all who are committed to their instruction, and who may never obtain it elsewhere. If all worldly wisdom, even the very highest literary and scientific attainments, be worthless, when the soul is lost for the want of the knowledge of God, most assuredly it is folly to seek the former and neglect the latter. If the soul be more valuable than the body, eternity more important than time, the things of God far better than the things of *this* world, the service of God better than the service of the devil, then let us educate our children, not for this world, not for time, not for Satan, but for God, for eternity, for the bliss and glory of heaven. Let us, not in theory, not in name, but in fact, in reality, and as the *first thing*, teach our children at home, in the school, and in the Church, that "man's chief end is to glorify God and enjoy him forever."

## ARTICLE V.

## SUSTENTATION.

The sustentation scheme, a term with which our readers are now perfectly familiar, was inaugurated by the General Assembly at its meeting in Memphis, Tennessee, in the winter of 1866, and was intended to take the place of what had previously been known as the Committee of Domestic Missions. It was not intended to do away with the work of domestic missions by any means; but as the control of that work was thereafter to be recognised as under the exclusive management of the presbyteries and their committees of missions, and as it was to be chief office of sustentation to furnish the means by which it was to be carried on, as well as to help in the support of feeble churches, there was great propriety in adopting this new term. As it proposes to help in sustaining feeble churches and carrying on the missionary work, it is simply an agency for sustentation. Presbyterian committees, inasmuch as they control and direct the work of missions, are not properly committees of sustentation, as they are sometimes called, but committees of domestic missions.

The Sustentation Committee is a central financial and advisory agency, intended to receive all the funds raised throughout the Church to sustain feeble churches, to aid in the work of missions and church erection, and to disburse the same for the benefit of the whole Church in accordance with rules and by-laws given by the General Assembly for this purpose, and in concert and coöperation with the presbyteries or their committees of missions. By this arrangement the most intimate relationship is established between the Central Committee and the various presbyterial committees throughout the Church. The chairman of every presbyterial committee is a corresponding member of the Central Committee; and in this way the latter committee is made intimately acquainted with the wants and condition of every portion of the Church, and can therefore disburse the fund committed to its care, not only in the most equitable manner, but so as to pro-

mote the best and highest interests of the whole Church. It is difficult to see how any wiser, more scriptural, or more effective scheme could possibly be devised; and if our people will only have the patience, the perseverance, the wisdom, and the confidence in each other, to carry it into full and practical effect, it must, under the favoring hand of Almighty God, not only place our beloved Church on a solid and broad foundation, but make it one of the most harmonious and effective bodies in the Christian world.

The sustentation scheme was called into existence by the peculiar circumstances of the great body of our churches at the close of the war. Previously there had been no need for any special agency of the kind. Such churches as then needed help were those that had not risen above the *missionary status*, and were provided for by existing missionary organisations. But at the close of the war one-half, if not two-thirds, of all our churches were left in a completely prostrated and helpless condition, so that the great want of the time was an agency that could sustain and keep alive these churches through the trying crisis they were called to pass. The missionary or aggressive work had to occupy a secondary and subordinate place for the time being; and to a limited extent, this has continued to be the case up to the present time. The general scheme, however, looks forward to the time when the aggressive work shall occupy the most important position; and the Committee has spared no pains to get all our prostrated churches on their feet as speedily as possible, that the united strength of the whole Church may be directed mainly to assaults upon the kingdom of darkness. It will be a long time, however, before we can withdraw altogether, or even lessen materially, our efforts in the way of sustaining feeble churches. We must strengthen every post as we advance, or our conquests will be of questionable advantage. Unless our settled ministers are sufficiently well supported to enable them to devote all their energies to the welfare of the churches, all our aggressive movements must necessarily be irregular and ineffective. Many untoward circumstances have combined to retard the recuperation of the Southern country generally; and until a

more favorable day dawns upon the land, our crippled and impoverished churches will not be able to support their pastors as they ought to be supported.

The powers confided to the Sustentation Committee by the constitution are strictly financial and advisory. In the exercise of the latter, it may, when requested to do so, aid presbyteries in procuring ministers and missionaries; afford aid in transferring ministers from one field of labor to another; keep the churches informed of the condition and wants of the work; and report to the Assembly from year to year the state and progress of the various departments of labor committed to its care. But the chief function of the Sustentation Committee is to decide, in view of all the claims brought before it by the various presbyterial committees, how the general fund may be so disbursed as to promote the highest interests of the whole Church. This is a very difficult and delicate task, and not only requires sound judgment on the part of the Executive Committee, but great kindness and confidence on the part of those who contribute most largely to the general fund. Whilst the functions of the Central Committee are strictly financial and advisory, all ecclesiastical control is lodged strictly in the hands of presbyteries, or in such committees of missions as they may appoint to carry out their behests. It is for the presbyteries, or their committees of missions, to decide what churches in their bounds are entitled to receive aid from the Central Committee; to appoint missionaries or evangelists, direct their labors and receive their reports; so also it is incumbent on the presbyteries to see that every church within their bounds is not only doing its duty in supporting its pastor, but in contributing, according to its ability, to the general fund, as well as to all the other schemes of benevolence authorised by the General Assembly. Nor is it less the duty of the Presbytery to see that every pastor, who is properly supported by his people, is devoting his energies mainly to their spiritual improvement. From the above, it will be perceived that these two coöperative bodies—the presbyteries and the central committee—move in distinct but entirely harmonious spheres, and that there is no necessity whatever for conflict or collision.

Heretofore they have acted in entire harmony; and so far as is known, the most entire satisfaction has been given on all hands, with the exception, perhaps, that presbyteries have not always received as much from the central fund as their circumstances seemed to demand; which, however, has been a matter of as much regret to the Central Committee as to themselves. As a general thing, all the weaker and poorer presbyteries have uniformly drawn more from the common fund than their churches have contributed; so that the Church is carrying out, as one whole, those great principles of brotherly love and mutual kindness which lie at the very foundation of our holy religion.

The great idea contemplated at the time of the organisation of the sustentation scheme, and which has been realised to a gratifying extent its practical working, was to unite all our widely scattered churches into one close compact brotherhood, so that the stronger and wealthier presbyteries and churches might uphold and sustain their weaker sisters. This was not only necessary as the means of self-preservation, but it was equally necessary to establish among us those great principles of Christian unity and charity which are so essential to true religion, and which were so beautifully illustrated in the earlier periods of the Christian Church. Our own Church at the time was in danger of its being forced out of its true and proper position. Congregational independency, from our long connexion with the Northern Presbyterian Church, had infused some of its very worst elements into its bosom. Presbyterianism, as a system of government and control, was gradually losing its hold upon the hearts of our people, and there were not wanting other indications of disintegration and ultimate ruin. But in the good providence of God, and mainly through the united action on the part of the whole Church, these mischievous tendencies have been measurably arrested; true Presbyterianism is reasserting itself in all our bounds, and our beloved Church, we have every reason to believe, is setting out on a new and grand career of usefulness. Much of this undoubtedly is to be ascribed to that spirit of unity and brotherly love that have grown out of our common calamities. We cannot, therefore, be too careful in

cherishing that great principle which has not only done so much for us in the past, but promises to do even more in the future. Any one who would make light of it, or would wantonly sever those strong bonds that have heretofore held our Church in such happy unison, would, if successful, inflict more real harm on the cause of truth and righteousness than can well be conceived. Whilst, therefore, we should carefully avoid all doubtful and dangerous alliances with other branches of the Church, especially with those in whose candor and orthodoxy we have not full confidence, we cannot draw the cords of unity and brotherly love too strongly around our own.

The functions of the sustentation scheme at the time of its organisation were restricted to three departments of benevolence, viz.: To aid feeble churches in the support of the gospel, to assist in carrying on the missionary work, and to afford aid in the matter of church erection. The claims of all three of these departments had to be met by one common fund, it being understood that the first should have the precedence. At the meeting of the Assembly in Baltimore two years afterwards, the fund for invalid ministers and the widows and orphans of deceased ministers was authorised, and the churches were called upon to take up an annual collection for this particular object on the first Sabbath in July, or as soon after as might be found convenient and practicable. This fund has always been kept distinct, and is administered as such. In disbursing this charity, no specific annual appropriations are made for any particular individual or family, but every case is treated according to its own merits, and upon renewed application sent up from year to year. This fund has never amounted to much more than \$6,000; and whilst this has afforded partial relief to eighty or more families or individuals, it has never been sufficient to meet the demands of the case. At the meeting of the Assembly in Louisville, Kentucky, two years subsequently, the Relief Fund was sanctioned and directed to be placed under the care of the Sustentation Committee also. This fund is to be raised in definite sums by individual churches, and is intended for the benefit of the pastor's family at his decease. The sums specified are \$30, \$60, or \$100, as any par-

ticular church or union of churches may elect, and secures for their pastor's family at his decease \$1,200, \$2,400, or \$3,600, to be paid in six annual instalments, according to the amount annually paid. These sums are to be raised in the same way with the regular salaries; and the amount is in fact considered as an addition to the regular salary, except that instead of being paid to the pastor, it is paid to the Sustentation Committee to be kept for the benefit of his family at his decease. The number of churches that have signified their intention to enter into the scheme is not yet sufficient to put it into full operation, but it is hoped that this will soon be done.

From the above it will be perceived that no less than five separate departments of benevolence are now included in the sustentation scheme, three of which have to be provided for out of one common fund, whilst the other two have each a separate fund. The General Assembly, at its late meeting in Huntsville, Alabama, directed that an annual collection be taken up in all the churches on the first Sabbath in April for the missionary or evangelistic work. This injunction was left somewhat indefinite; but if the Assembly intended the fund to be sent to the Central Committee to be used for the exclusive purposes of evangelisation, as was the intention of the mover of the resolution, it will not only render our general scheme of systematic benevolence complete, but will effect other important results in connexion with the general welfare of the Church. For some time past the Committee has had some difficulty in deciding between the claims of feeble churches and the cause of missions or evangelisation. In the first instance, the claims of feeble churches very properly had the precedence; but since they have had time to recuperate the claims of the two are brought to a more equal footing, which renders the difficulty of deciding between them still greater. If, however, a separate collection is taken up for each, (and their very great importance certainly justifies the measure,) the difficulty of deciding between their conflicting claims will be entirely removed.\*

---

\*We do not approve of the arrangement of the Assembly of fixing upon the first Sabbath in April for taking up the collection for Evangelistic



One of the great objects contemplated by the sustentation scheme from the very beginning, and especially in connexion with efforts made to sustain feeble churches, has been to raise ministerial support to the proper and necessary standard. This is still the great question of the moment, and it is scarcely possible to exaggerate its importance in connexion with the future welfare of our beloved Church. This is one particular in which the great body of our churches are sadly behindhand, and in relation to the serious and threatening consequences of which it is almost impossible to get their attention thoroughly aroused. Much of this deficiency is undoubtedly to be ascribed to their impoverished condition, but more to the want of proper training and right views of the sacrifices that should be made for the support of the gospel. Not one-half of our ministers are receiving sufficient salaries to enable them to devote the whole of their time to the great work of preaching the gospel. Many of them are compelled to betake themselves to teaching, or to some other secular employment, for the means of support; and not a few have been compelled to give up the ministry altogether in order to procure the means of supporting their families and educating their children. Such has been the reduction in the number of laboring ministers from these causes that it has now become very difficult for vacant churches to get their pulpits supplied at all; and no one can foresee the end of all this, unless our churches can be thoroughly aroused to the emergency that is upon us. The evil will not be remedied by the multiplication of ministers, unless corresponding provision is made for their

---

purposes, thus crowding it between the two collections for Publication and Foreign Missions. As there will be six annual collections for the various schemes of benevolence, it would be the best plan for them to be taken up on the first Sabbath of the alternate months—say, for Sustentation, (which is to include church erection,) the 1st Sabbath in January; Publication, 1st Sabbath in March; Foreign Missions, 1st Sabbath in May, (giving to this cause the monthly concert collections taken up on the alternate months when no other collections are taken up); Invalid Fund, 1st Sabbath in July; Evangelisation, 1st Sabbath in September; Education, 1st Sabbath in November. Discretion has been given to Synods to modify the arrangement for the greater convenience of their churches.

support. It is bad policy, to say the least, to educate men at great cost for the work of the ministry, and then have them spend the chief part of their lives at the plough-handle or in the school-room. Besides this, young men will feel very little inclined to enter upon this work, when they clearly foresee that it will necessarily consign them and their families to unavoidable poverty.

The General Assembly at its meeting in Baltimore in 1868, in order to rectify this evil, directed the presbyteries and the central committee to make the effort to raise the salary of every laboring minister to \$600 as the *minimum amount*. At a subsequent meeting they were directed to raise it to \$750, and by the last Assembly to \$800 as the *minimum*. Steady and persevering efforts have been made to carry these injunctions into effect; and although the specific object aimed at has not been fully realised, very encouraging progress has nevertheless been made in the right direction. Several presbyteries reported last spring that none of their ministers were receiving less than \$750, whilst a larger number reported a decided approximation to the same standard. It was further stated in the last annual report of the Sustentation Committee, that the average salary of ministers had increased in three years from \$500 to \$650, which is also a very encouraging state of things. The only difficulty lying in the way of the complete attainment of the proposed object, as it seems to the writer, is *the want of more prompt and thorough action on the part of presbyteries and their committees of missions*. The chief responsibility rests with the presbyterial committees, and only to a very limited extent on the Central Committee. As an illustration of this, it may be stated that the Central Committee is prohibited by the rules given it for its government from supplementing any salary up to \$750, unless the church or union of churches themselves will raise \$500, or two-thirds of this amount. It is the place of the Presbyterial Committee to see that this amount is raised; and until this is done, the Central Committee is powerless to raise the salary up to the proposed standard. Again, the Central Committee is prohibited, and very properly too, from doing anything at all to supplement

a given salary, unless the chairman of the Presbyterial Committee can certify upon conscience that the people themselves are not able to give their pastor a sufficient salary. But numerous cases are reported where congregations are able, but not disposed, to support their pastor. This again is a case for action on the part of the Presbytery, and where the Committee is powerless until the proper action is taken by the Presbytery or its committee of missions. Further, the Central Committee can do nothing in the way of supplementing salaries that really need it, except so far as the means are furnished by the churches; and it is for the presbyteries alone to see that all the churches within their bounds contribute according to their ability to the general fund. We have no hesitation, therefore, in expressing the confident belief, that if all our presbyterial committees would at once arouse themselves to the solemn responsibilities that have been laid upon them, would visit all the churches within their bounds, with the view of stirring them up to a proper sense of their obligations, both in supporting their own pastors and in contributing to the general fund, it would at once not only relieve us from all the distress that is now felt, but would inaugurate a new period of prosperity in the history of our Church.

We express perhaps the common sentiment of the great body of our Christian people when we affirm that the sustentation scheme, together with its kindred schemes of benevolence, has been the great and chief instrument used by providence in preserving and perpetuating our Church through all the trials through which it has been called to pass. The plan had its origin in the circumstances of distress in which the whole Church was involved at the close of the war, and it has always therefore been regarded as the child of providence. At the first meeting of the General Assembly, after the end of the war, the great question which occupied every mind was, How shall the preaching of the gospel be maintained in all our feeble, widely scattered, and impoverished churches? The answer which seemed to flow spontaneously from every heart was that we must stand shoulder to shoulder, as one united compact brotherhood, and make the aggregate

resources of the whole body, in a certain sense and to a certain degree, common property. The sustentation scheme had its origin in this great principle of brotherly love; and by its practical operation, our Church has been kept in a state of life and activity.

But whilst it is admitted on all hands that the scheme was admirably suited to the circumstances of the Church at the time it was inaugurated, doubts are now being entertained whether it is equally adapted to the present altered circumstances of the Church. A number of modifications or changes have been suggested, only two of which we propose to examine in this article.

One of these plans or suggestions is, that the two main branches of the sustentation scheme—the support of feeble churches and the work of missions—should be separated and placed under different committees. The proposition is virtually to have two committees to do the work that is now done by one.

Our first remark in relation to this proposition is, that it is in our judgment simply multiplying the machinery of the Church without securing any increase of efficiency. What is particularly needed at the present time is an increase of executive force, and not the establishment of a new office with a separate set of officers. One executive committee can, without any very great labor, discharge all the various duties involved in the present scheme of sustentation, provided the executive force is sufficient to perform the business in a systematic manner, as well as to attend to what may be regarded as its outside duties. Again, if a committee is needed for each of these departments of labor, then there will be equal reason to have one for church erection and another to attend to the invalid fund. The Northern Presbyterian Church has no less than eight separate committees to carry on its various departments of benevolence, each of which has its own staff of officers, place of holding its meetings, and transacting its business. The whole fund raised by our Church for the various causes of benevolence would not be sufficient to meet the mere expenses of such extended machinery.

It may be remarked further, that the five departments of

benevolence now included in the sustentation scheme are so closely related to each other that they can be more easily administered by one committee than by two or more. In the present state of the Church it is scarcely possible to separate the evangelistic work from that of sustentation. Almost every evangelist now employed is partly engaged in supplying feeble churches, as well as in carrying on the aggressive or missionary work; and if there are two committees for these different departments, then the evangelist must stand related to both, and draw his support from two different sources.

In the third place, to put the missionary or evangelistic work under a separate committee, is virtually to reestablish the old Committee of Domestic Missions, with all the vagueness and indefiniteness of powers that appertain to it, and with the constant liability of coming in conflict with the jurisdiction of the presbyteries. The lines of distinction in the present system between these two spheres are as clear as sunbeams. To bring back the old system with all the objections and difficulties that belong to it, is to substitute confusion in the place of order, and obscurity where light now reigns.

In the last place, we do not see that the organisation of a new committee to carry on the work of evangelisation will be likely to stimulate the churches to a higher degree of liberality. The call for a separate collection for this purpose undoubtedly meets the full demands of the case, and this can be as wisely disbursed by the present committee as by a new one, whilst all the expense of a separate organisation would be saved. The secretary of a separate organisation, provided he could spend a considerable portion of his time among the wealthiest and more influential churches, might augment their contributions very materially. But why could he not do as much, and even more, as an associate secretary in the present committee? Nothing but considerations of economy have heretofore prevented the appointment of a second secretary; but the time has come when this ought to be done, especially if the work of foreign missions is to be continued under same committee.

