

THE SOUTHERN
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW,

CONDUCTED BY

AN ASSOCIATION OF MINISTERS

IN

COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA.

Vol. XXIII. JANUARY, MDCCCLXXII. No. 1.

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

1872.

THE LIBRARY
THE UNIVERSITY
OF TEXAS

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Theology of the Plymouth Brethren. By the Rev. R. L. DABNEY, D. D., Union Theological Seminary, Va.,	1
Our Educational Policy. By the Rev. J. M. P. OTTS, Columbia, Tenn.,	50
On a Call to the Gospel Ministry. By the Rev. A. A. PORTER, D. D., Austin, Texas,	64
The Relations of Conscience to Truth and Falsehood. By Prof. CHARLES MARTIN, Christiansburg, Va,	105
Rights and Duties. By G. J. A. COULSON, New York,	112
Ministerial Consecration and Ministerial Support. By the Rev. J. L. GIRARDEAU, D. D., Charleston, S. C.,	161
Christianity and Greek Philosophy. By Judge WILLIAM ARCHER COCKE, Monticello, Fla.,	188
The Apocryphal New Testament. By the Rev. E. O. FRIERSON, Florence, Ala.,	214
The Presbyterate. By the Rev. J. A. SMYLLIE, Milford, Texas,	228
The Tribunal of History. By the Rev. B. M. PALMER, D. D., LL.D., New Orleans, La.,	245
Schools for Ministerial Education and their Endowment. By the Rev. GEORGE HOWE, D. D., LL.D., Theological Seminary, Columbia, S. C.,	263
Some Remarks on the Question of a Call to the Ministry. By the Rev. JOHN B. ADGER, D. D., Theological Seminary, Columbia, S. C.,	287
Apostolical Succession. By the Rev. THOS. E. PECK, D. D., Union Theological Seminary, Va.,	353
Paul a Presbyterian. By the Rev. T. W. HOOPER, Lynchburg, Va.	400

BOUND APR 28 1938

The Ordinance of Giving. By the Rev. J. O. LINDSAY, Due West, S. C.,	412
The Greek Catholic Church. By the Rev. GEORGE W. LEYBURN, Appomattox C. H., Va.,	423
The General Assembly of 1872. By the Rev. JOHN B. ADGER, Theological Seminary, Columbia, S. C.,	475
Logic and the Laws of Thought. By the Rev. L. G. BARBOUR, Danville, Ky.,	519
Romans vi. 4, and Colossians ii. 12, and the Baptist Controversy. By the Rev. W. R. ATKINSON, Charlotte C. H., Va.,	539
Method of the Argument for the Existence of God. By the Rev. J. A. WADDELL, Richmond, Va.,	554
Annals of English Presbytery. By the Rev. ARNOLD W. MILLER, D. D., Charlotte, N. C.,	584
Spiritism and the Bible. By the Rev. W. E. BOGGS, Memphis, Tenn.,	611

CRITICAL NOTICES:

Dorner's History of Protestant Theology, 129. Comedy of Convocation, 135. Milner's Religious Denominations, 141. Dale's Johannic Baptism, 145. Hefele's History of Christian Councils, 147. Memmiuger's What is Religion? 149. Mrs. Preston's Works, 335. Church's Seed Truths, 345. Lord's Prophetic Imperialism, 348. Gardiner's Harmony of the Four Gospels in Greek, 460. Porteus' Government of the Kingdom of Christ, 463. Pollock's Life in the Exode, 466. Alexander's Princeton College during the Eighteenth Century, 469. Jamieson's Fausset, and Brown's Commentary on the Old and New Testaments, 470. Neither Rome nor Judah: Out of the Dark; Gaffney's Tavern, 472. Stephens' Reviewers Reviewed, 473. Killen's Old Catholic Church, 655. Bartle's Scripture Doctrine of Hades, 656. Duke of Somerset's Christian Theology and Modern Scepticism, 657.

THE SOUTHERN
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXIII.—NO. 1.

JANUARY, MDCCCLXXII.

ARTICLE I.

THEOLOGY OF THE PLYMOUTH BRETHREN.

God's Way of Peace. By the Rev. H. BONAR. Richmond:
Presbyterian Committee of Publication. 1870.

Muller's Life of Trust. Edited by WAYLAND. Boston: 1870.

Notes on Genesis. By C. H. M., of Dublin. Inglis & Colles:
New York.

Scripture Testimony. Edited by CHARLES CAMPBELL. James
Inglis & Co.: New York.

A Word to Young Believers. By W. DER. B. Dublin Tract
Society.

The Return of the Lord Jesus. By J. G. BELLET. Dublin
Tract Society.

Waymarks in the Wilderness. Inglis & Colles: New York.
8 vols., 12mo.

The Witness. James Inglis & Co.: New York.

Who are the Plymouth Brethren? Mrs. H. GRATTAN GUINNESS.
Philadelphia: 1861.

Attentive observers have not failed to note, that for the last
twenty years a modified phase of the "Doctrines of Grace" has
been presented in the Calvinistic Churches of Great Britain and
America; and this movement is easily traced to the sect (if that
may be called a sect which has no recognised bond) named at
the head of this article. The reader will readily grant that no

VOL. XXIII., NO. 1.—1.

great uniformity or consistency is to be expected in a company of Christians whose fundamental principles repudiate the divine authority for any catholic visible Church, the existence of a regular order of ordained ministers, and the use of all authoritative creeds. Their common traits can amount to no more than a species of prevalent complexion. Nobody among them is responsible for anything, unless he has been found doing or saying it himself. Hence there arises an unavoidable difficulty in dealing with their system; and description or conviction can only approximate a correct application to individuals. There is also a large number of religious teachers in the other Evangelical Churches, who, without actual separation, have adopted the chief doctrinal views of the Plymouth Brethren, and are in sympathy with their spirit. Still, the features of the common family resemblance can be drawn with general accuracy.

To return to the sect itself, it is said to have originated with the eccentric movements of the Rev. John Darby, an excellent minister of the Anglican Church, about forty years ago. This zealous man having been constrained to repudiate the prelatial figment of an apostolic succession, went to the extreme of discarding all regular ordination and visible church order. Forsaking the English Establishment, he began to preach as a missionary in England, and in time, with the converts and evangelists whom he gathered around him, spread his opinions from that country to Ireland, France, Switzerland, and America. The name given by the outside world to the sect is derived from Plymouth, England, where their strongest and one of their earliest meetings existed. If they can be said to have any form of church government, it can only be termed a rudimental independency. For Darby and his brethren supposed that the Scriptures recognised no such government, no regular power of ordination in any human hand, and no authority in any church court. But it is proper that believers meet for worship only, in congregations, to prepare for Christ's second advent, which they supposed to be near at hand. Their usual characteristics are the preaching of the doctrines of grace with what they claim to be unusual faithfulness and freeness, adult baptism, absolutely

unrestricted lay preaching, and lay administration of sacraments, weekly communions in the Lord's Supper, the denial of all human creeds, and a passionate attachment to the doctrine of Christ's premillennial advent. The sagacious reader will hardly need to be told that these principles have, as was to be anticipated, produced a fruitful harvest of divisions and schisms among the brethren themselves. The Rev. Mr. Darby himself has ostracised and been ostracised by the larger part of his followers in England, who could not endure the stringent, autocratic rule of this reformer, who denied all ecclesiastical rule; and he has some time ago shaken off the dust from his feet against his rebellious native land, and confined his labors chiefly to the Continent. The Bethesda congregation of Bristol, famous for the presidency of the pious George Müller, has separated itself both from Darby and his adversary-brother, Newton. The Rev. James Inglis, of New York, their chief doctrinal representative in the United States, who was, we believe, first a Calvinistic Immersionist, and then a Plymouth Brother, seems to have been discarded by a part of the Brotherhood. The sect has been, perhaps, most favorably represented in this country by the amiable and pious lay-preacher, H. Grattan Guinness, Esq., whose accomplished wife has given to the American world a friendly view of the Brotherhood. But the periodicals and books by which their opinions are most known are those which proceed from the press of Inglis & Co., of New York. These have obtained such currency that they are frequently spoken of as "The Inglis Literature," and the views of doctrine as "the Inglis Theology."

The better part of this sect, among whom we willingly include the names mentioned above, may be said to be characterised by many admirable and by some mischievous qualities. To the former we wish to do full justice. They profess to hold forth the doctrines of grace with peculiar simplicity, scripturalness, and freeness; and in many cases we can gladly accord that praise to them, and thank them for the clear light in which they set the sufficiency of Christ, the simplicity of faith, and the privileges of the believer's adoption, and for the fidelity with which they expose the covert self-righteousness of a half-gospel.

T x U

Many of them also deserve all praise for the strength of their faith, the holiness of their lives, their alms-givings, and the disinterestedness of their missionary zeal. But, as we shall aim to evince, these excellent virtues are marred by a denunciatory spirit towards those who do not utter their 'shibboleth,' and by a one-sidedness and exaggeration of doctrinal statement, which has resulted in not a few positive errors. Not seldom are they found condemning the Reformed denominations for forsaking the true doctrines of faith and justification, when they themselves give us, in their better moments, the very same views of these truths which we hold and preach. In many cases they contradict themselves and the Scriptures by the extravagance with which a favorite point is pushed. But we especially desire to caution the reader against their tendencies in the following directions: Their wresting of the doctrine of faith and assurance, and entire depreciation of all subjective marks of a state of grace; their denial of the imputation of Christ's active obedience; their disavowal (in some places) of progressive sanctification, confusion of justification and sanctification, and assertion of a dual nature in the regenerate, suggesting to the incautious the worst results of Antinomianism; their partial adoption of a fanatical theory of the warrant for prayer; and their ultraism upon the pre-advent theory, resulting in a depreciation of the being, duties, and hopes of the visible Church, and of the dispensation of the Holy Ghost.

In the discussion of these charges, the traits of exaggeration and inconsistency which have been imputed to them will be abundantly evinced.

As disconnected specimens, the reader may, by anticipation, take the following: "Notes on Genesis," page 39, pervert the words that Adam and Eve knew good and evil after they transgressed, as teaching that then only they acquired a *conscience!* The argument is, that they could not have had a judgment of the moral distinction until they had *experience* of both kinds of acts. How, then, can God have a conscience? Or, if it be said he is omniscient, have the elect angels a conscience? Again, the Scripture tells us that "God made man upright, and he

sought out many inventions." A curious uprightness this, without a conscience!

On pages 69 and 74, we seem to be taught that Christians ought not to improve or ameliorate the state of this earth, which God has been pleased to put under his curse. Such lives as those of Jethro Tull, Sir Jno. Sinclair, Jesse Buel, of Albany, etc., are then unchristian!

On page 271, Jacob is greatly condemned, because, having prayed for deliverance from his angry brother, he used prudent precautions to protect his family. The author thinks "prayer and planning" very inconsistent. Bible Christians expect God to answer through means. Their maxim is: "Trust in providence, and keep your powder dry."

On page 153, the author denies all vicarious worth to all Christ's sufferings and works, save his pangs on the cross. His aim seems to be to show a valid reason why the sufferings of believers, in imitation of their Head, are not propitiatory. To us this seems a very bungling way of reaching that conclusion at the expense of contradicting the Scriptures, when reasons so much more valid might have been presented, in the fact that a believer's nature and person lack all those properties which fitted Christ to be a substitute and sacrifice.

I. In the "*Waymarks in the Wilderness*," Vol. VIII., pp. 1-26, is a narrative of the labors of Dr. Cæsar Malan, of Geneva, founded on his biography by his son. The peculiarities of that excellent man are defended throughout; and his son is rebuked for not defending them all. The well known tracts, in which Malan's peculiar views of the nature of saving faith were taught, are commended without reserve. Indeed, we believe that these treatises, and especially the one entitled "*Little Foxes*," have always been favorites with those who sympathise with the doctrines of the Plymouth Brethren. The source of this error is no doubt that doctrine concerning faith, which the first Reformers, as Luther and Calvin, were led to adopt, from their opposition to the hateful and tyrannical teachings of Rome. This mother of abominations denies to Christians all true assurance of hope, teaching that it is neither edifying nor attainable. Her purpose

is clear ; the soul justified by free grace, and assured of its union to Christ, would no longer be a practicable subject for priest-craft and spiritual despotism. These noble Reformers seeing the bondage and misery imposed by this teaching upon sincere souls, flew to the opposite extreme, and (to use the language of theology) asserted that the assurance of hope is of the essence of saving faith. Thus says Calvin in his Commentary on Romans: "My faith is a divine and spiritual belief that God has pardoned and accepted *me*." According to these divines, it is not enough for a penitent soul to embrace with all its powers the gracious truth: "Whosoever believeth shall be saved," while yet its consciousness of exercising a full faith is confused, and remaining anxieties about its own salvation mar its peace. Such an act of soul is not admitted by them to be even a true yet weak faith; they hold that until the believer is assured that *Christ has saved HIM*, there is no exercise of saving faith at all. This old error is evidently the source of Dr. Malan's view of faith, which, as visitors to Geneva twenty years ago remember, he was so sure to obtrude upon all comers. Now our Plymouth Brethren and their sympathisers have a contempt and mistrust for great ecclesiastical names and church authorities, which prevents their employing the recognised nomenclature of historical theology on this and many other subjects. Hence they prefer to express their peculiarities in terms of their own, less discriminating than the old. We do not find them indeed deciding that "the assurance of hope is of the essence of a true saving faith;" but we find them in substance reviving this extravagance of the first Reformers, and pressing its corollaries. Thus, if such is the nature of the assurance of hope, it is grounded in no rational inference, but it must be a primitive act of consciousness. Again, if this assurance is of the essence of faith in its first and its every acting, then all means employed by the believer on himself for its increment, all self-examination to discover whether "Christ is in us, or whether we be reprobates," all subjective marks of a true work of grace in us, are worthless, and indeed absurd. We accordingly find Dr. Malan applauded, (*Waymarks in the Wilderness*, Vol. VIII., p. 3), when he asked Dr. Osten-

tag, "Are you one of the elect?" "and pressed him not to rest his assurance of salvation on the sandy foundation of his own feelings and sentiments, or on anything in himself." Although the Rev. H. Bonar is a Scotch Presbyterian, yet his ardent sympathy with these religionists in the matter of pre-adventism, leads even him in his little work, "*God's Way of Peace*," to some most one-sided and ill-judged statements. Thus, pp. 23, 24: "The peace or confidence which comes from summing up the good points of our character, and thinking of our good feelings and doings, or about our faith, love, and repentance, must be made up of pride." . . . "It does not mend the matter to say, that we look at these good feelings in us as the Spirit's work, not our own." "Peace does not arise from *thinking about* the change wrought in us; but *unconsciously and involuntarily* from the change itself." On p. 34, the inquirer is rebuked for thinking "that unbelief is some evil principle requiring to be uprooted before the gospel will be of any use to him." We then have these most inadequate and misleading definitions of unbelief and faith; that the former is "a good opinion of one's self, and a bad opinion of God;" and the latter *vice versa*, a bad opinion of self, and a good opinion of God. On p. 39, the object of the Spirit's work is . . . "not to produce in us certain feelings, the consciousness of which will make us think better of ourselves, and give us confidence towards God." Here we have first a denial of the truth, and then a caricature of it. In "*Waymarks, etc.*," Vol. III., pp. 245-263, is found a treatise on "Assurance of Faith," (by which the writer means *assurance of hope*). In this article, Jonathan Edwards's "Treatise on the Religious Affections" is scouted as not only useless, but mischievous; and the drift of the writer is to ignore all self-examination and cultivation of spiritual discernment as means of strengthening faith and hope. On p. 258, we find the following astonishing travesty of the truth: "The *object* and *cause* of faith is the testimony of God and demonstration of the Spirit; but if we appropriate the mercy of God in Christ upon evidences in ourselves, faith and the testimony of God on which it rests are made void. For the marks so used must be such as, we

our Reformed pulpits, and set down in our symbols, save that theirs' have not the symmetry and scriptural accuracy of statements which our church teachers have given to our statements; and save that this Witness theology is continually contradicting itself and the Scripture by its exaggerations and perversions. We are told that the ministers who have imbibed these opinions are much in the habit of saying that the gospel has not been preached in its purity in our time, except by them; and that it is another gospel which is usually heard in our pulpits. This is a type of modesty which church history teaches us is a pretty sure sign of doctrinal defection. Another characteristic of the Witness theology is, to disparage all church teachers and church authorities who have reputation or influence, and to represent their human learning, pious writings, and fame, as simply a corrupting bane. These writers take great pleasure in admonishing us of this fact, and cautioning us, that if we would get at the real truth, we must roundly discard and condemn all the writers whom the Church has revered, (except their set!) and go direct to the Bible. Now all this species of talk is set in a sufficiently ridiculous light by one word. What are *they* aspiring to be, when they print these books, save to become human church teachers, to acquire influence over believers' minds, to have authority with them? Do they go to all this trouble, designing to have everybody neglect or reject their "witness"? We trow not. Or will they say they write only to teach believers the true meaning of the Bible? Well; no Reformed divine ever professed anything else. And by what patent of sincerity shall these late writers claim that they alone are honest in such professions? The fact is, that no uninspired church teacher is infallible; but yet they have their use; which use (in the case of these writers, and the wiser fathers of the Reformation who have preceded them,) is proportioned to their honesty, modesty, learning, and correspondence with the infallible word. But there is another fact, that the tone of consciousness we note is a symptom of an unhealthy mind; and that sensible people will not be very forward to adopt the writers who betray it as their special guides.

T:U

As we wish wholly to avoid the exaggerations which we lament in the "Plymouth theology," we begin our exposition of the true doctrine of faith and assurance by repeating the admission already made. The overweening attempt to ground our hope on introspection may involve self-righteous illusions; and if it does not, to the truly humble, it is likely to bring little comfort. "The view to be urged upon the weak and doubting believer is, that he has the same grounds as the strong assured Christian, for all his glorious hopes, if he only exercised that believer's faith. *He* does not ground his assurance primarily upon his gifts, his sanctity, his zeal, his abundant labors for Christ. He does not trust in himself, but in the simple word of his Saviour; and he has fuller comfort than this weak Christian, not because he claims the credit of more works and graces, but simply because he exercises a stronger faith. St. Paul usually makes the abundance of his labors for Christ, not the *cause*, but the *result* of the assurance of hope. Perhaps some one may object that this is virtually to urge an Antinomian dependence; for he who does not find the fruits of holy living in himself has no right to an assurance of his interest in Christ. True. To conclude that you have hitherto been in Christ, while lacking the fruits of holiness which result from union to him, is Antinomianism. But to make this past absence of fruits a reason for projecting your mistrust into the future, this is legalism and unbelief. You weak Christian would say to an unbeliever, paralysed by his mistrust from taking Christ's yoke, that his lack of comfort and other regenerate experiences might be very good proof that he *had been hitherto* an unrenewed sinner; but that it was sheer unbelief and sin to make his miserable past experience a ground for doubting and rejecting Christ's full and free salvation offered to faith. You, our weak brother, would require him to believe *in order to* experience the Christian graces. You did not indeed encourage him to believe that he was already reconciled while disobedient; but you told him that he might assuredly be reconciled and obedient in believing. So we reply to your discouragements, 'be not afraid, only believe,' and your joys and graces shall assuredly, in God's good time, follow as the *fruits*, and not as

our Reformed pulpits, and set down in our symbols, save that theirs' have not the symmetry and scriptural accuracy of statements which our church teachers have given to our statements; and save that this Witness theology is continually contradicting itself and the Scripture by its exaggerations and perversions. We are told that the ministers who have imbibed these opinions are much in the habit of saying that the gospel has not been preached in its purity in our time, except by them; and that it is another gospel which is usually heard in our pulpits. This is a type of modesty which church history teaches us is a pretty sure sign of doctrinal defection. Another characteristic of the Witness theology is, to disparage all church teachers and church authorities who have reputation or influence, and to represent their human learning, pious writings, and fame, as simply a corrupting bane. These writers take great pleasure in admonishing us of this fact, and cautioning us, that if we would get at the real truth, we must roundly discard and condemn all the writers whom the Church has revered, (except their set!) and go direct to the Bible. Now all this species of talk is set in a sufficiently ridiculous light by one word. What are *they* aspiring to be, when they print these books, save to become human church teachers, to acquire influence over believers' minds, to have authority with them? Do they go to all this trouble, designing to have everybody neglect or reject their "witness"? We trow not. Or will they say they write only to teach believers the true meaning of the Bible? Well; no Reformed divine ever professed anything else. And by what patent of sincerity shall these late writers claim that they alone are honest in such professions? The fact is, that no uninspired church teacher is infallible; but yet they have their use; which use (in the case of these writers, and the wiser fathers of the Reformation who have preceded them,) is proportioned to their honesty, modesty, learning, and correspondence with the infallible word. But there is another fact, that the tone of consciousness we note is a symptom of an unhealthy mind; and that sensible people will not be very forward to adopt the writers who betray it as their special guides.

T:U

As we wish wholly to avoid the exaggerations which we lament in the "Plymouth theology," we begin our exposition of the true doctrine of faith and assurance by repeating the admission already made. The overweening attempt to ground our hope on introspection may involve self-righteous illusions; and if it does not, to the truly humble, it is likely to bring little comfort. "The view to be urged upon the weak and doubting believer is, that he has the same grounds as the strong assured Christian, for all his glorious hopes, if he only exercised that believer's faith. *He* does not ground his assurance primarily upon his gifts, his sanctity, his zeal, his abundant labors for Christ. He does not trust in himself, but in the simple word of his Saviour; and he has fuller comfort than this weak Christian, not because he claims the credit of more works and graces, but simply because he exercises a stronger faith. St. Paul usually makes the abundance of his labors for Christ, not the *cause*, but the *result* of the assurance of hope. Perhaps some one may object that this is virtually to urge an Antinomian dependence; for he who does not find the fruits of holy living in himself has no right to an assurance of his interest in Christ. True. To conclude that you have hitherto been in Christ, while lacking the fruits of holiness which result from union to him, is Antinomianism. But to make this past absence of fruits a reason for projecting your mistrust into the future, this is legalism and unbelief. You weak Christian would say to an unbeliever, paralysed by his mistrust from taking Christ's yoke, that his lack of comfort and other regenerate experiences might be very good proof that he *had been hitherto* an unrenewed sinner; but that it was sheer unbelief and sin to make his miserable past experience a ground for doubting and rejecting Christ's full and free salvation offered to faith. You, our weak brother, would require him to believe *in order to* experience the Christian graces. You did not indeed encourage him to believe that he was already reconciled while disobedient; but you told him that he might assuredly be reconciled and obedient in believing. So we reply to your discouragements, 'be not afraid, only believe,' and your joys and graces shall assuredly, in God's good time, follow as the *fruits*, and not as

the roots of faith." The above we read from a practical sermon of one of our ordinary Presbyterian pastors, penned by him before he ever read a line of the Plymouth theology.

But now, on the other hand, it is sheer exaggeration to say, as we have seen Dr. Bonar, and the "Waymarks," write, that assurance of hope cannot derive any of its comfort from the discovery of gracious principles and acts in ourselves, without forsaking faith and building on self-righteousness. Let the reader review our citations above. They *contradict Scripture, experience, and precepts*. And we take great pleasure in staking our issue on this test; because these writers cry so loudly, "To the Bible alone!" Thus, then, we find the apostle expressly *commanding* Christians to seek their assurance of being in Christ, partly in that very way, which these writers condemn as legalism and the very antithesis of faith. 1 Cor. ii. 28: "But let a man *examine himself*, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup." Why? Because "he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, (the very point to be settled by the examination,) eateth and drinketh judgment to himself." 2 Cor. xiii. 5: "Examine yourselves, *whether ye be in the faith*; prove your own selves. Know ye not your own selves, how that Jesus Christ is in you, except ye be reprobates?" 2 Pet. i. 10: "Give diligence to assure yourselves of your calling and election." Rom. v. 4: "Tribulation worketh patience; and patience, experience; and experience, hope; and hope maketh not ashamed." Again we find the Bible saints testing the nature of their faith, and their title to a union with Christ, by their subjective affections and principles. Ps. cxix. 6: "Then shall I not be ashamed, when I have respect to all thy commandments." 1 John iii. 14: "We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren." 1 John v. 2: "By this we know that we love the children of God, when we love God, and keep his commandments." 1 John 3. 19: "And hereby" (viz., by the fact that we love in deed and in truth—*i. e.* by our works!) "we know that we are of the truth, and shall assure our hearts before him." So, 1 John ii. 3. And, chiefly, 1 John iii. 22: "And whatsoever we ask, we receive of him, because we

keep his commandments," etc. Once more: we find the Scriptures full of marks or tests of a gracious state; such as that of our Saviour in John xv. 14: "Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you;" or of James ii. 20: Faith without works is dead." The laying down of these marks evidently implies that believers are to apply them to themselves; and by that means, rationally, scripturally and spiritually ascertain the spuriousness or genuineness of their union to Christ.

Now does it not seem strange that readers of the Bible should impinge so rashly against scriptures so familiar and plain as these? The explanation is to be found in one-sidedness of temper; the overweening desire to push a pet idea (the immediate peace emerging out of the vigorous acting of simple faith) has made them blind to the fact that they had pushed it out of "the proportion of the faith," and the limits of truth. The truth is, that not only faith, but love, filial obedience, true repentance, Christian patience, forgiveness, (see Galatians v. 22, 23,) etc., are fruits, and so, *marks*, of God's sovereign new birth in the soul. The only difference as to the matter in hand, is, that faith is related to the rest as a seminal grace. The truth is, that the same God who has told us that true faith saves us, has also told us that these subjective graces are signs of a saved state. Here appears strongly the extravagance of the assertion, that the Christian has forsaken faith when he tries to ascertain by such *criteria* that he is a favorite of God. (*Waymarks*, Vol. III., p. 258). How on earth can a modest believer be justly charged with forsaking the testimony of God, *because he believes God* testifying that such or such a mark is a sure sign of spiritual life? It is as much a part of the divine testimony as this, "that the life is in his Son." But the "*Waymarks*" object: unless the *criteria* are infallible, the whole process is vicious. We reply, very true. But to the believing soul whom God endows (by his union to Christ and the indwelling of the Holy Ghost) with *spiritual discernment*, the scriptural *criteria* are infallible. And it is a most inconsistent thing in writers who profess to exalt the doctrines of grace, thus to ignore the grace of spiritual discernment, as though it had no place in the regene-

rate soul, unless possibly as to the single grace of faith. It is objected: self-deceivers self-righteously fancy that they find in themselves these subjective marks in their frames and works. We reply, so they do; *and so most notoriously do they often fancy that they taste the immediate peace of believing.* Where is the genuine believer's safeguard? The Scriptures reply: in that grace of spiritual discernment which the Holy Ghost graciously gives to them, enabling them to distinguish *their faith*, and all their other graces and works from the counterfeits. Dr. Bonar would have the whole matter decided by simple consciousness. "When we move, we are conscious of moving. So when we believe, we must be conscious of believing." And so, accepting the testimony of God, that he that believeth is safe; *that*, according to him, is the end of the matter, and the whole of it. This short view is solved by a very simple remark. There is a spurious, as well as a genuine faith. *Every man, when he thinks he believes, is conscious of exercising what he thinks is faith.* Such is the correct statement of these facts of consciousness. Now suppose the faith, of which the man is conscious, turns out a spurious faith, must not his be a spurious consciousness? And he, being without the illumination of the Spirit, will be in the dark as to its hollowness. But if Dr. Bonar's ideas are to be judged by his other declarations on the same subject, it is vain for us to hope that any rational light of scriptural truth, applied by the Holy Ghost, can avail here to save anybody from the cheat; for he tells us that the peace "does not arise from the change wrought in us; but *unconsciously and involuntarily from the change itself.*" In fact, these writers, after warning us very properly against mixing human philosophy with the theology of redemption, turn around and give us a philosophy of their own, to which plain Scriptures must be wrested. The only difference between them and other philosophic theologians is, that theirs is a false psychology, unscriptural, and so unphilosophical. For the psychology of common sense always agrees with the Scripture. Dr. Bonar evidently regards *consciousness* as a *supra-rational* (if not a non-rational) faculty. The truth is, that consciousness, just as much as the logical understanding, is a

rational faculty. The only difference is, that its acts are *primary* acts of the reason; while the logical deduction is a *secondary* or derived act of the reason. These writers will have the Christian's peace built, in no degree, upon any derived or deductive rational act of soul from subjective *criteria* however scriptural. They cannot away with it. Why? Their psychology virtually replies: Because the peace comes directly from the consciousness of faith going out of self to Christ; and consciousness (like "the animal sense of departed pain and present ease," Dr. Bonar's own most vicious and false analogy,) is supra-rational. Digest their philosophy of the matter, and it comes to this. How short and plain is this refutation, in which both common sense and Scripture concur, viz.: Our whole salvation is instrumentally by the Truth. But truth only acts on man's rationality. Hence, the whole process of salvation, however spiritual, must also be truly rational. The quickest consciousness which the soul has of its own faith (or other gracious acts) is yet truly rational, only it is an immediate primary act of reason. Hence there is no absurdity whatever, but the most perfect consistency in the Scriptures representing such consciousnesses as cohering with, and strengthened by, the deductions of the reason, as guided by the Spirit's illumination from subjective marks and scriptural premises.

But let us return to the other branch of the objection: that to draw any confidence of hope from graces which we perceive wrought in us, is self-confidence, in other words, self-righteousness. Now to a plain mind it does seem a most astonishing and perverse argument, when the whole encouragement of hope which the believer infers hence is inferred from this premise, viz., that he could never work those graces in himself; but, if they are in him, they were wrought by sovereign and gratuitous power. The question to be rationally, scripturally, and spiritually argued is this: Is Christ my friend? The sober believer reasons thus: "Yes, Christ is my friend," (conclusion,) "because I find in myself changes which he alone can work," (premise,) "and changes which only his unbought love prompted him to work." How this is self-confidence, or self-righteousness, or

how it leads to boasting, passes the comprehension of a plain man. But as Dr. Malan insinuates, to place any of our confidence of hope thus, is building it on a sandy foundation. Why? The Papist would answer, (very logically for him,) "Because these subjective graces are all mutable as well as imperfect." We ask, Do the Witness theologians believe in *the perseverance of the saints*? They loudly declare, yes! Then these subjective marks, if truly distinguished by the believer's spiritual discernment, through the witnessing of the Holy Ghost, are not a "foundation of sand," but of rock; for they are *God's peculiar work*, and the believer is arguing precisely as Paul does (Phil. i. 6), "confident of this very thing, that he which hath begun a good work in us, will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ."

The sum of this matter then is this: That we cannot object to the believer's "examining himself whether he is in the faith" by his subjective marks, on the pretext that many have abused the process to self-righteousness or despair; for God has commanded it and laid down the marks. And it is by this self-examination, coupled with contrition, confessing and forsaking of the defects detected, renewed acts of faith (thus strengthening itself by exercise) and watchfulness and holy living, that the true though weak faith of the beginner grows to the assured faith of the mature Christian. Yet faith also is a characteristic Christian grace—it is thus itself a mark of a gracious state—it is a grace of prime importance, bearing a seminal relation to all the others, so that if it be present they cannot be wholly absent. Hence we are glad to recognise this further truth, that the weakest babe in Christ, not yet conscious of any decisive action of the other graces, does derive, through his own consciousness of faith, some peace and hope, preserving him from absolute despair even in his most anxious moments. (See Conf. of Faith, Ch. XVIII., § 4.) But we do not describe this first reflex act of faith as Bonar's inconsistent monster, an "unconscious" consciousness, or a non-rational action of soul upon revealed truth—truth, the supreme object of sanctified reason. And once more: we fully admit that, just so far as self-examination awakens the believer's anxiety concerning his own state by revealing to his

repentance his indwelling defects, the proper remedy is to repeat our simple acts of faith, going out of sinful self to embrace a perfect Saviour and find rest in him. And this is doubtless one of the results which our Father designs in commanding self-examination. But, finally, the Bible also teaches us that in the maturer experience of God's saints they do find comfort of hope by recognising in themselves the sure marks of God's work of grace, which comfort is neither unbelieving nor legal, but gracious and believing, and a true fruit of faith and holiness, yielding glory to God and excluding boasting.

It is very obvious to the attentive reader that these views of faith and assurance which we have examined, ground themselves in the faulty definitions of saving faith which we received from the first Reformers. They, as we saw, defined saving faith as a belief that "Christ has saved *me*:" making the assurance of hope of its necessary essence. Now the later Reformers, and those learned, holy, and modest teachers of the Reformed Churches, whose influence the Plymouth Brethren regard as so unhealthy for true religion, have subjected this view to searching examination, and rejected it (as does the Westminster Assembly) on scriptural grounds. We merely recite the common-places of theology in arraying their unanswerable objections. First, God's word gives us, as the real object of our faith, in its first or direct acting, only this proposition: "Whosoever believeth shall be saved." But this overweening faith would substitute a different proposition, and one not in the Bible, as the object of faith, viz., "Christ has saved *me*, A. B." Second, inasmuch as the name of A. B. is not in the Bible, and the only proposition there offered him is the general one, "Whosoever believeth shall be saved," he can only come to the proposition, "I, A. B., am saved," indirectly through the general one, by means of this minor premise, "I am a believer, therefore I am saved." On the view of Calvin and Luther, faith, as a rational act of soul, is impossible; for the soul would be required to accept the proposition, "I am saved," in order to become saved. This is not only a logical contradiction, but is contrary to Scripture and experience; for every sinner comes to Christ by faith, as a per-

VOL. XXIII., NO. 1.—2.

son lost, and not saved. Such a faith is as unreasonable as requiring that a person shall bring himself into existence in order to exist; whereas he must be in existence beforehand in order to bring anything or effect any act. Calvin would doubtless attempt to answer this fatal objection by saying that true faith is not a rational, but a gracious, spiritual, and supernatural act of soul. The latter we grant, but not the former. It is a supernatural, spiritual, and *rational act* of soul—all the more truly rational because it is spiritual. The Bible tells us that God quickens the soul by his word. The word is the proper object of the rectified reason; the renewed actings of the soul are all the more rational, because it is now begotten again to a nobler life by the *Spirit of truth* and *through the truth*. Hence we return to the charge, and urge that unless there is a special, immediate revelation to A. B. of God's purpose to save *him*, by name, there cannot be a rational belief that God has saved him, save as inferential from the gospel proposition, that God certainly saves whosoever believe. Third, the experience of God's people in the Bible ages and since refute the scheme. See Ps. lxxiii. 13; xxxi. 22; lxxvii. 2; ix. 10. Fourth, were assurance of hope of the essence of a more saving faith, God would not have commanded *believers* (addressed as such) to perfect their faith by going on to assurance, nor would he have assigned them the further means for doing so. Last, it does not appear how God could justly punish the non-elect (as he will) for refusing to believe. For they would be still punished for not believing that God *had saved them*, when their dire experience in hell was proving that had they adopted that proposition they would have adopted a glaring falsehood. The direct act of saving faith then is the embracing of the general gospel proposition, "Whosoever believeth shall be saved;" and the moment the soul performs that act truly, it is justified. The comforting hope, "I am in a state of safety," is the reflex consequence of this saving act, mediated by the rational self-consciousness, as enlightened by the Holy Ghost through the word. But, as experience shows, all our acts of soul are not accompanied at the time by an intelligent and remembered act of consciousness. Rapidity of the mental acts,

or confusion and excitement of mind, may prevent it. And more important still, if the soul knows that there is a counterfeit faith as well as a true one, and if any uncertainty of view prevails in it as to what distinguishes them, its consciousness of its own actings cannot be more discriminating than those actings are. Hence the direct act of faith may have been really performed, and the soul may be by it in a saved state, and yet a clear consciousness of the act and full certainty of its result may be wanting. This is just the analysis of the state of the true but weak believer. The maturing of his faith up to a full assurance, must be the work of self-examination, time, and experience, especially in repeated direct actings of faith itself.

In dismissing this part of our discussion, we wish to utter a caution. We meet with many attempts in these books at novel and simpler definitions of faith. Let us assure the authors that there is no uninspired definition so safe and discriminating as that of the Shorter Cat., Q. 86: "Faith in Jesus Christ is a saving grace, whereby we receive and rest upon him alone for salvation as he is offered to us in the gospel." Many of these novelties of definition and illustration run a great risk of suggesting fatal error. Thus, Dr. Bonar says, "Unbelief is simply our having a good *opinion* of ourselves, and a bad *opinion* of God;" and faith is the reversed state of *opinion*. He seems, in another place cited, to make the assurance of hope as merely a *natural consequence* of faith, as consciousness of motion is of moving, or consciousness of seeing is of looking. Now we suppose that none will be more prompt to assert the spiritual and gracious source of both faith and hope, as consequent on the almighty quickening of the soul and the illumination of the mind, than he is. We forewarn him that he may very probably find some of his admirers adopting these novelties of explanation as authority for that false and soul-destroying Pelagian view of faith advanced by the followers of Alexander Campbell. He describes faith and unbelief as two antithetic states of *opinion*; it will be easy for his followers to misquote him as saying they are states of opinion merely. He seems to represent assurance as a merely natural and unavoidable result of consciousness, thus

appearing to ignore the necessity for the gift of spiritual discernment, and making the believer's whole joy in Christ a mere matter of natural knowledge. Again, we find the "Waymarks" speaking currently of faith as a "*means of regeneration!*" Vol. III., p. 331; II., p. 73. Now, in the order of production, the means precede the result; so that this language suggests that faith begins before the sinner is born again. Then, it is a natural exercise of the soul as carnal, and we reach the same Pelagian conclusion; whereas the Scriptures teach us that in the order of production the new birth precedes faith, and that none but the quickened soul exercises this gracious act of believing. Once more: we notice a most dangerous passage where the question is raised, what shall be said to the soul who anxiously desires to come to Christ for pardon, but is embarrassed by knowing that his desire for pardon is simply carnal and selfish. The answer given is, in substance, that he shall be encouraged to come to Christ, without analysing his motive for coming, because the Redeemer is so kind that he will meet the sinner sincerely coming to him, no matter how prompted. And then the same false view is insinuated, that this coming will, through grace, become the "*means of regeneration;*" and of the implantation of new evangelical motives. So that this alarmed transgressor, who came to Christ at first (and was accepted!) only to gratify selfish fear, will remain to embrace him from filial gratitude and desire for holiness. All this is inexpressibly mischievous and unscriptural. True, "Christ receiveth *sinner*." True, God "justifieth the *ungodly* who believe in Jesus." It is practically true that no man is regenerated apart from Christ, and that God's word (not a dead soul's dead faith) is "*the means of regeneration.*" But it is not true that Christ has promised to bless a faith merely carnal and selfish. And the right answer to the convicted sinner, whose case is supposed, would be, that the pure selfishness of his prayer and of his longing for pardon was the crowning proof of his utter death in sin, helplessness, and lost estate—that it behoved him to embrace Christ indeed, and at once, as an almighty Saviour, but to embrace him as much as a deliverer from this selfish desire and fear as a deliverer from wrath.

There is a certain *gospel paradox* here: that the sinner who is *dead*, is bidden to come to Christ for *life*; and yet the life which enables him to come must be from Christ. The true solution is in the great truth of sovereign, quickening grace, "blowing where it listeth." Where God designs to save, he gives the precept, "Come," to the helpless soul, and also gives the secret inward strength to obey and to come, not carnally, but spiritually; and the elect sinner is quickened, believing, justified . . . all at the same time, yet all out of sovereign grace; and yet justified because he savingly believes, savingly believing because he is quickened. Let not the teacher of anxious souls attempt to solve that paradox by the expedients of Pelagian speculation; but let him utter the appointed promise and precept; and then "stand still and see the salvation of God."

In one particular the view of faith presented by this "*Witness theology*," while professing a high Calvinism, lapses distinctly into Arminianism. The "*Waymarks*," Vol. VIII., p. 272, 273, distinctly denies the imputation of Christ's active obedience to believers as the meritorious ground of their title to the adoption of life. "It may be necessary, however," says this writer, "here to advert to the distinction which has been made between pardon and justification, in accordance with the use of these words in earthly relations, and to the consequent division of the work of Christ into his *active* and *passive* obedience; the one for our pardon, and the other for our justification." "We have already stated our objections to the notion of a vicarious keeping of the law, as well as to the distinction which it makes between pardon and justification, and the grounds upon which either of them rests. The opponents of it may very well challenge its advocates to give a scriptural statement of it, or to produce a single passage which intimates that, while we have forgiveness in his blood, we have justification through his keeping the law perfectly in our stead," etc.

We can scarcely persuade ourselves that intelligent Presbyterians need a detailed discussion to enable them to repel this stale Arminian view; or that they will have any difficulty in answering the above challenge by "giving a scriptural state-

ment" of our view. Such passages as these are at hand and too familiar: Zech. iii. 4, 5; Acts xxvi. 18; Rom. v. 1, 2; v. 19; Gal. iv. 5; John i. 12; Matt. iii. 15; v. 17; Rom. viii. 3, 4. Here we are taught that justification by faith was not only a stripping off of filthy garments; but the putting on of a fair mitre, and clean linen; that it is not only forgiveness of sin, but inheritance among all them that are sanctified; that one of the results of faith is title to be sons of God; "that Christ was made of a woman, *made under the law* (not under its penalty only, but under *the law*,) to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons;" that when justified by faith, we have not only peace with God, but access to a state of hope, joy, and glory; that we are "made righteous *by the obedience* of one," (Christ); that Christ does for us that which the law could not do in us, being weak through the flesh, namely, fulfil a complete obedience; for surely the law is very adequate to exact of man, in spite of his carnality, the due penalty. The souls in hell find it so to their cost.

But the confusion of language in the above scrap of Arminianizing is such as almost to compel us to believe that the author has no distinct knowledge of the doctrine which he imputes to Calvinists. He represents us as seeking justification one way, and pardon another way. Was ever a Calvinist heard of who did not hold that pardon is an essential element of justification? It would have been well for this writer to advert to the Westminster Catechism: "Justification is an act of God's free grace, *wherein* he pardoneth all our sins, and *accepteth us as righteous in his sight*, only for," etc. Justification includes both pardon and acceptance; these are its two inseparable elements. Without the latter element the sinner's salvation would be fragmentary; for to remit penalty is not the same thing as enduing with the title to the positive blessedness promised to obedience. He who has sinned, and (vicariously) paid the penal debt therefor, does not stand on the same footing of justice with him who, by not sinning, and, on the contrary, by actually keeping the law, has earned the franchise of reward. Unless the sinner's Substitute does the *latter* for him, as well as the former, he is not saved.

He certainly cannot do it for himself. This Arminian view of justification betrays a most inadequate conception of the relation between the covenants of works and grace, and the believer's connexion with the first Adam, and the Second Adam. When the first Adam entered under the covenant of works, he was guiltless; but not therefore justified. He was obnoxious as yet to no penalty; but he had no title to the adoption of life. *This* he was to earn by obedience. The Second Adam promises to place his believing seed, not in the state from which the first Adam fell, but in that state to which he should have raised himself and his seed, had he fulfilled the covenant of works. To accomplish this, Christ both pays the penalty, and completes the obedience due under the covenant of works.

No intelligent believer, then, speaks of being *pardoned* by Christ's passive, and *justified* by Christ's active obedience. Pardon is a part of justification. The whole, complete, inseparable change, from condemnation to sonship, is made by the imputed merit of a whole imputed righteousness, which righteousness includes all Christ's acts in his estate of humiliation, by which he "fulfilled the law," penal and preceptive.

II. It is the aim of the "Plymouth theology" to foster a certain type of religious experience, from which all doubt and anxiety are eliminated. To this end is pressed their peculiar view of faith and assurance. Hence also is the *animus* which has betrayed them into the second group of errors, on which we are constrained to animadvert as more dangerous than the first. The Bible theology teaches that there is a dead and fruitless faith which neither justifies nor sanctifies, and whose usefulness is to be practically tested by its fruitlessness. The Bible distinguishes justification, a purely forensic change of legal *status*, from sanctification, a subjective or personal change of moral state. As the former act passes in the *forum* of heaven, a tribunal not now accessible to our view, it must be practically known, according to the Scriptures, by the fruitful or sanctifying quality of the faith which the believer professes. Others can test it only thus; the man himself must test it chiefly thus. Hence, obviously, his comfort of hope is connected with his pro-

gressive sanctification, through his faith working by love. Such is the scriptural system. But the new system condemns this as covert legalism and unbelief. It insists that hope must exist before "experience worketh" it. For the anxious babe in Christ to say, "I doubt my own faith," is, according to them, a criminal doubting of Christ. Faith must bear its fruit of assurance directly and immediately. Hence it is obvious some new view must be presented, modifying the old gospel view of the relations of faith, acceptance, sanctification, and hope; for if the old doctrine stands, the old inference from it is unavoidable. Such we are convinced is the *motive* of the startling innovations which the Plymouth theology proposes in the doctrine of progressive sanctification. They shall state it in their own words. In "A Word to Young Believers," by W. De R. B., p. 52, we read: "'Ye are complete,' is a divine testimony. To add to this, to add to completeness, is to make a deformity; and this is what many are seeking to do. Men seek to persuade us that there is 'a progressive holiness,' to fit us for glory," etc. P. 74: "The walk of a believer in relation to God, is in the same character as that of a child to his father, whether it be good or bad. What I mean is, that it is independent of his standing. A son ill-behaved or well-behaved, is equally a son. So, a Christian walking right or walking wrong is a Christian still; and that is the very reason it is of such consequence," etc. The deadly error of these views is unfortunately plain, notwithstanding its barbarously bungling style; and the error is that of Antinomianism. It cannot be better unmasked than by exposing the false analogy of the author's illustration. In natural parentage, if a man has a son, he is equally *his son*, whether reprobate or docile. Very true; because in our fallen nature *depravity descends by birth*. But, in the spiritual birth, the glorious characteristic is, that it is always a *birth unto holiness*. What is it but simple impiety, to imply, as this illustration does, that the Holy Ghost begets seed unto depravity? If he has begotten any soul anew, he has begotten him to holiness. Hence, if any pretended son is unholy in his walk, it shows him a "bastard, and not a son."

But take the following from the "Notes on Genesis," p. 200: "Regeneration is not a change of the old nature, but the introduction of a new. . . . Nor does the introduction of this new nature, alter in the slightest degree, the true, essential character of old. This latter continues what it was, and is made in no respect better; yea, rather, there is a full display of its evil character in opposition of the new element," etc. It is not hard to see how terribly all this may be carried out to a God-defying carnal security. "The notion of progressive sanctification is false, and the work not to be expected. The evil nature in me is not at all weakened by grace, but rather inflamed. If I have faith, I have the '*standing*;' and I am not to doubt my faith because of a supposed deficiency of fruits; because to conclude it a true faith by any frames in myself, or works of self, is sheer legalism." What more does any Antinomian negro desire, to encourage him in his foulest hypocrisy, and most fanatical joys?

But see "Waymarks," Vol. I., p. 70: "The impression seems to be, that, after his justification, the believer must undergo a process of sanctification, and that for this reason he is left for a time amidst the trials and conflicts of a hostile world." This impression is then argued against. Again, Vol. III., p. 75: "It is remarkable that those who teach that sanctification is a great work to be accomplished subsequent to justification—a second conversion—a perfection to be attained in the flesh—when they attempt to sustain themselves by Scripture, almost invariably lay hold upon some unhappy rendering or ambiguous expression in the English version of the Scriptures." On p. 332, the writer complains against those believers who "speak of regeneration as a change wrought in the old nature—a mighty change indeed, which can be effected only by the influence of the Spirit of God. Perhaps it would be more correct to say, that they regard regeneration as the commencement of a change, the progress of which they style sanctification, by which the old nature is gradually transformed into a holy nature." P. 342, 343: "We conclude at present with a comprehensive statement of the truth regarding regeneration itself, with which some of our readers are already familiar. It is a new birth, the imparting of a

new life, the implantation of a new nature, the formation of a new man. The old nature remains in all its distinctness; and the new nature is introduced in all its distinctness. This new nature has its own desires, its own habits, its own tendencies, its own affections. All these are spiritual, heavenly, divine. Its aspirations are all upward. It is ever breathing after the heavenly source from which it emanated. Regeneration is to the soul what the birth of Isaac was to the household of Abraham. Ishmael remained the same Ishmael; but Isaac was introduced," etc. Let the reader note the last sentences. On p. 80, we find these dangerous words: "Be warned that the old nature is unchanged. The hope of transforming that into holiness is vain as the dream of a philosopher's stone, which was to change the dross of earth into gold. . . . On the other hand, never be discouraged by any new proof that *that* which is born of the flesh is flesh. It is there; but it is condemned and crucified with its affections and lusts. Reckon it so, and that therefore you are no longer to serve it. It is just as true that *that* which is born of the Spirit is spirit, and remains uncontaminated by *that* with which it maintains a ceaseless conflict." Similar assertions are made in Waymarks, Vol. V., pp. 29, 37, etc., and 302. In the last of these we find these remarkable words: "Thus two men there are in the Christian: so hath he evil; and so he hath not evil. If therefore he purge out the evil, it is his new man purging out his old man. Now these two men, within the control of the personality of the Christian, are real men, having each his own will, his own energy, and his own enjoyment. No one can read the 7th chapter of Romans, and not see that this is true," etc. One is strongly reminded here, of that which M. Bungener relates of Louis XIV., that this licentious and despotic king was wont to console himself for living a life of open adultery and cruelty, while devoutly practicing all the popish rites, by singing, with great unction, a Romish hymn beginning—

"J'ai deux hommes en moi," etc.

And one might ask, at least plausibly, if the Christian contains two men, and the evil one lives in full force until death, is he

very sure that *he* will come off safely when God proceeds to destroy the old man? A story is told of an emperor of Germany, who bitterly rebuked a great episcopal feudatory for his violences, so inconsistent with his sacred character. The lord bishop answered, that he represented two men in one, being both clergyman and baron; and that the military acts complained of were done in his secular character as a feudal baron. "Well, then," replied the Emperor, "bethink thee how the clergyman will fare, when the devil is roasting the baron for his rapine and murder." The application is fair. But more seriously, we remark: 1st. That these professed *literalists* should at least have been brought to a stand by the fact, that their favorite language concerning the nature of regeneration is no where found in the New Testament. This is especially just against them; because they boast so much in their consistent literalism, and taunt us with abusing the words of Scripture. Well, we challenge them to produce a text from the New Testament, where it is said that regeneration is the implantation of a "new *nature*" beside the old; or that the renewed man has two hostile "*natures*," or any such language. Does St. Paul say, Rom. vii. 23: "But I see another *law* in my members, warring against the law of my mind"? And in Gal. v. 17: "For the *flesh* lusteth against the *Spirit*, and the *Spirit* against the *flesh*"? Very true. He teaches that the renewed man (one man and one nature still) is imperfect; having two principles of volition mixed in the motives even of the same acts; but he does not teach that he has become "two men," or has "two natures" in him. Paul's idea is, that man's one nature, originally wholly sinful, is by regeneration made imperfectly holy, but progressively so. And what is that *Spirit* which in Gal. v. 17, lusteth against the flesh? Suppose we say it is the *Holy Ghost*? So interprets Calvin; and so reads Paul's context, verses 16 and 18. Where now is the argument? And it is a mischievous perversion to represent the apostle as holding forth the fruits of the Spirit and the works of the flesh (verses 19 to 23) as permanently combined during life in one Christian; when it is the very purpose of the apostle to point to these contrasted works and fruits as tests to distinguish Christians from

reprobates. See verse 24th for indisputable proof of this scope. And let us bring to the test of Scripture the doctrine which the Plymouth theologians intend by the proposition, "The old nature is unchanged" in regeneration and sanctification. For our part, we have to confess, in the simplicity of our minds, that if this is not what is changed, we know not what it can be. We, in all our reading of the Bible, thought that this was precisely what God intended to teach us; that the very object of these graces was to renew the old, carnal nature. When we read, Col. i. 21, 22: "You, that were sometime alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled . . . to present you holy," etc.; it seemed very plain to us that the nature that was alienated, etc., was the old nature. But this is what is made holy. So in Eph. iv. 23, in the midst of the very passage they pervert: "And be ye renewed in the spirit of your mind." See also Eph. ii. 1 or 5. What is it that is quickened? That which was dead in sins. So in verses 10 and 11: "*We*" (like the Gentiles in the flesh) "are created in Christ Jesus unto good works," etc. 1 Cor. vi. 11: "Such were some of you; but *ye* are washed, but *ye* are sanctified," etc. But why multiply texts so familiar? Will they return to the charge with the plea, that these texts say, indeed, the sinful *man* is renewed; but that they do not say the *old nature* is renewed? Very true; for the Bible-language is always more accurate. But note: the Bible is still farther from saying that the renewed man has two "*natures*." For then he would be two men, unless every conversion is a miracle of hypostatic union, like Christ's incarnation. But the Bible clearly teaches that the carnal man is renewed *as to his moral nature*, if the word may be used in the unbiblical sense of the Plymouth writers. But of this more anon.

2. This theory flies flatly in the face of the Scriptures, both when it denies the idea of progressive sanctification, and when it rebukes the believer for finding comfort of hope in the evidences of such progress. On both points the Bible speaks exactly the opposite. We will not swell our pages by writing out all these passages, but beg the reader to examine such familiar passages as Heb. vi. 1; Eph. iv. 11, 12, 13, 15, 16; 2 Peter i. 5-10; 1

Peter ii. 2; 2 Peter iii. 18; 2 Thess. i. 3; Phil. iii. 14; 2 Cor. iii. 18; vii. 1; 1 Thess. v. 23; Acts xx. 32, ("The word of his grace . . . able to *build you up*"); Eph. i. 13, 14; 2 Cor. i. 22; v. 5. Shall it be said that all these are misunderstood by us ordinary Christians, and that the seeming support of progressive sanctification is due only to a various reading or a mistranslation? Here may be added all those images of Scripture by which the saint is compared to living and growing things—as a vine, a fruit tree, a plant of corn, a living body, an infant. Is not the rhetoric of the Scripture just? Then we must suppose that these images are selected as instructive, partly because of this very trait that growth is their attribute.

3. The best symbols of the Reformed churches expressly contradict this Plymouth theology. Westminster Confession, Ch. XIII.: "They who are effectually called are regenerated, having a new heart and a new spirit created in them, are *farther sanctified*, really and personally, through the virtues of Christ's resurrection, by his word and Spirit dwelling in them: the dominion of the whole body of sin is destroyed, and the several lusts thereof are *more and more weakened and mortified*, and they *more and more quickened and strengthened*, in all saving graces," etc. Ch. XVIII.: Assurance is "founded upon the *inward evidences of those graces* unto which the promises are made," etc., etc. And this assurance, section 4, may be "shaken, diminished, and *intermitted*, . . . by *falling into some special sin*," etc.

Thirty-nine Articles (Anglican Ch.), 12th: "Good works are pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, and do spring out necessarily of a true and lively faith; insomuch that by them a true and lively" (living) "faith may be as evidently known, as a tree discerned by the fruit."

4. This feature of the Plymouth theology is formed on a false psychology, equally at war with the Scriptures and common sense, and as dangerous as it is erroneous. It discards the idea of progressive sanctification, teaching that the "new nature," being the work of a perfect God, is as perfect from conversion as its author, only its action outwards is obscured by the counter-action of the incurable old nature, somewhat as a lamp burning

perfectly well might seem dim, because enclosed in a lantern of foul or besmeared glass. Now, on this we remark, that a newborn infant is the handiwork of a perfect Creator; but for all that, its body is not that of a perfect man, but is constructed to grow to perfection. Again, it is contrary to common sense to say that human holiness does not really grow; because all qualities of man, the mutable creature, must grow. Depravity grows (2 Tim. iii. 13) in sinners. So we must expect holiness to grow in saints. (Prov. iv. 18.) The laws of human nature, as ordained by the same God who sanctifies us, explain and necessitate the fact. Habits grow by exercise. Faculties strengthen by use. Affections become more dominant by their own action. Even the pagan Horace understood this. (*Crescentem sequitur cura pecuniam, majorumque fames.*) Hence, if sanctification is not usually progressive, the man in a state of grace must have ceased to be a reasonable creature, with affections, understanding and will developing according to the law of habit in his rational nature.

But worse than this, the theory we combat is a vicious *dualism*, as full of danger as the Gnosticism of the second century, from which indeed it might very well have been borrowed. We have read this "Witness" theology, saying expressly, that "these two men within the control of the personality of the Christian, are real men, having each his own will, his own energy, and his own enjoyment." Did not this writer indulge too much contempt for the philosophy accepted among sound divines, to know the real drift of the language he was using, he would at least be aware that they must understand him as giving to this old or fleshly "man" in the Christian full personality. He makes him a separate, individual agent. For how is distinct personality defined, if not by separate will and energy? But this is too gross; it contradicts every consciousness of every Christian, even the most unlearned; for just so surely as he has one consciousness, he knows that he is one indivisible personality, and that he is one agent and has *only one will*, swayed indeed by mixed and diverse motives. But even in its mildest form this doctrine is *realistic*, and gives actual entity (not to say personality) to the carnal and the renewed natures, as distinguished from each and

every person whom these natures may qualify. Now what is this but the exploded philosophy of the schoolmen? Thus we have these most righteous and zealous denouncers of philosophy reinventing a merely human philosophy, and the falsest of all for the purpose of bending Scripture to their theories. What is a "nature?" Common sense answers, with sound philosophy, it is that aggregate of permanent characteristic attributes (that *essentia*) with which the man was *natus*. Now, in strictest speech, man's *nature* is never changed, either by the fall or by redemption; for if it were he would no longer be a *man*—he would become another animal, with a different *essentia* from that which made him a man. But there is a popular use (not found in the Bible use of the word *φύσις*) of the word "*nature*," and more frequently of the phrase "*moral nature*," which is neither a strict nor a philosophical use. But let that pass. Men mean by it the moral *habitus* or *disposition* which permanently qualifies the active powers of the soul for good or evil. Now this *habitus* is not a personality, it is not a separate entity, as abstracted from each person whom it qualifies, it is but an abstraction. Except it be a *quality of a person*, it is a mere idea. How far wrong, then, are they who assert that in an imperfect and mixed character the "two natures are two real men"?

Further. While the power which regenerates and sanctifies must ever be partly incomprehensible to us, the comprehension of the effect is so far easy, that the new birth *reverses* the moral *habitus* of the believer's will, prevalently, but not at first absolutely; and that the work of progressive sanctification carries on this change, thus omnipotently begun, towards that absolute completeness which we must possess on entering heaven. In the carnal state, the *habitus* of the sinner's will is absolutely and exclusively godless. In the regenerate state, it is prevalently but not completely godly. In the glorified state, it is absolutely and exclusively godly. This statement implies that the believer's motives, in the militant state, are complex; and that while the subjective motives usually dominant are godly, yet there is a mixture of carnal motives, no longer dominant but not annihilated, which carnal motives enter as part cause even into the

renewed soul's holy volitions. And this complex of subjective motives, of which one part may be morally diverse from another, may result in a single act of volition—the volition strictly *one*, while the motives prompting it are mingled. Thus it is that an act may be (as Calvinism and the Bible teach) formally right in shape and prevalently right in intention, and yet not perfectly holy before God. And here is the explanation of that strife between the “law of the mind and the law in our members,” of which every Christian is conscious, and which the apostle points in the 7th of Romans. Now in this prevalently sanctified, but imperfect character, there is a sense in which we may say the carnality and the godliness are complementary the one to the other. As sanctification eliminates the former, the latter extends. Or to speak more accurately, the extension of the principles of godliness is the corresponding exclusion of the principles of carnality, just as spreading light is the gradual removal of darkness, its opposite. A safe Bible similitude. Acts xxvi. 18.

Hence the reader may see how false and dangerous, both practically and scripturally, is the view given by this “Witness” theology of indwelling sin, and of the influence it ought to have on the Christian's hope and comfort. To us it seems clear that this new doctrine virtually represents matters thus: Neither regeneration nor sanctification change or weaken the carnal “nature” at all. It cannot be modified or improved. The believer must make his account to have it act in him to the end with undiminished force, or even to have it enhanced in activity by collision with the “new nature.” Hence the presence, and even flagrancy of indwelling sin, need suggest no doubts whatever whether his faith is a living one. Who can fail to see that there is terrible danger here of carnal security in sin? The darker danger, only less probable than this other, is, that the professed believer shall be taught to deny his responsibility wholly for the sins committed by this “old man,” who is “*a real man*,” with a “separate will and energy” from the “new man.” We know nothing in the Antinomianism of the “Fifth Monarchy Men” more alarming than this. The doctrine is positively false. The “old man” cannot continue unmodified in the

presence of the "new man;" because the one principle is the opposite and is exclusive of the other. To die unto sin *is* to live unto righteousness. The increment of light *is* the diminution of darkness. The waxing of the "new man" is the waning of the "old man." Hence, (and this is the Bible view,) if any professed believer has the "old man" as strong and lively as ever, it is proof positive that the "new man" has never entered at all; his faith is vain; he is yet in his sins. James ii. 22, etc. And if any professed believer finds the old carnal principle reviving, it is proof positive that his spiritual life is proportionally going backward at that time; just to the extent the recession goes, has he scriptural ground to fear that his faith is (and always was) dead.

We find in the "Waymarks" this sophistical plea against the necessity of progressive sanctification: that some Christians, dying very soon after conversion, must, according to our own showing, have gone to heaven without this gradual process of preparation. The fact we of course grant. God, by his distinguishing favor, perfects in an hour in their souls that purification which in others he carries gradually towards completion by the experiences, trials, and efforts of years. It is certainly as true of those who die young, as of any, "Without holiness, no man shall see the Lord." But there is another reason why, for those who do not die immediately after conversion, progressive sanctification is still imperative. The principle of holiness, if genuine, is incapable of tolerating indwelling sin in peace. The struggle is inevitable in a true Christian; and as "He that is with us is more than he that is against us," gradual conquests at least over indwelling sin are the general rule of every genuine Christian life. Among the texts which seem to favor this dualistic view, none is claimed with more confidence than Eph. iv. 22-24, which speaks of "putting off the old man," and "putting on the new man." We note this as a specimen of the manner in which Scripture is overstrained, and an example of the way in which it may be cleared of these extravagances. One can hardly deny that, in this well known passage, it is the most natural interpretation to regard the putting off of the old as *in*

VOL. XXIII., NO. 1.—3.

order to the putting on of the new; then the two are not coëxistent, but successive. But more decisively: Who is the old man; and who is the new? The obvious parallel in 1 Cor. xv. 22, and 45 to 49, shows that the "old man" is Adam, and the new man is Christ. The statement which we have to expound is then substantially this: that believers have "put off" Adam in order to "put on" Christ. That is, they have severed their connexion with the first federal head, in order to enter into a connexion with the second federal head. True, the moral, rather than the forensic, effects of the two covenants are here in view of the apostle's mind. We forsake Adam's "conversation, corrupt according to the deceitful lusts," and adopt Christ's conversation, who was "created after God in righteousness and true holiness," thus sharing the same new creation. But, says the apostle, (1 Cor. xv.,) "Howbeit, that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural: *and afterwards that which is spiritual.*" How very far is all this from teaching us, that depravity remains after the new birth a "*real man,*" unchanged, coëxistent with a new, holy nature superadded thereto, which is also a "real man"?

We may group under this head several errors and conceits touching the believer's practical life which require exposure. In the Notes on Genesis, p. 17, etc., a doctrine is taught against the authority of the Christian Sabbath, which seems to be virtually the same with that which has plagued and blighted the Lutheran, and some of the Reformed communions of Europe. The anonymous writer there asserts, on grounds largely allegorical and fanciful, that the Sabbath is forever abolished by the new dispensation; that the nature of this dispensation is such, it is impossible that a Sabbath could longer be binding on believers; that therefore the Lord's-day, the first day of the week, should never be termed the Christian Sabbath;" and that it should be observed as a Lord's-day, not from any preceptive obligation of the moral law, but on grounds of appropriateness and thankfulness only, as the commemoration of the joyful resurrection. The suitable mode of observance of the Lord's-day of course is not Sabbatical, and not strict. Christians are only

bound to celebrate worship, and make it a day of praise and religious joy. We direct attention to this error, not for the purpose of opening up this extensive discussion, but of remarking the tendencies of this revived heresy. We see not how any Presbyterian can countenance it, in the face of the 21st Chap., Sec. 7, 8, of his Confession, Chap. I. of his Directory, and the 116th Qu. of his Larger Catechism. In these places, we are expressly taught that the Sabbatical obligation of the Decalogue is perpetual under all dispensations; that the Lord's-day has become, by divine appointment, "the Christian Sabbath," and that it is to be sanctified as such.

Another conceit of this system is, to teach us that believers ought not to pray for the Holy Ghost, because, if they are believers, he dwells in them already; and that they ought not to pray for the pardon of sins, because, if they are believers, their sins are already pardoned. Thus, Waymarks, Vol. VI., p. 78, 79: "Prayers for a pentecostal outpouring of the Spirit may indeed only be a mistaken and unhappy form of words into which men may have fallen from imitation, while they mean nothing so unscriptural as their words imply; and the same may be said of other forms of expression which are painfully current. But making all allowance for this, it is not conceivable that a man should plead with God that he would send the Spirit, or entreat the Spirit to come, or that he should complain of the withdrawal of the Spirit, if he were consciously worshipping God in the Spirit, if he were believingly praying in the Spirit, and if in all service and testimony he were actually waiting upon the Spirit of God for guidance and power." See also, Tract, "*The Abiding Comforter*," J. Inglis & Co.

The first suggestion which comes into the mind in reply to these astonishing sentences is, What will the writer do with these texts, in which the Bible represents believers as praying for the Spirit and for forgiveness? Psalm li. 11, 12: "Cast me not away from thy presence, and take not thy Holy Spirit from me; restore unto me the joy of thy salvation, and uphold me with thy free Spirit." Eph. i. 17, Paul prays God to give the believing Ephesians "the Spirit of wisdom and revelation."

2 Cor. xiii. 14: "The communion of the Holy Ghost be with you all." Psalm xxv. 11: "For thy name's sake pardon mine iniquity, for it is great." Matt. vi. 12: "Forgive us our debts, as we also forgive our debtors." But as to the sophism by which these anti-scriptural rules are supported we would ask: Did the "Witness" theologians never hear of that principle enunciated by the Saviour? "He that hath, to him shall be given, that he may have more abundantly." And can they not understand that the new-born soul is so actuated by grace, as to respond in its breathings to this principle? Surely they have forgotten, that faith not only begins, but continues the new life; and that the practical union of the believer with his Head, is maintained by continually reënacting those applications to Christ in which the life began. It is Christ himself who tells us to "do our first works." Nor do we find in the Scriptures, that the assurance God designed to bestow a gift repressed the Spirit of prayer—it rather stimulated it. Thus Daniel tells us, (ix. 2 and 3,) that when he understood from Jeremiah's books, that seventy years were appointed to accomplish the desolations of Jerusalem, "he set his face unto the Lord God, to seek by prayer and supplications" the very restoration predicted. The petitions of God's people are not an attempt to get what is contrary to his purpose; they are the responses of faith leaping forth to meet that purpose in its gracious bestowals upon them.

In conclusion of this head, the reader may see a curious evidence of the extreme to which these teachers are willing to follow their crotchets, in the "Waymarks," Vol. V., p. 37, etc. Such is their zeal to dissociate faith from its scriptural fruits, they there gravely argue that Simon Magus was a regenerate and saved man, because it is said he "believed" and "was baptized." What if he immediately betrayed the mercenary nature of his principles by endeavoring to make merchandise of the Holy Ghost? What if the Apostle Peter devoted him and his money to "perish" together? What if he declared Simon yet "in the gall of bitterness and the bond of iniquity?" All this overwhelming evidence must be explained away; and Simon must be held a redeemed man, rather than accept the obvious explana-

tions of the statement, "Simon also believed," which have satisfied all sober students of the Bible either that a temporary faith is imputed to him, or that the historian only intends to be understood as stating what he professed. What is the motive of such an exegetical freak? We can imagine none but this—a desire to sustain their exaggerated and one-sided doctrine of assurance, by a Bible instance of a true saving faith without any fruits. But this is the very thing which the Apostle James condemns.

III. The theory of prayer advocated by the Rev. Geo. Müller, of Bristol, England, connects itself with the theories of the Plymouth Brethren by at least a few points. This German minister was, if we mistake not, once in full sympathy with them, and continues to hold most of their peculiarities. In the "Waymarks," Vol. I., p. 3, 35, etc., we find an unqualified commendation of his work, and the theory upon which it is built; and the only objection made against the American editions of his "Life of Trust," which is hinted, is, that they suppress the ardent attachment to the Pre-Adventist doctrine, which it is said was the chief stimulus of Müller's zeal in his orphan-work. And in the "Word to Young Believers," p. 67, the same overweening theory of trust seems to be expressly inculcated. The author is commenting on a special revelation which God made to Samuel, in the course of his peculiar prophetic privilege, by which he was made to recognise Saul as the intended king. And as though all Christians might aspire to be literal prophets, he concludes: "Beloved, if we walked in communion with God, waiting on him for guidance, we should always know when to act, and never would we make mistakes." But it should be said, in justice, that these writers in other places dissent from a part of the objectionable theory of our warrant for trust; and especially would we mention in the "Waymarks," etc., Vol. I., p. 42, a paper entitled, "The Prayer which God is Pledged to Answer," which contains many things very praiseworthy.

There have long been Christians who, on the apparent absoluteness of such promises as Matt. vii. 7; Mark xi. 24, found the following theory of prayer: That the only reason any prayer

of a believer, actuated in the main by pious motives, is not specifically and infallibly answered, is, that it is not offered in faith; and that wherever such a one *fully believes* that he will receive what he asks, he shall literally receive it without fail. Such prayer it was the fashion to dignify with the title of "Prayer of Faith." Müller's Life of Trust discloses a theory which involves the seminal error of this. He tells us in his surprising narrative, that he resolved to form an orphan house (among other enterprises of piety), which he subsequently enlarged, until it contains two thousand orphans, and has expended largely over a million of dollars. According to his express determination, it has never had a penny of endowment; nor has any human means been employed, according to him, for collecting donations to it. He has not even permitted the wants of the institution to be made known outside of its doors, when they were most urgent. The sole means has been prayer; he has simply asked God in secret for the money which his projects required. He tells us that the result has been, that while the enterprise was often in sore straits, and reduced to its last shilling, especially in its earlier years, it never actually suffered for money. And the motive which he professes was, that the success of this great charity might be to all men an ocular evidence that "God is a Living God," who does truly watch over his people and sustain them. He has also refused to employ any human means for providing a salary for himself as minister, and to lay by any provision whatever for his own wants or his family's; yet God has always sent him enough for subsistence. Many Christian readers evidently regard the remarkable success of Müller's enterprises as demonstration of his theory of trust. They argue: He has used absolutely no agency, invoked no causation whatever to influence any creature or second cause; whence it must follow that the whole work is God's direct answer to his prayers.

Now, in dissenting from this theory of trust, we wish to make cordially all the admissions which are his due. If the statements made of this wonderful charity are correct, (and we know of no testimony to refute them,) then no one can refuse his admiration to the founder's philanthropy, disinterestedness, and

executive talent. Nor would we intimate that he is in his religious character a mere fanatic. We have no doubt that he is a man of great Christian excellence, sincerity, faith, and devotion. We can go farther and say, that it would be a happy thing for the Church, and for individual believers, if they had more of the simple trust in God's faithfulness which seems to inspire him. If, like him, they were readier to "devise liberal things" from truly godly motives, they would more often find that "by liberal things they should stand." God would no doubt often honor such zeal and confidence, for his own glory, and in love to his children. Nor do we for a moment suppose that this enterprise of Müller has reached its present state without the permission, favor, and superintendence of a particular providence.

But when it is argued that the result proves God's approval of the founder's theology in every particular, because no second cause has been employed by him, nothing but secret prayer to God for what the project required, we beg leave to demur. Müller did not employ the usual machinery of collecting agents, charity sermons, and newspaper appeals; but he has employed a set of means most adroitly adapted to the temper of British Christians, and (whether with intentional cunning or not) better calculated to influence the *natural principles* of such a people than all the machinery above mentioned. He tells us that he did not make known to the public his wants, and was so scrupulous that, even when without a shilling, he declined to answer questions as to the wants of the orphan cause. *But he usually published an annual report*, which was circulated over England, and even in the Continent, mentioning every donation in such a way as to satisfy the interest of the anonymous donor at least; detailing with great particularity what had been done, and his purposes for the future; as well as publishing very carefully the remarkable and exciting features of his plan. Let the reader realise how he would be interested by the sight of such an institution, and of a great company of tidy orphans thus provided for; by the appearance of the strange, saintly founder, and the display of rare, of almost miraculous faith; and by the eager *encomiums* of the admiring widows, who as nurses and teachers,

had profited by Mr. Müller's success. We may be sure, that if the reverend man refrains from uttering his own praises, *these* do not fail to trumpet them to the multitudes of good sight-seers, whom curiosity or philanthropy draws to the Asylum. When the appearance of self-abnegation, and the romance of all this are considered, it is very plain that it has more wordly wisdom, as a means for drawing money, in Müller's unique case, than all the drummers who could be hired. It must be remembered that Mr. M. has this field to himself as yet. Let us suppose that it had become the ordinary plan of all the religious agencies in Great Britain, does any sensible person suppose that it would succeed thus with all? Obviously, with the loss of its singularity, the larger part of the romance would be lost, and with it the most of its efficiency.

It is doubtless true also (to Mr. Müller's credit), that his success may be, to a certain extent, accounted for by his own executive talent and purity of character. He is evidently, with all his enthusiasm, a very shrewd and practical person, a capital economist of time and money, a sharp judge of human nature, an indomitable worker, and endowed highly with the talent of command. His enthusiasm is itself a power. And many a ten-pound note has been drawn from the thrifty British Dissenters by the snug, commercial consideration, that Mr. Müller was *the man* to make it go the farthest in the subsistence of an orphan. His success is, therefore, not wholly unaccountable on natural principles, however dependent on Providence.

We now proceed to analyse the overweening theory of the warrant for prayer above described, without imputing to Mr. Müller, or to the Plymouth Brethren, all its errors. We do so, because we shall thus see best how their peculiar error is connected with the truth. We hold, then, that there is of course an implied limitation in the seemingly general promise of answer to prayer. This limitation is stated with perfect accuracy in 1 John v. 14: "If we ask anything according to God's will, he heareth us." To the question, How we may determine which are the things according to his will? We reply: *It is known*, if at all, *by the Scriptures alone*. We distinctly repudiate the

theory, that these things may also be certainly determined by our own frames in praying, or by any anticipative speculations on providences. (Events actually effected are of course revelations of God's providential will, so far as they themselves or their uniform and necessary effects go.) Now the Scriptures divide the objects for which a good man may pray into two great classes: temporal good things, ordinarily desirable, but not universally declared to be for man's ultimate, highest good; and the spiritual good things pertaining to redemption. To the former class belong such objects as health of body, restoration out of sickness, competent subsistence, fruitful seasons, prosperity, peace, etc. To the latter class belong the pardon of sin, adoption, sanctification, strength for duty obligatory on us, and such like. Now, of the latter class the Scriptures speak expressly, that it is according to God's will always to bestow them on believing petitioners. Let the reader see, for instance, such declarations as John vi. 37; 1 Thess. iv. 3; Luke xi. 13; Psalm lxxxiv. 11; James i. 5. There may be what we suppose delay; or the channels of the blessings may be unexpected; but with these exceptions, we believe that the soul which seeks this class of gifts in Christ is warranted to expect his answer with all the literal certainty claimed by the strongest advocate of the "prayer of faith." But as to the other class, we have no such guarantee. God has not expressly informed us that it is "according to his will" to give them in each specific case; nor does he intend that we shall, by any other sign, always know it. For while these secular objects are innocent in themselves, and naturally desirable, (and therefore properly asked and sought,) God has not informed us when they may become, on the whole, practical evils to the soul. He reserves to his superior wisdom the power of refusing them in such cases, even to the truest saint. Does the opponent reply: "Then there is a class of objects for which we are to pray in uncertainty? How can this consist with *faith*, which is the soul of true prayer?" We reply: Exactly so. In our view, the Scriptures are full of just such prayers. It is only to these extremists that there appears any solecism in praying in an uncertainty of a specific answer. For

the sober believer knows, that in any event he has this specific promise, that, whether the petition be granted or withheld, all shall "work together for his good." And this is enough for a submissive faith.

To proceed now to direct refutation, our first objection to the theory before us, is, that it calls its unwarranted petitions "prayers of faith;" but unless there is a warrant, there is no basis for faith. Have we a warrant *set down in the Scriptures*, for demanding of God explicitly the raising up of a valued ministerial comrade off a dying bed—as Luther is said to have done in the case of Melancthon? For explicitly claiming of God, that he shall make his people put their hands in their pockets and give us all the money for rescuing two thousand little negroes from the temporal and eternal ruin to which Yankee philanthropy (?) has consigned them? For curing us of the rheumatism or the fever? We trow not! But if we unwarrantably work ourselves into a persuasion that we have such a pledge, this is not faith—it is . . . *presumption!* It is in its nature not honorable to God, but dishonorable. It is not amiably and humbly pious, but wilful and arrogant. God is very forbearing with his wayward children. He may even answer such improper petitions, sometimes passing over their arrogance to bless their zeal and disinterestedness for the sake of his dear Son. But this is far from proving that he sanctions the theory.

2. The actual experience of the best believers in our day refutes the theory; for they often and earnestly deprecate temporal evils, or seek innocent goods, which are not warded off or bestowed according to their prayers. Shall all the Christian widows and parents who interceded in agony, yet in submission, beside the bed-sides of sick husbands and children, be told that those prayers were graceless, because their loved ones died? Away with the cruel arrogance!

3. We have a surer proof in the actual experience of Bible saints, whom we know to have prayed graciously. Of David (2 Samuel xii. 16–19) praying for the life of his infant, which did not live; of Paul (2 Cor. xii. 8–10) praying for the removal of his thorn in the flesh, which was not removed; and, above

all, the venerable and hallowed instance of our Redeemer, who prayed, "being in an agony," "If it be possible, let this cup pass from me," and yet drank it to the dregs. Truly, it is "enough for the servant to be as his Lord"!