As to the fears sometimes expressed of this committee becom-

ing a central and overshadowing power in the Church, we do not see how any constitution could possibly be framed to guard more effectually against such a result. The Committee, as now constituted, can accomplish nothing at all, except so far as it commands the confidence and coöperation of the presbyteries. It has no direct or official connexion with the churches as such, but transacts all its business through the medium of the presbyteries. If at any time its affairs are not conducted in accordance with its constitution, or so as to give satisfaction to the Church at large, a single vote on the part of the Assembly may place it in entirely different hands, and compel it to administer its affairs in accordance with the wishes of the whole Church. To suppose that the present incumbents, or the incumbents at any future period, could retain their power after they had lost the confidence of the Church, would argue a degree of degeneracy on the part of our people generally, such that God grant we may never witness.

The other suggestion to which reference has been made, and to which it is important to revert, is, that it is best in the present state of the Church to have the whole work of sustentation and evangelisation remanded to the synods, and let them be made responsible for its proper administration. It is argued that the churches will coöperate more heartily when their contributions are expended in the improvements of the country immediately around them; and the success of the Synod of Kentucky, in raising the salary of all their ministers to \$1,000 as the *minimum*, is adduced in illustration of the soundness of this general principle. We do not believe that either the principle or the illustration can stand the test of scrutiny.

As to the general idea, that the churches will act more vigorously in reference to the narrower field immediately around them, than for a larger and broader one, we think the great Head of the Church himself has given any thing but an equivocal deliverance. The field he marked out for his disciples was not confined to the narrow boundaries of Palestine, but comprehended the whole world. The evangelisation of the whole world was not only assigned to them as a matter of duty; but the Saviour

distinctly foresaw that nothing short of this would develop their energies or their faith, as he intended they should be. And this is in strict accordance with the experience of the Church itself. What has stirred up her energies so powerfully, or given such life and vigor to her faith, as what she has done to impart the gospel even to the remotest heathen nations on the face of the earth? What she does for the home field is in a great measure the work of *sight*; but what is done for the heathen nations is, in a greater measure, a matter of *faith*. Nor are we wanting in illustrations taken from nearer home. When the sustentation scheme was first inaugurated, a number of our presbyteries determined to carry on the work of missions and sustentation in a separate and independent way; supposing that their churches would contribute more freely when the money was to be laid out in the cultivation of the field immediately around them, than when it was merged in a general fund for the benefit of the whole Church. Nor was it surprising that our brethren should have felt inclined to adopt this course. In previous years they had been compelled to adopt it as a matter of self-protection; but the continuance of it after the necessity had ceased to exist, they soon found to be unwise and inexpedient, and almost without exception these presbyteries have fallen into general ranks both as a matter of duty and expediency. They have seen that it is best for their churches, as well as for the Church at large, to act in union and concert.

In relation to the case of the Synod of Kentucky, our first remark is, that those who appeal to its support of their peculiar views are making such use of this example as our brethren there never intended they should. Their plan, which in all important respects is but a copy and counterpart of our own, was intended to be temporary in its character, and was adopted, as leading brethren in that Synod have repeatedly avowed, as a matter of sheer self-preservation. Their frontier was constantly menaced; and it was absolutely necessary as a matter of self-preservation that the whole of their resources should be used in self-defence. And it is their intention, unless we have been misinformed, to abandon the independent features of their plan as

soon as they can do so consistently with self-preservation. We do not feel disposed to find fault with them for adopting their course under the circumstances of the case.

In the next place, the case of the Synod of Kentucky is not parallel to that of the Church at large. The people there have never known the ravages of war as the great body of the Southern people have. The loss of property consequent upon war, the repeated failure of the crops since that time, the heavy taxation that has been laid upon our people, as well as other adverse influences, have reduced the mass of our Southern people to the very greatest straits; and it is a marvel that they have got along at all, much more that they should have made decided progress in enlarging the borders of the Church. At the same time, it is probable that there is more real wealth in the single Synod of Kentucky than in any three of our other synods, with the exception perhaps of that of Virginia. More than this, we must bear in mind that the churches in Kentucky were brought up to the present standard of liberality in the support of their ministers by very great and extraordinary exertions made on the part of a number of their leading men, and especially by Dr. Stuart Robinson—such efforts as we are unable to make in the existing state of our churches. At the same time it should be remembered, that almost the whole of the resources of that Synod have been devoted to this one object. Some of our other synods, if they had adopted the same exclusive policy, might perhaps have effected equally as much for the support of their own ministers. But if all that were able to have adopted this course had done so, what then would have become of our poorer presbyteries and churches? and, especially, what would have become of the missionary work in Texas, Arkansas, Louisiana, and other portions of the country?

But the worst feature about this plan is, that it would be the beginning of a process of disintegration that would never probably stop until it had landed us in outright congregational independency, and ultimately into open infidelity. If the General Assembly cannot be trusted with the administration of the Church's benevolence, what reason is there to suppose than any



particular synod would prove itself more worthy of confidence? If the synods bring their claims to manage these things in competition with those of the Assembly, why will the presbyteries not follow the example and bring theirs in conflict with those of the synods? And if the work of separation and disintegration is countenanced by the synods and the presbyteries, is it not almost certain that the churches will fall into the same current of disorganisation? And where shall we be then, but on the broad sea of Independency and Congregationalism? And how shall we work then, if we feel inclined to work at all, but on the voluntary plan, and thus dishonor the great Head of the Church, whose plan we shall ignore and set aside altogether?

---

ARTICLE VI.

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF 1871.

The Assembly at Huntsville, Ala., lasted from Thursday, 18th May, at 11 o'clock a. m., until Thursday, the 25th May, at 2 o'clock p. m. It was, as is generally agreed, a good Assembly, and a pleasant Assembly. Huntsville is a beautiful town, with its grand mountain scenery, and its magnificent spring, and its refined, generous, and hospitable people. The attendance was very full and the material of the body excellent, both as to ministers and elders. This is certainly a matter of great consequence, and every Presbytery should bear it in mind when electing its commissioners. Let us put away from us completely all ideas of rotation in these elections, and let Presbyteries always send as their representatives their best men. This does not mean their oldest men or their greatest men, but the men who will in their judgment best discharge the duty.

THE MODERATOR.

The retiring Moderator, Rev. R. L. Dabney, D. D., delivered a discourse upon "The Form of Sound Words," from 2 Tim. i.

13, and Titus i. 9, the doctrine being that Church teachers and Church rulers must maintain a strict and harmonious conformity to revealed doctrine. Drs. Hill, Wills, Porter, Plumer, Kirkpatrick, and Mr. Berry, were nominated to the chair. Leave was granted for the names of Drs. Kirkpatrick and Wills to be withdrawn. On the first ballot the vote stood: Hill, 30; Porter, 27; Berry, 6; Plumer, 34. The second ballot was by the Moderator's ruling upon the two highest names, and it stood, Hill 44, Plumer 49. Nobody who knew him expected anything else than that, as moderator, Dr. Plumer would give entire satisfaction; and these expectations were not disappointed, for he presided with dignity and courtesy, only equalled by his skill and promptness. Possibly strangers might have supposed his venerable form and patriarchal beard betokened the feebleness of old age; but every such impression must have been dissipated as they saw his quick perception of every point that presented itself in the debates, and observed the unflagging watchfulness with which he presided, and the agility with which he rose to put every question. If it is a matter of importance to have suitable material in the commissioners to an Assembly, it is certainly important to have a good moderator. Both the comfort and the efficiency of the body depend upon it. The man who presides over an Assembly well, performs a service greater perhaps than two or three of the ablest and most industrious men upon the floor. Let us never elect for compliment, but only for service.

The opinion has been expressed that Dr. Plumer's election was contrary to Presbyterian usage, because he had once before been moderator of the Assembly. We were ourselves of that opinion very decidedly, and therefore when we first heard of Dr. Plumer's election regretted it not a little. Reflection has somewhat modified our opinion. Is our Church the same Church in whose Assembly Dr. Plumer presided before? If so, his election certainly was contrary to the usage. But we came out of that Church as truly as the Reformers out of the Church of Rome. We took a new name, adopted standards and a psalmody for ourselves, organised our Church schemes after a new fashion, and have set up no claim to any portion of that Church's funds.

These things would seem to show that we can not be said in every sense of the terms to be *the same Church*. At the same time, it is true that the very presbyteries over which Dr. Plumer presided at Huntsville were present when he sat before in the moderator's chair, and he did therefore once before preside over them as their moderator. It is also true, that we justly claim all the glorious history of the Old School Presbyterian Church in this country as in part ours, and, accordingly, all the noble line of former moderators our Church must and will claim as partly hers. On the whole, the question is an open one, and we are not prepared, after much consideration, to take very positive ground on either side of it.

#### THE REPORTER OF THE ASSEMBLY.

This was an officer serving informally, indeed, yet most efficiently—the Rev. Geo. L. Wolfe, of the Presbytery of Chesapeake. *The Central*, *The Southern*, and *The Southwestern Presbyterian* newspapers shared the expense and the advantage of his labors amongst them. His reports were admitted to be exceedingly full and accurate, so that multitudes not privileged to be present can read, by his labor and skill, the exact words spoken on the Assembly's floor. We wish the Assembly could always have him for reporter.

#### PLACE OF THE NEXT MEETING.

This business came up at the outset of the proceedings on the second day. Richmond and Wilmington were put in nomination, and the former was chosen by a majority of eleven votes. The First church was first selected, but subsequently it appeared that an invitation had been sent on from the Grace Street church (Dr. Read's) of that city, which by some accident had been mislaid. The matter being reconsidered, and the admirable accommodations which that church building offers to the Assembly having been set forth, it was chosen as the place for the next meeting.

#### REVISION OF THE BOOK OF CHURCH ORDER.

A report from the chairman of this Committee (Dr. Adger)

informed the Assembly that it had not been possible to obtain a full meeting of the Committee during the year, and requested a continuance of the Committee. Drs. Peck and Pryor were for discharging the Committee and indefinitely postponing the whole matter. Drs. Miller, Kirkpatrick, and Hendrick, maintained that the results of the revision thus far had been most valuable to the Church, and they urged that ample time be allowed for presbyteries to examine the work, and especially that the Committee should be instructed to confine their labors to the Book of Discipline. Leave was granted for the motion of indefinite postponement to be withdrawn, and the question recurred on the continuance of the Committee. Mr. Berry and Mr. Strahan opposed it. Dr. McInnis said we have a second order of the day much more important, and moved to docket this and take up that. His motion was lost. Dr. J. R. Wilson reminded the house that the answers of the presbyteries in 1869 had been referred by that Assembly in one mass to this Committee for examination and collation. This work the Committee had been doing, and now it was proposed to cut them off in mid career. Dr. Wills thought no good would come of this work. The new book is full of crotchets which are not Presbyterian, and will damage Presbyterianism. The Church wants life rather than law. Dr. Samuel J. Baird said the principles of Presbyterian church government are found in the Scriptures; the details as found in our Constitution are of less than one century's standing, and some of these are the results of compromises of principle by various parties, involving as a consequence the emasculation of the Church's strength and energy. Moreover, our present book is adapted in its details to the small and dense population of Scotland, and not to this country; to a period one century back, and not to this age. Missions are hardly named in our book, and the Sabbath-school is utterly unknown to it. He urged moreover that the examination of the book of ministers and laymen had been of great service to the Church, and wished the Committee continued, but not restricted in their labors; but desired that they in their wisdom select such portions of their work to be reported from time to time as it might be convenient for

the Church to consider. The motion to instruct the Committee was not agreed to, and the question recurred on continuing the Committee. Mr. Cater said the oldest member of his Presbytery had pronounced that the leading principles of the new book were neither in the Scotch standards nor the Bible. The motion to continue the Committee was agreed to.

It is gratifying to note the intelligent conservatism which thus marked the Assembly's decision. Touching the actual condition of opinion throughout our presbyteries as to this revision, there was some error in the statements of some of the speakers. It is very far from being correct, that the Church has "almost unanimously rejected the Committee's work." How could that be the judgment of the Church, and yet her Assembly year after year manifest such a different estimate? In this very Assembly several men of influence exhibited the desire to put an end to this whole undertaking, yet the Assembly refused to sustain them. *First*, there was a motion for indefinite postponement of the subject, which upon discussion was withdrawn. Then, *secondly*, there was a motion to confine the Committee for the present to the Book of Discipline; and whilst that was under discussion, there was, *thirdly*, another motion to docket this business and take up what the mover thought was "much more important." But the Assembly differed with this opinion. Then, *fourthly*, the Assembly voted not to confine the Committee to the Discipline. *Fifthly*, and finally, it voted to continue the Committee without any restrictions. These proceedings of the Huntsville Assembly, as well as those of Louisville and Mobile and other Assemblies, show that it must be an error to suppose that our Church is generally, not to say unanimously, unfavorable to the revision. But we have it on the very best authority, that a careful collation of the answers of presbyteries to the Assembly at Louisville, which were all referred back to the original committee by that Assembly, reveals a very different state of opinion amongst the presbyteries generally from what some of the speakers in the late Assembly supposed to exist. Out of some thirty-nine presbyteries which responded to the Mobile Assembly's overture, not more than three expressed

the desire to have the revision come to an end. The remainder expressed themselves generally favorable to the revision, if certain changes could be made in that document. A number of the largest presbyteries went through a very minute and thorough revisal of the revision and indicated all the changes they desired; whilst nearly all the presbyteries pointed out more generally their corrections. It may not be amiss to state here, on the same authority, that there is not one captious criticism amongst the many offered, and not one which exhibits any other disposition towards the revision than to make it as perfect as possible. And further, that nine out of ten of all the changes suggested are such as the Committee of Revision must themselves unhesitatingly approve and recommend; so that, in the language of members of that Committee, the collation manifests these two things—*first*, that the revision is at least fifty per cent. the better for the work bestowed on it by the presbyteries; and, *secondly*, that there is one hundred per cent. more ground to believe now than previously to this examination of it by the presbyteries, that it is destined to be adopted by the Church. Meanwhile it is getting to be more and more the fact, that this revision is the work not of any committee, but of the whole Church. And this, of course, is the best possible augury both for the acceptableness and the goodness of the work.

#### THE PROPOSED UNIVERSITY.

Dr. Wills read the report of the Assembly's Committee on the Report of the late Education Convention. It was for substance that the Assembly should adopt that report and issue it as a circular letter to all our churches. The report set forth that the promotion of education in all its departments is the duty and necessity of our Zion, and that it cannot be left to the state, or any other body, except our own Church. As to the establishment of the university, the people of our communion were probably not prepared to enter upon it at once; but the idea should be encouraged, and the execution carried out at the earliest practicable period. Colleges already in existence ought to be sustained, but the number ought not to be multiplied; on

the contrary, the effort should be to perfect those we have. Offerings of funds for endowment of the university should not be discouraged; but rather the Trustees of the Assembly should be authorised by the Assembly to hold and manage such, and for the present the interest should be used to sustain our existing colleges. Dr. Miller, when the discussion opened, objected to the principle of committing the entire work of education to the Church alone. The state and the family are both divine institutes, and each has some thing to do with education. Dr. Wills denied that the purpose was to put education or the university under the control of the Church. Dr. Pryor objected to one great university under control of the Presbyterian Church. Governor Patton said Presbyterians had fallen back in their zeal for education. Dr. Pryor denied this—it is only that other denominations have been roused to more zeal than they once exhibited. Mr. Bryson pleaded for a Presbyterian university of our own to prevent our young men from going to Germany and other European countries for education. Dr. Kirkpatrick said going to Germany for education was just *a fashion*; we have institutions of the highest grade already under salutary influence according to the strict Presbyterian standard. He was not prepared to commit the Church to this university scheme. Dr. Dabney never would be willing to see one university for the whole Presbyterian Church governed by this Assembly, but was ready to give all that is asked, namely, the countenance of the Assembly for enlightened efforts in this line by members of our Church in the southwest. There is no danger, however, of this project ending in the creation of any overshadowing institution. As for Virginia, she is certainly out of the ring, and means to paddle her own canoe. Make your southwestern university as fine as you can, we will hold our own against you. He was willing for the Assembly, in its mere advisory capacity, to recommend the experiment under consideration to all who were willing to commit themselves to it and take the responsibility. Mr. Berry urged that the Church may not defile herself with any secular affairs. Dr. Marshall thought the brother's argument destroyed itself, because if the Assembly may not found a uni-

versity, then no session can make a parochial school. Dr. S. J. Baird defended the superintendence of secular education by the Church. Mr. Cater said most of the young men who go to Germany for education, only get a little more of the "big head" and become "*greater calves*." Mr. J. W. Baker moved to strike out the words committing the Assembly to a university. The report was recommitted and came back conformed to Mr. Baker's motion. Dr. Dabney then urged, that instead of the Trustees of the Assembly holding the funds to be given, it was better that five of the very first men of our Church in the southwest be appointed. Dr. Wills preferred the Trustees of the Assembly. Dr. Miller said that at the outset the advocates of this measure had disclaimed the desire to have ecclesiastical control, but now we are to have a Board of Regents or Trustees responsible to and supervised by the Assembly. He therefore protested the second time against committing the Church to this enterprise. Dr. Peck sympathised with Dr. Miller's objections. Dr. Dabney said Dr. Miller's objection was unanswerable, if the Trustees of the Assembly were to be made rectors of a literary institution. But he was willing to appoint five men for life, and to be a close corporation, which was the safest kind of guarantee against all perversion of the funds. He sympathised fully with Dr. Peck and others who object to ecclesiastical control. It is neither constitutional nor expedient. Col. Mitchell held that the Trustees of the Assembly were the proper body, and the present the golden moment, for there are thousands of acres of land now worthless, and which our people could give now without any sacrifice, which by and by will be worth millions. Mr. Junkin preferred a Board of Trustees incorporated under a well guarded charter securing Presbyterian influence. Dr. Kirkpatrick said our Church can hold no money except through its Trustees. Mr. Cater said his investigations had been very extensive into the nature and abuses of corporations holding trust funds, and he might venture to express an opinion. He held Mr. Junkin's view. He never before had known an effort made to separate the persons who were to manage, direct, and appropriate the funds, from those who are to hold and invest them. Mr. Lynn.



was opposed, and so was his Presbytery, to any ecclesiastical control of secular education. Dr. J. R. Wilson proposed that the Trustees of the Assembly hold the funds given, until some future Assembly should determine the questions now in dispute. The Moderator decided both this motion and Mr. Junkin's out of order. Dr. Peck was reluctant to seem in opposition to any good scheme of education, but was unwilling to have any Board of Regents which should be a creature of the Assembly. Dr. Kirkpatrick urged that there could be no second Board of Trustees of the Assembly. He could see no difficulty in the control of secular education by the Church—not even when you come to the teaching of law and medicine, for both law and medicine are lawful studies. Dr. Wills most heartily concurred with Dr. Kirkpatrick. If you strike out from this report the idea of ecclesiastical control either directly or indirectly, you kill the whole movement. It will be a magnificent failure, “the play of Hamlet with Hamlet left out,”—a mountain in labor, and bringing forth a “ridiculus mus.” He desired the distinct issue now made, Is ecclesiastical control of colleges legitimate or not? Rather than remove the institution from all ecclesiastical control, he would prefer to postpone the whole matter indefinitely. That would be a decent disposal of it, and better far than mangling it. Coming here to do something, and then doing nothing, is preposterous, and beneath the dignity of this body. I say, therefore, I would be glad if the distinct issue could be made to day, for I believe the majority of the Assembly is in favor of some sort of ecclesiastical control. Dr. Pryor moved the indefinite postponement of the whole matter; and Mr. Berry to lay it on the table. The latter motion was lost, and the former came up. Dr. S. J. Baird urged harmony of action. Dr. McInnis was against indefinite postponement, and said two old persons who proposed to give largely to these funds might die before another Assembly. Mr. Otts referred to other like cases, and hoped the matter would not be indefinitely postponed. He was born and brought up in the eastern part of our Church, and had heard on moving west of the eastern portion wishing to have preponderance; and he observed that opposition to this univer-

sity comes from the east. He began to be afraid there was some of the feeling alluded to. He might be mistaken; he hoped he was. Dr. J. R. Wilson said Mr. Otts was greatly mistaken. Mr. Otts said the motion for indefinite postponement came from Virginia. He hoped Dr. Wilson's motion would prevail, which postpones the issue in the Assembly, but not the whole matter. The motion for indefinite postponement was decided in the negative by a large majority. Mr. Junkin's substitute was called for; but, on motion, was laid on the table. Col. Mitchell's amendment was also laid on the table. Dr. Wilson's amendment was then called up and agreed to; and the whole report as amended was then adopted.

No subject engrossed so large a share of the Assembly's attention as this magnificent project of a great Southern Presbyterian university. Want of space has compelled us very much to shorten the admirable report of the debate, but we have endeavored to give the most important thoughts of nearly all the speakers. Reviewing the current of the debate, one discovers four varying opinions prevalent in the Assembly. *First.* There were those who held it lawful for the Church in her organised capacity to take charge of secular education. Amongst these, although on practical grounds objecting to the project under consideration, stood Dr. Kirkpatrick, who fairly and squarely insisted on the right of the Church to carry on secular education. Nor could he see any greater objection to her control of a university teaching law and medicine, than to her control of a college teaching classics; because law and medicine are lawful studies. With Dr. Kirkpatrick, there stood Dr. S. J. Baird, and at the last, though apparently not at the beginning, Dr. Wills, the chairman. *Secondly.* There were those, as Dr. Miller, Dr. Peck, Dr. Pryor, Mr. Berry, and Dr. Dabney, opposed definitely to this idea. The Church is a spiritual body, and must handle no secular interests—secular education, no more than agriculture, commerce, politics, all of which have direct and powerful moral bearings. *Thirdly.* There are those willing, with Dr. Dabney, to indicate to the Convention which the last Assembly went so far as to convene, what they supposed to be the best disposition

of the matter. *Fourthly.* There were those, and these a majority of the body, willing to receive funds for this purpose, to be held by the Assembly's Trustees until some future Assembly shall determine the questions now not possible to be settled.

Such a disposition of the matter could not be altogether satisfactory to the especial friends of the proposed university. Dr. Dabney's solution would probably have suited them better. Indeed, since the decision in the Assembly, the Convention has unanimously adopted resolutions carrying out his idea. Drs. Waddel, Palmer, and Lyon are a Committee of the Convention to constitute a medium of correspondence and agents for promoting the object. Should the Trustees of the Assembly receive by May, 1872, donations or pledges which shall give promise of success to the enterprise, then this Committee are to urge the next Assembly to instruct its Trustees to hold in perpetuity all funds given and to be given for this object under covenant, to leave to the regents the *entire management, government, and control* of the university so long as they administer the same in the interests of sound Christian education, according to the principles of our Church—the regents to be appointed by the Assembly as a *close corporation*; and in case of its failure by death or perversion of trust, the Assembly to have power to create a new board with the same powers.

In the conflict of opinion touching the first principles of the question, this was probably the best possible compromise, and one which should harmonise all minds. The great principle of non-secularisation of our church courts is saved as far as it could be expected to be saved, and the believers in that principle may congratulate themselves on its vindication. At the same time a great and noble enterprise is put upon the most permanent and solid basis possible, and a plan for its management adopted which must prove at once safe and efficient. The regents to be appointed can do all and more than all that the Assembly could have done directly for the institution.

#### THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES.

The Standing Committee, through Dr. Kirkpatrick, reported

an increase of students, libraries, and funds, in both seminaries, and expressed the belief that our candidates now enjoy at these schools advantages equal to any other in this or in foreign countries. The Assembly inaugurated Dr. J. R. Wilson Professor of Pastoral and Evangelistic Theology and Sacred Rhetoric in the Columbia Seminary. After he had delivered his inaugural address on the Power of the Pulpit, Dr. Peck, of Union Theological Seminary, delivered the charge to the new Professor.

#### DELEGATES FROM OTHER CHURCHES.

The Rev. Dr. Jno. A. Todd, Commissioner *primarius* from the "General Synod of the Reformed Church in America," commonly known as "the Dutch Church," presented to the Assembly the greetings of his Church. The Assembly through the Moderator and by resolutions responded, expressing our Church's delight at hearing of the probable extension of the evangelical labors of that venerable and orthodox Synod amongst the desolations of the Southern States. Delegates were appointed to convey our fraternal salutations to that Synod at their meeting in June, 1871, in the city of Albany, New York.

The Rev. R. P. Farris, D. D., Rev. J. L. Yantis, D. D., and Mr. Edward Bredell, appeared as delegates from the Old School Synod of Missouri, and were received and heard and responded to by the Moderator and by the Assembly also through resolutions. Delegates were also appointed to bear our salutations to the Synod.

The Stated Clerk read a letter addressed to the Assembly by the Rev. D. H. Cummins, who had been appointed by the last Assembly as a delegate to the Associate Reformed Synod of the South, reporting that he had attended their meetings, had been cordially received, had presented the Christian salutations of this Church, expressing the hope that the two Churches might be one ere long; and that the Synod had reciprocated our greeting and expressed deep interest in our welfare. He stated that the desire for organic union with us appeared to be on the increase among them, that the Moderator expressed the desire that the two bodies might be drawn closer and cooperate more

fully, and that they had appointed delegates to the present Assembly. The report was received and approved.

From the Cumberland Presbyterian Church no delegates appeared, although it is known that such were appointed. The Assembly appointed delegates to bear its salutations to both these bodies.

#### THE EXAMINATION RULE.

Dr. Dabney presented the following report, which was read:

The Committee of Bills and Overtures would respectfully report to the Assembly Overture No. 1, from the Presbytery of Augusta, praying the Assembly to rescind the "Examination Rule" of the Assembly of 1837. Your Committee recommend the following answer in the words of the Assembly of 1849. "That inasmuch as the General Assembly must have power to enjoin upon presbyteries the performance of any duty which they are confessedly competent to do by the provisions of the Constitution, and in requiring which no right is violated, and nothing constrained, but the discretion they (the presbyteries) had in ordinary circumstances; and inasmuch as the general utility of that resolution is not yet called in question, even by the respected memorialists themselves, therefore the Assembly declines acceding according to this request at present."

At the request of Col. Mitchell, the argument of the Presbytery accompanying the overture was read. Dr. J. R. Wilson stated, as a member of the Presbytery of Augusta, that the overture had not been adopted unanimously. Col. Mitchell, as a representative of that Presbytery, urged that there was no longer a necessity for the rule. He was always mortified as an elder to see ministers examined in whom he had confidence. Dr. Hill hoped the views just expressed by his venerable friend would not prevail. He reminded the Assembly how Absalom Peters, Secretary of the Home Missionary Society, used to control the presbyteries during the New School controversy in 1833-38, by sending them his young men with clean papers which they could not dispute. In this way he managed to regulate the election of commissioners to the Assembly according to his own wishes. Now let me suggest a case to this Assembly. Suppose our good brethren of the Northern Assembly wished to.

control the action of this body. We are thrown into daily contact with them along the border; we are in much more direct and constant contact with them than you in this part of the Church are. One of them is within four miles of me; his church is beside mine; his members associate with my members; he and I associate daily. He is now a delegate to the Northern Assembly in Chicago. Suppose that in our constant associations we should get up a scheme for uniting the two bodies; and such a case is certainly supposable. I hardly ever meet with those brethren that they do not put the question to me: "You are a moderate man; cannot you suggest some way by which we can be brought together again?" I believe that is the first question put to me every time I meet them. Suppose now that our Presbytery should become desirous of uniting with the Northern Assembly. They have very ample funds at their command, and could have much more, if they desired it for such a purpose. Many of their men there, especially the Old School portion, are very anxious for a union with our body. Suppose they should find your presbyteries in this part of the Church divided on that question; suppose we are in favor of union; they put a large fund into my hand and say: "Wherever you find a Presbytery down South nearly equally divided, we will send four or five young men into your body, and you can send them down to some of the churches in that Presbytery to turn the scale; and say to every church in that Presbytery, (just as they are saying in our Synod,) 'We will give you \$600 to support them.'" Do you not see that, according to Col. Mitchell's argument, if I were ambitious and had that purse and that Presbytery at my command, I could turn the scale in every doubtful Presbytery? All that I would have to do, would be to find out such presbyteries and send into them the young men, who would come pouring down from the North. By that process, I could do just what that brother referred to was long ago trying to do with their General Assembly, by sending in his Congregationally inclined men. I could control this Assembly. I was Secretary of the Board of Missions for fifteen years, and I know the power. I do not wonder that some of those brethren are a little jealous of the action

of the secretaries. It is a very annoying position, and I sympathise with the brethren who hold it: but it does give a wonderful power. A man who has the funds, and knows where the men are, and can say quietly, without anybody knowing anything about it, Go into certain presbyteries and decide certain questions, has great power. I do beseech you, brethren, not to destroy this power that each Presbytery has to protect itself. Let the presbyteries have the power to shut men out if they choose to do so. This question may be upon you, brethren, sooner than you suspect. These brethren in the North tell me that they cannot give up so large a portion of the United States as we occupy. If we will not unite with them, then they must come down and take possession of our country. I am glad for all the good they can do; I love them as brethren; I think they are in error; that they ought to recant their error. If they recant and become real Presbyterians as we are, I should hail the day and rejoice to unite with them. But they have not done so yet; we must protect ourselves against them; and I see no other method than that which this rule gives us. You may have this question upon you in less than five years; you may have it in less than one year. You must have the means of protection. The constitutional question I heard argued when I was a boy a thousand times over; but I make these remarks, because I think I see certain influences at work that may make this rule very important. The brethren who are now anxious to break it down, may wish when it is too late that they had this power back in their hands. Dr. Burgett moved to amend by leaving the rule in force, except in cases where the applicant had been licensed or ordained by or in former years a member of the Presbytery about to receive him. He referred to cases of examination such as he wished excepted which had seemed farcical. Dr. Hendrick said the rule had worked so admirably since 1837 that we cannot better it. It had preserved us from evils heretofore to which we are likely to be exposed as extensively in the future. The argument as to its constitutionality is at too late a day. Dr. S. J. Baird maintained that the rule had no tendency to disorganise the Church, but contrariwise, was a bond of union, because ordered by the As-

sembly. Nor could any brother feel disparaged by it. He had once, along with Dr. Peck, and Lewis Green, now in glory, examined the venerable Moderator, who did not feel himself at all disparaged by it. Ruling elder Davidson said the Presbytery of Louisville does not wish this rule changed. It works no harm to any one and we prefer it to stand. Dr. Burgett's amendment was not agreed to, and the report was adopted.

Upon one observation by Dr. Hill during this debate, it is proper to offer a few remarks. Dr. Hill referred (as we understand him) to the jealousy of some of our own brethren towards our own secretaries, and admitted that they do have a "wonderful power"—they "have the funds, and know where the men are, and can quietly say, Go into such a Presbytery and decide such a question." Applying this language to the boards in our former church connexion, the statement may be perfectly correct. It is not for us to deny it, and we do not deny it. Dr. Hill says he knows the truth of it, for he held this power for fifteen years. But applying this language (if Dr. Hill intended to apply it) to our committees, the statement is altogether incorrect. The Assembly of our Church wisely conferred on our committees *no ecclesiastical power whatsoever*. Our Sustentation Committee (which answers to the one at Philadelphia to which Dr. Hill refers) is simply a central agency to divide out funds according to certain rules fixed by the Church. It can undertake no work within the bounds of any Presbytery. And it can make no appropriations concerning any Presbytery's territory, except upon *its own application*. It commissions no body to go and preach within the bounds of any Presbytery; it can divide no funds among any such commissioners of its own, if it had any such. Hence there is no such parallel between our committees and the old boards as Dr. Hill's remark implies. And hence there can be no reasonable jealousy of our secretaries or committees. Receiving a certain amount of money for distribution, they sit in judgment on the applications of the different presbyteries and divide out the sum according to rules adopted by the Assembly. This is the whole of their power.



## JUDICIAL CASES.

Dr. Hill, chairman of the Judicial Committee, asked that that committee be discharged, adding that it was a subject of congratulation that there were no complaints or appeals before the Assembly. The Committee was discharged.

## STATISTICS.

Dr. Dabney, from the Committee on Bills and Overtures, presented the following report:

Overture from the Presbytery of New Orleans, to the General Assembly in session at Huntsville, Alabama, May, 1871.

The Presbytery of New Orleans respectfully overture the General Assembly to reconsider the decision of the last Assembly, and found upon page 505 of the minutes, substituting in the statistical tables for the presbyterial collections, a column for the salaries of pastors; for the reason that this change was made without having been to any extent considered by the Church at large; and because in the impoverished condition of our country, a public exposure of the state of such individual churches would be injurious rather than profitable, and would be in its operation reproachful to many of the churches who are straining their utmost in accomplishing even the little they would report.

The Committee respectfully recommend to the Assembly the following answer: That the Assembly believing the evil effects deplored by the memorialists will not follow, do decline to rescind a rule so recently adopted by the Assembly, and promising good results. Adopted.

## MEMORIAL ON THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION.

Dr. Dabney, from the Committee on Bills and Overtures, presented an overture from the Trustees of Union Theological Seminary, asking that this matter may not fail to receive attention. Dr. Kirkpatrick, chairman of the Committee to which said memorial was referred, gave the history of the matter as follows: A memorial proposing certain reforms in theological education was sent by Dr. Dabney to the Assembly, and was by it submitted to the Trustees and Faculties of the two Seminaries. The last Assembly received the action of Columbia Seminary, but not that of Union, and action was for that cause postponed.

I attended the meeting of the Trustees of Union last June, and called their attention to the matter, but for some cause there was no copy of the memorial on hand, and the Board referred the matter to the Faculty. I was prevented from attending the meeting of the Board this spring from want of time, but understand they did nothing in the matter. I do not feel that I have failed in my duty. I would prefer that the Assembly would lay this duty on some one else; but if our committee is continued, I will do the best in my power. The committee was continued.

This matter has certainly run a somewhat singular career. In 1869, Dr. Dabney sends up his memorial, and it is referred to each seminary—directors and faculty. In 1870, Columbia answers, and Union does not answer. Then it is referred to a Committee to meet at Greensboro. The chairman of that Committee tells us that he called the attention of the Trustees of Union Seminary to the matter last year, but they referred it to the faculty, and that this year also the trustees did nothing respecting it. And yet here comes an overture from them to the Assembly, and presented by Dr. Dabney himself, requesting that the subject may not fail to receive attention.

#### RELIEF FUND.

The Assembly adopted a report heartily endorsing the plan of this fund and requiring all the sessions to bring the matter before our churches.

#### SYSTEMATIC BENEFICENCE.

Rev. J. M. P. Otts presented the report, and the Assembly enjoined upon the Presbyteries:

1st. That they (the presbyteries) require from all their churches full statistical reports of what they (the churches) have done during the ecclesiastical year for the various objects of general benevolence to be sent up to their spring meeting; and, in order to facilitate this duty to the churches, that the stated clerks of presbyteries be recommended to furnish to all their respective churches blanks on which to make said reports.

2d. That all our presbyteries be earnestly recommended and enjoined to give, at their next stated meetings, earnest attention

and a thorough examination to the vital subject of systematic benevolence in all its bearings.

3d. That the presbyteries earnestly recommend all their respective pastors, stated supplies, and missionaries, to give frequent instruction to their churches as to their duty in this matter, which is not only of prime importance to the progress, but even indispensable to the continued life and permanent existence of the Church.

4th. That the presbyteries earnestly recommend and solemnly enjoin it upon all their church sessions to afford to the people in every congregation an opportunity to contribute to each and all of the objects for which collections are ordered by the General Assembly.

#### PRINTING REPORTS OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES.

Rev. Edwin Cater offered a resolution to have these reports printed and laid before the Assembly, and that time be allowed each member of the Assembly to examine them before he is called on to vote, so that he may know what he endorses by his vote. After a short debate the resolution was rejected. Mr. Cater entered his dissent on the record.

#### QUORUM OF PRESBYTERY.

The Committee on the Records of the Synod of South Carolina reported, recommending approval.

Mr. Cater said he was not prepared to approve that Synod's decision that Charleston Presbytery was irregular in holding a meeting without the presence of a ruling elder. The Synod's decision was contrary to the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church; for the General Assembly of 1843 had decided that the Presbytery might proceed without a ruling elder's presence. Dr. Hill said he was with the Synod of South Carolina, and thought the Presbytery of Charleston was wrong. The lower courts were bound by the decisions of the Assembly, but one Assembly is not bound by the decisions of another. The question had agitated the whole Church, and he hoped the present Assembly would not hastily decide it. Dr. Kirkpatrick thought the question should be passed over for the present, and moved an amendment to that effect, which was agreed to.