4. The Bible doctrine of affliction refutes this theory. "God scourgeth every son whom he receiveth." Surely he does not always do this by tearing away *sinful* objects claimed by the saints; it is not the characteristic of saints to demand sinful joys of their God. No, he usually chastises by taking away legitimate joys. But unless the privation were felt by the victim, it would not be chastisement. The rod which does not *smart* gives no correction to the child. But in the approach of this privation the Christian is an active free agent. The possession being legitimate and dear, he will of course exercise his Christian privilege of interceding for it. Hence, were this theory true, God's hand holding the rod would be uniformly arrested; the true believer could never meet chastisement.

5. We may know, *a priori*, that God would not commit himself to any such theory of prayer, because the effect of it would be to deprive his children of the benefit of his own omniscience. Whenever a Christian came to him, in a filial and trusting spirit, asking for a thing not positively illegitimate, God's hands would be tied. He would be compelled by his engagement to give it, though he saw it was on the whole injurious. For the reader must note, the possession of a filial, trusting spirit does not by any means make all good people infallible in judgment. Witness the vagaries of the good brethren under discussion! Now, do prudent human parents make such rash promises to even amiable children? Still less will our heavenly Father.

But from this conclusive demonstration our brethren have an evasion. They refer us to such Scriptures as Rom. viii. 26, 27, teaching us that believing, pious, filial petitions, are such as are suggested by the Holy Ghost. But this Holy Ghost has the same omniscience and covenant love with the Father and Son. So that the contingency supposed can never happen—namely, that of a desire, filial, believing, and pious, and yet mischievous. They argue, moreover, that the believer may know infallibly

when he has an object before his heart which the Holy Spirit prompts him to seek, by the character of his emotions. If, say they, the desire is very strong and abiding, returning after many postponements—if the conscious motives are godly, when tried by a faithful search of the heart—if the temper of the soul, while thus exercised, is amiable and filial towards God—it is supposed that by these signs the saint may know that the omniscient Spirit, whose will is in absolute harmony with the Father's, has set him upon this petition; and so, he is sure to get it.

Now, it is at this place that the theory of prayer prevalent with the Plymouth Brethren connects itself with the scheme under discussion. Just such are their speculations. We shall not of course deny that accepted prayer is prompted by the infallible Spirit. Nor shall we deny, that such experiences in praying, as are above described, give comfortable evidence of a gracious state. (This is just the theory of the grounds of assurance which we assert, and the "Witness" theology impugns!) Nor that they even raise some probable grounds of hope as to the specific answer. But from these premises the desired result does not follow. First, because no Christian can certainly discriminate in his consciousness, in advance of the event, those desires or affections which a nature *generally* sanctified prompts of itself, and those which the Holy Spirit himself prompts. That this is so, every honest Christian must admit from his own experience. That it must be so, is certain from this law, that the Holy Spirit, as our Paraclete, does not act *across*, but *with*, our normal faculties of right feeling and judgment. He does not supersede, but rectifies, enlightens, and employs the natural faculties of understanding, will, and affection. Hence the most distinctly gracious action of soul must wear a perfect *naturalness* to the saint's own consciousness, as to its normal rise and exercise, as *his action*. Only "by their fruits shall ye know them." For instance: this *persistence of desire*, which is advanced as proof that the Holy Ghost is suggesting the object, how is the good man to know infallibly that it is not the mere result of the natural trait, a determined will which grace has not destroyed, but only curbed? This conscious *disinterestedness of motive* may not infallibly be

from the present, specific acting of the Spirit; for carnal men have done disinterested things. This *amiability* of frame may be as much from human love, as from divine. And *what degree* of these indefinite measures of desire or feeling shall amount to proof? But second, it does not follow from such gracious frames that God intends to give the specific gift, because in the Bible his Spirit has several times *given the frames and withheld the gifts*. Paul doubtless prayed for the removal of his "thorn," with just such frames; but it was not removed. We have a more sacred instance in the prayer of Gethsemane. Does one ask, how can God consistently communicate such frames to the petitioner, when he does not intend to grant the petition? We answer, it may very well be that *he communicates them to prepare his saint to profit by the refusal*. Vide 2 Cor. xii. 10. And these are the grounds which sustain us in saying, that so far as the believer can certainly know what petitions are "according to God's will," he learns it from the written Scriptures alone, and from no anticipative surmises about the "leadings of providence," or the frames of pious feeling observed in himself.

IV. But the *Locus Palmarius* of the Plymouth theology is the pre-millennial advent of Christ. Pre-adventists, though claiming a *literal* scheme of interpretation for the unfulfilled prophecies, differ much among themselves. But the Plymouth theologians in America appear to agree in the doctrine of two resurrections, separated by the *millennium*: the first of the elect dead, with the change of saints then living; the second coming of Christ (as in Acts i. 2), at the former date; the destruction at that date also of all unbelievers, save elect Israel, who will be converted by the Advent; the personal reign of Christ in Jerusalem, with the risen saints in glorified bodies; the resurrection of the non-elect and general judgment at the end of that reign; and especially the belief that all the prophecies preliminary to Christ's return are now fulfilled, or nearly so, insomuch that every saint should expect to see that Advent in his day, rather than bodily death. This present expectation seems to be made by them the test of a vigorous faith and pious "love for the Lord's appearing."

We do not design, in the end of a discussion already too long, to go into a full refutation, or to establish an opposite scheme of explanation for unfulfilled prophecy. Our remaining purpose is, rather to leave a declaration and dissent in the form of a few statements.

In our view, the Pre-Adventist scheme of exposition is in reality no more *literal* than ours, and it solves no difficulties in the understanding of unfulfilled prophecies, while it raises some insoluble ones. The effects claimed for it, as to edification and experimental faith, are wholly illusory. And it involves some consequences inconsistent with Scripture, and injurious to God's cause. We claim that if the old scheme be completed by this proposition, that this earth regenerated will be, *after the final consummation*, the everlasting home of the Church and her Messiah, (according to 2 Peter iii. 13; Rev. xxi. 1 to 3,) then that plan will have every advantage in reconciling the prophecies claimed for Pre-Adventism, without its difficulties. But,

1. It requires us to do violence to many predictions of events yet to be fulfilled before Christ's return. And it cannot be necessary to the highest edification and "love of the Lord's appearing," for us, in our day, to expect the Advent rather than our death, because Paul, Augustine, Calvin, could not have done so. Had they cherished that hope, time has now stubbornly proved that they would have erred. Was *delusion* then a desirable means of Christian edification?

2. It is unfavorable to a faithful performance of ecclesiastical duties, as witness the disorganising tendencies of the Plymouth Brethren. If no visible Church, however orthodox, is to be Christ's instrument for overthrowing Satan's kingdom here—if Christ is to sweep the best of them away as so much rubbish, along with all "world-powers," at his Advent—if it is our duty to expect and desire this catastrophe daily, who does not see that we shall feel very slight value for ecclesiastical ties and duties? And should we differ unpleasantly from our Church courts, we shall be tempted to feel that it is pious to spurn them. Are we not daily praying for an event which will render them useless lumber? See how the "Waymarks" almost argue this con-

clusion, and confess the lamentable influences upon the usefulness of such men as Malan and the Haldanes, Vol. VIII., p. 7, 8. But has not Christ ordained a visible Church with its officers and duties? How else can it be constituted, than by denominations, misnamed "sects"? If all of ours are too bad to be retained and reformed (even), let the Plymouth Brethren organise a better one and stick to it, as Christ commands.

3. The Pre-Advent scheme disparages the present, the dispensation of the Holy Ghost, and the means committed to the Church for the conversion of sinners. It thus tends to discourage faith and missionary effort. See how, in the Waymarks, Vol. VI., pp. 252, 253, our hopes of further prosperity for the Church are travestied, as though they were mere carnal expectations. Whereas Christ represents the presence of the Holy Ghost, and this his dispensation, as so desirable, that it was expedient for him to go away that the Paraclete might come. John xvi. 7. Pre-Adventism represents it as so undesirable that every saint ought to pray for its immediate abrogation. Incredulity as to the conversion of the world by the "means of grace" is hotly, and even scornfully, inferred from visible results and experiences, in a temper which we confess appears to us the same with that of unbelievers in 2 Peter iii. 4: "Where is the promise of his coming?" etc. They seem to us to "judge the Lord by feeble sense," instead of "trusting him for his grace." It is an essential and cherished idea with them, that to the end the elect are to be a "little flock" among men. The only object they profess for missionary exertions, is to gather out this elect seed from the mass, so as to clear the way for Christ's coming to destroy it. Such expectations are unfavorable to missionary spirit. No man can use the means of grace which he habitually disparages as means for the world's conversion, as heartily as he should. In order to be as zealous where his best expectation is to be to fellow men "a savour of death unto death," the evangelist must be more or less than a man.

4. This scheme is unfavorable to the promise of Israel's ingathering, so clearly stated in prophecy. True, it teaches that Israel will be saved after (immediately after) and by means of

the Advent; but most inconsistently. For first, St. Paul says, they are to come in "with the fulness of the Gentiles; "but Pre-Adventism expects no such fulness. Second, he says they shall be regrafted into "their own olive tree," which is the visible Church. But Pre-Adventism holds that Christ's coming will abolish the visible Church. Third, where shall unbelieving Israel be put during the terrors of the first resurrection and universal fires which are to destroy all other unbelievers? Last, the scheme is unscriptural in expecting Jews to be savingly impressed by outward catastrophes, whom the truth of the word cannot impress. "If they believe not Moses and the prophets, neither would they believe though one went unto them from the dead." Christ's first advent could not convert Israel; why should his second?

The Pre-Advent theory tends to two errors: a sensuous or animal happiness in the millennial state, and a disparagement of the blessedness of Christian souls in their disembodied state. According to that scheme, the latter state is less desirable or blessed than the millennial; for Pre-Adventists insist that we shall hope and pray for an entrance into the *millennium*, far rather than into the disembodied state of the blessed dead. Again, they must admit that the millennial grade is lower than the heavenly state which follows the final judgment; for then the Bride enters into the marriage supper of the Lamb. The millennial state, then, is lower than the heavenly; and the disembodied state lower than the millennial. This last must then be quite low indeed. Thus is explained the tendency seen in many millennarians, as Bickersteth, and the Waymarks, Vol. VIII., p. 152, etc., to depreciate the blessedness of the departed. Some tend to make it an unconscious, or at most, a semi-conscious state. Again, in the heavenly, or highest state, saints are "equal unto the angels, neither marrying nor giving in marriage." But the millennial is an inferior state to this. Therefore it may be surmised that, in it, the saints will marry! The reader should know, that many British Pre-Adventists, at least, boldly avow this, and other sensuous features, to a degree worthy only of an ancient Chiliast.

6. Pre-Adventists usually claim that their expectation of the Lord's coming is peculiarly promotive of spiritual-mindedness, strong faith, and close walking with God. A Christian who had not adopted their scheme, is represented as exclaiming, when it was unfolded, "If I believed so, I must live near my Saviour indeed!" If he did, he exclaimed foolishly. For first, did not God give one and the same system of sanctification to us and to primitive Christians? But these could not have cherished the expectation of seeing the "personal advent" before death; for stubborn facts have proved that it was not less than 1800 years distant. Second, every Christian, even if he is a Pre-Adventist, must know that it is far more probable his body will die before the "advent," than that he will live to see it. All admit that in a few years the body must die. Then the season of repentance will be done; the spiritual state of our souls decided forever, and our spirits reunited to a glorified Redeemer in a better world than this. Now, if there is faith, these certainties contain more wholesome *stimulus* for it, than can possibly be presented in the surmises of any Pre-Adventist theory. The only reason the latter is to any persons more exciting, is the romance attaching to it; the same reason which enabled the false prophet, Miller, to drive multitudes into wild alarm by the dream of approaching judgment, who were unmoved by the sober certainty of approaching death. The hope of us common Christians is to meet our glorified Lord very certainly and very soon (when our bodies die) in the other world. It passes our wits to see how a less certain hope of meeting him in this world (a worse one) can evince more "love for his appearing."

7. We close with the remark, that Pre-Adventism is directly against our Standards. So far as we can now remember, the word *millennium* does not occur in them; and, on the question, whether the whole race of man will be converted in the latter day, they observe a wise silence. But they distinctly teach one resurrection, and the only remaining advent of our Lord at the judgment-day. They utterly ignore the Pre-Adventist's "personal reign of Christ" on earth. See Shorter Catechism, Q. 28th; Confession, Chapter VIII., Sec. 4, ("shall return to judge

men and angels at the end of the world.") Chapter XXXII., Sec. 2; Larger Catechism, Q. 53, 56.

We would humbly submit, then, that the Presbyterian who desires to be a Pre-Adventist, is bound in candor to move for a revision of our Standards on these points.

ARTICLE II.

OUR EDUCATIONAL POLICY.*

A Convention, called under the recommendation of the General Assembly of 1870, met in the city of Huntsville, Alabama, in last May, and spent several days in considering "the whole subject of the educational policy of our Presbyterian Church." There were able men in that body, and the results to which they arrived in their deliberations are worthy of the earnest attention of the entire Church. They are embodied in a report which was adopted, with certain amendments, by the Assembly as its own deliverance on the subject. That report has been issued in the form of a circular letter, and is now before all the churches for their consideration.

That paper does not purport to be a final settlement of the question of the educational policy of our Church. The question is still open for discussion. The report only claims to set forth "certain well established principles which were reached with entire harmony." It was characterised by the Rev. Dr. Wills, the able chairman of the Committee that brought in the report, "as a complete compromise, and as not representing fully the views of a single member of the body." The compromise did not consist in blending together, by mutual concessions, the disharmonious views of different parties, but in the agreement of

*This Review being an open journal upon sundry questions, we cheerfully admit this communication without committing ourselves to the sentiments expressed by the esteemed writer.—Eds. S. P. R.

all parties not to push the subject farther than they could all go together in harmony. The action of the late Assembly only comes up to the point where a divergence of opinion begins; the compromise was the mutual agreement of all parties to pause at that point—for *the present*. The great points at issue in regard to the establishment and control of a central university for “the higher education” were not settled by compromise, or in any other way; they were simply postponed. The paper *truthfully* expresses the views of all parties so far as it goes, but it does not *fully* represent the views of any party, because it does not extend out into the debatable ground. In regard to the question of the proposed university, it was the unanimous judgment of the Assembly, that “our people at large are not prepared to enter at once upon the important enterprise of putting such an institution into immediate operation.” Thus far all parties were agreed. There were those in the Assembly that doubt the desirableness of the proposed university at any future time. They were willing, however, for the Trustees to be authorised to receive and hold in trust any donations that may be given for the cause of a future university. They neither expect nor desire to see the university-scheme come to anything; they were, however, perfectly willing to let the university-men have a fair and safe opportunity to see what they can do. The whole question of the nature of control over said university, in regard to which there is a fundamental difference of opinion in the Church, was postponed to some future Assembly. In view of what the Assembly has done, and also of what it has not done, but specified as work to be done at some future day, it is very clear that our educational policy is not a settled question. The question is still open; and we have a few thoughts on the subject which we wish to place before our brethren for their consideration.

What do we mean by the educational policy of any corporate body? Clearly that system of education which is best adapted to protect and promote the interests of the said corporation. What are the interests of our Presbyterian Church which are to be protected and promoted by its educational policy? They seem to us to be the following:

1. To conserve to our own Church the children of our own families, and to have them thoroughly instructed and indoctrinated in the peculiar principles and practices of Presbyterianism.

2. To augment the aggressive power of our Church, and to increase its influence over the minds and hearts of those now outside of our organisation, to the end that as many of them as possible may be brought under the control of the spirit and principles of Presbyterianism, and ultimately within the pale of our Church.

3. To raise up among ourselves, out of the number of our own children conserved to our communion, and of those brought into it from other families, a body of able ministers of the gospel, who shall be thoroughly imbued with the principles and spirit of our Presbyterianism, and thoroughly prepared, intellectually, morally, and spiritually, to be efficient workmen in the holy ministry.

4. To train up our entire membership, both men and women, in the knowledge and spirit of our doctrines and principles.

5. These vital interests being guarded and protected by our educational policy, a very desirable and most important result will inevitably follow—the educational influence will be both extensively and intensely felt upon the whole country, and eventually upon the entire world.

It will be noticed, that, in this statement of the interests which our educational policy is to protect and promote, we have left out of view the end of education abstractly viewed as education. We have not done so by oversight. Every system of education must have its fundamental design to be the fullest development of man as man. That is the end of education viewed abstractly as education. But that is not the question now under consideration; our question is, What is the best educational policy for a certain corporate body? that is, How can the education of those whom it undertakes to educate be systematised and conducted, so that, while imparting the best education to the individuals in training, the best and highest interest of the corporation as a whole will be subserved? We must carefully distinguish between these two points; the one is the abstract question,

what is the best system of education for the highest development of man as man? the other is, how can that best system of education be administered by a given corporation for the fullest development of its interests as a corporation?

The latter question is the one we have under consideration. On this subject we must take enlarged and liberal views. The eye of the discussion must range far and sweep wide. When the Church comes to legislate on this subject, its legislation will not be for one section nor for one day, but for the whole Church and for all time to come.

We are not called upon to say what is the best educational policy for the State, or for some other Church, or for our Church under different conditions and circumstances; but our question is, What is the best educational policy for our Presbyterian Church considered just as it is in its actual facts and reasonable probabilities? Our policy must be one adapted to meet our educational necessities, and at the same time its expenses must be within the limits of our pecuniary abilities. We want a policy practicable for our work, and possible for our means. A scheme might be consistent with itself, perfect in its theory, beautiful in its conception, grand in its development, and in every way magnificent on paper; and, still, it may have attached to it the fatal difficulty of utter impracticability under our circumstances. We want no Plato to dream out for us an ideal republic, which can never be realised except in the luxurious land of his own rich fancy; nor More to plan for us a Utopia, which can find a location only in some romantic isle of the broad sea of imagination. Any such an educational policy would be as likely to benefit the inhabitants of Neptune as the members of our Presbyterian Church, and far less likely to waste their money and otherwise to do them damage. We want an educational policy, practicable under our circumstances, adapted not only to give to those to be educated a systematic and thorough physical, intellectual, moral, and religious training, but also to exercise an aggressive influence on the outside world, so as to bring into our schools the children of those not decided in their religious tenets, and to raise up among those of our own children conserved to our com-

munion, and others brought into it, an able and efficient ministry, and to train up in our Church an ever increasing membership of men and women who shall be intelligently and earnestly devoted to the principles and interests of our Zion—the grand result of all being the advancement of the intelligence, strength, respectability, purity, and influence of our Presbyterian Church. We would not have our educational policy to be narrow and sectarian; we would have it to be broad, but at the same time strictly and emphatically denominational. We are surrounded by other branches of the Church, some of which do not try to conceal their purpose and earnest efforts to proselyte the children of our communion into their own; others are insidiously and secretly prosecuting with vigor, and in some quarters with alarming success, their efforts at proselytism. This work is done principally through their institutions of learning. Self-preservation is said to be the first law of nature; and ruin and disgrace will, sooner or later, come to that individual or corporation that fails to defend and protect itself when its vital interests are assailed. If those proselyting denominations are better than ours, let us all go over to them *en masse*; if they are not as good as ours, then let us put forth and sustain the most earnest and systematic efforts, not only to retain all our own children, but also to bring under our control and into our communion as many as possible from the outside world. This work of self-protection and denominational advancement, is to be effected mainly through the instrumentality and influence of our institutions of learning.

We now have before us what we conceive to be the great and vital interests which are to be protected and promoted by our educational policy. Will one grand central university meet and accomplish these desirable ends? or, is there some other scheme better adapted to the present necessities and circumstances of our Church? That such a central institution for the “higher learning” as is proposed, if we only had, or could get it, would exert a potent influence in protecting and advancing many of our most important interests, no one can deny. That point has been made out beyond a doubt. When we look at the advan-

tages that would accrue to our Church from such an institution, and shut our eyes to all our other educational necessities, we feel that the Church must have such an institution without any delay, that we cannot afford to do without it, and that every other educational interest must be made second and subsidiary to this scheme. The scheme of this grand university is a taking idea; when it was first suggested by the great Dr. Thornwell in the Convention that met during the meetings of the Assembly in Augusta, we were captivated with it. It rose up in the grandeur of its conception and the magnificence of its proposal, and dazzled our eyes. The only question we then asked was, Is it possible? Shall we live to see it an accomplished fact in our history? For a while we were like those who have been looking into the face of the sun—when we turned our eyes away, we could not see anything else. But after we had gotten somewhat accustomed to the grand conception, we began to inquire about its practicability and utility. We could still see so many important interests that such an institution, if it should even come into existence, will subserve, that we were at first inclined to fall in with the views of the great and good men who are the advocates of the University-scheme as *the* educational policy for our Presbyterian Church; but, as we have advanced with our investigations, we can now see so many of the most vital and important interests of our Church which must be reached by our educational policy, and which can never be touched by this grand university-scheme, that we have begun to look upon the scheme with some degree of disfavor. As preventing us from going over to the side of the university-men, we were met with certain difficulties which we will here state, and upon which we invoke their criticism. Let them be put to the severest test. Let them be put into the crucible of criticism, and subjected to the white heat of debate; if they volatilize and pass away in fumes, it will be well to have them exploded; but, if they are found to be true and deep principles, involving the present necessities and vital interests of the Church, they must not be neglected for remoter possibilities, nor for advantages that are problematical.

1. The first great interest to be subserved by our educational policy, is, the conservation of the children of the Church under its own control, and to its own membership. To reach this end, our educational influence must be brought to bear upon them while they are yet children, and must follow them through all the years in which they are forming their opinions and characters. When the fact comes to be known, it will be found that most of those, who are won over from our Church to other denominations, did not have any Presbyterian opinion or character drilled into them in the early and formative period of their lives. Early youth is the seed-time of life—the period in which our opinions are adopted and characters formed. Religious opinions are the earliest received, and the longest retained. The university, even were it now in existence, would not reach the children and youth of the Church in the formative period of their lives. Very few young men would go the university before they are twenty; and four-fifths of the membership of the Church are converted previous to that age. The young men converted while at schools under the influence of other denominations, would be likely to seek their “higher education” in their institutions. Thus, unless our educational policy should reach the children in their earliest years, they would be turned away from any university we might have for the “higher education.”

We are also to bear in mind the fact, that not more than one young man out of ten in any Church seeks the “higher education.” The university-scheme makes provision for the *one*, and lets the other *nine* go wherever they can find such educational advantages as they want. Through the educational policy of one central institution common to the whole body, our educational influence would be brought to bear only indirectly upon the great masses of the Church. It would be a provision for the few, leaving out the many.

This scheme would expend the educational resources of the Church on the male population, and leave the female portion unprovided for. Just here is where our Church is making a fatal mistake. We give more attention and money to provide educational advantages for our sons than we do for our daughters.

The result has been the loss of many a noble woman to our Church; and for one, we regard the loss to the Church of a highly educated and deeply pious woman as about equal to the loss of an earnest and faithful minister of the gospel. Under our present system of education we do turn out a company of ministers, that, for intelligence and thorough education, are not equalled by the ministry of any other Church in the world; but, notwithstanding this fact, other denominations are growing faster than we are, through the instrumentality and influence of their excellent institutions for female learning. While we let other denominations educate our girls, the natural result will be, that many of them will go over to those denominations; and our educated young men will naturally and properly seek educated young ladies for wives, and many of them will marry some of those young ladies who have gone from us, and then follow them into their adopted churches. Here is a great leak in our communion which ought to be stanchd by a change in our educational policy. We should give as much attention, and spend as much money for the promotion of the thorough and Presbyterian education of our daughters, as for our sons. Through our neglect at this point an artery has been opened at which the Church is bleeding, if not to death, most certainly to weakness. We must stop this drain on our very life-blood.

2. We have seen the total inadequacy of the university-scheme to conserve to our Church our own sons and daughters. Will it constitute the most efficient power in the Church for aggression upon the outside world? Will it attract large numbers to its halls from beyond our own communion, and then turn them out as thoroughly educated Presbyterians? It will not begin to attract any large outside patronage, until it shall have made for itself a famous name. It must become great and famous before it can become aggressive, any more than our colleges are at the present day. That result is far off in the very distant future. If the university should stand alone, it will even then exert a very restricted and limited influence in this line. We have already shown that the religious opinions and characters of youths are formed before they are ready to seek

the "higher education" of the university. It will follow, therefore, that even when men of other churches begin to be attracted to the great university by its high literary and scientific advantages, they will usually go away from it with precisely the same religious beliefs they had when they entered. If we would have our educational policy to reach and influence the children of the outside world, it must be brought to bear upon them while they are yet children. We can only make aggression, and win other children to our communion, in the same way and through the same instrumentalities by which our own children are to be conserved to our own Church. Unless this is done, when they are grown up they will not go to your grand Presbyterian university; or, if a few of them should go, they will come back no more Presbyterians than they were when they entered.

3. We can see many very great advantages that would result to the Church from a central university of the highest grade. It will be a great and very useful thing whenever the Church shall find itself "prepared to enter upon the important enterprise of putting such an institution into operation." Very wisely did the Assembly determine, that the day for entering upon that grand enterprise has not yet come. It may come; and it may come much sooner than many think. What we have now to do is, to lay a broad and deep foundation, and build up to the right place for the university to come in. It will then become a necessity; and, after it once becomes an absolute necessity, it will not be long in becoming an actual fact. We will now briefly develop our scheme for the educational policy of our Presbyterian Church, and show how, we think, the Church should lay its foundation and build up to the university, and then build the grand university on the top of all for what the last Assembly was pleased to style the "higher education," but which henceforth in this essay we will style the "highest education." We would have primary or elementary schools, high schools or academies, higher schools or colleges, and the highest school or university; and we would have these classes and gradations of schools for both the sons and daughters of our Church.

1. There should be in every congregation, or in any number of congregations that could unite their children in one place, a primary school for elementary education in letters, religion, and Presbyterianism; which school should be under the control of the session of the Church, or of the sessions of all the congregations united in it. This control might be exercised directly, but it would be better to have it in the hands of a small and competent Board of Trustees appointed from their own number. The control might be thoroughly Presbyterian without being ecclesiastical. This remark will apply to each one of the schools that we shall hereafter designate. The property might belong to the Presbyterian people, or it might belong to the Presbyterian person who is to teach the school. We think that such a primary school as we have indicated, might be put into operation in every community where we have a church in less time than a month. Let the effort be made. If there is a school in your congregation taught by a suitable Presbyterian, agree with the teacher to give him or her the hearty support of your united patronage, for the privilege of such control as has been indicated. If there is not now in existence in your community a school available for your purpose, let one be organised without delay, and make the best school in the neighborhood. Unite earnestly your patronage upon it, and then it will soon attract outside patronage, and become self-sustaining. In these primary schools we would have the boys and girls together; but, if any congregation thinks differently, let them have two schools.

2. In every Presbytery there should be at least two high schools—academies or grammar schools—one male and the other female. In these schools we would have the branches of learning taught that are usual in schools of similar grade, and such Presbyterian religious instructions and principles imparted as would be adapted to the age of those gathered in them. Each one of the schools should be under the supervision of a small Board of Trustees, all of whom should be clerical or lay communicants of the Presbyterian Church. They should be designated by the Presbytery. In each Presbytery there should be a sufficient number of these high schools, both male and female,

to meet its demands. What we have said about the way in which the primary school might be originated, will, *mutatis mutandis*, apply to these high schools. In one year's time every Presbytery could acquire control over schools now in operation, or put new ones under their control into operation.

3. Every Synod that is strong enough, or a union of adjacent Synods, should have at least two higher schools or colleges for education in the higher branches of literature, arts, and sciences—one male and one female. These higher schools should be first-class colleges, endowed, incorporated, and in every way equipped and furnished to give a thorough and liberal education; and they should be under the control of a small and competent Board of Trustees designated by the Synod or Synods to which said colleges belong.

For our young men we have already in operation a sufficient number of these colleges to meet our present demands. The Assembly did wisely in discouraging their multiplication under our present circumstances, and in recommending those Synods adjacent to such colleges now in operation "to concentrate upon them their interest, their means, their patronage, and their prayers."

We wish that the Assembly could have done more than, simply because it was timely, "speak a word of encouragement to those of our brethren engaged in the education of young ladies." We wish that the Assembly had looked into that subject with some degree of interest and earnestness, and had not passed over it with a mere glance of the eye and a single word. Whenever our Church shall convince the people, that we *as a Church* feel as deep and lively an interest in the education of our young ladies as of young men, then we will be no longer under the necessity of exhorting "our people to send their daughters to institutions where their moral and religious training will be in accordance with the faith of their fathers." Why did not exhortation say, "in accordance with the faith of their *mothers*"? Was it because the Assembly was conscious that, as a Church, we have, in our institutions of learning, made no special arrangements to guard and protect the faith of our daughters? As there was so

little earnest attention given to this point when the present mothers were in their school-going days, perhaps the Assembly did not feel very certain as to what the faith of the mothers of the present day might be. The Church did not look after the faith of the mothers when they were in school. That faith, however, is sound and thoroughly Presbyterian in those mothers that remain with us; but, because the Church has not given the attention to the education of her daughters that the cause demands, many noble women have gone out from us, and are now mothers in other communions, and are raising their children and exerting their influence not "in accordance with the faith of their fathers," because they were not themselves educated in that faith. As a Church, we have been neglectful of this vital interest, and we suffer loss in consequence of the neglect. There are several noble Presbyterian individuals, a few Presbyteries, and two or three Synods, that have thought it worth while to look after the education of daughters, to see that it be conducted under Presbyterian influences. Well, we are glad that the Assembly could afford to let fall from its table a single crumb of "encouragement to those of our brethren engaged in the education of young ladies."

We would see all our colleges put under a uniform system of education, both in their curriculum of study and order of discipline. Let them thus be prepared to become the colleges of the university that is to be. While this preparatory work is being done, let the necessary funds for the grand university be gathered into the place of safety indicated by the Assembly. When the proper time comes, and the Church has gotten ready "to enter upon this important enterprise," then let the university come into existence. Let the university be located at some central point where there shall be one of our colleges for biblical education. In the university there should be schools, each independent of all others, for the highest education in every professional department of learning, art, and science. We have not space to unfold in this paper our idea of what the university should be. It should be a combination of schools for the "highest learning."

Under this arrangement our educational policy would be one system, extending from the parochial schools to the university, and embracing the whole field of education in its broad arms. This policy would penetrate and permeate the whole Church with its presence and influence. The university would then be the grand reservoir, into which there would be streams flowing from every congregation. The primary schools, under control of trustees designated by sessions, would form a multitude of fountain-heads in all parts of our Zion, from which streams would flow into the high schools under the supervision of presbyteries; from these, larger streams would flow into our higher schools or colleges proper under synodical supervision; and, from these again, still larger streams would flow into the university, equipped with all the necessary and best appointments for the "highest learning," and placed under the control of the Assembly, or rather, of a small board of curators designated by the wisdom of the highest court of the Church.

Then, are we, after all, in favor of the university? Yes; but you must first give us a broad and solid foundation for it to stand upon. We want to build for it a foundation as broad as the whole Church, as deep as the necessities of the whole Church, and as solid as the very foundations of truth itself. Then, wherein do we differ from the university-men? In holding that the true educational policy for us is to begin with the lowest and build up to the highest—to begin with the primary schools and to build and systematize till we come to the university. The university we will need; and the university we must have so soon as we begin to need it. From the very beginning we should have the university in view as our ultimate object; in creating and systematizing our primary, high, and higher schools, we should keep the university in view at every step of the progress as the highest school, up to which we are to build and work. The university-men would begin at the top and work down; we would begin at the bottom and work up to the top. Let the Church begin right where it now stands; let what is in existence be systematized; let what is lacking be completed and brought into the system; let the work *for* the university begin

now, and let the work of the university begin as soon as we shall have carried up our educational edifice to the point at which the university should begin. Let all the Church go to work, in harmony and earnestness, to put into execution this scheme, and then in ten years' time our system of education will be completed; and when completed, it will be the grandest educational temple standing on our globe. Let no one say that this scheme is impracticable. It is now, in all its essential points, in successful operation in Prussia. It is the power that has brought Prussia up into the proud position which she to-day occupies. We only ask to see the Prussian system of education adopted as the educational policy of our Presbyterian Church, with the necessary changes to adapt it the differences in our circumstances. We have only taken the ideal of the Prussian system, and shown how it may be applied to our case.

We have only indicated in meagre outlines the scheme which seems to us to constitute the best educational policy for our Presbyterian Church. We have said enough to convey a general idea of the plan as it exists in our mind; if what we have said attracts any favorable attention in the Church, we are ready to go into the details of the scheme.

We would like to say one word as to the nature of the control over the various schools which we have suggested. It need not be ecclesiastical. It can be thoroughly Presbyterian without being presbyterial. We do not object to ecclesiastical control *on principle*, as some of our brethren do; but we do object to it *on expediency*. The control of every institution of learning should be in the hands of a very few, and they the most competent men. We fully coincide with the governmental policy indicated by Dr. Dabney on the floor of the Assembly at Huntsville. We can not go into this point now. It is not necessary that we should; for the Assembly has very wisely deferred the question of the nature of control over any institution of learning that may hereafter be created to whatever future Assembly may inaugurate the scheme. We only wish to state emphatically that our plan does not involve the necessity for direct ecclesiastical control.

ARTICLE III.

ON A CALL TO THE GOSPEL MINISTRY.*

The Church of Christ differed marvellously from every religious institution which had previously existed in the world. Never before had men heard or conceived of a religion without priests, without sacrifices, without altars, without a temple, or at least some sacred place where the Deity was especially worshipped and was supposed especially to dwell.

The apostles preached, for the first time, a religion without any sacrifice, but that one, transcendently perfect and all-sufficient, offered up by our divine Lord: without any priest but him, now ascended into the heavens, and none upon earth, except in so far as every one of his followers presented himself as a living sacrifice unto God and offered up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God by Jesus Christ: and without a temple, other than the community of believers, who are builded together for a habitation of God through the Spirit.

It was indeed a conspicuous doctrine of Christianity, every where urged with utmost emphasis, that the substance and reality of things having now come and been made manifest, the old types and shadows thereof were become useless and abolished. No longer was there any place or necessity for an order of priests, distinct and separate from other men, forming a link between them and God, through whose office and mediation they must find access unto and communion with him. The glad tidings were sounded forth for all the world to hear, that now, that was done away which separated man from God, and a free way laid open unto all for approach into his very presence through Jesus

*The substance of this article was prepared by appointment of the Presbytery to which the author belongs, and delivered before that body. It is now published in accordance with its request.

[The Editors of the *Review* would announce that the April Number will contain an article taking issue with some of the positions of the present writer on the subject of the "Call."—EDS. S. P. R.]

Christ. Now there was to be one great High Priest, one and the same Mediator, for any and for all. Thereby, all who come to him, being reconciled and united unto God, become themselves a royal priesthood, and a holy nation. There was to be one divine Lord, Guide, and Teacher; one Prophet, Priest, and King, through whom all are brought nigh unto God; one faith; one hope; one Spirit, living and life-giving in all. All were to be called with the same holy calling and high vocation; and the height and the sanctity of it was only this—to consecrate their whole life as a sacrifice of thanksgiving to the service and glory of their Redeemer, to show forth the power and grace of him who had called them out of darkness into his wonderful light. Their whole life was to be separated, set apart, and devoted to the spiritual and priestly service of God, and as a witness and testimony unto him who loved them and gave himself for them.

And so the growth and increase of his kingdom, both in the world at large and in each community of believers, was not to the concern of a particular, select, and separate class of Christians; “but the nearest duty of every individual Christian.” Every one was to contribute to this object according to the gifts and ability bestowed upon him by the providence of God and the grace of the Spirit. There was to be no distinction among them, between spiritual and worldly, priests and people, clergy and laymen. But all, equally and alike, as Christians, “called to be saints,” set apart and consecrated to the Lord, were to be in heart and spirit men dead to the world, living not unto themselves, but unto him who died for them; and, in the power of an overcoming faith and love, devoting simply all they were and all they had to the service of their divine Master. In order the more certainly to secure and render effectual that service unto all the ends for which it was appointed, they were united in a spiritual community or society, under rules and laws ordained by him; and became the Church of Christ in the world, but not of it. The special kind of service and the measure thereof to which each particular member of this community was called, was determined by his particular *gifts* and *ability*. He was called to do for his Lord that which he was able to do. Whatsoever gift

he had, by nature, by providence, or by grace, or that he could lawfully attain—that was to be joyfully consecrated to his God and Saviour, and used for his glory. Whatsoever he had, whatsoever he could do, that he was called to have and to do in and for the kingdom of the Lord.

All the members of this Church, which is the body of Christ, the fulness of him who filleth all in all, have not the same gifts: “For there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit. And there are differences of ministries, but the same Lord. And there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God which worketh all in all. But the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal. For to one is given by the Spirit” one gift, and to another another, “dividing to every man severally as he will.” “Having then gifts differing according to the grace given to us,” whether it be one or another, we are called, “as every man hath received a gift, even so to minister the same,” “as good stewards of the manifold grace of God”—“as of the ability which God giveth; that God in all things may be glorified through Jesus Christ: to whom be praise and dominion, forever and ever.”

But while all have not the same gifts, all, equally and alike, are under the same obligation and duty to use the gift they have received, whatever it be, for the glory of the Lord—to be wholly and altogether consecrated with these gifts unto him. The particular kind of gift which has been received, determines the special duty and work to be performed. Whatever it be, even so we are called to “minister of the same.” The *power to do* defines the duty and creates the call.*

And not only so, but we are not to be content with the gifts already received, and in the faithful use and ministry thereof; but, if the opportunity be allowed, we are also to seek for others, even the greatest, the best, and the most precious. Not

*A reader familiar with Neander's History of the Church during the Three First Centuries, will observe the similarity of these introductory remarks to those in the first part of Section 2 of that work. But these ideas have long been common property in the Church; and lying so directly in the track of our purpose, we did not hesitate to follow his footsteps.

only the power of service in the kingdom of the Lord, now possessed and exercised, but whatever more, additional, and different, we may lawfully acquire—this also we are to desire and to gain. The obligation to seek greater ability to serve the Master, if we can obtain it, is the same as that faithfully to employ the gifts we already possess. Hence to all comes the urgent call, "*Covet earnestly the best gifts.*"

Now, from these diversities of gifts and dispensations of the Spirit among the individual members of the Church, it necessarily and obviously follows, as has been said, that all have not the same work and service. One is called to one office and ministry, and another to another.

The same thing results from another cause. For although all Christians have the same priestly character and privilege—although no distinct class of priests can exist within it—yet the Church, as a society instituted to establish and extend the kingdom of God, and being formed of men yet in the flesh and in the world, though not of it, there must be some form and order appointed among its members; for without these no society can exist and continue among men. An organised community, organised for an end and purpose, implies and requires some order and form of government and office among its members. Hence, of necessity, some members thereof were called to hold and exercise the offices required, in order to the effectual attainment of the ends for which the Church was established. And those particular members of the Church were called to these offices who had received such special gifts as qualified them for the proper discharge of official functions. They who could best perform these duties were *called* thereto.

Among these offices, originally ordained in the Church, and appointed to be permanently preserved therein, we are agreed were those which pertain to the preaching of the gospel to all the world, the teaching of the Church itself, the administration of the sacraments, the exercise of the discipline and spiritual rule appointed of the Lord for the government of his kingdom in the world, and the ministry of relief and comfort to the poor and the afflicted. We have in the Holy Scriptures perfectly

clear testimony that in the beginning certain members of the Church were called to the special discharge of these functions. We have therein also the plainest instructions, showing who are to be called thereto—those, namely, who have received gifts and abilities enabling them rightly to fulfil these duties, which gifts and qualifications are specially and fully described and declared.

But while these officers were specially charged with special duties, both within the Church towards its members, and towards the world without, their appointment, it must be remembered, did not discharge the other members thereof one whit of the work and service to which every one of them was called, according to the gifts *they* had received. Their office was itself only a gift, one more and additional to those which they had previously possessed, and imposing additional duty, but not taking from the brotherhood any part of the work and duty to which they were called by their gifts. Hence we find that all Christians are commanded to teach, admonish, exhort, and reprove one another, to testify to the world of the grace of God, and by one of those marvellously comprehensive utterances with which the inspired word is accustomed to sweep over the whole extent of a matter at once, to “do good to all men as they have opportunity.” Good, benefit, of whatsoever kind or degree, the need of a fellow-man of it, and the ability of a Christian to render it, creates a call—calls—for him to do it. For example, the possession by a Christian of superior knowledge to another Christian, or to one outside of the kingdom of the Lord—the ability on his part to communicate it, and the willingness of the other to receive it—call him to teach it. If he know one thing more, or anything better, than the other, both Christian charity and the command of the Lord call him to this service. And yet more: one inferior to ourselves in knowledge and ability, by the utterance of that long known and familiar to us, may speak it with new and living power to our souls, producing in us the fruits of salvation, and bringing to pass that which is written, “Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings thou hast perfected praise.”

Nothing can be more manifest than that among the first Chris-

tians it was the right of any one to speak for the edification of his brethren, and both publicly and privately to teach and exhort both believers and unbelievers. The only limitation of this, found in the Scriptures, is the one forbidding women to teach, and requiring them to keep silence in the Church. At the same time, it does not hence follow that all the members of the Church are called to the ordinary and regular office and work of teaching and preaching the gospel. There is a wide distinction and difference between an occasional and extraordinary discharge of this ministry, according to times and circumstances, and the gifts and qualifications necessary thereto, and its regular and ordinary performance, and the gifts and qualifications required for this. Moreover, it is evident that the propagation of the gospel and the maintenance and defence of its pure truths in the world could not be left dependent on the occasional and irregular ministry of individual Christians. The necessities of the case required that there should never be wanting in the Church some who should be qualified, at all times, regularly and constantly to instruct their brethren in the knowledge of the truth as it is in Jesus, and to proclaim it to the world. And this work evidently requires gifts and qualifications which all Christians neither possess nor can acquire. Hence the gift of this manner of teaching, and the office of those who labor in the word and doctrine, are recognised in the Scriptures as belonging to some but not to all. All the members of the Church, as they had opportunity, were called to teach and exhort one another, but all were not called to this as their regular and ordinary work and duty.

Furthermore, one supreme function of the Church on earth is to bear witness to the truth—to make it known to all men—perpetually to keep it sounding abroad in the world, that men may know it, and believe it, and be saved, to the glory of God. But in the nature of the case it is at once evident that the Church cannot fulfil this function aright except by selecting and appointing certain of its members to proclaim that truth in the name and on behalf of the Church—to speak for the Church—to give utterance to the voice and testimony of the Church. In

appointing its members to this office, the Church is required to select only those who have received the gifts and qualifications enabling them to discharge its duties. This office is the office of the preacher of the gospel. The gifts and qualifications which impart ability to fulfil it, and the appointment thereto by the Church, constitute a *call* to that office. Setting any one apart to this work, certifying his qualifications to perform it, and giving him authority to speak in the name and on behalf of the Church—this is *ordination* to the gospel ministry.

To this office of the gospel ministry belong, according to the order and usage of our Church, the preaching of the gospel, instruction in its doctrines and duties, the administration of the sacraments, and, in coöperation with other divinely-authorized officers, the exercise of that rule and discipline appointed of the Lord for his Church. It is the office designated in the Scriptures under the names pastor, teacher, bishop, and the elder who not only rules but labors in the word and doctrine. And it is in reference to the *call to this office* we are now more particularly to inquire.

This subject may present itself in the form of various questions, such as, What is a call to the gospel ministry? What constitutes or creates such a call? What is it to be called thereto? What do we mean by such a call? *How* does God call men to this office? In what way, and by what agency, or means? *Who* are called to its work and duty? These questions are substantially different ways of regarding the same thing, and must all be covered and included in our further consideration of the subject.

There seems to be some difference of view among us in reference to this subject; at least some confusion of ideas and misapprehension of the truth and facts of the case. And it is necessary that some distinctions and definitions concerning it should be set clearly before us. The general principles bearing upon the subject which we have already presented will no doubt be concurred in by all. They have been long admitted and received by the Church.

It is agreed that a gospel minister has his commission and

authority as such from the Lord Christ. But it may be questioned how that is given, whether by a direct, immediate, divine operation in the soul of the individual, designating him to his own consciousness to this office, independent of the use of outward means and instrumentality, or at least by such a divine operation superadded thereto, as makes the person called conscious, and assures him, that it is Christ who calls—that is to say, by revelation, for this view amounts to no less;* or whether this commission and authority for the discharge of the ministerial office is conveyed and imparted to the individual, mediately and indirectly, through the instrumentality of the word, of providence, and of the Church.

Those who maintain the former view appear to regard it as necessary in order to vindicate the divine authority and commission of a gospel minister. It is obvious, however, that this point is abundantly secured if it be held that Christ our Lord by his own divine authority ordained this office to be permanent and perpetual in the Church, and gave specific rules and orders as to the individuals to be appointed thereto—when his revealed will in reference to the office is complied with, even in the absence of any special revelation communicated to the individual or to others. Whether one be designated to this office by special

*It is to be regretted that those who write on religious questions do not observe the technical and established meanings of theological terms and the distinctions between them. Thus *revelation* and *inspiration* are sometimes confounded. A supernatural communication from God is a revelation. Authority and infallible guidance to make known such a revelation to other men is inspiration. Bannerman, in his able work on the inspiration of the Scriptures, shows the importance and necessity of this distinction. "Inspiration" and "inspired" are sometimes improperly applied to the ordinary influences of the Spirit in the souls of believers and his indwelling therein. This is at least an improper use of terms, and tends to confuse and even destroy the true doctrine of inspiration. Morell and his school taught that kind of inspiration, but made void the word of God. So the word "supernatural" is misunderstood and misapplied. To apply it to the divine agency in natural phenomena may be good doctrine in the meaning of the writer, but it is terrible etymology; and while intended to vindicate the reality of a divine power, really tends to destroy the proofs of it and faith in it.

direct revelation, or receive it simply in accordance with standing, permanent, and written instructions and regulations, contained in the word—in either case his commission as a minister is of divine origin and authority—he is the minister of the Lord and not of men.

Further, it is agreed that *God calls and sends* all who are duly authorised to enter on the work of this ministry. But it is questioned as before *how* he calls and sends—whether by making known his will directly and immediately to the individual called—or by leading him to a conviction and knowledge of his duty through the ordinary means of his word and providence, and the agency of his Church; or whether, while including the use of these means and instruments, by such a direct and immediate divine influence accompanying them, or in addition thereto, as assures the consciousness of the subject of it, that it is God who calls; and yet further, whether either one or the other of these methods is observed universally and invariably in all cases; or whether, while one method may be adopted in one case, another may be employed with a different person. Here again it is evident, that whether the will of God be made known in a direct, immediate, and extraordinary manner, or indirectly by the use of means and the instrumentality of second causes, the fact remains firm and unshaken that it is God who calls and God who sends. In the latter case, the call is traced through agents and through instruments up to God himself. A call is no less divine, coming from him, through howsoever many agents and instruments, than when it comes direct and immediate by special and express revelation. It is not conclusive, therefore, when the advocates of the latter view appeal to the testimony of the Scriptures, that it is God who calls and who sends ministers of the gospel. This may be true, and it is; and yet he may call and send by the agency of means and instruments, and not by a direct and immediate revelation. And while it may be admitted, that in some extraordinary cases it may seem to him good or even necessary to call men to this service by direct revelation, it may yet be held that such is not the ordinary and usual plan he employs. For though there are diversities of operations, it is the same God which worketh all in all.

To present the same thing in another way, it is not disputed whether in a call to the ministry the Holy Spirit exerts his grace and power to convince the individual of his duty and to lead him into the office. To this all will assent. It always has been the faith of the Church. We are all agreed that a conviction of duty to enter the ministry is essential to a call to that office, and that this conviction is produced in the soul by the Holy Spirit. But here as before, the question is, *how* does he produce it? In answer to this question, three suppositions or theories are possible. First, it may be held that the Spirit imparts a knowledge of this duty by a direct and immediate communication of his will by an operation independent of and separate from any use of means. Secondly, it may be held that he brings the soul to this conviction by and through the ordinary means, but yet so works in and by these means in this process of conviction, as to impart to the consciousness of the individual an assurance that it is the work of the Spirit. And thirdly, the Spirit may lead the mind to this conviction by these means in such a manner that the individual shall not be conscious of any supernatural influence, the Holy One hiding himself, as he often does, making his power known only in its effects and results.

It is also a further question, whether, while the Spirit may employ one of these methods in one case, he may not adopt another in a different case. And it should be observed that the first two of these theories or suppositions are substantially the same. The first manifestly supposes a revelation. And in regard to the second, by whatever means or instruments the Spirit communicates a knowledge of duty, if it be done in such a way as imparts to the consciousness of the individual an assurance that it is the Spirit who communicates it, then *that* amounts to a revelation—is a revelation.

It does not settle these questions to appeal to the scripture testimony: that it is the Holy Spirit who makes men overseers or bishops in the Church; and that no one may undertake the office of the ministry, except he be moved thereto by the Holy Ghost. For it is his work if it be wrought by him through instruments and means, as really and truly as when it is direct

and immediate; and when the subject of it is not directly conscious of the Spirit's agency, as when he is.

We have further to distinguish between an *ordinary* and an *extraordinary* call of God to work and office in the Church. An extraordinary call is when one is called to some extraordinary duty, to some special, it may be new and unusual, work and service in the divine kingdom. Such was the call of the prophets under the Old Testament, of Aaron to the priesthood, and of the apostles and prophets of the New Testament. Such manifestly was the call of those who were appointed to introduce a new dispensation; and such perhaps is the call of those whom God at any time may raise up for the reformation of the Church when it has become corrupt. An extraordinary call is commonly, if not always, special and direct by the Holy Spirit and by revelation to the person called. His duty is made known to him by the Spirit in a peculiar, extraordinary, and direct communication, accompanied with an infallible assurance that this communication is from God. But we cannot argue from these extraordinary calls to those which are ordinary. Hence the common application to the gospel ministry of that passage in Heb. v. 4: "No man taketh this honor unto himself but he that is called of God, as was Aaron," and the argument founded thereon, must be regarded as a mistake. The "honor" of which it speaks is the office of a priest, an office radically and generically different from that of a gospel minister, one that no longer exists in the Church, except so far as it belongs to all Christians. This use of that passage grew out of, and helps to confirm, that lamentable error that the gospel ministry is a priesthood, than which none more grievous and prolific of all evil has ever cursed the Church. And it is to be observed that the argument and affirmation of the apostle refer to the institution of a *new* priesthood, such as was Aaron's, and also Christ's. The first introduction of such a priesthood he declares requires an immediate call of God. And let us confirm this view of that passage by the exposition of it given by the great Owen, "prince of theologians." He says: "Our apostle disputes here about the erection of a new priesthood, such as was that of Christ. . . . He who

first enters on such a priesthood not before erected must have a call of God thereunto. So had Aaron at the first erection of a typical priesthood. He had his call by an immediate command of God. And although in other things the Lord Christ is compared to the high priests in general, yet as to his entrance into his office upon the call of God he is compared with Aaron only. This being the proper design of the words, the things disputed from this plan about the necessity of an ordinary outward call to the office of the priesthood, and by analogy unto the ministry of the gospel, though true in themselves, are foreign unto the intention of this plan. For the apostle treats only of the first erection of a priesthood in the persons of Aaron and Christ, whereunto an extraordinary call was necessary. And if none might take on him the office of the ministry but he that is called of God, as was Aaron, no man alive could do so at this day."

Owen also points out the fact that the successors of Aaron were *not* called, as he was, by an immediate and extraordinary call, but by a law originally given when Aaron was called, and applied and carried out by the Old Testament Church in an ordinary manner. There was no direct and immediate call for those who followed Aaron in the priestly office. Yet were they all truly called of God, and held their office by his divine authority and commission, when appointed in accordance with the original constitution thereof. The use and application sometimes made of this text would invalidate the office of every priest of the ancient Church between Aaron and our Lord. If it be held simply that it implies the general principle that no one may enter any church-office without the call and authority of God, we shall have but little objection. But if it be meant that none may undertake such office without a call similar to that of Aaron and of our Lord himself, there is not the shadow of support in this text for that notion. And the countenance which such use of it gives to the baneful idea that the office of the gospel ministry is of a priestly character, is exceeding pernicious.

Before we proceed further, let us recall some other principles of the faith generally received and admitted.

1. It is the clear doctrine of the Scriptures, and has ever been the faith of Christians, that the Lord Christ governs and administers his kingdom on earth by the Holy Spirit; and this truth is of universal application to all the affairs and interests of that kingdom, great and small.

2. In this government and administration the Spirit ordinarily acts by, through, and with means and instruments. These means are chiefly the word, the Church, including the ordinances, offices, courts, and communion thereof, and the manifold duties of individual Christians by them performed for the glory of God and the good of men.

3. In extraordinary times and emergencies and for extraordinary purposes, the Spirit has manifested himself and put forth his grace and power in an extraordinary manner, working, not by or through means and instruments, but by a direct and immediate agency in cases of revelation, inspiration, and miracles, for example.

4. In the ordinary dispensation of the Spirit, wherein he fulfils his work in the kingdom of the Lord in the use of means, the power and efficacy of that work are not those of the means simply and alone and of themselves; but in a manner ineffable and incomprehensible by us these means are made gracious and effectual by the power of the Spirit. In some manner, not given us to explain or understand, the power of the Spirit goes with and accompanies the means, so that they become efficacious unto the ends he would effect. And without that co-working grace of the Spirit, all means equally and alike are futile and in vain—whatever effect they may produce of their own natural efficacy, or by human power, not being gracious, saving, or acceptable to God.

5. Whether in the ordinary dispensations of the Spirit he is pleased to put forth any operation of his divine power on the souls of men, except in connection with some appointed means—that is to say, separate and apart from, independent of, and in addition to, that power which he puts forth in and with those means—is a difficult question. The great divines of the seventeenth century, and the views of scripture doctrine which our

Church has adopted, teach, for example, that all the effects which the Spirit may produce by the use of means on the soul of an unconverted sinner, do not regenerate him; but that in addition thereto, there must be a direct and immediate act of his divine power, whereby the sinner is born again and becomes a child of God. Those old divines denominated *this* act of the Spirit "physical," whereat some moderns, not knowing what they say, nor whereof they affirm, have been greatly and ignorantly offended and uttered words of folly.

Whether moreover there may be, in some cases, an influence of the Spirit separate from that with which he accompanies the ordinary means, and in addition to that put forth in the sanctification of believers, and in guiding them in their work and duty, is another question. We do not think men are authorised to limit the Spirit as to the methods and mysteries of his divine operations. But this would seem to be certain, that if any receive such an influence of the Spirit, he cannot describe it, or explain it, or prove it, except by a miracle. If it is so given as to impart to his own consciousness an assurance that it is from the Spirit of God, he only can know this. If it has reference to a question of duty, it is a revelation.*

*The following from Dr. Thornwell's sermon on "The Gospel, God's Power and Wisdom," presents the view on this subject commonly received by orthodox Christians:

"The power which he exerts in the regeneration and sanctification of the sinner consists partly in a direct action upon the faculties of the soul, and partly in what has been technically styled moral suasion. In other words, he first, by a direct and immediate exercise of power, puts the soul in a condition to receive the truth, and then, by the truth, effectually persuades. These two operations are always associated in his saving work. He first enables, and then persuades; and at every step in the subsequent progress of the divine life he must sustain and invigorate the holy principles which he at first implanted, or the work of sanctification would come to a stand. This *direct action* on the soul is peculiar to God alone."

In reference to this direct action of the Spirit, whether on the soul of a sinner in the act of regeneration, or on the soul of a Christian in the work of sanctification, let us remark:

1. The subject of it is not conscious of it. Of its consequences and results he is, not of the action itself. Sometimes these consequences and

6. In the phraseology and use of technical language well established in theology, when "the *direct*" or "the *immediate*" agency of the Holy Spirit is spoken of, such an act or operation is meant as he puts forth without the use of means; whatever means his power may employ in preceding or succeeding influences, in *this* act, without the use or intervention of any means or instrument, he comes into direct contact with the soul and works in and upon it his divine will. Such an act our old divines held to be the central, radical, essential act of regeneration—stoutly affirming, and as we believe, victoriously arguing it to be necessary to the change of the sinner's moral nature.

Further, these terms are properly applied to that peculiar agency of the Spirit which he exercised of old in communicating his will, the knowledge of truth, or of duty, as in the case of the patriarchs, prophets, and apostles—of all to whom was given a revelation for their own instruction, or both revelation and inspiration for their fellow-men. In these cases it was sometimes without and sometimes with means—but always so exerted as to give to the subject of it an assurance that it was the agency of God.

Such an agency as this has been held by some to be put forth by the Spirit in the souls of Christians in all ordinary times and for many purposes, but commonly held only in proportion to the ignorance of those who advocate it, or their inability to apprehend truth and to express it with accuracy, exactness, and discrimination.

Now, the question before us in regard to a call to the ministry is not whether the Spirit calls—for every one holds to that—but *how* does he call? whether by and through the use of means and instrumentalities? or in addition to any use of means he may employ, by a direct and immediate act put forth on the soul of the individual? and whether such a call as this is his

results in the soul are of such a character as to assure the individual that the power of God has wrought within him, but assuredly not always.

2. This direct and immediate action of the Spirit on the soul does not communicate any knowledge of truth, either of doctrine or duty: it only prepares the soul to receive the truth.

ordinary method, and necessary to authorise any one to enter the ministry, and the proof of it necessary to authorise the Church to admit him to the ministry? The question is not whether there is any putting forth of the power of the Spirit in a call to this office, but whether, in ordinary cases, it is only through ordinary instrumentalities, or also in a direct and immediate operation on the soul. It is not disputed as to the *degree* of the Spirit's influence, but as to its nature, whether mediate or immediate, direct or in the use of means. Those who hold that in all ordinary cases this call is by and through the use of means, will admit that the degree of power exerted by the Spirit in connection therewith will be such in each case as may be necessary, different in different individuals. In the experience of some it may be very great and awful, producing a vivid and overpowering sense and conviction that it is the divine Spirit dealing with the soul through his chosen instruments. In others it may be more gentle and less manifest; even as in the effectual calling of a sinner into the kingdom of the Lord, the work of the Spirit is more or less conspicuous and sensible to the subject thereof, as it may please Himself.

We do not, indeed, know that any among us really hold intelligently and explicitly that a call to the ministry by the divine Spirit is direct and immediate in the sense explained. Some use these terms as they do many others, in a vague, undefined manner, without precision or accuracy. And others, accustomed to a fervid and exaggerated style of utterance, in the heat of an argument sometimes use expressions which on calm and careful reflection they would avoid.

Some, however, do appear to adopt this theory; and as it seems to be the only material point of difference among us, we will present the following arguments in opposition to it:

1. It really affirms nothing less than that the individual so called to the ministry receives a *direct and special revelation* of the will of God in regard to his duty in this particular. In whatever way such a call may be described, whether as a conviction of duty, the testimony of the man's consciousness, an impression fixed on his understanding, conscience, or heart, a

suggestion, an impulse, or an inward voice—if it is referred to a direct and special agency of the Spirit, it affirms a revelation: it asserts that the man's duty is made known and communicated to him directly and immediately by the Spirit. This is a revelation. The view in question amounts to this, or else to nothing. If it means to teach that the Spirit brings the one called to a knowledge and conviction of his duty through and by the ordinary means, this is only the other view, about which there is no dispute.

But if the theory we oppose does in fact affirm a revelation, as we have shown, this consideration may be left to weigh with its own simple and sufficient force against it, without attempting to prove that the idea of any special and particular revelation is unauthorised and fanatical, in the present order of the divine kingdom.*

* That we have not misrepresented the theory which we oppose, the following quotations will sufficiently prove:

"I say not that this or the other motive—as many will assert—or any motive at all, beside the simple one of obedience to the voice of the heavenly monitor—should mingle with the inward fixed conviction: nor that this proof, or the other proof—as many will contend—or any proof at all, beside the testimony of consciousness itself, should beget within us this strong assurance that it is God's Spirit which has wrought us for this self same thing."—*The Christian Pastor, etc., a Sermon by Dr. R. J. Breckinridge, p. 21.*

"It is direct, immediate, powerful, to this very department of labor."

"That a supernatural conviction of duty, wrought by the immediate agency of the Holy Ghost, is an essential element in the evidence of a true vocation to the ministry, seems to us to be the clear and authoritative doctrine of the Scriptures."

"He should have a commission certified to his own mind from the King of heaven."—*Southern Presbyterian Review, Dec., 1847.*

"This influence is exerted only on those whom God has selected for his work: so that it is a direct, an immediate voice from him to them, saying, 'Go work in my vineyard.'"

"No man is authorised to take this work upon himself who has not received a direct, special, personal commission therefor from the Lord himself."

What kind of a call this writer understands by this language appears from the following:

"But the Apostle Paul received a direct, special, personal commission,

2. If the evidence of such a call to his own consciousness be necessary to authorise any one to undertake the work of the ministry, then it is sufficient of itself, without being submitted to the judgment of the Church. For such a call authenticates itself, and the subject of it may not confer with flesh and blood; and no man may forbid. Or, if it be held that, nevertheless, such a call must be authenticated to the Church, then it would seem to follow that if a direct and immediate testimony of his call be necessary to the individual himself, similar testimony is equally necessary to those who are to sit in judgment on it. A lower testimony cannot authenticate a higher. The Church must have as certain evidence that the Spirit has called the minister as the minister himself. An extraordinary call must present extraordinary evidence. But this leads us to results preposterous and incredible.

3. It cannot be shown that such a call is *necessary*, either to bring men into the ministerial office, or to secure the ends and uses of the ministry in the kingdom of the Lord. On the contrary, on the supposition that the Spirit calls through means appointed for that purpose, no reason can be shown why his agency in this manner should not be effectual to the leading of men to engage in that work, while the divine commission and authority of the office, together with all its rights, powers, privileges, duties, and benefits, are as effectually established and secured. Unless, therefore, the Scriptures certainly teach the fact of this direct and immediate call, the circumstance that it is not necessary to the ends required makes it impossible to be believed.

as we may clearly see from the history given in the 9th chapter of Acts. We maintain that Paul was not singular in this. The circumstances of his call were peculiar, extraordinary: but there is nothing to justify the belief that the call itself was so." Further on, quoting from another the remark that as Paul's preaching "was *not assumed but imposed upon him by immediate revelation from God*, it was a matter of *specific duty*, and if he failed to perform it to the best of his ability, he would incur the curse of the Master who employed him," this writer says: "To all this we give a hearty assent and say that just such is the position and the feeling of every gospel minister."—*Southern Presbyterian Review*, July, 1870.

4. This theory opens a wide and dangerous door to fanaticism, superstition, and blind enthusiasm. The idea that this call is a direct and immediate conviction or suggestion—that it is by some impression or impulse imparted to the mind, not referable to the ordinary influences of the Spirit through the rational faculties of the soul and through the use of ordinary means—brings it at once within the region of blind human fancy and imagination and of Satanic influence. It is to place the evidence of this call in a state of feeling common among enthusiasts and fanatics, which prevails most among the ignorant and deluded, and just in proportion to the demand for it, and which is the peculiar and almost universal claim of heresies and false religions.

5. This theory teaches that the Holy Scriptures are not the only and sufficient rule and guide of duty—contrary to their own testimony and the faith of the Church. It affirms that in addition to all they reveal and teach in regard to the duty of Christians, the Spirit does directly and immediately reveal and make known, in many instances, the duty of his servants. It adds to the perfect, complete, and sufficient rule, already given to the Church, another, which in the very nature of the case, depends on evidence which incurs danger of the greatest delusion and fanaticism, which cannot be certainly authenticated, and is not necessary at all.

Dr. Dabney has well said: "Is there any other expression of God's will given to us except the Bible? Where else does God authorise us to look for information as to any duty? The Holy Spirit has ceased to give direct revelations: he speaks to no rational adult now through any other medium than his word, applied by his gracious light to the understanding and the conscience. To look for anything else from him is superstition. While the call of prophets and apostles was by *special revelation*, that of the gospel minister may be termed a *scriptural call*."

6. This theory is inconsistent with the teaching of the inspired word; at least it adds to the instruction and rule there given us on this subject.

We have already remarked that we hold the office of the gospel ministry to be the one designated in the Scriptures as the

office of the bishop or elder. Now, it so happens that we have two passages (1 Tim. iii., and Titus i.,) in which full and particular instructions are given as to the character and qualifications of those who are to be appointed to this office, and in neither of them is any mention or suggestion made of the necessity that they should have a direct and immediate call thereto by the Spirit; not a word requiring of them a consciousness, conviction, or declaration, of any such call. Indeed, it is most remarkable, that while these Scriptures go into minute particulars and details to guide the Church in appointing ministers of the gospel, they omit altogether the one qualification which the advocates of this theory make the one most necessary and essential.

It is to no purpose to refer, as in support of it, to the Scripture testimony that it is the Lord of the harvest who sends laborers into the harvest; that the Holy Ghost makes elders to be overseers or bishops over the churches; that pastors and teachers are the gift of Christ; that they are ambassadors for God; that they are chosen, qualified, sent, commissioned, and authorised, by the Lord. All this is true, of course. But the truth of it does not require or prove the necessity of a direct and immediate call by the Spirit. If our Lord has ordained this office to be permanent and perpetual; if he has directed the Church in all ages to appoint some to fulfil its functions, prescribing its duties, rights, privileges, authority, and qualifications; if in the government and administration of his kingdom by the Holy Spirit, by and through the ordinary means and instrumentalities, chosen and appointed thereto, he continues to supply the Church with ministers, as all of us believe, then is the truth of all these scriptures maintained and confirmed, in unimpaired force and integrity; then does it still hold good that the gospel minister has his commission and authority from God: is called and sent by him; is his servant and ambassador; and by him given to the Church for its salvation, that he may be glorified. It is but a feeble and baseless misapprehension to suppose that a commission is not divine except it come direct and straight from his own hand.

7. It is fatal to this theory that it is contradicted by *facts*—by the history and experience of the Church and of the ministry—multitudes of faithful men have served God and the Church in this office who had no consciousness or knowledge of such a call. They were approved by every possible test as truly called to its duties, having the seals both of the Lord and of his Church to their ministry; but they were not called to it, so far as can be known by the facts of their history and their own testimony, by any direct and immediate agency of the Holy Spirit. Among such instances I may mention names no less illustrious than those of Calvin, Knox, and Halyburton, the circumstances and history of whose call to the ministry are well known, and give no place to the theory we oppose.

8. Furthermore, it is contrary to the judgment of the Church, as expressed by its highest assemblies, and by its teachers, to whom has been given, in the most eminent degree, the spirit of wisdom and knowledge in things pertaining to the kingdom of the Lord.

A careful examination of these testimonies will show that they agree almost unanimously in the following particulars:

1. While they refer a call to the ministry ultimately to the Lord and to the agency of the Spirit, they do not teach that agency to be direct and immediate, but only through ordinary means and instrumentalities.

2. These means are chiefly the whole doctrine of the inspired word in reference to this office, including its institution and appointment by Christ, his command in regard to it, its work and duty, its privileges and rewards, its nature and necessity; the dealings and dispensations of his providence with individuals; the prayers of his people to himself for a supply of ministers; the instructions and exhortations of Christians addressed to individuals in regard to this work. All these and any of them may be and have been used by the Spirit as the vehicle and means of his grace and power, by which he calls and sends men into this work and service. Indeed, what may he not employ for his gracious purposes? He may make the heavens above us and the overarching firmament an instrument to convince us of

our duty and lead us to attempt it. At his pleasure the winds may bear to us the instruction he would impart, and the stars in their courses make it known; some sweet and precious joy, or some great and bitter grief; the admonition of a godly minister or pious friend; the voice of a loving and holy mother; the breathing of a trembling prayer, a tear, or a sigh; a thunderbolt or an earthquake—anything he will—becomes an instrument and means whereby he calls men into the kingdom and thereafter guides them to duty; but always and everywhere using for the clear and complete fulfilment of his work the ever blessed and ever necessary WORD, which he has magnified above all his name.

3. The Spirit *executes* the call to this office by two particulars: first, by bestowing on whom he will the gifts necessary to the fit discharge of its duties; and, secondly, by leading the Church to call and appoint them to its work and service.

It is not needful here to discuss what those gifts and qualifications are. The object of this discourse does not require it, and they have been often and fully explained. But there is very scant and infrequent authority for including among them the direct and immediate call of the Spirit for which some appear to contend. The general principles announced at the outset of this article, that in the kingdom of the Lord all are called to serve him with whatsoever gifts they have received, that the possession of the gift creates the duty and constitutes the call, the gift being bestowed for the express purpose of use and profit, have always been accepted, and by almost all. The bestowment of these gifts is the foundation of the obligation and the guide of the Church. The Church, needing ministers, and finding those who have received gifts suited for that service in accordance with the word of God, calls them to the discharge of its duties. The possession of these gifts and the call of the Church are the *call of God*—complete, perfect, and of divine obligation.

It may be well to refer to some of these testimonies more explicitly.

And first we take that of Calvin. He marks a distinction

between "the external and solemn call which belongs to the public order of the Church," and "that secret call, of which every minister is conscious to himself before God." But lest we be misled by this expression, in consequence of our own preconceived ideas, let us observe that he says of this secret call, that it "is not known to the Church." If so, it cannot be made by the Church a ground of its own judgment. Further, he describes this secret call as "the testimony of our heart" in the acceptance of the office when it is offered to us, and not any such testimony or consciousness going before our seeking that office. He says: "This secret call is the honest testimony of our heart that we accept the office offered to us, not from ambition or avarice, or any other unlawful motive, but from a sincere fear of God, and an ardent zeal for the edification of the Church. This, as I have hinted, is indispensable to every one of us, if we would approve our ministry in the sight of God." Further on he adds: "It is even common to speak of private persons as called to the ministry who appear to be adapted and qualified for the discharge of its duties; because learning, connected with piety and other endowments of a good pastor, constitutes a kind of preparation for it. For those whom the Lord has destined for so important an office, he first furnishes with those talents which are requisite for its execution, that they may not enter upon it empty and unprepared." In reference to the apostles, he says theirs "was a case somewhat different from the common call of other ministers. For as theirs was an extraordinary office, it was necessary, in order to render it conspicuous by some eminent character, that they who were to sustain it should be called and appointed by the mouth of the Lord himself."—*Institutes, Book 4, Chap. 3.*

The Church of Scotland, in its first Book of Discipline, affirmed it to be the duty of the civil magistrate, with the consent of the Church, to "compel such men as have gifts and graces, able to edify the Church of God, that they bestow them where greatest necessity shall be known; for no man shall be permitted to live idle, or as themselves list, but must be appointed to labor where" the civil authorities "and the Church shall

think expedient." Again, to "compel all men to whom God has given any talent to persuade by wholesome doctrine, to bestow the same, if they be called by the Church, to the advancement of Christ's glory and the comfort of the troubled flock." Again, "men in whom is supposed to be any gifts which might edify the Church if they were well employed, must be charged by the ministers and elders to join themselves with the session and company of interpreters, to the end that the Church may judge whether they may be able to serve to God's glory and to the profit of the Church in the vocation of the ministry or not; and if any be found disobedient, and not willing to communicate the gifts and special graces of God with their brethren, after sufficient admonition, discipline must proceed against them, provided that the civil magistrate concur with the judgment and election of the Church; for no man may be permitted as best pleaseth him to live within the Church of God, but every man must be constrained, by fraternal admonition and correction, to bestow his labors, when of the Church he is required, to the edification of others.

In the "Short Form of the Book of Discipline," it is said "the Church and faithful magistrate should compel such as have gifts to take the office of teaching upon them."

"We should consider first whether God has given the gifts to him whom we would choose; for God calls no man to the ministry whom he does not arm with necessary gifts."

In the famous "Second Book of Discipline," in reference to all offices in the Church, equally and alike, it is affirmed, "There are two sorts of calling, one extraordinary, by God himself immediately, as was of the prophets and apostles, which in churches established and well already reformed, has no place. The other calling is ordinary, which, besides the calling of God, and inward testimony of a good conscience, has the lawful approbation and outward judgment of men, according to God's word and order established in his Church."

Coming down to the seventeenth century, to that illustrious era in the history of the Church when it pleased God to raise up a generation of wonderful men, by their labors in defence of the

truth against mighty adversaries, to explain, define, and confirm it in a manner so complete and triumphant, that it must forever be the admiration and joy of all who come to know and understand it, let us take the opinion of two of the greatest and wisest of them all. And first, that of Turretine:

“The call to the ministry is in one respect inward; in another outward. The *inward* call is that by which the heart is moved by God to consecrate itself to the work of the ministry, which is rather a preparation of the mind to receive the call, than the call properly so termed, by which a man is conscious to himself before God that he is induced to undertake the office, not by ambition, or avarice, or any other carnal motive, but by sincere love of God and desire of edifying the Church.” “The *outward* call is either *immediate*, which is immediately by God himself, without the intervention of men, such as was the call of prophets in the Old and apostles in the New Testament; or *mediate*, which, although it is originally from God as its primary author, is nevertheless by the intervening agency of men, whom God uses as instruments, when he calls through the Church; such is the present call of ministers.”

“Again, a call is either *ordinary* or *extraordinary*. An ordinary call is that which is usually made through ordinary means; such was the call of priests in the Old Testament, and of pastors in the New. An *extraordinary* call is various: 1, that which is made immediately by God, without the agency of men, and no established order being observed, as was the call of prophets and apostles, and so is identical with an *immediate* call; and 2, that which is not according to the custom and corrupt established order of some (any) Church.”—*Institutio Theologica. Locus 18. Questio 23.*

The great Owen discussed these matters in several of his voluminous writings, and with his accustomed fulness, accuracy, and force. We will give the chief points of his statements and arguments, in his own language, from a few of these:

“How, or by what means, or by what acts of his sovereign power, the Lord Christ doth communicate *office power*, and there-

with the office itself, unto any persons, whereon their authority is directly from him; and what are the acts and duties of the Church in the collation of this authority.

“The acts of Christ herein may be reduced unto these heads:

1. “He hath instituted and appointed the offices themselves, and made a *grant* of them unto the Church for its edification; as also, he hath determined and limited the powers and duties of the officers.

2. “He furnisheth some persons with such gifts, abilities, and endowments as are necessary to the discharge of such offices in the powers, works, and duties of them.

3. “In his institution and appointment of the *way* and *means* whereby persons, gifted and qualified by himself, ought to be actually admitted into their offices.” “By virtue hereof, all that are called unto this office do derive all their power and authority from him alone.

4. “He hath hereon given *commands* unto the whole Church to *submit themselves* unto the authority of these officers in the discharge of their office, who are so appointed, so prepared or qualified, so called by himself, and to obey them in all things, according unto the limitations which himself also hath given unto the power and authority of such officers.

“By these ways and means doth the Lord Christ communicate office-power unto them that are called thereunto; whereon they become, not the officers or ministers of men, no, not of the Church, . . . but the officers and ministers of Christ himself.”

Of the call of any one to the office of pastor particularly, he says:

“1. There are certain *qualifications* previously required in him, disposing and making him fit for that office. The outward call is an act of the Church, as we shall show immediately; but therein is required an obediencial acting of him also who is called. Neither of these can be regular—neither can the Church act according to rule and order, nor the person called act in such a due obedience—unless there are in him some previous indications of the mind of God, designing the person to be called by such qualifications as may render him meet and able for the discharge of his office and work.

“2. None can or may *take this office upon him*, or discharge the duties of it, which are peculiarly its own, with authority, but he who is called and set apart thereunto according to the mind of Jesus Christ.”

After fully proving this point, that none may enter this office unless they are called and set apart thereto by the Church, and according to the rules of Christ, he shows *how* this is done, *viz.*, by *election* and *ordination*. Previous to election he shows there must be a "*meetness* of the person for his office. It can never be the duty of the Church to call or choose an unmeet, an unqualified, an unprepared person unto this office." And the meetness of any one for it must be made known and judged of in two ways: 1. "By an *evidence* given of the qualifications in him before mentioned;" and 2. "By a *trial* of his gifts for edification."

"The things following are essentially necessary unto" the call of any one to this office, "so as that authority and right to feed and rule in the Church in the name of Christ, as an officer of his house, may be given unto any one thereby. . . . The first is, that antecedently unto any actings of the Church towards such a person with respect unto office, he be furnished by the Lord Christ himself with *graces* and *gifts* and *abilities* for the discharge of the office whereunto he is called. This divine designation of the person to be called rests on the kingly office and care of Christ towards his Church. . . . Secondly, there is to be an *exploration* or *trial* of those gifts and abilities as unto their accommodation unto the edification of that Church whereunto any person is to be ordained a pastor or minister. . . . Thirdly, the *first act of power* committed unto the Church by Jesus Christ, for the constitution of ordinary officers in it, is that election of a person qualified and tried unto his office which we have now vindicated. Fourthly, there is required hereunto the *solemn ordination*, inauguration, dedication, or setting apart, of the person so chosen."—*True Nature of a Gospel Church, Chapters 3 and 4.*

In his admirable discourse on "Spiritual Gifts," having distinguished between extraordinary calls, gifts, and officers, and those which are ordinary, he says:

"But whereas the other sort of officers was given by Christ by his immediate call and communication of power unto them, it doth not appear how he gives these ordinary officers or min-

isters unto the Church? I answer, he did it originally, and continueth to do it, by the ways and means ensuing:

“1. He doth it by the law and rule of the gospel, wherein he hath appointed this office of the ministry in his Church, and so always to be continued.

“2. The Lord Christ giveth and continueth this office by giving spiritual gifts unto men to enable them to discharge the duties and perform the work of it.

“3. He doth it by giving power to his Church in all ages to call and separate unto the work of the ministry such as he hath fitted and gifted for it.” “It is obedience unto the law of Christ, and following the guidance of his previous communication of gifts as a means to communicate his power unto them who are called to the ministry, that is the whole of what (power) is committed to any in this kind. The Church hath no power to call any to the office of the ministry, where the Lord Christ hath not gone before it in the designation of him by an endowment with spiritual gifts.” “And by reason of these things the Holy Ghost is said to make men overseers of the flocks who are thus called thereunto; because both the communication of power in the constitution of the law, and of spiritual gifts by internal effectual operation, are from him alone.”