The distinction pointed out by Dr. Hill is an important one, but it needs a word of explanation to guard it from being perverted. When the Assembly decides any point, that is *the law*; and the lower courts are of course bound by the decision. But whilst it is for the Assembly to interpret and decide the law, and their decision must stand as law until some succeeding Assembly shall reverse it, yet none of these decisions of Assemblies are infallible. They may be in the very teeth of the Constitution or of the Scriptures. In such cases it is the right, and it may be the duty of every Synod, Presbytery, session, minister, and private Christian, to exercise their right of judgment, and pronounce the Assembly wrong. The Assembly's decision therefore is always law; but not always equity and truth. It is to be obeyed; but it may be disputed and condemned. And it never should be pleaded by any true Presbyterian in any case as decisive of any question.

“All synods or councils since the Apostles' times, whether general or particular, may err and many have erred; therefore they are not to be made the rule of faith or practice, but to be used as a help in both.”

*Confession of Faith, Chap. XXXI., 3.*

#### ECONOMY IN PRINTING.

Dr. Dabney presented the following:

The Committee on Bills and Overtures report to the General Assembly Overture No. 5, from the Presbytery of North Mississippi, praying the Assembly to enjoin upon all its agents the most rigid economy and prudence in all contracts for printing.

Your committee respectfully moves the Assembly to adopt the following reply:

The Assembly, believing that its clerks and other executive officers are fully aware of the necessity of rigid economy and prudence in this and all other expenditures of sacred funds, and having no proof of their failure therein, deem it unnecessary to take further action upon this memorial at this time.

Mr. Cater said the Committees of Sustentation and Foreign Missions expended the Church's money extravagantly both

in salaries and printing, and proceeded to specify particulars. The Committee's report was adopted without a dissenting voice.

#### THE PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR.

Dr. Dabney reported the following :

The Committee on Bills and Overtures report to the Assembly Overture No. 6, from the Presbytery of North Mississippi, requesting the Assembly to rescind the rule of 1869 "allowing the secretaries of the Executive Committees, and the clerks of the Assembly, to have the privileges of members on the floor of the Assembly," as a "dangerous violation of the constitution."

Your committee respectfully recommends the following answer :

A reference to the rule (Minutes of 1869, p. 390) will show that "the privileges of members on the floor" are not conferred by it on the above officers; but only the privilege of making statements and explanations touching the trusts committed to their care. This the Assembly regards as both safe and convenient, and therefore respectfully declines to rescind.

Mr. Cater explained that his Presbytery objected not simply to the making statements, but the privileges of members in all matters pertaining to their office. The Committees report was adopted without a dissenting voice.

#### ITEMIZED REPORTS.

Dr. Dabney presented the following :

The Committee on Bills and Overtures reported to the Assembly Overture No. 7, from the Presbytery of North Mississippi, praying the Assembly to require of all treasurers of church funds a specific itemized report of all receipts from all and every source, and also of all disbursements in the same specific itemized manner; and that the same be published in the Minutes of the Assembly.

Your Committee respectfully recommend the adoption of the following :

The detailed accounts of all the Executive Committees are annually exhibited to the Assembly, and by the Auditing Committees examined and settled. The Assembly regards these measures as substantially securing the faithful disbursement of the funds.

Mr. Cater—My Presbytery does not consider that the fact that the reports of the committees are submitted to the Auditing Committee of the Assembly is sufficient to give the Church the information that it wants. The business as now conducted, as far as the Church is concerned, is a “secret service.” It is odious to any citizen of any State to be taxed to furnish money to the Government for secret service.

Dr. Dabney—I regard the spirit of the overture as eminently wise and proper. The Committee was very near unanimously adopting a resolution to that effect, if I remember correctly. There was certainly a very considerable expression in its favor, and for this reason, that the annual reports which now contain specific accounts of all the receipts, should contain specific accounts of all disbursements, and be published to all the churches. The reason why that was not the report of the Committee was simply this: it was suggested to us that it would unfold to a sort of publicity the domestic status of many a minister’s family. We doubted whether this would be for edification—whether it might not be in many cases galling to the most praiseworthy ministers and their families. That was simply the motive that controlled the Committee. I, for one, feel no disposition to resist the adoption of that measure. Of course, your Executive Committees ought not to have the least personal motive to resist the publication of such a detailed account of their disbursements. It is not their delicacy that would be affected at all, but the delicacy of the recipients.

Dr. J. Leighton Wilson—An itemized report, such as Mr. Cater speaks of, as I stated in my report the other day, has been presented here. Every single item of expenditure is put in it. I made a motion in our Committee to print that report so as to place it in the hands of every member of the Assembly, but the Committee overruled me, and I think very judiciously. Are you going to expose here every minister, every family, that receives funds from this Committee? The report of items is here in the hands of the Auditing Committee, and the Committee on Sustentation—just as perfect as it could be made. But if the Assembly so orders it, we can publish every one of these disburse-

ments, and spread them before the world. The Committee were influenced by the very consideration to which Dr. Dabney refers. The report was adopted without a dissenting voice.

#### REPORTS OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES.

The want of space compels us very reluctantly to omit, besides some other matters of interest and importance, all reference whatever to these reports, except those of the Sustentation and Foreign Missions Committees. And our reference to them is confined almost entirely to the question of the charges against the Committees, especially against their Secretary and Treasurer.

On the second day of the Assembly's meeting, Dr. J. Leighton Wilson presented the report on Sustentation; and along with it the minutes and two tabular statements, *not for the Assembly, but its Standing Committee*. One was printed and stated every cent contributed through the year; the other was a supplement to the Treasurer's Report, and gave a full account of every expenditure. Still another paper was submitted containing the name of every individual who had received aid from the invalid fund.

Dr. Wilson, after some remarks on the Report, said he had a painful duty to perform, which was to lay before the body another paper stating, on behalf of himself as Secretary, and of the Treasurer, that they had been charged, himself with neglect of official duty, and the Treasurer with dishonest management of the Church's funds. These charges had been made by one who was a member of the present Assembly, and circulated all over the Church in one of our papers. He asked for an investigation that the officers accused might be vindicated, if innocent; but degraded from office, if guilty. Dr. Pryor moved the reference to a special committee. Mr. Cater said he was prepared to defend himself against that paper, and was willing to go before a committee; but preferred to meet the matter directly before the Assembly. The paper was then referred to Gov. Patton, Judge Swann, Mr. Enslow, Dr. Burgett, and Dr. Kirkpatrick.

On Tuesday, the fifth day, Gov. Patton presented the following report from the Committee of Investigation:

The Special Committee to whom was referred the request of the Secretary and Treasurer of the Executive Committees of Sustentation and Foreign Missions, that the Assembly would institute an investigation concerning certain charges or complaints made and published against them through the columns of one of our religious journals, in reference to their official conduct, beg leave to present the following report :

They have carefully and diligently examined the published articles referred to and placed in their hands, and noted particularly those portions reflecting upon those brethren in their management of these great interests of our Church intrusted to their care, and in connexion therewith they have had access to all the necessary books and papers for ascertaining satisfactorily whether or not there is any ground for complaint.

After such examination, they feel compelled, in view of the facts in the case, and in justice to those brethren and the Church, which has reposed in them those trusts, to come to the following conclusions :

1. It is insinuated that they are aiming by a centralisation of power and authority to obtain exclusive control of matters intrusted to them, that they may thereby promote the welfare of one portion of the Church to the detriment of other portions which are equally or more deserving of help.

For this insinuation or complaint, in the judgment of your Committee there is not the slightest ground. There is no evidence that the Secretary or Treasurer, or those associated with them in these Executive Committees, have exercised or aimed to exercise any more power or authority than is given to them by the General Assembly ; and they are glad to know that whatever influence may be possessed, especially by the Secretary or Treasurer of Sustentation and Foreign Missions, is due to their eminent piety, to their moral worth, and their great devotion to the interests of the Church.

2. It is insinuated that the causes of Sustentation and Foreign Missions are suffering through mismanagement and neglect of the Secretary and Treasurer, because of the multiplicity of their engagements.

In the judgment of your Committee, and after an examination of the facts as furnished in the documents before us, there is no evidence that these interests of the Church are suffering in any degree by a multiplicity of their appointments.

3. It is intimated that there has been embezzlement or culpable expenditure of the funds placed in their hands, which has been covered up by false or defective reports.



From an examination of the accounts, to all of which your Committee have had free access, there is not the slightest proof of any dishonesty or careless disposal of such funds. The accounts, moreover, of each year, as every member of the Assembly knows, have all been audited by a committee appointed for that purpose, and found to be correct and sustained by proper vouchers.

4. It is insinuated that they have taken advantage of their position to pay themselves more, in the way of salaries, than was authorised or proper under the circumstances.

An examination of the books shows that their compensation for so much labor and responsibility has been only such as was authorised by the Executive Committees, and is so moderate that it is difficult to know how any person can complain of its being too large. It is ascertained, moreover, that all the expenses of conducting these important matters, including salaries, clerk's hire, office-rent, fuel, lights, etc., etc., have been remarkably economical, amounting to a fraction over seven per cent. of the whole amount—some \$73,000—received and disbursed by them.

In view of all the facts in the case, your Committee would recommend the adoption of the following resolutions:

*Resolved*, 1. That this Assembly does hereby most cordially endorse the conduct of the Secretary and Treasurer of Sustentation and Foreign Missions, the Rev. J. L. Wilson, D. D., and the Rev. James Woodrow, D. D., in their management of the trust committed to them.

2. That this Assembly condemns *in toto* all such complaints and insinuations as may have been made against these brethren, who have been so faithful and untiring in their official duties, as alike unjust to them and injurious to the welfare of the Church.

3. That the Assembly, while fully admitting the right of free discussion of its own acts and deliverances, as well as the official conduct of all its officers, does hereby most earnestly caution the editors of our religious journals, as well as their contributors, against the publication of articles reflecting thus publicly on the conduct of those who are acting as its servants, because of the injury which might be inflicted upon them personally, and upon the Church generally; and that it reminds and urges on all who have charges or complaints to make, which, if true, would result in the removal of those complained of, that the proper place for making such charges or complaints is on the floor of the Assembly.

After some discussion, at Mr. Cater's request, this report was not taken up at once, but the consideration of it postponed until

the next day at 11 o'clock. Upon its coming up on Wednesday, Dr. Hendrick moved that it be referred to a committee of three to bring in a minute which should dispose of the matter without a long debate. Gov. Patton and Dr. Pryor objected to this plan of procedure, as did Dr. Peck, who also expressed, along with Dr. Hendrick, the wish to hear from Drs. Wilson and Woodrow. Dr. Hill offered as a substitute the following :

“The General Assembly having appointed a committee to examine into the official conduct of its Secretary and Treasurer of the Committees of Foreign Missions and Sustentation, and said committee having had all the books and accounts of those committees before them, feels constrained to express its entire confidence in the perfect honesty and integrity of said officers, and their general wisdom and skill in the management of the sacred funds intrusted to their care. These officers have an arduous and difficult work to discharge, and are liable to fall into errors. Whilst, therefore, the Assembly would recognise the right of all the lower courts and ministers, elders, and others, freely and in a proper spirit of love to canvass those errors, it would recommend to all such to do it in such a way as not to shake the confidence of the churches in them, and thus inflict an injury upon the causes which they represent. The Assembly would at the same time express such confidence in these officers that they feel assured that any errors or mistakes into which they may fall, will be promptly corrected when properly pointed out.”

In the course of his remarks, Dr. Hill referred to certain censures by his Presbytery and Synod, of a part of the conduct of the Foreign Missions Committee. The young brethren sent to China from his Presbytery had not been supplied promptly with funds. He had been appointed to correspond with the Committee on the subject. He had heard their explanations, which did not fully meet, he must say, the difficulties in the minds of his brethren. He did not think Dr. Wilson was to blame; but that Dr. Woodrow had had so “many irons in the fire” that he could not give the required attention to these young brethren. That is the opinion of a large number of the brethren in Kentucky. The suffering entailed was partly the fault of the young brethren themselves, partly of the missionary since deceased; but

the Treasurer ought to have had sufficient knowledge of the mode of transmitting funds to have supplied the wants of the missionaries. Why, those missionaries had been compelled to borrow money for six or eight months from missionaries of the Northern Board! Yet he had perfect confidence in Dr. Woodrow, who would no doubt do his duty in the future, though he had not done it in the past.

Dr. J. Leighton Wilson said that Mr. Cater had yesterday promised statements in substantiation of his charges, and desired that they should be made before Dr. Woodrow should begin his defence. But Mr. Cater replied that Dr. Wilson had misunderstood him; he had no statements, and was no complainant; and had not accused any party of any crime. Dr. Pryor then urged that, while Dr. Hill's statements, emanating as they do from the Synod of Kentucky, were fresh before us, Dr. Woodrow should now make his explanations.

Dr. Woodrow thanked the Assembly for their courtesy in inviting him to appear and make a full statement of his official conduct, not only during the past year, but the former years in which he had been serving it. He considered himself honored in standing thus before the whole "Presbyterian Church in the United States." Yet it was strange he should be standing there to *defend* himself against charges not intended, it is said, to affect his character—only charges made by one "friend" against another—mere inquiries into his official conduct. He acknowledged the Church's right to make these inquiries. He courted investigation. But he claimed that he must either be vindicated as the Assembly's servant; or else condemned and cast forth as a vagabond with a mark on his brow more infamous than that on Cain's. His brother Hill had said we must not be too sensitive; but when that was touched which was as dear to him as virtue to a woman, he could not but be sensitive. If but a small portion of the charges uttered and published far and wide over this land and through the Church be true, he was so degraded that he should be passed by in the street as too polluted to be noticed, except to seek to rescue him from eternal degradation. He would proceed to show what were some of these charges. First.

There had been published all through the Church in the *Christian Observer* by two ministers of our Church, in an article signed N. R., that the Committees of Sustentation and Foreign Missions—being some of them Professors in the Seminary, and Editors of the *Review* and *Southern Presbyterian and Index*, and holding in their hands the fund for the relief of Disabled Ministers, etc., and also the new Assurance scheme—were wielding “a power that may eventually crush out liberty of thought and freedom of speech in the Presbyterian Church,” and had also clearly “manifested their disposition in that direction.” Again. It had been charged that the officers of these Committees, himself and Dr. John Leighton Wilson, were “immersed in other business—beloved men anxiously willing to ‘toat’ every thing.” If immersed in other business, they must be unfaithful in the discharge of the duties committed to them by the Church. Now *he* was directly pointed at in these charges, which made him out guilty of the attempt to use the power committed in part to him, in a direction “dangerous to godliness and sound doctrine,” and tending “to crush out liberty of thought and freedom of speech;” and of neglecting what had been given him to do, because “immersed in other business.” But, further, it had been alleged and published, that while Dr. Wilson mentioned in his report one thousand dollars as appropriated to one thing, he (Dr. Woodrow) had charged the Treasury twenty-seven hundred dollars for the same item; and, again, that a bond for one thousand dollars had disappeared. Again. It was charged that “Prof. Woodrow was already employed by the Church for the whole of his time in one direction, and she pays him \$3,000 for it.” Now, what would the Assembly think, if he (Dr. W.) were to say of a clerk, that he employed him for the whole of his time for \$600, and then that he was working for others in his time and getting paid for it? Would that be a charge affecting his honesty and integrity? He saw men of business around him, and he asked, what they would think of one paid by them for the whole of his time, and then selling portions of it for money? Would *swindling* be too strong an expression for the crime? Would *embezzlement*? Whatever is the word which

expresses the taking of money which does not belong to you, *that* would be the right word. It is taking money which did not belong to him that he was charged with. Yet he was told that he was too sensitive in wishing the Assembly to investigate the matter to see whether or not it was true. And then as to the "bond for \$1,000 which had disappeared." If money were put into his hands, and if it disappeared in any way, he cared not how, he ought to be regarded as appropriating to his own use. Money does not disappear from one's hands accidentally. Such things never occur. Thus he had, by reference to these last two points, established that charges had been brought against him, which, if true, ought to blast his character forever.

But he had been told by brethren on many hands that nobody believes such charges. He was firmly persuaded that nobody who knew him could believe them. Yet they were brought in such a way that he could not afford to despise them. First, they are brought by one who is a member of this body; and he could not despise any charge by any one who can sit in this body. Nor could he afford to despise charges by any one who represents a Presbytery—nor by any one whom he heard spoken of in the speeches made as "brother," "the excellent brother." Moderator, if any one charges you with stealing, I will not call him brother; and yet "an excellent brother," as I hear him called on all hands, has done this very thing to me! And there was still another circumstance he could not omit to mention. These charges had not been made in private, but circulated by thousands of copies. No, this was a matter he could not pass lightly by. The Assembly must either visit him with a condemnation which should follow him with its blighting influence to the grave; or else give him a vindication such as will prevent a repetition of such accusations. As had been said by a venerable father in this body, these charges are such that they must be fatal to the peace of conscience of him who made and those who published them on the one hand, or of himself on the other.

But before he would enter upon his own vindication, he would observe that the antecedent probability of such charges depends on the character of him who makes them. If the peace-loving

Isaac attack, it may be supposed there is good reason for it; if Isaac's brother make the attack, there is no such presumption. He submitted, therefore, that it was proper for him to require whether his assailant were the peace-loving Isaac, or his brother [Ishmael]. But before this could be considered, there was still another question: Were the charges by one person or by many? Are they fresh charges or a reiteration of old ones? Dr. Woodrow proceeded to speak of the repeated assaults which had been made upon him and the various names assumed by the one person who had made them all, and introduced a comparison of what had occurred to him, with what happens sometimes to the traveller in Africa, who hears in one direction the terrific roar of the lion, and in another the yell and shriek of the tiger, intended to drive him from his tent, and then when both these fail, there comes from another quarter a plaintive wail, a cry for pity to move the traveller's compassion and bring him forth. All, however, comes from *one* animal, not many; and in like manner all the various persons who had assailed him were embodied in that single person of Mr. Edwin Cater. He proceeded to detail a variety of circumstances in the past intended to show that his assailant was not the peace-loving Isaac, but his brother. But our space is limited, and we pass them over. He was proceeding to reply to the statements made by Dr. Hill relative to the missionary funds, when Dr. J. Leighton Wilson interposed and requested him, in the interest of the cause of missions, to desist. He was yielding to the Secretary's suggestion, when Dr. Pryor said he hoped Dr. Woodrow would proceed. Dr. Hill said the same. Dr. Woodrow replied: Since Dr. Hill hopes I will proceed, I shall do so. He passed a high eulogium upon the three missionaries, Houston, Stuart, and Helm. He knew no three ministers in our Church he could more surely trust, and if at any time any one of them had used any expression to his detriment, he was confident they had done it through misapprehension. Dr. Hill had said the mission in China had frequently been left without funds. If they had indeed been very nearly left without funds, it would not be strange in the history of this Church; for that had been the case with most of us. He proceeded then to

VOL. XXII., NO. 4.—8.

read a letter from Mr. Stuart, of date Sept. 24th, 1869, saying that his "wants had been abundantly supplied," and that he "had never feared" on the score of his support; also from Mr. Inslee, Nov. 9, 1869, saying he "never intended any such interpretation as that of our being in personal want," and again, Dec: 12, 1869, stating that they had "never been in personal want, though once or twice were run rather close." Then he read from a letter of date July 6, 1870, by Mr. Thomas E. Converse, (since returned to this country) as follows: "Your mission here is a set of beggars. The mission treasury has not had one cent in it for the past four months;" but the Mission Treasurer, Mr. Inslee, on the 7th June, 1870, wrote that he had just received two thousand Mexican dollars. He was proceeding with more of the same sort of extracts, when Dr. J. Leighton Wilson again interposed, and Dr. Woodrow desisted. Dr. Pryor, however, requesting him to explain again the misunderstanding betwixt himself and Mr. Inslee about the transmission of funds, he stated that at Mr. Inslee's request he had deposited money in New York subject to his draft, supposing that Mr. Inslee knew that the directions he had given to the Treasurer were correct; but it turned out that he was in error in one important particular, and hence could not draw upon the money kept for him in New York.