“4. The Lord Christ continueth his bestowing of this gift by the solemn ordinance of setting apart those who are called in the manner declared by fasting and prayer and imposition of hands. By these means, I say, doth the Lord Christ continue to declare that he accounts men faithful and puts them into the ministry, as the apostle speaks.”

In his comment on that noted text in the Epistle to the Hebrews, he says:

In an ordinary call “there are three things: 1. A providential designation of a person to such an office, work, or employment, . . . the providential disposition of the circumstances of his life, directing his thoughts and designs toward such an end.”

“2. It is a part of this call of God when he blesseth, succeedeth, and prospereth the endeavors of men to prepare themselves with those previous dispositions and qualifications which are necessary unto the actual call and susception of this office. And hereof also there are three parts: First. An inclination of their hearts in compliance with his designation of them unto their office. . . . Secondly. An especial blessing of their endeavors

for the due improvement of their natural faculties and abilities, in study and learning, for the necessary aids and instruments of knowledge and wisdom. Thirdly. The communications of peculiar gifts unto them, rendering them meet and able unto the discharge of the duty of their office, which in an ordinary call is indispensably required as previous to an actual separation unto the office itself. 3. He ordereth things so as that a person whom he will employ in the service of his house shall have an outward call according unto rule for his admission thereto."

In his commentary on Hebrews vi. 7, 8, he says: God calls and sends preachers of the gospel—first, by endowing them with spiritual gifts, enabling them unto that work and duty. The gospel is the ministration of the Spirit; nor is it to be administered but by the gifts of the Spirit." "Secondly, this communication of gifts unto men, is ordinarily accompanied with a powerful and effectual inclination of the minds of men to undertake the work and engage in it, against those objections, discouragements, oppositions, and difficulties, which present themselves unto them in their undertaking. This is so, I say, ordinarily; for there are more instances than one, of those who, having the word of prophecy committed unto them, instead of going to Nineveh, do consult their own reputation, ease, and advantage, and so tack about to Tarshish. And there are not a few who hide and napkin up their talents which are given them to trade withal. But these must one day answer for their disobedience to the heavenly call."

We have quoted largely from Owen, for several reasons: Because of the great weight due to his opinion on account of his unsurpassed eminence in learning and wisdom, in knowledge of the Scriptures, and of all theological questions, doctrinal and practical; because his authority is representative, being more entitled than that of any other to be regarded as an exponent of the views of the Reformed Church generally; because having discussed the subject before us so often and systematically, as a part of the very subject matter of the questions he treated of, it cannot be supposed that a point which the theory we oppose regards as vital and fundamental had any place in his views at

all, as he never once mentions it, unless to exclude it as entering into a call to the ministry.

As Turretine does, he confines an immediate call to an extraordinary office and work. He gives no countenance to the idea that the Spirit reveals or makes known directly and immediately to the individual his duty to enter the ministry. Over and over again, and in places which we have not quoted, he teaches that the Lord "designates the persons" to be called by the Church by endowing them with the requisite qualifications for the office; "appoints and prepares them by the gifts he bestows." And when he enumerates and describes fully and particularly those gifts and qualifications, he does not mention, or even remotely suggest, any inward testimony of the Spirit, any inward consciousness of the mind, as to the fact of a call, or any thing of the kind whatever. Any one having received the necessary gifts, or enabled to attain them, has what Owen calls the *material* call. The *formal* call is when the Church, having evidence of that, and having made proof and trial of them, elects, appoints, and ordains the person to the office of the ministry. The two together constitute a complete divine call, according to the will and authority of the Lord.

9. Moreover, the theory we condemn is certainly inconsistent with the teachings, provisions, and practice of our own particular Church. This has been controverted, but it can be maintained by several proofs. We will present but one. Let it be remembered that this theory affirms that it is essential to a true call that the subject of it have a conscious conviction that he is called by the Spirit; that his own inward consciousness must testify, not only that he is called, but called by the Spirit; if it is not absurd to speak so, that he must be conscious of the Spirit, as well as of the call; at any rate that he must have as conscious certainty that it is God who calls, as that he is called.* Now, as we have already remarked, such a call authenticates itself, at least to the individual. He needs no other proof, test, or trial of it. He can have none equal to its own evidence. But it is a fact that our Church requires every asserted or supposed call to be subjected to test, proof, and trial, and that not merely for

the satisfaction and full conviction of the Church, *but also for those of the individual himself*. This we presume will not be intelligently questioned. It is implied in the very fact and nature of these trials. For, on the supposition that these trials in any instance fail to sustain the truth and genuineness of the call, (and if they never do so they are unnecessary and impertinent,) then the Church is bound to decide against it; and equally so is the individual himself. That is, he is bound to surrender what to him is the higher and stronger evidence in favor of the lower and weaker. There is but one alternative, viz., to conclude that such a call as this theory supposes is a mere imagination. It may be well to quote in this connection a remark of Owen, in which, speaking of an immediate and extraordinary call, he uses an expression sometimes applied or misapplied to the ordinary call of a minister of the gospel. "A man pretending to extraordinary vocation by immediate revelation, in respect of self-persuasion of the truth of his call, must be as ascertained of it as he could be of a burning fire in his bones, if there shut up." This kind of a call belongs in Owen's view, not to the ordinary ministers of the gospel, but to the extraordinary officers and servants of God, such as prophets and apostles.

To sum up the general principles we have sought to establish, the following statements will present the whole extent of the matter:

1. The Church of God in the world is a community chosen and called and set apart of him, "a holy nation, a royal priesthood, a peculiar people," to be wholly consecrated unto him, to serve him every one, with all and whatsoever gifts they have

*For if this meaning be rejected, and it be said to teach that all one is conscious of is the conviction that he is called, to which conviction he has come through the exercise of his rational faculties under the teachings of the Scriptures and of providence, and under the influences of the Holy Spirit with and through these, this is the theory which we accept; and it cannot be said to be an immediate call, or produced by the immediate agency of the Spirit. Moreover, it cannot be complete, conclusive, and certain, *until the Church has called*; for this is an essential part, both of the teachings of Scripture, and of the indications of providence in regard to the matter.

received from him by nature, providence, and grace, or may be able to obtain from him.

2. This Church, which is the kingdom of God in the world, is governed and administered by the Holy Spirit, wholly and universally, in all its interests, affairs, and operations, whether of internal relations among the members thereof, or of outward relations to the unconverted world, and whether of less or greater importance and magnitude.

3. In the administration of the Spirit he bestows on the members of this Church diversities of gifts, dividing to each severally as he will, imparting to some whatsoever gifts and abilities may be necessary and required for all the work, ministry and offices of the Church, and of the individual members thereof.

4. The gift received by any one in this kingdom of the Lord determines the kind of work and service he is to render therein. In bestowing the ability and qualification for any work, or the opportunity lawfully to acquire them, the Spirit indicates his divine will that that person should perform that work. Thereby he designates him both to himself and the Church to that ministry and office. The possession of the gift is a call to the work.

5. The administration of the Spirit in the ordinary government of the Church, including the bestowal of gifts and ability for the work and service appointed to be done, is by and through means and instruments appointed and chosen and employed by him according to his sovereign and gracious will and pleasure.

6. Any service and duty needing to be performed, whether of Christian charity, or of office, the Church finding those on whom the Spirit has bestowed suitable qualifications and abilities, calls and appoints them thereto; if it be to the duty and service of an office appointed of the Lord in the Church, tries and proves those gifts and fitness, elects, appoints, and ordains them to that office.

7. Any one so placed in the office of the gospel ministry is truly called of God, has a divine commission and authority as such, is a minister of Christ and not of men, has been put into the ministry by him, is by him chosen and sent, has been made a bishop over the Church by the Holy Ghost, is the herald, the

messenger, the ambassador of the Lord; and whosoever receiveth him, receiveth not him, but his blessed Master—to whom be all the honor and glory forever and ever.

These principles being established, several important consequences flow from them of a practical nature:

1. It follows that the Church ought, diligently and faithfully, to use means to secure an adequate and abundant number of ministers suitably prepared and qualified for the work. If the ministration of the Spirit is a ministration of means, it is not of means dead and mechanical, but the means of a living Church and living members thereof; and of means in the hands of the living Church and its living members, by them used and employed as active and faithful co-workers with the Lord. And as for all the ends, and for all the service to which the Church is called and appointed, it is called and required to use means and agencies and efforts, rational, naturally adapted thereto, and within the reach of human power; so also for this, namely, that a sufficient number of those who are called to be saints, shall also be suitably furnished, qualified, called, and sent into the work of the gospel ministry.

In opposition to this some may resort, as has been done, to the convenient and easy device of representing it in terms which make it appear false and absurd. It may be said, for example, that to use means to increase the number of ministers, is to suppose that in some way "God's action in raising up and sending forth preachers, may be stimulated or its frequency increased." And it seems to be thought that this way of putting the thing is a sufficient argument against it. But obviously the same false-looking statement may be employed in opposition to the use of any means for the conversion and salvation of men, and with the same validity, which is none at all. It may be made against the duty of prayer to the Lord of the harvest to send forth more laborers, which is plainly commanded; and against all prayer, as has often been done by the profane and the ungodly.

It may be said that we need not concern ourselves about a sufficient supply of ministers, or use means to secure them; for the Lord of the kingdom will take care of its interests, will

certainly call all whom he intends to call to this work, or needs to carry forward his glory in the world; and that all whom he calls will certainly obey the call, for it is effectual and invincible. But obviously again, precisely the same argument, if it is worthy to be so called, with equal force and power, which is none at all, may be urged against all means and efforts to convert and save dying sinners. Appealing to the precious doctrines of predestination and election and the effectual call of the Spirit, it may be said all our labors are vain and uncalled for—as often has been said and will be said, but always said to no purpose whatever. The plain reply to it all is, that the kingdom of God in the world is a kingdom of means, of human instrumentalities, of Christian efforts, prayers, and labors, through which the will and purpose of God are accomplished and glorified; that his pre-determining and gracious purposes and the invincible might and power of his grace are made known to us, not for the rule and guide of our duty, not to stay or relax our endeavors, but to inspire our faith and hope, to stimulate and encourage our yet more ardent efforts. Besides, the call to the ministry is not always effectual and invincible unless it be direct and immediate by the power of the Holy Spirit; which doctrine we trust has been shown to have no foundation in fact or in scripture. There can be no question, that not a few who have received gifts to be of great service in the ministry, and who were called thereby, and by the indications of providence, and by the necessities of the Church to enter upon its duties, have, as Owen expresses it, hid their talent in a napkin, and stood aside from their duty.

The means to be used by us to obtain a sufficient supply of ministers are chiefly these. Prayer is first of all; frequent, fervent, importunate, faithful prayer. Next, we should use the Holy Scriptures, by faithfully instructing the Church in the whole doctrine of the ministry, touching the nature, necessity, uses, benefits, blessings, authority, privileges, and rewards thereof, and that publicly and privately, with the whole congregation and with individuals, on all proper and suitable opportunities.

Again, another means important and necessary to be used for
VOL. XXIII., NO. 1.—7.

this end by the Church, is duly to appreciate, employ, sustain, encourage, provide for, and use those ministers who have already been called to the work. If their brethren in the Lord, who are one with them in all the privileges, blessings, hopes, trials, afflictions, and responsibilities of his glorious kingdom, and equally called as they are to be wholly and unreservedly consecrated to God, do not so value the ministry and seek to enjoy its benefits, and support it, and sympathise with it, and give it all due encouragement in the Lord; how can we expect him to put so heavy a burden on others which they cannot bear, and on the Church which will not? And how can it be but that some who ought to enter the ministry will fail to do so, knowing the sacrifices and trials it must require? It is vain to say that none ought to be deterred from duty by such motives; the fact is, they are and will be, in all the varieties of Christian obligation, both of a private and of an official nature. Grace will be given some to triumph over all difficulties and discouragements. For the Lord will not leave himself without witnesses. But to expect him to multiply this divine gift of a faithful ministry, when that of it already bestowed is dishonored, unappreciated, neglected, and unsupported by the Church, is to expect wickedness to be rewarded and ingratitude to be blessed by the just and righteous King of Zion.

Another important means to this end is, for those who are now in the ministry fully and faithfully to discharge the duties thereof, to maintain and make manifest its usefulness and honor, to make it a praise and a blessing in the Church and before the world. An idle and unprofitable ministry, which does not command the respect and reverence of men, and prove its usefulness and divine calling by the character and life and labors of its members, must be a mighty hindrance to the calling of others. When the ministry of any Church generally, or any considerable number of them, are not truly consecrated to their work, become worldly and secular in spirit and conduct, seek for selfish and carnal ends, and walk in a manner unbecoming their office and calling, few will be found to enter their ranks. They become a reproach among men, and an offence unto God. Any one such

minister exerts an influence, wide-spread and terrible, to prevent others from seeking the office. If, therefore, we would have the number of ministers increased, of such as are truly qualified and called to this service, let those who are already engaged in it, elevate its character, prove themselves workmen who need not be ashamed, to live and so labor that all men may be constrained to honor and reverence the office, and to confess its blessing and usefulness to the Church and to the world.

Still another means which ought to be used to obtain more ministers, is, to encourage and assist those who may possess the necessary gifts for the office, or who can acquire them to seek and to enter it. If the principles we have endeavored to maintain are correct, then it evidently follows that it is proper for the Church, for a minister, and even for a private Christian, to exhort and to aid any one who already has the ability and qualifications required for the work of the ministry, or with regard to whom there is a reasonable probability that he may be able to do so, to seek and to enter upon that work in the appointed way. It is impossible to assign any good reason why we should not exhort and admonish one another in regard to this work as much as any other, of course with such limitations and cautions as are always necessary to be observed. If it is the duty of all to serve God with whatever gifts they have received or can lawfully acquire, if we are to covet earnestly the best gifts for this purpose, then it is our duty also to teach and exhort and help one another to do so, in respect to these gifts and this service as well as others. And those who have not the ability to serve God in the ministry, and cannot obtain it, ought, to the utmost of their power, to encourage and assist others who can, by constant prayers for them, by loving and helpful words, by every manner of good deeds they can perform, by caring for their wants, and by contributing means for their training and preparation.

2. It also follows from the general principles we have tried to establish, that if there is need in any Church for more ministers than are already employed in the work, there are some of its members *who ought to be in the ministry and are not*. What mean the many "vacant" churches all through our Church, in

every part of it—churches without a regular pastor, and the unsupplied missionary fields at home and abroad? What is the meaning and interpretation of that cry which continually comes up from every portion of the land, like the voice of a great multitude calling for ministers of the gospel? What signify the waste places and desolations of Zion, so many and so piteous, that we could wish our head to be waters and our eyes fountains of tears, that we might weep over them day and night? Does it all mean that the merciful Lord of the Church will not prepare and qualify and call and give to the Church as many ministers as it needs? that he has forsaken any part of Zion and given over his heritage to desolation and death? that he is unwilling to bestow on his people the priceless and inestimable blessing of a faithful ministry? Never! a thousand times never! It means that some who ought to be in the ministry are not engaged in that work. It means that if there are ten places in the Church where ministers are needed for every one who comes forward to supply them, there are nine men for that one who ought to enter the ministry and do not.* Why do they not? Either they wilfully and sinfully refuse to do their duty, or the Church has not used the necessary means to obtain them from the Lord of the kingdom, or it has required and set up a standard of qualification for the ministry not authorised by the word of God, or it has adopted a theory in regard to the call to the ministry which is false and pernicious, which has no foundation in scripture, and which keeps them out—one or other of these reasons, and perhaps all of them combined, would seem to answer that question. And assuredly there is need for the most careful and searching inquiry to be made every where and by all, What is the true and real reason? It ought to spread over the whole Church, piercing to the soul and conscience of every congregation, every minister, elder, and member. It ought to peal its alarming cry through our assemblies and synods and presbyteries and sessions, till all our ears shall tingle and our cheeks grow pale and our knees smite together, and each one of us is ready to say, "Lord,

*Dr. Dabney.

what wilt thou have me to do?" We ought not to shirk this question, to cover it up, postpone or defer it. There is a dreadful sin and fault somewhere, and upon somebody—a sin at which the skies above us might well grow dark and the earth tremble beneath our feet, and at which the Church should clothe herself in sackcloth and repent in dust and ashes. There is and there can be no good reason, without blame and guilt somewhere, why there should not be a supply of ministers equal to the wants and necessities of the Church.

3. Furthermore, it follows, from the principles we have advocated, that if the Church needs more ministers, it should carefully seek and look among its members to see if there are any, not yet called to that service, on whom the Lord has bestowed the necessary gifts and abilities for it, and if it find any such, at once call them to undertake it; and they, so called by the Church, are under the highest obligations to obey that call as the call of their Lord and Master. It is not for the church in need of a minister to sit with folded hands and wait until one present himself, professing to be called of God and asking to be admitted to the office. But plain duty requires to bestir itself to inquire and make diligent search whether there may be any who has received such qualifications as the work and the word of God demand. If any such be found, it is the right and duty of the Church to lay its hand on him and call him to the work. Thereupon he may not refuse but in violation of his vows to his divine Lord, and of a fundamental principle, whereby alone he has any place in the kingdom of God—namely, the consecration of his whole self unto the Lord, to serve him with all his powers in whatsoever way he can and the work of the Lord have need of him. And therein he is required to be obedient to the voice of the Church, and submit to them that have the rule over him.

This consequence from the preceding discussion, is evidently of a very serious nature. It would lead to results, if practically acted on and carried out, so different from our actual practice and administration of Church affairs, and may be an idea so foreign to prevalent impressions and established customs, that it is wholly vain and useless to present it. But it so evidently and

necessarily follows, from the principles we have endeavored to establish, that we shall not argue it further. It stands or falls with them. We will add, however, our clear and immovable conviction that in this way all the ordinary officers of the Church were called in apostolic times; and that a candid and intelligent examination of the New Testament must prove this to be a fact. If this be true, it is a truth of the most solemn importance, and will be disregarded at the awful peril of the most precious interests of the Church, and tremendous responsibilities of those who rule and control the Church.*

Whatever may be our views in regard to a call to the ministry, we must all agree, for we cannot but know, that there is a most lamentable deficiency in the number of ministers needed by our

*The ordination of a ruling elder to the gospel ministry during last summer by the Presbytery of South Carolina, under unusual circumstances, has attracted some attention in the Church, and that Presbytery has thought it proper to adopt a somewhat elaborate and carefully prepared minute in explanation and defence of its action. It appears to us that that action was in exact accordance with the principles we have sought to maintain in this article and the conclusions we draw from them. It is our happiness to know personally nearly every minister and very many of the ruling elders of that Presbytery, and they will not take it ill if we venture some criticism on the minute adopted in reference to this case. It seems to us that the call of the beloved ruling elder to the ministry in this instance should not be styled "an extraordinary call," an "extraordinary vocation." This is a phraseology appropriated by old and established usage to very different cases, as we have shown, and is liable to be misunderstood. Considerations of prudence also might be suggested why it should be avoided in such a case as this. The manner in which this brother was brought into the ministry may have been *unusual*. Our Presbyteries do not now commonly proceed in this matter in the way in which the South Carolina Presbytery acted in this case. But there appears to be no reason why the call of this gentleman should be described as extraordinary. In fact, similar cases were neither unusual nor extraordinary in the early times of the Reformed Church. The only peculiarities in the case referred to, as it seems to us, even when compared with our modern way of managing this matter, were that the Presbytery did not subject the person ordained literally and precisely to the very forms of trial prescribed by our rules, and that the Presbytery declared its judgment that he was called to the ministry previously to any declaration on his part of conviction or desire in regard to it. But if we are not in error,

Church, and the prospect for a full supply of them is anything but bright and hopeful. And we hear of no destitution in any measure proportionally as great in any Church but our own. In what denomination, and where, can be found any considerable number of congregations remaining, year after year, unsupplied with the regular services of a minister? Some such churches there may be in all communions from time to time; but in all except our own they are comparatively few, and they do not long continue unsupplied. How it is with us, all of us well understand. These facts have a tremendous significance, and they cry aloud for attention with a voice that ought to be heard.

And surely there is need for the greatest wisdom, and caution, and fidelity, and courage, both on the one side and the other,

he had already made full trial and proof of his fitness and qualifications for the office in other ways, and there was abundant evidence of this. In regard to the second peculiarity, the Presbytery itself says well, in language which virtually implies that such a call is not properly extraordinary: "In ordinary cases a call from God to preach the gospel is ascertained when three elements combine together—viz., the individual's own conviction that he is so called; the testimony of some particular congregation conveyed in their election and vocation of the individual; the judgment of the Presbytery in confirmation of the individual's convictions and the congregation's testimony. But our Form of Government, following the Scripture, dispenses with the second of these three elements in cases like the present. This being so, it is plain to this Presbytery that the order in which the three elements must present themselves cannot be viewed as a fixed or necessary one. In many cases the individual's convictions are first in the order of time; but there is no reason why this order should always prevail. It is just as legitimate for the testimony of a church to be the first element, or, as in the present case, it may be proper for Presbytery to take the initiative."

We must object, however, to the apparent meaning of this, in referring this case to that of an evangelist, that this office, as we now employ it, is "extraordinary;" and we could wish every Presbytery had "a score of men," such as this one, to call to the work, so that there might be no temptation to regard such cases as either unusual or extraordinary.

May not the earnest and repeated assertion that none may "volunteer" for the service of the ministry, be misunderstood and work harm? See, in reference to the extraordinary call of the prophet, Isaiah vi. 8.

and on all sides, at the same time. A few years ago, soon after the close of the Confederate war, it was joyfully reported that an unusual number of our young men were turning their thoughts to the gospel ministry. The tidings were heard with universal gladness and thanksgiving throughout the Church. It seemed to be a part of those rich spiritual blessings vouchsafed unto us amid the distress and desolations of those terrible times by an ever faithful and most merciful God. Many of our best and most useful ministers had been taken up to the heavenly glory during that wicked war. Many of our young men, who were being led by the Lord and the Church to the work of the ministry, had died triumphant in the faith while in the service of their country. And amid silent pulpits, and wasted churches, and scattered congregations, it was indeed good tidings of great joy to hear that many of the young men still spared to us were seeking the ministry. But in our rejoicing a cry of "*danger*" was raised. It was intimated that some of them were seeking that office from unworthy motives. That cry was repeated in high places. It was sounded throughout the Church. Every body was exhorted to guard the doors of the ministry, lest they should be crowded with unfit applicants for admission. We do not question the motives of those who raised this alarm. We do not know what facts led them to awaken it. But we must confess that cry smote the heart with another terror. We feared lest we might be led to slight and refuse a special and most gracious gift of our Lord—lest we might be guilty of a grievous want of faith. We found it more easy to believe in his great mercy and compassion and special grace in our great need, than to believe that many of the young Christians among us would seek the office of the ministry in an impoverished Church from unworthy motives. However, the fact now is that we have no reason to be alarmed by the crowd of candidates for the ministry, or to fear that many will seek it from unhallowed reasons. But we may well ask, Have we no ground for a different fear and another alarm? And if there is need of caution, is there not also need of courage and of trust?

ARTICLE IV.

THE RELATIONS OF CONSCIENCE TO TRUTH AND FALSEHOOD.

Does conscience take cognizance of the distinction between truth and falsehood in morals?

Questions of this kind often arise from a misapprehension, or a confused use of terms, or both. This misapprehension and confusion will generally be found, both to spring from, and lead to, misconceptions of the things marked by the terms. An examination of terms and their uses is therefore generally the most ready and satisfactory method of settling such questions.

To "take cognizance of the distinction between truth and falsehood," admits of two distinct significations which may be easily confounded or interchanged in the course of an argument. It may mean, to examine and determine what is true or false in any given case, and thus establish the distinction; or it may mean no more than to recognise, or admit, what has already been determined as true or false—to accept the distinction which has been already established.

If it is meant to inquire whether conscience does the first—determines and distinguishes the true and false—then the answer must be, No! unless we are prepared to show, either that two distinct faculties of the soul are necessary to determine such questions; or that one faculty can determine questions of this kind in one sphere of the soul's activity, while another faculty is necessary to determine them in a different sphere.

The formal expression of a truth is the assertion of a relation which really exists between the subject and predicate; while the formal expression of a falsehood is the assertion of a relation between subject and predicate which does not really and truly exist. There is open to predication, both true and false, a wide field of thought and fact, into which conscience does not and cannot enter. With the truths or falsehoods, as such, in mathematics and the physical sciences, conscience has no more to do

than with the color of one's eye. Here, undoubtedly, truth and falsehood are distinguished by some other faculty than conscience. Whether this be the critical or logical faculty, the reason, the understanding, the judgment, or whatever it may be named, it is certainly not the conscience. Touching all things, and all relations of things, outside of moral beings and their relations, this faculty, whatever be its name, examines, determines, and distinguishes the true and the false. In this wide field, no such question as duty arises; and conscience, therefore, has no jurisdiction. Both the things and their relations in this wide field of fact and thought, excite various emotions in the mind, but never the emotions of conscience, however analogous they may be. There is the sense of fitness or unfitness, of beauty or deformity, of convenience or inconvenience; but no sense of obligation to do or not do, as befitting or worthy of the doer and the one to whom the action is done—no command, to obey which is right and worthy of honor—to disobey which, is wrong and disgraceful, and deserving of punishment. These latter emotions arise in the field of facts and falsehoods touching moral beings and their relations, and are the functions of conscience.

If the critical faculty distinguishes truth and falsehood in the field of facts and relations where conscience has no play, it must do so in the field where conscience is called into action; unless these truths and their distinctions are so different that they are incapable of being the proper objects of this faculty. But it will not be contended that truth and its formal expression, as such, in the field of morals, is different from truth in any other field of thought, or that it can be determined in any other way than any other truth is determined. So far is it from being true, that the critical faculty is in abeyance in the field of morals, or entirely subordinate to conscience in its clearly ascertained determinations—it even becomes the critic of conscience, and determines whether the exercise of this function of the soul is true or false. The critical faculty, then, being competent to distinguish truth and falsehood in all fields of inquiry, it must be denied that conscience distinguishes, or “takes cognizance of the distinction

between truth and falsehood," in the sense of ascertaining the true and the false in morals.

In ascertaining whether conscience recognises this distinction in the second sense—whether it accepts as true or false, and *because* it is true or false, what has been otherwise determined, an opportunity is at once presented for confusion in the interchange of terms. In the field of morals, and in designating moral conduct and feeling, the terms, *true* and *right*, on the one hand, and *false* and *wrong*, on the other, are constantly interchanged and used as synonymous. It is true that these terms are used interchangeably in regard to truths and falsehoods outside the domain of morals; as a right and wrong, or a true and false, answer to a mathematical problem. In these cases, the words are taken as equivalents, and are used to designate what has been determined by our critical faculty, and what conscience has no concern with whatever.

But in the field of morals, were these terms used correctly, a thing or action would be pronounced *true* or *false*, because the reason has so determined it, and at the same time would be called *right* or *wrong*, because the conscience approves or disapproves of it. The interchange of terms in this case is quite different from their interchange in the other, because they are properly used with reference not to one faculty, but with reference to two clearly distinct faculties of the soul—the reason and the conscience. If this interchange of terms is admissible in the case of moral distinctions, it can be, or ought to be, only where these two faculties agree in approving or disapproving, as true and right, or as false and wrong. That they are not generally so used is notorious.

But because they are or may be used interchangeably with reference to the decisions of conscience alone, it does not follow, that they are so used in the question at the head of this article; for this would be to ask if conscience (whose function is to approve and command the right, or to disapprove and forbid the wrong) takes cognizance of the distinction between right and wrong. Such equivalence of terms cannot therefore be contemplated by the question. This would be still more evident, if it

could be shown that the same mind can approve as right what it distinguishes as false, and the reverse. That one mind can approve and command what another sees to be false, is an everyday occurrence; and one great practical difficulty in the moral relations of life, is to harmonise the conscience of one man with the logic of another.

Leaving out of view the possibilities of disagreement between the reason and the conscience of the same mind, no one will dispute that there are innumerable cases in which conscience approves and commands as *right* what reason determines as *true*, and disapproves and forbids as *wrong* what reason determines as *false*.

The question then returns, whether conscience accepts these results of the critical activity—cognises the truth determined to its hand—as the basis of its action? Is the approval of conscience made in view of the fact that what it approves is *true*, or in view of the fact that what it approves is *due*? Is it adjudged by the conscience to be *due*, because it has been logically ascertained to be true; or does the conscience approve it as due by an immediate, simple, intuitive apprehension of its fitness to the relations of the parties, and independent of all critical examination of these relations? Or is this harmony accidental, and due to the fact that these two functions of the soul are exercised in the same field of facts and relations, to effect different, though not incompatible results?

If these two functions are *necessarily* connected, and conscience waits on reason to determine the basis, or justify the correctness of its action, does it not follow that the feeling of duty cannot arise antecedent to reasoning, nor the feeling of obligation be perfect before the critical faculty has pronounced on its correctness? Whether this be so or not, can be determined by an appeal to consciousness alone.

If this harmony be accidental, and due to the fact that both reason and conscience range over the same field in morals, will it not then follow that the mistakes of reason cannot be corrected by conscience, nor the mistakes of conscience by reason? Whether such corrections are ever made or not, must be de-

terminated, as in the other case, by an appeal to consciousness.

If consciousness does not find the consequences of their *necessary* connexion to be true, and so invalidates the *necessity* of the connexion, then there remains the accidental connexion to fall back on. Then, should consciousness find that these two faculties do correct each other's mistakes, it would remain to be determined whether the corrections were accidental or necessary. Should they appear to be necessary, then this view emerges, that in all cases of harmony in the action of these two faculties, conscience recognises the distinction between truth and falsehood, not as *truth* and *falsehood*, but as *obligation to do or not to do*, and commands accordingly. In other words, it is not the function of conscience to distinguish truth and falsehood, *as such*, but as *right* and *wrong*, otherwise conscience and reason would be undistinguishable. That they are clearly distinguishable, is attested by consciousness.

There is, however, a class of phenomena which may at least illustrate this connexion of reason and conscience as necessary, even if they do not establish it by strict analogy. That this connexion is often felt by every one, is taken as granted. The phenomena of sensation and perception present a field full of illustrative facts. Let it be admitted, if any one contends for it, that sensation, without its attendant perception, is possible. No one will contend that the perception is possible without the sensation, or an undoubting belief that the sensation is felt. The perception corresponds to—is in keeping with—the sensation, no matter how abnormal and diseased the sensorium may be. Even in cases of diseased sensation—cases of hallucination—where the slightest examination shows that the state of the sensorium—the sensation—is not due to the presence of any external object to which perception immediately, intuitively, and necessarily, refers it—even in this case the feeling of perception continues while the sensation remains, and undergoes correction, *pari passu*, with the correction of the sensation. Even amputated limbs furnish their apparent sensations and inseparable

perceptions years after the surgeon's knife and saw have consigned them to dissolution.

On the other hand, let it be granted that every possible truth and falsehood within the whole region of morals may be distinguished by the critical faculty, without any corresponding emotion of conscience, may it not be successfully maintained that no emotion of conscience is possible, unless attended with an apprehension of the truth or falsehood, or a firm belief in the truth or falsehood, of those relations which come within the jurisdiction of conscience? Does not conscience change her mandates just as reason changes her conclusions?

In this way it is that an act or feeling which seemed to be right when a given set of relations were concluded to be true, appears to be wrong when the determinations touching these relations are found to be false, and the convictions of the conscience change as the conclusions of the reason change. It is in this way that false reasoning misleads conscience, just as diseased sensation misleads perception; and conscience is as impotent to determine about the correctness of the reasoning as perception is to determine the correctness of the sensation.

As in a court, it is the business of the jury to determine the truth or falsehood of the charges alleged in the indictment, but the business of the judge to pronounce the sentence of acquittal or condemnation and command its execution, so conscience seems to wait for the verdict of reason before she approves or disapproves of any act or feeling, and commands or forbids accordingly.

So entirely subordinate to reason does conscience seem to be, in many cases, that even her own acts of approval or disapproval—her commands and prohibitions—have to be submitted to the investigation of the critical reason, by which they are often ascertained to have been false; and thus convicted of wrong, conscience is forced to countermand her own orders. In all this, however, she maintains her own autonomy, and in her apparent subordination is really a concurrent power, as absolute in her own realm as reason is in the realm of logical distinctions; and

she commands the right, not as *true*, but as *due*; while she forbids the wrong, not as *false*, but as *wicked*. Only in this view, that reason and conscience are independent but still concurrent and coördinate powers, can we comprehend and explain those extreme cases—those occasional prodigies, of minds distinguished for remarkable logical power and acuteness without the corresponding moral emotions, or remarkable moral sensitiveness without the corresponding logical power—two antagonistic enormities—a kind of logical and moral insanity.

In this light emerges the error of that system of education which either tacitly assumes, or formally maintains, that the development of the intellect, the cultivation of the logical powers, must *necessarily* be attended by a corresponding development of the moral sentiments and emotions, though these receive no special training. Their connexion is not *causal* and *necessary*. Hence, in this light, appears the truth of the antagonistic system of education—that these functions are distinct—that each has its appropriate culture; that neither can be neglected without injury to the other; and that a sound and normal education must develop reason and conscience by distinct, yet appropriately combined, means, going hand in hand, like the healthy development of mind and body, from infancy to maturity. While all things and their relations furnish an appropriate field for the development and exercise of the logical powers, in determining the true, only moral beings and their relations furnish a proper field for the development of conscience and the exercise of her regal power.

ARTICLE V.

RIGHTS AND DUTIES.

Nearly a century ago a declaration was presented to the civilised world containing the important announcement that God had made all men equal. The true intent of that famous publication was to insist upon the equality of a colony with the parent State, and the general statement was merely the introduction to this particular claim, more explicitly set forth in a subsequent paragraph of the same document. This declaration also asserted that God had endowed all humanity with certain inalienable rights, some of which it enumerated. All of these sentences are sonorous, but the words are vague and inaccurate, or else they do not convey the same meaning to-day. Perhaps the world is a hundred years wiser than it was when those high-sounding words were written. Certainly, the men who most industriously reiterate those phrases every year at the summer solstice, most accurately contradict every principle that the phrases are supposed to involve. Amongst them the press, the forum, the bench, and the pulpit, agree with remarkable unanimity to-day, in declaring that there are millions of men in this land who are neither free nor equal nor endowed with any of the rights specified. If these inheritances and endowments have been forfeited by these millions, the loss was incurred in the performance of an act precisely similar to the declaration aforesaid. Altogether the statement is decidedly unsatisfactory.

The equality of "all men," according to God's estimate, is found in the naked fact that all men are sinners. It is so stated explicitly. God hath concluded all under sin, and there is no difference between Jew and Greek in this regard. Consequently the proffer of salvation is made alike to all. No difference of terrestrial condition counts in the divine estimation, when dealing with the matter of sin and the other matter of restoration. All men come into the world already condemned, and all men must pass through the portals of the new creation

in order to obtain a foothold in the better inheritance. But otherwise, that is, outside of this narrow line, all professions of equality are delusions or shams. There is no such thing on the face of the earth. Aside from the fact that various kinds of influence enable one man to dominate over another, there are in all cases relations involving rights on one hand and duties on the other, which are constantly modified by the providence of God. Nor does this difference in status result from the lapsed condition of the race, because the law and purpose of God are written upon the nature of man—the same in Eden and in Sodom.

Looking first at the concrete manifestation of this invariable rule of variation, it is seen that the relation of parent and child must needs involve authority and subordination. The abstract principle is hidden in the fatherhood of God, whereof the terrestrial relation is the necessary shadow. At the outset of the argument, it should be noted that God has not adopted this title of Father because he could find no other earthly relation which so nearly resembled that subsisting between him and his creatures. Neither has he appropriated other titles with which men are familiar for the purpose of revealing himself under these names, and in these or like attitudes, to the apprehension of men. But all ordinary human relations exist by the decree of God, because the domination of the true Father, Ruler, and Husband in heaven is the enduring substance from whence these terrestrial shadows come. Man was made in the image and likeness of God, and therefore there would have been fathers and children, kings and subjects, husbands and wives on the earth, if the race had been confirmed in holiness.

I. In the order of this discussion, those relations for which the second table of the law makes provision, naturally cover the whole ground. And the lowest of these is the identical relation that the law names, as if the duties belonging to it rose up by regular gradations, and applied to all the conditions into which humanity socially developed. As expounded by Christ, those special commands touching duties that grow out of these higher conditions, are all included in the command: "Thou shalt love

thy neighbor as thyself." So the first and foundation duties to be considered belong to man, or rather are entailed upon humanity by reason of the brotherhood of the race. Nor were these obligations, whatever they are, entailed upon a *fallen race*, because they are, first, enstamped upon the nature of man by the Creator; and, secondly, because they must exist in the nature of the case, in order to distinguish earth from hell. Neighborhood, therefore, claims attention first.

It is manifest that nothing but sin could disturb the fraternity of mankind. Some transgression of God's law, or some want of conformity to it, as plainly announced in his word, must needs interfere with human happiness, in so far as this depends upon man's social condition. It is true that man cannot be happy separated from God, and consequently the highest exhibitions of human happiness can never be found except among God's restored children. But considering the creature independently of his natural obligations to the Creator, his capacities for happiness under temporal relations can never be known on this side of the millennium. And considering the millennial controversy, independently of God's revelation, a potent argument on the side of literal interpretation is here presented. Is it likely that God would have endowed man with these enormous capacities in vain? Because sin has entered into the world, and no mortal of Adam's race has ever reached the limit of his native capacity in this direction. But suppose the theory of the personal, terrestrial reign should be true?

In this initial condition of social life, there is not much to be said about the "rights" that may be claimed between man and man. Under God's law—this same moral law—each man's individual *rights* are founded upon the express *duties* which are incumbent upon all others. In the last analysis these duties are discharged in "doing unto others that which man should wish others should do unto him." It is evident that the universal observance of this golden rule would abolish all forms of contest between nations and individuals. This sufficient and simple law of God, if obeyed, would effectually dispose of all legal tribunals, all armies and navies, all international treaties—in a word,

all the cumbrous machinery wherewith humanity has surrounded the "rights" of mankind.

Now it is specially noticeable, that human law deals very sparingly, and generally by mere implication, with "duties" abstractly considered. Law is usually prohibitory. It does not so much say what its subjects must do, as what they must refrain from doing. Its primal object is to defend life and reputation and property, and its sanctions are levelled against assaults upon these. It offers no reward for acts of beneficence, and it threatens no penalty against covetousness, envy, or hate, unless these grow into overt acts. While it may be said that human laws are formed upon the great moral law of God, they precisely invert the order upon which the latter proceeds. The thoughts and intents of the heart, which affix a moral quality to the outward act are the things upon which the divine command fastens. But the earthly tribunal examines the *act*, and then tracks back in search of malice aforethought. The rule which God established in Israel with reference to the man-slayer, making a difference between him "who hated not his neighbor in time past" and the deliberate murderer, is the model upon which the human enactment is formed, with its provisions for accidental and justifiable homicide. But all the laws on earthly statute-books are based upon the fact that men are sinners, and their main intent is to hedge about "rights" that may be invaded by the vicious or the criminal. In no place do they interfere with the sinner as such, however; and if they did, it would be the duty of sinners to resist them.

It is, however, true, that both laws specially define and defend certain rights. The decalogue expressly provides for the security of life, reputation, and property. Thou shalt not kill; thou shalt not steal; thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's goods; thou shalt not bear false witness—that is, to damage thy neighbor's reputation. Under the brighter light of the gospel, and in holy societies, the love due to one's neighbor fulfils all of these specifications which are brought to light by the existence of sin in the world. Under the same light these rights became extremely attenuated, because God is the Lord of life and the Sovereign

Proprietor of all things. Men are only stewards of his bounties, and the best men have expressed their readiness to be counted as "the offscouring of all things" in his service.

That these specifications should fall naturally in the line of obedience to the abstract law of love demonstrates the divine original of the rule. There can be no doubt that holy angels live in constant obedience to the first table. The relation of Creator and creature involves this much at least. If God made the angels, they are bound to love and adore him forever. But concerning the second table, it cannot be said that the same application holds. Nothing in revelation indicates a relation resembling brotherhood as obtaining among the heavenly intelligences. It is conceivable that these mighty hierarchs, each one independent of all the rest, and each differing from all others in powers and vocation, are continually engaged in the development of God's boundless and symmetrical providence. And so the results of their individual employments at last fall into exact harmony under the almighty power and infinite wisdom, while they may be totally unconscious of their personal coöperation. One cannot conceive of them as antagonistic one to another, nor yet as cultivating aught like terrestrial affections or friendships. It was a bold flight of fancy that led Milton even so far as he ventures in his vague hints concerning the loving intercourse betwixt the different members of the heavenly host. Still it is not possible to *affirm* the contrary. There may be some such controlling power as that which induces the "love of the brethren" on earth, where each recognising the likeness of Christ in the other, is led to love that image. The angels were never *redeemed*, but they are worshippers of *our* Redeemer.

Possibly the distinguishing characteristic of the inhabitants of earth, wherein they differ from all other intelligent creatures, may be found in the social relations that exist upon this planet. No man may say how far the creative energy has extended, and the record in Genesis deals only with the earth and its inhabitants. Here the law that regulates the conduct of men in their lowest relation of "neighborhood" is clearly based upon their

mutual interdependence; and the point of the argument thus far is attained in the conclusion that follows.

On account of this mutuality, or rather by reason of it, the law deals with "rights" only *incidentally*. Because the implied enumeration of the rights is necessary to define the "duties" that flow from them. "Thou shalt not steal" could not have been written had there been no rights of property to conserve. So the decalogue, and all human enactments that are not wicked and oppressive, take hold upon all men alike, and plainly define what man shall do unto his neighbor, and what he shall refrain from doing. Society is therefore not a combination for the conservation of rights, but a combination rather for the enforcement of duties. This is God's method. Behold how directly man has reversed the order! Society is in *fact* an association for the defence of rights which are exposed to assault continually in exact violation of God's express command. For the whole law of God as affecting social relations is comprised in "the duties God requires of man."

II. But another commandment has been added, because Christ has raised his redeemed Church into another relationship higher than that of neighborhood. In making his people "brethren," he separated them from the rest of the race; and here he does not deal much in specifications. "Love one another" is the simple and all-sufficient command. But as this same injunction had been written upon the nature of the race, there must be some amplification in the rule. "A new commandment I give unto you;" and it was evidently in its application to this new relation subsisting betwixt members of his chosen family that this affection was to be exercised. It is no destruction or reversing of the old obligation. The children of the covenant gathered into the ark, and entertaining each for the other "the love of the brethren," are instructed to exert all their energies to bring others into the same security; and the unbounded charity due to the race of the first Adam is no whit diminished by the new creation which unites the saint to the Second. But as he floats secure upon the broad ocean of time, his ready hand is

outstretched to succor and save the perishing multitudes adrift upon its treacherous surface.

The brotherhood of the Church is, however, a great advance upon the neighborhood of the race. There is nothing in nature corresponding with the communion of the saints. These are the subjects of a new birth, the possessors of a new life principle, far more glorious than anything that pertained to the first covenant. If Adam had maintained his integrity, he would have secured "everlasting" life for himself, and probably for his posterity. But the second covenant secures *eternal* life to him that believeth, and the manifestations of that life are wholly beyond the comprehension of an unregenerate world. It is a hidden life; "for ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God." The life inherited from the progenitor of the race, perished on Calvary, where, "if Christ died for all, then all died;" "and the life which the saint lives upon earth, he lives by the faith of Christ." Something more than mere vitality is here meant, because all the functions of native vitality are exercised alike by saint and sinner. But that the Christian's life is derived directly from the Lord is asserted in many places. "I am the true vine, and ye are the branches;" and the announcement is enforced by the assertion, that these branches would inevitably wither and perish if severed from the vine.

In merely temporal matters, the Lord jealously hedges about this new relation. In contests between brethren they are forbidden the appeal to ordinary tribunals, which would be right for them but for their brotherhood; because these tribunals are established by his authority. Damage not the conscience of a weak brother by eating in an idol temple, albeit the act had no moral quality but for this brotherhood. "Defraud not your brother in this matter," because Christ is the avenger, and not the civil magistrate. The reason attached to the prohibition is peculiar and startling. And it is specially noticeable that human inventions for the conservation of rights are ordinarily in the teeth of the gospel system. Take for example such combinations as trades-unions, where the power of the organisation depends upon the enforced idleness of "strikes." Here the

wrong done is twofold. The capitalist is kept from fulfilling his contracts by the cessation of producing labor, and the laborer is forced into direct contradiction of the beneficent law that commands work. Supposing the striker and the employer to be brethren, it is plain that their brotherhood is totally subverted by the operation of the trade combination. Going a step higher, those governmental arrangements which affix "customs tax" to certain imported commodities fall under the same condemnation, because the operation of the law enables the native manufacturer to take more than is just from the native consumer. Aside from all political considerations, the fact abides; and it contains an argument that is unanswerable upon ethical grounds. It is not a pure legal enactment; but it is the fulfilment of a compact between the voter and his representative; and as it includes a fraud upon the consumer, it is a conspiracy, and therefore contrary to the genius of all law, human and divine. Both of these examples, that of the trades-union and that of the tariff regulation, are based upon the inherent *antagonism* subsisting between man and man defining "rights;" and are opposed to the inherent *brotherhood* of the gospel which enjoins "duties." In the millennial state there will certainly be neither trades-unions nor custom houses.

The moralist, who works out his salvation by the exact fulfilment of law, still fails to reach the status here indicated—because he is conserving rights all the time, his own as well as others. So long as he does exact justice, his conscience is serene. His is the old law of neighborhood. But Christ, in expounding this law, revealed the hitherto unknown doctrine, to wit, that the second table, with its injunctions and prohibitions, involved and concealed the abstract principle of brotherhood. The good Samaritan did more than the letter commanded, and manifested the charity which is the bond of perfectness. And, finally, upon this point, it may be that all the kindly offices which the Christian is bound to render to his brother *man*, proceed upon the always possible fact that the recipient of his bounties may be included in the sovereign election of God, and therefore entitled to the ministrations of his brother *saint*.

III. Another relation, a step higher in the development of the race, is that subsisting betwixt ruler and subject. It is undoubtedly another shadow, and the substance is the kingship of God. Consequently, the duties springing from this relation are enforced by God's authority, and the sanctions of the temporal power are limited by God himself. The obligation resting upon the subject, whether under an absolute monarchy or a republic, to render his dues to Cæsar cannot be questioned, though the identity of Cæsar *may* sometimes be questioned without sin. In the matter of government, however, there is a suggestion that is appropriate here. If the Bible is indeed an all-sufficient rule, providing for all conceivable relations of life, it is rather remarkable that no provision can be found in all its pages for republican forms.* Kings, governors, and magistrates, but neither presidents nor oligarchies. And the fact that these latter are, under American theories, the servants of the sovereign people, only widens the difference between the rule and the example. Because the multitudinous sovereigns are not unanimous in their sentences, and so it comes to pass that a little more than half of them tyrannise with remorseless domination over all the other sovereigns in the land! Perhaps the *rouge* revolts that have once and again devastated the so-called capital of the world, are the legitimate culmination of these unrevealed theories of government.

The only egress from the difficulty here suggested that is apparent, is found in the undying principle that rulers are the executors of law. So, whatever title you may give them, their power, if justly exercised, must lie in the authority of the law whose officers they are. The domination of Darius the Mede was perhaps as pure a form of absolutism as the world ever saw, yet it was the potency of the unalterable law that consigned Daniel to the den of lions even against the desire of the king. This seems to be the only satisfactory method of reconciling popular forms of government with the injunctions of Scripture touching the obedience due to "rulers" as such.

*Is not the Church of Christ a free Christian commonwealth—a representative republic?—[EDITORS S. P. R.]

Returning to the main topic, it may be observed that the proverbial expression very frequently quoted, "all men are equal under the law," would be more accurate if it read, "all men are equally under the law." Because the idea of subordination is the central fact, and the universal or uniform domination of law, without respect of persons, is the main assertion. But human law cannot reach sins or vices, as such. It can fasten only upon crimes. So a new difficulty confronts popular legislation at this point. A majority of the sovereigns are vicious, or sinful, or both, and they are not likely to enact laws that oppose their proclivities. The action of the French Republicans in abolishing the Sabbath, the rights of property, the marriage relation, and all forms of religion, was perfectly legitimate, if the central principle which gives all power to majorities is sound. Among the "powers that are ordained of God," it is absolutely certain that a mobocracy is not included. Yet this terrible evil is precisely the highest development of popular sovereignty.

Therefore, the "equality" of all men under the law consists in their universal subjection; and once more the rights fade away as the duties come into the foreground. The consideration of the rights enjoyed by the ruler, or of the duties incumbent upon him, has no special bearing upon this discussion; as the vast majority of men are subjects to authority, and God reminds kings that he is the one king maker, and that they are subordinate to him. But the dominion of the ruler is clearly established by God, and the duty of obedience to the executive authority is really the obligation to keep God's law as administered by the civil magistrate.

Now, the point aimed at under this head, is that the faithful performance of all the duties arising from this relation does not merit reward. The opposite conduct entails punishment, but the law-abiding subject *earns* nothing. Nor does the faithful executive deserve anything more than the acknowledgment of his faithfulness, and he cannot attain the crown of martyrdom in the mere fulfilment of his official duties. And the subject may attain the rank of a hero on the battle-field, dying in a just

cause, without being canonized. The world makes no greater mistake than that of counting for saving grace the native virtues that adorn humanity. The valiant soldier who falls in the "imminent breach" in defence of king or country, or even of hearthstone and altar, could do no less, as a true man, while he may be far from saintship.

There is a word to be said concerning another relation, analogous to that subsisting betwixt ruler and subject, yet differing in many essential particulars. It is that of master and slave. A large part of the preceptive portion of Holy Writ is devoted to the duties arising from this relation, and by necessary consequence, to a clear announcement of the rights involved in ownership. For the propriety of the master in the body of his slave, whether born in his house or bought with his money, is as absolutely stated as any proposition in the Bible. It is true that this ownership (in the nature of the case) consisted mainly in the right of the owner to the labor of his servant. The master could not dominate over the soul—could not control the thoughts or affections of his bondman; but so far as human authority could extend (in the nature of the case), the domination was very nearly absolute. Solomon, reigning over all Israel with undisputed sway, ruled the slaves of his household with still more despotic authority, and this by the authority of God himself. No candid reader of the Scriptures will doubt or deny this statement, although modern legislation has enacted God's law on this subject out of existence. There will come a time when the descendants of these legislators will square the divine record with the enactments of this age—outlawing Sinai—by showing that God's laws regulating slavery were only intended to reach half through the nineteenth century! There is no other possible egress from the difficulty.

But the main point here sought to be established, is that the rights of ownership, which are declared in the Bible explicitly, are still so hedged about in both Testaments with positive duties that the former are made less prominent by the contrast. On one hand, slaves are reminded that the service they are bound to render, both to the gentle and the froward, they render to

Christ, who is the one Master whose eyes behold and whose eyelids try the children of men; and on the other, masters are taught to remember their subjection to the same Lord Christ in the exercise of their lawful authority, and to deal justly, equitably, and mercifully, with those committed to their care.

And just here the argument in defence of the abolished institution is applicable. God placed an inferior race not only under tutelage, but also under the kindly care of an authority closely resembling that of the parent. In fact, the servants of the household are classed with the children; and in the parable teaching the power of prayer, the servants of the householder, according to Augustine,* are included in the word which the common version has translated "children." In many of the narratives of the Old Testament, wherein the slaves are brought prominently into notice, the affectionate regard subsisting betwixt master and bondman is plainly indicated. A relation which God has surrounded with stringent laws, and which he made beneficent to the subordinate by defining the duty of the superior, can never become a "dead issue" while his revelation is authoritative.

IV. There is another form of domination, and of consequent subjection, in which the very ultimatum of blank despotism is sometimes reached in this sin-cursed world. The authority of the parent is based upon the Fatherhood of God, and no terrestrial relation involves a more absolute and irresponsible system of government. In modern times, however, legislation has been invoked once and again to hedge about and limit parental authority when brutally exercised; but there are many methods of torturing cruelty which human law cannot change, while the present structure of society continues. It is incredible that this despotic system of government could obtain among rational creatures by chance. It is inconceivable that it could abide the levelling tendency of democratic institutions, unless some inflexible law, written upon the nature of man, sustained it. Among savage tribes, where the commandment with promise has never been heard, God has still stamped the principle upon

*"Jam cum suis servis dormientem," etc.

the savage nature, and it has survived, while all other traces of his second table have disappeared.

Upon the theory that paternal authority is founded upon the domination of God as the Father of all—the earthly dominion being the shadow of the heavenly—the duty of unanswering obedience on the part of the child is clear. The ownership is absolute at first, and according to Bible ethics, the child can never outgrow his consequent subordination. Human traditions have invented “corban,” but no provision is made in Scripture for the utterance of this unfilial word. The “rights” of the child are very slightly conserved, either by human or divine legislation. In the former, the law-makers have instinctively relied upon the great law of nature, which makes the claims of simple dependence so urgent and resistless. And in the latter no special enactment was needed, because the law-maker was the God of nature and the author of all her inflexible laws. But the “duties” that grow out of the relation are enforced with constant reiterative and terrible sanctions. Murder is not more explicitly forbidden than disobedience to parental authority, and in the Decalogue the command that defines the duty of obedience is the only one with a specific promise annexed.

So when we come to the later revelation, there is no relaxation of the old rigid requirement. On the contrary, the rebukes of the Lord in the Gospels are directed specifically against the traditions which had supplanted the word of God upon this subject. And in the prayer which he taught his disciples, the first words of it reaffirm the absolute authority of the relation, by ascribing to God the title of universal Father.

In view of the inflexibility of this domination, and the consequent absoluteness of subordination, it might be expected that the “rights” belonging to fatherhood would be so universal as to overshadow the “duties” which God requires of those who exercise this authority. But there are really no exhortations addressed to a class that is dominant—such as to masters, elders, husbands, and fathers—where the right to enforce obedience is specially pressed. The exhortation to “train up a child,” the command to the officer of God’s house to “rule his

children and his own house well," and all kindred precepts, constantly imply the fact that the good of the subordinate is the ultimate object of attainment. Thus the possession of the right to rule always includes the duty to rule well and in the constant fear of God, the one infinite Ruler of all.

V. One other relation, involving authority and subordination, may be noticed. It is that subsisting betwixt husband and wife, where the right to rule and the duty of submission are both explicitly stated in the Bible. In the face of God's clear revelation on this subject, are all the modern schemes touching Women's Rights. Independently of human laws, of human experience, and of the very nature of the case—all of which show the absurdity of the doctrine and the impossibility of its enforcement—the theory of equality as applied to the sexes is flatly contradicted in the Old and New Testaments. The lordship of Abraham over the princess his wife, is emphatically asserted in both Testaments, and no better example is needed.

Here, then, is an illustration of positive rights, and the case is all the stronger from the fact that the marriage relation is the accepted type of that subsisting betwixt the Lord and his Church. In Eden, and ever since, this tie has been the shadow of that enduring substance, and the domination of Christ in his Church is the most absolute of all forms of dominion. He is the Redeemer of a lost people. He is the purchaser of bond-slaves, sold under sin. He is the elector of a chosen generation, and he is the only King in Zion. No limit to his power, no limit to his authority. His dominion is an everlasting dominion. And always and specially it is the lordship of the husband over the bride. The most scathing rebukes addressed to his unfaithful Church are those in which she is likened to a disloyal wife. And it is worthy of notice that the examples of marriages given in Scripture, correspond in some essential particular with the great marriage of the King's Son. The first of all, where the wife was given the regal title "Woman," because she was taken out of man, accords with the relation subsisting betwixt the true vine and the branches. The long toil of Jacob for Rachel typifies the travail of the Athlete who came in dyed garments

from Bozrah, and who trod the wine-press alone in the greatness of his strength. And it may be noticed here that the correspondence of Jacob's case, regarded typically, has been carried still further. The two wives are referred to as types of the two Churches—the first and less beloved represented by Leah, and the second the elect Church gathered from among the Gentile tribes who had no rights of primogeniture to urge. It is also worthy of remark that the children of Rachel, Benjamin, Ephraim, and Manasseh, seem to have been special objects of God's favor. In the 80th Psalm, these three are enumerated to the exclusion of the ten other tribes, and the omission could not be accidental.

The temptation to enlarge upon the marriage relation is very urgent, and it might well form the subject of a separate article. But avoiding all issues that do not fall naturally in the track of the present discussion, it may suffice to observe that no other relation known to humanity corresponds with it. All of those ties which are regarded as preëminently natural yield to it. Man is commanded to forsake and practically ignore all others when he assumes the honor and responsibility of husbandhood. And in fact, no other tie compares with it in the experience of mankind. Father and son, mother and daughter, brother and sister—even twin children—all fail to realise the closeness, the very identity of interest subsisting betwixt husband and wife.

Thus, therefore, the "rights" once more fade away as one discerns the true proportion of the "duties." The undoubted dominion of the husband, as defined by God himself, becomes an illogical paradox, when it is considered that the authority exercised is over one who is bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh. It is true that the race has lapsed, and therefore *true* marriages are comparatively rare.

VI. If these slight suggestions may be called an argument, it is now concluded. There are multitudes of relations subsisting among men in which both rights and duties are incidentally involved, but it has been no part of the present purpose to offer an "exhaustive" argument. Those that are enumerated exist in one form or another wherever men are found. The chief

design in the foregoing discussion has been to discover the true intent of the law as it applies to human relations. And this object has been attained, if it has been demonstrated that the chief end of man is to glorify God by the performance of duty, in believing and doing; and if this be true, that the scope of scripture teaching is the revelation of the rule.

Concerning the rights which God confers upon men, there is a word to be said *per contra*. It is sometimes man's highest duty to peril fortune, life, and all temporal good, in defence of his rights; and this duty is founded clearly upon both tables of the law, and accords accurately with the foregoing argument. When your altars are invaded, whether by positive aggressions of idolaters, or by the more stealthy and more deadly assaults of modern infidelity, you are bound to stand in their defence. When God's holy law is set aside, and a higher law enforced, either by positive enactment or by popular clamor, you are bound to resist to the death. There have been cases in which the portentous threat of a coming flood of God-dishonoring heresies had driven Christian men to arms, and in such cases every blow struck against this threatening flood, has been struck on God's side and in the interests of truth and righteousness. Nor does the success or failure of such a warfare alter the case one whit. It were infinitely worse to secure ease and material prosperity in avoiding the struggle, than to come out of it conquered and impoverished with the scars of the conflict to abide upon you until you stand at the judgment bar. They are not shameful now, and if won in God's service they will not be shameful then.

And for the second table. When your hearthstone is invaded you are bound to defend it at any cost. You may not tamely relinquish your personal rights and shun the contest to secure personal safety. Because your "neighbor" has claims upon you, and he is in similar peril, and you are not at liberty to forsake him in his hour of need. Your good name, your kindred, your children, your brethren in the Lord, all call upon you to wage a good warfare.

There is no king in Zion, excepting the Lord Christ. There

is no gospel-brotherhood, except among those who acknowledge His authority.

Thus through many relations, all of them so natural that they seem to grow out of the necessity of the case, yet all of them so orderly in their divine arrangement that only Sovereign beneficence could ordain them—thus is man conducted through boundless fields of duty. And the symmetry of “Pauline theology,” as contradistinguished from all the creeds of man’s invention, is herein clearly manifest. The old slander applied to-day to Calvinism, as it was applied of old to Paulism, charging it with teaching that continuance in sin makes grace to abound, is here refuted. At the very foundation of Presbyterian standards, is the declaration that God made man for His own glory; and that the creature glorifies the Creator in the performance of revealed duties. There is no contest here between faith and works. “This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent.” And the abounding grace is not revealed merely in the pardon of sin; but perhaps its most astounding manifestation is in the acceptance of duties so lamely performed by unprofitable servants.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

History of Protestant Theology, particularly in Germany, viewed according to its fundamental movement, and in connection with the Religious, Moral, and Intellectual Life. By Dr. J. A. DORNER, Oberconsistorialrath and Professor of Theology at Berlin. Translated by the Rev. GEORGE ROBESON, M. A., Inverness, and SOPHIA TAYLOR. With a preface to the Translation by the Author. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street. 1871. 2 vols. 8vo., pp. 444, 511.

Under the auspices of Maximilian I., the Historical Commission of the Royal Academy of Sciences at Munich has undertaken to issue a complete History of the Sciences in Germany. Of the twenty-five histories embraced in their prospectus, the History of Protestant Theology, by Dr. Dorner, has been one of the earliest to appear. It has passed through more than one edition already in Germany, and is considered one of the most valuable of the theological productions of the last five years. It is claimed for it that even Roman Catholic reviewers give to it the palm of superiority as a scientific work over Dr. Werner's History of Catholic Theology—a companion or rival work.

The variations of Protestantism have always been its reproach. Popery points exultingly to its constant tendency to divisions as something essential to it, and as something in contrast with the harmonious life of the so-called "true and Catholic Church," as though it were not well known how the bosom of that communion is torn with dissensions between Gallican and German theories on the one side, and Ultramontane ideas upon the other. Infidelity also carps at the multitude of Protestant and other sects, and proudly demands that there be some manifest unity amongst all these contending churches before any condemnation pass upon the unbelief which rejects all creeds of Christendom alike.

VOL. XXIII., NO. 1.—9.

Dr. Dorner's undertaking to write the history of Protestant theology, presupposes that this theology is "somehow or other a unit." And this unity he finds in the "nature of Christianity as it is handed down to us in documentary form in the Holy Scriptures." There is the "ultimate foundation" of Protestantism, which "does not consist in a chaos of tendencies of every possible kind, not in a confused mass of accidental opinions, . . . but may in spite of its many internal differences be represented as a homogeneous formation indicative of one principle." (Vol. I., p. 2.) This principle of the Reformation is "the sole divine authority of the Holy Scriptures, and justification only by faith in Christ, each in its independent worth and title, but both also in their inward inseparable connection." (P. 220.) "*The word and faith, faith and the word*, are that which Luther always conjoins in decisive movements, and where the ultimate principle is being treated of." (P. 249.) "Three factors coöperate for the salvation of man, and only by means of their coöperation does there arise the living formation of the new personality. These factors are, the Holy Spirit, the word, and faith. Their result, salvation, is not effected by the word of the Church, or of the Holy Scriptures in itself without the Holy Ghost; God is not changed into the word, but broods over it as his medium and makes the word operative. He does not work however without the medium of the word, neither by external nor internal magic. In the word there is presented what is to be believed, and thus there is room left for faith." (Pp. 250, 251.) Protestantism then is "the Christian Church entering a new stage in the appropriation of salvation and the development of Christianity." (P. 4.) It is true that she thus acknowledges herself beforehand "to be a special particular movement within the sphere of universal Christendom." But it "no ways follows from its thus acknowledging itself a mere many-membered part of the Church, that it seeks only to confess to a part of Christian truth, or must or will exclude any thing whatever which is able to prove itself truly Christian." "In spite of its particularistic appearance . . . it necessarily makes this claim that the essential of that for which it contends is designed for all and all for it, for this

essential is the common matter of Christianity (which also boasts an outward universality or catholicity), but that common matter *in personal application and in a personal direction*; and this latter, so far as it has an intrinsic right to, although it does not yet enjoy a universal recognition in Christendom, possesses at least an intrinsic catholicity. Compared with the other two great Church parties of Christendom [the Greek and the Roman Catholic Churches] Protestantism will neither rest content with a mere intellectual appropriation of Christianity, whether in a speculative form or in a recollective form that faces a traditional doctrine, nor with a mere subjection of the will to a dogmatic or even practical Church law. Christianity is for it power, light, and life, which must be appropriated and worked out by the whole person in the believing heart, and it [Protestantism] lives in the confidence that the Church of Christ has thereby begun to gain a new and higher stage." (Pp. 4, 5.) The Protestants in the beginning therefore were those who "wished to preserve evangelical liberty, and to allow no human and separating medium to stand between believers and Christ; but they wished to have that liberty controlled by evangelical truth and love, and by the regulations to which these might have given rise." The true meaning of the name is therefore "a free and candid testimony to scriptural and evangelical truth in opposition to all perversions of it." (P. 3.) The one divine design of having the Christian Church enter the new and higher stage referred to, is "the uniting power for all who are truly grafted into the great Reformation movement of the sixteenth century; they constitute and exhibit in the midst of the rest of Christendom one family of homogeneous type whose parent seat is the German nation." (P. 4.)

This last expression of Dr. Dorner he intends we should understand literally, and accept the same in all its extent. He says, "there is probably no branch of the whole Protestant Church amongst the different nations on this and that side of the channel and of the sounds, and even of the Atlantic, but must own that the strength of scientific Protestantism, both in exegetical, historical, and systematical theology, rests in Germany."

(P. 9.) Accordingly we read on his title page "The History of Protestant Theology, *particularly in Germany.*" And thus by far the larger part of the two volumes relates to Lutheran ideas. Zwingli and the Swiss Reformation are mere foils to set off Luther and the Reformation in Germany; Calvin himself, with his life, character, doings, and doctrinal system, are disposed of in some thirty out of nearly one thousand pages! And the consequence is, that the reader is occupied with the multitudinous details of the history of Lutheran theological controversies. This is of course all right, seeing that Dr. Dorner sets out deliberately to accomplish this very task, and seeing that he holds the German nation to be the centre of the Reformation. He takes no unfair advantage, but makes known distinctly what he purposes to do and does it. But admitting all that he claims for the German mind in point of fertility and industry, and also of scientific attainments in Exegesis and in History, we must demur to his claim that, in point of theological science, they are beyond all competition. The Reformed Church never has been behind the Lutheran in this matter, and we humbly conceive is not now. And whilst Dr. Dorner puts Luther foremost amongst Reformers as the theologian who brought out most fully the Reformation principle, we recall the better judgment of Dr. William Cunningham, who said "John Calvin was by far the greatest of the Reformers with respect to the talents he possessed, the influence he exerted, and the services he rendered in the establishment and diffusion of important truth." "The Reformers who preceded him (continues Cunningham) may be said to have been all men who, from the circumstances in which they were placed, and the occupations which these circumstances imposed upon them, or from the powers and capacities with which they had been gifted, were fitted chiefly for the immediate necessary business of the age in which their lot was cast, and were not perhaps qualified for rising above this sphere, which, however, was a very important one. . . . After all that Luther, Melancthon, and Zwingli had done, there was still needed some one of elevated and comprehensive mind, who should be able to rise above the distraction and confusion of existing contentions, to survey the wide field

of scriptural truth in all its departments, to combine and arrange its various parts, and to present them as a harmonious whole to the contemplation of men. This was the special work for which God qualified Calvin, by bestowing upon him both the intellectual and the spiritual gifts necessary for the task; and this he enabled him to accomplish." Dr. Cunningham proceeds: "The 'Institutes' of Calvin is the most important work in the history of theological science. . . . It may be said to occupy in the science of theology the place which it requires both the '*Novum Organum*' of Bacon and the '*Principia*' of Newton to fill up in physical science." And he goes on to say, that "Melancthon's Common Places is not to be compared to Calvin's work in the accuracy of its representations of the doctrines of scripture, in the fulness and completeness of its materials, or in the skill and ability with which they were digested and arranged."

It is no disparagement of Dr. Dorner to say that Melancthon was more competent than he can be to pronounce upon the comparative powers of Luther and Calvin. Now Melancthon it was who bestowed upon John Calvin whilst yet living the title of "The Theologian." Indeed the very fact that the Lutheran adoption of the word of God as the rule of faith and order was *negative*, whilst Calvinism has always adopted it as such *positively*, is enough to stamp the Lutheran theology as necessarily and always and in every high and noble quality inferior. To say that whatever is manifestly contrary to Scripture is to be rejected, but that within that limit men may invent dogmas or rites, is to open the doors of course for will-worship and every other species of religious corruption. So long as that is the aspect in which scripture is regarded, theology itself must ever be a mere mixture of divine and human elements; such as the iron and clay feet of Nebuchadnezzar's image. But the doctrine of Calvinism is, and ever has been, that the Bible is the only and the sufficient rule of faith and practice; that whatever is not commanded is forbidden; and that all things necessary for God's glory, man's salvation, faith, and life, are either expressly written down in scripture, or else deducible from scripture by good and necessary consequence. And this view of the word necessarily

stands connected with a full and symmetrical exhibition of the whole truth of God respecting the doctrines and the order and the worship of his house. And so, whilst Luther saw the truth of God with wonderful clearness as respects justification by faith, he did not see it so clearly as it concerned all the other doctrines, nor as it concerned Church government and worship. With him that one great doctrine was the *Articulus aut stantis aut cadentis ecclesie*; and if he could have had that truth accepted by the Pope, and if Tetzels and a few other horrid abominations had been put out of view, Luther might perhaps have been content to abide in the Church of Rome. He departed not very widely from Rome as to the Supper; and he retained private confession, exorcism, also instrumental music, images, and the altar in the house of God. It was for the comprehensive mind and scientific judgment of Calvin, adopting the idea that the word is positively and not negatively the rule of faith, to place justification in its proper place alongside of the other fundamental doctrines of the gospel, and at the same time to apply its teachings fairly and fully to Church government and all God's ordinances.

This partiality for his own nation and Church does not prevent us, however, from expressing a high sense of the learning, eloquence, and value of Dr. Dorner's great work.

One singular mistake we notice is twice made. The Scotch Church is said to "find in scripture a divine *law* prescribing the only correct form of Church government, instead of leaving to the mind of the Church and its own perception of what would in each age be most beneficial, freedom to fashion its government according to existing necessity." This is a true statement. But it is not true, as Dr. Dorner goes on to intimate, that Presbyterians regard their form of Church government as "essential to the true Church," as "a necessary divine ordinance," or as a "condition of salvation." (Vol. I., p. 390; Vol. II., p. 51.) With us Church government is a revealed doctrine to be received by all Churches. But it is no more essential to the being of a true Church to receive the truth on that point than on the divine decrees.

It is amusing to us of the South to notice how small "North American theology"—(which of course means the theology of Americans at the North)—how small and meagre this theology looks in Dr. Dorner's eyes. Of his one thousand pages, more or less, he devotes to this theme only three pages and a half! And few, and those few not always by any means the worthiest, are the names emblazoned on these three pages and a half. After Schaff and Nevin come Channing and Parker and Bushnell, also Professor Park and Dr. Taylor, Moses Stuart and Edward Robinson, Hackett and Conant (Baptist), and Henry Smith of New York. As to the Presbyterians, he says they separated "in 1837, after the attempted union with the Congregationalists." He adds, that the "theology of the New School is scarcely to be distinguished from that of the Congregationalists," whilst that of the Old School is "essentially Scotch." And then he adds: "To the Old School belong Breckinridge, Rice, and H. Woods. Its present leader is Hodge." This would be indeed amusing, if it were not sad. But Dr. Dorner has heard of, and rejoices over, the glorious "*Reunion*." And of course he must say a word too about "slavery." "America is as yet on the threshold of its theological existence; but the future of Protestantism greatly depends on the further development of this powerful nation, delivered as it is now from the curse of slavery." It is very important (he adds) to this great end that America "increase its acquaintance with German theology;" and he says she may yet by means of abolition and this theology grow to be somewhat. It is thus the work closes. Of course there is a little hope now also for us of the South.

"*The Comedy of Convocation in the English Church*. In two Scenes. Edited by ARCHDEACON CHASUBLE, D. D."

This little book is a burlesque of the baseless and arrogant pretensions of High-Church Episcopacy, written by a Papist, and from a popish point of view. The author is said to be a distinguished English pervert to Rome; and his work displays all the animosity of the renegade. Its spirit is indeed as bitter and unchristian as much of its logic is vigorous. In this argument,

we have the advantage of following the processes of a mind thoroughly familiar with the history and pretensions of high-church Episcopacy, and convinced of their absurdity when tried by their own prelatial premises. While it is a mocking burlesque, it is also a discussion intensely urgent and serious, of the theory of the Anglican Church, and the apostolic succession in it; and had we fuller access to the periodicals and controversial pieces of the different parties in that heterogeneous body, we should doubtless find the real counterparts to all the views advanced by the fictitious disputants.

The book professes to be a truthful report of the debates of two sessions of the Convocation of the clergy of the provinces of Canterbury and York; the first held in the "Jerusalem Chamber" at Westminster; and the second informally convened in the parlor of one of the dignitaries of that Church, "Dr. Easy." The debaters are certain venerable Deans, Blunt, Pliable, Critical, etc.; Archdeacons Jolly, Theory, and Chasuble; Drs. Easy, Viewy, and Candour, and a number of reverend gentlemen, representatives of the different schools of Anglican Episcopacy. The question debated at the first sitting is this: "Would a clergyman, openly teaching that there was no God, in the English Church, be liable to suspension?" This question is decided in the negative, after thorough discussion from the principles of the Broad Churchman, the Puseyite, the Anglican Catholic, and the Ritualist; the only dissenting voice being that of the Evangelical, the "Reverend Lavender Kids." This is a deserved satire upon the mischievous broad-churchism of that communion, and the indecision and time-serving of the Privy Council, its anomalous supreme court. In the course of this debate, Dean Critical requests his reverend friends to inform him where the *authority* for deciding questions of the faith was placed in their Church. In the Archbishop of Canterbury? No canon gave such authority to him; he never presumed to exercise it, and would be obeyed by nobody if he did. In the other bishops? They contradicted each other without limit! In "her Majesty the Queen," the head of the Church? "Dean Critical could not forget that her Majesty, in whom they

recognised a model of every Christian virtue, frequented indifferently Presbyterian meeting-houses and the churches of their own communion. If, therefore, as the law appeared to admit, the authority of the Anglican Church resided in her royal person, it followed that the Westminster Confession and the Thirty-nine Articles were equally true; and it followed that every Anglican was also a Presbyterian." Does authority reside in the Privy Council? The answer is, that it usually decides in favor of both truth and error. In Convocation? It was agreed that this "was only a clerical debating club, of which every member took himself for the pope, and the Church for his pupil." And if the formularies and articles were appealed to, the answer was but mocking laughter, when "they were sworn to with equal facility by those who claim to 'hold all Roman doctrine,' and those who protest against it."

Such is a specimen of this exposure of the sores of the English Church. The cover is stripped away by this writer with a hand ruthless, mocking, and malignant. But despite our reprehension of this spirit, and our admiration for the many saintly and evangelical men who have labored and are laboring in it, we are forcibly reminded by him of the grave and criminal defects, which in some aspects make the Establishment a greater outrage against Christianity than Romanism itself, and which render it so worthy of its obviously approaching doom. This bitter accuser convicts the Anglican Church of unmitigated Erastianism in its origin and administration; of shameless simony; of an unblushing faithlessness to doctrinal truth in permitting men of all opinions and of no opinions to swear sacred allegiance to a Calvinistic creed; and the High-Churchmen among them of inconsistency towards the people under its care in denying the right of private judgment, and yet giving them no infallible guide; and of the injustice towards those without, of repudiating them for their Protestantism, when their own communion is, indisputably, nothing but Protestant, or else merely human.

The position of the Puseyite and the self-styled Anglican Catholic is shown up to deserved ridicule, as being absurd from every point of view, repudiating on the one hand the rights of

Protestants, and on the other, the submission of the Papist. "In point of essential, unmitigated Protestantism, the Puseyites surpass their Low-Church rivals as much as they do in ability and learning. It had been observed by Dean Blunt, that *self* was the *alpha* and *omega* of the Low-Church party. But if *self* was the Bible at Exeter Hall, it was also the supreme Pontiff at Oxford." "The Bible interpreted by the Church" (the Puseyites' motto) meant "Both interpreted by myself;" and "The Fathers interpreted by the Church," meant "*My* opinion of the Fathers, interpreted by *my* opinion of the Church." . . . "The truth is that Puseyism is simply ultra-Protestantism, *plus* twice its pretensions, and *minus* half its cant." . . . "To assert the principle of authority, while daily repudiating it in practice; to claim to be 'Catholic,' while cheerfully remaining out of communion with any church, school, or party in the Christian world; this was the special glory of gentlemen who had always surpassed the modest and timid warfare of their neighbors, and contrived to enjoy the luxury of protesting at the same moment against the Roman Church, their own Church, and every other Church. It was true, indeed, that in order not to be quite alone in the world, they affected to transfer their homage to a purely imaginary *primitive* Church, which existed only in their own brain, and their pretended obedience to which relieved them from the irksome duty of yielding the slightest obedience to any other. This submission to a Church which had ceased to exist for many centuries, if it ever existed at all, was the most ingenious of Protestant contrivances for submitting to nothing and nobody."

In the second scene of the "comedy," the members of convocation, tired of the unprofitable discussions of that body, meet informally in the parlor of Dr. Easy; and the question debated is: "*Are English orders human or divine?*" The result of the discussion is, that an Anglican can find no divine source for his orders, and if he is consistent, can only claim a State-appointment to Church-office by the English kings and queens. We have never seen the objections against the apostolic succession in that Church summed up with more unanswerable force than in the following passage.

“They had first to prove that Parker” (Archbishop) “was really consecrated; then to consider whether Barlow” (the leader among those ordaining him) “had either the will or the power to consecrate him. Next, to account for the fact that all England believed the whole thing was a sham, which Elizabeth’s characteristic decree frankly confessed by trying to *repair* it; and that the bishops were of the same opinion, since they evidently felt that, if the queen could do nothing for them, their case was hopeless. Then they must deal with the fact, that all the (Anglican) Reformers, and their immediate successors, were not only ill-affected towards the apostolic succession, but did everything they could to discredit it; clearly proving that they neither attached any importance to it, nor imagined that they themselves possessed it.” Episcopalians must reconcile the Reformers’ “deep hatred of the doctrine of sacrifice with their ordination of a priesthood, whose chief function it was to offer sacrifice. They must explain also why, if Edward’s Ordinal were valid, Anglicans need have been so anxious to change it a hundred years after it had become too late to do so with any possible result. When they had accomplished these preliminary difficulties, they must refute the really irresistible reasons for believing that a vast number of English bishops and clergy must have lived and died unbaptized, and were therefore perfectly incapable of either giving or receiving ordination, or any other Christian rite. And when they had arranged all these points to their own satisfaction, they would have to consider, finally, what object Providence could have in view in creating whole generations of ‘priests,’ who neither wished to be so, nor believed that they were, nor ever consciously performed one single act belonging to the sacerdotal office!”