Coming back to the allegation of Mr. Cater, that he had charged the Treasury \$2,700 for \$1,000, he showed that Dr. Wilson's statement and the Treasurer's had not referred to the same thing; and that Mr. Cater had made a similar blunder regarding the thousand dollar bond which was lying at that moment in the church-safe in his office.

Dr. Woodrow proceeded: You have been told in these articles, and you have been told by Dr. Hill that he believes it to be true; that I have "too many irons in the fire." Well, as you have seen, I *have* a good many. First, I am a Professor in the Theological Seminary. I did not fix my salary; and when I became your Professor in your Theological Seminary, I did not sell you all my time, if I did get three thousand dollars from you. I do not perform the work of my professorship in that

way. I do not "work by the day;" I "work by the piece." You did not buy all my time, and you know you did not. It is asked, How do you know it? You appointed me, when I was already Professor, to be Treasurer of Foreign Missions in 1861. Well, I did not want any more money. I had enough. I had not very much, it is true; for I had a wife and some children to support, and I had use for all the money I could honestly get. But I did not want any more from the Church. (You have forced me to speak of myself; I cannot help, in vindicating myself, presenting these personal matters.) When you call upon me to perform any duty, I obey you. The voice of this Assembly is to me the voice of God. You bade me take care of the funds of the Foreign Mission Treasury, and I did it. I did not want any money for it. Then, in 1863, you made me your Treasurer of Domestic Missions, and I begged that no salary should be attached to that office. So I served for three years. But Dr. Dabney, when he was chairman of one of your standing committees at Charlotte, in 1864, brought in a report, in regard to which I knew nothing beforehand, saying in effect that this was not right—that I must receive a salary; and the General Assembly ordered the Committee to pay me a salary. You thus taught me that you did not think you had previously paid for all my time. If, therefore, it is stealing your money to take pay for work I do, on the ground that you have with \$3,000 paid me for all my time, it is *you who did it*, not I. This is all I get from the Church. But I work for it. I did not sell you all my time, and you said I did not. I submit, therefore, that to charge me before the world and before the Church with taking your money twice for the same thing, is something that a "good brother," an "excellent brother," a "cordial friend," a representative of the Church of Christ, ought not to do.

That was not all, however. "You have ever so many other small irons." Well, that was so—he had. He was editor of the *Southern Presbyterian*. How did that happen? It was necessary for some one to take up and carry on the paper—in all the broad region where the paper circulates, there was but one opinion as to the necessity of it for fostering all the enterprises



of the Church. But who should do it? You know the condition of things at the end of the war. We had no money; I had none. I had only a will to serve the Church with whatever of gifts God might bestow upon me. I had no money; but I have a brother, a noble brother—Thomas Woodrow, of Chillicothe, Ohio—who had money, and who placed it at my disposal for myself; or for my Church, if I loved her more. I accepted it, and established the paper; I trust, by the help and with the approbation of my Master in heaven.

But I am, also, the publisher and one of the editors—the junior, the least important editor—of the SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW. Well, what was the state of things at the end of the war with respect to this? Here Dr. Woodrow made similar statements as in reference to the paper. But he had “also a Depository”—Yes, he had. Before we had any Committee of Publication, he began a little Committee of Publication on his own account, and for the little he had done in this line, men had thanked him whose thanks any one might be proud to receive. But when communication became easy, and there seemed to be no longer any imperative call for his little Committee, he had given it up. There was still a little of that iron sticking in the fire, but he had taken it out just as far as he could. But he had still another iron. “You have a printing office.” Yes, I have a printing office, and a good deal of work is done there, and there is something made at it. But no one will say that having a printing office is in itself a very bad thing. But you have other irons. “You are teaching outside the Seminary.” He explained how he had accepted, after much solicitation, with the advice of his colleagues, and of elders and ministers all over the State, the vacant chair of chemistry in the University to save it from being unworthily filled. He had had that small iron in the fire ever since. But was it a sin? He thought it could not be very bad to have scientific proclivities. He referred to some which Mr. Cater had manifested in former years, and recounted how he had sought in vain to get this very chair. It could not, therefore, be so very wrong for him to hold it, sustained in the acceptance of it by the persons he had named.

Dr. Woodrow went on to explain how it happened that all these things could be done by one man. Well, he was not very strong—they saw he was not very big! But he had consecrated himself, with all that he was and all that he had, to the service of his blessed Master. And he cheerfully endeavored to serve him up to the utmost limit of his strength. He had in this view considered it a privilege to give up the pleasures of society. The Moderator knew he had not been able to accept *his* invitations—no, not those of *his own sister*. And he had verily thought he was doing God service in giving up to him the time he might have spent in the pleasures and duties of social life. Then, all men have a right to rest; but he had cheerfully relinquished his needed rest in order to keep some irons from burning. Also he had offended many brethren whose letters on private business (not the business of the Church) he had failed to answer. And she, whose “whose price was above rubies,” aided him in all he undertook, she too relinquishing for this purpose the pleasures of society. And yet it has come to this, that because we have united in reverently laying upon the altar of God our whole strength and all our time, my name (and my name is her name) is made a by-word to be mocked at.

But it is reiterated, you are making too much money. He did make a good deal of money. What did he do with his money? He might say this is no other man's business. But before the Church of God, as he thought he was now standing, he assumed no such attitude. He had never told any but his most intimate friends what he did with his money. But what was he doing with it? Are not the Trustees of the Southwestern Depository right in their opinion, that to publish a religious newspaper is one important means of glorifying God? Does not the Synod of Mississippi do well to appropriate funds in the hands of these trustees to that noble project? Was it not right for the friends of religious literature in Mobile to collect and expend ten or twelve thousand dollars to establish a religious journal there? Moderator, I cannot establish a religious paper for nothing any more than any one else, and God forbid that I should boast; but I am forced in vindication of my own character to say, that I

have spent between thirteen and fourteen thousand dollars of my own hard-earned money in establishing the *Southern Presbyterian*, and between three and four thousand more in continuing the SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW. Have I sinned in so doing?

I am glad that I appear in this Assembly, not only for the reasons I have given, but for others as well. A pale and delicate boy—scarcely more than a boy—twenty-two years ago landed upon the southern shore of this State. He had not one friend within hundreds and hundreds of miles; but he believed that in this and in the contiguous States, though he was born across the Atlantic on a foreign shore, there would be those who would welcome him in due time, if he was worthy of welcome. And I have been welcomed. And I stand not now before strangers, but before those who have been observing my course from that day to this, and who have without ceasing bestowed upon me every mark of confidence and affection. I am happy to see in one of the members of this Assembly a member of the church with which I first united in this State soon after I reached it—the elder who is now representing the Presbytery of Tombeckbee [Mr. R. F. Houston.] The beloved brother who is sitting before me, now from Lexington, Virginia, [Rev. Dr. J. L. Kirkpatrick,] was the first minister in this State to extend to me the elements of the broken body and shed blood of our ascended Redeemer. Father McCorkle, who is present in this house, though not a member of the Assembly, was the first along with other brethren, twenty years ago, to intrust to me the first official position which I ever held in the Church. Father Wilson, and others who are here from the Synod of Georgia, more than eighteen years ago called me to a still higher position. And here, let me say, I never thrust myself higher. I never sought any office of honor or profit which I have ever received; and I have received many from the Church, and I have received the offer of many from the different States. And so I have gone on, step by step; and I rejoice that there are multitudes of brethren here who have been observing my course day by day. There are a number of my students here, too—an unbroken succession from 1853 to this

day—those whom I have delighted to take by the hand and lead in the paths of knowledge, whether secular or sacred. To them I appeal, whether I have ever neglected any of my duties performed under their daily scrutiny. It is not before strangers that I stand to-day, therefore, though that boy was a stranger. It is before the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, which has for many years and in many ways honored me with its confidence. I beg you that you will not withdraw your confidence, unless you see good reason so to do. But as you opened your arms to receive the young foreigner and confided in him, so now thrust him from your embrace, and cast him down to the lowest depths of the infamy which he deserves, if he has proved unworthy—if he has betrayed any of the trusts which you have so lavishly confided to him.

But, Moderator, I beg that you will not by any neglect, by “faint praise,” by any praise accompanied with exceptions, unless you now go fully into the investigation of the exceptions, leave any stain upon the name I bear. Moderator, that name is very dear to me. In 1525, in the western part of Scotland, Patrick Wodrow, just after the beginning of the Reformation, began to preach the same glorious gospel that it has been your privilege so long to preach. At the close of the “Revolution,” James Wodrow, in 1688, was made the first Professor of Theology in the University of Glasgow, after he had been hiding from his persecutors, preaching the gospel as he might, for twenty-five years. You are indebted to Robert Wodrow for the *Annals of Scotland*, in so far as relates to the memorials of those days of bloody persecution that have come down to us a precious heritage. The venerable Thomas Wodrow, now under my own roof, has been preaching the gospel from the Orkney Islands to the south of England, from the snows of Canada to the warm plains of South Carolina, for more than fifty years. Another Thomas Woodrow has offered his purse to this Church through me; and this Church through me has received it. Moderator, the name is dear to me; and I would fain transmit it without a stain to the little band of prattlers now at my fireside—to the four little ones who for these past weeks

have been gathering around me, attracted by the conversation of their elders, and asking questions with their eyes full of wonder—"What is this? what are they saying about you? what do they mean by 'bond disappearing from the treasury'? And do they say you took money twice for the same thing? What do they mean by these things which we are hearing?" And then, "Do they mean that you took the Church's money? that you have been doing wicked things? You—*you?*" And then they cluster around me, twining their little arms around my neck with loving caresses to shield me from harm, if there is no one else to protect my fair name. And shall that name be dishonored which she whose "works praise her," in the proudest hour of my life consented to receive as her own? Shall I be permitted to transmit to these little ones an honored name? or shall it be tarnished by such rumors; by such attacks; by such—I will not characterise them. Is it, is it, fathers and brethren, to be my fate to transmit this honored name received from honored ancestors to a disgraced posterity? I appeal to you, fathers and brethren, to judge whether I have deserved this at your hands.

Dr. J. Leighton Wilson said he had come that morning expecting to make an extended speech, moved to that resolution, because a respected member of the Assembly had said no man had any complaint against him, but some did except to my associate Dr. Woodrow. That determined me to speak, and perhaps speak long; but I feel that the necessity is removed. He proceeded to state that he had been charged with occupying his time in conducting a large school. His school was a charity institution, which cost him every year between five hundred and one thousand dollars. He had only the general care of it, and, except to open it with prayer, he had not spent four hours in it for four years. But he had felt after the war that his region of country was gone, unless female education could be promoted. And he had the satisfaction of knowing that he had educated about thirty girls, daughters of ministers and of widows unable to educate them. Dr. Wilson went on to say, however, that this was not his line of defence against the charge made; but he held, that when any officer of the Church discharges the duties

of his office, the Church has no right to inquire what becomes of the rest of his time. There was not one prominent official in the Church who could not be convicted, if this principle does not stand. Referring again to his accused associate, he said he must tell some things which his own modesty had prevented his disclosing, and which even now he had not his permission to tell. Then he recounted the loss of \$3,000 of the Committee's money by failure of a banking-house in New York, which Dr. Woodrow insisted on bearing himself against the protestations of the Committee; and how he had advanced, with the aid of his noble brother, Thomas Woodrow, \$5,500, to meet drafts coming from Brazil and China, and which our Church had not in her Treasury. Yet, this is the man some want to tumble out of doors, and put a mark upon him! He closed by saying, that he had nothing to live for but his Church and his family. It had been one of the profoundest sources of enjoyment to him that his Church had been so harmonious; and he deplored the fact of the springing up in the midst of it of such elements of discord.

At the close of Dr. Wilson's remarks, Dr. Hill's substitute was laid on the table, and the Assembly adjourned to meet at 4 o'clock p. m. In the afternoon, Dr. Dabney, from the Committee on Bills and Overtures, presented a report on the overture from the Presbytery of Memphis, asking for the "return of the Committees of Education and Sustentation to the places where they were first located, and from which the war necessitated their removal—the Committee of Education to Memphis, and Sustentation to New Orleans." The Committee recommended the following answer: "That there appears no evidence that the above changes are required by the general sentiment of the churches and presbyteries, and the Assembly therefore respectfully decline action at this time." Mr. S. B. O. Wilson had been instructed by the Presbytery of Memphis to urge this removal, but felt a delicacy in doing so in the peculiar circumstances of this meeting of the Assembly. The matter was not new, but had come before this body last year. There is danger in centralisation. He did not urge the removal from any lack of confidence in the brethren at Columbia, but with an eye to

the benefit of the Church. Mr. Lynn, of the same Presbytery, made similar remarks. Dr. Kirkpatrick would adopt the report of the Committee on Bills and Overtures, but hoped the time would come when the business of our Committees would require a Secretary for each, and he would then favor their dispersion. Mr. Cater said the question was of more consequence than the Assembly seemed to think. Dr. Porter said the Synod of Texas was against the removal of the Sustentation Committee to New Orleans, although specially interested in that Committee's doings; and that he understood the judgment of the brethren at New Orleans was likewise against the change. Dr. John Leighton Wilson said the brethren at Columbia were stated in the public prints to be opposed to the removal, but he did not know of one of them who had ever uttered in public any opinion or written a line on that subject. On the contrary, he had brought the matter himself before the Assembly at Baltimore, which declined to remove it. The separation of the two Committees would relieve him from a great amount of labor. Mr. Tenney (Eastern Texas) differed from Dr. Porter as to the feeling in Texas, but himself desired no removal. Dr. Baird said the Committee of Education had never conversed at all about the matter, and he had never undertaken to influence any one on the subject. All he desired was the good of the Church. The report was adopted.

On the next day, when the report of the Investigating Committee came up, Mr. Cater said he had prepared himself to make some protracted remarks, but he should make but few, and then dismiss the subject. It had caused him a great deal of distress and anxiety of mind. There has been a great conflict in my heart. I perhaps had a vast struggle with the "old Adam;" and I trust the grace of God has enabled me to overcome him. After some further remarks of this nature, he concluded by begging permission of the house to withdraw every remark which has been wounding to the feelings of his brethren. And more, sir—I beg leave to say, that I do, from my innermost heart, forgive everything which they have said, so harshly, as I think. God give me grace ever to pray for them.

Dr. Woodrow—Mr. Moderator, I earnestly pray God that he

will inspire me with that wisdom from above which is "first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be entreated." If, as has been intimated by the member who has just spoken, my purity was not intended to be assailed, and if it has been vindicated before this Assembly, and so before the Church, and the world, I would have naught but peaceable thoughts in my heart; and I therefore here declare myself satisfied with the explanation that has now been made. And I further say, that if I have gone one step beyond what He who is not only the God of truth and righteousness, but the God of love, would fully approve, I here, without reserve, withdraw it.

Dr. Kirkpatrick offered the following resolution, to be adopted in place of the Committee's report:

*Resolved*, That the General Assembly having received the report of the Special Committee appointed to investigate the charges or complaints respecting the official conduct of the Secretary and the Treasurer of the Executive Committees of Foreign Missions and of Sustentation, in compliance with the request made by those officers, and having received full and explicit information concerning the several matters involved in said charges or complaints, does not deem it necessary to take any further action in the premises than simply to declare, as it does hereby declare, in the most emphatic and unqualified terms, that it finds nothing in any of the facts brought to its view to shake, but much to strengthen, the confidence hitherto reposed in the fidelity of the said officers to the trusts committed to them, and in their wise, vigilant, and successful management thereof.

Governor Patton heartily assented to the substitution. And after some remarks from Drs. Hill and Pryor, the resolution was unanimously adopted. Dr. Marshall moved that the Moderator lead the Assembly in returning thanks to God, which was agreed to; and, through the Moderator, the Assembly did accordingly, and with much feeling, offer devout thanksgiving for the happy result which had been reached.

#### PRESBYTERY OF SAO PAULO.

Dr. Hendrick presented the following:

The Committee on Foreign Missions would report in regard to the organisation of a Presbytery in Brazil:



1. That Rev. G. Nash Morton, Rev. Edward Lane, Rev. James R. Baird, and Rev. W. C. Emerson, with the church in Campinas, be detached from their presbyteries; and they hereby are constituted into a Presbytery to be called the Presbytery of Sao Paulo, in connexion with the Synod of Virginia.

2. The boundaries of said Presbytery shall be commensurate with the limits of the kingdom of Brazil.

3. The Presbytery of Sao Paulo is directed to meet in Campinas on Saturday before the second Sabbath in January, 1872, at 11 o'clock a. m., and be opened with a sermon by Rev. James R. Baird, or, in case of his absence or inability, by Rev. Edward Lane, who shall preside till a moderator is elected.

Adopted.

#### VALID BAPTISM.

The report of the Committee was read as follows :

The General Assembly of 1870 resolved as follows :

"That a Committee be appointed, which shall present to the next Assembly a report of full and clear instruction to the Church, on the whole subject of valid baptism, and the extent to which baptism administered by other churches should be recognised."

"This Committee was appointed to consist of the Rev. Drs. R. L. Dabney, Thos. E. Peck, J. B. Adger, and Geo. Howe." Minutes 1870, p. 537.

Your Committee, in fulfilment of the duty above assigned them, would beg leave to refer to the Assembly's Digest, Book III., Pt. I., Chap. 2. This chapter, from the enactments of previous Assemblies, presents what appears to us to be a safe and scriptural collection of rules concerning valid and invalid baptism. We are there taught that baptism is in no case to be administered by any save a minister of the Church of Christ, called to be a steward of the mysteries of God. See Directory for Worship, Ch. VII., § I. That baptism, by a clerical imposter, who has, in fact, never received ordination to the ministry in any Church of Christ, or by a minister duly suspended or deposed, is invalid, and so, null and void. That although the personal unworthiness of a minister officiating in any church of Christ does not invalidate the ordinances of that communion, yet peculiar and intentional profanity in the administration of a particular baptism may properly render it invalid; but in this case the church session and pastor are the best judges, and must decide from the particular circumstances whether to re-administer the sacrament in a regular manner; and that all baptisms ad-

ministered in the Unitarian and Popish communions are invalid. We respectfully recommend to the Assembly to reaffirm all these rules.

The Assembly of 1870, being asked whether persons who have been baptized in the name of the Holy Trinity in the "Christian Church," (commonly called Campbellite), and applying for membership in our Church, shall be invariably re-baptized, did, from the same principles, answer this question in the affirmative; whereupon was adopted the resolution appointing to the undersigned the present duty.

If any other instruction to the churches is needed on "the whole subject of valid baptism, and the extent to which baptism administered by other churches should be recognised," we would respectfully submit the following:

Inasmuch as contact may hereafter arise with religious denominations now having no relations with our churches, or not even in existence at present, this instruction cannot now be given by a complete specific enumeration. It can only consist of the statement of scriptural principles, which determine each case as it arises.

Our Church has always held, agreeably to the Scripture, that the administration of baptism may present irregularities or imperfections which are not to be approved, but the sacrament may still have substantial validity. It is plain from the Scriptures, that baptism has, by the Lord Jesus Christ, been given to his true visible Church catholic,\* and cannot be out of her pale. The administration of this sacrament may be in two ways invalidated; either by the apostasy of the body wherein it is exercised, so that this society is no true part of Christ's visible Church; or by the utter change or corruption of the element and doctrine of the sacrament. And our Assemblies have correctly held, that the form called by the Popish communion "Christian baptism" has ceased, for both reasons, to be valid; because that society is declared in Scripture to be Antichrist, and Babylon, and apostate, out of which the Lord requireth his "people to come, that they may not be partakers of her plagues;" and because she hath, with superstitious design, substituted a mixed element in place of water, which Christ ordained to be used as the emblem, and hath utterly corrupted the doctrine of holy baptism into an incantation working *ex opere operato*.

In other societies, as the Unitarian, their rites may have due

---

\*See Matt. xxviii. 19, 20; Acts ii. 41, 42; 1st Cor. xii. 13; Book of Gov., Ch. VII.; Dir. for Worship, Ch. VII., § 1.

regularity of outward form, and yet be no valid baptism; because these bodies are not true parts of Christ's visible Church. The validity of such cases therefore depends upon the claim of the communion in which they are administered to be true Churches of Jesus Christ. But the scriptural mark of a true Church is its holding forth the word of God.\* In view of the fact that several Churches hold grave errors in connexion with much saving truth, and that perhaps no Church receives in everything the exact mind of the Spirit, it may be asked: With what degree of strictness or liberality this mark of a true visible Church is to be applied? It seems to us consonant to the Scriptures and the judgment of charity to answer, that so long as any communion so retains the essential truths of God's word, and the aids of the Holy Ghost, as to save souls by its ministrations, it shall be held a true, though imperfect, member of his visible body. Though it may omit or impugn some principles which we have received from God, and may even deny to our ordinances all recognition, and to our communion all church character, yet we may not imitate its uncharitableness; so long as Christ visibly intrusts it with his saving word and Spirit, we are bound to recognise it as of his visible body, notwithstanding its errors, and to pray for its attainment of a more peaceable unity in the bonds of the truth. But in judging the tendency of its ordinances to save souls, it is obviously proper that we shall estimate those ministrations as a consistent whole, as set forth by this communion. If their only tendency as a whole, taken as it expounds them to its members, is destructive to souls, then we cannot admit that it is a pillar and ground of saving truth, merely because of some disjointed fragments of the gospel-verities, mixed with heresies which, if heartily accepted by the people as taught, must be fatal to souls; or because a few persons, through the special teaching of God's Spirit leading them to select the spiritual meat and reject the poison, actually find Christ under those ministrations. For, the proper function of a visible Church is instrumentally to communicate to its disciples spiritual discernment, and not to presuppose it. And the happy escape of these souls from damnable error is due to the special grace of God shielding them against the regular effect of these ministrations, rather than employing and blessing them. If this rule of judgment be denied, then might a valid church character possibly be established for an association of infidels investigating parts of God's word only for purposes of cavil; since the Al-

---

\*See Rom. iii. 2; 1st Tim. iii. 15; Book of Gov., Ch. II., § 2; Con. of F.. Ch. XXV.. § 3.

mighty Spirit might, against those purposes, employ those parts of the word to awaken and convert some member.

When we examine the numerous societies founded by Mr. Alexander Campbell and his coadjutors, we find that their distinctive principle is a rejection of all use whatsoever of creeds or symbols of faith of human composition as antisciptural and infringing liberty of conscience and Christian unity. But none the less do we find, in the teachings of their recognised founders and leaders, a particular theological system which has generally among them the virtual force of an accepted creed, even to the extent of being employed as a test of ministerial standing and rule of expulsion. The leading points of this system we find to be the following :

The inspiration of the Old and New Testaments is admitted, but the authority of the former as a rule of salvation under the new dispensation is superseded. The death of man's soul in sin, and his inability of will unto all spiritual good, are denied. A temporal sonship of Christ, with his divinity and vicarious sacrifice, are held, as also the personality and mission of the Holy Ghost as Comforter. Justification, which is defined to be remission of sins only, is on account of the merit of Christ's sacrifice alone; and this merit received by faith is first applied and sealed to the believer only in immersion; than which no other water-baptism is recognised. This faith, when genuine and justifying, always worketh by love, producing repentance unto life. But the renewing and quickening agency of the Holy Ghost in producing this faith and repentance, is expressly denied, save as he exercises a moral suasion, by holding forth inducements thereto in the Scriptures; and the sinner is required to quicken himself unto the exercise of these saving graces of his own free will. For it is declared that no man can receive the Spirit until after he hath received Christ and been reconciled to him in immersion. The mission of the Holy Ghost is therefore, according to them, only to promote the comfort and sanctification of the believer after his adoption by dwelling in his soul. Regeneration is taught to be no more than the introduction of a person into an estate of reconciliation. This, taken with other preceding propositions, manifestly abolishes the whole doctrine of effectual calling. As faith is made prerequisite to baptism in every case, infant baptism and the membership of the children of believer's in Christ's Church are utterly repudiated. And as the only faith required for adult baptism is the temporary faith of the soul exercising solely its native powers, (whereas the Scriptures require of adults a living faith in order to baptism,) it is hard to

see what part of the doctrine of baptism is left uncorrupted. While this is the system of faith which distinguishes their body, they require as the only declared basis for Christian communion the reception of the Lord Jesus Christ for salvation, expressed and sealed in immersion.

If your Committee may believe the current testimony within and without these societies, while some who are admitted to them hold more, many hold less of God's saving truth than is embraced in the above erroneous and fragmentary doctrine. Such must be the result of their rejection of all symbols of belief. If this first principle be consistently carried out, any one who is willing to attest in immersion a profession of his faith in Jesus Christ as God's Son and his Saviour, must be admitted to communion, and may be admitted to the ministry; whatever may be the sense in which he construes the terms "faith," "Messiah," "Sonship to God," and "salvation;" although that construction may be Sabellian, Arian, Pelagian, or Socinian. To this must be added the fact, that these societies admit no theory of church government, save the Independent, and no superior church courts of review and control. Whatever, then, may be the excellence of one member, or one congregation, in this denomination, the Christian world has no evidence or guarantee that the next is not of a far different character.

In such circumstances, even if the Assembly admitted that the system above delineated contained sufficient substance of saving truth to redeem the soul embracing it, this difficulty would remain: This communion refuses us all guarantee that the person baptized into its pale held at the time even that fragmentary outline. We are persistently left in the dark, whether both he and the minister who baptized him, and the congregation which received him, may not have apprehended the Trinity whose name was used, the faith professed, and the salvation embraced, in the sense of the unbelieving Pelagian or Socinian, unless we happen to have the incidental evidence of a personal acquaintance with these several parties. In these circumstances, there appears no way for the Church to protect the testimony and sacraments of her divine Head from disparagement, (a sacred duty in the performance of which no option is left us,) except to refuse to recognise in that body, as a whole, a part of Christ's true visible Church. Believing that it embraces many individuals and some congregations who are true saints of God, we sincerely regret, for the sake of these, the necessity of assuming this ground. But it is a necessity which they create, in refusing to separate themselves, by a definite testimony, from those who teach.

“another gospel;” for our sovereign Lord has strictly forbidden us to bid God-speed to such.

Dr. S. J. Baird was prepared to adopt this report without a word said. Mr. R. T. Berry was not ready to vote for it. Some of its positions were extreme ones. His chief objection was to the ground taken in regard to Roman Catholic baptism. First, that Church comprises three hundred millions of souls professing themselves Christians. He was not prepared to unchurch so many. Secondly, this Church, whatever its errors, holds the fundamental doctrines of the Christian religion. They hold the Apostles' and the Nicene creeds. Again, this Church is the historical Church of the world. Again, in regard to order as well as doctrine, they hold the same fundamental principles that we hold, viz., that the fundamental and original order of the ministry is the presbyter. Again, the Reformed Churches have never denied either the orders or the baptism of the Church of Rome. Again, that communion to this day holds the doctrines of Christianity more soundly than Protestant communions which deny the divinity and the atonement of Christ. Dr. Wills proposed to amend the report by substituting a resolution of thanks to the Committee for their able explanation, and to have it published in the Minutes for the information of the Church. There was a great deal of learning in the report, more than could be digested at that time. He thought the conclusions of the report sound, but there was not time now for their discussion. Dr. Peck explained that the last Assembly had not appointed this Committee to report whether Campbellite baptism is valid or invalid. It decided that question, reaffirming the decision of the Assembly of 1814 against Unitarian baptism, and that of the Assembly of 1845 against Popish baptism, and it merely appointed this Committee to expound and vindicate the position taken. As to Mr. Berry's argument, he considered it extraordinary; and he was surprised to hear his statement that his view was that held by the Reformed Churches. His reading of history had been very different from that. He read, then, from the deliverance of the Assembly of 1845 to show that Mr. Berry's charge of ultraism belonged to that venerable body no less than to us. After

VOL. XXII., NO. 4.—9.

some further remarks from various brethren, Dr. Wills's substitute was rejected, and the report adopted. At a late hour, on Dr. Wills's motion, the Committee of Publication was directed to publish the report for circulation.

Here we are compelled to arrest very summarily this review, commending our Church and all her interests and affairs to the guidance and blessing of her adorable Head.

---

#### ARTICLE VII.

#### THE PRACTICAL EFFICIENCY OF OUR CHURCH.

As a Church it is well not unfrequently to recur to the inquiry, are we fulfilling the end of our high calling and meeting the demands of our day? This does not imply that we are now specially inefficient; much less is it designed to intimate that positive evil is promulgated in any department of our system or its practical working. Neither is it intended to raise the question of efficiency as compared with other periods of our own history, or with other Christian communions; nor to depreciate the necessity and importance of enlarging our contributions and increasing our ministerial force. Such inquiries would of themselves open interesting and profitable fields of inquiry; but we do not design in this article to enter any of these. Our design is to raise *the bare question of practical efficiency as attained in our present actual state with our present effective strength.* It is well to consider the question of enlarging the outward and divinely appointed means of efficiency. The Lord honoreth the increase of these means when rendered in honor to him, used in humble reliance upon him, and that to promote his glory. Yet it is even more pertinent to inquire into the efficiency of our Church as it is. It is not by might, nor by power; an increase of the outward and formal elements of strength is not necessarily

an increase of real efficiency. God often selects the weak things of the earth to confound the mighty, that his may be the glory. It is possible that our efficiency may be increased by looking into the methods of our system as actually worked, correcting our errors if we find such, and improving by the lessons of practical experience. And in any suggestions offered upon this point, there is certainly no spirit of fault-finding or of innovation, but a sincere desire to promote the highest interests and advancement of the Redeemer's cause as intrusted to us. May we not seek and expect a higher degree of efficiency in the Master's cause, more perfect conformity to his word and spirit? And to this end, may we not with propriety inquire into the practical efficiency of our Church?

There are two prime conditions of spiritual efficiency in every degree, which we assume, and will simply mention. First, *the presence of the divine Head of the Church through his promised Spirit*. This yields spiritual life, growth, fruitfulness, and a gradual perfection in his likeness and preparation for his everlasting enjoyment. Spiritual efficiency is not obtained by perfection in the outward formal elements of strength, or in the laborious and faithful use of them. They are necessary as means to an end, and have a divinely approved fitness to the end for which they are used. But there is no innate efficiency in the order or ordinances of the Church, nor any law established as co-active with their use. They are wholly dependent upon a present divine power to render them effective to salvation; and there is always danger of a spirit of self-complacency and self-dependence, when the outward organisation of the Church is imposing and her means abundant. Under all circumstances it is well to remember the source of spiritual life and power, and to seek and improve the presence of that Spirit which our Lord waits to confer, and which the Church always needs. If we have not the Spirit of Christ we are none of his; but they that abide in him and he in them, the same bring forth much fruit; for without him we can do nothing. No condition whatever should ever tempt us, therefore, to entertain, in the most latent form, the impression that spiritual efficiency can ever be attained,



except as the immediate product of the presence and power of the Spirit of Christ.

The second prime condition of efficiency which we assume, is, *the effectual working together in the measure of every part.* Just as truly as life and power is derived from Christ through his Spirit; just so truly in its practical and saving operation does it assume the effectual working together of all the parts of Christ's body, which is the Church, as an invariable condition. It is not necessary to inquire in what sense it is an essential condition, but simply to impress our hearts with the truth, which none of us question, that when God works in his Church and people to do those things which are pleasing in his sight, they will and must work out the same practical result; and if they do not strive to do his will, he does not and will not work in and for them to this end. Often doubtless we attribute our inefficiency in the Church to want of means, deficient organisation, paucity of ministers, and such like causes, when in truth, the principal, if not the only cause, is that we have not that spirit of zeal and self-denying, persevering labor for God and for Christ, which God loves and blesses. And to the extent that we are filled with the desire to labor in season and out of season, patiently and industriously casting the seed beside all waters, to this extent may we anticipate in due season a good harvest, if we faint not. And whilst we may properly raise any inquiry in which we consider the success of Christ's cause involved, we need go no farther in seeking an explanation for our inefficiency, if we find a spirit of inactivity, sloth, and self-indulgence. The Lord hath assigned to every servant his work; and the effectual working of every part in the fulfilment of this work, and all together for the same end, is certainly one of the prime conditions of efficiency in the Church of God. Without this we may always anticipate imperfectly developed Christians, barren fields, and the inroads of sin and error.

The presence and power of the Spirit of Christ, therefore, working mightily in and through an active, devoted Christian people, we might affirm a condition which always yields efficiency in the work intrusted to the Church. The system of truth under which

this condition is best fulfilled, and the form of church government best calculated to guide and cherish such a spirit, it is needless for us to say, we believe to be that which is held forth in the standards of our own Church. And yet it will not do to affirm that there is nothing in our system, or in the methods in which we have come to interpret and apply it, which deserves attention; nor to believe that there is no possibility of improving it as a practical system, either by modifying its details or applying its principles to methods of usefulness already tried, with more fidelity to those principles, or by applying them to new methods of Christian activity. Of course under the providential government of God, as seen in his Church, we will learn more and more of his character, more and more of the effectual working of his grace and Spirit, and may also expect from time to time demands to be made for a Christian activity which will require modified forms of those general principles which the Head of the Church has left for its guidance. Hence such topics as that suggested by this article may always afford food for reflection. Assuming, then, the conditions above mentioned, we offer the following suggestions as deserving some consideration in seeking to promote the greater practical efficiency of our Church.

1. *Are we as a Church in full sympathy with the masses?*

No Church which fails in its practical working to come fairly and fully in the arena of common life, need ever expect to wield its full influence over the human family. The great commission under which the Church goes forth in its work of evangelisation, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature," is in itself a command to the Church to place itself in such an attitude that its whole power shall be felt by every class of the human race. Our great Head and exemplar was distinguished in his mission on earth as a teacher of the masses. He mingled with the people, he was accessible to the people, he taught so that he might be understood by the people; and "the common people heard him gladly." It was one of the marked features of the latter dispensation, that the poor should have the gospel preached to them. Most undoubtedly every Church which seeks to reach with its healing power the extent of human woe, should take its

stand in the avenues of common life, and extend its saving, redeeming grace to the souls of the famished, dying masses as they crowd the thoroughfares of daily active life. Here its remedial and redeeming power is needed, here its divine victories are achieved, and here its heavenly origin is displayed. No Church which does not, in the nature and attitude of its organisation and in its practical working, take a place amidst the moving, seething masses of the people, need ever hope to reach a high degree of success in carrying out the work which our Lord has intrusted to us.

Now, whilst we recognise this, as any Church possessing to any extent the Spirit of Christ must, the question to what extent our method of practical working places us in full sympathy with the current of actual life around us, and whether it gives us a commanding position for reaching the masses of men—this question well merits investigation.

Upon this general inquiry we may ask, first, whether our method of preparation for the ministry *does not tend to isolate that class which above all others is expected to wield the greatest influence among men for Christ and for his Church?* Without doubt a careful and thorough preparation for the work of the ministry is important, and it is essential to the highest degree of usefulness. Nor do we in the slightest degree undervalue it. And yet we cannot conceal it from ourselves, that the student's life, which our candidates lead for so many years, and so purely such, does but little to teach them those methods of practical thought and influence which prevail among men, and in fact yields a type of ministerial character in many instances out of harmony with the people to whom they have to minister. And many of our Seminary students suffer much from this cause, and have to labor hard to overcome it, if they ever do. It is certainly important, too, if not positively necessary, that our theoretic principles should be tested in the crucible of experimental life before becoming impervious to such influences. And how far it is wise to carry a course of professional education without such a course of practical instruction, certainly deserves careful consideration. Professors themselves, it is well known, by long

continued service in the lecture-room, and in the atmosphere of theoretic investigation and speculation, fall out of the line of common thought and influence, and thus often facilitate the tendency in the direction indicated rather than counteract it.