“Had the Archdeacon” (Chasuble) “and the clergy who shared his opinions, while consoling themselves with the belief that they derived their orders from Rome, ever seriously considered how such a claim could be reconciled with the language of the Reformers, including the principal founders and doctors of their own Church? The latter thought and said, with an energy of expression which made all doubt about their meaning impossible,

that for nearly a thousand years the whole Roman priesthood lay wallowing in idolatry and corruption. They proclaimed, as the all-sufficient defence of their own separation, that it was necessary to the salvation of every Christian soul to flee from that apostate Church, and to form a new religion with Thirty-nine new Articles of Christian belief, new forms of Christian worship, and new and frightful penalties for non-conformity. For more than two hundred years the English bishops, whom they were now bid to regard as *Catholics*, gave their hearty assent to laws which made it *death* to be reconciled to the Church of Rome, *death* to say or hear mass, *death* to be or to harbor a priest; and as if this were not a sufficient proof of their hatred to Rome, life-long imprisonment and confiscation of goods was the penalty either for sending a child to a Catholic country for education or having him brought up a Catholic at home.

“But this was not all. During that whole period, and from the first hour of her existence, all the pulpits of the national Church had resounded with imprecations against the Roman sorceress, and successive generations of Englishmen were carefully nurtured by *the bishops* and clergy in that passionate abhorrence of the very name of *Catholic* which distinguished them to this day. Their very literature had been formed in the same spirit, which breathed in every page, not only of episcopal charges and parochial sermons, but even of biographies and works of fiction, the same unflagging hatred of the religion which England had abolished.

“And now, in spite of these well-known facts, they were seriously told, that during all this time they had been Catholics without knowing it; their bishops heirs of St. Augustine, St. Anselm, and St. Thomas of Canterbury; and their ministers sacrificing priests, full of reverence for the mysteries of the altar, and the august sacrament of penance! He wished to speak calmly; but he would venture to ask, Was ever God so mocked?”

One single point which this Papist makes in another place is sufficient to dispose of the whole Episcopal claim to the apostolic succession. *To what* do these pretended successors succeed?

To what office and power? Rome says, to the office of *priests*, and to the work of creating a Christ in the mass, and offering and eating him. When Rome ordains, she ordains to this or nothing. But this Anglican succession came through Rome, if it came at all. How impossible, then, if all the other difficulties were out of the way, that Rome can confer her succession upon men who have sworn before God that the transubstantiation of the bread and wine in the Eucharist cannot be proved from the Sacred Scriptures, but it is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and giveth occasion of many superstitions," (Art. 28); and "that the sacrifice of the mass is a blasphemous figment and pernicious imposture (Art. 31). While we do not justify the truculence of this Papist, yet no honest mind can fail to experience some movement of indignation and contempt against men who are both unscrupulous and absurd enough to advance the High-Church claim.

Religious Denominations of the World, comprising a General View of the Origin, History, and Condition of the Various Sects of Christians, the Jews, and Mahometans, as well as the Pagan Forms of Religion existing in the different countries of the earth: With sketches of the Founders of various religious sects from the best authorities. By VINCENT L. MILNER.

A new and improved edition, with an Appendix brought down to the present time by J. NEWTON BROWN, D. D., Editor of *Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*. Sold only by subscription. William Garretson & Co., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Galesburgh, Illinois; Columbus, Ohio; Nashville, Tennessee. 1871. Pp. 622. 12mo.

Charles Desilver, in 1859, published at Philadelphia in two parts a history of the religious denominations in the United States, and in England and Scotland, the whole forming a volume of more than eight hundred octavo pages. It was embellished with numerous inferior wood-cuts.

In the same year Dr. Joseph Belcher published likewise at Philadelphia a work of more than one thousand octavo pages (with two hundred wretched pictures), bearing much the same title with the first part of Desilver's history. Of this work

Belcher was himself the author. The other claimed to be prepared by representative men in the different bodies.

There have been other works of the same general character; some on one, and some on the other of these two plans. Dr. Belcher remarks, that the plan of having an author for each sketch may have its advantages, but it does not always secure impartiality, while it destroys unity of style and manner and occasions much repetition.

The book before us claims to be a compilation from the best authorities. The Appendix by Dr. Brown, favorably known as editor of a valuable encyclopedia, brings the history down to 1871, and contains a number of valuable papers. The unity of the work, however, and the convenience of the reader, have both been sacrificed by the adoption of this sort of division. Had Dr. Brown's articles been added to each particular history by Milner, both these important interests would have been advanced instead of sacrificed.

The engravings in this volume are for the most part excellent though not very numerous, and the whole getting up of the book is highly respectable, while the price is moderate.

We have read of course with particular interest the account given of the Presbyterians in this country. The title under which this subject is treated is that of *American Presbyterians*. The propriety of this title we must challenge. It is not the name assumed by any body of Presbyterians in this country. It was never applied until the days of the controversy between the Old and New Schools, and was then used by some of the latter to throw odium on their opponents as the *Scotch party*, and claim glory for themselves as the *American party*—the party of liberty and progress. Presbyterians may be Scotch or English or Irish or American; but Presbyterianism is neither the one nor the other. It claims to come out of the Bible; and it asks nothing and expects nothing of race or blood or government or any other distinctions of men.

A ridiculous error occurs on the first page of this article, where the author states that "the Greek Church alone is made up of the Greek Church proper, the Russian Greek Church, the-

Georgian and Mingrelian Churches, the Nestorian Churches, the Christians of St. Thomas, the Jacobites, the Copts, the Abyssinians, the Armenians, and many other minor denominations." This statement does not encourage us to confide in the competency or accuracy of the author. In no sense of the term "Greek Church" can it be said to include all these bodies. If the author means the present Greek Church, he is manifestly, in error. But if he means the Eastern Church as distinct from the Western, how can he join the Monophysites and the Nestorians with the so-called orthodox Eastern Church which excommunicated them as heretics?

Still another curious statement follows this one: "The Romish Church, the English Episcopal Church, and the American Episcopal Church are also each of them a portion of that great family of Churches included under the term Prelacy."

But the most interesting portions of the volume to us are two articles at the close of the Appendix—one on the "Reunion of the Presbyterian Church," and the other on the "Southern Presbyterian Church." We cheerfully accept the latter as a clear and comprehensive and correct statement of the position and principles of our Church. It is of course brief; but its author, whoever he was, knew very well the ground beneath his feet; and he has our thanks for his able and satisfactory representation of the case. We also give our thanks to Dr. Brown for admitting (if he did not write) this truthful and fair account of the attitude of our Church. We are not accustomed to fair dealing in books which hail, as this does, from Pennsylvania, Illinois, and Ohio, as well as Tennessee.

And we also pronounce the "Reunion of the Presbyterian Church" to be an honest and correct account of that matter, which we are willing to recommend to all our readers, notwithstanding some distasteful seasoning from the unwarrantable and unfair term, "Southern Rebellion," which it contains in common with some other portions of the book.

The just and truthful representation of the author is, that that "rebellion" operated with weighty power in bringing about this Reunion. It helped greatly to bring the Old and New

School Assemblies on a common platform on two of the very subjects which had most widely divided them—Church-boards and Slavery. (Pp. 590, 591.) He describes the sympathy which grew up between them as the war upon the South went on, from all the experiences of hope and fear and trial and sacrifice; and also Christian labors for their soldiers during the four terrible years. How the pressure of those tremendous years caused doctrinal controversy to cease betwixt Old and New School-men is briefly but clearly, and with unquestionable correctness, set forth. And this part of the story ends with the statement that “large-minded laymen, practical men of business, like Robert Carter and Wm. E. Dodge, could see no reasons for prolonging” the separation, and that “both bodies were rich in divines of standing and influence like Gardiner Spring and Albert Barnes.” Thus it stands confessed, that the Reunion was born of common hatred of the South, and common loyalty to the Government, of common opinion amongst the populace on both sides that the separation was groundless, and of the common possession of divines of influence whether orthodox or heretical. All these elements combined cannot constitute the Reunion a great, wise, deliberate, and becoming movement of two Churches in the fear of God and in loyalty to Christ, the only King in Zion. The writer, truthful and fair as far as he goes, has omitted one of the elements (kin to those he has named) which entered powerfully into the operation—the element of popular impulse. The *public* (which means *the world*) was crying out for the Reunion. But that would not have helped the author’s case. Neither would it have been benefited by allusions to still another element as powerful at the last as any other, namely the influence of social gatherings, dejeuners, dinners and soirees in the elegant mansions of rich Presbyterians in New York city, where the leaders on both sides toasted each other and made speeches all on the side of Reunion! History will not pronounce this Reunion the result of calm, thoughtful, God-fearing deliberation and prayer on the part of Presbyters gathered in Church courts where popular impulse and political influence had no force.

An Inquiry into the Usage of βαπτίζω, and the Nature of Johanneic Baptism, as exhibited in the Holy Scriptures. By JAMES W. DALE, D. D., Pastor of the Wayne Presbyterian Church, Delaware County, Pa. Philadelphia: Wm. Rutter & Co. 1871.

We have already noticed most favorably the preceding works of this author on the same general subject. The present volume displays the same qualities of fairness, of scholarly research, of clear, conclusive argumentation, which distinguish "Classic Baptism" and "Judaic Baptism." As these have not been answered by the denominational immersionists, and cannot be, so is this equally beyond their strength.

The work before us of over four hundred octavo pages is divided into seven parts: Baptist Criticisms, Various Views of John's Baptism, John's Knowledge of βαπτίζω, John's Commission, Places of Baptism, Baptism of the Lord Jesus, Summary. Dr. Dale's review of his reviewers in the opening portion is very good; but we think that until a square answer is attempted to his arguments, it would be wiser to take no notice of his criticisms as undeserving of serious mention. When learning equal to his own shall have taken up the cudgel of controversy, it will be time enough to enter upon a defence. This, however, is a matter of taste, and does not affect the value of the discussion, which, being pursued on grounds not heretofore attempted, stands alone and quite independent of the ordinary prejudices of Baptist belief. We will not attempt an exhibition of the various steps which have led our author to his incontrovertible conclusion. The book must be carefully read, *studied* rather, in order to a just appreciation of its contents. We cannot, however, deny ourselves the pleasure of quoting the final summary which is condensed into the following statements:

"Johanneic Baptism" is a spiritual condition of the soul, a "βάπτισμα into repentance," "into the remission of sins," which condition of repentance and of remission (like every other baptism) has no self-determination, and is the work of the Holy Ghost. This is Johanneic Baptism in its reality. This same

VOL. XXIII., NO 1—10.

βάπτισμα is declared by word and exhibited in symbol, by the application of pure water to the person in a ritual ordinance. This is Johannic Baptism in its shadow. The manner of using the water in John's ritual baptism is not stated by any word. The word *βαπτίζω*, as used in Scripture, has no more control over, or connection with, the manner of using this water, than a broken arm has control over, or connection with, the movement of the solar system. Dipping or mersing "into water" is phraseology utterly unknown to John's baptism. "Baptism into repentance" and "baptism into water" are, as to their nature, as far removed from each other as is pole from pole. The first of these is the baptism of John; the second (changed to a dipping and therefore nullified as a baptism) is the baptism of the (Baptist) theory. The theory has nothing to stand upon. In whatever aspect we look at it, it is "in the air." It is a contradiction of classic usage. It is without support in lexical definition. It is the antipodes of patristic sentiment. It is not a "new version," but it is an adding unto, and a taking away from, the word of God, which is utterly destructive to the most express teachings of the Holy Ghost. "The ground of the conclusions reached," says Dr. Dale, "is distinctly stated. It is deferentially submitted for examination. If it cannot abide the most searching scrutiny, it will, and will most justly, fail. But if the foundation cannot be broken up, then *baptism of the soul* BY THE HOLY GHOST, and its ritual exhibition BY SYMBOL WATER applied to the body will abide as the heritage of God's people; while the unhappy theory leaves its too confiding votaries with a *dipping into water*, but—I am truly sorry to say it—with NO BAPTISM."

Most cheerfully do we commend this valuable work, with its predecessors, to those of our readers who wish to be thoroughly informed as to the true state of this perplexing controversy.

A History of the Christian Councils, from the Original Documents, to the close of the Council of Nicæa, A. D. 325. By CHARLES JOSEPH HEFELE, D. D., Bishop of Rottenburg, formerly Professor of Theology in the University of Tübingen. Translated from the German; and edited by WILLIAM R. CLARK, M. A. Oxon. Prebendary of Wells, and Vicar of Taunton. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street. 1871. Pp. 502. 8vo.

The author of this work was a distinguished member of the late Council of the Vatican. He opposed all the way through its deliberations the doctrine of the Infallibility, and at the last when it came to the vote was one of those who said *non placet*. Years have been spent by him upon the preparation of this work. What is given to the English reader in the volume before us brings down the history only to the Council of Nicæ—the first general council; but in German the publication has gone much further. It is claimed that it brings within the reach of all scholars an amount of information regarding the ancient councils to be found only in part even in those large collections of Hardouin and Mansi, which are seldom to be met in private libraries.

The contents of the volume are first an introduction of sixty-seven pages, treating of the origin and authority of Councils, of the different kinds of Synods, (Universal, General, Provincial, Diocesan,) of the Members and Presidency of Councils, of the relation of the Pope to the Council, of the infallibility of Œcumenical Councils, of the appeal from the Pope to an Œcumenical Council, of the number of the Œcumenical Councils, of the customs observed in such councils with respect to signatures, precedence, manner of voting, etc., and of the Histories of the Councils. Then follows Book I. which treats of the Antenicene Councils in three chapters: the first relating to those of the first two centuries; the second, to those of the third century; and the third, to those of the first twenty years of the fourth century. There is a Book II. with two chapters on the Council of Nicæa, and the volume concludes with an Appendix “on the so-called Apostolic Canons,” and a full index.

Although Dr. Hefele did vote *non placet* on the late council's decree respecting the infallibility of the Pope, it must not be supposed that he has abandoned that doctrine. In discussing the relations of the Pope to the Œcumenical Council, he asserts that the Council of Constance, when it declared the Council superior to the Pope, did not intend to utter a universal truth, but only to speak of the case before it, where three popes were contending for sovereign power. "It was more concerned to solve an entirely peculiar question than to propound a general theory." He proceeds to say, that the question is deeper than either the Gallicans or the Ultramontanes have been accustomed to suppose, for the Œcumenical Council represents the whole Church; so that there must be the same relation between Pope and Council, as between Pope and Church. "Now is the Pope above or below the Church? Neither the one nor the other. The Pope is in the Church; he necessarily belongs to it; he is its head and its centre. The Church, like the human body, is an organised whole; and just as the head is not superior or inferior to the body but forms a part of it and the principal part; so the Pope, who is the head of the Church, is not superior or inferior to it: *he is therefore neither above nor below the General Council.*" He continues to use this figure, and says an assembly of Bishops separated from the Pope is a lifeless trunk, and no Œcumenical Council; and he concludes that it is a false statement of the question, to ask whether the Pope is above or below the General Council. Then comes up the question, whether the Council can depose the Pope. Constance, Basle, and the Gallicans, say that either bad morals or heresy is good ground for deposition. But Dr. Hefele insists that only heresy constitutes such a ground. "A heretical pope ceases to be a member of the Church; he therefore can be its president no longer. But a pope who is guilty of *ob mores*, a sinful pope, still belongs to the visible Church; he must be considered as the sinful and unrighteous head of a constitutional kingdom, who must be made as harmless as possible, but not deposed. Should there be several pretenders to the pontifical throne, the Council can decide betwixt them; but its decision will not have "the

authority of an Œcumenical Council until the legitimate Pope enters into relations with it and confirms it." The conclusion is, that no assembly of Bishops can be an Œcumenical Council without being in union with the Pope. "The sanction of the Pope is also necessary for ensuring *infallibility* to the decisions of the Council. According to Catholic doctrine this prerogative can be claimed only for the decisions of *œcumenical* councils, and only for their decisions *in rebus fidei et morum*, not for purely disciplinary decrees." Dr. Hefele proceeds to make the meagre and unsatisfactory statement of their proofs from Scripture for the Church's, that is the Council's, infallibility, backed up by the opinions of Constantine the Emperor, of Athanasius, Ambrose, Leo the Great, Gregory the Great, etc. Then he states that the Non-Œcumenical Council is also infallible when its decrees have received the sanction of the Pope and been accepted by the whole Church. Finally, he declares that "to appeal from the Pope to a council, an authority usually very difficult to constitute and to consult, is simply to cloak ecclesiastical insubordination by a mere formality."

This is to us a very interesting statement, and suggestive of much comment, for which we have not space. One remark however must be made. Here is the doctrine of Papal Infallibility, as one of the most enlightened Roman Catholic doctors in the world sets it forth. Scripture basis it has none; and slight is its foundation amongst the early fathers; but reason and logic (we say it with great respect for our author) would make terrible havoc with the superstructure, if their batteries should open upon it.

What is Religion? A Protest against "the Spirit of the Age:" A Plea for the Reality of the Spiritual. By Rev. R. W. MEMMINGER. Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen, and Haffelfinger, Nos. 819 and 821 Market Street. 1872. 12mo. Pp. 246.

In returning an answer to the momentous question which forms the title of his book, Mr. Memminger manifestly did not intend to use the term *religion* in its widest extension. His

answer is to the question: What is the religion of man as a sinner? Nor does he seem to have designed the discussion to be logically exhaustive even under that limitation of the term. It would appear from the introduction to the work that his great purpose was to indicate those leading features of religion to which the materialistic spirit of modern science evinces so marked an antagonism. Moreover, he did not mean to treat religion objectively as a dogmatic system, but subjectively as a conscious life. We deem it but just to Mr. Memminger at the outset to make these remarks, as the question, What is Religion? would, without express restrictions, lead the reader to expect a more comprehensive reply than is actually furnished by his book.

There are two sources from which he draws his answer to the great question which he propounds—consciousness and the Scriptures. These he uses as occasion demands; sometimes separately, and sometimes in their relation to each other. He very justly observes that consciousness is the necessary condition of all knowledge; and contends that, as physical science ultimately depends upon the report of consciousness in regard to the facts of the external world, it is arrogant and unfair in invalidating the report which consciousness furnishes in reference to the phenomena of our internal constitution. If it may be false as to the latter, it may be false as to the former. The book is divided into three parts. The first consists of “an analysis of the facts or elements contained in what may be called specifically ‘the religious consciousness,’ considering them in their organic connection with each other.” The first of these fundamental facts or elements which he notices is the consciousness of God. This he regards as connatural with man, and as lying at the basis of all religion. He sometimes, in the progress of the discussion, appears to admit that in certain cases it may be absent; but we suppose he means that this original testimony of consciousness may be overlapped and silenced by perverse speculation, or by wickedness of life. The mode by which we know God is precisely that by which we know the external world, and know ourselves. We are conscious of an outward world; we are con-

scious of ourselves; we are conscious of God. At first the infinite object of this consciousness is undefined, and as such is worshipped. We are conscious of the substance of God, but we have little conception of its qualities. By a necessary process we gradually add to this notion of substance, given in consciousness, properties and attributes which are furnished by the operations of the mind. The concrete of these qualities will take its complexion from the circumstances of education, culture, and association, in which each individual is placed.

The next element which Mr. Memminger signalises is, what he terms Theism, or the theistic element in man. This is the result of that process which has been previously indicated, by which we pass from a simple consciousness of the substance of God to some definite conceptions of his attributes. It is the intellectual conception of God which the mind rears upon the basis of consciousness. This idea may of course be furnished by direct revelation; but apart from that it would arise from tradition, from contact with nature, and from the consciousness of our own intelligent and moral qualities. In the two last cases we naturally transfer to God, in a higher degree, the conceptions of the powers of external nature, and of the attributes which characterise ourselves. The different possible conceptions of Deity which emerge from this merely natural process are enumerated as Monotheism, Polytheism, Pantheism, and Atheism. Of these Mr. Memminger gives an able and graphic portraiture.

The third element of the religious nature which he mentions is the fear of God. In endeavoring to point out the precise sphere in which this feeling operates, he draws a distinction between the moral consciousness as such, and the religious consciousness. Granted the consciousness of God, and they act in harmony; but supposing an arrest of that consciousness the moral exists alone. In this case there is the painful result ensuing upon a resistance of moral forces, but no fear. Add the distinct consciousness of God as related to moral law, and the resistance to that law becomes guilt. The necessary consequence is the fear of God, leading to unhappiness in the present, and apprehension for the future.

The fourth element is sacrifice. Guilt leads to fear. This being postulated, the necessity of sacrifice, as a conscious element of experience, follows. The Deity must be propitiated; his anger averted, and his favor secured. This is attempted by sacrifice. At first it will assume the form of self-sacrifice, or self-torture. But the sense of justice forces to the conviction that this is insufficient to meet the case. It is God who is offended, and he must inflict the punishment. Here the natural man stops. He is in despair. But God by revelation intervenes and indicates what nature could never have suggested, that he may be propitiated by vicarious sacrifice—the sacrifice of a substitute in the room of the guilty. Hence the origin of typical vicarious sacrifices foreshadowing the sacrifice of the Son of God. In the historic development of the race, one people only retained the typical feature of sacrifice; all others retrograded from it. The Gentile nations employed sacrifices as intrinsically efficacious; the Patriarchs and Jews as symbolical representations of the promise of redemption through the great Mediator. The Old Testament believer looked upon the animal sacrificed as a substitute for himself, bearing his guilt, which so far as it was ceremonial and civil was thus actually removed; and so far as it was moral was typically predicted to be removed by the sacrifice of the Redeemer. Christ fulfilled these sacrificial types; realised these sacrificial pledges. He is the God-man. As man he becomes connected with human guilt *by sympathy*; and so, by virtue of the union of the divine and human natures in his person, God becomes conscious of guilt. In this way an adequate vicarious sacrifice is rendered for the guilty. Divine justice is satisfied; and the believer, conscious of this fact, is discharged from the sense of guilt, and consequently from the fear which it endangers.

The fifth element—and it is the last indicated—of the religious consciousness is prayer. This is natural. It springs necessarily from the immediate consciousness of God which the author predicates of the soul. Grounded in this consciousness, which leads to a sense of dependence on God, prayer lays hold of those attributes of Deity which it is felt are able to supply

human wants and meet human exigencies—his almighty power and his infinite goodness. But the consciousness of guilt obstructs free access to God. When this difficulty is removed, the soul comes without hindrance to the Deity and enjoys communion with him. The intellect, however, raises difficulties. The fixed order of the world, the undeviating reign of law furnish to intelligence insuperable objections to any interference in favor of the individual resulting from prayer. This difficulty which to intelligence is invincible, is overcome by the soul; for Mr. Memminger sharply distinguishes between what he calls our psychical and our intellectual states and acts. Intellectually, prayer is unreasonable; psychically, it is eminently reasonable. Hence prayer, though irrational, as viewed from the side of the intellect, is logical as contemplated from that of the soul—there being a logic of the soul, as well as a logic of the intellect. The result is, that however much the intelligence may object to prayer, the soul prays in faith and hope.

In the second part of the work, which is entitled "A Synthesis," it appears to be the author's purpose to show how these fundamental elements of consciousness which he has described are concentered and developed into a subjective religious life. In this process, if we understand him, he indicates three stages, each of the first two of which may be independent, or may pass into another and a higher. These are the moral life, the religious life, and the divine life. We have occupied so much space in the account given of the discussion in the first part of the book, which seemed to furnish a basis for his subsequent theories, that we must content ourselves with a very brief statement in reference to the second and third parts. The moral life is the result of the effort which the soul makes to conform itself to a moral standard. Its necessary moral judgments are, by a natural process, classified and digested into a moral code. This code becomes to the individual, in the first instance, his moral standard. The aggregation of these moral standards of individuals constitutes a public moral standard. These public standards will derive their complexion from the communities in which they are erected. There is a standard of the Church, and a stand-

ard of the world. In the attempt to conform itself to these, there may be failure, and consequently dissatisfaction. This unhappy condition is relieved by a relaxation of the moral standard. In this lowered form the soul is able to meet its demands, and so self-complacency emerges. A man may be an atheist and realise this form of life. Thus far the moral code has been considered as originating from the moral judgments of the soul itself; but Revelation also furnishes a moral standard: first, in an authoritative moral law; and secondly, in the moral life of Christ. When the attempts to reduce these external standards to subjective experience prove a failure, the same effort is made, as in the other case, to lower them, and so to bring them within the possibility of attainment. Thus formalism, self-righteous and self-satisfied, results, and in this way there may exist even in the Church a moral life entirely dissociated from religion.

The religious life the author distinguishes from the moral life by its possession of two characteristic elements—the consciousness of God, and the sense of guilt. It is the result of an effort made by the soul in its own natural strength to obliterate the consciousness of guilt and the consequent dread of God by works of righteousness. This attempt necessarily proves abortive until, as in the case of the moral life, the legal standard is lowered. Conformity to the law thus relaxed is felt by the soul to be possible, and it settles into a self-complacent religious formalism, in which, while there is a consciousness of God as the lawgiver, there is no longer a sense of guilt and a fear of retribution. The law is satisfied, and the Judge is propitiated.

The divine life, as Mr. Memminger terms it, differs from the two preceding forms of life, in the fact that its origin is supernatural, while theirs is natural. It is produced by the supernatural grace of God. According to the author's statement it is necessarily preceded by a preparatory condition of legal conviction which he denominates penitence. When this condition is fully attained, the soul is supernaturally renewed—is born again, and contemporaneously with this vital change exercises faith in the atoning Saviour. Justification is the result; which, on

God's part, the author represents as consisting in the pardon of guilt; and on the believer's part in the immediate consciousness of forgiveness. Faith in Christ then becomes the channel through which the Holy Spirit confers sanctifying grace. A state of conflict now ensues. The guilt of sin is removed, but the consciousness of its power remains. A duality is thus developed in the consciousness of the believer—a duality which “resides not in the personality, but in its conditions,” and springs from the coëxistence in one personality of the old man as sinful, and the new man as regenerate. The Holy Spirit dwells exclusively in the new man, which from its very nature is essentially holy and cannot sin. The old man, on the other hand, from its very nature cannot be holy. The method of sanctification is to increase the life of the new man, and to weaken that of the old man. This is done, on the believer's part, by faith, which constantly maintains in the soul the sense of justification in Christ, and through which the grace of sanctification flowing from Christ is continually administered by the agency of the Spirit. The complete realisation of the divine life is never made in this world; it is only attained in the state of final glory.

In the third part of the work Mr. Memminger shows that the Scriptures are the grand instrumentality which God employs in the production of the “divine life.” They “have been, and must always be, the means whereby man is to be saved.” The providence of God towards the human race has involved a great scheme of religious education. The heathen nations have been left to themselves, with the possession of only the original promise of redemption, and the rite of sacrifice. Their course has been one of retrogression and degradation. They are thus ultimately led to a conviction of their moral helplessness and misery, which Mr. Memminger terms penitence, and are consequently prepared to appreciate the redemptive provisions of the gospel. The course of the Jews, on the other hand, was one of steady progress under the education of those divine revelations which deposited with them gradually accumulated into the complete word of God. Their discipline was mainly legal until its full historical development was reached in the atonement of

Christ. That disciplinary process led to a sense of guilt and want, and prepared the Jewish race for the gospel. Thenceforward to mankind—Gentile and Jew—the Scriptures became the means of producing the true religious life of the soul.

In the last place Mr. Memminger portrays the contest which the Church is called upon to wage in support of the Scriptures against certain theories of modern science. The main issue he represents as being between Geology and the Bible. He contends earnestly for a literal interpretation of the Mosaic records, and takes bold and unequivocal ground against the hypotheses of an indefinite age of the earth, the partial extent of the Deluge, and an antiquity of man beyond six thousand years. He maintains that if these hypotheses be true, the Bible is false; but if the Bible is true, they are false; and he calls upon Christian men to stand by the Scriptures in a conflict which he affirms to be one of life and death.

The transcendent importance of the subject of this work and the nature of the discussion have rendered it impossible to do anything like justice to the author in a less extended notice; but we regret that we have so little space left for comments of our own. The work evinces the possession by the author of original powers of analysis of a high order. Mr. Memminger is a thinker; and it is evident that he thinks for himself. He makes no citations of authorities; no references to the opinions of others. This feature of self-reliance is one of the most striking which his discussions reveal. Indeed, we are at a loss to what school of thought, philosophical or theological, to assign him, except to his own. He traverses at a stride, and with an air of indifference, the path of conservative thought trodden by philosophers from Aristotle to Hamilton. We would be inclined to suppose that, philosophically, his affinities would be mainly with the Absolutists, did we not judge that, on religious grounds, he would protest against being reduced under that class. Theologically, he appears to symbolize with no school. He is partly Calvinistic, partly Arminian, and partly *sui generis*. It is to be feared that a system thus compounded will tax all his abilities, high as they are, to preserve it in har-

mony with itself. With many of Mr. Memminger's views we most heartily concur. We have read with interest and admiration much of what he has so ably said in regard to the distinction between a religious formalism and true religion, the necessity of supernatural grace to the production of the spiritual life, the vicarious atonement of Christ, the vital offices of faith, the influence of the Holy Ghost, and the spiritual conflict in the soul of the believer developing to consciousness the antagonism of two irreconcilable principles. In these respects we sincerely trust that the book as "a protest" against the naturalistic and materialistic "spirit of the age," and as "a plea for the reality of the spiritual," will be blessed of God to the accomplishment of great and lasting good. There are some points, however, upon which we are compelled to express a respectful dissent from the views presented by Mr. Memminger. We can only very briefly indicate them:

First. He appears to assume as an axiom—for he offers no proof of it—that we are immediately conscious of God. If he means to imply that, by virtue of our fundamental beliefs brought by experience into contact with the cosmical order of the universe, and with the moral and religious elements of our nature, the knowledge of God is necessitated, we have nothing to object. But this does not seem to be his meaning. He tells us that we are conscious of God just as we are conscious of external objects and of ourselves. Now our knowledge of external objects is either presentative or representative. If presentative, then we are conscious of the object as brought into immediate contact with our minds. In that case we gaze directly upon the object, and are able precisely to describe it. Does Mr. Memminger mean that God is thus presented to consciousness—to every human consciousness—and, that, therefore, we can describe him as we would a man upon whom we look? If our knowledge of external objects is representative, then we apprehend the object not immediately in itself, but a mental image which mediates between it and consciousness. What we are directly conscious of is not the object itself, but the image which represents it. The image is given presentatively; the original object

representatively. Would Mr. Memminger say that we know God through an image of him which is presented to consciousness as representing him? But he goes further, and tells us that we are conscious of the substance of God; that this is what is *first* given in consciousness; and that we subsequently, by the processes of intelligence, add to this notion of substance that of properties and attributes. This is extraordinary. We have been accustomed to suppose, that what we first apprehend in consciousness is phenomenal and relative properties, and that we are led by a necessity of the mind to infer the substance in which they inhere. Does Mr. Memminger mean that any substance—let alone that of God—is directly given in an act of presentative knowledge? If so, then what is substance? What is the substance of the table on which he penned this remarkable statement? If we are conscious of substance, we ought to be able to tell what it is of which we are conscious. What then is the testimony of consciousness in regard to the substance of God?

Secondly. We cannot agree with Mr. Memminger in his account of the mode in which the guilt of the sinner is removed from him to Christ. He holds that the Son of God in assuming human nature was brought into connection with its guilt by *sympathy*; and that as he is God and man in one person, God thus becomes conscious of guilt. "God did really become consciously guilty. . . . God experienced the feeling of guilt." This view is attended with insuperable difficulties. Is it not simpler and more scriptural to say that Christ in taking human nature voluntarily assumed the legal guilt of his people; and that the Father imputed that guilt to him? The human nature of the God-man was putatively guilty, and the divine-human Priest offered it up as a sacrifice to justice. We can conceive of even the human nature of the Saviour as sympathising with man alone, not with his guilt. Personally he abhorred it, while he consented legally to bear it. Much less can we think of his divine nature as experiencing sympathy with human guilt.

Thirdly. We have to differ with Mr. Memminger's position that penitence is a condition precedent to the new birth and to

faith. What he represents as penitence, we regard as simply legal conviction inducing natural sorrow. Repentance in all its forms, the Scriptures treat as involving the possession of spiritual life; and therefore it cannot be experienced before that life is begun. Faith which unites to Christ is plainly the first function of that life, and must therefore, in the order of production, precede the godly emotion of penitence. But as we do not desire to be captious, we will not press this point. Mr. Memminger may employ penitence as expressing simply the condition of conviction of guilt. Even so, however, the term would be unhappy and apt to mislead.

Fourthly. We cannot but consider the charge as pressed in too exaggerated a form against the Protestantism of this age: that it is responsible for the want of peace so frequently experienced by believers; that the doctrine of justification is presented in a manner too purely dogmatic and abstract. Whatever may be the deficiencies in this matter of certain Protestant preachers, the symbols of the Reformed and Lutheran Churches are clear and explicit in relation to the practical results of justification; and we are disposed to think that the defect in the preachers—if indeed it exist to the extent lamented by Mr. Memminger—is not that they fail to unfold the blessed fruits of justification, but that they too much neglect to proclaim the blessed doctrine itself. It is consigned to Dr. Dry-as-dust who still fumbles among the fossils of a past age! It is not suited to the progressive spirit and the advanced thought of the nineteenth century!

We had hoped to be able to say something in regard to the issue which Mr. Memminger so boldly and sharply makes with the geologists; but we have already passed our limit, and must content ourselves with simply observing, that while we gladly join him in warning Christian men against every unscriptural hypothesis, we do not doubt that the final results of scientific inquiry will vindicate the Bible, or that the elect of God will continue to hold to it against all the "oppositions of science falsely so called." The heavens and the earth will become an illuminated commentary on the text of Scripture; nature and

the Church will bow together in common worship; and the sisterhood of the sciences will join that of the heavenly graces in chanting the praises of redemption.

We hope to be able to present, at no distant day, articles reviewing the Works of the Rev. Dr. Thornwell, and also the Rev. Dr. Hodge's Systematic Theology.

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 unless 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 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 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 the REVIEW will be sent to their former office.

✎ The Editors of the SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW think it is due to themselves and to their subscribers to announce that they do not endorse in every particular what is uttered in their pages. Each author is responsible for the views he expresses. This is a matter of convenience where there are minor differences between editors themselves, or between them and their brethren. Free discussion, too, is important to the interests of truth, if kept within just limits. These limits must be strictly observed. Editors would be worthy of 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. XXIII. APRIL, MDCCCLXXII. No. 2.

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

1872.

CONTENTS.

ARTICLE	PAGE
I. Ministerial Consecration and Ministerial Support, -	161
II. Christianity and Greek Philosophy. By Judge WM. ARCHER COCKE, Monticello, Florida, - - -	188
III. The Apocryphal New Testament. By the Rev. E. O. FRIERSON, Florence, Ala., - - -	214
IV. The Presbyterate. By the Rev. J. A. SMYLLIE, Milford, Texas, - - - - -	228
V. The Tribunal of History. By the Rev. B. M. PALMER, D. D., LL.D., New Orleans, La., - -	245
VI. Schools for Ministerial Education and their Endowment. - - - - -	263
VII. Some Remarks on the Question of a Call to the Ministry. - - - - -	287
VIII. CRITICAL NOTICES:	
1. Mrs. Preston's Works, 335. 2. Church's Seed Truths, 345.	
3. Lord's Prophetic Imperialism, 348.	

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXIII.—NO. 2.

APRIL, MDCCCLXXII.

ARTICLE I.

MINISTERIAL CONSECRATION AND MINISTERIAL SUPPORT.

Perhaps there is now before the Southern Presbyterian Church no subject of more pressing interest than that which is announced as the theme of the following remarks. The particular view of it which we desire to present is: The hindrance to ministerial consecration arising from the diversion of the ministry to secular pursuits, the causes which conduce to it, and the means by which it may be removed. The subject in general is delicate, for one cannot but feel reluctant to urge upon the attention of others a duty in the discharge of which personal inefficiency and short-coming must be deplored. Infinitely preferable would it be to bend with them at the Master's feet, there to confess unfaithfulness, to entreat forgiveness, and to crave that furniture of gifts and graces which only His Spirit can impart.

In the special aspect, too, in which it will be treated, this subject is difficult; and that for two reasons: First, although the duty of ministerial consecration will, in the abstract, be at once admitted, there are concrete cases in which it seems to be limited and modified by peculiar circumstances, which to some extent condition the relation of the minister to his proper work. To

VOL. XXIII., NO 2—1.

weigh justly the influence of these circumstances and to make due allowance for them, so as while urging the performance of an obvious duty, to exonerate from censure those who are driven by necessity, would be no easy task. It is in the application of the general rule to individual cases that the difficulty exists. Secondly, the example of the Apostle Paul appears to furnish a warrant to preachers of the gospel, in certain cases, in engaging in temporal business in order to secure a support. To urge upon the conscience of each minister the necessity of separating himself from all worldly engagements, and appropriating his whole time and energy to the work to which he is peculiarly called, may be to enforce a rule the special application of which is invalidated by apostolic precedent and therefore by apostolic authority. Yet, delicate and difficult as the subject is, it is one which demands attention. The condition of our Church makes its consideration imperative. She is suffering incalculably from the want of pastors, and of pastoral consecration where in many instances the pastoral relation nominally obtains. Should there be no change for the better, the day may come when this question will assume still more vital consequence—it may be to her one of life or death. May God give us grace now, in time, to look the difficulty in the face, to ascertain its causes, and to apply the remedy before all remedial measures shall be too late!

The Apostle Paul employs the analogy of a soldier's life to illustrate the necessity of entire consecration on the part of a minister of the gospel to the work to which he is called. "No man that warreth entangleth himself with the affairs of this life." When the soldier enlists he forsakes utterly the ordinary business of life, and devotes himself to the performance of military duties. They engross his whole time and attention; nor will he be permitted by the authority which has mustered him in to turn aside to his workshop, his merchandise, or his farm. So is it with the minister of the gospel. Jesus, his Sovereign and his Commander in the field, has enrolled him and placed him as an officer in a position of responsibility and trust. He is called to the very front; the enemy is just before him. He cannot look behind him; he cannot turn aside to the right hand or to

the left. Unremitting vigilance, unceasing toil, are his lot, until the clash of arms has been hushed, and the victor's rest attained. The illustration is complete. If it would be vain to expect the soldier to discharge military functions, and at the same time to attend to the common employments of life; it is equally futile to suppose that the minister of the gospel can properly and adequately accomplish his great and holy work, and at the same time turn aside to the unspiritual pursuits of the world.

I. In the first place, then, we remark, that the work to which the minister of the gospel is called, is of such a nature as to absorb his whole time, attention, and energy; and that engagement in secular pursuits so tends to entangle him as to hinder his consecration to that work. It is of the pastoral office that we would chiefly speak, since it is that office the great majority of ministers, under the operation of our system, discharge, and since special provision is made in our general sustentation scheme for the support of the evangelist. A simple enumeration of the functions which the pastor's calling requires will serve to illuminate the truth of the foregoing propositions. What are those functions?

First of all, the pastor is called to preach. This is the foremost of his duties; and this involves a twofold office—the inculcation and defence of the truth, and the proclamation of the gospel—offer to sinners of all ranks and conditions. The flock of Christ committed to his care must be fed with that word, which is the aliment of spiritual life, and the instrument of sanctification. All who have become familiar with the first principles of the doctrine of Christ must be conducted to those advanced views of Christian truth which their practised faculties demand to satisfy them. He must keep himself in their lead, still impressing them with his superior knowledge as a teacher; or his ministrations will fail to edify this portion of his charge, and ultimately fall into contempt, or be regarded with indifference. The truth of the gospel, vital to the welfare of the souls intrusted to his oversight, must be defended from objections, misrepresentations, and undisguised attack. He is set for its defence, and must contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the

saints. The enemy must not be permitted to flourish his banners, and proclaim his triumph in the very house of the Lord. To do this he must be a theologian, prepared by his intimate acquaintance with the whole system of revealed truth, not only didactically to state its component elements, but to expose error, convince gainsayers, and stop the mouths of adversaries. What a furniture of knowledge is thus required! And how can he attain it but by close, continual, toilsome study? The pastor must be a student to the end. He can never close his books and say, I need no farther extension of my stores—I have enough. He must study while grey hairs are upon him, and lay aside his books and parchments when he undresses for the bed of death.

In addition to this function of teaching, he must herald the tidings of redemption to the perishing sinners around him. He must convince the understanding, move the affections, and endeavor to persuade the will. It is incumbent on him to perform this great office as well as the labored cultivation of his powers will admit. The preparation to preach effectively is surely no light and easy task. Think, too, what an incessant and exhausting drain is made upon his faculties, as Sabbath after Sabbath he stands up to utter himself before the same hearers! No other profession is subjected to one so trying. A great modern master of oratory has said, that he who has passed through the ordeal of an extemporaneous effort without utterly breaking down should render special thanks to God. This danger most of our preachers incur week after week. Is carelessness or recklessness a fit preparation to meet it? What study, what discipline of thought, what charging of the mind, are required against such oft-recurring exigencies! To avoid a monotonous sameness, he must be by diligent application a steward who brings forth things new and old; and he must save himself from stale repetition of the mode of exhibiting truths which, from their intrinsic value, must needs be often reiterated. Add to this the oppressive responsibility involved in venturing to preach at all; and what true preacher is there, who does not cry out, "Who is sufficient for these things?" It is said that Martin Luther often trembled upon entering the pulpit. The pulpit!

What a place it is! There the majesty of divine law is vindicated, and the love of the gospel portrayed. There are heard the thunder-tones of Sinai; there the melting accents of Calvary. Now it is luminous with the glory of the Cross, and anon it is clothed with the terrors of the judgment-bar. There truth—heavenly truth—arrayed in the garments of salvation, and invested with the sanctions of eternity, speaks to mortal men of their immortal destinies. There, it is true, a sinner stands to address sinners; but there, too, Jesus, the Saviour of sinners, lifts his hands to bless his people, and stretches out his arms of mercy to a ruined world. There a matchless Prophet extends his instructions; there a merciful and faithful High-Priest shows his atoning blood; and thence a mighty King issues his laws and bestows the Spirit of converting grace. To be prepared to occupy such a place; to do it with dignity, to do it with impressiveness, to do it with power, to do it as an ambassador of Jesus Christ to dying men, were sufficient, not to absorb the faculties of a man, but to exhaust the abilities of a seraph.

Cognate to the great duty of preaching, is that of catechizing the children and youth of the Church. It has always been conceded that the catechetical is the most effective method of imparting instruction. It was the method of the most remarkable teacher of Pagan antiquity, and no wise instructor will disregard it as a medium of communicating Christian knowledge. It is all-important that the young of the Church should be thoroughly indoctrinated in the truths of the gospel. It is upon them that these truths make the deepest and most lasting impression. Our fathers of the Scottish Churches always insisted upon this department of ministerial duty; the Church of England makes it incumbent upon her ministers. It cannot, without culpable neglect, be wholly remitted to other hands. No doubt the family is the great school for the religious training of children; but the minister is the shepherd of all the separate flocks of his charge. It is the collection of them which constitutes *his* flock. He is the pastor—the feeder of the little ones. Now he may accomplish this duty in one of several ways. He may teach from house to house; or, he may gather the children and instruct

them collectively; or, he may take advantage of the Sabbath-school, an institute demanded by the spirit of this age, and throw himself into connection with it as the surest means of reaching the largest number of the children of his charge. But whichever plan he adopts, it is one of his functions to impart the knowledge of gospel truth to the youth of his congregation.

Next in order comes the function of pastoral visitation. It is by no means intended to affirm that this duty rests exclusively upon the minister. There are also others who are appointed by the authority of Christ to perform it. The ruling elder is an overseer, a bishop of the congregation, and his office of inspection can only be properly discharged by personal visitation of so many of its families as may be assigned to his special oversight and care. It is cheerfully conceded that the thorough visitation of the people can only be accomplished jointly by the minister and the ruling elders; and that to devolve the whole duty upon the preacher is at once to overburden him with excessive responsibilities and to violate the express injunctions of the Head of the Church. But at the same time, it must be admitted that, as the minister is alike teaching and ruling elder, this duty rests by eminence upon him. He is in part to discharge his several functions of overseer and teacher by analysing his congregation, by inquiring into the spiritual condition of individuals, by comforting the poor, the sick, and the afflicted, and by instructing and praying with families at home. Thus would every house become a sanctuary, and every family a congregation. Oh, how sadly do we fail in preaching from house to house! How little can we say, with the faithful apostle, "I ceased not to warn every one night and day with tears!"

It is also one of the functions of the minister to organise the active elements of his Church for the work in the Master's vineyard, which can only be adequately accomplished by an employment of the two principles of combination and division of labor. The Church is a living organism united to a living Head by a living Agent who dwells and works in her. She is not a mere aggregation of independent units, a simple collection of persons who stately assemble to hear the gospel and worship God, im-

portant as these ends confessedly are. The bond which unites them to Christ, as it makes them partakers of his life, imparts to them organic unity as sharers of a common spiritual life. They are one in Christ Jesus. Each member of this living body has a vital function to discharge; each has its own separate and peculiar office, and each combines with every other to the sustenance of a joint vitality, and the production of a common end. This great principle makes it clear that the Church should be a working body. There are three subordinate principles in obedience to which the energies of the Church should be employed to secure the glory of her Head and the welfare of men. The first is, the organisation of the working elements by combining such as possess kindred qualifications for usefulness in order to effect a joint result. The second is, the division of labor, in order that all may not be concentrated upon each separate object, and so loss of time, indefiniteness of aim, and confusion in action emerge, but that those who are peculiarly fitted for accomplishing certain specific offices may be set off from the mass by sub-organisation and detailed for the discharge of those offices. Some, for example, are eminently suited by their gifts for missionary labor in the community which surrounds them. They would properly be associated and assigned to that particular branch of Christian work. The third principle is, the direct responsibility of the working body as a whole, and in its detailed sections, or committees, to the session as the directing and governing power. The formation of independent, voluntary societies within the Church would thus be prevented. By the recognition and employment of these principles, a Church passes from the negative condition of a merely passive recipient of spiritual benefits, and rises in response to her Master's call—"Go, work to-day in my vineyard," into an active, energetic organisation. She becomes what the Master intended her to be, not only a school of training for individual souls, but a charitable institute, succoring her own needy members, and dispensing blessings to particular communities, and to the world at large. Of course, in all that has been said, it is not implied that the Church is not already organised by the divine appointment of office-bearers

with their respective functions distinctly assigned them. What is urged is the necessity of employing the membership, in which resides a vast amount of latent working-power which is too often permitted to lie unused in the performance of Christian labors adapted to their unofficial position. Nor is it intended by any means to imply that where such an organisation of the membership for evangelical work does not obtain, the Church is a useless society. Far from it. The first, great end, subordinate to the glory of God, for which the Church exists, is the salvation of souls, and this is secured by a believing reception of the saving word. And it is also admitted that the very instincts of the new nature will lead individuals to work for Christ and souls where no such organisation as that described is in existence. But yet it is true that the perfection of the Church as an active institute cannot be attained without the employment of this great principle of union for the acquisition of joint ends, and that without it the tendency is to satisfaction with mere individual benefit. The power, under God, of a single church properly organised for labor is simply enormous; and what is here insisted on is, that the minister ought not to neglect the use of this joint power for the promotion of the Master's glory and the welfare of men. But this involves patient thought, untiring labor, incessant oversight. Having, with the coöperation of the membership of the Church, which must be secured by careful instruction of them in their duty and privilege in this respect, enlisted their energies for common work, he will find it necessary to supervise the operation of the whole scheme; to solve difficulties, to check the forward, to stimulate the fainting, to encourage the doubting, to support the weak. Like a faithful leader, he must throw himself along the whole line, but especially at the points which are threatening to give way under the pressure of the enemy.

Another function which the minister is called to discharge is that of ruling. In this respect he sustains a twofold relation: first, to his own congregation; and secondly, to the Church at large as a member of its upper courts. In connection with his own charge, besides the ordinary oversight of its interest in his

several and joint capacity, he will often encounter questions involving important principles and far-reaching precedents; and from the new and peculiar conditions, the modified aspects and relations under which old and familiar principles are presented, he will find his mind, however acute and penetrating, frequently tasked to its utmost ability. The exercise of discipline, always difficult and trying, will make large drafts upon his time, and often exact the most anxious and protracted reflection. These considerations are enhanced by the demands upon his time and attention, which are enforced upon him by virtue of his relation to the great and often embarrassing questions which he must meet as a member of the higher judicatories, and which he cannot overlook or slight without delinquency in his duties as a presbyter.

In addition to these binding obligations, he will feel himself, it may be, impelled to use the press—the grand modern agency for the extensive dissemination of the truth, and discussion of conflicting views, a medium through which he will be able to address a larger auditory than he can orally reach. He will also endeavor to fulfil, as far as in him lies, the offices of the Christian philanthropist. Pervaded by love for his fellow-men, he will feel a sympathy with every good enterprise which is warranted by the word of God, and does not contravene the constitution of his Church; and by active influence in their advancement contribute, to the extent of his ability, to the melioration of social evils, and the promotion of the public weal.

In what has been urged, nothing has been said of the greatest duty of all—that which lies at the basis of all others—the duty of attending to his own spiritual culture, and of living in communion with God, without which all his functions are dead works—all his gifts, however splendid, sounding brass and tinkling cymbals. Every Christian, it is true, experiences the same obligation; but it presses eminently and peculiarly upon the minister of the gospel. His faith must be a great faith; his love a mighty passion; his fight the combat of a champion in the forefront of battle; his conflicts with temptation such as men wage who hold against odds the gates of a citadel. When

others fall, he must stand; when they faint, he must press on; when they are cold, he must burn; and when apostasy sweeps off its hundreds, he must lift his standard between the living and the dead. No influence of earthly contagion must lower the tone of his spiritual life. When the earth is like iron and the heavens like brass, he must plead with his head between his knees until the harbinger of refreshing rains darkens the distant horizon and rolls its volumes of blessing across the face of the burning sky. And "as an eagle stirreth up her nest, fluttereth over her young, spreadeth abroad her wings, taketh them, beareth them on her wings," so must he nurse the weak, raise the fallen, cheer on the lagging, and on strong pinions of faith and love bear upward his charge to higher regions of holiness and joy.

This statement of the functions of a minister of the gospel, and of the work which he is required to perform is in itself sufficient without argument to show that he has no time for attending to a secular pursuit. Time! He has not time enough to do his proper work—this mighty, all-absorbing work which his Master has committed to his hands, and the adequate performance of which is demanded by his relations to undying souls, and the nearness of that account which he must render for them at the bar of final judgment. Time! When he has toiled night and day, rising early and burning the midnight lamp, he longs for more time. When the exhausted body falls like a dead weight upon its couch, he begrudges the time which its rest exacts. How often does he wish that he could duplicate himself, so that he might bring two minds and two bodies to the discharge of duties which his single self pursues but ever fails to overtake. "Oh," exclaims he, "that I had studied more diligently in the past, so that I might better meet the rigorous demands now made upon my intellectual furniture; but, alas! the exactions of my pastoral work in measure forbade it." "Oh," cries he at another time, "that I had more faithfully visited and prayed with and preached to the families and individuals of my charge; but, alas! the necessity of study, and of constant preparation for the pulpit greatly hindered me." "Oh," laments he again, "that I had oftener seized the opportunity to perform missionary labor

to destitute souls in my vicinity; but, alas! my pastoral work confined me to my flock." Time! Had he the age of Methusalem—one thousand years save thirty-one—in which to accomplish a work which must be achieved in an uncertain fraction of three-score years and ten, he would feel that not too much time were consecrated to an enterprise so gigantic, to ends so noble and sublime. Time! A few, brief—ah, how brief—years slip away, and his overtaxed voice begins to yield, the fires of his youth to die down, the vigor of his manhood to decay; and still there ring in his ears the thrilling words of his laborious Master: "I must work the works of him that sent me while it is day; the night cometh when no man can work." And as one beloved brother after another, who has wrought side by side with him, drops down under his burden, voices as from the eternal world, issuing from their graves, call like trumpets to him to "finish the work" which his Lord has given him to do. *What time, then, has a minister of the gospel to devote to temporal pursuits?*

It is perfectly clear that time is equally necessary to the successful accomplishment of any secular business. What employment is there that can be vigorously pursued as a secondary and subordinate affair? What merchant, or farmer, or mechanic, is there who feels that he has more time than can be legitimately and profitably bestowed upon his avocation?

It is equally obvious that concentrated attention is required, either for the thorough discharge of ministerial duties, or the adequate accomplishment of any worldly business. It is out of the question that it can be competently paid to both. There is apt to arise, in cases in which both are undertaken by uninspired men, a competition between them, in which one or the other must give way and suffer. It deserves serious consideration, which is likely to yield to the claims of the other? which will exercise the paramount influence? Let us, then, contemplate the probable effects of this rivalry between the ministerial work and a secular pursuit?

1. In the first place, either one succeeds in a temporal business, or he does not. If he does, his success is the result of the devotion of time and attention to the pursuit in which he is en-

gaged. That supposes a corresponding withdrawal of those elements of successful work from the labors of the ministry. If he fails, the cares and anxieties which follow must needs have the effect of diverting his mind from the cure of souls, and the heavy, though sacred, burden of ministerial responsibility. Let him succeed or not, in either event a prejudicial influence is, to a greater or less extent, exerted upon his proper work.

2. In the second place, a consecration of the minister to his sacred calling is in this case hindered by the law that two supreme ends cannot be pursued at once, two controlling principles of action cannot coördinately operate in the same heart. "No man," says our Saviour, "can serve two masters; for either he will hate the one and love the other, or else he will hold to the one and despise the other." Now, in what way is it likely that this law will operate in the case of a minister who pursues a secular business? He will probably, if a conscientious servant of Christ, will certainly commence aright. Unable to secure a comfortable support by the preaching of the gospel, and yet, by the love of his great work and the profound convictions which relate him to it, impelled to continue its discharge, he betakes himself to some temporal employment to furnish him the means of proclaiming the unsearchable riches of Christ to his fellow-men. His motive is undoubtedly a commendable, a noble one. And in cases in which stern necessity exists and in which that motive continues to exercise a supreme control, it is hard to ascribe any other spirit to such a man than one which the Lord Jesus will himself approve. But constituted as even such a man is, the question arises, whether he will be likely to end as he began. The danger which he incurs is one which springs from the fact that he is imperfectly sanctified; that there co-exist in his one personality two natures which are in perpetual conflict, and which struggle incessantly for the mastery of the soul. The one allies him to Christ, to holiness, to heaven; the other to the earth, to the devil, to sin. The new nature by its very instincts, affections, and principles, urges him to the performance of his holy work; the old, as by the force of gravitation, draws him downward from it. His engagement in a secular

employment powerfully enhances the tendencies of his carnal nature. It gives it peculiar motives for exercise and opportunities for domination. It is difficult enough for one who is entirely consecrated to his sacred work to resist the impulses of his sinful nature, so potent within him as often to wring from him the cry of the agonized apostle, "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" But how much more arduous must it be for him who, in addition to these native cravings of the old nature, is compelled to supply the additional incentives to its desires which spring from an earthly employment foreign to the very genius of that singular mission to which he is divinely separated. Is it not manifest that there must be a tendency at least to the relaxation, if not the overthrow, of that supreme motive with which he commenced this dual employment of his energies? Is there not danger of his bestowing a divided heart upon the work of the Lord?

These painful apprehensions are strengthened, when we reflect that, from the nature of the case, more time is ordinarily devoted to the secular than to the ministerial work. The necessities of a temporal business require that this be so. Its results are more tangible, and the fruits of neglect very speedily and conspicuously show themselves. This is serious; for the earthly thoughts and affections are thus seen to have immense scope in which to develop themselves, while even proportionate opportunity for expansion is denied to those principles which infuse spiritual energy into a minister's heart and work. He is in danger of looking at the things which are seen and temporary, and not at the things which are unseen and eternal.

Let it be remembered, too, that it is easier to bestow attention upon a secular business than upon the self-denying, self-sacrificing work of the ministry. The former falls in with the natural tastes of the heart, and the wants of the body; and the peril thus created of one's being absorbed by it is immeasurably increased by the very law of contagion. In pursuing an earthly employment he has the sympathy of all around him who are similarly engaged. In the ordinary intercourse of life he will be stimulated by this community of earthly interest and fellow-

ship of secular feeling, even against the protests of the minister's heart, and the cautionary remonstrances of the Spirit of God to think, feel, and act as a man of the world occupied like others in the things of the world.

It cannot, moreover, be disguised, that during this period of engagement in worldly business, the tendency must be great from the very laws of his nature, to the establishment of worldly habits which, if they do not actually oppose his ministerial culture, go to neutralize and hinder it. He is in danger of becoming secularized. It is important to reflect that habits of genuine ministerial labor are not the most facile of formation. They require for their mature development time and painful effort. To the zenith of his activity the habits of the minister are forming. It is apparent, therefore, that the contemporaneous cultivation of secular habits must tend to interfere seriously with the legitimate growth of the ministerial character, and the highest attainments of ministerial usefulness.

In order to vacate these considerations of their force, it may be replied that they would impeach the piety of every Christian man who industriously devotes himself to his earthly business. The answer is, that were the two cases strictly parallel, it would have to be acknowledged that the temptation is sore on the part of every non-ministerial servant of Christ to sacrifice his sympathy with his Master's kingdom in his engrossment in his temporal interests. What prayer, what vigilance is required to defeat this threatening danger! And when all means are employed to avert it, how small is the success which the Christian man obtains, compared with the convictions and desires of his spiritual nature! One of the great and pressing wants of the Church and of a perishing world, is the consecration of the members of Christ to his glory, his kingdom, his cause. What could not be accomplished, did this dedication by Jesus' people of their energies and their property to him once become a fact! Such a discussion as this would be superfluous, since no minister would have a reasonable excuse for engaging in a secular pursuit. The treasury of the Lord would be full. All the tithes would be brought into his storehouse; and the soldier of Christ paid

out of his coffers would feel no temptation to entangle himself with the affairs of this life. But the cases are not wholly analogous. They differ in important respects. The ordinary Christian is legitimately employed when he devotes his time and attention to an earthly pursuit. To this he is called in subordination to his chief end—the glory of God, in the edification of the Church, and the salvation of souls. The minister, on the other hand, is called to a special work, the very nature of which separates him from worldly avocations. He is set apart to this work. This—no other—is his employment. The one in encountering dangers which arise from a legitimate calling is authorised to expect the aids of grace, and privileged to rely upon the promises of God. The other, in cases in which no absolute necessity exists for it, turns aside from his appointed work, and may find that God will turn aside from him, that he may be left to the full force of temptations which are not pertinent to his own proper calling. And even where necessity does exist, the analogy between the supposed cases fails; for, by devotion, within proper limits, to his secular calling the private Christian more and more qualifies himself for the service of God in his appointed lot. This is his business; and there can be no contradiction between it and the end to which his life ought to be consecrated. The minister, on the other hand, the more thoroughly he becomes an expert in a worldly pursuit, the more disqualifies himself both by desuetude, and by contrariety in the very nature of the things themselves, for a thorough prosecution of his peculiar calling—his holy and unearthly work.

3. In the third place, the effect on the minister's preaching must in a greater or less degree prove detrimental. The preacher who is wholly consecrated to his work finds it extremely difficult to secure and maintain that frame of mind and heart which effective preaching demands. How different at different times is the unction with which he delivers the gospel! Now he is borne as in the chariots of Amminadib, and anon the wheels of his soul drive as heavily as those which were disabled in the mud of the Red Sea. How hard it is at times to preach, when it is easy to speak! It is one thing fluently to utter a lecture or an

oration on the gospel; it is quite another thing to preach the gospel with power and with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven. To thrust out the world, to divorce the soul from distracting thoughts and cloister it with the subject, to be so pervaded by the truth that the word of the Lord is like a burning fire which breaks forth with a vehement flame, to discard the arm of flesh and hang dependently on the arm of the Spirit, to glow with zeal for the glory of God, to melt with love to a dying Saviour, and to yearn with tenderness unutterable over perishing sinners—all this is difficult indeed to him to whom preaching is the one great business of life. Must not the difficulty be greatly increased by that occupation of the mind with worldly thoughts and of the heart with worldly feelings which engagement in a secular pursuit must tend to produce? Nor is this all. The case is aggravated by the consideration that the unction of the preacher is ordinarily the measure of God's blessing upon the people. Usually there is a correspondence betwixt the state of his heart and the spiritual effect of his preaching upon the souls of his hearers. When he is warm, they burn; when he is cold, they freeze. If, therefore, the tendency of a preacher's occupation in worldly matters is to damage the effectiveness of his preaching, it is obvious that only reasons of the most cogent character will justify him in incurring so fearful a responsibility.

II. If, then, these things be so: if the work of the minister of the gospel is of such a nature as to absorb all his time and attention; if engagement in a secular pursuit robs him of a portion of the time and distracts the attention which his proper calling imperatively requires for its efficient prosecution; if there is danger of his becoming entangled in the affairs of this life, so as in measure to disqualify him for the thorough-going discharge of his spiritual functions, the question obtrudes itself, Why are so many ministers occupied in temporal avocations? What account can be given of this extraordinary fact? Can it be that there is a lamentable failure on their part to appreciate the force of their divine call to devote themselves to the preaching of the gospel and the cure of souls, or to apprehend the true significance of the work assigned them? Can it be that their faith is

so small that they dare not, while laboring for Him, trust for their earthly support in the providence and promises of the Master they serve? Can it be for once supposed that they are not content with a maintenance sufficient for the reasonable wants of themselves and their families, but, impelled by the covetousness they rebuke from the pulpit, grasp after an accumulation of this world's goods? In short, is this remarkable state of things to be ascribed to the defective piety of the ministry? They themselves would be the first to admit their shortcomings in reference to the holy work to which they are called; but it would involve the most signal injustice to them to say that there are no other causes than those mentioned for the diversion of their energies into secular channels. Yes, other causes there are which go far to explain the huge anomaly; and it is a question which merits our profoundest attention, What *are* those causes? We will endeavor to describe the most prominent of them:

1. The principal cause of this state of things is, beyond doubt, the failure of the churches to furnish them an adequate support. Where this is the case, there are three alternatives before the minister between which his election must be made: either he must abandon the preaching of the gospel; or, continuing to preach, he must accept suffering for himself and his family; or, he must resort to a secular pursuit to eke out his support. The first he cannot do, if he be a true-hearted preacher of the gospel. Necessity is laid upon him, and preach he must. The second he might perhaps do, were he alone involved; but he would ill discharge his obligations to those dependent on him for subsistence by allowing them to want the necessaries of life. The third course is that which alone seems feasible; but must he be shut up to its adoption, with all its attendant evils? Shall he be driven to a worldly avocation through defect of comfortable maintenance by the church he serves? One is tempted to believe that a church needs only to know its duty in this matter in order to fulfil it. It may not be unprofitable, therefore, once more to state the grounds upon which ministers are entitled to support, and upon which the con-

sequent obligation of the churches to furnish it is susceptible of clear establishment. In briefly doing so, we will follow the argument which the Apostle Paul so lucidly and convincingly urges in the ninth chapter of the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians.

First, the right of ministers of the gospel to adequate support, is evident from the universally recognised principle that the laborer is entitled to reward. This principle lies at the root of society. It could not exist without it. It is founded in natural justice, and commends itself even to the conscience of the heathen. All men act upon it. "Who goeth a warfare at any time at his own charges? Who planteth a vineyard, and eateth not of the fruit thereof? Or who feedeth a flock, and eateth not of the milk of the flock?" The only way in which the resistless force of this argument can be evaded is, by denying that the minister of the gospel is in any proper sense a laborer. If he be a drone in the hive of society, as the infidel says, if the offices he discharges are useless, then his case falls outside of the scope of this fundamental principle. But our Saviour pronounces him a laborer, and a "laborer worthy of his hire;" and Christian men would be the last to deny the fact. Why, then, upon the principles of natural justice, does he not receive his reward? Strong as this view is, it does not present the whole case. The relation of a pastor to his people is of the nature of a formal contract, and if his hire is withheld, there is not only injustice but fraud. And still further, as he is, as a laborer, also the representative of his Lord, his servant hired out for His glory, the fraud is perpetrated not only against him but against Christ. The Master is cheated of his dues.

Secondly, the same right is strictly enforced in the law of the Old Testament dispensation, even in regard to brutes. "For it is written in the law of Moses, Thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn. Doth God take care for oxen? or saith he it altogether for our sakes? For our sakes no doubt this is written; that he that plougheth should plough in hope; and he that thresheth in hope should be partaker of his hope." Here the general principle that labor is entitled to reward, is enforced by statute; and in accordance

with it the special labors of the priests and Levites—the ordinary ministers of that economy—were secured a competent reward.

Thirdly, the minister of the gospel is entitled to adequate support upon the principle of commutative justice. “If we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great thing if we shall reap your carnal things?” There are three things suggested by this particular argument. In the first place, even taking the low view of commercial exchange, in accordance with which one thing is given for another, the minister ought to have temporal support. He gives to the people his things; they ought to give to him their things. In the next place, the argument is from the greater to the less: the minister furnishes to the people the higher class of benefits—the spiritual; they in return ought to supply the lower class of benefits—the carnal. In the third place, if we mistake not, the apostle intimates that this demand of commutative justice is enhanced by gratitude. You have received through us ministers the priceless blessings of redemption; even gratitude would impel you by yielding your carnal and perishable things to supply our ordinary natural wants. The argument is irresistible.

Fourthly, the analogy of all religions, especially of the Jewish, vindicates the right of the gospel ministry to a competent maintenance. “Do ye not know that they which minister about holy things live of the things of the temple? and they which wait at the altar are partakers with the altar?” The priesthood of every religion are supported in the discharge of their functions. This was eminently true of ministers of the Jewish religion. Their maintenance was most carefully provided for, not only from the system of tithes, but from the sacrificial offerings of the worshippers. They partook of what was given to God. Shall this analogy be violated only under the Christian scheme? Shall the ministerial dispensers of higher benefits than any other religion imparts, constitute the only exception to this universal rule? The Jewish minister lived of the temple, the Pagan priest ate of the altar; only the preacher of “the glorious gospel of the blessed God” shall be denied this privilege! *He* must labor with his own hands for his daily bread! “Tell it not in

Gath, publish it not in the streets of Askelon; lest the daughters of the Philistines rejoice; lest the daughters of the uncircumcised triumph."

Fifthly, the support of the ministers of the gospel is provided for by the express ordinance of Christ himself. "Even so hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel." Evidently, the allusion is to Christ, the Head and Lawgiver of the Church. As under the old dispensation provision was made by divine enactment for the temporal sustenance of its ministry, even so has the Lord Jesus ordered that the support of his ministers under the gospel economy should be derived from the discharge of their sacred functions, and not from their engagement in secular pursuits. Here the argument necessarily closes; the authority of Christ is invoked. That is enough, surely, to make it obligatory upon the ministry to seek from the Church, and upon the Church to furnish, such support as their circumstances require.

The only escape from the obligation thus irrefragably established, is upon the plea of inability resulting from poverty. In such cases several things would seem to be clear: In the first place, a church so situated, though unable to support the ministry, ought notwithstanding to enjoy its offices, in accordance with the principle that to the poor the gospel is preached. It must, at the same time, be content to be so classified. In the second place, it ought to refrain from entering into contracts which its circumstances preclude its fulfilling. In the third place, before declining to furnish a support to the ministry, it must be sure that the plea of inability is well-founded; that it is not suggested by the absence of a self-sacrificing spirit, rather than by the actual stress of its circumstances. Otherwise it incurs the guilt of disobedience to the express ordinance of Christ, and must expect to be visited with the tokens of his displeasure. In the fourth place, it should endeavor as speedily as possible, either by uniting with other churches, or by the development of its own resources, to secure the services of a pastor, and to give him a support. Its life is involved in it.

2. A second cause of the diversion of ministerial energy into

secular channels, is a partial misconception of the position which was maintained by the Apostle Paul. He wrought with his own hands in order that he might make the gospel without charge; and what was done by an apostle may be done by humbler servants of Christ. This consideration has a twofold bearing—upon the mind of the minister of the gospel himself, and upon the expectations of the Church. Perhaps no one reason has been so powerful as this in producing inattention on the part of both ministers and churches to the plain law of Christ, that they who preach the gospel should live of the gospel. But what if the course of the great apostle has been somewhat misapprehended, and his authority misquoted? What if that which was in his particular case purely exceptional has been constructed into a precedent for the institution of a rule contradictory to his teachings? Let us look closely into the case in the light of what Paul himself has said touching this matter.

First, it deserves to be considered that the apostle vindicates his right to a support from the very church from which he declined to receive it—the church of Corinth. This he does in the ninth chapter of his 1st Epistle to that church.

Secondly, he mentions the fact, at least by implication, that the Corinthian church supported its ordinary teachers, and claims at least an equal right with them to be maintained in preaching the gospel to it. “If others,” argues he, “be partakers of this power over you, are not we rather?” It is plain from this reasoning, that the Corinthian church supported its teachers, and that Paul approved of their course in so doing.

Thirdly, he received contributions to his support from the Philippian church and others. He seems to have had no objection to taking “wages” from them, as he terms the offerings sent him by those churches. Addressing the Corinthians, he says: “I robbed other churches, taking wages of them to do you service.” It does not appear that he refused to accept contributions to his support from any other church than the Corinthian. It is probable that the reason of his laboring with his own hands at Thessalonica, was the “deep poverty” of the

church at that place, for he commends their liberality. The wealthier Corinthians, on the other hand, seemed to think it hard—to deem it a species of indignity to them, that the apostle persistently declined to take anything from them. He justifies himself in doing this, by asserting his determination to be independent in this particular instance. For this exceptional action he alleges a special reason—his motives had been assailed. There can be but little question that certain teachers, or at least speakers, had attributed to him mercenary ends in preaching the gospel. Sustaining as he did a position altogether singular—that of the first preacher of Christianity to the Pagan world—he deemed it right to silence this accusation; and he did it effectually by utterly refusing to accept contributions from the Corinthian church. From this it follows, that the rule to which Paul ordinarily conformed himself was that which he stringently enforced by argument—the rule that the church ought to support the ministry; and that he departed from that rule only for two reasons: either the deep poverty of a church, or the vindication of his motives as a preacher, and his authority as an apostle. The position of Paul, therefore, in relation to the church of Corinth can afford no precedent to a church now to expect a minister to labor for his own maintenance, for they were willing to contribute to Paul's support. It was he who was unwilling. And surely no church would feel justified in giving grounds to a minister to decline a proffered maintenance by attacking his motives in preaching the gospel. The only excuse then for a church in failing to support the ministry is sheer inability. On the other hand, no minister is at liberty to cite the example of Paul as a precedent warranting departure from the scriptural rule, except in those peculiar cases which determined the attitude of the apostle. No general feeling of independence, and, above all, no desire for wealth or social position will sustain him in resorting to secular pursuits. To follow the example of the glorious apostle to the Gentiles, is to tread the painful path of self-denial and sacrifice.

Fourthly, the Church was in a forming condition in the apostle's day; and what may have been proper then, may not be

so in a settled state of the Church. Paul endeavored to educate the infant Church, just emerging from heathenism, up to the full measure of its duty. When the state of maturity is reached, the full complement of its duty ought to be discharged. What holds of an infant, does not hold of an adult. Besides this, the apostle did not sustain the specific relation of a pastor; he was an apostolic evangelist, and what he did in that capacity may not furnish a precedent for imitation by pastors. While he declined support from the Corinthian church, he admitted that it maintained its ordinary teachers.

Fifthly, it may not be unworthy of mention, that the secular business in which Paul engaged was one which made no draft upon his intellectual energies. It was a very simple mechanical employment—he made tents. His whole mental energy was devoted to the preaching of the gospel and the care of the churches. This is worthy of consideration by those who may be disposed to quote his example as entitling them to pursue secular avocations which, from their very nature, tend to enlist largely, if not to absorb, their mental faculties.

Sixthly, Paul was inspired. He did not indeed despise the aids of human learning, or neglect the means of attaining it. Even after his call to the apostolate, which of course involved inspiration, his “books” were the companions of his travels; and this, in itself, constitutes a powerful *a fortiori* argument for such a pursuit of knowledge by an uninspired ministry as would leave little time for temporal engagements. Was Paul a student? Who of *us* can decline to be? But the fact of inspiration places a chasm betwixt the case of an apostle, and that of an ordinary minister of the word. All his oral utterances and his written deliverances as a public teacher were inspired by the Holy Ghost, and consequently infallible. Such a man could better afford to engage in a secular employment, than one who, destitute of this extraordinary gift, must labor night and day to save himself and save others, by God’s help, from the blunders and faults to which every uninspired preacher is exposed. The argument from Paul’s case to ours must take in and make allowance for this capital consideration. We must toil even to

approximate that freedom from error which the apostle received by immediate inspiration; and that toil, if faithfully undergone, excludes habitual application to any foreign business.

These considerations go to show that the example of Paul has not unfrequently been misused by the ministry in justifying their engagement in secular pursuits, and by the Church in permitting them to do it.

3. The third and only remaining cause which we shall allege for the fact under consideration, is one which, though special and local in its bearing, exerts a controlling influence. It is to be found in a condition of the Church induced by the precedents established by some of our venerable fathers in the ministry of a former generation. They founded churches which were either too poor or too little trained to yield them at once an adequate support. In order to enable them to minister to these beloved flocks, they betook themselves to temporal pursuits; but unfortunately the state of things which they thus inaugurated, and which ought to have been temporary, has become in many instances the permanent condition of our churches. In regard to this matter we have three remarks to make. The first is, that it is far from our intention to derogate one iota from the honor due them as the laborious pioneers of our Church. They were good men and true, and their memory is deservedly held in the highest esteem by their survivors and the descendants of those who sat under their ministry. The second is, that though good and true men, they were fallible men, and, be it said with all deference, committed an error which has entailed most unhappy results upon the Church. That error was, not that in defect of adequate support from their poor or untrained charges they labored with their own hands to secure it; but it was, that they failed subsequently to indoctrinate their people in their scriptural duty in this matter, so that they might themselves have ultimately retired from secular avocations, and have saved their successors from the necessity which they themselves encountered in an infantile condition of the churches. The fact is that they virtually perpetuated that infantile condition, so far as their example went; and all the force of their character and the

honor rendered justly in other respects to their ministry, tend to hinder the emergence of the Church from that imperfect state. Their example is now appealed to as against those who labor to promote a more scriptural order of things. The third remark is, that, as our Saviour has instructed us to call no man master or father, we should refuse to be brought into bondage to the errors even of these good and holy men, and endeavor to emancipate ourselves from a yoke which they ought not to have imposed. One is our Master—even Christ. He has laid upon the Church and the ministry an obligation which no human authority however exalted can destroy, no human example however revered can impair. He hath ordained that they who preach the gospel should live of the gospel. That is our law. The Church and the ministry should alike strive to reach a better and more scriptural condition than that which has thus come down to us from a former generation. “Hoary-headed error,” said a great writer, “is not on that account the more venerable.” If this be an error it ought to be removed, even though it be hung round with precedents and grey with age. And an error—a grave and ruinous error—it is, if there be justice in man, truth in the Scriptures and authority in Christ.

III. What, then, is the practical conclusion to which we are driven by the discussion of this subject? It is, that it is alike the duty of ministers thoroughly to consecrate themselves to their one great and peculiar work, and of the churches to furnish them a comfortable support in the prosecution of that work. The responsibility of both the ministry and the Church in this solemn business is primarily to the Lord Jesus Christ. In view of the call which he has given the minister to do this work, of its stupendous import, its multiplied and arduous functions, of the consuming demands which it makes upon his time, attention, and energy; in view of the injurious effect likely to be exerted upon his ministry by his engagement in worldly avocations, and of the ordinance of Christ that he should seek support from the Church, it is evident that nothing but a stringent necessity, or the vindication of his ministerial character from unjust imputations, will warrant him in turning even partly aside from it to

secular pursuits. No other pleas will excuse him for slighting his proper work when he is confronted by its tremendous responsibilities, and stands side by side with his flock of deathless souls before the final bar. On the other hand, in view of the imperative law of Christ, that they who preach the gospel should live of the gospel, and of the impossibility of the minister's consecrating himself entirely to the service of the Master and the good of the Church without a comfortable support, nothing will discharge a church from its duty in the premises but an inability created by unavoidable indigence. No precedents of the past by whatever names supported, no plea of imaginary poverty, no husbandry of resources for the luxurious maintenance of families, no accumulation of property to be squandered by those who wrought not for it, no thoughtless inattention to the claims of Jesus and his cause, will avail a church when it looks in the face of the impartial Judge, and of His badly-treated servants in the blazing light of that judicial day. Sacrifice, self-sacrifice, ought to be the law of the ministry and of the Church, as it was the law of the life and of the death of their common Saviour. What is needed is, that the lesson of his Cross should be more deeply enstamped upon all our hearts. Spirit of Jesus, take us daily to that Cross, and imbue us with the self-sacrificing devotion, sympathy, and love of him "who gave himself for us" there!

But there is also a secondary obligation which the ministry and the Church reciprocally sustain. It is not to be expected that a church will make efforts to support a minister who, instead of consecrating himself to its service, is doing well for himself by employing his energies in a secular pursuit; nor is it to be expected that a minister will consecrate himself to the service of a church which fails to provide for himself and his family the necessaries of life—food, raiment, shelter, and the means of educating his children. What then? Must there be a deadlock? Not necessarily. There is one remedy for this difficulty—it is that both ministers and churches should do their duty, and do it simultaneously. Let the minister, in the exercise of a strong faith, throw himself upon the people of Christ; let him judiciously train them by instruction from the pulpit and by

practical measures, in the grace, the privilege, the duty of giving themselves and their substance to the cause of the Lord Jesus; let the chief motive appealed to be a love which responds to the dying love of Christ, and the manner of impressing it one of manifest affection to the souls of his people; and then let him resort to a secular employment only when he is convinced of the inability of his flock to support him, or when his church, though able to sustain him, drives him from his scriptural position by its invincible penuriousness and disobedience to the law of Christ. Because a people at first declines to guarantee a competent support, let him not at once make other arrangements to secure it. He should begin with the understanding that he on his part will do his duty. He should set his people the example of consecration, of faith, of liberality in proportion to his means, and leaning on them should look to God to incline their hearts to give him his daily bread. We cannot but feel persuaded, that if a minister should thus endeavor to comply with the divine call which sets him apart to God's work, neither God nor the Christian people would allow him to suffer. At any rate it is worth the trial. Nay, there are those who *have* tried it, and have not been disappointed. Oh, the measureless power of a simple faith in God, and a Christ-like love to men!

On the other hand, let the churches in a like spirit of faith make sacrifices to furnish a competent support to their ministers; let them divest them thus of all necessity for turning aside to worldly pursuits. There is no church with a fair number of members and a moderate share of this world's goods which cannot do this. All that is wanted is faith and love. Had we faith as great as a grain of mustard-seed, we should say to the mountains, Depart, and they would go. Had we faith in the promises of the eternal covenant, we should, without fear of loss, give of our substance to him who indeed calls us to the Mount of Sacrifice, but illuminates it in the light of that immortal word, "Jehovah-jireh." A little faith in him to whom all power is committed, who holds the reins of universal dominion, whose are the cattle on a thousand hills, the beasts of the forest, the fulness of the sea, and the countless treasures of earth and

heaven, what church that had it would hesitate to give of its earthly substance to Him through fear of privation and want? And had we that love for Jesus which impels us to provide for the physical necessities of our wives and children, we could not withhold our means from him who, in the persons of his servants in the gospel, throws himself upon the liberality of his people. Had we a little of that love to him which led him to die for us, we should deem no sacrifice too great to be made for the support of his gospel and the advancement of his kingdom.

ARTICLE II.

CHRISTIANITY AND GREEK PHILOSOPHY.*

Christianity and Greek Philosophy; or, The Relation between Spontaneous and Reflective Thought in Greece, and the Positive Teaching of Christ and his Apostles. By B. F. COCKER, D. D., Professor of Moral and Mental Philosophy in the University of Michigan. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1870.

This is a work of learning, and exhibits skill and ingenuity in its arrangement. It treats of an interesting subject which has divided eminent theologians for centuries. The more our attention has been drawn to the work before us, the more are we impressed with the necessity of giving it a full and impartial examination. The author's mind is richly stored; and while we admire the magnificent temple reared by his talent and labor, yet we regret that, in its structure, he has worked up many materials too nearly assimilated to the perishable matter of the Pantheon, and its inner courts adorned with too many images of Pagan philosophy, to bear the touch of Christian truth.

It is to be regretted that moral philosophy, which ought to

*We give place to this article, so excellent in some aspects, without committing ourselves to its philosophy.—EDS. S. P. R.

teach Christian truth, comes to us under so many disguises, and in such protean shapes, as to require the most minute and accurate inspection before allowing it to be presented to minds unused to logical methods of investigation.

If some master does not arise to expose the errors of the schools of moral philosophy and theology of the present day, and rescue truth from the absurdities which surround it, the time is not distant when they will have misled the human mind into infidelity, and developed opinions shadowing forth the most distressing state of public as well as individual corruption.

The manner in which the author discusses the questions embraced in his work is to reverse the order in which he states the subjects; commencing with the alternative part, "*or*, The Relation between Spontaneous and Reflective Thought in Greece, and the Positive Teaching of Christ and his Apostles."

We will not explain the terms spontaneous and reflective thought as used in philosophy. But why apply them to Grecian philosophy, more than to the superstitions of the Hindoo widow who consents to be burned on the funeral pile of her husband; or the more inhuman mother who dedicates her child a sacrifice to the waters of the Ganges? for such acts are the result of spontaneous or reflective thought, though not "in Greece."

We must not forget that the Bible is the corner-stone of the only system of moral philosophy that can be presented as entirely true and utterly impervious to sophistry.

Let us view Christianity and Greek philosophy, and see what similarity exists between them; and if we show that there is none, then we have but little to say about "spontaneous and reflective thought in Greece." The Jewish and the Christian religion is the same—this no theologian will dispute; nor can it be denied that, amidst the darkness of the universal fall, God selected the Hebrews as the source of that gospel light which was to spread to the Gentile nations.

We shall endeavor to show that there was no medium of communication, before the advent, with that religion which led to Christ, but through the Abrahamic covenant. If we succeed in this, we will have gone far in pointing out the leading errors in

Dr. Cocker's work, if indeed it does not overthrow his theories. As respects a future state, the corruptions of the heathen were... not only gross and revolting, but imperfect and false. How could a philosophy thus tinctured, tainted, and corrupted, lead to any conception of Christ? What was their Tartarus? What the despairing thirst of Tantalus? What was there in the eternal stone moistened with the ceaseless sweat of Sisyphus? What was there in the endless gnawing of the vulture on the liver of the offending Prometheus? Nothing even that could illustrate the ideal suffering of the body with the reality of suffering souls. And there was scarcely any thing in their Elysian pictures that was not gross and sensual, without one ray of spirituality.

We will demonstrate how, under the Abrahamic covenant, Pagans were brought to Christ, the great central figure and light of Jewish theology. As we trace this chain, which was ultimately to encircle the Gentile nations, it will be seen that there was a golden link which was to unite the nations of the world; this was John the Baptist raising his voice in the wilderness, the great object of whose mission was to show the connection between the old and the new dispensation—the leading principle of the former being comprised in the sentence, “Fear God and keep his commandments;” as a leading principle in the latter is, “Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved.” But John, the forerunner of Christ, never spoke of Socrates or Plato; nor Paul, of Demosthenes; nor Jesus of any writers save Moses and the prophets.

The errors of the work before us can be easily exposed by an examination of its principles of moral philosophy, though more palpably demonstrable by its departure from Christian theology. The alternative of the title “or, The Relation between Spontaneous and Reflective Thought in Greece, and the Positive Teaching of Christ and his Apostles,” as connected with Christianity and Greek philosophy, is not only suggestive of great errors, but fraught with mischief. The human mind, left either to spontaneous or reflective thought, is essentially prone to wickedness. Modern history is fearfully full of instances of cultivated intellects seeking to obscure the truths of Christianity

beneath the mists and shadows of moral and intellectual philosophy, as we find them trained and trimmed by human speculation, and the agency of spontaneous and reflective thought. It is at this point our author has, no doubt unintentionally, thrown open the door to absolute infidelity, by giving strength and currency to an argument which can and will be used with a view of breaking down, if possible, not only the inspiration of the Scriptures, but the very necessity of revelation. It might indeed form one of the most acute sophistries of the followers of Morell's theory against the inspiration of the Scriptures.

That it may be seen we do the author no injustice, we make the following quotations from his own writings, and from the authors he has followed.

“Therefore the preparatory office of Greek religion and Greek philosophy, is fully recognised by Paul in his address to the Athenians.”*

Speaking of St. Paul, he quotes from Merivale: He thus “recognised the Spirit of God brooding over the fall of heathenism, and fructifying the spiritual element in the heart even of natural man. He feels that in these human principles there were some final adumbrations of the divine, and he looked for their firmer delineation to the figure of that gracious Master, higher and holier than many whom he contemplated in his own imagination, and whom he was about to present to them.”†

This is the view Merivale attributes to St. Paul. We will see whether the apostle ever authorised any one thus to speak for him, though our author adopts the opinion of Merivale.

Dr. Cocker, in contending that Greek philosophy was propædeutic of Christianity, says, p. 473, “This function of ancient philosophy is distinctly recognised by many of the greatest of the fathers, as Justin Martyr, Clement, Origen, Augustine, and Theodoret. Justin Martyr believed that a ray of the divine Logos shone on the mind of the heathen, and that the human

*Cocker's *Christianity and Greek Philosophy*, p. 473.

†Merivale's *Conversion of the Roman Empire*, p. 78—cited by the author, p. 473.

soul instinctively turned toward God as the plant towards the sun. 'Every race of them participated in the word. And they who lived with the word were Christians, even if they were held to be godless, as for example among the Greeks, Socrates and Heraclitus, and those like them.'* Clement taught 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.'† 'Philosophy was given as a peculiar testament to the Greeks, as forming the basis of the Christian philosophy.'‡ Referring to the words of Paul, Origen says the truths which philosophers taught were from God, for 'God manifested these to them, and all things that have been nobly said.'§ Origen, Jerome, Eusebius, Clement, do not hesitate to affirm that Christ himself revealed his own high prerogatives to the gifted Grecians. From this hypothesis, however, the facts of the case compel them to make some abatement."||

Among the modern writers with whom our author identifies himself, may be mentioned such eminent names as Cudworth, Neander, Trench, Merivale, Schaff, and we regret to say also the distinguished French writer, Pressensé, whom he thus quotes: "It would be difficult to overrate the importance of Greek philosophy when viewed as a preparation to Christianity."

These extracts show the point to which Dr. Cocker would bring his readers, and can be succinctly stated by a quotation he makes from Theodoret: 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." Is not this rationalism?

*First Apology, Ch. XLVI.

†Stromata, Bk. I, Ch. V.

‡Ib. Bk. VI., Ch. VIII.

§*De Civitate Dei*. Bk. II. Ch. VII.

||Cocker, p. 476.

We do not think that our author goes to the extreme of Butler, to whom he refers as holding the opinion that Plato was *partially* inspired, a position we readily acknowledge our inability to appreciate, as we are satisfied that God has never left his work partially executed; yet we think him inconsistent in not following his distinguished associate, from whom he imbibes his philosophy, to his logical conclusions, especially as he attempts with him to harmonize philosophy and revelation upon pure rationalistic principles.

If philosophy brought the Gentile nations to Christ, as did the Abrahamic covenant the believing Jews, it was the result of an exercise of the mind, and as such requires an acknowledgment of a most intimate connection between heathen philosophy and revelation; or what is more unscriptural, it either reduces Hebrew theology to the level of heathen philosophy, or elevates the latter to equal dignity with the sublime teachings of the inspired lawgiver of the Hebrews. Let us see where the logical sequence of such teaching would carry human belief. What is mythology? Upon what principle of philosophy does it rest? It is not allied to theology. It is clearly the fruit of mental philosophy. The word *mythos* means a fable; but it was a method used by Pagan writers to illustrate moral truth, by the substitution of a person or an animal to represent a principle, or sentiment, or passion. Intellectually it is a beautiful conception, and illustrates the desire of the mind after some fountain from which to trace the streams of human sentiment, as well as of the human passions. In its fruitfulness we have the Pantheon, of the earth, earthy, crowded with gods and goddesses of every sin; and representing the avocations and passions of men, but with no desire to worship the true God. Turn for a moment to Mount Olympus. Is it not represented as being vexed with scenes of violence, anger, envy, strife, intrigue, and licentiousness? This was the intellectual product of Greek philosophy; but what doctrine has come down to mortals from Olympian heights to ensure even virtue in a human sense? The ambitious knelt at the shrine of Jupiter; the avaricious worshipped Mercury; the lovers of pleasure courted the propitious smiles of Apollo and Minerva:

VOL. XXIII., NO. 2—3.

the warlike yielded homage to Mars; while multitudes fell into the arms of Venus. This is mythology; and Grecian philosophy yielded to its empire, as it is even the law of the wicked to this day. The refined Athenians erected an altar to Ate, the goddess of hatred and revenge; who, expelled from Olympus on account of her wickedness, is even to this day honored on earth with an almost universal obedience. This is a part of the unchristian creed of the world; hatred and revenge are deified among men. This is Grecian philosophy. This was the philosophy of the great cities of the old world. Where are those cities now? What the result of their philosophy? The Athenians mocked when Paul talked about the resurrection of the dead; the doctrines of the immortality of the soul; of a future state of rewards and punishments; of the one self-existent, eternal, invisible God. Such Christianity was rejected by Grecian philosophy; and indignantly spurned by the poets, the philosophers, the statesmen, and we may say by that ubiquitous class known as the politicians.

Christ was unknown by the light of nature, and surely our author would not contend that natural theology was designed by the Creator to bring any people to Christ; either objectively, by looking to the material world; or subjectively, by the influence of nature's moral teaching upon the mind.

The author presents a strange view from the text embraced in Acts xvii. 22-31. More especially from the 23d verse, which reads: "For as I passed by, and beheld your devotions, I found an altar with the inscription, TO THE UNKNOWN GOD. Whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, him declare I unto you."

The author contends that, by the ignorance in which the Greeks were placed, by a philosophy which induced them to worship an unknown God, they were in truth and in spirit worshipping the true God. This is the logical conclusion drawn from his premises. The Greeks had no knowledge of the true God, nor belief in him, and placed an inscription among their idols to a God they knew nothing about; yet the author would have his readers believe they were worshipping the true God. In answer to this St. Paul has said, "The world by wisdom

knew not God." (1 Cor. i. 21.) And in express interpretation of the point under consideration, St. Paul has also said: "Whom therefore ye worship, though ye know him not, him declare I unto you."

Greek philosophy was developed by human education, unassisted by revelation: there is no ray of divinity lighting up its dark and dreary pathway; and being so opposed to Christianity, it is impossible to believe that it was designed by God to lead the Gentile nations to Christ. There was but one way for them to be saved, that was by adopting the religion of the Hebrews. All men are by nature opposed to Christ, and if left to themselves would be lost. Before the foundation of the world was laid, God proposed to save his people through Christ, and arranged the plan, which was through the Abrahamic covenant until the advent.

Man could adopt no plan before the advent that would lead the Gentile nations to Christ. His free agency in spiritual matters was destroyed by the fall; God provided the only scheme for man's believing in Christ, which was communicated to the Jews before he was revealed in the gospel. The argument from the inscription, "TO THE UNKNOWN GOD," which our author uses as designed to represent the true God, is the most patent *petitio principii* we have ever seen.

If the true God was known to the Greeks, why did they worship such a Pantheon of false Gods? It is somewhat surprising to find what strange views have been promulgated by eminent writers in sustaining the position held by Dr. Cocker.

Dr. Adam Clarke's view of the term, "unknown God," is very unsatisfactory. He thinks that St. Paul used it as a skilful parronomasia. "Assuming it as a truth," he says, "as the true God was not *known* by them, and that there was an altar dedicated to the *unknown God*, his God was that God whose nature and operations he now proceeded to declare. By this fine term he eluded the force of the law which made it a capital offence to introduce any new god into the State, and of the breach of which he was charged; and that he showed that he was bringing neither a *new god* nor a *new worship* among them, but only

explaining the worship of one already acknowledged by the State, though not yet known." Clarke's Commentary, Acts xvii. 23.

We regret that so wise a man as Dr. Clarke should attempt to convict St. Paul of a play upon words; in no other sense can we understand the term *paronomasia*. The question is of too much importance to be thus treated; nor can we suppose that one sent by God would have resorted to such subterfuge.

Thomas Scott on this point appears much more judicious. Speaking of the term "unknown God," he says: "It is attested by many writers that there was such an altar; and some think, that having imported the deities and worship of most other nations, they had erected this altar to the God of the Jews, who was always spoken of as invisible and incomprehensible, and whose name the Jews themselves scrupled to mention. Various other conjectures have been formed; but perhaps, after multiplying their deities to the utmost, some of them suspected that there was one God superior to all their idols, of whom yet they had no knowledge; and therefore they prevailed to have an altar dedicated to him also." Scott's Com., Acts xvii. 23.

The Scriptures inform us that the Hebrew race was selected by the Almighty as his chosen people, and for them the Abrahamic covenant was made. The Christian religion was first introduced to the Jews. The books of the Old Testament were essential to the constitution of the Jewish State; they were received by the Jews as of divine authority, and as such were published and preserved. The prophecies, which are the result of divine communication from God to man, are full and explicit as to the coming of the Messiah. The Jewish religion was distinguished from all others as alone inculcating the worship of the only living God. No believer of the Bible denies its perfect suitability to the purposes for which it was designed. The promise that through Abraham all the families of the earth should be blessed, excludes all ground for supposing, after God had instituted a plan of salvation through the Jews for all the families of the earth, that the mere intellectual suggestions of a wicked nation could exercise the slightest influence in bringing

any people to Christ, or preparing them for the reception of the Saviour.

There was a devout man in Jerusalem waiting for the consolation of Israel; he came by the Spirit unto the temple, and when the child Jesus was brought in he took him up in his arms and blessed God, and alluded to the light to lighten the Gentiles, and the glory of his people Israel. What light had the Gentiles before this period, other than the faith of the believing Jew, which could bring them to Christ, or prepare them to believe in Christ after the advent? Simeon was moved by the Spirit, and the same Spirit was to lighten the Gentiles. Luke xi.

If we duly appreciate the nature of faith, so beautifully set forth in the 11th chapter of Hebrews, without which we cannot please God, and observe how it was communicated to man, we think any one will be satisfied that the mere intellectuality of philosophy could have no agency in preparing the mind of a nation to believe in Christ. It is impossible to trace any analogy between Christian theology and Greek philosophy; yet all theologians admit the connection between Judaism and Christianity; and it is manifest that there was an antagonism between Judaism and Grecian philosophy. Christ stood to the Jews the centre of prophetic light; but no where does it appear that he thus stood to the Gentiles, except through prophetic influence.

The sacraments of the Jews were in many instances typical of ours. "And all were baptised unto Moses in the sea; and all did eat the same spiritual meat; and all did drink the same spiritual drink; for they drank of that spiritual rock that followed them, and that rock was Christ." 1 Cor. x. 2, 3, 4, 5.

"It was the will of God that the Jews should be instructed by these prophecies, so that they might direct their eyes to Christ whenever they wanted deliverance." Calvin's Inst., Vol. 1, p. 311. Was it not through these same prophecies, and these alone, that the Gentiles could be prepared for the coming of Christ, or believe in a future salvation before the advent?

We come now to a question of vast interest, which if presented scripturally will destroy the favorite argument of Dr. Cocker,

and answer the repeated inquiry, What was the ultimate end of the Gentiles? No man can answer it more scripturally than Calvin: "Since the fall of the first man, no knowledge of God, without the Mediator, has ever been available to salvation. For Christ speaks not of his own time only, but comprehends all ages, when he says, that 'this is life eternal, to know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.' John xvii. 3. And this aggravates the stupidity of those who set open the gates of heaven to all unbelievers and profane persons without the grace of Christ, whom the Scriptures universally represent as the only door of entrance unto salvation. But if any man would restrict the declaration of Christ to the period of the first promulgation of the gospel, we are prepared with a refutation. For it has been a common opinion in all ages and nations, that those who are alienated from God are pronounced accursed, and children of wrath cannot please him without a reconciliation. Here add the answer of Christ to the woman of Samaria: 'Ye worship ye know not what; we know what we worship, for salvation is of the Jews.' John iv. 22. In these words he condemns all the religions of the Gentiles as false, and assigns a reason for it: because under the law the Redeemer was promised only to the chosen people; whence it follows that no worship has ever been acceptable to God, unless it had respect to Christ. Hence also, Paul affirms that all the Gentiles were without God, and destitute of the hope of life." Calvin's Inst., Vol. 1, p. 307; Ed. Pres. B. P.

It is pertinent to this part of our subject to remark that, preceding the apostolic period, the conversion to Christianity was confined to those who had become proselytes to the Jewish religion, of which the history of Naaman furnishes a beautiful example. Nor was there at the time any other mode of being converted to God. In the days of the apostles we find the development of a remarkable change in the progress of the gospel. The disciples had not at the time of the conversion of Cornelius entered fully into the spirit of the gospel as to its extension to all nations. They believed that the gospel was to be preached every where, but expected that all nations would become Jews,

adopt Jewish rites, and as Jews become followers of Christ. Matt. xxviii. 19; Mark xvi. 15.

The time had come to correct these views, and introduce the gospel at once among the Gentiles. Peter was the favored person selected for this purpose. The 10th chapter of Acts relates the method which God employed to prepare him to visit a Gentile family; and it also informs us of the divine approval which followed his making known the gospel to those who were found ready to receive it without becoming proselytes to the Jewish religion. This is beautifully illustrated in the history of the conversion of Cornelius. He had become acquainted with the true religion; but it is clear that though a Gentile, it was not under the previous teaching of Pagan philosophy, but a divine influence working through the power of the Spirit, which brought a man before him "in bright clothing," who announced unto the penitent sinner that his prayer was heard.

The Old and New Testaments must be considered as a unit, though the old dispensation is annulled; the truth which it discloses retains its place as a part of revelation, which we can only appreciate through the New Testament. We see the landmarks of the Old Testament by taking our position on the heights of the New, where we can view them in a clearer light; but never could the beauties of either be seen if obscured by the impure medium of Greek philosophy. We trace link by link the Christian Church from the New Testament back to the days of the patriarchs and prophets; let us preserve this golden chain free from the corrosive touch of human philosophy. This heavenly connection can never be more beautifully nor forcibly expressed than by the apostle, "For the law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things." Heb. x. 1.

The apostles and the fathers in Israel come nearer and nearer to each other, until they unite in a loving embrace; nor is there room between them for the Pagan ever to enter; they unite their devotions to the God of Abraham, with love and faith to the Saviour; no Pagan prayer, no Pagan philosophy can mingle therewith. It was never intended that the relation of the old

to the new dispensation should be corrupted by the idolatry of the Gentiles; nor illustrated, nor explained by their philosophy. To admit that Greek philosophy could lead the Gentiles to Christ, would be an acknowledgment of the existence of a wicked principle intervening between the divine relationship which binds Judaism and Christianity with a common and a kindred tie.

No argument can shake the doctrine derived from the Bible: that man in his present state, despoiled of freedom of will, is subject to the slavery of sin, from which he can escape only by the grace of God; and that the soul has no faculty of spontaneously aspiring to that which is good, for it is too weak to rise into solid affection, or to excite any endeavor. Calvin's Inst., Bk. II. Ch. II., XXVII.

We have undertaken to prove it is a great error in a theological sense, to maintain that Greek philosophy had any agency in bringing the Gentile nations to Christ; and in leaving this part of our subject, we are gratified in having our views of the Bible doctrine sustained by that eminent theologian, John Calvin.

This question involves the doctrine of free will, in reference to the sinful proclivity of the human heart, which Calvin disposes of in the following lucid manner: "What reply shall we make to the Lord, who pronounces by the mouth of Moses, that every imagination of the human heart is only evil?" "We are all sinners by nature; therefore we are all held under the yoke of sin. Now, if the whole man be subject to the dominion of sin, the will, which is the principal seat of it, must necessarily be bound with the firmest bonds. Nor would there otherwise be any consistency in the assertion of Paul, 'That it is God that worketh in us to will,' if any will preceded the grace of the Spirit." Calvin's Inst., Bk. II., Ch. II., XXVII. There was no motive power in man to come to Christ, and it was impossible for the Gentile race to exercise spontaneously the faculties of the mind in such direction, when by nature they were impelled in a different direction. It is conceded that physical action, and even mental determination, in reference to subjects which do not pertain to man's relation to God, may be subject to

the human will; yet righteousness is referable to the special grace of God. In reference to free will, a distinction has prevailed which enumerates three kinds of liberty; first, freedom from necessity; second, freedom from sin; third, freedom from misery; in reference to which Calvin remarks: "The first is naturally inherent in man, so that nothing can ever deprive him of it; the other two are lost by sin; this distinction I readily admit, except that it improperly confounds necessity with co-action." "This being admitted, will place it beyond all doubt that man is not possessed of free will for good works, unless he be assisted by grace, and that special grace which is bestowed on the elect by regeneration." Calvin's Inst., Bk. II., Ch. II., v. VI. Moses taught under the old dispensation a doctrine exactly the reverse of that held by Dr. Cocker and the many eminent divines with whom he agrees. The Hebrew lawgiver reproaches his own people for their forgetfulness. He says: "Thine eyes have seen the signs, and those great miracles; yet the Lord hath not given you a heart to perceive, and eyes to see, and ears to hear." Deut. xxix. 34. But the Lord promised, as an instance of peculiar grace, that he will give the *Israelites*—excluding under the old dispensation all other nations—"a heart to know him." Jer. xxiv. 7.

On this passage Calvin remarks: "Plainly suggesting that the mind of man has no spiritual wisdom any further than it is enlightened by him. Christ has also clearly confirmed this by his own declaration, that no man can come to him except the Father draw him." Calvin's Inst., Bk. II., Ch. II., XX.

In opposition to the Bible truths which we have presented in this review, the reader will be surprised, when he is informed that Dr. Cocker maintains the opinion: "That 'true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world' shone on the minds of Anaxagoras, and Socrates, and Plato, as well as on the mind of Abraham and Rahab, Cornelius, and the Syro-Phœnician woman, and in a higher form, and with a clearer and richer effulgence, on the mind of Moses, Isaiah, Paul, and John. It is not to be wondered at then, if, in the teaching of Socrates and Plato, we should find a striking *harmony* of sentiment, and even

form of expression, with some parts of the Christian revelation." *Christianity and Greek Philosophy*, p. 459.

In support of the above position, he cites *Socrates and Plato*. We submit, upon the authority of *Moses, and John, and of Christ himself*, that it is utterly untenable.

Comparing Grecian philosophy with the moral law, we see the adaptation of the latter to the ethical exigencies of mankind, and that it supplied for the time being the religious necessities of those for whom it was intended. What good ever resulted in any religious sense to the Grecian nation from their moral philosophy, history has failed to inform us.

The author says it was propædeutic to the Christian religion. We have shown how unscriptural is such position. But as he has sought to connect human wisdom as the forerunner of Christ, as a preparatory school for Christianity, and argued in support of his views upon the natural development of physical and mental laws, we propose to meet him upon that ground, and to show that he has been as unphilosophical in this respect as he was unscriptural in the other.

The teachings of Greek philosophy fail to recognise or acknowledge faith towards God, as it does regeneration, repentance, justification, and sanctification. As a purely intellectual system, it led the mind from the practical and essential principles of true religion, away from God, away from Christ as God and as Mediator between God and man.

In examining the intellectual bearing of Greek philosophy upon the Christian religion, we cannot forget that, before the foundation of this world was laid, God proposed to save his people through Christ. He appointed the means for its accomplishment. The rites and ceremonies of ancient Israel were so disposed by the will of God, as to be interwoven with the dispensation of grace: but in no sense could Greek philosophy assist the heart or mind in coming to Christ. Those portions of the ceremonial law which are of divine origin, are admitted to be types bearing directly upon revelation. Is their any thing in human philosophy like the temple on Mount Moriah; or the priesthood; or the rites peculiar to the Passover, or the feast

of Pentecost? These are among the institutions which are of divine origin. While Pagan philosophy was exercising the human mind upon mental phenomena and all the various phases that reason assumes, was it ever enlightened by an illustration that can compare with the sublime faith of Abraham, which required no exercise of the mind beyond a perfect obedience to the will of God? Is there any thing in the philosophy of Plato or Socrates that can explain the feelings that actuated the "father of the faithful" as he raised the obedient hand over the head of his son?

In the entire range of Greek philosophy, what is there in a moral or intellectual sense typical of a Saviour? Is there a problem in its philosophy that would prepare the mind for the exercise of faith in Christ? If there is, human reason has reached the throne of grace, and supplied the place of revelation.

It is not contended that the mission of the divine lawgiver was limited in its influence to the Jews. In a typical sense it was designed for mankind, and logically speaking our author must exclude it from the Gentile world before he substitutes any effort of the human mind in its place.

To whom were the oracles of God committed? Paul tells us to the Jews. Is there any allusion to the Gentiles, or Greek philosophy? We are informed by holy writ that God was angry with the Israelites for serving other gods. Judges x. 13. Yet our author would have us believe that a philosophy which recognised other gods among the Gentiles would prepare the mind to believe in Christ. Here we may appropriately notice, in connection with the above reference to Judges x. 13, that as late as 198 B. C., Judea passed under the rule of the kings of Syria, and during the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes a bloody war ensued, occasioned by the effort of Antiochus to force upon the Jews the worship of the heathen gods; but under the determined resistance of Mattathias, and his son Judas, styled Maccabee, they successfully defended the altar of the true God. 1 Maccabees. At this period Greek power had waned before the Roman sceptre, yet Greek philosophy was in high repute over the heathen world.

But amidst all this contest, this religious war, this passing away of empires, under a struggle for mythology, the heathen in fighting for the Pantheon was sustained only by the followers of Greek philosophy.

It seems to us that our author and those of his school fail to make a proper application of the doctrine of justification by faith as applicable to those who believed in a Messiah. The Lord was pleased to make a second covenant of grace; salvation was offered through faith in the Messiah to other nations, but its acceptance was to be manifested by a conformity to the Jewish rites. It must be an error, while Paul said the doctrine of Christ crucified was to the Greeks foolishness, to maintain the position that their previous views of moral philosophy had prepared their minds for even an intellectual belief in Christ. 1 Cor. i. 23.

In the work before us, the author quotes from Clement of Alexandria and Origen to sustain his views as to the influence of Greek philosophy in bringing the Pagan mind to Christ. We say nothing as to the general weight of character of these eminent authors; yet on this point their opinions are liable to objection. Clement lived at the beginning of the third century. He was reared in the Alexandrian school of philosophy. It is apparent from his writings that he was unduly influenced by Greek philosophy, at that time considered by the Alexandrian school as an element of Christianity, and to be studied for true wisdom rather than the Scriptures, which were interpreted according to the touchstone of philosophy. If Clement lived at this day, with the influence of the Alexandrian school upon his mind, he would be a rationalist. There was an alarming danger to the Church at that day; for under the influence of the Alexandrian school, it was, as is too much the tendency now, rapidly forgetting the teachings of Scripture, and seeking after "the wisdom of this world." Origen was a student under Clement, and imbibed his doctrines. We feel but little disposed to rely upon him as authority in spiritual matters; for, after a trial by an Egyptian synod, he was pronounced a heretic, and deposed

from clerical duties. If he lived at this day he would have been a Unitarian, and may have been the oracle of the unfortunate Arius who lived a century later.

Theodoret, another distinguished Greek father, is quoted as authority. He was a Catholic bishop of Cyprus, A. D. 420. He was tried for heresy at the Synod of Ephesus and deposed; we are however informed that he was afterwards restored. An eminent writer says in reference to the philosophy of the Alexandrian school: "It was adopted in the third century by Origen, a zealous disciple of the Platonic school. Finding a ready admission with many learned Christians who had been educated in that school, and being diffused by the credit of Origen's writings through a great part of the Christian world, it early began to produce those corruptions, which under different names and with very different effects have continued from that time to the present day." Hill's Lectures on Divinity, p. 603, Amer. Ed.

It must be apparent that a system of human learning which corrupted and continues to this day to corrupt the Church of God, could have no influence in preparing the mind for the reception of Christ. Dr. Cocker says: "The great work of preparation in the heathen world consisted in the developing of the desire for salvation. It proved that God is the great want of every human soul; that there is a profound affinity between conscience and the living God; and that Tertullian was right when he wrote the '*Testimonium animæ naturaliter Christianæ.*'" And again, "As Leverrier and Adams were enabled to affirm from purely mathematical reasoning, that another planet must exist beyond *Uranus* which had never yet been seen by human eyes, and then afterwards, that affirmation was gloriously verified in the discovery of Neptune by the telescope of Galle; so the reasonings of ancient philosophy, based on certain necessary laws of mind, enabled man to affirm the existence of a God, of a soul, of a future retribution, and an eternal life beyond the grave; and, then, subsequently, these were brought fully into light, and verified by the gospel." Christianity and Greek Philosophy, pp. 521, 523.

The quotations from Dr. Cocker's work are justly character-

ised by a remark made by Dr. Hill on p. 604 of his Lectures on Divinity, wherein he describes a certain class of theologians, as "so near to deistical principles, as to believe that there is an inward light common to all men, and sufficient without any extraordinary legislation, to bring those who follow it to eternal life."

Among other things the Doctor thinks that by natural laws man was enabled to affirm the existence of a soul. This a misuse of the logic of philosophy; and the application of the principle of physical laws to the laws of mind is positivism to an alarming extent, which if true would supersede the necessity of revelation. And if true, why did not some Pagan philosopher assert his positive belief in the existence of the soul, "of a future retribution, and an eternal life," instead of waiting for the light of the gospel? Alas! the light of philosophy left the Pagan in spiritual darkness.

In reference to the position of our author on this subject, we can use no argument so beautiful and so clear as that of Calvin, who says:

"For it has been a common opinion, in all ages and nations, that those who are alienated from God, and pronounced accursed and children of wrath, cannot please him without a reconciliation. Here add the answer of Christ to the woman of Samaria: 'Ye worship ye know not what; we know what we worship, for salvation is of the Jews.' John iv. 22. In these words he at once condemns all the religions of the Gentiles as false, and assigns a reason for it; because under the law the Redeemer was promised only to his chosen people; whence it follows, that no worship has ever been acceptable to God unless it had respect to Christ. Hence also, Paul affirm *that all the Gentiles were without God*, and destitute of the hope of life." Eph. ii. 12. Calvin's Inst., Bk. II., Ch. VI., I.

An interesting feature of the work before us, is the division of the periods of Greek philosophy into pre-Socratic, Socratic, and post-Socratic. The first period he divides into the sensational, the idealist, and the natural realist. On these topics he shows much thought and learning; but he is pursuing metaphysically that track in which we have traced him theologically—

the tendency of reason alone to lead the mind to that point, which Scripture tells us is never reached except under the influence of the Spirit—that point is faith. We will endeavor to show that his theories are unphilosophical. It is an error to trace philosophical thought, under the various influences of sensational, idealistic, or realistic mental phenomena, to that heaven-born principle in theology, which is nothing less than that faith which is the gift of God.

In using the term sensational, does he rely upon that system of philosophy which ascribes all of our knowledge to information derived through the senses? If so, it is infidelity. When he refers to the idealist, if he adopts that system of philosophy which teaches that, from external perceptions, the objects immediately known are ideas, this is fanaticism, and reduces everything to the unreal, the imaginary; the fanciful, which is a wicked form of scepticism. Under the received meaning of realism, which is a simpler term for natural realism, the author can draw no argument in a philosophic sense indicating an approach of the Greek mind to a knowledge of Christ. Metaphysicians have contended that the doctrine inculcated was, in perception there is an immediate cognition of the external object. This view can throw no light on the pathway of the author. It seems to draw us far away from a true theological course.

We will not discuss the pre-Socratic school, for it was eminently physical, looking almost exclusively to natural philosophy; though from it the author traces up to the Socratic period, what he calls a "philosophy of mind." How a system of mental philosophy could spring from natural philosophy is undemonstrated, and we rather think will ever remain so. We are now at the Socratic period which the author terms *psychological*. Let us see what there was in this period of philosophy which was propædeutic of Christianity. It is not necessary to review the Socratic system, but only to inquire what there was in its period that led the Greek mind to Christ. We think it can be shown that the learning of philosophy at this period was the reverse of a preparation of the mind for the advent of the Saviour. When Socrates arrived for the first time at Athens, polytheism was in

the full tide of its popularity. He at no time opposed it. He left no writings that indicate opposition to the system of mythology so dear to Grecian philosophy. He acknowledged his devotion to the system, for he worshipped the gods. It avails nothing in the present inquiry to prove that he effected a great revolution in the method of thought, which our author thinks was the inductive system applied to facts of consciousness. But Socrates failed in this method, as has every one who attempted to reason on psychological questions from cause to effect, or to discover moral laws from moral facts. It presents a difficulty inexplicable by any law of logic. We do not deny the partial application of the inductive system to the moral sciences; but we do, to the extent that it is used in the physical sciences.

Socrates had many good qualities in a worldly sense, but the greatest exercise of his reasoning faculty did not extricate him from polytheism or mythology; under the principles of which systems it was impossible to lay the foundation of a natural theology which would lead the Greek mind to Christ.

In following the plan of our author, in placing the Socratic system as the central sun of Pagan philosophy, we unavoidably have our attention drawn to the moral character of his followers. The great genius next to him is Plato. Did his powerful intellect, working alone with reason, indicate any faith in a coming Messiah? If not, his philosophy was not propædeutic to Christianity.

Plato did more to advance the system of intellectual philosophy than any other Pagan writer, we can not say moral philosophy, for the virtue of that science is in the doctrines of the Christian religion. Metaphysicians have been generally pleased with the Platonic theory of the cognitive powers of the intellectual faculties, by which the mind attains to different degrees of knowledge. But it is impossible to prove by the most accurately defined system of philosophy, that the cognitive powers ever brought the Gentile nations in a condition to receive the teachings of the Saviour. Such position must convict our author of unqualified rationalism; while history proves that it was practically the reverse of his reasonings, inasmuch as the Gentile

nations when left to their philosophy universally rejected Christ.

Plato had enlarged ideas of the power of the reasoning faculty, but they were something between opinion and intuitions, and he failed to employ his power of reasoning in its highest department. He had an idea of the existence of the soul, but he could make no use of that idea; it was but a vague impression. He had no idea of future punishment for sin, no feeling of repentance for the violation of God's laws; nor could he under any law of mind obey those laws. Did Plato ever seek to ascertain how the soul might be delivered from the illusions of sense; or the distemperring influence of the body; or the effect of the passions? The author asks these questions, and answers them by saying Plato believed and hoped this might be accomplished by philosophy. "This he regarded a grand intellectual discipline for the purification of the soul. By this it was to be disenthrall'd from the bondage of sense, and raised into the empyrean of pure thought where truth and reality shine forth." P. 351. Here Dr. Cocker destroys his propædeutic system by throwing what light there was in Pagan philosophy beneath the clouds of the infidel school of rationalism. The term infidelity does not apply to the Greek philosophers, because they were in total spiritual darkness; for before the advent God spoke to the fathers by the prophets—not by worldly learning—so in these last days he speaks to us by his Son. Heb. i. 1, 2.

The influence of Greek philosophy in bringing the Gentile nations to Christ has been pressed with much force in modern times, and by a process of reasoning purely rationalistic. We feel that this review would be incomplete if it did not present positive evidence from Greek writers that its principles were heathenish. What said Socrates when condemned to death? "And O ye judges, ye are going to live, and I am going to die, which of these is best, God knows, but I suppose no man does." Well might Wesley exclaim, "Alas! what a confession is this!" It is on a footing with the distinguished modern infidel, who said on his death-bed, that death was a leap in the dark.

So far as we can perceive, the positive tendency of the phi-

losophy of Plato, was to induce the Greek mind to reject Christ as soon as the Christian religion was preached to them; and if they had relied upon their philosophy, they would have rejected him forever. Plato was eminently practical. His every effort was directed to some temporal advantage. His object was man in his relation to the world and his duty to society, keeping self ever prominent. He was a witness and an actor in the midst of that ferment of humanity exhibited in the democracy of Athens. He lived as a man of the world, interesting himself in the political revolutions of the times. In his philosophy we find only an appeal to reason, and man's selfishness to relieve him individually and collectively of such evils as were continually besetting his pathway. No where does he rely upon God. His virtues were practical, not from principle; but, as many a dishonest man has said and acted, because "honesty is the best policy." He enlightened the mind, but not the heart. He taught a doctrine of the immortality of the soul; but his theory had no force, because it did not recognise the necessity of a Redeemer, and felt no fear of sin; there was to him no punishment hereafter. Nor was there in his theory any necessity for punishment, inasmuch as there was offence only to man. Enfield's Hist. of Phil., Vol. I., p. 229—*et seq.* Tennemann's Manual, p. 177.

Without reviewing the philosophy of Aristotle, we may remark that it was not only antichristian in its tone and bearing, but was rejected by the early Christian fathers on account of its atheism, and was no doubt the cause of its author's many wicked habits.

In the post-Socratic school, which approaches nearer the range of moral philosophy than any which had previously existed in Greece, we find Zeno and Epicurus. Dr. Cocker acknowledges that Epicurus was an unmistakable atheist. "He did not admit a God in any rational sense." Cocker's work, p. 441. We would ask the author how that moral philosophy, which denied the existence of God, could lead the mind to believe in or be prepared for the mission of the Son of God?

Zeno was born 362 B. C., and was the founder of the Stoics.

His passionate temper, which made him a suicide, is enough to destroy all confidence in his philosophy as a preparation for the coming of Christ. We will dismiss the philosophy of the Stoics, by saying we concur fully with the author, when he says: "The fundamental doctrine of the Stoics was a spiritual, ideal, intellectual Pantheism, of which the proper formula is, *all things are God, but God is not all things.*" Cocker's Work, p. 450. It is unnecessary to ask the well-informed reader if Pantheism could have any beneficial agency in any conceivable sense, morally or intellectually, in preparing the Greek mind for the coming Christian period.

The Septuagint, made 270 B. C., is the first version of the Old Testament in Greek. It was known at least six years before the death of Zeno. His cultivated and active mind would have taken notice of a work brought before the Greeks by a public act of Ptolemy of such importance as the ordering the Hebrew Bible to be translated into Greek by seventy of the most learned men of that day, if he or his followers—the then prevailing sect—had seen any analogy in the theology of the Bible and their theories of moral philosophy. But the doctrines of the Bible did not mingle with the popular philosophy given: and here we thank the author for a convincing argument in favor of our position. He tells us truly, "Greek philosophy was unquestionably a development of reason alone." P. 476. This is enough to exclude it from divine origin.

If the spirit of the moral philosophy of Greece could be traced to Jewish sources, or gave any indication that it was ever under the influence of Jewish literature, then there would be some ground on which the theologian could stand, in his effort to connect Grecian philosophy as a preparatory agent for the coming of the Messiah. The efforts to demonstrate any such position, notwithstanding the learning of Justin Martyr, Tertullian, and many of their followers, have been signally unsatisfactory.

It is difficult to follow the author in some of his abstract reasonings, but we have a clear insight into his purpose, which is stated in the question, "Is God cognizable by reason?" The

word "cognizable," as our author uses it, is not expressive, in a philosophic sense, of his exact meaning. If it be as our author uses it, a proper term, then as a logical sequence God is apprehensible by the senses. It is by such ratiocinative process that he brings the Greeks through their philosophy to know God, notwithstanding Paul says: "Man by reason cannot find out God."

The heathen having no faith in God, consequently no conception of his providence, it was impossible for them to form an idea of a Saviour, especially in that sense in which the mission of Christ was intended as understood by revelation. At a later day than the existence of any eminent Greek writer, lived Cicero, who, perhaps the best of the Pagans, Atticus excepted, and thoroughly versed in Greek philosophy, taught that "Fate or fortune governed the world."

Dr. Cocker and Sir Wm. Hamilton, the peerless metaphysician, are opposed to each other, upon the Doctor's favorite and fundamental theory, that God is cognizable by reason. Theologically we have shown that our author differs with St. Paul. We are surprised to see a strenuous effort made to convict Hamilton of what Dr. Cocker styles "subjective atheism," an awkward expression, though "subjective" is an expressive and familiar word in modern science. Dr. Cocker comes to the conclusion that Hamilton was an atheist, because in his lecture on the "Unconditioned" he contends that God is not cognizable by reason. The "Unconditioned" Hamilton has defined to be that which is inconceivable or incogitable. This embraces the incomprehensibility of God, which Dr. Cocker thinks is atheism.

It would be a work of supererogation to review the beautiful and philosophic lectures of Hamilton on the "Conditioned," or to endeavor to add a word to prove his faith or piety. But we will conclude this article by a citation from Hamilton's lectures, as an incontrovertable reply to every thing Dr. Cocker has written on the subject of God being "cognizable by reason."

In a lecture of great force and clearness, in which Hamilton is discussing the "Regulative Faculty" as one of the cognitive faculties, he says: "The sum therefore of what I have now

stated, is, that the conditioned is that which is alone conceivable or cognizable; the unconditioned is that which is inconceivable or incognizable. The conditioned or the thinkable lies between two extremes or poles; and these extremes or poles are each of them unconditioned, each of them inconceivable, each of them exclusive or contradictory of each other. Of these two repugnant opposites, the one is that of unconditioned or absolute limitation; the other, that of unconditional or infinite illimitation. The one we may, therefore, in general, call the absolute unconditioned; the other the infinitely unconditioned, or more simply, the absolute and the infinite; the term *absolute* expressing that which is finished or complete; the term *infinite*, that which cannot be terminated or concluded. These terms which, like the absolute and infinite themselves, philosophers have confounded, ought not only to be distinguished, but opposed as contradictory. The notion of either unconditioned is negative; the absolute and the infinite can each only be conceived as a negation of the thinkable. In other words, of the absolute and infinite we have no conception at all.

“I shall only add in conclusion, that, as this is the one true, it is the only orthodox inference. We must believe in the infinity of God; but the infinite God can not, by us, in the present limitation of our faculties, be comprehended or conceived. A Deity understood would be no Deity at all, and it is blasphemy to say that God only is as we are able to think him to be. We know God according to the finitude of our faculties; but we believe much that we are incompetent properly to know. The Infinite, the infinite God, is what, to use the words of Pascal, is infinitely inconceivable. Faith—belief—is the organ by which we apprehend what is beyond our knowledge. In this all divines and philosophers worthy of the name are found to coincide; and the few who assert to man a knowledge of the infinite, do this on the daring, the extravagant, the paradoxical supposition, either that human reason is identical with the divine, or that man and the absolute are one. The Scriptures explicitly declare that the infinite is for us now incognizable; they declare that the finite, and the finite alone, is within our reach. It is said (to cite one

text out of many) that ‘*now* I know in *part*’ (*i. e.* the finite): ‘but *then*’ (*i. e.* in the life to come) ‘shall I know even as I am known,’ (*i. e.* without limitation.)’*

We leave our author with his opinion, that God is cognizable by reason, to wriggle against the invincible arguments of Hamilton. The charge of atheism against Hamilton is so easily refuted, that it appears to be but the ebullition of puerile spite against the force and sublimity of a doctrine his assailants are unable to comprehend. Especially does the charge of “subjective atheism” come with bad odor from a follower of Dr. Adam Clarke, who was driven to the necessity of borrowing from the Socinian school a denial of the essential omniscience of God, because he saw that this attribute if admitted would land him in the temple of Calvinistic theology.†

ARTICLE III.

THE APOCRYPHIAL NEW TESTAMENT:

OR, THOUGHTS ON THE FORMATION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT CANON.

We become conscious of a degree of anxiety that is disagreeable and painful when called upon in the providence of God to inquire into and explain the origin and grounds of our religious beliefs. We imbibe them with our earliest thoughts, and they become so interwoven with all our subsequent impressions and views that practically they acquire all the sanctity and authority of first principles. We do not like to allow curiosity to pry into their sacred precincts or permit later investigations to disturb their hallowed repose. Their age invests them with a degree of reverence that should protect them against the obtrusive assaults

*Lectures on Metaphysics, by Sir Wm. Hamilton; Lecture XXXVIII.. pp. 530, I.; Boston Ed., 1863. 1 Cor. xii. 12.

†Clarke’s Com. on Epistle to Romans. Miller’s Doctrine of the Presbyterian Church. p 36; Philadelphia Ed., 1836.

and annoying scrutiny of more recent and less venerable opinions. They claim a merited exemption from the disturbing investigations of philosophers, and the unsettling interrogatories of critics. Hence the conscious aversion of many stable and sincere but uncritical believers to examine into the grounds of our belief in the Bible as an inspired revelation. The nature of inspiration, the history of the sacred record, the method of its preservation, its integrity and purity, the question of interpolations or omissions, the possibility of an adulterated text having descended to us, and all those inquiries that relate to the compilation, collocation, and canonical completeness of the sacred volume, are regarded with suspicion. They awaken a feeling of anxiety for fear their investigation may lead to results adverse to cherished ancestral convictions. They may give rise to doubts where no doubts existed before, and disturb the composure of common Christians who have all along enjoyed the satisfaction of implicit faith. But a belief or opinion that cannot by rational and honest argument be proved true, ought to be proved false. If its title to credence cannot be made out with sufficient clearness to induce belief, that title ought not to be held good. Truth suffers nothing from investigation. If it cannot be made to appear, then it is no truth to us. For what does not appear, is all one to us with what does not exist. Truth may exist indeed in a region beyond our faculties, but it can be no truth to us. Truth is relative to our capacity of comprehension. The two are correlative and coëxtensive. The one goes as far as the other and no farther. But our comprehensions, and consequently our beliefs, often fall short of the extent to which they might go. The neglect to investigate circumscribes our beliefs within too narrow limits, and often causes them to rest on foundations which deeper investigation and further inquiry would discover to be unsafe and treacherous. Or, if the basis be secure, more thorough investigation will evince its security and serve to strengthen our belief.

This train of thought applies with great propriety to the subject of the grounds of our faith in the Scriptures as the revealed word of God. God is doubtless honest with us. He is too wise

to err, too good to deceive. If there be a flaw in the evidence which establishes the genuineness and authenticity of the Scriptures, we may be assured he is entirely willing for it to be discovered. In all his manifestations in providence or in grace, he challenges criticism the keenest, and scrutiny the most searching. If there has been any tampering with the Bible by transcribers, copyists, or versionists; if there has been any error or omission in its compilation; any book left out that was entitled to admission, or any taken in that was not so; if the canon is defective either by omission or redundancy, the discovery of any or of all these things can do no real harm to the faith of the humblest believer. Truth harms no one, while error ruins many.

These cogitations have been excited by and have reference to a publication entitled "The Apocryphal New Testament: being all the Gospels, Epistles, and other pieces now extant attributed in the first four centuries to Jesus Christ, his apostles and their companions, and not introduced into the New Testament by its compilers." This book was published in London in 1820. Though the originals are well known to those who have pushed their studies far into the annals of Christian antiquity, this publication which sets them forth in an English dress is a literary curiosity to the younger theological student, and may serve to sharpen the appetite of the less profound ecclesiastical antiquary. The editor has contributed by its publication to the advancement of biblical study if in no other way but that of leading those who may have hitherto satisfied themselves with superficial views to a more careful examination of the canonical integrity of the New Testament. The exhibition of error is indeed a successful mode of bringing the truth to light. Now, upon referring to the introduction to Luke's Gospel, we find that he intimates that such apocryphal writings were in existence. "Forasmuch," says he, "as many have taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things which are most surely believed among us," etc. Here, then, we have what remains of the writings, not of the "many" of whom Luke speaks, but of others who attempted to arrange and digest a history of Christ and his apostles in the first ages. It is certain Luke refers, in the words

quoted, to other gospels and epistles then extant, which have not been admitted into our canon. We have others now before us making the same pretensions. It becomes therefore a question of primary interest and importance to inquire why those we have were received and these rejected? Who executed the delicate and difficult task of severing the true from the false—the precious from the vile? Who sifted the chaff from the wheat? How was our canon formed? By what principle were the compilers guided in making the discrimination? Many books were in circulation during the first three or four centuries, purporting to be narratives or memoirs composed by apostles and inspired men. They possessed ingenuity, plausibility, and verisimilitude—were received and treated with respect by many of the pious, and were circulated with more or less diligence under the belief that they were genuine. Any attempt therefore to discriminate between them and the true writings of the apostles must have been attended with no little difficulty and debate. Certainly no more important question ever claimed decision at the hands of man.

1. The earliest traces of the existence of the New Testament refer to them as *already collected together in one volume or book*. The discrimination was already made, and the canon already constituted anterior to the first notices of it in history. Origen is the earliest father who gives us a list or catalogue of the sacred books. He does not describe the formation of the canon, but only tells of what books it consisted. After him, others give us similar information; as Eusebius Pamphilus, Athanasius, Cyril, Epiphanius, Gregory Nazianzen and others. Now this is exceedingly valuable information. We rejoice to know that the canon we possess is precisely the same as that used by these ancient fathers. But that is not the point upon which we seek to be informed. We wish to know by whom and how this catalogue which constitutes the sacred canon was formed. Even the earlier fathers, commonly called apostolic fathers, Clement of Rome, Ignatius, Polycarp, Hermas, and Barnabas, who were contemporary with the apostles, though they quote from the sacred books, and frequently cite them in their own writings, yet they

give us no clue to the mode of its formation. Here **history fails** us. She conducts us up to Origen who gives us the first catalogue, and then on to the very times of John and Paul, and tells us the canon was *then* in existence; but how made out, and by whom, "this deponent sayeth not." We are therefore left to conjecture. Being without definite and authoritative data, we must fall back upon probability. Here the critics come to our assistance. Olshausen, in his "Introduction to the New Testament," has suggested an ingenious hypothesis to account for the collection of the Gospels into one book or volume, by supposing that they were composed in the chief cities of the Roman Empire—Jerusalem, Rome, Ephesus, and Alexandria. Matthew, he thinks, wrote his in Jerusalem; Mark and Luke, theirs in Rome; and John, his in Ephesus; and by means of correspondence, visits, and other intercourse between the Christians of these cities, each city sent a copy of the Gospel composed in it to the brethren in the others, and thus each church, having a copy of all four of the Gospels, for convenience, bound them all together, and thereby formed what was termed the "Gospel." Thus the gospel collection appeared simultaneously in all the chief cities of the world. This is a plausible conjecture, and in default of one more satisfactory, we are content to adopt it. That we have no historical information on the point does not constitute any objection to it; for as the records of those times are exceedingly fragmentary at best, it is not unreasonable to suppose that this, like many other events, escaped notice, or if recorded the account has been lost.

With regard to the Pauline Epistles, we are even more destitute of definite information than in regard to the Gospels. For the most diligent research of critics has not as yet enabled them to frame even a consistent hypothesis on the subject. It is evident they were collected together in one volume very early, even before the death of Paul himself. For Peter, 2 Peter iii. 15, 16, alludes to Paul's Epistles in such a way as to lead to the belief that they were then bound together and circulated under Paul's name. But who collected them is unknown.

Of the compilation of the seven catholic Epistles, a like igno-

rance prevails. Who collected them, or where the collection originated, biblical research has as yet failed to discover.

2. Up to this point then we have reached this conclusion, viz., *that the precise method by which our New Testament canon was made, is not known, and perhaps never will be.*

Now what is the significance of this conclusion? What effect ought it to have on our belief in the genuineness and authenticity of the canon? It looks as if we had failed to discover a material fact. Ought a knowledge of the formation of our canon to be made a condition of our receiving it? Would it be wise and just to require of every believer that he be able to tell where, when, and how the canon was formed, before he makes it the foundation of his faith? With equal propriety might we insist on knowing the name, the character, and nationality of a mechanic, before we will consent to take shelter in the house he has built. As well require a starving man, as an indispensable condition to his eating, that he be able to tell where the vegetables grew that are set before him, who was the butcher, and who the cook. A traveller exposed to the storm cares not to know the style of architecture after which the house is built—whether it be Doric, Gothic or Corinthian. Provided it affords him good shelter, he cares for nothing more. Nor does the hungry traveller tarry long in discussing the *cuisine* of his food, provided it be palatable and enough to satisfy his appetite. We do not know who compiled the canon of Scripture; but we do know what is of far greater importance to be known, viz., that it is a pure, complete, and infallible form of faith and practice. We know that if it were defective—if any writings had been admitted that ought to have been left out, or any left out that ought to have been received, the jealous eye of primitive Christians, and the vigilant criticism of ancient heretics, would have detected and exposed the imposture. An impure canon could never have “run the blockade” successfully between the terrible crossfire of the Origenes, the Gregories, and the Eusebiuses on the one side; and the Marcions, the Celsuses, and the Porphyries on the other. Inspiration is the very soul of the New Testament canon, and no writing that could not trace its genealogy to an inspired

origin by an indisputable line of evidence could be admitted. Hence the wisdom of making up the catalogue of sacred books at a very early period, while competent witnesses were abundant to establish beyond a doubt the claims of each book to an insertion in the canon. Delay would have been dangerous. Each year that was allowed to pass would diminish the number of competent witnesses and multiply the difficulties of making out a correct one. But as it was made out in the very midst of apostolic times, and during the lives of apostolic men, we have the best possible guarantee of its complete purity and correctness. Therefore we may safely turn over the questions of the place *where*, the time *when*, and the men *by whom* the collection of the New Testament writings was made, to the mere literary amateur and ecclesiastical antiquary as themes for curious speculation, but in no degree affecting the stability and vitality of our faith.

3. A subject of far greater interest will be to inquire, *Why was any collection made at all?* Why were the sacred books associated and bound together? Why are the fathers so careful to inform us of the collection of these books? What mysterious virtue is there in this union? What is the "magic of a list?" Were they not all and each separately true and inspired? Could not each one stand on its own evidence and be supported by its own credentials? Was it upon the principle that "in union there is strength?" Was any additional confirmation imparted by their being joined together? Not a single writer, either among the Christians or the heretics, ever referred to any of the sacred books as existing alone. They are universally quoted as a *collection*—"Oracles of the Lord," "Gospels," "Scriptures," "Divine Scriptures," "Divine Fountains," etc., are the invariable titles under which they are quoted and alluded to by the fathers and early Christians. This is a very noteworthy fact; for it is certainly true that each of the books might have remained separate and been circulated and used as profitably as when taken as a whole. They were known to be true and inspired writings, and that alone would give them authority over the conscience independent of all adventitious circumstances.

An inspired book is an inspired book and authoritative rule, whether it be found in connection with other inspired books or not. The simple fact of a collection or union of books could neither increase nor diminish their authority. But still the union is regarded, and justly too, as of great importance. Whence that importance? *The union of the books presupposed a union of believers.* The collection of them was the *result* of a previous union of those who believed in them. And here we discover the origin of the Roman Catholic dogma, which declares that the Scriptures owe all their authority to the Church; that the Church is the "pillar and ground of the truth," in the sense that her endorsement or attestation is necessary to give them validity and authority. But Rome errs in confounding the mere collecting of the books, the severing of the inspired from the uninspired—in other words, the fixing of the canon, with imparting inspiration to them. The former man may do; the latter is the prerogative of God alone. The Church may collect the books and declare her opinion as to which are genuine and which are not. But they are either true or false antecedent to all such deliverances. "Thus the famous Council of Trent has attempted to make that divine which is notoriously human; and that inspired which, in the sense of an apostle, is notoriously of private interpretation." Thornwell on the Apocryphal Books.

This is blasphemy and a profane usurpation of divine prerogatives. The Church collected the books, but she did not inspire them. We mean something very different from this, when we say that the collection of the books was due to a previous collection of believers.

In the days of the apostles numerous powerful sects of heretics had arisen. They not only distracted the churches, but adulterated the truths of revelation with human speculations. The Judaizers, Marcionites, and Gnostics, wove into their theories many points of apostolic doctrine, and by blending a little from Moses, and a little from Christ and the apostles, with much from Plato and Zoroaster, endeavored to construct an independent or mongrel gospel. Nothing was left the true believers but to resist these encroachments. They must meet these enemies and

oppose them, or stand by and suffer the true apostolic doctrines to be entirely displaced or utterly neutralised by this motley amalgam. But the sporadic resistance of a few here and there would avail but little in the presence of such skilful and powerful adversaries. Hence at the suggestion of the divine Spirit, the faithful determined to *combine* and deliver a united testimony in behalf of the truth; and the union of *themselves* led to the union of their *books*. So that the collection of the inspired books became their most powerful protest against error. They gathered up all their strength and delivered it in one mighty volley against the enemies of revealed truth. Thus the formation of the canon is the united protest of universal Christianity against all forms of error. Thus in seeking for the origin of the New Testament canon, we have found the origin of the *catholic or universal Church*. Saul went out to seek his father's asses, but found a kingdom in their stead. Individual churches existed in different places before, even from the day of Pentecost; but the formation of the canon marked the epoch of their visible union as one great spiritual republic.

4. Besides this reason, growing out of the circumstances of the primitive Church, there was another motive for gathering the sacred books derived from the character of the *Old Testament*. That portion of divine writings existed at that time in a collected or codified form. It was not handed down from the Jewish fathers in separate books and circulated among the pious in Israel in the form of *disjecta membra*. Even from the days of Moses onward it had been bound together and preserved in a collected form in the sacred crypt of the temple. Deut. xxxi. 25, 26. And as new authors arose, who wrote as the Holy Ghost moved them, their works also were added and bound up with those already constituting the divine codex. During the idolatrous reigns of Amon and Manasseh, the law was neglected and lost. But under good Josiah, upon the occasion of repairing the temple, it was discovered among the rubbish and restored to its place in the archives. 2 Kings xxii. 9, 10, 11. And when the Old Testament canon was arranged and settled by Ezra and the Great Synagogue after the captivity, it continued in that

collected form down to the days of Christ and the apostles. Now, from the example of the Old Testament being collected and bound in one volume, was suggested to the primitive Christians the thought of arranging all the divine books of *their* times into one compact body. To this, if we add their love for the divine books, a desire to have them in convenient form for preservation and for safe transmission to posterity, we conceive that we have discovered sufficient reason for putting all the sacred books into one collection—in other words, we have discovered as far as may be the origin of the New Testament canon.

5. Horne in his great work, "The Introduction to the Study of the Scriptures," a work whose value cannot be overestimated—being a complete thesaurus of biblical knowledge—has given a very satisfactory account of the reasons why these books of the "Apocryphal New Testament" were refused a place in the canon of Scripture. We shall mention his principal reasons without enlarging on them.

(a) They were not acknowledged as authentic, nor were they much used by the primitive Christians. No quotations from them are found in the genuine writings of the apostolic fathers—Clement of Rome, Ignatius, Polycarp, and Ilermas, whose writings reach from A. D. 70 to about A. D. 108.

(b) The enemies of Christianity, who were accustomed to cite passages from the four Gospels for the sake of perverting them or turning them into ridicule, have never mentioned these productions.

(c) Few or none of them, which it is pretended were written in the apostolic age, were composed earlier than the second century, and several of them were composed as late as the third century, and were rejected as spurious at the time they appeared. The pseudo "Epistles of Abgarus, and of Jesus Christ," contained in this Apocryphal Testament, were never heard of till published by Eusebius in the fourth century. The "Epistles of Paul and Seneca" were unknown till mentioned by Jerome and Augustine near the close of the same century. The "Protevangelion," ascribed to James the Less, and the "Gospel of the Birth of Mary," were both rejected by the ancient Church, and esteemed

to be the work of some Hellenistic Jew. The "Gospels of the Infancy," in two parts, ascribed to Thomas, were received only by the Marcosians, a branch of the Gnostics, in the beginning of the second century. They were used by some of the Nestorian Christians, and by Mohammed in making up the Koran; but their use was condemned by a Synod at Angamala in the mountains of Malabar, A. D. 1599. The "Gospel or Acts of Pilate" was forged by Leucius Charinus in the fourth century, and the "Acts of Paul and Thecla" were a confessed forgery by a man who was degraded from his office for his crime.

(d) Sometimes the fathers quoted from them for the express purpose of showing their learning; not to sanction or approve them, but only to show their opponents that they were not ignorant of other books besides their own inspired Scriptures. Thus Origen says: "The Church only receives four Gospels,—heretics have many. These we read that we may not be esteemed ignorant."

The *internal evidence* of the spuriousness of these books is much stronger than the external. In illustrating this point, Horne shows that these productions propose or sanction doctrines and practices contrary to those that are known to be true—as the sanctity of relics, the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary, etc. They mention things which are later than the time in which the author lived whose name the book bears. They contain direct contradictions to authentic history, sacred and profane. They abound in unimportant frivolous details of numerous miracles that are useless, improbable, and absurd, ascribed to Mary and her infant son. Even, in some cases, *vindictive* and *mischievous* miracles are ascribed to Jesus. *E. g.* In the Gospel of the Infancy, Part I., Chap. xix. 22, we read: "Another time when the Lord Jesus was coming home in the evening with Joseph, he met a boy, who ran so hard against him that he threw him down; to whom the Lord Jesus said, As thou hast thrown me down, so shalt thou fall nor ever rise; and that moment the boy died."

In the "Gospel of Nicodemus," we have a long account of Christ's descent into hell, and the confusion, agitation, and terror

caused among the devils by his appearance there. Beelzebub reproaches Satan for his having instigated the Jews in their persecution and crucifixion of Christ, and thereby caused him to descend to hell. The Old Testament saints are represented as being there confined, all except Enoch and Elijah, and Christ by his descent releases them and takes them to Paradise. A graphic account is also given of Christ's trial before Pilate—Nicodemus boldly defends him and many of those whom he had healed of diseases are made to bear testimony to his innocency and excellency as a man. The impotent man who lay at the pool of Bethesda thirty-eight years, blind Bartimeus, the leper who was healed, the woman with the issue of blood (whose name this gospel informs us was Veronica), some one who saw him turn the water into wine, and, last of all, *Centurio* (the author evidently took "centurion" for the man's name instead of the title of his office), is made to plead in his behalf. All these by turns are permitted to speak to Pilate in favor of Jesus and against his persecutors. But the reader is ready to exclaim, "Eheu jam satis!" and so I will spare him any further specimens of this Nicodemian Gospel and allow him to read for himself.

Thus an examination of the books of this New Testament evinces in the clearest light their apocryphal character. The compilers of the canon could not have received such a mass of contradictions, vain rhapsodies, and extravagant falsehoods, without shutting their eyes to both truth and common sense.

6. The only difficulty in making out a correct canon was in *ascertaining certainly what books were inspired*. A book that is theopneustic is *ex vi termini* an authoritative rule of human conduct. It is as far above all other books as God is above men. If God is the universal King, then his words must be the universal law. The only question then of any real difficulty that presented itself to the compilers of the canon was, whether any given book was inspired—whether it proceeded from a man who had given adequate proof of his having been commissioned from God to declare his will. Jesus Christ and his apostles had given indubitable evidence of this fact, and therefore any book

known to be from them, whether they wrote it or only gave it the benefit of their sanction and approval, was *ipso facto* inspired. Now as to the ability of the compilers to ascertain *that fact*, the evidence is complete. We have seen that the canon was in existence during the lives of the apostles, and therefore whether they made it or it was made by others, it certainly had their approbation, or at least their tacit endorsement. They did not discountenance it. Barnabas, who was Paul's companion in his missionary journeys, quotes from the Gospels; Clement, mentioned in Phil. iv. 3, and whom ancient writers agree in asserting to have become afterwards bishop of Rome; Hermas mentioned in the Epistle to the Romans; Ignatius, Polycarp, Justin Martyr, Papias—all of whom lived in apostolic times or immediately after, quote the gospels as then extant. Now if they had erred in so doing, how easily might they have been corrected? They quote the books as inspired. They had every opportunity to know whether they were so or not. They were conversant with some of the authors themselves; so that their citations, going unchallenged by any apostle or other inspired man, amounts to a moral demonstration that the books were inspired, and that their insertion in the canon was due to the known fact of their inspiration.

On this point I take pleasure in transferring to these pages the following extract from Dr. Thornwell's vigorous work against Bishop Lynch on the Apocrypha, a work written in his early life, and characterised by that masterly logic for which he was so remarkable: "It is a favorite scheme of the papist," says he, "to represent the settling of the canon as a work of gigantic toil and formidable mystery. It evidently, however, reduces itself to a simple question of fact—what *books* were written by men whose claims to inspiration were either directly or remotely established by miracles? It is a question therefore of no more difficulty than the *authenticity* of the sacred books. To illustrate the matter in the case of the New Testament. The churches that received the epistles from Paul could have no doubts of their canonical authority, because they *knew* that the apostle was supernaturally inspired as a teacher of the faith.

He produced in abundance the signs of an apostle. So also the writings of the other apostles would be recognised by their contemporary brethren as the word of the Lord. The books actually written by the apostles, or approved by their sanction, would be known by their having witnesses of the fact. The historical proofs of the fact, that is, the testimony of credible witnesses, would be sufficient in all future time to attest the inspiration of any given book. If a man, for example, in the third century, is doubtful of the Epistle to the Romans, all that is necessary to settle his mind is to convince him that Paul *actually* wrote it. This being done, its inspiration follows as a matter of course. If a book, on the other hand, which pretends to be inspired could produce no adequate proof of apostolic origin or apostolic sanction, its claims would have to be rejected unless its author could exhibit in his own person the signs of a heavenly messenger. The congregations in possession of inspired records were accustomed, as we gather from the apostles themselves, to transmit their treasures to the rest of their brethren, so that in process of time this free circulation would put them in the hands of all the portions of the Church; and as each church became satisfied of their apostolic origin, it received them likewise as canonical and divine, and in this way a common canon *was gradually settled*. The idea that a council or any mere ecclesiastical body could settle the canon is preposterous. To settle the canon is to settle the inspiration of the sacred books; to settle the inspiration of the sacred books is to prove that they were written by divine prophets; and to prove this fact, is to prove either that the prophets themselves established their pretensions by miraculous achievements, or were sanctioned by those who were already in possession of supernatural credentials." (Arguments of Romanists Refuted, p. 183.)

In this extract, it is clearly shown that the compilers of our canon had nothing, and needed nothing, to guide them but *facts*; and of those facts they were of all men the most competent judges. And as the supposition of dishonesty in yielding to the facts their due influence is purely gratuitous, if not impossible.

it may reasonably be discounted. Thus investigation into the origin of our belief in the Scriptures, instead of unsettling, confirms our faith, and enables us to give a reason for the hope that is in us with meekness and fear.

ARTICLE IV.

THE PRESBYTERATE.

There is no doubt a wide dissatisfaction in our Church with its Form of Government. It is equally clear that a great variety of views exists, as to whether any, and if any, what changes should be made. It is noteworthy, that no such differences exist in regard to doctrinal views. In former days, doctrinal differences largely existed. There were different views held in regard to the atonement, imputation, original sin, and the sinner's inability. The indications are, that the errors in regard to these points have measurably passed away among all American Presbyterians. There are, at any rate, no symptoms discoverable of their existence in the Southern Church. But whilst we harmonise so completely on doctrinal points, the same is not true in regard to the principles of Church government.

In the formation of our standards, there were no compromises on doctrinal subjects. These were looked upon as vastly more important than questions of Church polity. The Westminster Assembly more especially gave itself to the settlement of scripture doctrines, and agreed upon a form of government by compromises; this subject being regarded as comparatively of small importance.

A system formed by compromises never was coherent. It is a question both sides of which has adherents among us, whether our system has three or only two orders of permanent Church officers. On the one hand, our system appears to favor the idea that all presbyters are officially equal; on the other, certain

duties and functions, regarded as belonging exclusively to preaching presbyters, favor the idea of a rank superior to that of ruling presbyters. Even a session must have a preaching elder to moderate it, except in an extraordinary case; so of congregational meetings to call a pastor. The preachers are permanent members of judicatories; while the ruling elders only have a seat when officially appointed to the position. Not unfrequently a ruling elder is called a *layman*, a term of prelatie use, and implying that he has no office at all. Those who so use the term think they are speaking according to the Book. A coherent system could hardly have given origin to such a controversy as has existed in regard to the question, whether ruling elders should lay on hands in the act of ordaining a preacher; nor, under it, could there have been such a diversity of practice touching the ordination of ruling elders and deacons considered as a ministerial or governmental act.

The Westminster Assembly endeavored to effect such a compromise as would be accepted by all parties. The result was that many important points were left unsettled or obscure; and those professedly adopting the system have differed both in their interpretation and in their practice.

It would seem to be a strange fact that so many are wedded to the Book as it is, and so averse to any change. That which is confessedly an assemblage of compromises, assuredly needs to be so far changed as to be made coherent; especially do things that are undetermined and vague need to be accurately defined. There were Prelatists, Presbyterians, Independents, and Erastians, in the Westminster Assembly. They were not agreed as to whether the Scriptures settled questions of Church polity, as it did questions of doctrine. Custom, for ages, had assigned different ranks to ecclesiastical rulers. It is not wonderful that old usages should have had great influence upon them, sufficient to account for the incoherency of the Church polity which they finally fixed upon. We see this same influence in the pertinacity with which some minds adhere to an incoherent system, confessedly made up of compromises, and attach so much sacredness to it.

There are leading points that must be settled before we can ever come to a general agreement on the subject. According as individuals take sides on these leading points will result the opinions which they shall hold. The points referred to are such as these: Do the Scriptures give us a *jure divino* system of government, discipline, and worship? How much, if anything, is left to human discretion? Is there only one, or are there two ranks of Church rulers by divine authority? Is every permanent office which Christ has appointed "articulately described" in the Scriptures, and officially named? It is constantly assumed among us that what is called *the parity of the clergy* is by scripture warrant. It would be interesting to see the proof of this position. A clergyman is understood to mean one who has taken orders in the Church, in contradistinction to him who is denominated a *layman*. This latter term (from *λαός*) signifies one of the people, that is, one not having taken holy orders. The question is now often asked, to which class does the ruling elder belong? If of the laity, then he has no office at all, and is only as a matter of privilege and sufferance permitted to advise with the clergy. If we say the ruling elder is of the clergy and has taken holy orders, where does he stand as to the matter of parity? Is he officially equal to all other Church rulers? The Prelatists constantly use these terms in their proper sense; the term *laity* referring to those holding no office at all; of the clergy, they hold that there are three orders. If the ruling elder holds office, and is not of the same rank with other presbyters, then what becomes of our parity?

Is it contended that we hold only to the *parity of the ministry*? In regard to this, it may be observed that the term minister literally means a servant, and is applied in the Scriptures to all Church officers, even to the deacons. They are all *servants* of the Church to which they minister. There are several Greek words that may be translated *servant*, slave, or minister. The one most frequently applied to Church officers is *Διάκονος*: this is the word from which our word *deacon* is derived. It is made the official designation of a church officer, as is plain from 1 Tim. iii. 8, 12; and Philip. i. 1. In its common acceptation, it

is applied to all the followers of Christ (see John xii. 26); and the apostles apply it to themselves in such passages as the following—1 Cor. iii. 5: "Who then is Paul, and who is Apollos, but ministers, (Διάκονοι) by whom ye believed?" Eph. iii. 7: "Whereof I was made a minister (Διάκονος) according to the gift of the grace of God." See also Col. i. 23, and xii. 25. So that this word, as an official designation, belongs to the diaconate, and in its general or common acceptation is applied to the apostles, evangelists, and all Christians. Another Greek term (ὑπηρέτης), in its general sense, is applied in the same way, but is not used to denote office in the Church. It literally means an *under-rower*; and thus a subordinate of any kind; an attendant or assistant; one whose will is merged in that of another. See 1 Cor. iv. 1: "Let a man so account of us as ministers (ὑπηρέτας) of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God." Luke i. 12: "Even as they were delivered unto us, which from the beginning were eye-witnesses, and ministers (ὑπηρέτας) of the word." John xviii. 36: . . . "My kingdom is not of this world, if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants (ὑπηρέται) fight."

The phrases, *minister of the gospel*, and *ministry of the word*, are frequent in the New Testament, clearly referring to the preacher and his work. The former expression is found in Eph. iii. 7, as quoted above, taken in connexion with the previous verse. An example of the latter is found in Acts vi. 4: "But we will give ourselves continually to prayer, and to the *ministry of the word*." Similar expressions are found in Acts i. 17, 25; xii. 25; xxi. 19; Rom. xii. 7; 1 Cor. xvi. 15; 2 Cor. iv. 1; v. 18; vi. 3; Eph. iv. 12; 1 Tim. i. 12; Col. iv. 17; 2 Tim. iv. 5, 11. It is very remarkable, that in every one of these passages, the Greek words are *διάκονος* minister, and *διακονία* ministry, the very word which as an official designation denotes the diaconate.

Will it be contended that the term *preacher* is the proper official designation of him who is authorised publicly to expound and proclaim the gospel? In regard to this, it may be remarked, that the term *preacher* is used, it is believed, only four times in the New Testament: once in Romans x. 14, where the question

is asked: "How shall they hear without a preacher?" There appears to be no evidence here that the word is used in any other than its common acceptation, of herald, simply. The word is used again in 2 Peter ii. 5, where Noah is styled a *preacher* of righteousness. It is not applied here to religious teachers under the New Testament dispensation, and therefore has no reference to the point in question. The other two examples are in 1 Tim. ii. 7, and 2 Tim. i. 11. The language of the apostle in both these places is almost precisely the same: "Whereunto I am appointed a preacher, and an apostle, and a teacher of the Gentiles." Is it possible that there are only two examples in the New Testament of the use of the official designation by which a permanent Church officer is pointed out—an officer holding the "*first and highest office in the Church*;" and in both cases the term is applied to an apostle, and not to that officer? There are several Greek words which are translated *to preach* in the New Testament. *κηρύσσω* is the most common word so used. In the form of a noun, it is *κήρυξ*, a preacher. This is the term translated, a preacher, in the four cases above mentioned. The other words which mean to preach, are *λάλειω*, *εὐαγγελίζω*, and *διατίθημι*. While *preacher* as a noun is only used four times, the word *preachest* is used once; *preacheth* is used three times; and *preaching* is used twenty-two times. Paul twice employs the term *ambassador*, in application to himself, in 2 Cor. v. 20, and Eph. vi. 20. In the former of these passages he uses the term in the plural form, ("*we are ambassadors*."") This may be an example of what is called *the plural of excellence*, or he may include others besides himself; but whether he does or not is of no consequence to the argument, as the Greek word translated *ambassador* is *πρεσβεύω*, which means to exercise the office of a presbyter.