Can nothing be done to insure in our system a somewhat parallel progress by our students of divinity in the professor's course in the lecture-room and the pastor's work among the people? This we think might be secured without any serious modification of our Seminary system; certainly without impairing its real advantages. How to adjust the two things, a thorough preparation in the departments of formal study, and at the same time an experimental acquaintance with the methods of practical usefulness, so that both may be attained as equally valuable qualifications for effectiveness in the ministry, deserves careful thought by the Church. This we feel confident is not now attained, and yet its advantages are manifest. Combining the two departments all along together, each would act to the advantage of the other, and our candidates would enter the ministry with a preparation such as the real necessities of their work demand. And under such a system our ministers would not so often be moulded in the cast-iron type of unattested theories and mental idiosyncracies. This unfortunate and unnatural state of mind would be prevented, or largely eliminated where existing, by the teachings of actual life. In fine, whilst we might not have as many in the ministry distinguished for speculative power and purely intellectual cultivation, we would have greater influence in bringing the gospel to bear upon the masses of men as a practical and powerful agency for their salvation, and more practical knowledge with which to deal with the various practical subjects in which the efficiency of the Church is so intimately involved.\*

---

\*The above is written by the respected author in no spirit of unfriendliness to a course of Seminary training. It is no doubt the case, that the life of a student does tend to remove him from contact with men who are engaged in other pursuits, whether they be mechanical, mercantile, or agricultural. He cannot be a student and be gadding about in promiscuous society, or mingling in the occupations of other men. The two walks in life are incompatible with each other. Nor can one obtain an acquaintance

2. Another fact in our history which tends to the same result, is the *almost total omission of our Church to recruit the ranks of the ministry from men of mature age and experience.* It is exceedingly rare that any one ever turns aside from another vocation to enter the ministry of the gospel. It is questionable in fact whether this duty is considered even by Christian men who are already engaged in branches of ordinary business. Their consciences seem rarely if ever to be alive to this important inquiry. And it is even more surprising that the Church seems so little alive to the importance of looking out from among the ranks of our church members persons of this class who have the necessary qualifications for this great work. Why do we in our zeal to increase the numbers of those who preach the gospel, go solely to our college halls, seeking from the youth of our Church alone those who are to fill this office? Certainly it was not so in the primitive days of the Church; and why it is so now we cannot say. Assuredly there are numbers of men of this class in the vigor of life, of devoted piety, possessing all the natural

---

with that knowledge and that compact discipline of mind which marks the scholar who is breaking in upon his seasons of study by frequent engagements in supplying vacant pulpits, or in spasmodic efforts to advance here and there and everywhere the interests of religion. Men of this class are found to run down after a few years labor, and to be incapable of ministering long to an intelligent people with any success. "The greater part of the leaders of the revival of English religion last century," says Ryle, "were university men." "Five of them, Wesley, Whitefield, Romaine, Hervey, and Walker, took their degrees at Oxford. Three of them—Grimshaw, Berridge, and Venn, took their degrees at Cambridge. Toplady was educated at Trinity College, Dublin. Rowlands and Fletcher alone were at no University at all." The English University life, and that of the Fellows at College, is as scholastic, to say the least, as that of our Seminaries. Under present arrangements, the four months of vacation are now largely spent in direct missionary labor, an efficient corrective of the tendency complained of. Our theological students are offered employment under committees of presbyteries as lay exhorters, and are extensively availing themselves of such offers, thus far to the great good of the Church, and not without profit to themselves. Nor are they slow in occupying the hours which can be spared in term time in efforts at doing good in the neighborhoods contiguous to their places of study.—EDS. SO. PRES. REVIEW.

endowments necessary, who might become eminently useful in the ministry. Many such from the learned professions, and from the more practical avenues of business, who could easily make the special preparation necessary and enter the sacred office, with all the practical knowledge of men and the world which they have acquired, and which contributes a great deal towards usefulness in the ministry. Why, we ask again, may not the ministry be recruited by such a class of practical men taken from the ranks of business life? It would tend greatly to increase our efficiency, not simply by the numerical addition thus made to our ministerial force, but by adding a class that would bring our Church into fuller sympathy with the masses of our people.

3. There is one other fact that we will mention, which has a decided tendency to suppress the hearty sympathy and coöperation of our people in the active work of the Church—they are almost entirely excluded from any share in the consideration of its interests, and are largely ignorant of its condition and of its wants. We do not mean to say that our form of government should in any sense recognise the principles of Congregationalism; but we should certainly so recognise the people as to bring them into hearty coöperation with our ecclesiastical courts in all the interests of the Church. As it is, all matters pertaining to the spiritual interests of the Church are disposed of by the session, the temporal affairs are managed by the deacons, and the body of the people in most churches are never convened to hear of or consider the state and interests of the Church, and of course remain largely ignorant of what is done and what is desired. In so far as this is the case, we fail to that extent to reap the advantage of an entire unity and a common participation in all the schemes of the Church by the whole body of believers. It is true that some of our churches in our cities and larger towns enjoy more opportunities of information in regard to the Church at large, and some few of them adopt some plan of keeping the private members of their respective churches informed and interested upon the various matters of interest which pertain to the prosperity of the Church. But in the large majority of instances the people know but little of the state of the Church to which

they belong, and hence do but little for its advancement.. Why is this? Doubtless there is much delinquency on the part of the officers of the Church in instructing the people; but another and possibly the strongest reason is that there is never any assemblage of the people in which all may learn, speak of, and pray over the interests of their respective churches. Thus they might be enlisted in these things by actual and personal participation. When the deputation from the Gentile churches came up to Jerusalem to consult the apostles in reference to certain questions of the Jewish law, not only the apostles and elders, but the brethren were likewise called together to consult concerning these things.\* And who can doubt but that a yearly convocation of all the members of the Church to consider its spiritual interests would be of great practical value. It would be valuable to the officers in obtaining the views and securing the approval of the entire Church, and valuable to the people in giving them a personal knowledge of its state and an interest in its prosperity. Why not elicit the hearts of our people and keep them in full sympathy with the office-bearers of the Church by some such plan? There might be congregational meetings held at regular intervals, presided over by the session, at which all facts pertaining to the spiritual condition of the Church, its financial state, and its plans of active usefulness, might be presented, greatly to the gratification of all who were interested in the Church, and we

---

\*The older MSS., as the Sin., Vat., Alex., omit the conjunction between "elders" and "brethren," in vs. 23, and this reading is adopted by Lachmann. Neander (Planting, etc.,) defends it, and says it is found in Irenæus. So Alford, who says that in this, the first mention of Presbyters, it is very natural that the import of the term should thus be given by attaching "brethren" to it. These writers are not moved by any polemic views apparently to this decision. The hypothesis of the London ministers in that masterly treatise, "The Divine Right of Church Government," in 1646, was that these were brethren of other churches than those of Antioch and Jerusalem present as members of the Synod. They of course read the conjunction "and," which the older copies do not have. This comment is not to be understood as a dissent from the current of thought here expressed as to the desirableness of having the private members of the Church "earnest workers" in the cause of Christ.—EDS. SO. PRES. REVIEW.

think greatly to the advancement of its interests, and this without in the slightest degree impairing the distinctive principles of our church government.

We should certainly use every effort to bring our Church, in all the departments of its activity and influence, into full harmony with the people, among whom and for whom we labor—the ministry, whilst furnished with all the knowledge and culture to make them men that need not be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth, yet acquiring and cultivating that practical knowledge of the human character with which they have to deal, and the world in which they must live and labor, which will give them ready and easy access to men as they find them in common life; and the people at the same time kept alive to all the interests of the Church, and actively coöperating in all the measures of its usefulness. Thus, when all effectually work together in the measure of every part, the body will make increase of itself into its edification in love.

2. A second requisite to full efficiency, which deserves our attention as a Church, is, *that our ministerial force be adjusted and worked with an eye to the interests and necessities of the entire field.* Efficiency proportionate to our effective strength will never be attained till this is done. As long as there is no recognised and authoritative method of applying our force as the necessities of our territory as a whole may suggest, there must be talents unemployed or unwisely employed. Some part of the visible body of Christ must suffer, and if a part suffer, the whole will suffer. And we must confess that in this particular there is to our mind a serious defect in the practical working of our Presbyterian system. To keep alive the things that remain, to take the tide of an inviting, favoring providence, there must be an eye ever awake to the condition and varying necessities of the whole Church, and some power lodged some where to act with the necessities of the case. It is this fact that forms the capital excellence of the Methodist system in its practical working. The state of the case among us is, that each church is left to provide for itself as best it can, without any reference to the necessities of any other, except as



may be suggested by its own interests. The consequence is, that some churches being either pecuniarily strong, or otherwise in favorable circumstances, secure the preached gospel; whilst others that may really deserve more consideration fail; and many weak churches and important missionary fields are left wholly destitute. This is the case in a greater degree in some presbyteries than in others; but in none, we fear, is there that disposition of ministerial force which will secure the highest degree of efficiency compatible with the actual expenditure of means, and the real strength of the body. There is no definite, approved plan under which our whole territory is worked in proportion to its relative claims. Hence protracted vacancies occur, an undue amount of labor is bestowed upon unpromising and unproductive fields, valuable ministers are only partially employed, and compelled to turn aside in part at least to secular employments.

Now to accomplish this desirable end, we think there are three conditions necessary. First, *the presbyteries should exercise their authority in fixing and defining the limits of the fields of labor for our ministry.* To the Presbytery this power belongs, and it ought to be used. Our constitution in committing to the Presbytery the power of supervising the settlement of our ministers, certainly did not contemplate that nothing should be done save the simple constituting or dissolving the pastoral relation, though this seems to be really the construction put upon it in practice; but the doing that which would most conduce to knowledge and piety in connexion with the proposed settlement. It is not of course intended that, regardless of the views and wishes of the parties interested, there should be any arrangement made, but with their concurrence or acquiescence, which we believe could be very nearly, if not always obtained. By the presbyteries fixing the fields of labor, the wants of all our people would be consulted, the various fields be so arranged as to cultivate the whole, each would receive the amount of attention it might deserve, considered in relation to the necessities of others, and all would aid in the support of the gospel. Secondly, there must be a competent support provided for each

of our ministers. This is of course necessary, at least to the extent of preventing the necessity of resorting to other employment to secure a support; else we lose a part of our effective strength. What this amount should be depends much of course upon the man and upon the field in which he lives. Only let it be so much as will enable him to devote himself fully to the ministry. To secure this should be one object in view in arranging the fields of labor. And where the field is not self-sustaining, we have already provision made to meet the case in our sustentation scheme. The third condition we mention is: There should be some recognised channel of intercommunication between our vacant churches and unemployed ministers for the entire Church, and possibly in our several synods. This would greatly facilitate the filling up of our vacant pulpits, and promote the effective and speedy employment of such ministerial force. If we mistake not, there was some such arrangement as this at one time contemplated by the Assembly in connexion with the Sustentation Committee. Certainly it would greatly aid us in having always at command a knowledge of our wants, and of the available means which we have to meet them. And this knowledge is absolutely necessary in any effort to use our ministerial force with an eye to the interests and necessities of our whole Church.

Under some general system based upon these conditions, which we think altogether feasible, our whole ministerial strength would be used, the whole of our territory would be cultivated, and the whole pecuniary ability of the Church be made available for securing, as far as possible and at the same time, a competent support for its ministry and a supply of ministerial service for all its necessities. There would be fewer vacancies, fewer ministers unemployed, and a better support given them. All of our churches would be supplied, at least as far as is possible, and all would be united in the support of the gospel. And if this could be done, it would certainly contribute greatly to the efficiency of our Church.

3. A third suggestion we make as calculated to promote the efficiency of the Church, is, that we use *with more concert and*

*protracted effort the preaching of the gospel, the great agency of God for converting the world and edifying his Church. It pleases God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe. The ministry of the word is undoubtedly the divinely appointed means for glorifying God's name in the salvation of souls. Therefore it should be faithfully and fully used. And, to do this, to secure the benefit of its full power, it is essential often that there should be united and protracted effort. The disciples after the ascension continued daily in the temple with one accord, praising God and having favor with all men; and the Lord added daily to the Church such as should be saved. Paul, for the space of three years, ceased not to warn the people of Ephesus night and day, and that with tears. The urgent injunction of Paul is, "Preach the gospel; be instant in season and out of season." The whole spirit of our mission, and many injunctions and examples, teach us that we should spend our whole time in the preaching of the gospel and the public service of God, as the duties which we owe to our temporal concerns will allow, and that we believe will promote the interests of Christ's Church and the salvation of men. And it commends itself even to our minds, and is confirmed in our experience, that the continued and repeated application of religious truth to the mind is calculated to make a deeper impression and awaken greater interest. There are some churches in which the stated services of the sanctuary are frequent, and there is rarely any necessity of increase of the means of grace; but it is specially important where religious services are held irregularly or at long intervals. There has been great prejudice against such meetings; but it has arisen, where there is real ground for it, from the abuses which have often accompanied the services of such occasions. The Assembly of 1849, in a pastoral letter on the subject of revivals says, "We suggest whether the practice of assembling the people for several consecutive days for prayer, and praise, and preaching, might not be happily revived. Prudence should be used as to the time when, and how long such meetings should be held. That they are not novelties, is plain from the Directory of Worship, Chap. VIII., Sec. 6."*

(Baird's Digest, pp. 207, 208.) The Holy Spirit has honored such meetings in the conversion of many of our people. And, as a Church, we fear that our apprehension of abuse has led us to positive delinquency in this matter, and, under this impression, we fail to use our whole energies in the work intrusted to us. We counsel "nothing inconsistent with the sobriety of the gospel, the decorum of public worship, and the gravity and gentleness which the word of God every where enjoins;" but these all may consist with the fervent, zealous, and protracted preaching of the gospel. We suggest, therefore, whether the practice of assembling the people of God at such times as may be convenient, for several consecutive days for prayer, praise, and preaching the gospel, under the conduct of two or more ministers of the gospel, may not be revived, with the hope of increasing the efficiency of our Church.

4. We make one additional observation on the general topic of our efficiency as a Church in closing this article, viz.: There is a tendency we apprehend somewhat prevalent among us to *subject the spirit of the gospel to the letter of our constitution*. We do not mean to intimate that there is any conflict between our standards and the spirit of the gospel, of course. But there is some danger probably in the very adoption of a formal distinctive system of doctrine and government to be too much restricted by it in the varied calls of God in his providence, to look to it to the exclusion of God's word, or in preference to it. If this be the case, it is well to guard against it. We know it is said that any method of interpretation other than that of strict construction is liable to great abuse. But we need entertain no apprehension for the constitution when we are in manifest accordance with the spirit of the gospel. In truth, thus alone can our system be perfected, or its general principles be brought out in detail. There are special forms of duty liable to arise at any time in the history of the Church, which have not been anticipated and provided for in the concrete. In all such cases the spirit of the gospel must be our guide. Nor need we hesitate when this is the case, for in delay we may fail to meet the demands which God makes of us. There was a very manifest

exhibition of the spirit to which we allude, in the treatment of the question of our duty as a Church to the negro race after their liberation and consequent changed relation to us. Instead of following the spirit of the gospel, and preaching to them, gathering them into the Church, aiding them in attaining an increase of religious knowledge, and eventually rising to an educated ministry, as we would have done with any other race in the world, we entered upon a tedious and protracted discussion based upon the constitutional requirements of an educated ministry, church representation in our higher courts, etc., which in no way merited consideration as a practical question at the time, and this continued to such wearying length that we actually became afraid to touch the matter. And now it lies in a very imperfect state, and the opportunity of doing much for their religious welfare is gone, we fear, never to return. This is not the only instance in which theories and theorizing on abstract points prevails to such an extent as effectually to deter the Church from embracing opportunities of practical usefulness. Time must be taken to inquire not only whether it is in the spirit of the gospel, and is the call of God in his providence; but whether it fits the finely chiseled theories of certain human minds! And we think one impediment in the way of the full efficiency of the Presbyterian Church, and by which some golden opportunities are lost, is this tendency to enslave the spirit and liberty of the gospel by the letter of the constitution. In place of taking hold of every practical question in a practical way, in humble dependence on the Spirit and guidance of Christ, it must be sifted through and through a fine sieve of abstract and "higher law" theories. The Presbyterian Church in consequence, whilst not inferior in fidelity and perseverance in the ordinary channels and methods of usefulness, does not take the lead in seizing and pressing the openings of providence in the history of the world. There is an incrustation of formal theory and high points of constitutional law which it requires a good deal of heat to remove. And even when it rises to active exertion, there is an incubus of dissenting minds that never get outside the influence of an intractable, restrictive theory. We

know there are such minds among all educated classes; but the extent of it among us is unusual, and may be accounted for by the fact, that the minds of most of our ministers are moulded before they are brought in contact with practical life, one of the evils alluded to in our system of ministerial education.

With these suggestions we close this article. We know that the Spirit and power of Jesus Christ, working in and through his people, is the source of all spiritual and saving efficiency in the Church of God; we know, too, that he often uses weak and imperfect human agency that the glory may be his. But this does not release us from the duty of seeking in our organisation, attitude, and active service as a Church, those conditions of fruitfulness and efficiency which he has indicated in his word and in the history of the Church. In fact these coexist, when, as a Church, we are filled with the Spirit of Christ, we will attain under his quickening power and divine guidance the outward conditions of full efficiency. May we be filled with this Spirit, yield to his teaching, and be made perfect in every good work to do his will, through Jesus Christ, to whom be glory forever and ever. AMEN.

## CRITICAL NOTICES.

*Questions of Modern Thought; or, Lectures on the Bible and Infidelity.* By Rev. JAMES MCCOSH, D. D., LL.D., Rev. J. P. THOMPSON, D. D., LL.D., Rev. WILLIAM ADAMS, D. D., Rev. PHILIP SCHAFF, D. D., Rev. WILLIAM HAGUE, D. D., Rev. E. O. HAVEN, D. D., LL.D. Philadelphia: Zeigler & McCurdy. 1871.