The conclusion is, that there is no official designation for the preacher, as such, in the New Testament, unless the terms *bishop*, *presbyter*, and *pastor*, are to be so understood. There is nothing clearer from the Scriptures than that these words are used as convertible terms, all of them applied to the very same persons, of whom there was always a plurality appointed in

every church. Acts xx. 17: "And from Miletus he sent to Ephesus, and called the elders of the church." To these presbyters he made his farewell address. In that address to them, he says, verse 28, "Take heed therefore to yourselves, and to all the flocks over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers" (bishops) "to feed the Church of God." . . . The Greek word here translated to *feed*, signifies to act the part of a shepherd or pastor. It is the very same word which the Saviour used to Peter, "*feed my lambs,*" "*feed my sheep.*" See also 1 Peter v. 1, 2: "The elders which are among you, I exhort, who am also an elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, . . . feed the flock of God which is among you," (the same Greek word expressive of the pastoral work,) "taking the oversight thereof," . . . Here the Greek word is *ἐπισκοποῦντες*, which literally signifies exercising the office of a bishop. If there is no official title for the preacher, separate and distinct from that applied to other church rulers; and if there is no articulate description of him, or his work, or his qualifications to office, in contradistinction from that which belongs to other presbyters, then there is no basis for the theory, that he holds a higher rank than other presbyters, or that he holds the "*first and highest office in the Church.*"

A writer of some reputation claims that he finds the scripture warrant for the distinction of rank between the preaching elder and the ruling elder, in 1 Cor. xii. 28: "For God hath set some in the Church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues." The writer referred to, admits that here only is found a clear warrant for the principle. It will hardly be claimed that this is a catalogue of office-bearers, according to their respective grades. If so, then there were in the apostolic Church no less than eight distinct official grades. Admitting that the apostolic office was not to be permanent, on the principle that eye-witnesses cannot have successors; admitting that the age of miracles has passed away, and that therefore the grades here entitled *prophets, miracles, gifts of healings, and diversities of tongues*, were not to be permanent, there still

remain three grades, viz., *teachers, helps, governments*. In this catalogue the diaconate does not appear. The power of rule must be that referred to in the term *governments*. There still remain the teachers and their assistants, entitled *helps*. No where else in the Scriptures are these helps referred to, and especially are they not mentioned as holding a distinct grade of office. If "*helps*" refer to the deacons, then they make priority of rank to rulers. Will it be contended that, by divine appointment, there are three distinct grades of office-bearers in the Church above that of deacons? No such theory is contended for by any Presbyterian. Consequently the passage with such an interpretation proves too much. The conclusion seems to be inevitable, that the catalogue in the passage is not a catalogue of official grades, but of gifts (*χαρίσματα*) conferred upon the Church. The power of rule was bestowed. It was that one of these gifts which the apostle styles *governments*. But the passage does not settle the question as to *whom* these gifts belong. Some of them may have been possessed by private unofficial members. A single individual may have possessed one, or a plurality of them. The apostles at different times appear to have exercised every one of them. It may be that the order in which these gifts are mentioned, serves to establish their relative value and importance. But so far as the power of rule is concerned, the passage seems only and merely to express the idea, that this power is one of the gifts conferred in the Church for edification. We can learn from other parts of the Scriptures, upon whom this power of rule was conferred, that it was, and is to be, in the hands of those who were styled indifferently either presbyters, bishops, or pastors.

A certain writer observes, that "the preacher's office is unquestionably set forth in Scripture (1 Tim. v. 17) as one of the ordinary and perpetual officers of the Christian Church." The passage in Timothy is in these words: "Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honor, especially they who labor in word and doctrine." If the preacher's office is in this passage "unquestionably set forth," then it must be admitted that he is here called an *elder*; and this very same term, which

is admitted to be an official designation, is applied to those who are not preachers, viz., to those who are only rulers in the Church. If two official ranks are here set forth, it would seem to be unfortunate that the same official term is applied to both, and neither of them has any other official title which the other does not equally share. Every existence must have a name by which it is distinguished from all other existences; and without a name it can be spoken of only by circumlocutory description. As soon as the apostolic simplicity was departed from in the primitive Church by having different ranks of rulers, necessity compelled the use of different names; hence the higher rank were called *bishops*, and the lower presbyters. Jerome, in speaking of the matter, says they were all at first of equal rank, but a priority was attached to some for convenience, and that which at first was allowed as a privilege, was afterwards claimed as a right.

The apostles called themselves elders, but they did not call all elders apostles. The apostolic being the higher office, included in it that of elder. But if all elders were called apostles, and all apostles elders, and so the words used as convertible terms, there would not be the slightest proof that there was any difference of rank between them as designated by these terms. If any official title can be found for the preacher that is not applied to the elder who rules only, then there is a basis for the theory of difference of rank, not otherwise.

The term *judge* is an official designation. There are different ranks among them. In every case that difference is indicated by a descriptive appellation. We speak of a judge of the county court, the judge of the district court, and the judge of the supreme court. When we speak of the district or other judges, we obviously allude to persons holding the same rank. When we speak of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, we make a distinction of rank among those occupying the supreme bench. We find the expression in the Old Testament, "*chief ruler of the synagogue*," which indicates a rank higher than that of other rulers; but we do not find the expressions in the Scriptures, *chief elder, chief bishop, or chief pastor*. We do find, however, when

it came to be the case after the apostolic age, as Jerome testifies, that differences of rank were introduced by human authority, the expression *chief bishop* was in common use. No more conclusive proof need be asked, that there was no distinction of rank among presbyters than the absence of all descriptive appellatives by which the difference is pointed out.

It might be justly said: Let the judges of the supreme court, who preside with dignity and impartiality, be counted worthy of double honor, especially they who prepare and deliver the opinion of the court. This declaration would not necessarily imply that those who were especially to be honored occupied a higher rank than others. The statement might be made in a case when there was in fact no distinction of rank among them. Even in the case where there was a chief justice among them, it might not be he that always or usually prepared and delivered the opinion of the court. Were it to be said that the office of chief justice of the supreme court is "*unquestionably set forth*" in the statement above, it would be manifestly a case of *non sequitur*.

It has been said by some that "the primary idea of the presbyterate is ruling; but it is preaching which constitutes its subsequent and higher development." This may be the case, and if so, it would seem to be necessary to attain to the presbyterate in its "primary idea" in order to advancement to its "subsequent and higher development." There are indications that this was actually the case in the apostolic Church. In every case a plurality of presbyters were ordained. Neither in the statement of the facts, nor in the directions as to their qualifications, is there any distinction made. Some of them are found preaching afterwards without any intimation of a new ordination; whilst others, it appears did not preach. It is not once intimated that any other officers than those called either elders or deacons, were ordained over these churches. It is consistent with the statement that "the primary idea of the presbyteriate is ruling," to say that it might have been the case that all presbyters, in virtue of their presbyterate, might preach; but some not having the ability or gift (*χρησιμα*) failed to do so,

and in consequence of this were judged not to be "especially worthy of the double honor," as those who, while they ruled well, also had the gift of preaching to edification. It is consistent, too, with the same language, to admit that it might have been the case that some presbyters were forbidden to preach by their peers, acting in the capacity of a parochial or provincial presbytery, for the reason, that though sufficiently intelligent and orthodox, they did not, in the judgment of these peers, have the requisite ability to speak to edification. A theory which harmonizes all the Scripture facts would seem to be the true theory.

A certain writer observes as follows, viz.: "Paul and Barnabas ordained several presbyters in every little church which they organised. These could not all have been preachers, as God does not waste his grace." It is admitted to be intuitively certain that "*God does not waste his grace.*" But not so certain that it would be a wasting of grace for two or three, or even four or six, preaching presbyters to belong to a church in the midst of a dense population. Were every one of a half-dozen presbyters preachers, they might find abundant opportunities to exercise their gift of preaching, in such places as Antioch, Athens, Corinth, or in almost any place in Asia Minor and Greece, where the apostle at that time mostly labored. The argument is founded on the idea that a church must have but one place of preaching, as is commonly the case in modern times. But might not a church, having as many as six ordained presbyters, have the service of preaching going on in as many as six different places at the same hour? That would be a church of such efficiency as would not be undesirable in modern times. They could easily convene as a parochial presbytery, to examine and receive their respective converts to membership, or to transact any other appropriate business.

There is evidence nearly or quite satisfactory, that in apostolic times but one church organisation was formed in any one locality even in the large cities. As some of these cities, as for example Rome, had before the close of the first century an immense multitude of Christians in it, it must have been the

case that they were too numerous in that city to worship in one congregation. Therefore there must have been a plurality of such congregations, although but one organised church. So of other cities, as Alexandria, Jerusalem, Antioch. As there were of necessity many congregations in these large cities, and but one organised church, there must have been a plurality of preaching presbyters in the parochial presbytery, and still no *necessary waste of grace*.

There is constantly cropping out among us the evidences of an extensive dissatisfaction with the slow progress our Church is making in extending its influence and power. Some ascribe it to one cause, some to another. In most cases the preachers bear the brunt of the blame. A statement in the following language has recently appeared in one of our weekly newspapers, for the author of which the editor expresses a high respect: "If the Church is to march on to the conquest of the world at the rate it is now going, then I want to know by what elongated calculus, or other branch of mathematics, a result so disproportioned to the means can be figured out." This is the sort of sentiment coming not unfrequently from our best friends, the ministers and members of the Church. Every effect must have its adequate cause. In some cases the cause is thought to be in a radical defect in the training of our preachers. Without doubt, the Church as organised in the apostles' times, is the model for us to follow. What they did in this behalf was by divine direction. It is impossible for human wisdom to improve on that which is divine. If in any thing we depart from the divine model, we so far cripple the efficiency of the Church in our day. The divine model makes no objection to the highest sort of mental training. It rather specially honors and commends it in the person of the Apostle Paul. He was the only one of all the apostles fully trained in all the learning of the times; hence he is the most conspicuous character among them on the pages of the New Testament. He in fact wrote about one-third of it. The Acts of the Apostles is for the most part taken up with a recital of his multiform labors. But the divine model did not reject from the work of preaching the gospel

such as were competent to edify the churches, although they had not as finished a training as Paul had. Our Book is formed in good part on this model; but our practice does not altogether harmonise with the Book. The cases are comparatively few in which we encourage into the preacher's office any but those who have passed through a regular collegiate and theological training. The Book prescribes the training through which we should endeavor to carry our candidates, but gives authority to make exceptions in cases not having this training. It may be asked, what is the object to be accomplished by the training required? And the answer to this must be, to impart such mental culture as will enable persons to become able expounders of God's truth. Why should we not be anxious to make the exceptions permitted in the Book, in all cases in which the ability already exists or is likely to be easily acquired by sufficient practice, especially where the regular training is impracticable? Some of the ablest lawyers the country affords have not been disciplined by a regular college or university training. These men might have been still more able had they possessed this discipline, but it was impracticable, and their native powers of intellect, along with the necessary energy and industry, made their life a success without it. So it is with preachers—some of the most efficient, acceptable, and successful preachers have not had the specified training. It is so in other Churches. We have had some examples in our own Church. We might have a great many more; if not examples of prominent ability, yet of such ability as would be acceptable to the churches and efficient for doing good.

The Mobile Assembly authorised the presbyteries to appoint a selection of their ruling elders to do what has been miscalled *lay preaching*. The expression is a contradiction in terms. We might as well speak of a *lay clergyman* or a *clerical layman*. The action of the Mobile Assembly was a departure from time-honored ruts in which our system had been running, but it is believed by many that it is a departure in the right direction. Had it been our uniform custom in the past, it is not difficult to believe that the number of our effective preachers at this moment

would be double or treble what it is. Indeed, it is not difficult to imagine that the measure would have given such an impetus to the Church as might fairly be likened to a geometrical progression in multiplying churches in waste places and supplying them with the preached word. We surely ought not to act as if the *only* way to recruit the ranks of preachers, is to take a person in his youth and thoroughly train him for the work; that no other sort of men are at all fit to preach, no matter how pious, intelligent, and able. Our efforts are directed almost exclusively to this way of obtaining preachers. The result has been that we have uniformly failed to secure them in sufficient numbers. How many ruling elders have a very respectable education, are shrewd business men, clear thinkers, and either already acceptable public speakers, or easily capable of becoming so by a little practice? Should we not bring it before their minds and constantly keep it there—the duty to serve God with whatever talent he has given them? All ruling elders must adopt the Confession of Faith equally with the preacher at their ordination. If their orthodoxy is evidenced in this way, where is the danger of allowing any or all of them that can, or that can be encouraged into it, to talk in public to their neighbors on religion, or, in other words, to preach? We might as well close their mouths in the Sabbath-school, as to close them when the parents of the children come in. What harm would result, if it were the universal understanding that, in virtue of their ordination, it was their right and privilege, and in certain circumstances must become their duty, to preach. This at least would be carrying out the theory, that all presbyters, bishops, or pastors, are officially equal as holding substantially the same office.

It is as plain as it can be, that, as a Church, we are continually losing ground for the want of preachers. We have hundreds of churches that are without regular services. The members and their children, for the most part, are compelled to attend upon the ministrations of other denominations. Is it any wonder that those churches are lingering through a sickly existence or dying out altogether? It seems amazing, as well as appalling, to some of our leading men, that these churches con-

tribute little or nothing to the benevolent schemes of the Church; whereas the fact is just what might be expected. Neither their grace of benevolence nor other graces have had the proper training. Not unfrequently they would as readily give, if they give at all, to some other denomination as their own; especially to the one with whose membership they ordinarily worship. If they take any religious paper, they would almost as readily take one of some other denomination. They are continually hearing the doctrines of their own Church opposed or misrepresented. If one of our own preachers happens to make his appearance, or is sent by the presbytery, he is too polite and liberal to vindicate his own doctrines. In fact it might sometimes be unacceptable to them were he to do so. The voluntary societies have been so successful in propagating anti-sectarian sentiments all over the country, that, in not a few communities, a preacher's acceptability is forfeited forever should he dare to vindicate his own peculiarities of belief. Then it is to be remembered that these little churches are for the most part poor. They do not feel themselves able to sustain the ministrations of the gospel at home. They very naturally, or if you please, perversely, think, that until they can do this, and then have something to spare, they are under no obligation to help support the gospel for others.

One thing may be mentioned that would likely become a fatal barrier to the practical working of this apostolic plan. Let it be constantly proclaimed from high places among us, that he who presumes to instruct his fellow-Christians around him, or to exhort them to the performance of their duties, must necessarily drop all secular pursuits and devote himself wholly to preaching—this would be the fatal barrier. Common sense tells us that a half loaf is better than no bread; that a child must crawl previous to walking; that when walking is first commenced, it is a tottering and unsteady performance. It is not till after months or years of practice that the quondam child can perform with his limbs the full functions of maturity. When a church is newly born, must we expect and require of it all the character-

istics of maturity? A mature church has its full bench of presbyters and deacons; its house of worship completed and paid for. It has been trained to give to the cause of benevolence; besides, to put its preacher or preachers above the necessity of secular cares. This is a desirable maturity to be aimed at in all cases, but cannot be expected of small and feeble churches just struggling into existence. Paul did not expect all this of the little church composed only, at first, of Lydia and her household. He did not exact of this little church that it must at once either make such arrangements as to put its preacher above secular cares, or else do without the ministrations of the gospel. He had no such procrustean ideas as this. On the contrary, apostle as he was, as well as evangelist, he labored at his secular trade, when necessary, in the midst of his abundant labors in the gospel. If we would encourage the presbyters of these little churches to exercise their gifts to the edifying of the churches without insisting that the farm, the workshop, or the counter must be deserted at once, the little churches might be nursed into some degree of vigorous life. The exercise of gifts would increase the amount of gifts, and when the church had arrived at sufficient strength to put their preacher above secular cares, the person of their choice would not improbably be found in their very midst. In this case we would have the credit before the world, as well as in the sight of the Master, of *preaching the gospel to the poor*—a credit which we have not now, to any great extent, even in our own estimation. We might therefore confidently expect a corresponding blessing from the Master. The fact is we are reduced to a choice between two alternatives: we must either nourish these little churches in this way, as well as organise and establish others, which might be done by the dozen; or we must leave the interests in this part of our field to dwindle. Experience has proven beyond a doubt that the sustentation scheme as at present organised cannot overtake these wants. That scheme can neither get the means nor the men. What has been done in extending the gospel in these waste places has been accomplished by the regularly trained preachers at their own charges mostly, but the number of them

has been vastly too few to do the work that ought to have been done.

The apostolic model involves a large use of the evangelistic feature of the work. The apostles appear to have given themselves to this feature of it. Paul, with the assistance of Silas at one time, of Barnabas at another, then of Timothy and Titus, carried the gospel to regions beyond, where Christ had not before been named. The little churches he thus established were again visited by him from time to time. In Acts xv. 36, his language to Barnabas was: "Let us go again and visit our brethren in every city where we have preached the word of the Lord, and see how they do." Paul and Silas "went through Syria and Cilicia confirming the churches." Acts xv. 41. Not administering the prelatie rite of confirmation, for no such rite was heard of at that day. In Acts xvi. 15, the same fact is stated: "And so were the churches established in the faith, and increased in number daily.

To do this evangelistic work required their best men. In it a high mental culture came most effectually into play, producing large results. The local presbyters were to attend to the work in their absence, and did it efficiently, as "the number of the disciples increased daily." Acts xvi. 5. These were the features of the divinely-appointed model of propagating the gospel and building up the Church. We cannot do better than to follow it. If the sustentation scheme of our Church would give itself to the work of sustaining evangelists, it would be a work sufficiently large for that scheme to undertake; the local presbyters meanwhile conducting the services and attending to pastoral supervision, but not necessarily renouncing their secular means of support. This would be a similar work to that accomplished in the Methodist Church by *local preachers*. The evangelists could come around once in two or three or six months, as occasion might demand, assist on sacramental occasions, and conduct the services for a series of days if deemed expedient.

It is suggested that these evangelists ought to be well supported. The compensation should be such as to command the best talent. Their employment ought to be a matter of stipu-

lation between them and the Presbytery in whose bounds they labor—the Presbytery having previously arranged with the Assembly's Committee as to how much they could rely upon getting; and their responsibility for faithfulness being of course to the Presbytery only. The salary promised ought not to be conditioned on the question whether the churches they immediately serve would furnish the means of paying the whole amount. The sort of talent we want would accept no such conditional promises. As with the foreign field, it could be made a matter of previous calculation what the revenue of the Committee would probably be, leaving a margin for contingencies. If the evangelist could not be employed for the whole year, he could be employed to do a specific work. That specific work being done, he could be at his own charges the residue of his time. The evangelist might be employed for a portion of his time by some church at or near his place of residence, the Presbytery, with the aid of the Assembly's Committee, employing the remainder of it for general evangelistic work. If he chose to rest, however, for a portion of every year, it would be his right to do so. The doctrine was broached in the last Assembly, "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." It is not proposed to dispute the principle, but only to suggest that the principle being true is as applicable to the evangelist as to any other person.

Thus it has been attempted to develop to some extent the legitimate results of the underlying principle, that all presbyters are officially equal, in its practical outworkings in the model Church of the apostles. Other results would follow from the same principle. The presbyters would all be on the same footing in the provincial presbytery, with the same rights, duties, and privileges. They would either all have a seat in said presbytery, or only such of them as might be delegated by the sessions, the number from each church to be determined by the number of constituents.

If it can be conclusively proved that all presbyters are equal, having the same rank and holding the same office, there ought to

be no objection to a consistent carrying out of the principle. If it can be demonstrated that the principle is not according to scripture warrant, let it be shown. It is believed that it cannot be successfully done.

ARTICLE V.

THE TRIBUNAL OF HISTORY.*

The most elaborate oration of the great Pericles, as recorded by the historian Thucydides, was that pronounced over the soldiers who had fallen in the Peloponnesian war. The delicate sense of Athenian honor did not suffer the slain to lie disgraced upon the field of battle. With this sentiment of national pride was united the deeper instinct of religion, which, among the Greeks, enforced a strict performance of funeral rites, without which the restless shades were doomed to wander upon the banks of the gloomy Styx, forbidden to pass to the Elysium beyond. Even amidst the carnage of battle, the bodies of the slain must be rescued from the foe, and borne with solemn pomp for interment in their native soil; whilst the memorial shaft blazoned their heroic deeds in double testimony of a soldier's prowess and of a nation's gratitude. It was fitting, too, that the pageant of a public funeral should be illustrated by the highest eloquence; and the first orators of Greece, such as Demosthenes and Lysias, did not disdain the opportunity for the display of their loftiest genius.

It was after the disastrous campaign of the summer of 431 B. C., when all Attica had been ravaged by the Spartan legions, and the entire population was compressed within the walls of

*This article was delivered in a lecture before the Southern Historical Society in New Orleans. It is now published with only such verbal changes as were necessary to convert it from an oral address into an article for the *Review*.

Athens, that Pericles, the consummate statesman, whose name is imperishably linked with Athenian empire and art, ascended the Bema to speak the honors of the Athenian dead. It was, however, no empty panegyric, the filigree and frost-work of mere rhetoric, but statesman-like and grand in the utterance of practical convictions. As described by Mr. Grote,* it was "comprehensive, rational, and full, not less of sense and substance, than of earnest patriotism"—"impersonal and business-like in its character, as it is Athens herself who undertakes to commend and decorate her departed sons, as well as to hearten up and admonish the living." In the most graphic and suggestive style, Pericles sketches "the effect of her democratical constitution, with its diffused and equal citizenship, in calling forth not merely strong attachment but painful self-sacrifice"—"the anxious interest as well as a competence of judgment in public discussion and public action, common to every citizen, rich and poor"—"the combination of reason and courage which encountered danger the more willingly from having discussed and calculated it beforehand"—"the liberty and diversity of individual life" at Athens, as opposed to "the monotonous drill of Sparta, or some other ideal standard impressed upon society with a heavy-handed uniformity." Having presented thus the many-sided social development which prevailed in the city of Minerva, "bringing out the capacities for action and endurance," the great orator points the conclusion of his argument: "Such is the city on behalf of which these warriors have nobly died in battle, vindicating her just title to unimpaired rights, and on behalf of which all of us here left behind must willingly toil; drawing the lesson that the conflict is not for equal motives between us and our enemies who possess nothing of the like excellence."

We have detained the reader with this lengthened preamble, for the purpose of justifying an inference which will be found to underlie all that shall hereafter be submitted to his perusal, viz., that war is not always the mere outburst of human passions;

*Grote's History of Greece, Vol. VI., pp. 142, 143.

but that when projected upon a large scale and protracted through a long period, and especially when occurring between members of the same race, it is usually the logical result of an antecedent conflict of opinions; which, having sought arbitration in vain, appeal finally to the sword, from sheer necessity, to settle the question of ascendancy. With the whole of Grecian history before us, for example, it is abundantly evident that the thirty years' war between Sparta and Attica was but the culmination of the struggle between the Doric and Ionic elements of the Grecian stock, which emerged at the earliest dawn of authentic history. These two became from the outset the exponents of two opposing systems of government and social discipline: Lacedæmon espousing a policy which may be defined as continental and oligarchic; whilst Athens represented the ideas of commerce and democracy. Both strove for empire; but under different banners, and with opposing watchwords: Sparta, seeking to consolidate the continental states under the supremacy of the few—Athens, to weld the maritime states into a democratic confederacy, of which she should be the centre and the soul. The antagonism was fundamental; and two nations struggled together, like Jacob and Esau, even in the womb. So ancient was the feud, that even the armed invasion of Persia scarcely composed it for a time; only to break forth again in the war of the Peloponnesus, so fatal in its issue to the independence of both. All this, however, is not a whit more clear to the eye of our critical philosophy, than it was to the statesman-like discernment of Pericles himself. We, who stand upon the top of so many centuries and survey the whole landscape of the past, understand perfectly that the wildness of individual freedom, so fatal to the permanence of her power, was yet the necessary condition under which Athens fulfilled her mission and became the school-mistress of the world. The largest liberty of human thought, and the freest development of social life, under the stimulus of a popular government which woke every individual into action, were perhaps the only conditions under which those exquisite models of poetry, eloquence, and art, could in the first instance be created, which succeeding ages have been content

simply to reproduce. And beyond the glory even of her sculpture and her song, which throws such a halo around the name of Athens, is the glory of presenting the first demonstration on the page of human history of equal citizenship in a free State. All this, however, is traced with a needle's precision by this sagacious statesman; who, in this splendid relic of forensic eloquence, has adroitly linked the pious sepulture of the heroic warrior with the exposition and defence of the constitution and laws for which he bled. The orator was right. With the instinct that belongs only to genius, he struck the keynote of the solemn dirge which weeping Greece was chanting over the tomb of the slain. It was not a sentiment of natural affection alone, seeking to hallow the remains of brothers, husbands, sons. It was not the impulse of haughty honor only, rescuing the brave from the iron hoofs of an insolent foe: it was the deep, though possibly unpronounced, conviction that the dead were martyrs to a cause for which their own blood might as easily have flowed. This made Greece weep, as she drew her mantle over the slain, and gave their names to lasting marble. And Pericles was eloquent, simply because he interpreted the silent thought in a thousand souls—that death for a great principle was a sacrifice to the gods.

We of the South have been stirred by the power of the same sentiment. In all the melancholy which has shaded the fortunes of nations, there is no more pathetic spectacle than of this stricken land yearning after the bones of its dead bleaching upon a hundred battle-plains from Maryland to Mexico. Breathless and panting in its exhaustion at the close of a long and cruel war, with three-fifths of its property practically confiscated by a single stroke of the pen, with its system of labor unhinged and its industry paralysed, overwhelmed with a degree of taxation rendering the poor the envy of the rich, with a band of harpies fattening upon the public revenue more obscene than those described by Virgil—

“ Like fowls with maiden's face—their paunches
Wide defiled with garbage great—
Their hooked paws outspread; and ever pale
With hungry looks——”

under all this pressure of outward wrong and inward grief, this modern Niobe yearns in stony sorrow over her still unburied sons, who should only sleep upon the soil watered by their martyr blood. This deep and holy sentiment takes even a mellow form. Alas! if like ancient Greece the children of the slain could only be the children of the State—educated from the public treasury, till old enough to be equipped with shield and spear! But with the loss of legislative control, private beneficence must partially pay the debt of public gratitude; and these orphans of the State must fall into the arms of such as are willing to be the trustees of the Commonwealth! Helpless alike to alleviate the present or to consecrate the past, our only resource is an appeal to the judgment of posterity. “Our harp hangs upon a blasted branch. The sound of its strings is mournful. Did the wind touch thee, O harp, or was it some passing ghost? Another song shall rise.” It shall chaunt “the chiefs of other times departed, who have gone without their fame.” “Our fathers shall hear it in their airy hall. Their dim faces shall hang with joy from their clouds.” “Fingal shall receive his fame. The voice of Ossian has been heard. The harp has been strung in silence.”

We have thus insensibly drifted upon the theme of this discourse, which has for its object to exhibit THE SOLEMN TRIBUNAL OF HISTORY: before which all the generations of men must bring their deeds to be adjudicated; and in whose final verdict, justice and truth are sure to meet a proximate vindication. It looms up through the prospective of coming centuries; when the passions of the past are dead; when historic criticism shall have purged the record of prejudice and calumny; and when impartial truth shall plead before a panel beyond the reach either of seduction or of fear. But is there such a tribunal before the great Assize, when the Ruler of the universe shall pronounce the sentences of eternal destiny? The scepticism of this inquiry, We propose now to meet, by asserting the reality of a judicial process going forward perpetually in the court of time, and reversing the hasty judgments rendered amidst the passions of the passing hour.

I. There is in the human soul a principle of justice, the noblest relic of that image of God in which man was first created. Our nature is majestic even in its wreck. As the broken columns, half-hidden in the sands, reveal the ancient glory of a Baalbec; so amid the ruins of the fall we discover traces of the grandeur of soul with which man was originally endowed. The achievements of science attest the splendor of his intellect, even though it be darkened by sin. The sweet charities that bloom still in the desert he has made, reveal him as once the peer of the angels in love. The very superstition that cowers in fear before its bloody altars, proves his early priesthood amongst the worshippers of God. And so this rugged sense of justice remains, shattered and defaced it may be, warped by passion, obscured by prejudice, blundering through ignorance and mistake into a thousand errors; yet there it is, a permanent attribute of man, answering back, through conscience as its organ, to the justice that is in God.

In fact, it is just this principle that underlies the whole framework of civil government and law. The magistrate would bear the sword in vain, and all the insignia of empire would be a mockery, if the instinct of obedience were not originally planted in the human breast. The entire machinery of justice in our courts would lock, unless driven by this spirit within its wheels. Conscience is the organ of law, simply because it interprets and enforces before its secret tribunal that unpronounced sense of justice lying at the foundation of our moral nature. Hence, in proportion as this is blunted or fails to be duly educated, men become impatient of the artificial restraints of law; and those gigantic despotisms require to be created, which simply overwhelm resistance by the exhibition of brutal force.

Even this view, however, is not profound enough to exhaust the significance of this primary attribute. The whole structure of religion rests equally upon this basis. What mean those deprecatory rites of every system of worship devised by man, but that the Deity is an object of supreme terror to the transgressor? All the religions of earth, except that of grace in the gospel of Christ, are religions of fear; simply because the

instinctive principle of justice in man prejudices the infliction of the curse. This piercing confession of ill-desert rings through all the penances and tortures, the vows and bloody offerings, by which the avenging justice of a violated law may be appeased. The value of Christianity founds precisely upon this, that salvation is acquired for man through a perfect satisfaction to the outraged majesty of the divine law; and the sinner rests peacefully upon a vicarious atonement, because the sense of justice in him recognises the justice in God, which must assert and maintain the eternal supremacy of a perfect and holy law.

The argument is very short to our conclusion. If there be in man this ineradicable principle, at once the corner stone of religion and of law, and which holds the very fabric of society together, then should we look for its operation through the whole domain of history. It is no dormant property of our nature, but one lying at the root of all human activity in every sphere and relation of life. It may be overlaid for a time, so as to be apparently suppressed. It may vacillate in its judgments, through the conflicting evidence upon which it rests. It may oftener still take a false direction, and render verdicts both unsafe and untrue. It may be clouded by the mists of passion that distort the objects presented to its vision. But from these very causes there will spring an unsatisfactoriness in its earlier decisions, begetting suspicion as to the truth of the finding. It will then go back upon its path, sifting its own prejudices, breaking through the rubbish by which malevolence and ignorance block up its way, placing itself in all the cross-lights shooting upon its search; until a verdict is pronounced which shall lay its unquiet spirit to rest, and the final decree is nailed against the walls of its chancery which the universal conscience of mankind shall accept as "true and righteous altogether."

It will be asked, Where are the chambers of this high court of commission before which old issues are to be thus retried? What judges sit, from whose decree there can be no appeal except to the bar of God? Whence the advocate, who flings his broad indictment over the defamations of all the centuries? These are questions not difficult to answer. The forum, where this

high adjudication is held, is the broad world itself. The public conscience is the judge, roused to honesty by the very responsibility of his function. The intelligence and virtue, the truth and candor of the race, constitute the panel before which the cause is heard. And a sublime Providence raises up the advocates who speak—men of a judicial build, and who have a lofty scorn for all the shams and cheats that are the idolatries of the past. Look at Motley, drawing from the archives of the Escorial itself the damning evidence which had slept for three hundred years, and upon which the Second Philip is convicted as the blackest felon that ever disgraced the purple. Upon the same page too stands the silent William in all the relief of contrast: the man who, out of the loss of every battle, wrung even from defeat and massacre the redemption of his country, and who, in matchless endurance and moral sublimity, is the only prototype in all European history, of the American Washington and of our own immortal Lee.

Look again at Carlyle, with his rugged honesty, piercing through the flams and falsehoods circling around the corridors of history; and in his uncouth, inverted style, redeeming Cromwell from the aspersion of "Regicide." Planting his burly form against the breast of the billows, he rolls back the tide of prejudice from the Puritan Protector, which had swelled against his just form these two hundred years. At the touch of his disenchanting wand, the motley fool's garb, in which the wit and satire of England's great novelist had clothed these "pragmatical round-heads," falls aside; and to-day the verdict of history stands recorded, that all of constitutional liberty which England enjoys is due to these men of robust principle, who, beneath the mask of a fantastic fanaticism, were yet loyal to truth, and had the stubborn will to place law and freedom upon the throne of the Stuarts. And then Macaulay: whose gorgeous colors throw upon the canvas the long struggle of 1648-1688, as the mighty conflict between prerogative and privilege—upon whose issue hang all the chartered rights possessed this day on either side of the Atlantic. Who, too, could have dreamed that, under the constraint of pure historic justice, the Socinian Bancroft would come

forth from all the prejudices of his cold philosophy to be the special advocate of the great Calvin; or that, on the 17th of March this last year, the free-thinking Froude would stand before the University of St. Andrew's to pronounce the eulogy of the Genevan hero—in the memorable proposition, that whatever may be said as to the truth of his dogmatic creed, the only men who have ever wrestled successfully in life's great battle and rescued it from defeat, have been the men who, in some form of philosophy or religion, have recognised the ordinations of a Supreme Will ruling over all the contingencies of this earthly sphere? Surely this does not happen by mysterious chance. These are not solitary and accidental revelations, through a wayward fancy stumbling hap-hazard upon the truth. Consider it well, and you shall find illustrations crowding upon you of this historic justice, unravelling the dark deeds of the past, and bringing you face to face with prejudices that are hoary with age. Somehow, the good who have been stabbed by slander will not sleep in peace. Their restless ghosts wander above their historic tombs, flitting in the dim moonlight, until their spell is cast upon some honest champion of their wrongs. Passions, too, that have shaken the earth to its centre, subside at last. The mists of error and mistake roll up and drift away, after hanging their curtains long around the truth. A holy Providence gives the token of its own judicial process by and by in that lower tribunal it has created in the human soul; and eternal justice throws down its great shadow upon the earth in these solemn historic retractions, the last judicial findings in its court of appeal.

II. We are not, however, remanded to purely abstract reasoning in this matter. History is but the working out of principles and theories, the scope of which can only be known in their practical results; and God has so conditioned this probationary life that, whether for good or evil, these results are permitted to accrue with little of intervention or restraint. By consequence, history is throughout the progress of a trial. Human actions are perpetually passing under critical review in the light of the fruits they produce. In the long unfolding of these we are often

perplexed by the contradictions that emerge and make providence a paradox. Hence men of every faith, and men of no faith, stumble over the scandals of the divine government. Good and evil are jumbled together in a strange mixture. The virtuous and the vile move together upon the same plane, beneath the same protection, and apparently in the enjoyment of equal blessings. Nay, often the discrimination seems to be against the good: who, though declared to be in favor with God and the heirs of eternal life, go with "their heads bowed like the bulrush;" while "the wicked prosper in the earth" until "their eyes stand out with fatness." And men, in their partial induction, leap rashly to the Epicurean conception of a Deity in stately repose, wholly unmindful of the affairs of earth. The mistake lies in forgetting the true character of life as a discipline. They measure the arc of their little segment of providence, and think it the diameter of the entire circle; and from this narrow basis, affect to estimate the stupendous administration of the Almighty. His comprehensive plan takes in the breadth of all the ages. Individuals and nations alike are but single-factors in the final product. The limits even of time are overstepped; and the threads broken by death are woven into a new fabric beyond the stars. Not until the vast tapestry is unrolled before us in the pavilion of eternity itself, and the constituent figures are seen to be wrought with an exquisite unity of design, shall we be able to frame a judgment of the wisdom of the whole. According to the great author of "The Analogy," "the natural and moral constitution and government of the world are so connected as to make up together but one scheme, and that a scheme or constitution imperfectly comprehended." Not until the issue is traced in the connexions that are beyond time, is the solution given to the vast, complex problem of human life. But though unable to sum up all the equations of this problem, there is nothing to hinder the continuous application of the broad principle at each step of the calculation. If the whole history of providence would be understood when gathered into its final result, we may partially try the separate portions of that history by the proximate fruits they produce. Indeed, we are shut up.

to this by a simple necessity; and these fixed conclusions become the stations along the great highway of history, by which we measure our progress, and at which we pause for momentary repose. They constitute new points of departure for successive observations, which are hung up as lanterns in the darkness over the path we are treading.

Accepting, then, the disciplinary character of life, we have the key to the interpretation of history. We no longer wonder at that strange tolerance of evil which has ever been the opprobrium of providence. The divine method, we see, is to give man his opportunity. His true character will work itself out; and the nature and worth of his principles will be determined by the issue. Nothing is wanted but the element of time; and the world will pronounce its irreversible judgment, when the results of his career are fully ascertained. As with the individual, so it is with every corporate society. These, too, run their allotted course, with the full liberty of developing the principles on which they are based. Every false conception of government, like the flaw in cast-iron machinery, reveals itself in some terrific catastrophe, when it has had time to grow warm by friction, and the unusual strain presses against the weak spot. It may lie hidden long, far down amongst the principles untested as yet. But the crisis comes at length, which brings forth its unsuspected power; and with this, the crash that astounds the world.

Here, then, is the second joint in our argument. Misrepresentation and calumny may becloud many an honorable name, and the world lavish its praise upon the traducers for a time; and perhaps so long that the decree may seem fixed forever, which assigns the historic position of both. But when the policy of each shall have run to its conclusion, and the remote effects, as well as the near, have been traced through the lapse of centuries, the vindication is compelled at last. An indignant world rises up in judicial resentment of the fraud so long practised upon its credulity, and takes reprisal for the wrong in the complete reversal of its previous judgment. The decision pronounced is final, because it has been rendered in a court of appeal, and because the evidence is perfect upon which it rests. Indeed, this

is the only species of retribution to which states as such can be exposed. Individuals stand in a definite personal relation to the divine law, and retribution meets them in another world. But corporations are impersonal, and limited in duration to this lower sphere. If, then, the providence of God extend over these at all, it can only be manifested by visiting upon them in their present existence the crimes and follies they commit—very much for the same reason that the vices of men which were against society at large, are overtaken in the immediate consequences that entail; while the deeper sins against the majesty of heaven are reserved for exposure at that solemn bar before which “every secret thing will be brought into judgment.” The universal conviction of mankind of this earthly retribution finds expression in their proverbs, which so pithily represent the collective conscience and reason of the race. “The mills of the gods grind very slowly, but they grind very small.” “The gods are just, and of our pleasant vices make instruments to scourge us;” which is but another rendering of the inspired aphorism, “They shall eat of the fruit of their own way, and be filled with their own devices.” And what was that fine conception of the Greek Nemesis putting a check upon the extravagant favors conferred by fortune, and the avenging deity who sooner or later overtakes the reckless in their faults, but an impersonation of this earthly justice which on its lower plane is the type of the divine, and “vindicates the ways of God to man?”

The illustrations of this from the actual facts of history would involve the transcription of almost the entire record. Let a few examples suffice. Every reader knows how the fierce struggle between the patrician and plebeian orders ran through the whole stormy history of the Roman Republic; but it was only after a searching criticism had subjected the whole career of that martial people to reëxamination, that it was found to be the secret, but real, cause of their downfall. It had its origin in the aristocratic sentiment which identified the state with the founders of the imperial city; whilst its population, enlarged by conquest, were admitted to only a qualified citizenship, constituting no healthy middle order, but really the subjects of a governing class. It

was inevitable that they who bore the burdens and did the fighting of the state, should clamor for the legal recognition of their power; and more than once their open mutiny brought the infant republic to the verge of ruin. The catastrophe was delayed for centuries by that political idolatry of the state which was the peculiar feature of all Roman history. Intermittent wars resulted in the gradual absorption of the Italian States; and then Rome, stepping from Sicily upon the shores of Africa, entered, through the destruction of Carthage, upon those imperial conquests which made her the mistress of the world. "Her empire spread like a vast arch over the Mediterranean basin, with one foot resting on the Atlas, and the other on the Taurus." But there was not inherent strength to bear the weight of the mighty superstructure. With no grand commonalty possessed of clearly defined rights, there was nothing to which the conquered races could be assimilated; and no bulwark could be raised against the tide of corruption flowing in upon the bosom of such enormous wealth. "The Roman aristocracy became intoxicated, insatiate, irresistible—the middle class was gone—there was nothing but profligate nobles and a diabolical populace." Such is the language of Draper, who tersely adds: "And now it was plain that the contest for supreme power lay between a few leading men. It found an issue in the first triumvirate. . . . Affairs then passed through their inevitable course. The death of Crassus and the battle of Pharsalia left Cæsar the master of the world. The dagger of Brutus merely removed a man, but it left the fact. The battle of Actium reaffirmed the destiny of Rome, and the death of the Republic was illustrated by the annexation of Egypt." Thus after the lapse of two thousand years do we summon ancient Rome before the tribunal of history, to be weighed in the scales of equal justice. Thus do we trace the secret source of that strange metempsychosis by which she slipped from a republic into an empire back to a fatal schism in her original constitution, preventing her people from being welded into a homogeneous state. And thus does history lift at last the deep reproach which had settled upon her Gracchi; who pass from beneath the censure of an offensive

agrarianism into earnest patriots who vainly sought to heal the wounds of "the gored state," and stay the ruin by which it was finally overwhelmed.

Look again at Spain. Early in the sixteenth century, by the annexation of Portugal and a political combination with Austria and with England, as well as by her immense possessions in the new world, overshadowing all Europe with her greatness; beneath which the other powers stood shivering with fear; yet in the bosom of her fierce despotism lay the seeds of her early dissolution. In the language of a writer whom we have already quoted, "it was her evil destiny to ruin two civilisations, oriental and occidental, and to be ruined thereby herself." Her intolerant bigotry lost her the Netherlands just rising to opulence and prosperity, through which she might have controlled the commercial interests of the continent. Her expulsion of the Moors, who had become the children of her soil, enriching it with the learning, industry, and art of the East, robbed her of the opportunity, which England seized, of becoming, through her manufactures, the mart of Europe. The lust of gold through the importations from her mines in America, and the consequent diversion of her people from those pursuits by which alone wealth can be created, sunk her into the condition of a mere broker in the precious metals to the rest of the world. And for centuries she has stood "a hideous skeleton among living nations;" a terrible example of that avenging Nemesis, which follows in the track of guilty nations scourging them with their crimes. At this very moment, her empty throne is farmed out by the will of others to a needy adventurer, who, amidst the scorn of her nobles and the derision of all Europe, grasps the sceptre once wielded by a Charles V.

Shall we point to the Socialists and Communists of modern France? The fatal song of the sirens, luring the unwary mariner upon the rock of Scylla, breathed no more seducing accents than those of "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity," which roused the passions of the wild enthusiast dancing around the tricolor of the French revolution. Yet the true import of these insane ravings was soon read amidst the horrors of the Bastille and the

guillotine, until the world stood aghast at the frightful spectacle of blood and crime. And the burning Paris of to-day—spared by the conquering Prussia only to smoulder under the torch of her own incendiaries—tells the bitter fruit borne by that Radicalism which sweeps like the whirlwind through America and through England—the direst foe of constitutional freedom wherever it is found, and which, unless checked by the power of God, will yet sack the very world, and lay the earth in ashes at his feet.

III. The last consideration to be urged upon your attention, will be presented in fewer words. It is, that with all the uncertainty hanging about particular facts, there is in every portion of history an amount of generalized truth, as to which scepticism would be simple affectation. A most remarkable effort has been made in our own day to reduce history to the category of a positive science, by attempting to trace the necessary laws under which human actions are produced. In an elaborate work, treasuring the labors of a studious life, but arrested before completion by the hand of death, Mr. Buckle pushes the reign of inexorable law into the sphere of the variable and contingent. Not satisfied with the proposition that the volitions of the human will are determined by a law of their own, altogether inscrutable by the reason and perfectly consistent with freedom and responsibility, he boldly pronounces that the connexions of cause and effect are as traceable here as in all other departments of nature; where from given conditions the consequences may be anticipated by the power of logic. He proceeds, therefore, to analyse the elements of human character, and to enumerate the possible conditions of human conduct; deducing the conclusion, that human history in all its forms is a natural development like the growth of a tree. This at least is the representation of his theory given by his reviewer, Mr. Froude; who, besides being a philosopher, is also an historian, and who, on the other hand, objects that the phenomena of history never repeat themselves; and that we have not that recurrence and periodicity upon which the inductions of natural science rest. He stoutly maintains, therefore, that “it would be just as easy to calculate men’s actions by

laws like those of the positive philosophy, as to measure the orbit of Neptune with a foot-rule, or to weigh Sirius in a grocer's scale."

All this is immensely typical. Between these extremes, all along the dotted line, there is every shade of credulity in the facts and deductions of history, and every phase of scepticism as to both. In the gloom which hangs about us there is a prevailing tendency to spurn the testimony of all human records. We are in a condition to see how history is manufactured for a purpose; how an impudent partisanship manipulates the facts; how the truth we personally know is suppressed; how gross fictions are stereotyped by endless repetition; how the brand of injurious epithets is freely used to stamp falsehood with the seal of truth; and how misrepresentation and calumny are stuffed into books which circulate around the globe and preoccupy the minds of men. Is it strange if some should morbidly infer that all history is but a romance at best, if it be not also a libel and a slander? To which we reply, that falsify the record of particular and isolated facts as men may, there is a residuum of truth which cannot be destroyed, and which shall be the basis of a safe appeal to the judgment of an impartial posterity. Throw into the region of fable all the achievements of Semiramis and Sesostris, still Assyrian and Egyptian histories will survive, which in the aggregate we are able to measure, and whose precise values we can determine. History delves amidst the ruins of Nineveh and Persepolis, walks around the hanging gardens of Babylon, surveys the temples and tombs and pyramids of Egypt, calculates the physical force which lay in all those ancient despotisms, and then renders her decree. It is, that this long succession of gigantic empires simply held the world until the light of freedom could break from the west—until, out of the bosom of a better civilisation, philosophy and science should rescue it from the dominion of a superstitious and fantastic imagination. It points the wholesome moral, that of all things on earth nothing is weaker than force; and in its calm judicial tone, pronounces the most withering sarcasm upon the ambitions and achievements of the sword.

Regard the siege of Troy as a myth, and renounce all belief in the existence of Hector and Achilles; nay, discount the more veritable record of Xerxes binding with foolish chains the angry Hellespont; or of Leonidas holding at bay the hosts of Persia in the pass of Thermopylæ; or the sublime story of Themistocles gathering the population within "the wooden walls" of his fleet, and standing upon the prow of his own ship to exclaim "This now is Athens:" yet, when you have winnowed Grecian history of a thousand legends and even many of its veritable facts, there at last it stands before you with its indented coastline, and you pronounce to-day just how much Greece has been worth to the world. In the vast pantheon of history, she has a niche which no other nation upon the globe can occupy but herself.

Let Niebuhr with his dissecting criticism prune away the legends of ancient Rome; let the stories of Romulus and the she-wolf, or of Numa and the nymph Egeria, dissolve like the mountain mist: still Roman history remains in its rugged grandeur, throwing its awful form against the back-ground of the sky, working out the solemn problem of government and law, and laying the broad foundations upon which rest the systems of jurisprudence and the constitutions of civil polity still obtaining among men. With precisely similar results we pass through all the galleries of modern history, and unlock the chambers in which the dusty archives of European diplomacy are kept—assigning to each country its proper place in the general combination, and the contribution which each has made in the progress of human civilisation.

What we affirm then is this: That the value of these final generalisations is scarcely impaired by the doubt which may be cast around the truth of this or that particular fact. Contemporaneous history, written in the interest of passion or of prejudice, may be largely a libel; and future criticism may be sorely perplexed to distinguish between the truth and its travesty. Still in the aggregate result these, by a strange smelting process, are sifted out as not material to the issue. As we may poison a single fountain, but cannot poison the broad ocean; so we may

corrupt the isolated facts, but cannot transmute the whole broad history of a people into a lie. A thousand hidden hints of the truth will lie embedded in the record, which antiquarian research will disentomb. The long silent voices will repeat their testimony in the court of final adjudication—and in the solemn decisions of that great Tribunal, the good and the brave will find an honest vindication.

The application of this discourse we shall leave, reader, to silence and to you. "That which hath been, is now; and that which is to be, hath already been." Invective and reproach will, in the sacred name of history, continue to be poured upon those who deserve only her applause. The faithful witnesses of truth will go in cloud and sorrow to the tomb, burying their principles only in a protest. But they will do it in the certain faith of a resurrection. As for their own fame, they can afford to wait. Eternity is long, and it is their life-time. Upon the lip, too, of that boundless sea, their prophetic eye can seize that burnished throne which human justice makes its last tribunal, and before which the nations and the centuries are arraigned for trial. Defamation and slander fall as lightly upon their calm spirits, as the salt spray that crystallizes upon the silent rock. If, too, the warnings of the past, like the prophecies of Cassandra, are heard only to be disbelieved, still let modern despots know they are but sowing the dragon's teeth of an armed and fiercer retribution. Constitutional freedom has not come forth from the conflict of ages, to be stifled now when she spreads her broad shield over two continents. She will reappear again and again amid the birth-throes of regenerated states: for regulated liberty is to the Commonwealth, what piety is to the Church—the very law of its life. Both have struggled through corruption and decay towards a complete realisation. But if the day should ever come, when despotism shall so consolidate its power as to crush human freedom forever beneath its iron heel, then will be consummated the second apostasy of man, after the flood, in the usurpation of Nimrod. Human history will have completed its great cycle, and nothing remain but the summons to the Universal Judgment.

ARTICLE V.

SCHOOLS FOR MINISTERIAL EDUCATION AND
THEIR ENDOWMENT.

There are many traces in the Sacred Scriptures of the fact that those men whom God employed as the instructors and ministers of his Church were prepared for their office as teachers by human culture as well as by those more important influences which came directly from above, changing their moral character, and qualifying them to teach the way of salvation by their personal knowledge and experience. To a sufficient number of them, to selected individuals, did he communicate his truth by immediate revelation. And a sufficient number of these did he inspire to publish the truth so revealed, and to communicate it by word of mouth, or significant act, or to leave it written on the sacred page, using them as his instruments, with the endowments they possessed, or were furnished with in the process, till the work was done. Such was Enoch before the flood, Noah, Moses, the prophets and apostles. But the great body of the teachers of his Church in all ages have been uninspired men, including the long retinue of Levites and priests, of elders and scribes, men, too, whose official position, though of divine appointment, was ordinarily authenticated without miracle to attest it.

But for the most part there is evidence that these men, whether inspired or not, were men who had been disciplined by intellectual culture. The traditions about Enoch would show that this was the understanding of the Jews as to him. The education of Moses, elaborate as Egyptian culture could make it; the eloquence of Aaron; the schools of the prophets; the exceptional call of Amos, who was not the son, *i. e.* a pupil, of the prophets; the residence of the priests together in sacerdotal cities, in part that they might be there trained for their public duties; the choice of Paul of Tarsus, a proficient in the studies and learning of his nation, and that, too, in the Augustan age,

when the influences of the studious men of Greece and Rome told somewhat upon the oriental world; the calling of Luke, "the beloved physician," to be one of the penmen of the Gospels; the engaging and powerful eloquence of Apollos; the education of the twelve under their Great Teacher for the three years of their pupilage, show that when inspiration was superadded, it was to those who had enjoyed rare opportunities of training and culture. And it has not been God's ordinary providence to carry forward his Church by the labors of men who could not teach and would not learn.

It was by the efforts of educated men that the Reformation was effected. Men who could read the Scriptures understandingly in their original tongues, and by the study of these originals burst asunder the shackles of stereotyped error, and set the human mind free from the dark superstitions that had enchained it, pouring upon it as they did from the fountain head those refreshing and invigorating truths so long withheld. And out of the labors of these trained scholars; of that master mind of Calvin that thought to enjoy itself in the fields of literature till the trumpet voice of Farel summoned him under the imprecation of heaven's vengeance to the conflict with error; and of Knox, who had proposed to himself a similar life of study till he was in like manner summoned from it—out of the labors of men of this class in Holland and France did our Presbyterian Church emerge replete with energy, with talent, with culture, and religious life. And having well moulded her discipline and conformed her doctrine to the apostolic standard, she sought to transmit them through well qualified teachers to succeeding generations.

In Scotland she found institutions of learning in existence. For the Romish Church had engrossed the education of youth destined to fill the higher walks of life; or rather, to perform the functions of the priesthood. For this purpose the conventual schools were used, whatever may have been their origin; and when Episcopacy arose, and the moderator or chairman, *cathedralis*, of Presbytery became a perpetual moderator, the large church, where was his *cathedra* or chair of office, was called *the*

cathedral, and schools were formed in connection with it for the education chiefly of the numerous clergy, though not to the exclusion of others. Our fathers in Scotland found it so. Wardlaw, Bishop of St. Andrews, had founded a university in 1411, which was sanctioned by the Pope. To this, other colleges were added successively by other bishops of the See. The University of Aberdeen was founded by the Bishop of that See in 1495 by authority from the Pope; the University of Glasgow by papal edict in 1450; the University of Edinburgh by James VI. on a broader basis, in 1577–1583. These institutions the Scotch reformers found ready to their hand, and availed themselves of them for the education of aspirants to the ministry and others. They came under the care in part of the General Assembly, which exercised the power of visitation over them.

Among the South Britons, the University of Oxford dates as far back as the year 1149, or, according to other statements, to A. D. 872. Oxford was indeed a seat of learning as early as the end of the ninth century. Cambridge became so in the twelfth century. Wood quotes from a sermon preached by an Oxford Master, named Richard of Armagh, before the Pope at Avignon in 1387, a passage which seems to us incredible. "Although," he says, "there were at the studium at Oxford, even *in my time*, thirty thousand students, there are not now six thousand." This diminution he ascribes to the intrigues of the Dominicans. (*Athenæ Oxienses* I., p. 80.) The whole population of the city of Oxford, inclusive of the universities, does not amount to much more than two-thirds of this number now, and we must set down the alleged prodigious attendance upon the university of that day among the equally incredible statements of the numbers which attended upon the instructions of Abelard, or of the Rabbi Nathan at Cordova.

According to one statement the University of Cambridge, England, owes its origin to Joffrid, Abbot of Croyland, who established a school in which Odo, one of his brother monks, read grammar according to the method of Priscian and Remigius; Terricus taught the logic of Aristotle according to Porphyry and the elder Averroes (?); William, a brother, lectured on Tully's

Rhetoric, and the Flores of Quintilian; and Gislebert, a professor of divinity, preached and lectured on the sacred text. This was in the year 1110. The first mention of the university by name is in the acts of Henry the III. in 1231. It would appear therefore that the University of Cambridge, like most of the universities of Continental Europe, originated in entire dependence on the Church. The earlier teachers in these were generally ecclesiastics, and most of the pupils were designed for the numerous church offices which had arisen. Secular students afterwards increased, and eventually laymen were permitted to hold the position of teachers.

The first students of universities assembled for the sole purpose of study, and lodged according to their convenience. Then hostels or boarding-houses were established, first by religious orders, for students of their own order, in which the scholars lodged under certain superintendence. These establishments were afterwards endowed by charitable individuals for the purpose of providing poor scholars with free lodgings. Stipends were subsequently added for the support of a certain number of scholars frequenting these inns, while others were left to provide their own means of living. These paid their own board, and as the number of these exceeded those provided for, these payments became a source of revenue. The original character became modified in process of time, and they were converted into colleges governed by a master, principal, or provost (*præpositus*). There were stipends for a certain number of graduated students usually, who were termed *fellows* (*socii*), who either obtained their fellowships by competitive examination, or according to other rules and limitations of the founders. These, with the stipends above mentioned for undergraduates, constituted one chief part of the endowment of the hostel, hospital, or inn, which thus became a college. In the process of time the instruction of the students came to be altogether conducted in these colleges, the Fellows appointing the professors when the statutes of the founders did not otherwise provide, appointing them frequently from their own number. The Fellows, too, became tutors of the undergraduates. The halls are distin-

guished from the colleges in having no formal incorporation, and were originally without permanent property. Sometimes they originated from private schools set up by individual teachers, sometimes from the association of students coalescing and choosing their own managers. These halls in process of time were furnished with all the means of instruction which the colleges enjoyed, but many of them were absorbed by the colleges and disappeared as distinct institutions. From various sources, from the donations of private persons, sometimes of noblemen, occasionally of princes and kings, all these institutions were more or less endowed with landed property, houses, money, jewels, and articles of value, church patronage, and other means. Originally arising from small beginnings, with accommodations cheap and mean, they were able to provide for themselves buildings of the most permanent materials, and of great architectural beauty. There are nineteen of these colleges and five halls at the University of Oxford; and fourteen colleges and three halls in the University of Cambridge. The number of graduates resident at Oxford, in 1842, was 391; of whom 196 were Fellows. Undergraduates 1,222, of whom 233 were on foundations. The total of residents was 1,613. At Cambridge, in 1841, the number of resident graduates was 274, of whom 154 were Fellows of college; undergraduates, 1,195. Total, 1,469. The University itself does not give instruction. This is committed to the colleges and halls. The University in this republic of letters corresponds with the Federal Government of our own country. Like the States, the colleges and halls have separate jurisdiction, separate duties, and to some extent separate interests. They have their own usages and laws. Each college decides for itself each year on the fitness of its students. The University itself is a corporate and representative body meeting in two houses, the House of Congregation and the House of Convocation, by the latter of which all degrees are granted. Both Oxford and Cambridge are, as it were, cities of colleges, an *imperium in imperio*, the student not amenable to the municipal authorities, but to the government of the University and Colleges alone. It is at these institutions that the clergy of the Established Church are edu-

cated. Until very recently the Fellows of the Universities lost their position and emoluments if they should marry, a remnant of the old law of the celibacy of the clergy under the Church of Rome, during whose ascendancy most of these colleges were founded, and showing to what extent these institutions were originally designed for the education of the clergy. As to the income of the Universities of England and Scotland, adding to these the University of Dublin, and deducting the tuition money, and the value of the benefices at the disposal of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, it is computed to amount to £500,000 sterling per annum. If the tuition money and the benefices in the disposal of the two Universities were added, it would increase the amount to £800,000. The first of these sums, deducting from it the earnings of the Oxford and Cambridge University Printing Houses, which was assumed in 1838 to be about £15,000, would amount to £485,000, or \$2,425,000, and will represent the annual proceeds of the endowments of these institutions which have been conferred upon them by the voluntary donations of the friends of religion and education in Great Britain during the last six centuries.* But to this must also be added the cost of the massive and often magnificent architectural structures, and the rich and extensive libraries which have been derived from the same source. The direct benefits of these institutions have enured to the Established churches, both the ministers and members, of England, Scotland, and Ireland. Dissenters from these have been principally dependent on institutions which they have themselves founded or are annually supporting, the statistics of which are not so easily obtained.

It will be seen that the Church has had much to do in originating these foundations in past ages, and doubtless the prime motive has been the training of ecclesiastical men who might be her leaders or teachers.

*The English Universities. From the German of Prof. V. A. Huber; by Prof. Francis W. Newman, London, 1843, 2 vols., 8vo. *Le Keux's Memorials of Cambridge*, 2 vols., 8vo., London, 1841. *Memorials of Oxford*, by James Ingram, D. D., President of Trinity College, 3 vols., 8vo., London, 1837.

In our own country, Harvard University was the first institution for general education erected. The first appropriation made for it was in 1636. Nathaniel Eaton, its first principal, was appointed in 1637, in which year the Rev. John Harvard, of Charlestown, left it a bequest of near £800, and the college thenceforward bore his name. Sixty years afterwards, according to Cotton Mather, it had educated 460 men, 250 of whom, more than half, became ministers of the gospel. Under the second President, the Rev. Henry Dunster, not only the Latin and Greek, but the Hebrew, Chaldee, and Syriac were subjects of study, and Friday in each week was devoted especially to these. His successor, the Rev. Charles Chauncy, was Professor of Hebrew, and afterwards of Greek, in one of the Colleges of Cambridge, England. His views excited the displeasure of Archbishop Laud, and he found a home in America. He pronounced his inaugural address in the Latin tongue, which he wrote with purity and elegance. He was regarded also as a good oriental scholar. About one-fourth of the graduates of this College are believed to have been clergymen, and until within the present century have been free as a class from heretical doctrines.

William and Mary College, Virginia, was founded in 1691. Yale College was founded in 1700, for the same general purposes as Harvard, and with the same general provisions for education, the object being the "upholding the Protestant religion by a succession of learned and orthodox men." The clergy were the principal promoters of this enterprise. One fourth of its graduates, according to the Triennial of 1836, had been ministers of the gospel.

Dartmouth College arose out of the efforts of Dr. Eleazar Wheelock, of Lebanon, Connecticut, to promote the spread of Christianity among the aborigines of America. Into the school which he undertook, as many ministers of that day and since were compelled to do, in order to supplement an insufficient salary, he received Samson Occum, a Mohegan Indian, whom he kept in his family and educated for four or five years, beginning with December, 1743. This man was ordained as a preacher of

the gospel by Suffolk Presbytery on Long Island; and such was his success as a preacher that Mr. Wheelock was induced to educate others. He was assisted in this by benevolent individuals, by the legislatures of Connecticut and Massachusetts, by the Commissioners in Boston of the Scotch Society for propagating Christian knowledge. In 1766, Mr. Wheelock sent Occum and Rev. Nathaniel Whitaker to Great Britain to raise funds for this object. Occum's preaching excited great attention, about £7,000 sterling were raised—the king subscribing £200, and Lord Dartmouth fifty guineas. This sum was deposited with a board of trustees in London, of which Lord Dartmouth was President, and John Thornton, a wealthy and benevolent merchant, who aided the Rev. Mr. Springer, one of the early ministers of Upper South Carolina and Georgia, in his education, was Treasurer. In 1770 he removed his school, now known as Moore's Indian Charity School to Hanover, New Hampshire. He had meanwhile obtained a charter for a college, whose primary object was to educate pious youth who should labor as missionaries among the Indians, and secondarily to educate persons for the ministry among the English. With such laborers as he could command, like Elijah and the sons of the prophets, he hewed down the trees of the wilderness, and erected first a log hut, in which his wife and daughters were sheltered, his sons and students living for a season in booths, till accommodations for them could be erected. At the first commencement in August, 1771, four young men were graduated. Dr. John Wheelock, who succeeded Dr. Eleazar Wheelock as President of the College and School, and Sylvanus Ripley, who was the first Professor of Divinity in the College, were among them. He presided over the next seven commencements; and of the seventy-two young men who graduated under him in the collegiate department, thirty-nine, more than half, became ministers of the Gospel. One of them, Dr. John Smith, Professor of Ancient Languages, was the author of the first Hebrew Grammar, we believe, that was printed in America; another was Rev. Dr. McKeen, the first President of Bowdoin College, and the Rev. Dr. Burton, of Thetford, Vermont, with whom many of a former

day in that region, studied theology. Dr. Wheelock was a Presbyterian, and the church he founded was originally a Presbyterian church, connected with some twelve or more in New Hampshire and Vermont under the care of a Presbytery, then known as Grafton Presbytery. These churches have now become Congregational in their ecclesiastical discipline.

The College of New Jersey obtained its charter in 1748, and commenced its existence under Rev. Jonathan Dickenson, author of "The Letters on Religion" so much esteemed, at Elizabethtown, where he was pastor. His pupils, after his death in 1747, were placed under the care of Rev. Aaron Burr, of Newark. In 1756 the students were removed to Princeton, where the first college edifice and president's house had been erected, by funds obtained from various sources. The Synod of New York ordered public collections in the churches for the College in 1752. In 1753 they sent Gilbert Tennent and Samuel Davies to Europe to obtain funds, who bore a petition from the Synod of New York to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. This petition sets forth "the want of preachers of the gospel in the colonies of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, and Carolina, and especially in the large settlements of North and South Carolina, where multitudes are extremely desirous of the ministrations of the gospel; but they are not yet formed into congregations and regularly organised for want of ministers." This state of affairs is very impressively presented. And it is added, that "it is to the College of New Jersey only that your petitioners look for the increase of their number; it is on *that* the Presbyterian churches, through the six colonies above mentioned, principally depend for a supply of accomplished ministers." In 1769, under Dr. Witherspoon, subscriptions were ordered by the Synod in each Presbytery; and in 1768 and '69, collections were made by order of Synod for the support of a Professor of Divinity. In pursuance of these measures the Rev. James Caldwell, of Elizabethtown, New Jersey, one of the heroes and victims of the Revolutionary war, visited the churches in the low country of South Carolina and

Georgia to collect funds for the College. This was in the winter of 1770.

Shortly after this, measures were taken by the Presbytery of Hanover, which led to the foundation of Hampden Sidney College in Virginia, a college which, while it has been greatly useful otherwise, has subserved the interests of our Church in its ministry since its first foundation.

It was in such institutions as these that our ministers were chiefly educated. Each of these institutions in this century had its Professor of Divinity, whose principal office for the most part, however, was to act as the spiritual pastor of the college. It became the habit of graduates who aimed at the ministry to resort to the more eminent of the clergy for direct instruction in theology as private pupils, before applying for licensure as preachers of the gospel.

That remarkable man, John Mitchell Mason, D. D., was the first to conceive the project of a Theological Seminary. About the beginning of the present century, he projected the plan of such an institution, to be established by the authority of the Associate Reformed Church, to which body he belonged. This plan he carried into effect in 1804, and of this institution he was the life and soul. To procure a library for it he visited Great Britain, where he left behind him a wide reputation for great eloquence and power. The arduous duties of Professor of Theology were ably discharged by him; but, in addition to this, he was pastor of a large metropolitan church in the city of New York, the editor of the *Christian Magazine* established by him in 1806, and the Provost or President of Columbia College in the same city. The melancholy sequel of these excessive labors, as it has been in other cases, was the premature breaking down of his physical system and his splendid mental endowments.

The Andover Seminary was established in 1808, in part to furnish a more thorough theological training to the rising ministry in that region, and partly to counteract the Socinian tendencies of Harvard University, which were viewed with alarm by

the great mass of the descendants of the Puritans in the Eastern States.

The Theological Seminary at Princeton was founded, and Dr. Archibald Alexander elected Professor of Didactic and Polemic Theology, in 1812.

The Union Theological Seminary in the Synod of Virginia was established, and Dr. John H. Rice, its first Professor of Christian Theology, was appointed in 1826.

The Theological Seminary at Columbia was established, and Dr. Thomas Goulding, its first professor, was appointed in 1828.

It has thus come to pass in our country, that the department of Theology, as well as those of Medicine and Jurisprudence, has been separated from that of the Arts (embracing the departments taught in our colleges), instead of being combined with them as in the universities of Europe. Even where there are Seminaries of theological learning in the same localities with colleges for the arts and sciences, these are held for the most part wholly distinct and independent of them.

This is the necessary result in our extended territory, and our wide-spread Church. For whatever advantages might occasionally enure to a professional school by its close connection with a college, no one college or university in this country could supply that number of theological students which would justify the foundation of a regular school for their instruction.

We do not doubt that there are many advantages which the American system has over the European in the education of the ministry. Except in the preparatory studies, which in some countries are more thorough than in ours, the American system is at once more practical and more thorough, and the educated ministry of our country will compare favorably with that of any other.

As to the way in which the expenses of educational institutions which are independent of the State, are provided for, there is a discrimination to be made between those that are for secular education, and those which are for education for the ministry solely.

As to the first, there are two ways, namely, by permanent
VOL. XXIII., NO. 2.—8.

endowment and casual and constant benefaction, and by payments for tuition, rent of rooms, payments for board where there is a common table, and for library fees, fees of graduation, and other college expenses.

The permanent endowments and casual benefactions are for buildings, for the foundation and augmentation of libraries, for the needful apparatus, museums, and other collections to illustrate the principles and classifications of physical science, funds for professorships, and foundations for scholarships and fellowships, the rewards of merit, or inducements to the needy to seek the higher education which will qualify them to be the leaders and instructors of others. To all these ends, so far as they will reach, may the products of tuition and other fees contribute. And in many institutions they are the chief, if not the only, support of the teachers from the highest to the lowest.

The income of the British Universities arising wholly from endowments, and which we have already mentioned, £485,000, represents, at six per cent., a capital of £8,083,333 sterling, or about \$40,416,665. And yet almost none of this was bestowed by the State. It is the result of endowments of various individuals, male or female, private men, occasionally men of noble rank, sometimes of kings and queens, (but derived even then from their own privy purse,) the growth indeed of long years, but sustaining these grand old institutions, without a perpetual drain upon those who have enjoyed their benefit.

But in relation to those schools in this country designed for direct instruction in theology, the idea of their support in any considerable degree by fees for tuition is preposterous. The compensation of a clergyman is in general no adequate remuneration for his services. It furnishes at best a bare living, and in many, if not most instances, not even that. When a young man, otherwise unable to support himself, is taken away from employments which furnish an ample support to other young men of his age, and his whole time is occupied in a studious preparation for the ministry, the least the Church can do is to provide him, without cost to himself, the facilities of a proper education. A theological seminary must necessarily be a benevo-

lent institution, eleemosynary in the strictest sense. It will have no income arising from tuition, none from any services which it performs. It must be furnished with buildings for the accommodation of students, rooms and halls for instruction, library, refectory; and to these are often added, and of right should always be added, dwellings for the professors. These are to be provided by the liberality of the Church at large, or by persons of generous and liberal soul found within it.

There are two ways by which these provisions can be made. By endowments permanently invested, supporting the institution by their annual revenue, or by constant contributions from year to year for the annual and daily wants of the institution. Both of these methods have been adopted. The Andover Seminary had the good fortune to be founded chiefly by endowments. The names of Abbot, Brown, and Bartlett, are connected with its earlier professorships, halls, and chapel. With large hearts and liberal hands they gave the means of inaugurating the institution without a general and constant appeal to the charities of the churches of that vicinity.

Princeton was established by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, and the means were first furnished by a general appeal to the presbyteries and churches within its bounds. The presbyteries of this region did their share. Their contributions began to flow to it in 1813. Between that time and 1828, when efforts were first made for the foundation of its own Seminary, the Synod* of South Carolina and Georgia had contributed more than \$42,000 to the professorships and scholarships, and for the aid of the beneficiary students of the Princeton Seminary. Five scholarships were founded in it, and another was attempted but not completed; and, in conjunction with the Synod of North Carolina, the endowment of a professorship was inaugurated, the sum of \$15,000 was assumed by the Synod of South Carolina and Georgia, and this pledge we have reason to believe was more than met, especially if we include what was given before this amount was formally voted.

The attention of the Synod was then turned to the endowment of its own institution, which the Presbytery of South Carolina

has the honor of originating. For a long time it had to be supported by contingent contributions, and the names of honored brethren, many of whom are now no more, who had been active for the Princeton effort, men of many virtues, who have well served their Redeemer and their generation, crowd on our memory as we write. But by gradual efforts it became to a large extent endowed, until at the commencement of the war in 1860-1861, its endowments in buildings, professorships, and other funded interests, excluding its valuable library, and without any of the fictitious values an inflated currency gave, amounted to \$229,459. When it came under the care of the General Assembly in 1863, its library debt and all liabilities paid, its endowments, as values then were, could not have been estimated at less than \$330,000. The magnificent donation from Judge Perkins of Mississippi of \$60,000, \$50,000 of which was for seminary purposes, and \$12,000 contributed by the North, are represented in this amount; the remaining \$258,000, with the exception of a few small sums, came from the churches of South Carolina and Georgia, after they had raised \$42,000 for the Seminary at Princeton, and while they were contributing some \$25,000 for contingent expenses. This was in the days of our greater prosperity.

No doubt a similar statement could be made, if we were informed on those points, respecting our elder sister institution in Virginia, that has done so much for the Church. This desolating war came, and the institution at Columbia stood in the path of the conquerors. It is fortunate that its buildings and library were saved, with the loss of but a few volumes, from the incendiary torch which destroyed two-thirds of the city in which it was located and the wealth there deposited. But the reverses we met with swept away two-thirds of its endowment. The churches interested in the institution are called upon for renewed efforts to sustain it, rising, as both our seminaries are, in the increasing numbers of their students, whose services the wide destitutions of the Church call for, and so much need, to fill the places of those who have fallen in these disastrous years, and to overtake the widening of our population in the

newer States. And of the two plans of providing for such institutions, to which allusion has been made, that of immediate endowment is greatly to be preferred over that of perpetual solicitation on the one hand, and scanty generosity on the other.

1. It is most *economical*, calling for the least expenditure of means. The investment of \$1,428.60 at seven per cent. would yield \$100 per annum, if the investment be a safe one, for 100 years, or to the end of time. In fourteen years, and from three to four months, the annual interest will equal the principal without being compounded, and at the end of a century would amount to \$10,000. And this would be the amount which the contribution of \$100 per annum would reach in that time, so that the investment of \$1,428.60 would save in a century \$8,572.40. This may seem a small matter, but in the conduct of a public institution it is of great account. In like manner, the investment of \$14,286 at seven per cent. would yield \$1,000 per annum in perpetuity; \$21,429 would yield \$1,500; \$214,290 would yield \$15,000 per annum; \$285,720 would yield per annum \$20,000. The interest on either of these sums would equal the principal in the time specified, viz., fourteen years and a little over three months. In twenty years' time the endowments would save to the Church in each of these cases, respectively, in the first case, \$5,714; in the second case, \$8,571; in the third case, \$85,710; in the fourth case, \$114,280. If the period should be extended to fifty years, the saving in these four cases of endowment would be, in that time, respectively, \$35,714, \$53,571, \$535,710, \$714,280. In one hundred years the saving to the Church would be in these several supposed endowments, \$85,714, \$128,571, \$1,285,710, \$1,714,280.

Let it be desired to create a library for such an institution. Let us suppose \$15,000 raised for this purpose. Let us suppose that books could now be purchased at the very moderate rate on an average of \$1.25 per volume, which the first purchases for the Astor Library were understood to have cost, a competent agent having been sent to Europe for this purpose. The \$15,000 would purchase at this rate 12,000 volumes. But let the \$15,000 be safely invested at seven per cent., and books be purchasable

at the same rates, and in fifteen years a library of 12,600 volumes of choice books, because more carefully selected, may be purchased by the annual interest of the investment, and the investment remaining intact, to procure a similar number, prices remaining the same, in each succeeding decade and a half of years, through any length of time: Let us suppose some benevolent person is willing to contribute \$3,000 for the support of worthy young men who are without means, while engaged in the study of theology. It would support successively five young men through a course of three years' study, and when fifteen years were past every cent of it would be expended. But let it be permanently invested, and it will continue to support successive students for centuries.

In various ways may the economy of permanent investments be illustrated.

"If," says the *Southern Presbyterian and Index*, of November 23d, 1871, speaking on this subject, "a man should decide to give one hundred dollars annually—say to sustain a professorship—he could, humanly speaking, give the sum annually for ever, by paying twelve or thirteen yearly payments in one. This capital judiciously invested would yield the annual payment, and the giver, should he so decide, can withhold his hand until the thirteen years are expired. Or, let him invest one hundred dollars annually with its accretions of interest, and in eight or nine years the interest will reach the amount of the yearly contribution. Thus, in the course of an ordinary lifetime, the giver really contributes three or four times his original gift, and the annual revenue from his contributions *continues* to the end of time. Suppose he should live fifty years after he begins to give, and regularly pay his hundred dollars to the treasurer of some institution of learning; he would give in all five thousand dollars, all of which would be expended, and his donations would end with his life. But if he should *invest* the same amount as above suggested, and place in the hands of the same treasurer the five thousand and its compounded accumulations, he would really give *five times as much*, and would continue to give five times as much, while his investments would

yield interest long after he had gone to his reward. The fact that he might make the same accumulations for himself, does not apply here as an argument, because the contrast is between annual givings to be *consumed* annually, and the same givings capitalized, or, in other words, shaped into endowments."

2. But where they can be secured, they are the *easiest* and *most acceptable* way of sustaining these important institutions of the Church. There are the great interests which the Church has inaugurated and intrusted to the supervision of its Committees of *Foreign Missions* and *Sustentation*, respect being had also in this to evangelistic labors in new and destitute fields on the one hand, and, on the other, to the relief of superannuated ministers or the suffering families of those who have departed, worn out with toil, and have left their families without any provision for their support; *Education*, the providing proper encouragement and support for the candidate for the ministry, who cuts himself off from those labors by which young men of his age often obtain ample means, that he may devote himself to a life of studious preparation for the ministry; *Publication*, the issuing and circulating of a religious literature of unexceptionable character among our people; the use of the press for this purpose, for promoting the cause of truth and righteousness, and enlightening and stimulating the minds of our people. These call for the constant efforts of those to whom those interests are committed, and of our whole people. It is desirable that they should be left free to the furtherance of these and other interests of a local nature as much as possible. The resolutions and apportionments of Presbyteries and Synods make no impression upon them as to other objects, unless they are constantly pressed upon the attention and conscience; and where there is no one specially charged with obtaining steady contributions to our schools of theology, or not deeply interested in their advancement, they will be forgotten, and laborious efforts and expensive agencies must be continually employed to accomplish the desired end. Shall the Professors themselves leave their studies and their teaching in which they should be assiduously employed, and undertake the business of soliciting funds for their own support? Can the

Church afford to spare their services from their legitimate duties; or can *they* consent to make solicitations in the way of *charity* for that which should be always ready at hand as wages for labor diligently performed, as the needed support of their households, as truly *earned* and as truly *owed* as the wages of the laborer that tills the soil? Shall an agent be continually in the field pleading their cause? The vacant pulpits all over the land answer, No!

The friction is too great, and the weariness of constantly stimulating and being stimulated too irksome on either hand.

It has indeed been pleaded, that if the Church is constantly called upon to give, her members will be kept more fully acquainted with, and more in sympathy with them as the objects of their prayers and their benefactions. But let these institutions be substantially and to a large extent endowed and be placed beyond peril, and there will still be abundant room for additional effort. There will be beneficiary students to be provided for, and a library always needing to be increased—many things indeed to be done.

3. These institutions should have a *permanent* and *stable position*. And this can only be accomplished by permanent and stable endowments. It is true that there is nothing that is not transitory in this sinful world. The fashion of this world passeth away. Civil war may change the values and endanger the endowments of any country where it is waged. Yet the endowments we have referred to in Britain have passed through many seasons of civil strife, through the contentions of rival dynasties, through the war of the Commonwealth and seasons of bitter persecution. And where a people is under just laws, and a regard for right reigns in the heart, these foundations which are made with wisdom for benevolent and religious purposes are as stable as any works of man can be in this imperfect state.

When Rev. John Bampton, Canon of Salisbury, England, bequeathed his lands and estates to the Chancellor, Masters, and Scholars of the University of Oxford, for the endowment of a lectureship in defence of the Scriptures and their doctrines, and to confute all heretics, he performed an important and lasting

service to the Church universal. The income of this estate in 1780 was £120 sterling, about \$600. From that time onward eight lectures have been delivered each year by a competent scholar, selected from the prominent divines of the English Church, the most of which have been published. They have been prepared with great care and research, and have been increasingly valuable from year to year, meeting as they do the protean forms of scepticism and error, in that eternal warfare which the prince of darkness, through his often unconscious agents, is waging with the truth of God. The endowment is not only intact, but must have increased in value; or it never could publish the volumes it does in these days, and reward the authors for their labor.

It may be objected that endowments can be perverted in the lapse of years to the support of error. We own that every thing in this world is liable to corruption. The sacred pulpit itself is not excepted. But God has given us a standard of doctrine in his holy word. And its truths after the contests of ages have been carefully defined and set forth in the Confession and Form of Government of our Church. So long as these institutions are under its direct control, its teachers appointed by itself, sworn to teach those doctrines only which its standards set forth, liable to removal for heresy, incompetency, or neglect of duty, they cannot become corrupt except the Church is so, and they may even point this Church back to its own violated standards if it should in any instance err.

Let, then, these Seminaries of ours be endowed and fully equipped. Let the teachers in them be suitably provided with the literary helps which the labors of past generations and the present have so amply furnished and are multiplying still. Let there be a suitable distribution of the several departments of instruction that there be no temptation, from the necessity of attending to all, to spread one's labors over too wide a surface in this most comprehensive of all the fields of human research. And when this is accomplished, the ultimate fruits of these schools will not only be the well instructed and disciplined men, whose efforts to accomplish the most they can for the Church of God, the salva-

tion of men, and the Redeemer's glory, have been led and stimulated by these their teachers. They will add in the end—those who come after them perhaps more thoroughly than those who have spent their days in efforts to bring these institutions into existence—to the literature of our noble calling and profession.

“We cannot,” says Dr. Chalmers, “imagine a more favorable condition for the formation of a great literary work, that shall have solid and enduring excellence, than that which is occupied by an ardent and devoted professor, whose course, by means of reiterated elaborations, receives a slow, it may be, but withal a sure and progressive improvement. Only conceive him to be fully possessed with his subject, and giving the full strength of his mind to its elucidation; and then, with the advantages of perseverance, and time, and frequent reiteration of the topics of his lectureship, he is assuredly in the best possible circumstances for bequeathing to posterity some lasting memorial of industry or genius. It is by the remodellings and revisings every year of his yet imperfect preparations; it is by strengthening what is weak, and further illustrating what is obscure, and fortifying some position or principle by a new argument, and aiding the conception of his pupils by some new image, or new analogy—it is thus, that the product of his official labors may annually acquire increasing excellence, and gradually approximate to a state of faultlessness, until at length it comes forth in a work of finished execution, and becomes a permanent addition to the classical and literary wealth of the nation. It is not so often by flashes of inspiration, as by power and patience united, that works are reared and ripened for immortality. It is not in the hasty effervescence of a mind under sudden and sanguine excitement that a service so precious to society is generally rendered. It is when a strong and at the same time a steadfast mind gives its collected energies to the task; and not only brings its own independent judgment, but laboriously collecting the lights of past erudition, brings them also to bear on the subjects of its investigation—it is thus that treatises are written and systems are framed which eclipse the volumes of their predecessor, and

taking their place become themselves the luminaries of future ages."*

The history of all literature substantiates these remarks of Dr. Chalmers. "If we except the poets, a few orators, and a few historians," says Adam Smith in his *Wealth of Nations*, "the far greater part of the other men of letters, both of Greece and Rome, appear to have been either public or private teachers; this remark will be found to hold true, from the days of Lysias and Isocrates, of Plato and Aristotle, down to those of Plutarch and Epictetus, of Suetonius and Quinctilian." "Greatly more than half the distinguished authorship of Scotland," according to Dr. Chalmers, "is professorial, the actual product of the labors of professors, in their capacity of teachers, and passed into authorship through the medium of their respective chairs."†

The same is eminently true in the department of theology. Calvin's Commentaries we so much prize are the product of his Theological Lectures.‡ So are the works of Turretine, Pietet, Witsius, Ridgley, Brown of Haddington, Dick, Hill, and Dwight, and others almost innumerable. "Almost the whole of German divinity is the result of professorial duties: there can scarcely be produced the name of any writer of eminence in that country, to whom the leisure, the occasion, and the foundation of his works, was not supplied by these employments."§ The same is true of much of the practical theology designed for popular perusal. Of the forty-seven translators of the English Bible, five only were parochial ministers, the rest were members of Cathedrals, or Professors, Heads, or Fellows of Colleges.

These remarks hold equally of the Protestant cantons of Switzerland, of the Protestant countries of Germany, Holland, Sweden, and Denmark.|| We could establish this by a large array of facts; but these will be sufficient to show that through

*Chalmers on Endowments, Chap. I., Sec. 28. Pusey on Cathedral Institutions, Pp. 59-61.

†Chalmers on Endowments, Chap. I., Sec. 27.

‡Henry's *Leben Calvin's*, p. 342.

§Pusey on Cathedral Institutions, Pp. 62, 63.

||Smith's *Wealth of Nations*.

all Protestant Europe the greatest share of the higher literature, both general and theological, has resulted from the labors of those holding the office of instructors in seminaries of learning. The full benefit of these institutions to our own country has not yet been felt. We are a young people, our institutions young and struggling for existence. The oldest Theological Seminary in the United States has existed but sixty-three years, and has as yet seen but its second generation of teachers. Yet have Drs. Porter and Woods, and Professors Stuart, Murdock, and Shedd, of that Seminary, and Dr. Alexander, the elder, and Addison, his gifted son, Drs. Miller and Hodge, *clare et venerabile nomen*, and others of Princeton; Dr. Robinson and others of the Seminary in New York; Philip Schaff and others of churches differing from each other in their exhibition of doctrine—already made most valuable contributions to the theological learning of our yet youthful country. Nor have our institutions of the South been wholly wanting. Drs. Rice, Sampson, and Dabney of Virginia, Dr. R. J. Breckinridge of Danville, have done something not unworthy in the way of authorship. Our own lamented Thornwell, cut down, alas! in troublous times, and before he had completed in writing those lectures which he had thought out so clearly, and so nobly expressed in that language of which he was master, has left that behind him which will not be suffered to die. Should our Seminaries be continued and preserved free from error, we may anticipate that they will be still richer blessings to the American Church.

It has been in connection with this sense of permanence to which we have alluded, that most of those names which have adorned the Church of our mother land have attained their distinction and influence. Archbishop Cranmer spent twenty-six years at the University, Bishop Ridley seventeen, Bishop Jewell nineteen, Archbishop Whitgift nineteen, Reynolds thirty-two, "the judicious Hooker" seventeen, Pocolcke twelve, Archbishop Tillotson ten, Whitby eleven, Prideaux eighteen, Kennicott never left the University. Some of these men were professors in the colleges, but many of them did not hold this office, but were supported in connection with these institutions, while they

devoted their labors to the interests of the Church. Their names are mentioned merely to show that permanence of situation, to which endowments conduce, is favorable to those scholar-like labors which the Church needs. In a country like ours, with a territory so wide, with much land to be possessed, and a population so rapidly increasing to be overtaken, such long residence at a seat of learning, for any but its teachers, is neither to be desired nor expected.

One of the features of the times that are passing, is the extent and generosity of the endowments which our brethren of the North are bestowing upon their institutions in the Church and out of it. Alas! that *our* people are so impoverished! Even greater is the lamentation that those few that have been comparatively prospered are not imitating such examples. There is probably no higher happiness in this world, than the happiness of that man whose labors have been so prospered that he has acquired the wealth that men seek after that they may expend it on themselves, but who prefers to employ it in founding institutions which will bless the world with their hallowed influences in his own generation, and in those which shall succeed him when he is resting in his grave. "Charge them that are rich in this world," says Paul to Timothy, "that they be rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to communicate; laying up for themselves a good foundation against the time to come, that they may lay hold on eternal life." An inheritance of great wealth is not always the best inheritance they can leave their children. If they are educated in the expectation of large fortunes, it may be to them a curse. This vast estate which comes without effort may be easily dispersed. It may lead to that self-indulgence, and that desire for ease, which will leave no motive for effort, so that this apparently favored child, will be enervated by luxury, will indulge his appetites without stint, a useless drone and cumberer of the ground.

There are other topics on which we might profitably dwell. But we close by adding, that it behooves those who occupy the post of teachers in our institutions of sacred learning, seriously to inquire whether our system of seminary instruction and disci-

pline is all that it ought to be, or is capable of being made. Is it as spiritual, as much illuminated and vivified by our own abiding and living faith in him who is the Light of the world and the Revealer of God? Is it as complete, extending over all those departments of theological knowledge with which an enlightened divine should be acquainted, and in each department illustrating all those topics which revealed religion presents to our view? Is it as thorough, penetrating into those deep thoughts and investigations into which the words of the Holy Ghost lead forth the minds of men? Is it as clear, leaving on the mind of the student distinct and well defined views of the doctrines of revelation, separating the chaff from the wheat, and tracing down through all ages that succession of doctrine which has waged a constant warfare with error, has been the glory and vigor of piety, and is to fill the Church with that energy with which it shall yet contend unto victory with the empire of darkness? Is it as inspiring to the pupils, commanding with authority their powers of attention and thought, stirring up their minds into constant, untiring activity, and forming them to manly effort? Is it based on those great principles, those leading truths, which, once fastened in the mind, become the key to unlock a thousand mysteries, and to settle satisfactorily a thousand questions which may arise in their future lives? Is it as practical, suited to make them prompt and skilful in the discharge of the various and important duties of the ministry, in the study, in the pulpit, at the sick and dying bed, in pastoral labor, benevolent effort, and the cure of souls? They have an office of dread responsibility. They need to be diligent and wise, and to sit continually as disciples at the Saviour's feet, while occupied in training those who are to be the future ministers of Christ.

ARTICLE VI.

SOME REMARKS ON THE QUESTION OF A CALL TO
THE MINISTRY.

In the twentieth volume of this journal (Oct., 1869,) there appeared an article from a writer, highly respected by us, in which is discussed "the popular theory of our Church" respecting a call to the ministry. A threefold statement of this theory is given "in language quoted from the very highest authority;" the first is from Dr. Dabney, who writes: "The Church has always held, that none should preach the gospel but those who are called of God;" the second is from the *Princeton Review*, which says: "It is a first principle not to be invaded, that a call to the gospel ministry is from God;" and the third is from Dr. Thornwell, who thus expresses himself: "That a supernatural conviction of duty, wrought by the immediate agency of the Holy Ghost, is an essential element in the evidence of a vocation to the ministry, seems to us to be the clear and authoritative teaching of the Scriptures." The Reviewer argues that this theory which he has set forth thus in threefold form, is, 1, unauthorised by our Standards; 2, incompatible with the Bible; and 3, inconsistent with our theory of the Church, which is a free corporation, and "makes her own ministers." His conclusion is, that "the theory of a supernaturally appointed ministry belongs to the Prelatists—not to us." Pp. 510, 11, 16, 17, 18.

Touching our Standards, this respected writer asserts that the framers of these documents did not *hold* the theory he combats, else "they would doubtless have distinctly announced it. And yet there is not a sentence which asserts it, nor a word which suggests it, but instead, they have given a definition of the Church which *excludes* it." P. 510. Now the definition of the Church found in the Confession, so far from excluding this theory, declares that "*Christ has given the ministry to the Church for the gathering and perfecting of the saints in this life to the end of the world; and by his presence and Spirit, according to his promise, makes them effectual thereunto.*" Then this Christ-

given ministry, by whom the Spirit works his great achievements to the very end of the world, is described in the Form of Government, Chapter IV., as the first office in the Church, both for dignity and usefulness, as having the oversight of the flock of Christ, feeding them with spiritual food, Christ's minister in his Church, governing it well, God's messenger and Christ's ambassador! Every one of these terms is replete with force and weight; and it will not do for a Presbyterian to make any effort to vacate them. But the Reviewer appeals to our practice. "When any one presents himself as a candidate for the ministry, our presbyteries proceed at once to inquire into his fitness," then they "license him;" and, if he is called by some people, "Presbytery ordains him." This is considered as altogether "free from suspicion of mystery, or the supernatural"—"there is not a step in the whole process which would suggest the thought of a supernatural call, nor one which it seems to us is compatible with it." But to our minds this is by no means evident. The very fact that the man *presents himself* as "a candidate (in the language of our Form) for the holy ministry" is proof that he feels more or less certified in his own mind that he is called of God to that office. And the Book requires that Presbytery at the very outset examine closely and particularly into the motives which have influenced him in coming before them. His first and strongest motive ought to be, of course, that he may obey the call of God, and do his duty. We have accordingly always supposed that one of the most pertinent and needful questions to be propounded to these candidates for the holy ministry, is, whether they feel themselves to be called of God, seeing that such a conviction is one element of the evidence by which the call of God is to be ascertained in the case of any individual man. Each one of these three elements is pointed at in this "process" which our Form of Government prescribes. For, *first*, there are the man's convictions more or less determinate which have brought him to the Presbytery as a candidate; secondly, there are the convictions of some church manifested in their calling him to be their minister; and thirdly, there are the convictions of the Presbytery upon viewing and review-

ing the whole case, manifested in their proceeding to ordain him.

The Reviewer objects, in the second place, to the doctrine of a supernatural and direct call as incompatible with the sufficiency of Scripture. He holds that the Bible is no complete rule of duty, if it does not teach every man whether or not he in particular is called to preach the gospel! This is certainly straining too far the Protestant doctrine. Our Confession says the Scriptures teach "those things which are necessary to be known, believed, and observed for salvation." But where does Scripture tell this man or that man in particular to go and preach, or the reverse? Where does Scripture tell a minister, whether he must accept this particular call, or that one? And what intelligent Protestant holds that the Bible is our rule of duty in such questions, independent of the supernatural guidance of the Spirit? In some things the Bible is a positive, in others a negative rule; but in nothing can it direct us without the Spirit. And the Holy Ghost does sometimes teach what is not written, as when he witnesses to this or that man that he is a child of God.

Regarding the third point, our respected friend lays himself open, we consider, to serious criticism. "The Church makes her own ministers"! Well may he add, "Such as she is, such will they be." And is any better explanation required for the "feeble churches" and the "waste places" which he refers to in the concluding paragraph? Church-made ministers are of course man-made. What we need is just the thing which the Reviewer over-generously gives away to the Prelatists—"a supernaturally-appointed ministry." We want in all our pulpits men authorised by no human power, but supernaturally, to take on them the ministry—men called by a direct, special, and personal vocation of the Spirit.

Not altogether different from this writer's is the ground taken by Dr. Porter in his able article in the last number of this work. He does not deny that a gospel minister has his commission and authority from the Lord Christ; but he does deny that the man called is designated to his own consciousness to this office; or is

made conscious that it is Christ who calls. He considers that this would amount to a revelation—nothing less; and constitute a call as “extraordinary” as that of the apostles and prophets. It is not denied that the Holy Spirit convinces of the duty; but in regard to the *manner* of this operation, three theories are possible: first, a direct communication of his will without the use of any means; secondly, a conviction wrought through the ordinary means, yet so as that the individual is assured that it is the work of the Spirit; thirdly, a conviction wrought in such a manner by the use of means that the person is not conscious of any supernatural influence. Now the first and the second suppositions, it is maintained, both imply a direct revelation. If the individual called is assured that it is the Spirit who calls, “then that amounts to a revelation—is a revelation.” P. 73. “If any receive such an influence of the Spirit, he cannot describe it, or explain it, or prove it, except by a miracle. If it is so given as to impart to his own consciousness an assurance that it is from the Spirit of God, he only can know this. If it has reference to a question of duty, it is a revelation.” P. 77.

A great deal which is said by our friend respecting the Spirit's mode of operation through the word, is true and is important to be said; but it may be allowable to observe that, as we conceive, he has sometimes given expression to views which cannot be sustained, and that the general drift of the article appears to be rationalistic and unscriptural. The view taken of the call, we are constrained to say, is much too low. Not content with questioning the Spirit's ever acting directly and immediately on the soul independently of the use of outward means and instrumentality, he especially objects to any consciousness on the individual's part, any assurance that it is Christ who calls. Pp. 71, 93, 94. He will allow that one may come to a conviction of his being called to preach “through the exercise of his rational faculties, under the teachings of the Scriptures and of providence, and under the influences of the Spirit with and through these;” but denies that the man called can have any certainty that it is God who calls. This is to deny any higher view of the call than is expressed by the Reviewer of 1869, when he says the

“man decides whether or not he shall preach the gospel.” S. P. R., Vol. XX., p. 511. The divine commission is vacated of its power and value, when it is robbed of the evidence of the man’s own conscience; and his conscience tells him nothing of force and value, if it does not tell him that the Holy Ghost calls him to the work. Dr. Porter frequently asserts what the previous writer denies, that the call is from God; but he might just as well deny that *God calls*, as deny that the called man *hears, and knows that it is God who calls* him. It is a clear contradiction in terms to say that God calls and God commissions a man to preach the word as his ambassador, and yet deny that he makes known to the individual that he does call him and commission him.

I. The first error which may be charged on Dr. Porter’s article (in which also the former one may share) is its misapprehension and consequent misrepresentation of the views of Dr. Breckinridge and Dr. Thornwell. Another writer is associated with them in the charges made; but he is alive, and we undertake the defence only of the dead.

Dr. Porter alleges that “any putting forth of the power of the Spirit in a call to this office” other than “through ordinary instrumentalities,” any “direct and immediate operation on the soul” of a man called to the ministry, “affirms a revelation” additional to Scripture; and that “the idea of any special and particular revelation is unauthorised and fanatical in the present order of the divine kingdom,” “opens a wide and dangerous door to fanaticism, superstition, and blind enthusiasm,” and carries us “at once within the region of blind human fancy and imagination, and of Satanic influence.” Pp. 79–82. And he quotes several sentences from Dr. Breckinridge’s celebrated sermon on the Christian Pastor, and from Dr. Thornwell’s review of it, as expressing this dangerous theory.

Now this short extract quoted from the sermon on the Christian Pastor does not fairly represent the doctrine of its distinguished author; and, as that discourse is not generally accessible, we undertake to set forth his views more fully and fairly.

The topic is thus introduced: “It is manifest that unless men were directed individually by a divine infallibility, we cannot

trust to their individual decisions that they are divinely called to such an office as this; nor is it less clear that nothing less than miraculous powers on their part, or a divine illumination on ours, is sufficient to enable us to decide individually with infallible certainty on the value of such pretensions. And yet it is of supreme importance that both they who minister, and they who are ministered unto, should not err in such a case. Nor need they, if they will deal humbly, faithfully, and honestly with God, with their own souls and with each other." He proceeds to expose (as Dr. Thornwell expresses it) "the futility of the three prominent theories to which almost every form of error upon this great subject may be ultimately reduced." Reserving for subsequent consideration the true vocation of a Christian pastor, Dr. Breckinridge makes three classes of all other pretensions to the call—"of pretensions to the call which are not founded upon a real call of God properly *authenticated according to the provisions of his word.*" The first class are those pretensions which claim to be *extraordinary*, and for these he insists that extraordinary evidence should be produced. The second class are such as rest on a perpetual succession transmitting the office from Christ the Head, which succession is a question of fact to be proved by testimony, and the validity of the title founded upon it a doctrine to be established by Scripture. The third class are the pretensions of the fanatics, who claim "that every one is the sole judge in his own case, and necessarily must be, and that all other evidence but the convictions of his own mind is inconclusive and needless." Next, he points out, 1, how it is the prerogative of God alone to select those who shall have authority in His Church; and 2, how the validity of His call to any man is evinced by the testimony of the individual's own conscience; 3, by the approbation of some congregation; and 4, by the concurrence of the Presbytery. He declares concerning the first of these three elements, what Owen had declared before him,* that "the clearness and force

*The more excellent any work of God is, the more express ought our call unto it to be. Owen on Heb. v. 5.

of our conscientious convictions [regarding any duty which we are required to perform] should be analogous to the magnitude, the perplexity, the difficulty of the contemplated duty. For a man then to presume to be an ambassador for Almighty God, and that touching questions no less awful than the glory of his throne, and the endless state of his rebellious subjects, without a settled conviction in his own soul that this fearful trust is laid on him by the King Eternal, is insane audacity." Then follows the passage quoted by Dr. Porter, in which the indispensable necessity is set forth of this "settled conviction in the man's own soul" as one of three elements of the proof that he is called of God. But this testimony of conscience, says Dr. Breckinridge, is not final and conclusive. It "cannot be sufficient evidence to others;" it "needs to be enforced even to ourselves by other and concurring proofs." We may "deceive ourselves" and be "deceived by others, into a conviction that we ought to preach the gospel." Hence the necessity of those other two links of the chain of evidence. "He who cannot in his ministry build up the saints, cannot have from God any part of the work of the ministry;" and, "beyond all controversy, the saints are the best of all judges" respecting the ministrations on which they wait. He who cannot obtain the testimony of the people, "seems to me to be shut out of the ministry by the direct prescriptions of the word." This is one of the two links. Here is the other: "The final testimony which we want to the fact that we have been divinely called to preach the everlasting gospel, is that of a divinely constituted spiritual court met in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and acting by his authority."

Reviewing this noble sermon, Dr. Thornwell said, in our number for December, 1847, that "a supernatural conviction of duty, wrought by the immediate agency of the Holy Ghost, is an essential element in the evidence of a true vocation." He goes on in the next sentence to say, that men are not led to the pastoral office as they select other professions, but "are drawn, as a sinner is drawn to Christ, by a mighty invincible work of the Spirit. The call of God never fails to be convincing." But the converse of this last statement he does not utter, viz., that the

man convinced, never fails to be one called of God. He proceeds to say, "No man ought to enter the ministry upon mere conjectural grounds. . . . If there be a calling, in which at every step in the progress of our labors we need the conviction that God is with us, that we are in the line of duty prescribed by his own eternal Spirit, that calling is the ministry of the word. A man ought to have assurance that he is no intruder, before he should dare to assume responsibilities at which an angel might tremble. He should have a commission certified to his own mind from the King of Heaven before he should venture to announce himself as God's ambassador or Christ's herald. We do not say that his assurance will never be disturbed, or that his mind will never be tossed with doubts; but we will say, that he never can preach in peace and comfort and hope as long as he is troubled about his authority to preach at all. The assurance of a call to the ministry is like the assurance of our pardon and acceptance, subject to many fluctuations, preserved by faithfulness, dependent on humility and singleness of heart—a source of joy when clear; of agony when darkened or disturbed. We can not persuade ourselves that a man, who never had this assurance at all, has ever been called of God." In concluding his review, Dr. Thornwell repeats: "The doctrine of a divine, supernatural call to the ministry, by the immediate agency of the Holy Ghost—evinced by the testimony of conscience, the approbation of God's people, and the sanction of God's judicatories—we hold to be alike the doctrine of our Standards and of the Sacred Scriptures."

It is now submitted that these statements are not very extravagant or alarming ones. The very first quotation made from Dr. Breckinridge's sermon, shows how far he was from wild *enthusiastic* notions about the infallibility of any man's conscience, and respecting the value which belongs to extravagant pretensions. He never dreamed (any more than Dr. Thornwell did) of asserting that every man must be called of God who is so convinced in his own mind, although his view of the subject requires the converse proposition, viz., that whoso is called of God never fails to hear the call and to be convinced

that he does hear it. But he very clearly points out the nature of the *extraordinary* call (strictly so called), which must always be evinced "by the signs of an apostle;" and the absurdity of that fanatical claim "which in its very nature denies the necessity of any proof at all." Surely in the light of all the passages produced from his sermon itself, he cannot be charged with uttering one word too much as to the awfulness of the ministry of reconciliation, and not one word too earnest regarding the necessity to every minister of a "settled conviction in his own soul that this fearful trust is laid on him by the King Eternal." The reader is doubtless ready to acknowledge, notwithstanding what has been alleged against his doctrine, that Dr. Breckinridge, on this topic, spoke words of truth and soberness.

As for Dr. Thornwell, who declared that he was uttering what had "long been" his "fixed and deliberate convictions on the subject," the reader will be very slow to conclude him guilty of any extravagance. He speaks of a "supernatural conviction of duty, wrought by the immediate agency of the Holy Ghost;" but proceeds in the very next sentence to show that he had in mind an operation of the Spirit similar to that "mighty, invincible" one by which he "draws sinners to Christ." Dr. Porter does not deny that in that work the Spirit acts directly on the soul. Why should Dr. Thornwell be charged with wild, fanatical ideas, because he ascribes another similar, direct, and supernatural operation to the Holy Ghost? His analysis of Dr. Breckinridge's views of the call, given on page 135 of his review, (a part of which we borrowed above) should have been enough to show that his own opinions were sober ones. He warns against entering upon the dreadful cure of souls on conjectural grounds. Fools rush in where angels fear to tread; but a man who would venture on the work of an ambassador for God, ought to be certified to his own heart that he is no intruder, but has received his commission from above. Dr. Thornwell talks of no extravagant pretensions to any infallible call, but he wants an assurance of the call like the assurance of his own pardon and acceptance. Dear honored brother and beloved man of God! the

assurance which he coveted on both the points was to be the offspring of no proud self-confidence of human wisdom or human righteousness, such as fanatics always cherish, but "dependent," as he expressed it, "on humility and singleness of heart." He was clothed with humility beyond most of his brethren. And few, indeed, are there amongst them who can justly lay claim to more sobriety of judgment.

II. A second objection which may be made to Dr. Porter's article, (applying also in some degree to the former,) is, that by its making too little of the individual's convictions of his own direct and special call, both the call and the ministry are disparaged. Our friend indeed admits, yes, over and over again declares, what the former writer denies, that the call is from God; but in explaining *how* God calls, he repudiates any such divine operation in the soul as to his own consciousness designates the man to the office, on the ground that this constitutes an extravagant and delusive claim to inspiration. On page 73 this is expressly set forth *even in reference to the supposition that the Spirit "brings the soul to this conviction by and through the ordinary means."* "By whatever means or instruments the Spirit communicates a knowledge of duty, if it be done in such a way as imparts to the consciousness of the individual an assurance that it is the Spirit who communicates it, then that amounts to a revelation—is a revelation." The doctrine of any direct and supernatural call is held up as carrying us at once and necessarily into "the region of blind human fancy and imagination and of Satanic influence"—as placing the evidence of the call in a state of feeling which "prevails most amongst the ignorant and the deluded," and which "is the peculiar and almost universal claim of heresies and false religions." P. 82. "In whatever way such a call may be described, whether as a conviction of duty, etc.; . . . if it is referred to a direct and special agency of the Spirit, it affirms a revelation," (pp. 79, 80,) and then, "if the evidence of such a call to his own consciousness be necessary, . . . it is sufficient of itself without being submitted to the judgment of the Church, for such a call authenticates itself;" "or, if it be held that nevertheless such a call must

be authenticated to the Church, then it would seem to follow" that they must have similar "extraordinary" testimony. P. 81. Thus, the claim of having a settled conviction in his soul that the fearfullest of all trusts is laid on him by Christ, which conviction he is assured is the direct work of the Holy Ghost—such a conviction is held up by Dr. Porter as identical with that claim to inspiration made by fanatics, which Dr. Breckinridge signalises as "denying absurdly in its very nature the necessity of any proof at all." The settled conviction we speak of, both Dr. Breckinridge and Dr. Thornwell treat as one of three needful elements of the evidence that God calls—this first element not being sufficient of itself to evince any man's call, but needing confirmation by the Church's testimony and by the Presbytery's testimony. But Dr. Porter insists that any such testimony as that of a conviction which claims to be the Spirit's work and to be recognised as such by the man's conscience, either is a Satanic delusion, or carries us at once into the region of such delusions. Who ever claims to have such convictions is an enthusiast and a fanatic. Of course Dr. Porter and the two writers we defend are very wide apart. And our second objection to his article, is this denial of the spiritual and internal element in the call, and this low, rationalistic depreciation of that element as fanatical and dangerous. To deny that the man must needs hear the call if God does call him, seems to us a rationalistic denial of the true spiritual. To disparage the special and peculiar call of God's ministers, is to disparage his ministry itself.

Our friend says "it is fatal" to the theory of a supernatural call "that it is contradicted by *facts*," and he declares that "multitudes of faithful ministers have had no consciousness or knowledge of such a call." No doubt faithful ministers in general would repudiate with horror a call which is so fearfully conceived of and described—the call of fanatics and enthusiasts, which authenticates itself, and in its very nature denies the necessity of any confirmation of it. But a settled conviction in his soul, wrought by the Spirit, and certifying to him that he

does not run unspent, and that he goes not alone, but has Jesus Christ with him, guiding, sustaining and succeeding him—this assurance we believe no true minister of God ever did entirely lack, whether it were more fully or less fully communicated to him in the varying dispensations of the Spirit. With Dr. Thornwell, we can not “persuade ourselves that a man, who has never had this assurance at all, has ever been called of God. We see not how such a man can have the testimony of a good conscience. Conscience supposes light; but in this case, according to the very terms of the supposition, there is no light.”

Dr. Porter appeals under this head to the case of Calvin, Knox, and Halyburton. The history of their call gives no place, he says, to the theory of the supernatural vocation. Let us look at one of Calvin's utterances on the subject which our brother would fain explain away. The great Genevese is treating of the call, and announces that there are four heads of the subject: *Who* are to be made ministers, and in *what way*, and *by whom*, and with *what ceremony*. He begins by saying: “I am speaking of the external and solemn call belonging to the public order of the Church. But that secret call of which every minister is conscious to himself before God, and of which he has not the Church for a witness, I omit to speak—I mean the good testimony of our heart, that neither from ambition, nor avarice, nor any other base motive, but out of a true fear of God and desire to edify the Church, we undertake the offered office. This is indeed necessary for every one of us (as I have said), if we wish to approve our ministry to God.” Mark the words “secret call” distinguished here from the outward and public call of the Church, which he goes on to say even bad men may obtain. Mark the words “conscious to himself before God” and “necessary for every one of us [ministers].” Mark also the words “true fear of God” which must lead the man to undertake the office. And then say if Calvin does not hold to a supernatural conviction of duty, wrought by the immediate agency of the Holy Ghost—a settled conviction of a fearful trust imposed by the King Eternal, as the necessary secret experience of every

true minister. The original is appended for the reader's satisfaction.*

But what are those "circumstances and history of Calvin's call to the ministry, so well known," which "give no place to the theory" opposed by Dr. Porter? How much is certainly known by any body alive about Calvin's call and ordination? In the Romish Church, as we *do* know, he received only the *tonsure* administered when but twelve, and which may be received by boys after the age of seven. It did not put him into "orders." See Henry, Vol. II., Chap. II. Calvin himself says that "it was not a thing peculiar to the clergy, but used as it were by all." Inst., Book IV., Chap. XIX., § 27, French copy. So, then, he was not ordained in the Roman Catholic Church, nor if he had been, would that have constituted a call suitable to the purposes of Dr. Porter. But was Calvin ordained in the Reformed Church? From Beza, we learn that there was a Presbytery at Geneva when Calvin first went there; and Calvin tells Sadolet that his ministry at Geneva was "by a legitimate vocation;" and Francis Junius says Luther and Zwingli received ordination in the Romish Church, but Calvin was ordained "by those who preceded him," which is understood to refer to Farel and Viret and others, who were at Geneva before him. Other points of evidence are dwelt on, but we conceive not with absolute success of argument by Dr. Miller in his letters to Presbyterians; and by the American editor of Sibson's Translation of the Life of Calvin by Beza; and also by Dr. Smythe, of Charleston, who has elaborated the point in his "Calvinism Defended." But it is to be observed that all which either of these writers undertakes to make out is, that the Reformer was

* De externa et solenni vocatione loquor quæ ad publicum ecclesiæ ordinem spectat: arcanam vero illam, cujus sibi quisque minister coram Deo conscius est, ecclesiam testem non habet, omitto. Est autem bonum cordis nostri testimonium, quod neque ambitione neque avaritia, neque ulla alia cupiditate, sed sincero Dei timore et ædificandæ ecclesiæ studio oblatum munus recipiamus. Id quidem unicuique nostrum (ut dixi) si volumus ministerium nostrum Deo approbare necessarium est. Instit., Lib. IV., Cap. III., § 11.

ordained *after* he settled in Geneva. Now it is quite certain that Calvin was a public preacher in Paris and elsewhere amongst the Protestants in France years before he went to Geneva, and the question is, How did he get his call to *that* work? In his preface to the Psalms we read, that "God overcame him by a sudden conversion" whilst he lay "in the deep slough of Papal superstitions." He says that he was at once inflamed with the desire to learn the truth more fully, but that "before the year was past all who were desirous of pure doctrine were coming to me to learn, who was myself but a novice and a tyro;" he describes his shamefacedness and desire for seclusion, but that all places were made to him "like public schools" by the people running after him; and he says "God led and whirled him about and gave him no quiet till, contrary to his own disposition, he was brought out into light and action." As early as 1530, according to Henry, (Vol. II., Chap. II.,) he was preaching with great force in the assemblies of the Evangelical party in Paris and its surroundings. Not yet more than twenty-one, he was already at the head of the Reformation in France. Without any call from the Church in the form of ordination, but moved by a mighty supernatural conviction from the Spirit of God in his heart, he is called to preach, and obeys the call against all the inclinations of his retiring nature. Surely Dr. Porter can find little in all these "circumstances of Calvin's call to the ministry" to counterwork the theory of a direct and specific call of God.

Then as to the circumstances under which Calvin entered on his ministry at Geneva, it may be questioned if there was any thing in them which can help our friend to show that the Spirit of God does not operate very directly and specifically in leading men into the ministry, and guiding them also to particular fields of labor. It is well known from Calvin himself, that he "intended to spend only one night there, but was kept from proceeding to his coveted retirement by "the terrible threatenings of William Farel, which were as if God had seized me by his awful hand from heaven." He would have excused himself from the work, and did not yield, until Farel, like some old prophet,

adjured him in the name of the Lord. This solemn adjuration appears from his own account of it, to have struck terror by the power of the Holy Ghost into the soul of that mighty man, and then with a subdued and child-like spirit he gave himself up to the will of God interpreted to him through Farel. Bungener says that he yielded "with the profound conviction that he was yielding to God and not to man. . . . He loved to recall that scene, 'that fearful adjuration' he would say, 'as if God from on high had stretched out his hand to stop me.' Pref. to Psalms. He recalled it in woe, taking courage from the thought of that hand 'stretched out from on high' to lay hold of and support him; he recalled it in weal, to thank God for having chosen and sustained him." Bungener's Calvin, Book II., Ch. V.

Again, after his expulsion from Geneva, he was disposed once more to retire to a life of private study when, as he also relates in his Preface to the Psalms, Bucer, following the example of Farel, adjured him in the name of God to accept a new appointment. "Terrified by the example of Jonah, which he held up before me, I again accepted the teaching function." It is still this inward conviction that God is calling him, which Calvin does not dare withstand.

In like manner, we know that afterwards, when Geneva, now penitent, was urging her minister's return from Strasburg, and he was so loth to comply, it was Farel who was once more employed to rouse within his soul the conviction that he ought to go back. Then we hear Calvin pleading: "You can testify that I have been held back by no other bond than this, that I dare not cast off the yoke of the calling which I believed to come from God. . . . I solemnly declare, however, that I am not acting deceitfully towards God, nor seeking a pretence to escape." Letter to Farel, October, 1540. Again we find him writing thus: "It is surely known to you, that though I should fear the call, I do not flee from it." Letter of April 24, 1541. And again, "I might have refused if my conscience had suffered it, for although I excused myself with all earnestness, I would not go to extremities, lest I might have the appearance of resisting both man and God." Letter of May 4, 1541. At length yield-

ing again to the call, which was pressing on his conscience, he says: "If I had the choice, I would do every thing rather than what you wish, Farel. But as I am not left to my own choice, I bring my heart as a sacrifice and offering unto the Lord. . . . I know that in this matter I have to do with God, who can see through such deceits. I therefore submit my bound and subject heart to the duty which I owe to God." And in the same Preface to the Psalms quoted above, he tells how unwilling he was to put his shoulder again under the burden of that charge in Geneva, but how at length the feeling that it was his duty to God, and his fear of offending him, forced him to the step.

Now all these circumstances of the history of Calvin's original and subsequent calls as a minister, taken together, can hardly be said "to give no place" to the theory opposed by Dr. Porter. Indeed, it may be said that the reference to the Reformer's call and ministry was a somewhat unfortunate one for him to make; and that, in fine, of all the "illustrious names" with which it might have been useful and pleasant to adorn his argument, there is hardly one which it would not have been better for him to employ than that of John Calvin.

But are the circumstances and history of John Knox's call to the ministry such altogether as give no place whatever to the theory which the Reviewer opposes? It will be remembered that Knox had been ordained a priest in the Romish Church, but had been deposed for his Protestant heresy. He becomes tutor in the family of Hugh Douglas, of Langniddrie, a gentleman who had embraced Reformed doctrines, and has another gentleman's son also to teach. But he taught them religion as well as the languages, and so managed it (says McCrie) as to allow the rest of the family and the people of the neighborhood to reap advantage from it—he catechised them publicly, reading a chapter of the Bible, with explanatory remarks. *Life of Knox*, Vol. I., p. 43. He does the same thing afterwards in the castle of St. Andrew's. He is urged by many who enjoy his ministrations to preach in public. But (says McCrie, p. 52,) "he resisted all their solicitations, assigning as his reason that he did not *consider himself as having a call* to this employment, and would not be

guilty of intrusion." They would not desist however, but by agreement, unknown to him, on a fixed day, after a sermon on the people's power to call whom they would, he was publicly addressed by the preacher, John Rough, and solemnly adjured, in God's name, to undertake the office. He attempted to speak, but overwhelmed with emotion, burst into tears and rushed out of the assembly and shut himself up in his chamber. "His countenance and behavior from that day till the day that he was *compelled to present himself* in the public place of preaching, did sufficiently declare the grief and trouble of his heart"—is his own account of the exercises of his mind. "His distress of mind on the present occasion," says McCrie, p. 57, "proceeded from a higher source than the deficiency of some external formalities in his call." He proceeds to explain, that what terrified Knox so much was chiefly the dreadful care of souls. But he says, (p. 58): "*Satisfied at length that he had the call of God* to engage in this work, he composed his mind to a reliance on him who had engaged to make his strength perfect in the weakness of his servants, and resolved with the apostle, not to count his life dear, that he might finish with joy the ministry which he received of the Lord to testify the gospel of the grace of God." "I have little doubt," says McCrie, p. 57, "that he looked upon the charge which he received at St. Andrew's, as principally constituting his call to the ministry." McCrie means of course that this charge constituted his *external* call. It was all the external call which he had, for it is very certain he received no ordination with imposition of hands. And this sketch of the circumstances of his entrance on the work, shows conclusively, we think, that, led by a sense of duty, Knox was actually preaching long before his public external call to the work officially; that moreover he held to the necessity of an internal, specific, divine call to the work officially; that he had more or less definitely heard that call within, but that resisting it out of his dread of the responsibility it involved, he was, partly through the circumstance of Rough's solemn appeal to him, at length "*compelled*" (using his own expression) "*to present himself in the public place of preaching,*" and undertake the ministry he

had received of the Lord; and that Rough's solemn appeal constituted a call from the church, she having seen in his expositions of Scripture, and other edifying discourses, the evidence of God's having indeed called him to the ministry. Knox was actually, but not formally, a preacher before the Church called him, and the work she called him to, was not simply preaching, but the pastoral charge.

Touching the case of Halyburton, it is sufficient to remark, that whilst he refers in his autobiography to two ministers urging him to enter on trials, and then another minister, and then the Presbytery of Kirkaldy, yet throughout the chapter he is very full and distinct in his declarations "*of the Lord's making it out*" to him that he "*ought to change his station.*" Of course the theory opposed by Dr. Porter does not assert that the individual's convictions are *always first in the order* of the three elements which evince the call. "The Lord made it out" to Halyburton—"the Lord removed" his "scruples and cleared" his "mind" by means of the arguments of the ministers and Presbytery, or else, not having any personal conviction of the Lord's call, he had never preached.

Our brother reasons also from Scripture against the theory of a supernatural call, appealing to those passages in 1 Timothy and in Titus which give the character and qualifications of the bishop or presbyter. Full and particular are the instructions furnished, and yet "no mention of the necessity of any direct and immediate call by the Spirit—not a word requiring of them a consciousness, conviction, or declaration of any such call." And he holds it to be very "remarkable, that while these scriptures go into such particulars and details to guide the Church in appointing ministers of the gospel, they omit altogether the one qualification which the advocates of this theory make the one most necessary and essential." P. 83. Now we reply: 1. These passages are not a description of *preachers as such*, but of bishops or presbyters or rulers, made overseers, however, by the Holy Ghost. Surely, this breaks the force of the argument. Let our brother consult those passages where the preacher's work and office, as such, is really described by Paul in his account of his own min-

istry, and he shall find references in plenty to the call of the Spirit. 2. The theory opposed by Dr. Porter does not hold up a settled conviction wrought by the Spirit in the candidate's soul as one of his qualifications for office, but deals with it as constituting (the qualifications being all found to exist) one element of three which demonstrate the call of God. The question of qualifications or gifts is, however, of course, fundamental to the individual's convictions, as well as the Church's convictions and the Presbytery's convictions. But 3. We turn Dr. Porter's argument against himself: these two passages with their "full and particular instructions" say nothing about any sort of call at all, whether from the Spirit, or from the Church alone without the Spirit—and is our friend now willing to apply his own rule, and object that any call whatever "is inconsistent with the teachings of the word, or at least adds to its instructions on this subject"?

Our brother takes considerable pains to get Heb. v. 4, out of his way. Owen says the proper design of the words, "No man taketh this honor to himself," etc., was to set forth that Christ was called, as Aaron was, to a new priesthood, immediately and in an extraordinary way; so that the passage does not refer to an outward ordinary call; and the things disputed about the necessity of that kind of call are foreign to the intention of this place. This may be granted, so far as relates to the *primary* design and intent of the apostle's reference. But Owen adds, that those things are "true in themselves"—that is, the things urged about the necessity of the call, albeit this place does not *primarily* refer to them. And Owen himself makes use of the passage, just as is generally done, to set forth the necessity and solemnity of God's call. One of his "*Observations*" on the passage we have already quoted in a note to page 292. Another is: "It is an act of sovereignty in God to call whom he pleaseth unto his work and especial service. . . . There is the same sovereignty in his ordinary calls." Another is: "The highest excellency and utmost necessity of any work to be done for God in this world, will not warrant our undertaking of it or engaging in it, unless we are called thereunto." Owen,
VOL. XXIII., NO. 2—10.

therefore, would certainly not say with Dr. Porter, that the use and application of this text to set forth, that none may undertake a church-office "without a call similar to that of Aaron and our Lord, finds no shadow of support," for he makes that use of the passage himself. It is one thing, of course, to expound, and another to apply a passage of Scripture. It appears to be clear that the Holy Spirit did intend to signify by this passage all the truth set forth by Owen in his "Observations" as quoted.

Our brother quotes two passages from Owen's Exposition of Hebrews vi. 7, 8, but withholds the best portion—and that which connects his quotations together. It gives an account of "the woful work" they make, who are "sent of men, but not of God," to dispense the gospel. "Preaching," he says, "as to its proper ends depends only on God's sending." "I speak it not as though outward order and a due call were not necessary in a Church unto the office of a teacher; but only to show that all order without a concurrence of the divine vocation is of no validity or efficacy. Now the dispensation of these spiritual gifts . . . depends solely on the sovereignty of God. 'The Spirit divideth unto every one as he pleaseth.' . . . 'The whole of it depends, like the giving of rain, absolutely on his pleasure. And when men exclusively unto this part of God's call, will keep up a ministry and so make a preaching of the gospel, it is but a lifeless image of the true dispensation of it.'"

As Owen's Works are in hand, two or three more extracts may be here allowed, bearing on the present question, the like of which might be produced from his writings by the score:

"To say it is *divine and supernatural*, is to say that it is *not of ourselves*; but that it is the grace and gift of the Spirit of God, wrought in us by his divine and supernatural power." Reason of Faith. Works, Vol. III., p. 292.

"And if there be not a conformity unto him [Christ] herein, no man can assure his own conscience, or the Church of God, that he is or can be lawfully called unto this office." True Nat. of Gosp. Church. Works, Vol. XX., p. 401.

"For no sense of insufficiency can utterly discourage in the undertaking of a work which he is assured that the Lord Christ calls him unto." *Ibid*, p. 452.

These extracts from Owen will suffice as a test of the correctness of Dr. Porter's allegation, that Owen "never once mentions, except to exclude from entering into a call to the ministry," that supernatural conviction, which is "vital and fundamental to the theory we oppose." It is freely admitted that Owen's writings abound with rebukes and warnings against the enthusiastic spirit so rife in his times, and that he was led by discovering on every side of him such swarms of delirious sectaries of every name, to give great prominence in many of his discourses to the monstrous evils of fanatical delusion on the part of pretenders to immediate revelations; but it cannot be allowed that the great theologian ever called in question the Holy Spirit's direct and special dealings with the individual conscience. On the contrary, we affirm and stand prepared to prove it, that his works abound with the most express testimonials to the Spirit's direct and immediate operations on the souls of men. Our age has its own peculiar form of spiritualistic heresy, but it has another tendency also the very opposite of what is spiritualistic—it denies the supernatural. As always, so now the truth lies between false extremes. Owen can be quoted largely against one of the two extremes; but it is a great error to charge him with himself running to the other. He is as far as possible from denying or excluding the supernatural. If he were alive to-day, he would not be found striving to depress, but rather to elevate the tone of the prevailing sentiment amongst us upon this solemn question of a call to preach the gospel.

In connection with these remarks touching Owen's position, another may be ventured with reference to the imperial authority Dr. Porter would confer upon this "prince of theologians" to settle "all theological questions doctrinal and practical." Owen may cheerfully be accepted as a chief exponent and a most illustrious and worthy representative of the Reformed churches, without being set over Calvin and all others as our friend is disposed to place him. But it may perhaps be questioned, whether the great Independent is indeed worthy of the supreme confidence which Dr. Porter would have us repose in him, when, leaving the general field of theological doctrine, he

comes specifically to treat of the Church in its relations to the ministry. Sundry passages are quoted from Owen, and relied on by our brother to support his views, in which that eminent divine dwells emphatically on the part which the Church has in calling men into the ministry. He is represented as making the possession of gifts "the *material* call, and then the *formal* call is when the Church tries, elects, appoints, and ordains the person to the office of the ministry; the two together constitute a complete divine call, according to the will and authority of the Lord." P. 93. Now it would be perfectly easy to produce other passages in great quantity from Owen's writings, which might fairly be set over against what Dr. Porter has produced, showing that in some respects he has not fully apprehended him. But, not to take that course of argument, it is to be remarked that, as is well known, the principles held by Presbyterians and by Independents respectively diverge from each other very widely as concerns the office-bearers and the members in the Christian Society. Presbyterians draw a very broad line between the rulers and the ruled, and make these to be two fundamentally different classes having altogether different positions in the Church. But Independents or Congregationalists deny or extenuate this distinction; and one main ground they build on is the idea that all right to church-power is to be traced to the right possessed by individual believers, *as such*, to every privilege purchased by Christ for his Church. *Church-power* is one of these privileges, and thus it belongs to any and every individual believer actually to possess and use every portion of church-power according to the rules prescribed, on the ground that, as a believer, he is one of God's sons. It is on this ground thus set forth and explained, and by Owen himself, (*True Nature of a Gospel Church*, Chap. III., § 5,) that *any suitable number of individuals* are held amongst Independents to have the power *formally to constitute themselves into a church and set apart certain of their number to fill church-offices*. This is Owen's own statement and language. Dr. Bannerman in his "Church of Christ" (Vol. I., pp. 264-268) dwells forcibly on this clear and broad distinction between the Presbyterian and the Independent

systems. But he labors to prove that Owen approximates more nearly to the Presbyterian view than was to be expected from one occupying his ecclesiastical position. It never entered, however, into Bannerman's mind to represent the eminent Independent as the highest possible authority for Presbyterians upon such a question as the Church's part in the call to the ministry.

III. We are thus led to object distinctly, in the third place, to Dr. Porter's article, that it assimilates too much to the very faulty representations which the former writer made of the Church's relations to the call. Both writers seem to have followed (Dr. Porter expressly claims it for himself) in the footsteps of Neander upon this matter—of Neander who is by no means always a safe guide. The article of October, 1869, says, "The Church *makes* her own ministers. [The italics ours]. She takes of her own sons and sets them apart to this work. And she will select those who best represent her own spirit. Such as she is, such will they be." And again, the minister needs "no supernatural power, gifts, or calling any further than the humblest Christian." And so the article in the last number dwells much on the call of all Christians equally and alike to a holy calling and a high vocation; and while its author admits a diversity of gifts and ministries, yet he lays down this general principle: the special call of each is "determined by his particular gifts and ability." He is "called to do for his Lord that which he is able to do." "The *power to do* [the italics his] defines the duty and creates the call." P. 66. The Church is to select and appoint men "to proclaim that truth in the name and on behalf of the Church—to speak for the Church—to give utterance to the voice and testimony of the Church." P. 69. And "the gifts and qualifications which impart ability to fulfil" this office, "and the appointment thereto by the Church, constitute a *call* to that office." P. 70. All these extracts might pass for quotations from either the great Independent theologian, or the great Lutheran Church-historian; but there is more of the same sort which we must set forth. "In bestowing the ability or qualification for any work, or the opportunity lawfully to acquire them, the Spirit indicates his divine will that that person should perform

that work. Thereby He designates him both to himself and the Church to that ministry and office. The possession of the gift is the call to the work." P. 95. "The Church finding those on whom the Spirit has bestowed suitable qualifications and abilities, calls and appoints them thereto." *Ibid.* "Any one so placed in the office of the gospel ministry is truly called of God." *Ibid.* Thus the ability to preach, as the Church shall be satisfied that a man possesses it, without any inward conviction of his own that he is called to the work, for that is rather a bad mark—a sign of the fanatic, being a claim to special revelation—this ability to preach recognised by the people is all the call any minister needs! And thus all the objections which have been urged to the direct call of the Spirit culminate in the assertion that the call is directly from the Church, and but indirectly from God. Not God directly selects and thrusts forth the laborers, but the Church makes the selection in God's stead. She finds men having the gifts and she appoints them to preach for her, and so they preach for Him. And the ground on which she is to proceed in appointing her preachers is simply gifts possessed by them—the power to do creates the call. Every one able to preach is called equally and alike, and equally and alike the Church ought to call all such into the ministry. The former writer closed his article with these words: "Under the combined influence of our popular theory of a supernatural call, and our rigid requirements as to learning, the supply of ministers in our Church falls far short of the demand." And now Dr. Porter has a very easy way for supplying this demand—it is to lay hands on every man having the *ability* to preach, whether he feels inwardly persuaded of his call or not! The idea is preposterous! The common sense of the people would revolt against such a measure, and their fear of God confirm their opposition to it. What we want is better preachers, rather than more preachers—more life and power in the ministry, rather than more ministry. Instead of shutting out the Spirit of God from this work of calling men into the ministry, let us more implicitly confide to him the selection of them. Instead of putting the Church into the Spirit's place, let us call on her to go to her knees in earnest

prayer for the Lord of the harvest himself to thrust forth laborers into his harvest.

IV. There is one more objection to be made to Dr. Porter's article, and that is its erroneous representation of the Spirit's action in the call. Disparaging, as we think, in the first place, the individual's convictions, and secondly, exaggerating the function of the Church respecting the call, we have now to say, that it appears to us he fails to state properly the Spirit's part in this matter. The examination of this point will carry us to the very heart of the question.

And here it will be expedient to define exactly some few terms which are cardinal in this discussion. The first of these is "*revelation*." This signifies the immediate and direct communication of God's will to men which is contained in the Scriptures. This is the strict sense of the term, and no Christian will object to it. Dr. Porter would insinuate that it is never used properly except in this strict sense; and that there is in fact no other communication of God's will to men, except by and in this written word of revelation. But the Scriptures teach us that the word itself cannot convince or convert or sanctify men; and that the inward supernatural teaching of the Spirit is required in order to any saving knowledge of the truth. And accordingly Paul prays for the Ephesians to have given to them "the Spirit of wisdom and *revelation* in the knowledge of God." There is the word of revelation therefore, and there is also the Spirit of revelation. God reveals himself therefore, not by the word only, but by the Spirit and the word. As Dr. Charles Hodge expresses it, "God does hold immediate intercourse with the souls of men." Syst. Theol., Vol. I., p. 67. *Revelation* therefore signifies, in a wider sense than what is given above, any communication of his will which God makes to men. And the question between us and Dr. Porter, is, whether or not God can and does communicate, or reveal, his will to those whom he calls into the ministry by any direct teaching of the Spirit. We affirm that he can and does, and Dr. Porter denies. And he aims to employ this word *revelation* against our doctrine of the call, by charging that it supposes new "*revelations*" to the dis-

paragement of the written word of God. We shall look into the justice of this charge after a little.

Another term on which this discussion hinges is "*extraordinary*." There are extraordinary office-bearers of the Christian Church, as apostles and prophets, and in one aspect evangelists. There are extraordinary calls to office such as apostles and prophets had. There are also ordinary office-bearers and ordinary calls to office. The extraordinary call was sometimes by an audible voice from God, and sometimes by a vision appearing to the individual, and perhaps by yet other manifestations of this character. But whenever God commissioned a man to extraordinary office, and by such a call, the man and his commission were authenticated to those to whom he was sent by extraordinary signs. Now Dr. Porter denies that in the ordinary call of God to ordinary office in his Church there is or can be any direct and immediate operation of the Spirit upon the soul of the man called, that he can be conscious of being called, or conscious that the Spirit of God is communicating such a call to him. And against our doctrine, which affirms such direct and immediate teachings of the Spirit, our friend endeavors to derive some advantage from confounding such teachings with the extraordinary call of apostles and prophets. Because that call was in one sense of the terms *direct, immediate, specific, and infallibly assured* to the man called, which extraordinary vocation he was able to certify by doing miraculous works, we are not allowed to affirm, on the authority of Scripture, that the ordinary office-bearers of the Church now are called, in a different sense of the terms by *direct and immediate vocation* of the Holy Ghost. The penalty of such scriptural affirmation inflicted on us by Dr. Porter is our being charged with claiming for ordinary ministers and the ordinary call what belonged only to the *extraordinary*.

Another of these terms is "*supernatural*," which means that which is not by nature, but above it. The supernatural is the divine and the spiritual; those things of the Spirit which the natural man can not know, because they are spiritually discerned. Dr. Thornwell explains the terms as signifying the "spiritual, resulting from the gracious illumination of the Spirit."

Writings, Vol. I., p. 36. This is evidently the sense in which he applies it to the call, when he says that an essential element of the evidence of a true vocation to the ministry is a "supernatural conviction of duty, wrought by the immediate agency of the Holy Ghost." What we affirm is, that the call is from the Holy Ghost himself to the man called, and that he is conscious of being thus supernaturally called. This Dr. Porter holds to be fanatical and dangerous. According to his view, the call must not be considered other than *natural*—from the Spirit indeed, but only through the operation of means. This word "natural" may not be used by Dr. Porter, but he certainly condemns the term *supernatural* in reference to the call. And so it comes to this, that while the whole operation of saving grace is indeed supernatural—there being a supernatural Agent and a supernatural work by him, this supernatural Agent commissioning men to preach supernatural truth, and effecting by his almighty power a supernatural salvation—yet must we not dare to say that this initial part, this fundamental act by which he commissions his messengers to carry the news of salvation to perishing men, has in it aught of the *supernatural*! Every other part of the system may be held to be supernatural, but to apply such a term to this special, peculiar operation of grace, which is wrought upon a comparably small but incomparably honored company of Christ's disciples, by which they of all the household of faith are separated to the grandest and most solemn business done amongst men—to apply to this the term *supernatural* opens the door at once to enthusiasts and fanatics!

There are two other terms of frequent occurrence in this discussion—the terms *direct* and *immediate*. It is evident that Dr. Thornwell used them to signify, *first*, that the call is *specific*,—of this particular man, to this specific work. "The call to the sacred profession is not the absence of a call to any other pursuit—it is direct, immediate, powerful to this very department of labor. He is not here because he *can* be no where else; but he is no where else because he *must* be here." A *second* sense in which these terms are used by Dr. Thornwell is the sense of there intervening as a medium between the conscience

of the called and Him who calls, *no human agency*. This appears from his language respecting President Woolsey's ordination. The call is to be direct and immediate, impressed on the heart by God himself, and not interpreted to the individual only by other men. The terms *direct and immediate* relate to the question whether the Church and the Presbytery can certify to any man that he is called, unless he have the inward persuasion of his own conscience also. They do not so much relate to the question how far the word may come in as the means of indicating to the called his duty Dr. Thornwell did not deny, and we would not deny, that the Holy Ghost makes use of the word in impressing his call upon the individual conscience—the general truths of the word respecting the necessity of the ministry, the work of the ministry, the benefits of the ministry, etc., etc. But what we insist on is, that the word furnishes no special declaration touching any particular individual's duty to preach the gospel, and that it is not of itself sufficient therefore to set forth his duty in the premises without the direct and immediate teachings of the Holy Ghost.

There are two particulars of the greatest consequence in which our friend appears to us to forsake the doctrine both of the Scripture and of our standards. 1. He denies all direct and immediate action of the Spirit in the call as unscriptural and fanatical (pp. 79–82); and he denies that the Spirit ever, by direct and immediate action, communicates any knowledge of truth either of doctrine or duty. P. 78, note. These two denials are one and are to be objected to as at once unscriptural and dishonoring to the Spirit. 2. Again further, he denies that the subject of the immediate action of the Spirit, whether a sinner being regenerated, or a believer being sanctified, can be conscious of such action (p. 77, note); and he denies that when the Spirit works a conviction of duty in the soul of any man by the ordinary means, he ever does impart to the individual's consciousness an assurance that it is the work of the Spirit. P. 73. These two denials are also one and are to be objected to as subversive of the doctrine of Assurance.

1. Touching the former of these two particulars, it is manifest

that the sole purpose of the denials made, is to take out of the Spirit's hand any *direct* part in calling men into the ministry, and to diminish also his *direct* influence in regeneration and sanctification. True, as to the call, it is the Church indeed which is thus to be exalted at the expense of the Spirit; as to regeneration and sanctification, it is the word. Both these—the Church and the word—are of course great and glorious things: the Spirit's workmanship and means of working. But neither of them may be put above the Spirit. The Church must indeed be limited to the word, but the free action of the sovereign Spirit may not thus be hampered. But our brother, in his zeal to overthrow the doctrine of a supernatural call, would like to prove that the Church herself is competent to make her selection of men, and each man whom she calls able, through the word, to decide his duty, without any direct aid of the Holy Spirit!

Now all sound orthodoxy admits that the Spirit acts immediately in regeneration. The dead sinner can neither hear nor feel the word, and the gospel must therefore come “not in word only, but also in power, and in the Holy Ghost.” The exceeding greatness of his power—his mighty power, which he wrought in Christ when he raised him from the dead,—this it is which enables and persuades the sinner to believe, and gives to him new life. Every word of this Dr. Porter accepts. Whence, then, his anxiety to make out that the Spirit does not communicate any knowledge of truth in his direct and immediate acts of regenerating, or of sanctifying? Pp. 77, 78, note. It is simply that he may magnify the word. But why exalt the honor of the word as against him who gave the word, and whose breath it is? It is but an instrument, while the Spirit is the divine agent who makes use of it. What authority is there to make it the Spirit's *indispensable* instrument? Dr. Hodge says, to confine the Spirit to these channels of communication, viz., the word and sacraments, is unscriptural; for he works when and where and how he will. And he points out how this is the Romish, Anglican, and Lutheran error of making *causes* out of what are but *means* in the sovereign Spirit's hand; whereas the Reformed

“confine the Holy Ghost neither to the word, nor to the sacraments.” Systematic Theology, Vol. II., pp. 664, 665. What right has any man to dogmatize on such a deep mystery as the Spirit’s way of working on the soul, and undertake to define how much of that ineffable operation is accomplished by direct and immediate exercise of power, and how much by moral suasion through the truth? If we can accept the truth that the Holy Ghost directly and immediately quickens every dead sinner, so that he can begin to hear and understand the word; surely we need not stagger at the doctrine of the sovereign Spirit’s immediately operating on the soul of believers to communicate the knowledge of truth and duty. To communicate life is certainly the greater, and must include the less which is the communication of knowledge. To communicate life surely is to communicate all the knowledge given and possessed. As against human reason, therefore, as against the inward light of super-scriptural fanaticism, as superior even to the Church of God herself, we may well be zealous to uphold the honor of the word—but surely it is labor lost to strive at the protection of the glory of the word as against the Holy Ghost.

Our brother pleads that the Scriptures, according to their own testimony and the faith of the Church, “are the only and sufficient rule and guide of duty.” We submit that the doctrine of all Protestants is, that they are indeed the only *rule of faith and practice*; but that Dr. Porter is not warranted in making them our *guide*. Our Confession is very definite in its statements on this point. It acknowledges the necessity of the Spirit’s illumination, and makes the Spirit, speaking in Scripture, the Supreme Judge and Arbiter of truth for us. We submit, also, that mankind cannot dispense with a divine guide, not only for the reason that we are by nature blind, and must be enlightened from above, but also for the reason that the infallible rule of faith does not and cannot give us specific directions touching every point of our duty. In some things they are only a negative rule and not a positive one; only a general rule, and not a precise and specific one. Some questions of duty they cannot from the nature of the case determine otherwise than negatively and generally.

The world would not contain the books that must have been written had God intended to give us a written rule of practice touching every case we might all be called on to decide. But we have the Spirit to guide us, and we are taught to pray that he may guide us into all truth and all duty. We need to hear and we do hear his voice saying to us: This is the way, walk in it. Frequently indeed we are perplexed about the choice between two or more ways set providentially before us; but we want no new external revelations to guide us—the word is sufficient as a rule, taken negatively when not positively. Yet we do need, and in the goodness of God we have, a guide whose secret, inward monitions are made directly upon our hearts, and conduct us in the way in which we should go.

In regeneration, then, the Spirit, as is confessed, acts immediately and directly, as well as with the word, upon the soul; nor is it to be supposed that the truth coöperates with the Spirit. It may in certain cases not even accompany or attend the work of the Spirit. When the infant, the insane, or the idiot, is regenerated, who may venture to assert that the Spirit requires to use the truth at all? Regeneration is new creating, and as Dr. Hodge expresses it, affords “no place for the use of means,” any more than creation or miracle-working. And yet, of course, the regenerating Spirit does not only *enable*, but also *persuade*, men to embrace Christ as offered in the gospel. Systematic Theology, Vol. II., p. 685.

But there are some other ordinary operations of the Spirit on the heart which cannot be denied to be direct and immediate. They are such as he is carrying on continually in the Church, and will not be confounded by any with those extraordinary exercises of his grace and power referred to by our friend, such as revelation or inspiration. One is the communication of gifts for ecclesiastical office. The use of means may increase the measure of these, no doubt; but in the original *χάρισμα*, surely the Spirit is not confined to the channels of the word and sacraments. Take eloquence, or energy, or prudence, or take what Dr. Thornwell calls well, “the characteristic qualification for the ministry—the unction from on high.” Surely each of these

is manifestly the immediate gift of the Spirit. Our brother indeed asserts (p. 95) that this bestowal "is by and through means and instruments;" but he offers no proof, and we do not suppose that he could offer any. His view of the subject is not sustained by those to whom he would defer with great respect. Dr. Hodge says expressly that these gifts are not conveyed or effected through any such instrumentality as the truth; they are special operations of the Spirit. The Scriptures which Dr. Hodge quotes are such as speak of Bezaleel and Aholiab, the seventy elders, Joshua, Othniel, David and others. *Systematic Theology*, Vol. II., pp. 665, 666. Elsewhere he speaks of the operations and influences of the Spirit as "supernatural," and says the doctrine of the workings of the Spirit in the hearts of his people, "makes all the difference between Augustinianism and Pelagianism, between Rationalism and supernatural Evangelical religion." *Ibid*, Vol. I., Pp. 614, 615. And Dr. Owen, in the *Discourse on Spiritual Gifts*, justly styled "admirable" by our brother, very largely proves from Scripture that these ordinary gifts are to be distinguished from graces; are distributed by the Spirit according to his sovereign pleasure; the principal end of them is to enable church-officers unto the due administration of Church ordinances; they are not attainable by our own diligence and endeavor in the use of means, "no, not as under an ordinary blessing upon them, because they are arbitrary largesses or gifts which the Holy Spirit worketh in all persons severally as he will," so that "there is an immediate operation of the Spirit of God in the collation of these spiritual abilities."

Such being the manner of the Spirit in furnishing men with gifts for office in the Church, upon what ground can it be denied that he directly and immediately calls them to undertake office? The only ground appears to be, that any such direct call of the Spirit is "a new revelation," which it is fanatical to assert. But can it be dangerous to say the Spirit calls directly and immediately into the ministry, and yet safe to maintain that directly and immediately he fits and qualifies for that work?

2. Touching the second denial of Dr. Porter, it may be ob-

served that he makes it in very positive terms. The subject of the Spirit's direct operations, whether in regeneration or sanctification is not conscious of these operations, but only of their effects (p. 77); and the Spirit never imparts to the consciousness of the individual called into the ministry an assurance that it is the Spirit who calls him (p. 73); and to hold that the Holy Ghost ever puts forth a direct and immediate agency upon the souls of Christians in ordinary times is the sign of ignorance and the result of ignorance (p. 78). Now, in opposition to these statements, the old scriptural Reformed theology asserts another ordinary operation of the Spirit which is direct and immediate, viz., his witness to our spirits. Owen in his "Reason of Faith" describes the assurance of faith as "the work of the Holy Spirit enabling us to believe by a supernatural, immediate revelation of his mind unto us." This kind of assurance is of the essence of faith and belongs to the work of regeneration. But there is also the assurance of hope which is not of the essence of faith, yet is attainable by believers through the sovereign dispensation of the Holy Spirit to whomsoever he will. Our Confession sets forth plainly both these aspects of assurance; and it denies this witnessing of the Spirit that we are God's children to be any "extraordinary revelation." It is of course a very specific item of truth which the Spirit witnesses to a believer when he assures him that he in particular is a child of God; but it is not to be reckoned an *extraordinary revelation*, as though it makes a prophet of the man, or as though it disparages the completeness of the word as the only rule of faith and practice; or as though it vacates the ordinary means of grace of their legitimate value and efficacy. It is attainable without any other means but the ordinary ones, for the Spirit, in so far as he uses means at all in dispensing his grace, uses the ordinary and appointed ones. But the Spirit is not tied to the means and he sometimes sees fit to act immediately. It is an immediate act of the Spirit when he witnesses with our spirits that we are the children of God, for it is not the word which he uses. Our own particular election and salvation is not written in the word. What the Spirit testifies with our spirits, is something they can

not learn themselves from the word, something the word does not contain. The word teaches the way of life. When we are in that way and walk, as Fisher's Catechism expresses it, "in a track of holy and self-denied diligence in the way of commanded duty," then, as Fisher quotes from Isaiah xxxii. 17: "The work of righteousness shall be peace, and the effect of righteousness quietness and assurance for ever." When we love not in word, neither in tongue, but in deed and in truth, then do we know that we are of the truth, and shall assure our hearts before him. And if our heart condemn us not, then have we confidence toward God. Thus our works do justify our faith, and the fruits prove to ourselves as well as others that the tree is good. But this is not the witness of the Spirit, but the witness of our own heart and life. There is another and higher which coöperates with this, and it comes directly and immediately from the Holy Ghost. Two witnesses concur to assure us of salvation—we must not deny either the one or the other. But the denial is, that we can be conscious of any direct action of the Spirit. What then is the witness of the Spirit worth to us if we cannot know that it is his? How can he constitute an earnest, a seal, a pledge, a token of our acceptance, if we cannot be conscious of his presence and operations within us? As well deny the Spirit's witness at once, as deny that we can be immediately conscious it is his.

Now if the Spirit sometimes witnesses directly and immediately to believers that they are the children of God, and they can know that it is he who assures them, why should it be held a thing incredible, either that he can and does move on the heart communicating a direct and special call to the ministry, or that the heart moved on can and does recognise the Spirit in that operation?

But Dr. Porter declares that views of the Spirit's direct and immediate agency in ordinary times are held only in proportion to the ignorance of the holders of them.

1. Let us ask the great Owen, "prince of theologians," what is his opinion. In his "Causes, Ways and Means of Understanding the Mind of God," he gives us his opinion, by quoting Ephe-

sians i. 17-19, where Paul prays for the "Spirit of revelation" to be given those to whom he was writing. Without the effectual illumination of the Spirit, they would not be able to understand God's mind in the Scriptures. It was not however "a new, immediate, external revelation from God" which Paul desired for them, but "an internal, subjective revelation." And then Owen describes some in his day, who insisted always that the gospel is "rational," and that it is "fanatical madness" to talk of any special aids of the Spirit in order to their fully understanding the word. But the great theologian insists on the Holy Spirit's being "the immediate author of all supernatural effects and operations in us," such as the illumination he was speaking of in that treatise. Again, in his "Discourse of the Holy Spirit as a Comforter," he discusses what that is whereby God gives assurance to believers. And he concludes that it is "not any act of the Spirit in us that is the ground of our assurance, but the communication of the Spirit unto us." And he asserts, on the authority of 1 John iii. 24: "That God abideth in us and we in him is the subject matter of our assurance: 'this we know,' saith the apostle, which expresseth the highest assurance we are capable of in this world. And how do we know it? Even by the Spirit which he hath given to us." He proceeds to declare again, contrary to Dr. Porter, that it is not simply the effects of the Spirit's operation we are conscious of, but his own indwelling in us itself. Works, Vol. III., p. 221. London Ed. of 1826. And he repeats again (p. 223) that "it is not any act or work of the Holy Spirit on us or in us that is called his being an *earnest*. It is he himself who is this earnest." And again, whereas Dr. Porter objects to any influence of the Spirit if the subject of it "cannot describe it, or explain it, or prove it, except by a miracle," (p. 77,) the great theologian says that "this spiritual experience which believers obtain through the Holy Ghost in such as cannot rationally be contended about, seeing those who have received it cannot fully express it, and those who have not cannot understand it, nor the efficacy which it hath to secure and establish the mind." But as for "those internal aids whereby he establisheth and assureth our minds,"

“it is in vain for any to pretend unto the name of Christians by whom they are denied.” Reason of Faith. Works, Vol. III., Pp. 295-303. London Ed. of 1826.

2. Let us confer with Dr. Charles Hodge. He distinguishes “Mysticism, which claims immediate communication of divine knowledge and divine life from God to the soul, independently of the ordinary means,” from “the doctrine of spiritual illumination as held by all Evangelical Christians. The Scriptures clearly teach that the mere outward presentation of the word does not suffice, . . . there is need of an inward, supernatural teaching of the Spirit producing what the Scriptures call ‘spiritual discernment.’ This supernatural teaching our Lord promised to his disciples.” “Hence believers were designated as *πνευματικοί* . . . and men of the world, unrenewed men, are described as those who have not the Spirit. God therefore does hold immediate intercourse with the souls of men. He reveals himself unto his people as he doth not unto the world. He gives them the Spirit of revelation in the knowledge of himself. Ephesians i. 17. He unfolds to them his glory and fills them with a joy which passes understanding. All this is admitted; but this is very different from mysticism.” The difference is threefold, as Dr. Hodge goes on to explain: 1, Mystics have new revelations; 2, through no use of the means of grace; and 3, instead of the word, their minds are filled with their own imaginings, but the Spirit impresses the word and he is to be sought by prayer and the other means, and he causes the word to dwell in us in all wisdom and spiritual understanding. There is but one rule of faith by which every doctrine of men is to be tried; but the Spirit is a needful guide and teacher. The evangelical doctrine of the illumination of the Spirit and of the immediate intercourse which God holds with the souls of men, is not to be confounded with the ravings of mystics. Systematic Theology, Vol. I., Pp. 66-68, 99.

Again, speaking of the Spirit's office in the work of redemption, he expresses himself thus: “The Spirit also calls men to office in the Church and endows them with the qualifications necessary for the successful discharge of its duties. The office

of the Church in this matter is simply to authenticate the call of the Spirit. Thus the Holy Ghost is the immediate author of all truth, of all holiness, of all consolation, of all authority, and of all efficiency in the children of God individually, and in the Church collectively." *Ibid*, p. 532. Then as to the question of our being conscious or not of the inward workings of the Spirit, Dr. Hodge says: "There is something in the nature of these experiences and of the way in which they come and go, which proves that they are due to the operation of the Spirit of God. . . . These experiences have in them a character which reveals the source whence they come. . . . God reveals himself as distinctly in the workings of our inward nature as he does in the outward world. Men feel that they are in the hands of God, that he speaks to them, argues with them, expostulates, reproves, exhorts and persuades them. And they know that they are resisting him when they are striving to stifle this mysterious voice within them." Vol. II., Pp. 669, 670.

3. Let us see how Dr. Thornwell has expressed himself about the direct, immediate, supernatural operations of the Holy Ghost in others of his writings besides the one criticised by Dr. Porter.

"If there be anything in the Scriptures clearly revealed and earnestly inculcated," he says in his treatise on *Romish Baptism*, "it is that the faith by which we apprehend the Redeemer as the foundation of our hope, depends upon the *immediate testimony* of God. It is supernatural in its evidence as well as supernatural in its origin."

"Unquestionably the direct witness of the Spirit to the fact of our conversion is one of the most comfortable elements of Christian experience—it is the only evidence which is productive of full and triumphant experience." Rome, he proceeds to tell us, anathematizes all who hold such assurance. "So important an element of personal religion," he continues, "is the direct witness of the Spirit, that where it is cordially embraced it will infuse vitality into a dead system, counteract the principles of a professed Remonstrant, and mould his experience into a type of doctrine which he ostensibly rejects. It is the redeeming feature

of modern Arminianism; to it the school of Wesley is indebted for its power; it is a green spot in the desert, a refreshing brook in the wilderness. Wherever it penetrates the heart, it engenders a spirit of dependence upon God, a practical conviction of human imbecility, and an earnest desire for supernatural expressions of divine favor; it maintains a constant communion with the Father of lights, a habitual anxiety to walk with God, which, whatever may be the theory of grace, keeps the soul in a posture of prayer, and cherishes a temper congenial with devotion and holiness. He that seeks for the witness of the Spirit must wait upon God; and he that obtains it, has learned from the fruitlessness of his own efforts, his hours of darkness and desertion, his long agony and conflicts, that it is a boon bestowed in sovereignty, the gift of unmerited grace. It is through this doctrine that the personality of the Spirit as an element of Christian experience is most distinctly presented. It compels us to adore him as a living Agent, working according to the counsel of his will, and not to underrate him as a mere influence connecting moral results with their causes. Rome consequently in discarding this doctrine from her creed, has discarded the only principle which could impregnate the putrid mass of her corruptions with the seeds of health and vigor."

The reader will not complain of the introduction here of some comments upon Dr. Thornwell's language touching the call from one of his dearest friends—himself a most accomplished theologian—than whom no man living better understands the system of our eminent divine. "It is plain that he held the call to be so far direct and immediate, that it is not given through any human agency external to the man himself: it comes directly and immediately from God, not indirectly and mediately through human instrumentality. Does Dr. Thornwell imply also that the call is so far direct and immediate as not to be given through the medium of the word and other means of grace? He manifestly thought that the call to the ministry is not analogous to the call to believe in Christ. The latter is given to every one who hears the gospel; palpably the former is not: it is, as you say, to this man specifically and to this work specifically. In

the effectual call of the Spirit, *what* truth is used?—the truth that *every* man is called by the gospel to believe in Christ, therefore *you* are called and ought to believe? Where is the analogy? Does the Spirit in calling a man to preach convince him that *every* man is called, and therefore *he* is called? What truth of the word is used as the medium through which a man is called to preach—the truth that all Christians are bound to seek the salvation of their fellow-men? That would not make it obligatory on *this* man to seek it in *this* way. The truth that some men are called to preach the gospel? That begs the question: *what* men? Those who are *called*—this man must be convinced that he is called before that truth applies to him.”

“But, on the other hand, Dr. Thornwell thought that the call to the ministry is analogous to the witness of the Holy Spirit, which he held to be ‘direct and immediate.’ If we can get at his meaning in this case, we may apprehend it certainly in the other. Now he distinguished between the indirect and mediate testimony of our own spirits, and the direct and immediate testimony of the Holy Spirit, to the fact that we are the children of God. The testimony of our own spirit is clearly an act of reasoning in which the first judgment is based upon the word, and the second upon consciousness: the word says, ‘he that loves God is a child of God;’ consciousness says, ‘I love God, therefore I am a child of God.’ This testimony is inferential—mediated through the word and consciousness. It is natural, not supernatural—that is, it may be furnished without any special illumination of the Holy Spirit, through the ordinary operations of the faculties of the renewed man. On the other hand, the testimony of the Holy Ghost to the same fact is not inferential, it is direct and immediate. The Spirit supernaturally testifies to the believer that he is a child of God. The word does not declare that this man, A. B., is a child of God; the Holy Spirit testifies to this man, A. B., that *he* is a child of God. The Spirit therefore in this case does not testify *through* the truth, but *in concurrence with* the truth; he does not contradict the word—he concurs with its general principles. And how is a man to test the genuineness of this testimony? Evidently

by its concurrence with the testimony of consciousness and of the word. He cannot be fanatical if the sincere testimony of his own spirit agrees with this direct and immediate witness. This direct and immediate testimony is not that of his own spirit, for Scripture represents it as an other and different testimony from that; nor is it fancy, for it concurs with the testimony of his own spirit; nor is it from the devil, for it is supported by the facts of experience, and the general doctrines of the word.

“Now Dr. Thornwell held that a man is directly and immediately called by the Holy Ghost to preach, and it would appear to have been his opinion that the call is not *through* the truth of the word, though it *concurs with* the word and the facts of Christian experience. God does not call every pious man to preach, but he calls no man to preach who is not such. And how is God’s call to any man to be certified as indeed his call? There are two sources of this evidence—internal and external. He has a conviction within him that he is called directly by the Spirit, confirmed to him by his judgment as to his own character, gifts, and motives; for he is conscious that he is regenerate, and that he has the needful gifts and the proper motives. But all this is not enough to prove that any man is truly called of God to preach the gospel, though it is enough to evince one’s adoption as a child of God; for the Spirit’s witness concurs with that of the man’s own spirit. But here before us is a most peculiar case: the man believes himself called to a specific and exalted office, to which but a few of God’s true people are designated. The second source of evidence therefore must now be appealed to—the concurring judgment of the Christian people and the courts of the Church. For the individual, though convinced himself, must be approved, and otherwise the internal evidences of his call are refuted. The conclusion in this case must be, not that he was led into error by a true call of the Spirit, but that he erred in his conviction that he had such a call. Thus the danger of fanaticism is guarded against as effectually as the imperfection of the Church will admit.