Ever since Christianity appeared in the world, its teachers have been encountered, as Paul was, by the "oppositions of science falsely so called," by "certain philosophers of the Epicureans and Stoics" who have sought to "spoil"—to lead its adherents away as spoils—"through philosophy and vain deceit." Sometimes, like Celsus and Porphyry of the third century, they have set forth in exaggerated representations the alleged inconsistencies of the sacred writers; and sometimes have sought to account for the rise of Christianity by merely human causes, like Gibbon in the last century, and Strauss and Renan in this. The hostile forces of the prince of darkness are persistent and active in every age of the Church. Though vanquished, they renew the attack; though driven from one eminence, they take their stand on another. They are ever changing their front and wielding new and keener implements of warfare; so that each age has to renew the battle, and the many-sided truth oppose itself to many-sided error. The enemies of a supernatural revelation were never more numerous, ingenious, and earnest than now, in this country and others. Its defenders cannot repose on their former laurels, but must gird themselves for new conquests. And we are glad to see that, in more than one of our chief cities, some of our most able divines have been called upon to address our people on the current forms of popular scepticism.

Out of the pages of M. Renan's romance, entitled "The Life of Jesus," Dr. McCosh, who has brought with him from the old world a reputation second to none as a Christian philosopher, transfixes the capricious and volatile Frenchman with arrows

taken from his own quiver. Out of the four Gospels Renan has compiled a fifth, which he maintains is the true "Life of Jesus." In this compilation, he has acknowledged the substantial truth of the gospel history. And that portion on which he has cast the thin haze or black suspicion of doubt, is confirmed to us as irrefragable truth, by the abhorrent hypothesis of contrivance, jugglery, and falsehood, in the resurrection of Lazarus, to which he is obliged to resort. The *πρωτον ψευδος* of Renan, as we have shown on our preceding pages, Vol. XVII., is his denial of the possibility of a miracle.

Dr. Thompson takes up as his theme the unity of the Bible, in its representations of God, in his nature, attributes, government; in the character it gives of man; in its promises of a Redeemer and his kingdom, around which the history of ages and dynasties is made to crystalise; the unity of the spirit and object, which are clearly divine. The unity of the Bible, a book of various contents, historical, poetical, legislative, philosophical; embracing sixty-six distinct productions of about forty different authors; their composition extending through a period of sixteen hundred years; written in different countries, languages, and forms of civilisation, by men of different professions and degrees of intellectual culture; "a sublime symphony on the theme of man's reconciliation with God, emerging from the chaos of the fall in the song of Moses, rising more clear and waxing more loud in the doxologies of Paul, and the choruses of John, until it rolls through the arches of heaven in one magnificent choral of earth and sky, the song of Moses and the Lamb."

The "advantages of a written revelation" furnish the theme of discourse to Rev. William Adams, D. D., in which he exhibits the advantages of a written revelation, universal in its character, above one made to each individual separately, the advantage of one written above one handed down by tradition, the fairness of the evidence by which it is substantiated, its practical utility, its accumulating power and influence through the ages, and the prospect of its universal diffusion, by which we may resuscitate the faith of Abraham in ancient Chaldea, have Moses walking

TXU



again among the ancient tribes, Job revisiting the tents of Edom, David awaking with holy psalms the echoes of Hermon and Zion, Paul standing on the Acropolis speaking again of Jesus and the resurrection; Christ walking again not only by the sea of Galilee and in the streets of Jerusalem, but inviting the weary, wherever there is a human habitation, to come to him.

The Rev. Philip Schaff, D. D., of the Union Seminary, New York, delivered an apologetic lecture on Christ's Testimony to Christianity, in which he sets forth the four infidel constructions of the life of Christ, which exhaust the range of logical possibility, viz., the Christ of imposture, the Christ of fiction, the Christ of history, and the Christ of prophecy. In the first, he shows that Christ was no impostor, nor were his first disciples deceivers; in the second, that he was no enthusiast who deceived himself, nor were his disciples carried away by any self-deception according to the hypothesis of Renan; in the third, he shows as to the character of the Christ of history, that it is original, uniformly consistent, and adorned with sinless perfection; as to the fourth, that the Christ of prophecy and type is plainly the Christ of history, and that in all history the movements of that providence is seen, whose central object is Christ and his redemption; that "the noblest mission of the Greek language was to become the silver basket for the golden apple of the gospel;" and that the chief aim (not his, but God's,) of Alexander's conquests and the consolidation of the nations under the Roman rule was to break down the partition walls between nations and prepare them for a universal religion. So that Christ sums up the whole meaning of ancient history, fulfilling the unconscious as well as the conscious types and prophecies of the past, the ripest fruit of history before, and the fertile seed of history after his coming.

Of the two remaining lectures, the first is by the Rev. William Hague, D. D., on "The Self-Witnessing Character of the New Testament Christianity," founded on Acts x. 34-43, the first recorded explanation of Christianity ever offered by an apostle to an audience of inquirers outside of the pale of Judaism. The second, entitled "Soul: A Positive Entity," is by Rev. E. O. Haven, D. D., LL.D. These we have not time nor space in

the present number either to analyse or describe. The whole collection is valuable, as adding to the popular defences of Christianity.

*The Divine Human; or, Some Remarks on Inspiration and Atonement.* By a Member of the New York Bar. A. D. F. Randolph: New York. 1869.

The Rev. John Newton was once required to read through a book full of corrupt doctrine. After he had satisfied himself of its erroneous system and mischievous *animus*, by reading a small part, he replied: "If I find by the first mouthful that the meat is tainted, must I eat through the whole joint in order to be certain that it is not fit to eat?" So the Bible Christian need proceed only a very little way into this *morceau* to ascertain its poisonous character. He will probably find even the preface enough, of which we transcribe nearly the whole. The author calls it, not a preface, but

"APOLOGETIC."

"1. The following suggestions are offered by a layman upon inspiration and atonement—two topics which, above all others, are now uppermost in the popular mind, and drawing to themselves the keenest popular interest. 2. If it be asked, What does a layman know of these matters? it may be answered, first, that dogmatic theology is a dead lion, whose roar has lost its terror as well as its authority. 3. We, the laity, are a thousand to one of our theological leaders; and it is full as important that the one should know what the thousand think, as that they should know what the one thinks. 4. And, again, if the suggestions are crude, they may still contain enough of truth and gospel to lift dogmatic and polemic theology out of the ruts in which it has run since scholasticism built our creeds and misinterpreted the New Testament. 5. Systematic divinity has so many decayed pins in its structure that the tokens of a general dry-rot are apparent from the lean and totter of every part, as it sways and creaks in the wind of inquiry. 6. No work but Christ's can survive the keen search of modern criticism; and what that work was and is, is not to be learned from authority and dogmatism of man. 7. Orthodoxy must establish its affirmations at every step; and all resort to Church creeds and symbols will be taken as evidence of weakness and conscious inability by intrinsic argument to

defend its bulwarks from demolition. 8. It is no longer commendatory of a dogma, that it is contrary to human reason, and abases human pride: it must have intrinsic worth and unquestioned authority, and make humanity better, holier, in all thought and speech and deed," etc., etc.

In the above eight sentences there are far more of express or intentionally implied errors and blunders than there are sentences. To assist the reader we have numbered them. On sentence second we remark, that if by "dogmatic theology" the author means the theology of true dogmas, then it never was a lion, and never roared, as he intimates; but was always what it is now, the beneficent friend of all honest minds, and neither a beast of prey, nor violent despot. Nor has it lost any authority as compared with former days. If this "Member of the New York Bar" had a little tincture of the knowledge which any man ought to have, to presume to write and print on such subjects, he would know that in those days which he would call the palmy days of dogmatic theology, (the 17th and 18th centuries,) the same state of things existed which exists now. That is, the true dogmas had their friends and their enemies; intelligent Bible Christians who loved them; and virulent unbelievers, under the Christian name, who hated and travestied them, or else ignorantly misunderstood them. This sentence is also intended to intimate, as the subsequent ones more clearly imply, that the removal of dogmas is in order to the establishment of piety. We know well what such stuff means: it is always the forerunner of an attempt to remove true dogmas in order to foist in false ones. Every reasonable man knows that there can be no piety or religion that is not founded on dogma. What are dogmas? (Does this lay theologian know that the root of the word is in *δοκέω*?) Only *truths distinctly affirmed*. Did not our Saviour say that sanctification is through the truth? Can there be any practical principle, any moral motive, any affection, that is praiseworthy, which is not regulated supremely by some moral or spiritual truth? Obviously none. Then the writer who endeavors to prejudice the propositions which he resists by stigmatising them as "dogmatic," is either foolish or dishonest.

What are his own counter propositions but dogmas? If he advances no dogmas, (no truths affirmed,) there is no light in him: he is but babbling. If the word "dogmatic" is taken in the popular sense of dictatorial, domineering, imperious; then we submit that the advancers of heresy know how to dogmatise, at least as well as the orthodox. And this (modest?) little book is in this sense far more "dogmatic" than anything we ever read from a pious Calvinist.

The third sentence implies that parsons are hostile to a discussion of theological truths by laymen. This is notoriously false. On the contrary, they always hail such lay efforts as the most gratifying evidences of interest in the divine cause of which they are heralds. When Gen. D. H. Hill discussed the Sermon on the Mount, and Christ's Resurrection, with such edifying ability, his works were hailed with joy by all good ministers. They only object to the utterance of *error* about theology by laymen; and they are still less tolerant of it from their own "cloth." The fourth sentence has as many absurdities as clauses. The dogmatic and polemic theology, which is held by the Reformed communions, never ran "in ruts" in any vicious or mechanical sense. This poor, threadbare abortion of a witticism never was anything but a false analogy. The revealed theology must be unchangeable in its principles; because its Author is unchangeable and infallible. Fixed stability is its necessary character and glory. But, secondly, "scholasticism" did not make the Reformed creeds, or put them in their "ruts." Again, we say, had this writer possessed the smallest tincture of the theological knowledge he depreciates, he would know that the scholastic divinity was popish; that the great task of the Reformers was to overthrow it; that their method is biblical, as opposed to the scholastic; and that our "creeds" resulted from the dethronement of Lombard, Scotus, and Aquinas, and the enthronement and correct interpretation of the *Old and New Testaments*.

The fifth sentence is very true, concerning that systematic divinity which this author advocates: that is, the Socinian. Both its "pins" and its timbers are decayed, and the structure has been again and again prostrated by scriptural argument, only to be

again "patched up" by hands ignorant of the previous overthrows. All language of the sort of this sentence contains an implied sneer at *system*. Why this? Must not a moment's reflection teach that a set of propositions which are *true* must therefore be a system, because all truths are consistent *inter se*? The creed of this "Member of the New York Bar" is a system, only it is a false one. The true reason of all this cry against systematic divinity (which is an implied demand for a creed not systematised) is a desire for license. Unbelieving, rebellious minds lust after a license of dogmatising, without being made responsible for the contradictions of their pet dogmas against God's word and admitted truth. "Systematic divinity" explodes their heresies by showing their inconsistency with recognised beliefs. *Hinc illæ lacrymæ.*

Quoth the sixth sentence: "No work but Christ's can survive *the keen search of modern criticism,*" (viz., of this lay-critic). This implies that modern criticism is keener than the previous. No better example is needed than this little book, to refute this assumption. For its arguments are, in their staple, nothing but a wretched rehash of the stock cavils of Socinus and his followers, differing from their old, exploded sophisms, so beaten into fine dust by the Reformed divines of the 17th century, only in a more petulant dogmatism, and more reckless impiety of expression. Every well-read Calvinist knows that the points of this much-boasted "modern criticism" are but the revived platitudes, regularly refuted, discredited, and forgotten, at each movement in the history of doctrine, from the days of Pelagius to ours. The modern differs from the ancient, only in being more wicked and insolent, and less learned and adroit. We are also cautioned, that what Christ's work is, must not be "learned from authority, nor dogmatism of man." This implies that the Reformed divines usually sought to enforce it thus; which is expressly false. The grand characteristic of the Reformed religion is, that it refers to the authority of Christ and his prophets and apostles for everything. And to this we still hold, declining alike to defer to the dogmatism of Calvin, (if he were dogmatic in a bad sense,) and to that of a "Member of the New York Bar."

The seventh sentence affirms that any reference to church creeds is evidence of a lack of argument. That is to say, the deliberate judgment of those holy men, who digested the Gallican, the Belgic, the Genevan, the Heidelberg, the Westminster, and the other Reformed symbols, from the most reverent and faithful study of the Scriptures, many of them sealing their opinions by martyrdom, and the whole embodying a grand aggregate of learning, wisdom, integrity, and sanctity, is now to go for absolutely nothing! The marvellous concurrence of these most competent witnesses testifying independently, in different lands and churches, raises not even the faintest presumption or probability! How angelic must be this "modern criticism" that disdains such helps altogether? But, says the eighth sentence: "It is no longer recommendatory of a dogma, that it is contrary to human reason, and abases human pride." This implies that it was held a recommendation before "modern criticism" set things aright; and that "to abase human pride" is the equivalent of outraging the principles of man's reason. The one intimation is a falsehood, and the other a folly. The Reformed theology always made the clear distinction between the contradiction which outrages reason, and the high truth which transcends its comprehension. Every real science, natural as well as divine, teaches us many of the latter; thus giving a wholesome discipline to the pride of the human intellect. No true science (certainly not the Reformed theology) inculcates the former; because the mind neither will, nor can, sincerely embrace them. And the great characteristic of this theology is, that unlike Romanism, and unlike the older Lutheranism even, it refuses all that contradicts the reason. In the last place, says this writer, to be accepted by his folk, a creed "must have intrinsic worth and unquestioned authority." Right—say we; but most inconsistently said by him. For, where is the doctrine to get this "unquestioned authority"?—meaning, we presume, "unquestionable;" for, as a matter of fact, the "modern criticism" questions everything. Not from church creeds—on that point this book has spoken clearly enough. Not from the parsons—they are at a discount. Then, whence? From the Bible? But this

writer does not believe in the inspiration of all the Bible. Many parts—and he claims the right of judging which parts—are, according to him, uninspired and fallible. The only source beneath the skies, as far as we can see, for this “authority,” is the “Member of the New York Bar” himself. Yet he condemns dogmatizing!

One who is somewhat experienced in theological literature, can guess very shrewdly, as we indicated, the sort of writing which this kind of preface introduces. We can assure our readers, that they need not fatigue themselves by going into the book beyond its “Apologetic.” It is just what they expect—a Socinian treatise, denying all the cardinal doctrines of our atonement and justification, flouting substitution, imputation, vicarious satisfaction, as “insanities,” and only advancing the kind of cavils which one reads in the Racovian Catechism. The only difference is the more intense arrogance and conceit, and the bolder impiety, with an infusion of Yankee slang here and there. But the writer is evidently unconscious of the true *genesis* of his sophisms; we surmise that he is probably a Presbyterian in profession; and he evidently does not know how utterly unfit such a code of opinions is for such a profession. His ignorance is equal to his dogmatism. He demonstrates, by his own use of them, that he does not know the meaning of the words *guilt*, *expiation*, *imputation*, or *sacrifice*, as established among theologians. He affirms, for instance, that “it is impossible expiation can remove *guilt* ;” and advances as proof, the fact that a convict may be as *depraved* at the end of his full term in the penitentiary as at the beginning! This is the new teacher, who convicts the Westminster divines and John Owen of “insanity.”

This book is published by Mr. A. D. F. Randolph, the Christian bookseller, who makes conscience before God of the uses to which he puts his printing types; the chosen publisher of the evangelical tracts of Dr. Jas. W. Alexander, whose shop is the *rendezvous* of New York Presbyterian pastors. “If these things are done in the green tree, what shall be done in the dry”? The most charitable explanation of the existence of the book, and of the circumstances of its existence, is, that the

agents have no knowledge where they stand; are unconscious what soul-destroying and oft-condemned heresies they vent. It was thus only we could explain the reception given to the *Ecce Homo*; in which we saw a book intelligently and adroitly, and "of malice prepense," inculcating the most thorough-paced Socinianism, and differing from the *ultra* Socinian standards in naught but its dishonest mask, hailed as quite a tolerable, and even hopeful, exhibition of the gospel system. It is even so; while Cockney and Yankee pastors have been absorbed in the more congenial task of preaching abolition, war, freedom, and loyalty, a generation has grown up who "know not Joseph." They have let Christ crucified lapse. Their people know neither what their own churches really held in better days, nor why they held it; nor what they shunned as damnable error, nor why they judged it such.

Let Southern Presbyterians neither buy nor read. They will thus save their time and money from waste, their minds and hearts from contamination, and their sons from the seductions of assuming sophistry.

"*Among my Books.*" E. J. Hale & Son, Publishers, Murray Street: New York. 1871. 12mo. Pp. 270.

The twenty-one essays composing this attractive little volume, were originally published in the New York *World*; and this fact probably accounts for the slight treatment of the separate topics. Only one or two of them have grown beyond the usual limits of a newspaper contribution, and none of them profess to exhaust the subjects they discuss. The popularity of these essays among Northern readers is somewhat remarkable, when the undoubted disloyalty of their tone is considered. In so far as the author refers to later political history, he seems to betray more or less sympathy with the "Lost Cause;" and some of the notices of the Northern press, otherwise complimentary, refer to this fact disapprovingly.

As the title indicates, the book is a collection of brief essays, which might be suggested to the mind of a scholar who loved the



atmosphere of a well-stocked library. Reviews of Swift, Bolingbroke, Junius, Thackeray, and their writings, pleasantly mingled with scholarly gossip, form the best part of the work. An article on "The Prayer-Book," which the author treats as a merely literary production, most distinctly reveals his dislike of Puritanism; which, however, he does not apply, (according to the prevalent fashion,) to Plymouth Rock and the Pilgrims. The true Puritans of the time of the Stuarts, are the objects and subjects of his good-natured invective; and these, chiefly, because they quarrelled first with his beloved Ritual.

The externals of this work reflect great credit upon the publishers. It is handsomely printed and bound, and has reached a second edition.

# THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW

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

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

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

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

☞ Ministers of the Gospel, and others, who shall obtain three new subscribers, and remit the regular price, (Three Dollars each,) will be entitled to a copy of the REVIEW for one year, or, if they so prefer, one dollar for each new subscriber.

☞ Subscribers changing their Post Office are requested to give immediate notice of the same to the Publisher, or their REVIEW will be sent to their former office.

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

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