“In conclusion—1. There is no special declaration of the

word, as in the case of effectual calling, making it obligatory on the man to do a certain duty and which the Spirit enforces on his conscience; but in the absence of any declaration of the word making it the duty of *this man* to preach, the Spirit immediately convinces *him* that such is *his* duty. 2. This immediate call—not mediated through human agency, or *through* the special truths of the word as bearing upon certain particular individuals rather than others—is always *in concurrence with* the truth of the word. 3. This derogates nothing from the word as a rule of faith and practice *for all men* and to the exclusion of *every other external rule* whatsoever, but it merely acknowledges a sovereign guidance of the divine Spirit as our Teacher which never can be in contradiction to his own word. 4. There is no real danger of fanaticism growing out of this view, but there may be danger of formalism and *Moderatism* arising out of the opposite view. In fine, what I conceive Dr. Thornwell to mean is this: *first*, that the call is *supernatural*, in the sense that it originates with God and not in the processes of the believer's experience, or in the agency of human beings either as individuals or as organisations; and *secondly*, that the call is *immediate*, in the sense that it is directly from God by immediate impressions made upon the man's own mind, and is not dependent upon the testimony of other men, nor derived from any special deliverance of the word."

But we are not left to get our exposition of the views of our great theologian from his most intimate or competent friends, seeing that his published works give them to us in considerable fulness. In his treatise on the Personality of the Holy Ghost, (Works, Vol. II., Pp. 337-367,) he says: "That experience which does not recognise the *supernatural* character of the work which we attribute to the Spirit as well as the necessity that it should have been accomplished by an intelligent, voluntary Agent, falls below the measure of the Scriptures. We may in words profess to receive the operations of the Spirit, but it is only an empty declaration if we do not feel that influences have been exerted on us, our own hearts, understandings, and consciences, that could not possibly have been effected without the

agency of a glorious and extraordinary Person. . . . Such are the relations of the Spirit to the understandings and consciences of men in applying the great salvation of the gospel that it seems to be impossible that his office should ever be discharged in the mind of a sinner, without producing a consciousness of the extraordinary change which has been effected and a consequent impression of the distinct personality of the agent by whom it was wrought. Wherever he dwells, there must be displays of his glory and power. No heart can become his abiding habitation without adoring his goodness and responding to his love. . . . And is it possible that men can ascribe to him the glory due unto his name unless they are conscious of his hand in the work which he is said to perform—unless they know that it is his influence which their hearts have felt, etc.?" . . .

. . . "There cannot be a more overwhelming condemnation of these mechanical operations of the Spirit than is furnished by Paul in the memorable text, 'the Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirits that we are the children of God.' How can there be a testimony of the Spirit separate and distinct from the testimony of our own hearts, if, after all, we know the presence of the Spirit only from the effects which he impresses on us? How can a witness assure us of a fact, when we do not *know* that the witness is speaking? If Paul does not proceed on the assumption that we are conscious of the *personal* presence of the Holy Ghost, language may cease to be employed as a vehicle of thought. The complete reversion of this text by those who deny supernatural influences, is a humiliating instance of the stubborn reluctance of man to prostrate his pride of understanding before the authority of God. The Spirit, according to the apostle, bears witness to us that we are the children of God. That we are the children of God, according to the common exposition, is the only proof which we can have that we really possess the Spirit. So that we make Paul's proof our question, and his question our proof." . . .

. . . "As employed in modern times to cast reproach upon the gracious operations of the Spirit, the term [*enthusiasm*] may imply either diabolical possession or fanatical delusion. The

fundamental idea conveyed is, that all pretensions to supernatural assistance are extravagant and wicked, proceeding either from the craft of an impostor, the excitement of the passions, or the artful suggestions of the tempter. The leading assumption, upon which alone any plausibility can be given to the charge, is, that the divine illumination which is made essential to faith is philosophically absurd. It is supposed to be impossible that we can be conscious of the immediate agency of God. To say nothing of the numerous and pointed declarations of the Scriptures which directly teach that faith is an extraordinary gift of the Spirit, the fact that prophets and apostles must have known that their minds were possessed of the Holy Ghost, is conclusive proof that there may be manifestations of the Spirit which are accompanied with intuitive convictions of his presence. . . . To say that God cannot communicate an intuitive conviction of his presence to the mind, is not only to deny that prophets and apostles were directly conscious of their own inspiration, but boldly and presumptuously to limit the Holy One of Israel. No good reason can be given why an immediate revelation of himself is not as possible and easy as an indirect manifestation of his glory through the wonderful works which he has made. The fact, therefore, that the doctrine of supernatural illumination involves an immediate conviction of the presence of the Spirit is no necessary presumption against its truth."

"I do not mean to insinuate, however, that the divine illumination, which is the only cause of supernatural faith, is, by any means identical with prophetic inspiration. There is certainly a vast difference betwixt imparting original revelations, and enabling the understanding to perceive the impressions of divine glory in a revelation already communicated. But he who in the one case can manifest his presence so as to silence doubt and generate conviction, can also do it in the other." . . .

. . . "To maintain such an intuitive perception of the reality and excellence of spiritual truth is generally supposed to be fatal to the interests of sobriety and order, by opening a wide door for extravagant delusions and fanatical excesses. Every dreamer, it is said, may receive the ravings of a frantic imagi-

nation as the genuine impulses of the Spirit of God. This is nothing more than to say that faith, like every other faculty of our nature, is capable of being abused." Dr. Thornwell proceeds to show that counterfeits always imply real coin, and the delusions of fanatics the truth and genuineness of divine and supernatural impressions; and makes in the conclusion this significant statement: "THE GREAT DOCTRINE OF SUPERNATURAL GRACE IS THE GREAT OPPROBRIUM OF THE GOSPEL."

We add two extracts from unpublished letters of Dr. Thornwell which cannot fail to be read with interest by all who loved him, and which contain important suggestions touching the subject in hand. The first is of date March 12, 1845. He says:

"The circumstances in which you are placed must be full of embarrassment and perplexity. Broken in health, wounded in spirit, with two calls before you to different and responsible stations, you must feel very sensibly your need of divine guidance and direction in ordering your steps. I have but a single suggestion to make, and though it may not be new, it deserves none the less to be seriously pondered by those who would aim simply at God's glory.

"We are too often prone to misinterpret what are called the *leadings of providence*, and to take those things as intimations of the divine will, which are perhaps designed to be trials of our faith. I am quite satisfied that no one can ever reach the will of God in his own particular case by judging merely from promising appearances. The measures of human probability—it is a lesson recorded on every page of the Bible—are not the standard of divine wisdom. Every striking instance of faith commended in the Scriptures was *against* the conjectures of our narrow philosophy. Had Moses reasoned according to the prevailing principles of our day he would not have refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter. The prospect of extensive usefulness was so much greater in the court—the sphere of his influence would have been so much wider—he had been so singularly raised to that elevated station, and the hand of God was so visibly in the whole affair, that if he had reasoned as multitudes do, from the *leadings of providence and probable appearances*, he would have felt justified in accepting the glittering bribe which was offered to him. In this, however, he would have followed the impulse of *human reason* and been no example of *faith*.

“My friends sometimes charge me with a spice of fanaticism, but it is my deliberate conviction that the only way of arriving at a knowledge of the divine will in regard to us is by simplicity of purpose and earnest prayer. If we really desire with an honest heart to know our duty and apply to God to be instructed by him, he will impress upon the conscience *a sense of duty* just in the direction in which he would have us to move and which we shall feel it perilous to resist. This ‘sense of duty’ may be produced by some principles of the word which we perceive to be applicable to the exigency, or by an immediate operation upon the mind which we are unable to explain. This is my test; and I confess that until, after having sought from God with simplicity and honesty his divine direction, I feel such a ‘sense of duty’ upon my conscience, such a ‘woe is me’ upon the heart, I should feel it unsafe to move. . . . ‘The meek will he guide his way.’”

The other letter is of earlier date, having been written Aug. 27, 1842:

“You are right in supposing that a good work on ‘The Being of God’ is needed, but one which is much more needed is a judicious and learned treatise of the Holy Spirit. The only works in English upon the subject, of any value, are Owen, Ridley, and Heber. Owen’s style is bad and his plan was not sufficiently extensive: the history of theological opinion upon the subject ought to have been given together with the doctrine of divine influences as held amongst the heathen. Heber’s work I regard as mistaking the meaning of our Saviour’s promise and as entirely too low in its views of spiritual religion. Ridley’s book I have not yet read. There ought to be a masterly work on The Spirit.”

Dr. Porter having a high regard for Bannerman’s authority, we take up a very little space to add that he says: “There can be no authority exercised in his [Christ’s] Church which is not conferred immediately by him. . . . Office-bearers receive not from the Church, but from Christ himself. . . . If he is ‘called of God as was Aaron,’ he must have his call directly from God without the intervention of a third party. . . . It is the immediate call and warrant of God addressed to a minister that give him his title to the ministerial office.” He says afterwards, “there is needed no supernatural call,” but the context shows

that he means no *extraordinary* call (in the full and high sense of that term) such as Paul had. Church of Christ, Vol. I., Pp. 428, 429.

To conclude. It will not do for Presbyterians to disparage the supernatural, and cherish the semi-rationalistic. It will not do to deny that the call to the ministry is direct from the Spirit, and hold that "by the laws of mind conviction can only come from the rational operation of our own faculties." It will not do to insist on a sufficient rule of faith, and reject the Almighty guide who teaches us our way.

Again. We must not deny that whenever God truly calls, he can and does make the called to hear. We must not hold that gifts always determine the call, as well positively as negatively; for that would bring into the pulpit many of both sexes whom God has certainly not called to preach.

Again. We must not encourage any man to enter the ministry who is not persuaded internally of his own call from God. For such a settled conviction that the King Eternal commissions him to this specific work and no other, it will not do—it is most dangerous and wicked—to substitute any persuasions of friends, election by the Church, or favorable judgment of the Presbytery. No man can be relied on to abide constantly in the ministerial calling amidst all its difficulties and discouragements, without having impressed solemnly upon his heart and conscience a call from God himself.

Again. At the same time, we may preach publicly and privately about the dearth of ministers, instructing all men, both old and young, relative to the want of more laborers in the vineyard, and especially urging what our Saviour commanded, that we pray the Lord of the harvest to thrust forth such. But prayer for a blessing of course implies every legitimate effort on our part to obtain it. And he who commanded the praying would not forbid, but encourage all proper efforts. It is for the Lord to call; but he does not despise, but honor his own means. And he may sometimes make known his call in one way and sometimes in another, sometimes blessing one means and sometimes another, though still ever acting as the sovereign dispenser of all

gifts, graces, and calls. Yes! and we may not only as individuals signify to any man our impressions that he has the needful gifts and graces and call, and our desires to see him serving the Lord and his Church in the ministry, but a whole Church may urge any man, whom they desire, to undertake this work; and a Presbytery may of their own motion signify to any man that they consider him to be called. The call from God is indicated in the being called of the Church. But let no man go forward upon any such intimations of his duty from other men without having in his own soul the settled conviction that it is not merely man, but God who calls. The individual's convictions do not necessarily precede those of the Church; yet let us never say that the Church may testify that the man is called of God, but that the man himself can give no such testimony lest he prove himself fanatical thereby.

Again, finally. The Holy Ghost is a Person, and he works amongst men both mediately through the word and also directly and immediately. It will not do for Presbyterians to say that this divine Person stands at a distance and never comes near to act directly on our souls. That he uses no other external means of grace but such as himself hath ordained, is no doubt true. These are his only channels of grace when he makes use of any channel at all. But we may not confine him to any channels; we may not assert that he acts always through the word and by the Church. We are not to disparage the word, the only and sufficient rule of faith and practice; but we may not exalt the rule over the guide, the word over the Spirit who indicted it. Nor so long as those inward monitions which claim to be immediately from the Spirit are found to be in concurrence with the word, can there be any danger of their leading to fanatical abuses. The word is our only rule, but sometimes negatively and not positively. It cannot furnish the man called to preach with positive and specific directions to him on that point. We need a guide. We do well to pray for the Holy Ghost to lead us into all truth and duty. And where the word cannot give us any specific directions, He can and oftentimes does direct us by imparting "a sense of duty." He can and he does by his ordi-

nary operations direct us in the right way when we are greatly perplexed, so that we learn to prize not only the instructions of the word, but the influences of the Spirit also. All believers may ask and receive his guidance touching all the avocations of life; yes, and touching their minutest actions and undertakings. It may be said, of course, that God calls his children to the common occupations of life as truly as to the ministry; and we add, that he even calls them to walk on the one side or the other side of the street as they go to their various occupations every day. He does rule and direct the little as truly as the great affairs of our life. Yet a broad distinction should be made between the affairs of common life where Christ rules as sovereign arbiter and the concerns of the Church which is his peculiar kingdom, so that the call whereby he summons any man to hold office in that kingdom, and above all to preach the gospel of salvation, must be acknowledged to be most solemn and peculiar.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

“*Silverwood: A Book of Memories;*” “*Beechenbrook: A Rhyme of the War;*” “*Old Song and New.*” By Mrs. MARGARET J. PRESTON.

Some children once, in compliment to Sweden’s unrivalled songstress, Jenny Lind, named for her their pet mocking-bird; but when informed, to their chagrin, that they had perpetrated a misnomer, as only the *male* mocking-bird sings, changed the name to Jemmy Lind.

Shall we accept this fact from nature, as a significant hint, that the noblest strains of which bird-voice is capable, being uttered exclusively by the male mocking-bird, should also by consequence belong exclusively to the male minstrel of the human species? and that, because too, the mocking-bird has no peer in his powers of song, no other bird should presume to sing? or, that because there is but one Milton, there should be allowed to none other utterance in verse? And yet, many prefer the notes, albeit by writers adjudged inferior, of the nightingale—both sexes, too, which sing with equal melody and power; and even Audubon seems to deem it necessary to assert his favorite mock-bird’s sometimes questioned right to the title of “King of Song;” and some would prefer to any other lay, that of the matin-lark, rousing and quickening them to day-duty.

All ears are not sufficiently acute or cultivated to detect, in the elaborate evolutions of the mock-bird’s notes, those which, by imitation, they would represent and embody. Ofttimes, something simpler proves more soothing—more gratefully medicinal for some “mind’s disease.” The head may approve, the ear be pleased, but ah! the heart will *take it in*? So that, though it might be a reflection on our critical taste to withhold from the

mock-bird his title of chief-singer, yet on our own hearts would be greater reflection, if they refused, in spite of all higher claims, to acknowledge what is sweetest and best for *them*. Though the *Paradise Lost* of Milton stands avowedly the first of poems, yet until every one confesses to love and read it more than any other, and that it does more for his head and heart than do all others, we will not agree that all other poems have no mission, and all other poets no ministry. Some strike not so high a note as others, but strike one as true, one that goes as straightly to the heart in love and power; and woman with all her disabilities, with

“No cloistered thought; no hours unwinnowed of care;
No days hedged in from interruption,
And withdrawn inviolate from household exigence,”

may do, and therefore not refuse, this work. For that, but few women may secure that exemption from domestic toil and cares so absolutely necessary for art's highest development; and but that one woman, Mrs. Browning, has yet reached the intellectual and artistic goal. “*Excelsior*” is said more to redeem the sex from the charge of mental and artistic inferiority, than to excuse her who will not condescend to utter but from fame's proudest pinnacle those strains that might penetrate the world's great heart and make it better.

Mrs. Preston gracefully and nobly “accepts the situation,” and her work. For a woman—and that woman a wife, mother, mistress, hostess—she has trilled as loud and full and clear and perfect a song as one in these engrossing, absorbing relations may well aspire to do. If it is, as has been said, a shame for a non-professional performer to play too well on the pianoforte, because inferred the expense by which this excellence has been attained—the neglect of so many duties for this one accomplishment, so, as to the writer of superior verse, (requiring so much of head and heart, of time and attention,) it is not always highest commendation for a woman to be called a great poet; and though there are exceptional cases to this, still it accords to woman's credit even, there being fewer first-class poets among her sex, than

among men, who, if they have not more time in the aggregate, at least have it less disintegrated and interrupted than that of woman, ever responding to the constantly requiring claims of her household. Even Mrs. Preston, however partially or specially exempt from these recurring requirements appertaining to the lot and circumstances of most women, whether they take pen in hand or not, seems to feel an apology incumbent upon her for appropriating a little time to cull the flowers of Poesy, which she does thus beautifully :

“Day-duty done—I’ve idled forth to get
An hour’s light pastime in the shady laues,
And here and there have plucked, with careless pains,
These wayside waifs, sweetbrier and violet.
And such-like simple things.”

As the old lady, when the clergyman inquired of her by what sermon she had been converted, replied, “Bless you, sir, by no sermon at all; it was by *the text!*”—so, before perusing Mrs. Preston’s book, its dedication won us over to it. Then, her “apology”—for it seems she felt necessary a formal apology for *her* temerity in perpetrating poetry—would surely disarm the sharpest and severest of male critics. The following will show its animus:

“‘What right hast *thou* to chirp?’ I asked a bird
Whose slender trill I caught among the trees.
The twitterer, at my word,
Paused:—(yet I missed no note:)—‘Within the vale
Are mates of mine,’ he piped, ‘for whom the lark
Soars with a song too distant, yet who love
My quiet cooings in the leafy dark:
For *them*, not *thee*, I fill our nested grove:
Keep thou thine ear for lark and nightingale.’”

This modest apology (modesty generally indicating merit) might have in a measure prepared us for the regalement of taste and feeling, the ministration to heart and intellect, that were to follow.

When we first heard of Mrs. Preston,—it was before she had become an author,—we received the information that she was

VOL. XXIII., NO. 2—12.

addicted to Greek and Latin, and to making verses. Since that time, her published works evince her no "prentice-hand" in the latter employment, and her classical studies have served to prepare the rich soil of her mind for the rare fruit it has given to the world of letters.

"*Silverwood: A Book of Memories*," had a fair success for a first effort, and, for a book, not at all competing with those of the sensational school. It was followed by "*Beechenbrook: A Rhyme of the War*," written while the conflict was pending between North and South. Although this more ambitious and deservedly more popular effort might have prepared us for "*Old Song and New*," yet it did not. The theme was too modern, the events too recent, and too pregnant with bitter associations, harrowing us with pictures of that cruel past. Neither the poet's power nor mission was fairly tested by that sad, gloomy poem; then the anapaestic measure, with its "here we go uppy and uppy," etc., is not to our taste; but there are some true heart-bursts in it nevertheless. That "Slain in Battle" might "draw tears from eyes, albeit unused to weep;" and what heart would not throb at such a grand stanza as this?

"Again and again the reverberant sound
Is fearfully felt in the tremulous ground;
Again and again on their senses it thrills
Like thunderous echoes astray in the hills."

But in regard to "*Beechenbrook*," although the "*Round Table*" concedes that "it is not absolutely trash, and quite an advance on the majority of Southern verse," it is evident it does not really mean to "damn it with faint praise," for that periodical goes on to say, "even we of the North, who are not tainted by that sombre fanaticism, that sees no good in Nazareth, may find in it much to admire and applaud." After that, Mrs. Preston, you may live! But, said critic, though alive to some of your merits in the Queen's English, is death upon your Latin. Why, man, don't you know that any default there, must be "mistake of printer"? Why Latin is the lady's vernacular, so to speak! She has lived among classic shades all her life; the daughter of the president of a college, and the wife of a profes-

sor, she has sat at the feet of the masters of Latinity, has "Rudiman's" at her tongue's tip, and knows her Horace by heart! Some of your colleges will yet be trying to bribe her to be your president, and teach your future Grants and Lincolns Latin. "Beechenbrook," if it has done no more, has at least shown New England (as is the patronising prophecy of a Yankee critic) that *we are going* to undertake our "intellectual emancipation and be no longer dependent on New England for poetry, as well as piety, politics, and prints." Although not left for Mrs. Preston to strike the first note of triumph for our intellectual manumission, when a Poe, a Simms, a Welby, and many others, have long ago pealed such as have before this reverberated from the cliffs of *old* England, still she stands among the foremost of those who, during the war and since its sad termination, have convinced that the Southern mind is true to its finest instincts of highest art, which will be more and more developed as we have peace within our borders; for our Sunny South is surely redolent of all the charming influences conducive to poetic inspiration—her climate, her scenery, her flowers and fruits and vines, her heroic past, her martyred heroes. Mrs. Preston's theme, the war, was premature. Years, centuries, will increase its interest and value for the poet's pen and the painter's brush. When our glorious land purifies herself from this thick scum on her surface, then will she be, in connection with her past "Iliad of woes," fit theme for the immortal epic of some living Homer.

So, "Beechenbrook" did not quite prepare us for "Old Song and New," the latest, but we trust not the last gift to us from our gifted countrywoman; for Mrs. Preston, in "Old Song and New," evidently feels more than ever her mission, feels that for her one talent she is accountable—that she may not hide in a napkin or under a bushel any trust committed to her by her Lord. True, her woman's nature may shrink from publicity, as what true woman's nature does not? Even though she sit "by the fireside," it is not pleasant to her sensibilities to hear "the nations praising her, far off;" but this and more must she bide, if to her Lord's summons, like the young child of whom the Scriptures tell us, she would answer: "Here am I!" "Here am

I" *to do what thou biddest me to do*; no matter how averse to taste, to sensibility, to preconceived notions and prejudices—once, let my heart hear that voice, loud as thunder, yet soft as the zephyr. Oh! let me, by every test, by every monition, by faith, by prayer, be sure, without sign or shadow of doubt, that it is God's voice telling me what to do, and by his help then will I do it to the best of my endeavor and ability. Surely that voice has spoken to Mrs. Preston! Surely the angel has said unto her "Write"! Write for your species, your sex, your country, your God. With weeping, blushing, fearing, trembling, as is her woman's nature, she has done so; and though with firm and masculine power she wields the pen, yet are its efforts soft and gentle and womanly for all that.

In "Old Song and New" she gives us poems from the Hebrew and Greek. The first poem, "Ruth in the Land of Moab," albeit in artistic skill excelling, strikes our fancy perhaps less than any other in the book. Her history cut off so abruptly—why? We want more of it. Ruth makes a very "poor mouth," as the saying is; and we have heard so many of these since the war, that the sad monotone of each individual, who insists upon pouring into your ear his experience, is becoming monotonously wearisome; and now Ruth's catching us by the button-hole and telling us hers, is just too much. Why could not the artist have given her to us also in her beautiful womanhood's dawning prosperity among the golden wheat? Perchance old "Boaz" was in the way; but Henry Timrod, that painter-poet, did not mind that; nor did the author of the "Seasons;" it is the poet's especial excellence to make serviceable and pliable to his art the seemingly impossible. We wanted to hear from Ruth when about to become Mrs. Boaz, a happier strain, even, perhaps, something in the way of an *Épithalamium*. Through a number of these Hebrew song-poems we go. "The Daughter of the Gileadite," Zanoné, with her beautiful name, we have first. Then, we have "The Grief of Bathsheba," "The Choice of Barzillai," "Michal," "The Royal Preacher," "The Lament of Joab," "The Writing of the King," all being extensively copied into the religious periodicals of the day. But to our credit or not be it spoken—we do not affect

either her Hebrew or Greek song as much we do her "Ballad and Other Verse." We confess especially to becoming wearied with these stale old Greek and Latin stories, by each successive poet rehearsed, rehashed. "Nought is so tedious as a twice-told tale"—*twice told!* twice two hundred times! Their moral, too, is often more than suspiciously bad, and their language not always unexceptionable. Witness, but to denounce, in the very first of these Greek stories, Alcyoné's mad marine-suicide. Read, but to reprimand, such infidel raving as this:

"O my lord, my lord, my life!
Better to me than all the dwellers in heaven—
I die without thee!"

But there is plenty of nineteenth century wickedness for us to read, without any raked up from the foul pit of the past.

Then there is that other old musty fossil, "Rhodopé's Sandal," that we have had ding-donged into our ears ever since they were saluted by Cinderella's glass-slipper—that even Miss Thackeray will not allow to rest, but, raked up from the cineritious past, makes step forth again "new soled and toed." Mrs. Preston is mercifully brief in this her measurement of old-shoe, that Morris in his "Earthly Paradise" has made almost a whole book about. No! even if we *were* going forth as a bride, we would seriously demur to the "luck" that this same "old shoe slung after us" would bring to us and ours. So many, on these old rusty things, have harped with their harps, that they have become harsh and grating to the ear, instead of ministering to it melodious music.

Now, in painting, where the field is more limited, these old classics, as they are called, may be more allowably used, but even then he must possess great temerity and boldness who can presume to give a salient stroke or vital touch where the grand old masters have been before him. A little of presumption we dare to think it savors, for modern pen or even pencil to attempt these already grandly used up themes. The world is wide enough and teeming with themes rich, varied, new. Let us leave that in the Old World, on which it were entirely hopeless in us to presume we can compete with those who have never owned

a rival, and from the nature of things never can; and strike out something in this new land of ours for ourselves; if we fail, it will be less as imitators than originators. Let us not spin that old yarn of "Erinna's" any more, but begin, with unused material, a brand-new web for ourselves, and make it a classic, or at least try to. Then, from Alpha to Omega, it will stand confessed an original—not a copy.

But, threading our way admiringly, for the most part, through Mrs. Preston's book, we came to that division of it where our admiration is unqualified. The trifling verbal slips by which it may be amenable to hypercriticism cannot, to any unprejudiced mind, affect a most favorable verdict respecting that part of it entitled "Ballad and Other Verse;" for here Mrs. Preston is at home—her heart is here. And oh! what a noble and good heart it is, as expressed through some of these lovely poems! "The Lady Hildegarde's Wedding," what a gem that is! How the true woman's heart and faith and hope are shown, when her bridegroom tarried and she went up alone to the chancel rails, knowing in her heart, if alive, he would come *there!* Her "Dumb Poet"—let its last stanzas speak:

"He lives his Poem; day by day
Its choric chime his thought engages;
And songs of hope are stored away
Within the future's uncut pages.

Oh! my Dumb Poet, in whose soul
Love still the mystic psalm rehearses,
Make thou mine open heart thy scroll,
And fill it with thy marvellous verses."

In her "Alone" what could be more exquisite than this:

"Little trembler, no,—
You shall not go untended. Christ himself
Has travelled the pathway through, and made it bright;
And now He leaves the seraph songs a little,
To come and hold my tender baby's hand;
And just outside the dusk—(some call it death)—
He waits to bear you past the shady places.'
. . . . And from her mouth, ashened to deathliness,
Faltered consent articulate, which to him

Whose ear caught at its broken meaning, seemed
 The first, faint trial-note of that glad song
 Which the sweet baby-voice should sing forever."

Her muse on patriotic subjects soars sublimely. What could be finer than "The Color Bearer?" And of all the eulogies in prose and verse that have been pronounced upon Robert E. Lee from North to South, from East to West, in Europe and America, what one can bear the palm over Mrs. Preston's "Gone Forward"? Yes! there her muse has won, has triumphed there above all competitors; she wears her crown of laurel and of bay. This noble poem we would have read and reread; therefore we here insert "Gone Forward":

I.

Yes, "Let the tent be struck." Victorious morning
 Through every crevice flashes in a day
 Magnificent beyond all earth's adorning:
 The night is over, wherefore should he stay?
 And wherefore should our voices choke to say,
 "The General has gone forward?"

II.

Life's foughten field not once beheld surrender;
 But with superb endurance, present, past,
 Our pure commander, lofty, simple, tender,
 Through good, through ill, held his high purpose fast,
 Wearing his armor spotless—till at last
 Death gave the final "*Forward!*"

III.

All hearts grew sudden palsied. Yet what said he,
 Thus summoned? "*Let the tent be struck!*" for when
 Did call of duty fail to find him ready
 Nobly to do his work in sight of men,
 For God's love and his country's sake; and then
 To watch, wait, or go forward?

IV.

We will not weep—we dare not. Such a story
 As his grand life writes on the century's years
 Should crowd our bosoms with a flush of glory,
 That manhood's type supreme that appears

Our South has shown to the ages. Nay, no tears
For him who has gone forward!

v.

Gone forward! Whither? Where the marshalled legions,
Christ's well-worn soldiers, from their conflicts cease:
Where Faith's true Red-Cross Knights repose in regions
Thick studded with the calm white tents of peace—
Thither right joyful to accept release,
The General has gone forward!

We must be candid and say, we are no admirer of "sonnets" in the general, or of Mrs. Preston's in the particular. The thought or gist "cribbed, cabined and confined" within its conventional fourteen lines, always brings up the lament of Sterne's Starling, "I can't get out!" At least, seldom or never can we get into it. Well, if we could, it would not often be worth all the trouble. Mrs. Preston's muse demands sea-room, as does almost every sensible muse that ever we heard tell of. No wonder Petrarch failed to move Laura's obdurate heart by his sonnet-missiles. Our own Paul Hayne has made a whole book of them; but even a popular young poet can't make them palatable to popular taste.

Mrs. Preston, in the morally sublime, is at times grand—grand as she or any one else ever well can be. But, in the devotional—the spiritual—when her life's experience is deeper, intenser, perhaps sadder, she will reach beyond where she has ever yet gone. She will scale higher heights, and soar over loftier pinnacles, where, in the pure empyrean, she will have those visions of glory and of God that it hath not yet entered into her heart to conceive of. In her own language,

"There she'll breathe the strengthening essence
Of a purer, loftier clime;
There she'll learn sublimer lessons
Than from all the stores of time."

We want these beautiful poems to be read, and not to be stowed away on the shelf—we would that they might do their benign work of purification and refinement. We want these sweet utterances to penetrate the hearts of our people—they

need more of this sanitary literature. We have a true poet, right here in our Southern land; one indigenous to the soil; one to the "manor born;" one who feels how influential and how noble is her work. She is fitting herself for it more and more, by study, by thought, by prayer. Give her appreciation and encouragement, which will be to her help and hope. Nerve her hands and strengthen her heart for this task of God's appointing. She feels it no light thing to be a poet or interpreter of nature, art, and God. Give her an audience. She would speak to the universe's heart; but especially would she speak to the hearts of those of her own household, the people of her own stricken South.

She will yet do more for the land she loves so well. She has been and is still depressed by "the times." When it goes better with us, she will leave her classic shades more frequently, and going forth into the broad field of nature illustrate her more fully and variedly than she has ever yet done—nature amongst us in her own primeval and southern character, our lofty mountains, our vast prairies, our mighty rivers, our tall forests, our romantic everglades, our picturesque lagoons. She will give "new beauty to the eye, and new music to the ear." Her *trial-notes* have told us, that, when her song reaches its maximum of power, she will carry us at her own sweet will, up

Beauty's ascending steps that lead to God.

"*Seed-Truths; or, Bible Views of Mind, Morals, and Religion.*
By PHARCELLUS CHURCH, D. D. New York: Sheldon & Co.,
No. 677 Broadway. 1871."

The author's design throughout this neat little volume is to serve his readers with an "interior view" of the Bible, so as to illustrate the principles in which certain "anomalies" of the sacred word "and our present experiences alike cohere." His plan as delineated by himself, is, "first, to sketch the Bible man in his mental, moral, and religious characteristics; and then to trace him out in the states, transitions, and histories recorded of him in Scripture; and showing at the same time their agreement

with what we are, what our forefathers have been, and what our posterity is to be to the end of time." The whole amounting just to this: that human nature being the same in all ages, the inspired volume is adapted to it as such—no very new discovery. Dr. Church feels, however, that he has a complaint to lodge against a commonly perverted view of human nature. He expresses his mind thus: "It is usual, in our systems of education, to detach the science of mind, morals, and natural theology from revelation, and treat them on the basis of consciousness, our relations, or the evidences of design which we see around us. What is thus acquired, on merely human grounds of evidence, is preparatory to the study of the Bible. The divinity student, after being drilled in the study of man as conducted by the schools, is put to interpreting the word of God, as a Chinese lady is put to walking after her feet have been crippled in iron shoes. His mental muscles are indurated into a form, in judging of the man of the Bible, to compel him to be thus and not otherwise; or to be a puppet of the schools, rather than a piece of God's handiwork. The young preacher must have a strong decoction of philosophy, just a little tinctured with revelation, and then be sent abroad to give the mixture to the sheep and lambs of Christ's flock." Exactly what this means we are not prepared to say. Perhaps it is cleared up a little by the questions that immediately follow the above extract: "But, can the philosophical man act the part of the Bible man? Is there anything in a metaphysical Adam, or a metaphysical new man in Christ, to meet the description of Moses or the apostles?" We, however, get nearer to his meaning, when he says, further on, "No honest pupil can compare the science of man, as studied on merely natural grounds, with what he reads of the race in the Bible, without feeling that there are grave and inexplicable discrepancies; there must be something in human nature that philosophy has not reached, or the Bible must be given up as a revelation from God." No believer in revelation ever doubted the impossibility of man's becoming fully acquainted with himself unless under the guidance of inspiration. But this certainty does not render nugatory the decisions of mental science, and

shut us up to the necessity of confining our self-studies to the examples of Bible character, or to the expositions of Bible doctrine. Nor do we admit that the teachings of sober philosophy are inconsistent with those of the purest spiritual theology. On the contrary, they reciprocally throw light upon each other. As regards the doctrine of sin, of a Redeemer, of the precise relations of the fallen race to God, together with the nature of the hope of its restoration, the "wisdom of this world" has nothing authoritatively to say. In short, the *moral* side of man, in all those its aspects which exhibit him as a candidate for a blessed eternity, or as exposed to a dreadful perdition, is alone fully exposed to view in the Scriptures. But even here, whilst philosophy can help us to no important *discoveries*, it may help us to much corroborative testimony; and, as to the intellectual powers abstractedly considered, this same philosophy has much to add to the suggestions of holy writ. There is, therefore, no propriety in endeavoring to antagonize the science of mind and the revelations of God's word, as if truth were two and not essentially one. Our author seems to do this, and yet he cannot altogether mean it; for he says, "the Bible view of man, as acted upon by two worlds, is not without a certain kind of response from philosophy." He has, however, exposed himself to the charge of superficialness at this point, and to the grave charge of identifying Bible truth with a certain sort of mysticism.

The author begs leave "to hint, as the result of fifty years' reflection on the subject, that orthodoxy, to retain its hold on the restless thought of the age that is and is to come, must look for a more interior and untrammelled examination of the word. . . . The exterior view makes the primeval man holy in his creation; the interior finds him innocent and upright, and the candidate for a virtue and holiness to be acquired by trial. The exterior ascribes his fall to an outward tempter; the interior finds in his doubt, appetite, æsthetical nature, and various specific impulses, a basis for temptation apart from extraneous malign influence. The exterior makes depravity total; the interior makes it the extinction of spiritual life, or life in God, but not

of natural conscience and conservative qualities." There are other "exteriors" and "interiors" enumerated, most of which, like the above, are common-place, and one or two of them somewhat unintelligible. We are free to say, that, notwithstanding the vagueness (to make the least objection) of many of the statements of this book, it is a very readable volume, and contains a large number of very suggestive, even striking, thoughts that are out of the common rut. We commend its twenty-five brief chapters of "seed-truths" to the perusal of such of our readers as are desirous of informing themselves with respect to an important line of religious thought, and who would get themselves stirred up to think (whether with the author or against him) on matters deserving of profound reflection.

Prophetic Imperialism; or, The Prophetic Entail of Imperial Power. By JOSEPH L. LORD, of the Boston Bar. New York: Hurd and Houghton. Cambridge: Riverside Press. 1871. Pp. 96.

This little volume is brought out in the best style of the printer's art, and is not wanting in the attractions of refined culture and a devout spirit, which we must accord to its author. We are glad that it is not a political document, proposing to substitute the political autocrat for the rule of a democracy, albeit the latter, when absolved from the restraints of a written constitution, and of moral principle, might be, as we often feel that it is, a worse tyrant than Nero.

"It is the peculiar office of imperial power," says this author, "to preside over all other, even all other kingly forms of governmental power, and not like other forms over the members of particular communities. It is a kingdom of kingdoms, whose proper subjects are the kings and nations, the princes and nobles, the rulers and judges and great men of the earth." "'Thou, O king, art a king of kings.' These are the words which describe imperial power, according to the divine idea. It is kingship over the kings, and lordship over the lords of the earth." P. 20. "In a word, imperial power is the grand keynote of all forms of

human government." "It was a good and perfect gift." "It is God's own method. It is the way God reigns himself." "Its only repositories of whom we have any account are the first man Adam, Nebuchadnezzar, and his three great imperial successors; and the second man Adam, the man Christ Jesus, the Lord from heaven."

"It was given to Adam before his fall." "Let us make man," etc., "and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowls of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth."

"To Nebuchadnezzar God gave not only the same dominion in every particular which he gave to Adam in his innocence, but dominion also wheresoever the sons of Adam dwell over the whole of the now peopled-earth, 'wheresoever the children of men dwell, the beasts of the field, and the fowls of the air: into thy hand hath he given them, and made thee ruler over them all.'" "The gift of dominion to Nebuchadnezzar far exceeded the gift of dominion to Adam before the fall." "It was a good and perfect gift, coming directly from the hands of God," "of divine appointment and unlimited extent," "wholly absolute, unconditional, outright," "a continuing gift."

But Nebuchadnezzar abused the gift, "lifted up himself against the God of heaven, and walked in pride;" and was driven forth from the habitations of men for a season; yet had the glory of his kingdom and honor and brightness returned unto him. And Belshazzar, his son's son, sinned against heaven, and his kingdom was divided, and the empire passed away. But the dominion of Persia was "grandly imperial;" and so was the Grecian under Alexander, but yet inferior. Still greater was its decadence under "imperial iron Rome," with its ten toes, or kingdoms, "of unimperial clay." "*And if unimperial, then not God's method, but man's; not the gift of God, but the invention of man, since imperial power alone is in the gift of God.*" "The clay represents the popular, the Germanic and Slavonic element."

"The present divided maladministration of imperial power is

to reconcentrate itself in the hands of one supreme monarch over all, the antichrist of prophecy." "He will come from below, will plant the tabernacles of his palace between the seas in the glorious holy mountain." "He will make war upon the Lamb, when His feet shall stand in that day upon the Mount of Olives and shall be overcome." And "with the fall of antichrist, the last and greatest merely human repository of imperial power the earth will ever see will pass away." "With the fall of antichrist, this imperial gift of heaven to man, forfeited by all others and abused no more, will revert in all its heaven-born energy and lustre to its divine Reversioner, great David's greater Son, the First-begotten of the dead." "With the fall of antichrist, 'many (not all, but many,) among the sleepers of the dust of the earth shall awake: these (who awake at this time) unto everlasting life.' They shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and the stars forever and ever. This is the first resurrection."

It will be seen from these extracts that this little volume is an exhibition, with some novelties in the mode of presentation, of the hypothesis of the premillennial advent and personal reign on the earth of the Lord Jesus Christ in visible form. That which is peculiar to it is its eulogy of imperial power as the perfection of all government and as of divine appointment.

The first grant of it was to Adam the first man and the representative of all his race, who lost it, we suppose the author would maintain, by his own sin. But Adam never did exercise imperial power; never ruled through kingly, vice-regal, or other subordinate rulers; was never, so far as history informs us, an emperor at all over his race during the 930 years of his life; and if he never was, it was never designed that he should be. True, the history on the sacred page is a brief one, but if imperial power wielded by him was so great a boon, and so peculiarly a divine appointment, Scripture would not have been silent. The name Adam means man, and it was to *man* that this dominion over the earth and the creatures below him was granted. And it is by man that it is every year more and more wielded over the beast of the earth and the fowls of heaven and the fishes of the sea, and over the elements of nature itself. This the history

of the present century loudly proclaims. And it will be one day, and now is, completely and supremely exercised by that Man whom God hath ordained, whose human nature was mysteriously assumed by the Second Person of the Godhead, and who, from his mediatorial throne, with the sympathies of his human, and the perfections of his divine nature, rules over all. It is thus, according to the 8th Psalm, and the apostle's rendering of its import in the first chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, that God has in fact put all things under his feet.

It had been promised to Abraham that kings should come out of his loins, Gen. xvii. 6; xxxv. 11; and it had been made known to Moses that when Israel should occupy the land given to them they would desire a king, and regulations for this kingly government were then prescribed. In the old age of Samuel, the people in their restless discontent and pride rejected the government under which they had lived, and God "gave them then a king in his anger." But it was the design of God that this kingly rule, especially in the family of David their second king, should be the representative of the theocratic government under which they had hitherto lived, and that this king, who exercised a royal, but not an imperial power, as this author defines it, should, in the person especially of David, be the type of the Great King that now rules from the mediatorial throne, having received all power, chiefly that he may give eternal life to as many as God has given him.

As to Nebuchadnezzar, his second example of the good and divine gift of imperial power, he was indeed a man of great enterprise as a warrior in his earlier life, and one who enriched his country by his extensive system of irrigation, increased its wealth by protecting and promoting commerce, and its magnificence by the cities he built and the wonderful works he erected. But though the oriental language of Scripture gives him a universal empire, it was in fact limited to a small part of the earth's surface, and to a small portion of the inhabitants of the four quarters of the globe. It never was, and therefore was never intended to be, a universal empire. And all these earthly kingdoms at the best are but symbols of that spiritual kingdom

of the Mediatorial King, who, besides ruling in his providence through human agencies, acts directly upon the heart through the Holy Spirit, whose influences are to work those great and saving changes in human character, through which alone men are brought into fellowship with God. This kind of power has no example nor appropriate type in any human government, be it imperial, regal, or republican, and least of all in that of Nebuchadnezzar, who, despite his genius and grandeur, is held forth in the Scriptures as a man of overweening pride, of cold and relentless cruelty; impressed sometimes with the power and greatness of the true God, in the presence of the wondrous miracles that he could not gainsay; but at others a very Dionysius, Domitian, or Nero, rather than a great and magnanimous ruler.

May it not be that this yearning after the visible, sensible, and material in the kingdom of the future; after the visible throne, person, glory, pomp, retinue, officers, and ministers of state; after this earthly temple, earthly metropolis of the Great King, whose palace here and presence, as to his human nature, must be localized in some abode or abodes on earth, tends to sensualize and weaken rather than increase the believer's faith, and removes from him something of that peculiar blessedness to which our Saviour alluded when he said to Thomas, "Thomas, because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed: blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed"? Yet we all do look, at its proper time and in its proper *order*, for the glorious "appearing of Jesus Christ" our Lord, whom having not seen we love; in whom, though now we see him not, yet believing, we rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory.

Must not this waiting for the earthly and personally visible reign of the Redeemer tend to make its advocates indifferent in a measure to the present progress of Christ's spiritual kingdom, sceptical as to the success of present efforts to combat error and to carry the gospel forth to heathen nations, and so beget that "chilastic indolence" which has been charged upon those entertaining these views touching the conversion of the nations sitting in darkness? This we say, with due respect to the present author, who is to us in person unknown.

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. XXIII.

JULY, MDCCCLXXII.

No. 3.

COLUMBIA, S. C.

PRINTED AT THE PRESBYTERIAN PUBLISHING HOUSE.

1872.

Digitized by Google

CONTENTS.

ARTICLE	PAGE
I. Apostolical Succession. By Rev. THOMAS E. PECK, D. D., Union Theological Seminary, Va., - - -	353
II. Paul a Presbyterian. By Rev. T. W. HOOPER, Lynchburg, Va. - - - - -	400
III. The Ordinance of Giving. By Rev. J. O. LINDSAY, Due West, S. C., - - - - -	412
IV. The Greek Catholic Church. By Rev. GEORGE W. LEYBURN, Appomattox C. H., Va., - - -	423
V. CRITICAL NOTICES :	
1. Harmony of the Four Gospels in Greek. By Frederick Gardiner, D. D., 460. 2. The Government of the Kingdom of Christ. By Rev. James Moir Porteus, 463. 3. Life in the Exode. By A. D. Pollock, 466. 4. Princeton College during the Eighteenth Century. By Samuel Davies Alex- ander, 469. 5. A Commentary on the Old and New Testa- ments. By Jamieson, Faussot, and Brown, 470. 6. Neither Rome nor Judah; Out of the Dark; Gaffney's Tavern. Pres. Board of Publication, 472. 7. The Reviewers Reviewed. By Alexander H. Stepheus, 473.	

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXIII.—NO. 3.

JULY, MDCCCLXXII.

ARTICLE I.

APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION.

All branches of the Christian Church hold to an apostolical succession in some sense; for without it there is no ground upon which they can claim, with the slightest color of plausibility, a divine sanction for their existence. Presbyterians, for example, hold that they have the doctrine, the polity, the worship, which were taught and ordained by the apostles. They hold that the succession is to be determined, not by history or tradition, but by a direct appeal to writings which are not only more ancient than the writings of the *Fathers*, but have, according to the confessions of these Fathers themselves, a *divine* authority—the writings of the Apostles. The body which now holds the doctrine of justification without the works of the law, is, *pro tanto*, a truer succession of the church to which the Epistle to the Romans was addressed, than the church now at Rome which denies that doctrine and curses all who hold it. The body which is now governed by a presbytery is a truer successor of the church of Ephesus which was also governed by a presbytery in the days of Paul, than a church of the present day which is governed by a prelate, an officer of which the apostolic records

VOL. XXIII., NO. 3.—1.

know nothing. All this is true, *whatever the intervening history may be.**

We need not say that this is not the sense in which the term is used in this article. It is of the apostolical succession as held by the Papists and their "Apists" that we propose to treat, and especially of the doctrine as held by the Papists, which alone can claim the merit of being intelligible or consistent. The doctrine as held by their imitators, as we may take occasion to show, is mere moonshine, having no meaning because separated from the system of doctrine and worship of which it forms a part, and because destitute, upon its own principles, of any true historical basis.

The fundamental principle of the apostolical succession is thus stated by the Council of Trent: "Sacrifice and priesthood have been so joined together by the ordination of God, that both have existed under every dispensation. Since, therefore, the Catholic Church, under the New Testament, has received, by institution of the Lord, the holy, visible sacrifice of the Eucharist, it ought also to be confessed that there is in it a new, visible, and external priesthood. Further, that this priesthood was instituted by the same Lord our Saviour, and that to the apostles and their successors in the priesthood he gave the power of consecrating, offering, and administering his body and blood, as also of remitting and retaining sins, Holy Writ shows, and the tradition of the Catholic Church has always taught."†

Note, then, carefully, that among the Papists, apostolical suc-

*There is still another sense in which the term may be used. There has been such an *order of men as Christian ministers*, continuously from the time of the apostles to this day. This is a very different thing from the "apostolic succession" in the mouths of papists and prelatists, which is the succession, in an unbroken line, of *this or that individual minister*. "How ridiculous it would be thought," says Archbishop Whately, (*Kingdom of Christ*, Essay II., § 30,) "if a man laying claim to the throne of some country should attempt to establish it without producing and proving his own pedigree, merely by showing that that country had *always been under hereditary regal government!*"

†Concil. Trident. Canones et Decreta. Sess. 23, c. 1.

cession means a succession of *priests** in the proper sense of the word, *sacerdotes*, *ιερείς*, officers whose business it is to offer true and proper expiatory and propitiatory sacrifices. That this is the meaning of the Council is not left to inference or conjecture. It says that there has been a priesthood under every dispensation of religion; it argues that the Eucharist is a sacrifice, and therefore there must be a priesthood to offer it; in the canon corresponding with this decree, it curses all who say that the priesthood is "only an office and a naked ministry for preaching the gospel," and not a visible and external *sacerdotium*; it derives this priesthood from Christ, as the Levitical priesthood was derived from Aaron; that is, from Christ, not as the founder of the Christian Institute, but as the first in the order of priests under the new law, as Aaron was the first in the order of priests under the old; and, in proof of this, referring to Heb. v. 4, 5, it makes the apostles Christ's immediate successors as priests, and the priests of Rome the successors of the apostles as priests.

The difference between their priests and the ministers of the gospel, is much wider than between the priests of the family of Aaron and the ordinary Levites who were not of that family. It cannot be too carefully borne in mind, that the question of apostolical succession is a question about the succession of *priests*, not at all of *ministers of the word*.

Note, in the second place, that the apostolical succession involves a peculiar view of the sacraments. The priests are not ministers of the word, and, of course, a sacrament is not a *verbum visibile*, as Augustine calls it; not a sign of truths conveyed by the word and differing from the word (so far as it is a *sign*) only in the kind of language employed as a vehicle. If this view were allowed, the priests of the new law would be no better than those of the old. Their sacrifices would be only symbols and actually convey no grace. So low a view of her priesthood Rome cannot tolerate. "The power with which the Christian priesthood is clothed," says the Catechism of the Council of Trent, "is a heavenly power, raised above that of

*The English word priest is simply "presbyter writ short."

angels; it has its source, not in the Levitical priesthood, but in Christ the Lord, who was a priest, not according to Aaron, but according to the order of Melchisedec." So again the same Catechism: "Priests and bishops are, as it were, the interpreters and heralds (*internuncii*) of God, commissioned in his name to teach mankind the law of God and the precepts of a Christian life—they are the representatives of God upon earth. It is impossible, therefore, to conceive a more exalted dignity, or functions more sacred. Justly, therefore, are they called, not only angels (*Mal. ii. 7*), but gods (*Ps. lxxxii. 6*),* holding as they do the place and power and authority of God on earth. But the priesthood, at all times an elevated office, transcends in the new law all others in dignity. The power of consecrating and offering the body and blood of our Lord, and of remitting sins, with which the priesthood of the new law is invested, is such as cannot be comprehended by the human mind, still less is it equalled by, or assimilated to, anything on earth."

Every priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices; wherefore these priests must have somewhat to offer. The preaching of the word will not do, because anybody who knows the plan of salvation may tell it to his fellow-sinners. Singing, praying, and alms-giving will not do, for a similar reason. The two sacraments of the New Testament have been pitched upon because they are symbolical ordinances; and the meaning of a symbol is more easily perverted than the meaning of words. The

*Papists are not good interpreters. This passage has no reference at all to the Levitical priests. It is "a brief and pregnant statement of the responsibilities attached to the *judicial* office under the Mosaic dispensation." The judges are frequently called "gods" in the law. See *Ex. xxi. 6*; *xxii. 8, 9*, in the Hebrew *Elohim*. Hence *v. 6*, "*I have said, Ye are gods.*" Augustine (*Enarratio* in p. 81) regards Israel as a whole as the subject of the Psalm, and *v. 6*, as an address specially to the *elect*, "*eos qui prædestinati sunt in vitam æternam.*" The authors of the Catechism are unfortunate in citing a passage for the purpose of glorifying the priesthood, in which the tone throughout is one of severe rebuke, and in which these "gods" are told that they shall "die like men." Our priesthood is one which knows no change by reason of death—one after the power of an endless life. See 7th chapter of Hebrews, *passim*.

ordinance of baptism has been perverted, as to its matter, by substituting a mixture of oil, spittle, salt, and water, for the element of water, (that is, an element which *defiles* has been substituted for the element that *cleanses*); it has been perverted, as to its form, by ascribing a significance to it altogether different from that which the New Testament ascribes to it; and it has been perverted, as to its design, by making it a physical cause of grace to the recipient in every case in which no obstruction is opposed to its operation. It is not the baptism of the New Testament at all, but a ceremony totally different. It requires, therefore, a different kind of administrator from that minister of the word whose office it is, by the appointment of Christ, to administer *Christian* baptism.

In like manner, they have perverted the ordinance of the supper. It is no longer a simple memorial of the sacrifice of Christ which was offered *once* for all, but a true and proper offering of the body, blood, and divinity of Christ continually for the living and the dead. The matter, form, and design of this sacrament have all been so perverted, that its identity has been lost. "We therefore confess," says the Tridentine Catechism,* "that the sacrifice of the mass is one and the same

*See the Cat. Trident. on the Sacrament of the Eucharist. We quote, for the most part, from the English translation made by Donovan, Professor of the Royal College, Maynooth. Balt., 1833. So also the Council itself (Sess. 22) in its Canons. Can. 2. "If any shall say, that Christ in these words, 'Do this in commemoration of me,' did not make the apostles priests, or that he did not ordain that they and other priests should offer his own body and blood; let him be anathema." Can. 3. "If any one say, that the sacrifice of the mass is a sacrifice only of praise and thanksgiving, or a bare commemoration of the sacrifice performed upon the cross, and not also a *propitiatory* sacrifice; or that it profits only him who receives it, and ought not to be offered for the living and the dead, for sins, punishments, satisfactions, and other necessities; let him be anathema."

Bossuet in his "Exposition de la Doctrine de l'Eglise Catholique," which was written for the purpose of conciliating the French Protestants, softens the statement of the Council, or, at least, cites (in 1:3) the mildest language of Sess. 22, c. 1, and insists that the Church in offering Christ

sacrifice with that of the cross: the victim is one and the same, Christ Jesus, who offered himself, once only, a bloody sacrifice on the altar of the cross. The bloody and the unbloody victim is still one and the same, and the oblation of the cross is daily renewed in the eucharistic sacrifice, in obedience to the command of our Lord, 'This do for a commemoration of me.' The Priest is also the same, Christ our Lord: the ministers who offer this sacrifice, consecrate the holy mysteries, not in their own person, but in the person of Christ. This the words of consecration declare: the priest does not say, 'This is the body of Christ,' but, 'This is my body;' and thus invested with the character of Christ, he changes the substance of the bread and wine into the substance of his real body and blood. That the holy sacrifice of the mass, therefore, is not only a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, or a commemoration of the sacrifice of the cross, but also a sacrifice of propitiation, by which God is appeased and rendered propitious, the pastor will teach as a dogma defined by the unerring authority of a General Council of the Church." The Papists make a distinction, indeed, between the eucharist considered as a *sacrament*, and the eucharist considered as a *sacrifice*,* but the distinction is of no importance in the present argument.

to God in this sacrament, does the same thing which is done in the Reformed Church, except that the one affirms and the other denies the *real presence*. He denies that Rome pretends to offer any new propitiation for the appeasing of God anew, as if he had not been sufficiently appeased by the sacrifice of the cross; or, that any supplement is made to the price of our redemption as if it were insufficient. He represents all as being done in the sacrament in the way of intercession and application. Yet he expressly holds the doctrine of Trent, and what that is we have seen.

*See the Roman Catechism on the Sacrament of the Eucharist. It says: "The difference between the eucharist as a sacrament and a sacrifice is very great, and is twofold. As a sacrament, it is perfected by consecration; as a sacrifice, all its efficacy consists in its oblation. When deposited in a tabernacle, or borne to the sick, it is therefore not a sacrifice but a sacrament. As a sacrament, it is also to the worthy receiver a source of merit, and brings with it all those advantages which we have already mentioned; as a sacrifice, it is not only a source of merit, but also of satisfac-

Further, the Papists hold that all grace is conveyed through the sacraments; that "by them all true righteousness begins, or being begun is increased, or having been lost is restored."* They hold, also, that the grace is always conferred upon the recipient of the sacrament, where duly administered, unless the recipient places a bar or obstacle in the way; and the Trent Council curses all who say the contrary.† None, therefore, can be saved without baptism,‡ and all baptized *infants* (since they can oppose no "bar") are regenerated. As the sacraments can be administered (except in certain extreme cases) only by a priest, the priests have the whole matter of salvation absolutely in their own hands. The power of the priest to confer grace by the sacraments is not impaired by his personal character, however foul. He may be living in "mortal" sin; he may, like the Pope Alexander Borgia, be mixing poison with the wine which he is about to give his friend at his own table; nevertheless he can confer the grace of God in the sacraments; and, in Can. 12, Sess. 7, the *holy* Council curses all who say the contrary. The sacraments are everything; the preaching of the word nothing, in this holy, catholic, apostolic Church.

Again, as to the mode in which the priests since the time of the apostles become their successors, Rome holds that it is by

tion. As, in his passion, our Lord merited and satisfied for us; so in the oblation of this sacrifice, which is a bond of Christian unity, Christians merit the fruit of his passion, and satisfy for sin."

*Concil. Trident, Decretum de Sacramentis, Sess. 7, Proœmium.

†Canon 6, of Sess. 7. In Canon 8, all are cursed who say that the sacraments do not confer grace *ex opere operato*; but that faith alone in the divine promise is sufficient to obtain the grace.

‡Baptism is of great consequence in Rome, as it ought to be, seeing they make it the sacrament of justification. But the glory of the priesthood consists in the privilege of immolating Christ, and of judicially absolving men from their sins. Baptism may be administered even by a woman, by Jews, infidels, and heretics, in case of necessity, provided they intend to do what the Church does in that act of her ministry. Cat. Trid. on the Sacrament of Baptism. But the eucharist, the sacrifice of the mass, and judicial absolution, can be administered only by a priest. Con. Trid. Sess. 14, c. 6; Cat. on the Eucharist, 72.

the sacrament of orders. The main points of their doctrine are: (a). That as Christ made the apostles priests by imparting to them the Holy Ghost and the power of judicial absolution (John xx. 22, 23), so the apostles have transmitted to their successors, the bishops of Rome, the same gifts; which bishops, in their turn, by imposition of hands, communicate the priesthood to the lower order. (b). That, as in the sacraments of baptism and confirmation an indelible character is imparted, so also in the sacrament of orders. By this indelible character, he who has once become a priest is always a priest; he can never again become a laic.* (c). That with this process the people have nothing at all to do. They have no voice at all in making priests. Canon 7, Sess. 23 of Trent. The priesthood is a distinct *caste*. They perpetuate the Church as the apostles created it before them.

These points constitute the essence of the doctrine of orders. The apostolical succession as held in Rome is therefore summarily comprehended in the three assertions: (a). That there is a true and proper priesthood, on earth, under the Christian dispensation. (b). That there is a true and proper sacrifice to be continually offered. (c). That the succession of priests is secured by the sacrament of orders: this last point, of course, involving the assertion of the succession as a fact in history. We propose to consider these in their order.

I. As to the priesthood under the "new law," as the Papists delight to call the gospel, we remark:

1. That scarcely any truth is more clearly revealed in the New Testament than that of the *universal* priesthood of believers. The passages in which it is either expressly asserted or taken for granted are too numerous to be cited. One or two will suffice: "Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people." 1 Pet. ii. 9; comp. v. 5. The Papist will of course say that this description of believers under the gospel, is identical with that of Israel under the law (Ex. xix. 5, 6); and that, as the general priestly character of Israel was consistent,

*See Con. Trid. D. and C., Sess. 23, Can. 4.

in point of fact, with the existence of a special order of priests in the family of Aaron; so a special order of priests is by no means incompatible with the universal priesthood of believers under the gospel. As an abstract proposition, this may be conceded; but there is a very great difference between the two dispensations in point of fact. *First*, there is no institution of a priesthood in the New Testament as there was in the Old. *Second*, there is no limitation put upon the exercise of priestly functions or privileges on the part of the priestly people under the New Testament as there was under the Old. Let the Papists show us any chapters in the New Testament corresponding with such as the 8th Leviticus in the Old, and we will believe them. They have their "solemn ceremonies" in the consecration of their priests; but they are ceremonies which the court of Rome, not Jesus Christ, has ordained. If they say they observe the rites ordained in Leviticus, then they confess that their priesthood is after all the Aaronic, and not, as they have been accustomed to boast, a priesthood after the order of Melchisedec. Let them show us in the New Testament any such stern prohibitions against the people intermeddling with priestly functions as there are in the Old. So far from finding any such prohibitions, we find no discrimination at all, in regard to priestly character and function, between the ministry and the people, or (to use the language of Rome) between the *clergy* and the *laity*. It is the duty and privilege of all alike to offer *spiritual* sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ. The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews exhorts his brethren, without any note of distinction, to do what the high-priest alone could do, and that only once a year, under the law—"to draw near with a true heart unto God." He bases this exhortation upon the fact that they have "boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way which he hath consecrated for them, through the vail, that is to say, his flesh; and upon the fact that they have a High-Priest over the house of God." Heb. x. 19-22.

2. The apostles are no where called priests, or represented as performing priestly functions. Considering the extent to which

the institutions and technical language of the Old Testament moulded the forms of representation in the New, this fact is very noteworthy. The apostles do sometimes use the sacerdotal and sacrificial language of the Old Testament to describe their work, but it is always under conditions which show, beyond doubt, that they are speaking figuratively. Thus Paul (Rom. xv. 16) speaks of himself as "the minister (*λειτουργῶν*) of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles, ministering (*ἑρουργοῦντα*) the gospel of God, that the offering up (*προσφορὰ*) of the Gentiles might be acceptable, being sanctified (*ἡγιασμένη*) by the Holy Ghost." Here observe, (a). That while the word *λειτουργῶν* has no strictly sacerdotal sense, being used for any public functionary, (as for instance in this very epistle, chap. xiii. 6, of the civil magistrate; comp. v. 4, *διάκονος*;) yet we concede that there may be a reference to its sacerdotal use in the Septuagint. (See Deut. x. 8; xvii. 12; Joel i. 9; comp. Heb. x. 11). (b). That the second word, which is undoubtedly sacerdotal, is explained by the nature of the offering which is made to God, to wit, the *Gentiles*, not the *mass*. If the Gentiles are a *sacrifice* in the strict and literal sense of the term, then, of course, Paul is a *priest* in the same sense. But the first will not be asserted, we apprehend, even by a Papist. The truth is, Paul's statement amounts to this: "I am indeed a priest, but my priestly functions are exercised in preaching the glad tidings to the Gentiles, and in making an offering to God of those who are, through the word, sanctified by the Holy Ghost." If the priesthood of Rome were of this kind, no objection could be made to it. But it is altogether different. Its office is to offer a propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead.

We have said that the *apostles* use sacrificial language in describing their work. But Paul, we believe, is the only one of the apostles who does; and he only in the instance cited, unless Rom. xii. 1, Phil. ii. 17, 2 Tim. iv. 6, be considered instances. Peter, the "first pope," never uses it, so far as we have been able to find, in special application to the ministry. His style is, "We will give ourselves to the ministry (*διακονίᾳ*) of the word and to prayer." Acts vi. 4. "The elders who are among you I exhort, who am your fellow-elder and a witness of the sufferings of

Christ, and also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed, feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof (or, performing the office of bishops in it), not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as being lords over God's heritage,* but being ensamples to the flock." 1 Pet. v. 1-3. How strange would such words sound from the mouth of his pretended successors! It is too plain that the ministry of the apostles was not the same as the ministry of the papal priesthood; and that if the papal ministers are true and proper priests, they possess a dignity to which the apostles, with Peter at their head, did not dream of aspiring. It is hardly necessary to say that we hold with the apostles.

3. Not only do the apostles say that all believers are priests, and claim no special priestly character for themselves, but a special argument is made by one of them to show that there can be no true and proper priests on earth since the offering of Jesus Christ and his passing into the heavens. The doctrine of Rome makes utter nonsense of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and particularly of the 7th chapter. The papists say that their priesthood is of the order of Melchisedec; and yet the main feature of the priesthood of Melchisedec, according to the apostle, is that it *admits of no succession*. "They truly (the Levitical priests) were many priests, because they were not suffered to continue by reason of death; but this man, because he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood." Heb. vii. 23, 24. But why quote particular verses? Almost every verse in this chapter is a dagger which goes to the heart of the papal theory. Nothing but the most audacious effrontery could venture to maintain such a theory in the face of such an argument. The

*This is the only instance in which the word κληρος is used of *persons* in the New Testament; and yet it is the word from which the word *clergy* comes. According to this passage, the *clergy* or inheritance of God is the *laity* or flock, which is in danger of being lorded over. See Campbell's *Lect. on Eccl. History*, L. 9. This is worthy of being noted, because the distinction of clergy and laity came in with the notion of a sacerdotal ministry in the Church.

papal priesthood is simply an insult, impudent and shameless, to Christ, who alone possesses a priesthood after the order of Melchisedec. It is not only destitute of even the shadow of evidence, but is a direct contradiction to the teaching of the Sacred Scriptures; and being the corner-stone of the apostolical succession, the whole structure tumbles into ruins, or, rather, is proved to be "the baseless fabric of a vision."

II. As to the next element involved in this doctrine, the power of the priesthood to offer a true and proper sacrifice, it need not detain us so long. For,

1. If there is no proper priesthood on earth, there can of course be no proper offering of sacrifice. Priesthood and sacrifice go together; together they stand or fall.

2. The only true and proper sacrifice which the papal priests pretend to offer, is that of the mass; and this is a pure invention of men, instigated no doubt by the devil, that restless plotter against the glory of Christ and the salvation of his Church.

It would be out of place, in this discussion, to enter into an elaborate argument against the sacrifice of the mass. It will be sufficient to say, (a). That the *silence* of the Sacred Scriptures seals its condemnation. It is altogether incredible that nothing should be said about any sacrifice in the eucharist if that ordinance were a sacrifice, and especially if it had occupied the place in the religion of the apostles which it occupies in the religion of Rome—if it had been considered a fundamental point and necessary to the proper observance of Christian worship. The apostles give line upon line and precept upon precept in regard to things which the Papists themselves would confess to be of very inferior importance, and yet say nothing about this. This silence is the more remarkable upon the papal theory, because the doctrine of the mass is, by their own confession, hard to be believed, indeed plainly contradicted even by the testimony of the senses, and therefore liable to the strongest assaults of Satan. Further, how can these Judaizers account for the fact, that while in the old law there is constant mention of priests and sacrifices, and most minute details as to both, we

find nothing corresponding in the new? It is indeed an awful *mystery*, since the apostles have not even attempted to throw any light upon it.

But not too fast—the Papists pretend that they do find in the New Testament a sacrificial character ascribed to the eucharist. For example, 1 Cor. x. 21; Heb. xiii. 10. Now as to the first passage it is sufficient to remark that Paul does not compare the table of the eucharist with the altar of the Gentiles, but the Lord's table with the table of dæmons. The table of dæmons is not the *altar* of the Gentiles upon which they sacrificed to their idols, but the *table* upon which, after the sacrifice had been offered, the meats were spread for a feast in honor of the idol. And even if the comparison had been one between the Lord's table and altars, the conclusion would not follow which papal logic seeks to draw; for the apostle is not concerned about the reason and nature of altar or sacrifice, but only about the communion or participation of the worshippers with it. He aims to show that the Corinthians could not with a good conscience be present at these feasts in the idol-temples, because they had been made partakers of the Lord's Supper, and so had communion with Christ and professed his religion, as those who ate of the ancient victims under the law were made "partakers of the altar," that is, professed the Jewish religion.*

As to Heb. xiii. 10, we remark that nothing is said here about the eucharist; that the only sacrifices mentioned in the context as connected with this altar are *praise* and *alms-giving* (vs. 15, 16); that the altar is said to be Christ himself in v. 15;† and in v. 9, we have a solemn warning against just such a religion as Rome teaches—a religion of *meats* and not of *grace*.

(b). The only other argument we shall mention against the mass is that of the Epistle to the Hebrews. The argument is of the

*See Turretine, L. 19, Q. 29. Opp. 3, p. 456, Carter's Ed.

†So Aquinas: "This altar is either the cross of Christ, or Christ himself, in whom and by whom we offer our prayers to God." Bellarmine, though not very scrupulous about the arguments he uses, does not urge this place, because many Catholics understand by altar, here, Christ and the cross. See Turret. *ut supra*.

same sort with that respecting the priesthood. As the perfection of the priesthood of Christ admits of no succession of mortal priests, so the perfection of his sacrifice admits of no repeated sacrifices. Let us quote one passage only from the Hebrews: "Nor yet that Christ should offer himself often, as the high-priest entereth into the holy place every year with the blood of others; for then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world; but now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment; so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation. For the law having a shadow of good things to come, . . . can never with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually, make the comers thereunto perfect. For then would they not have ceased to be offered? because that the worshippers once purged should have had no more conscience of sins. But in those sacrifices there is a remembrance again made of sins every year." Heb. ix. 25-28; x. 1-3. This sword of the Spirit effectually cuts the throat of the sacrifice of the mass. With respect both to the priesthood and the sacrifice, the Papists have done the very thing against which the whole Epistle to the Hebrews is a warning. They have apostatized from the Gospel and have gone back to Judaism.

Having thus disposed of this second element of the doctrine of successson, we may tarry, before proceeding to the next, to say a word or two in reference to the doctrine of sacramental grace in all its forms. *First*: The whole idea of the Papists and their apists that salvation is conveyed through the sacraments rather than through the word, is utterly foreign to the thinking and language of the New Testament, which gives this prominence to the word and not to the sacraments. Take an example or two out of very many. Paul says to the Corinthians (1 Epistle i. 14-17), "I thank God I baptized none of you but Crispus and Gaius, lest any should say that I had baptized in my own name . . . For Christ sent me *not to baptize, but to preach the*

gospel." So Peter: "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by *the word of God*, which liveth and abideth for ever, . . . and this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you." 1 Peter i. 23-25. And even where the sacrament is spoken of as the means of regeneration it is almost always coupled with the word, or, if not, something is added in order to guard against the error that there is any efficacy in it *ex opere operato*. Thus in Eph. v. 26, Paul speaks of the Church as sanctified and cleansed "with the washing of water *by the word.*" "Go . . . preach the gospel. . . He that believeth *and* is baptized, shall be saved." Mark xvi. So Peter in speaking of baptism as saving us, takes care to say that he is not speaking of the outward ordinance, but the answer of a good conscience towards God. 1 Pet. iii. 21.

The idea of the apostles was that the *word* was the charter of salvation, and conveyed everything that was conveyed; that the sacraments were a species of symbolical word and *pro tanto* performed the same office as the word written or spoken; and that in addition to being *signs* or symbolical words, the sacraments were *seals* of the word as charter, ratifying the covenant contained in the word and possessing no value whatever if detached from the word. The doctrine of Rome that by the sacraments all grace begins, and when begun is increased, or when lost is restored, has not the shadow of a foundation in the Sacred Scriptures, or in common sense.

Second: That there is no grace given except through the sacraments, is a doctrine still more monstrous; flatly contradicting many passages of the Sacred Scriptures. See, for example, the case of Peter in Acts x. 47, where the "first pope" argues from the fact that these heathen had received the Holy Ghost, that no man could forbid them to be baptized. And then, be it observed, he does not baptize them himself, but commands them to be baptized. No more than his beloved brother Paul, does Peter seem to have been anxious about the rite of baptism, provided only it was done decently and in order.* But the Papists

*"No passage can be produced from the New Testament in which administration of the sacrament is, by a divine law, restricted to the apostles

and their imitators must make much of it, or their apostolical succession is nothing worth. Hence they must "deny the validity of all baptism but their own, and in defiance of decency, charity, and common sense, refuse to inter an infant who has not passed under their own patent process of regeneration. The consequence is that they throw doubt (and many of them do not scruple to avow it) on the final state of the myriads of unbap-

and their delegates, or the grace of these ordinances made dependent upon the persons of the administrators. See Acts ii. 41; viii. 33; ix. 18. (Ananias, for all we know, was a layman.) The two sacraments have, in the lapse of time, experienced a very different fate. By the Donatist controversy the principle was established, that baptism even when administered by those not in the communion with the Church, if only the word and the element had been present, was so far valid as that it was not to be repeated in the case of those who, having been baptized in schism, became reconciled to the Church. It was argued by Augustin, most conclusively, that the sacrament is Christ's, not his who administers it; and derives its virtue from the sacred name in which it is administered. This was in effect disconnecting the validity of the ordinance from the person of the administrator; for though it was still maintained that the recipient, so long as he continued in a state of schism, derived no benefit from his baptism, still the ordinance itself was pronounced valid, and, as such, was not to be repeated. . . . The eucharist, on the contrary, has always been most jealously guarded from the profanation of lay hands. Yet if there is any difference in the Sacred Scriptures, as regards this point, between the two sacraments, baptism is the one which has more the appearance of being restricted. Matt. xxviii. 19. But it is characteristic of the Church system to be most peremptory and exclusive in its decisions where the Sacred Scriptures supply the slenderest foundation for them." See Sitton's Church of Christ, p. 635.

The validity of the sacraments, therefore, does not require them to be administered by certain officers; but the great law of "decency and order" makes it necessary that the Church should appoint certain persons to this office; and the ministers of the word, for obvious reasons, are the persons whom the Church *has* appointed. This is the common doctrine of the Reformed theologians. See for instance Turretine, *De Necess. Secess. Nostra ab Eccl. Rom.*, Disp. 8, 5, 18, (Vol. 4, p. 190 of Carter's Ed., N. Y., 1848). In case of necessity, the general calling of Christians and the law of charity take the place of any particular calling of officers, and the law of decency and order. Even the Papists admit the same as to the sacrament of baptism, though upon the false ground of the *absolute necessity* of this ordinance to salvation.

tized infants. Whether they are, as some of the Fathers believed, neither happy nor miserable—consigned to a state of joyless apathy, or condemned to eternal suffering—we are all, it seems, in the dark. We may hope the best, but that is all the comfort that can be given us. To a Christian contemplating this world of sorrow, it has ever been one of the most delightful sources of consolation, that the decree which involved even infancy in the sentence of death, has converted a great part of the primeval curse into a blessing, and has peopled heaven with myriads of immortals, who, after one brief pang of unremembered sorrow, have laid down forever the burdens of humanity. It has been the dear belief of the Christian mother, that the provisions of the great spiritual economy are extended to the infant whom she brought forth in sorrow, and whom she committed to the dust with a sorrow still deeper; that it will assuredly welcome her at the gates of paradise, arrayed in celestial beauty, and radiant with a cherub's smile. But all these gloriously sustaining hopes must be overcast in order to keep the mystical power of regeneration exclusively in the hands of the episcopal clergy. All charity, all decency, all humanity, as well as all common sense, are to be outraged, rather than that the power of conferring some inconceivable nonentity should be abandoned.”*

Third: This doctrine in its extreme form is the merest paganism, and resembles much more the magical rites and mummeries of people sunk in brutish, heathenish ignorance, than that “reasonable service” which God requires of his worshippers. It is a system of forms which does not compel men to recognise a God, any more than the laws of nature compel such a recognition. It is a system whose tendency is directly to infidelity and atheism. It supposes that God departs from his usual method of working by the laws of nature to accomplish effects which can be discerned neither by sense nor reason. The mystic regeneration, so far as can be known, leaves the person regenerated in no respect changed. He is neither wiser nor better than

**Edinburgh Review*, for April, 1843, p. 274, Amer. Ed.

before; just as capable of committing mortal sin, and in as great danger of eternal damnation, as if the priest's hand had not applied the magic mixture of water, oil, spittle, and salt. It has not even the plausibility of the juggler's tricks; for the juggler *appears* to work effects which are extraordinary. What evidence can miracles afford to a man who believes the doctrine of transubstantiation? Miracles appeal to the senses. This is the differentia by which they are discriminated from every other immediate act of God upon the creature. But in transubstantiation we are required to believe a miracle which contradicts the senses. How then can a miracle ever authenticate a divine revelation? If the reality of the change in the substance of the bread and wine is ascertained to us by the words, "This is my body," the question may be asked, how are we to know that these words were ever spoken or written? It will not do to appeal to the testimony of eye or ear, for transubstantiation pronounces the testimony of the senses untrustworthy. If God were to impress the reality of the fact upon the mind *directly*, still the revelation could never go beyond the mind that received it. It could never be authenticated to the minds of other men. So that the doctrine of sacramental grace is either nothing at all, a pure imposture, or its legitimate consequence is absolute pyrrhonism. It is substantially the philosophy of Hume under a religious guise.

III. We proceed now to the last point involved in the papal doctrine of succession. It might seem superfluous to argue the question any further. If there was no priesthood instituted by Christ, if the apostles were not priests, then of course there can be no succession of priests. Remove the facts of a priesthood and a sacrifice (in the sense before explained, the papal sense,) in the apostolic age, you remove the very foundation of the apostolical succession, and the whole structure tumbles into ruins. This, we venture to think, has been very effectually done, if the Sacred Scriptures are to be the rule of judgment. But we shall undertake, *ex abundante*, as the logicians say, to prove that, even if the apostles were priests, they have had no successors, or at least that there are none who can know and prove themselves

to be such, which amounts to the same thing. De non apparentibus et de non existentibus eadem est ratio.

1. It is a principle clearly laid down in the Sacred Scriptures, that no one may presume to undertake sacerdotal functions without a divine call or commission. "No man taketh this honor unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron." Heb. v.* Every attempt on the part of unauthorised persons to invade the priest's office among the Jews was visited with severe penalties. For this offence Korah and his company were destroyed, and Uzziah struck with leprosy. The Papists of course apply this principle to their pretended priesthood, *a fortiori*; since the Christian priesthood as much excels the Levitical in dignity, as the new law is superior to the old. So Christ, the founder of the new priesthood, having been called of God as was Aaron, called his successors the apostles, and the apostles their successors the bishops, transmitting to them, along with the authority of priests, the ordinary sacerdotal grace which they themselves had received from Christ. The bishops of the apostolic age have in their turn handed down the same grace to their successors, to the present time, by consecration or ordination.†

2. The power thus transmitted is twofold—a power of *order*, and a power of *jurisdiction*. The power of order is the power of immolating and offering Christ in the Eucharist, as before explained and refuted. The power of jurisdiction is the power of judicial absolution from guilt. The apostles received the first power at

*It is to be regretted that these words should generally be quoted by Protestant writers in proof of the necessity of a divine call to the ordinary officers in the Church. Such a call is indeed necessary, but not a direct and immediate call, such as the call of Aaron, and of Christ, to their respective orders of priesthood. This sacerdotal call is immediate, without the intervention of the Church, and in the Hebrews (chap. v.) the writer uses the words in application *only* to Christ and Aaron. Christ's priesthood admitted of no succession, and the words admit of no further application since his inauguration into office. In the case of the Aaronic priesthood, they were true of all his successors, because the succession was determined by *birth*. Of this more hereafter.

†See Litton on the Church of Christ, p. 530, et seq.

the institution of the Supper; the last, when Christ breathed on them after his resurrection, and said, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost," etc. John xx. 22, 23. Conc. Trid. Sess. 14, c. 1. See Litton, On the Ch. of Christ, pp. 531, 2.

3. The external instrument of transmission is the sacrament of orders, the administration of which belongs to the bishop alone. The visible sign of the sacrament is the laying on of hands. The inward effect is twofold: first, the impressing upon the soul of a spiritual *character* or stamp, which is indelible, so that he who is once made a priest can never return to the condition of a layman; and second, grace, not sanctifying, but ministerial (*gratia gratis data*) for the valid performance of sacerdotal functions. Conc. Trid. Sess. 23, Can. 4. Litton, p. 532.

This is a clear and consistent theory. If no sacraments and no absolution, then no Church. If no lawful priesthood, then no sacraments, at least no eucharist and no absolution. If no successors of the apostles, then no lawful priesthood. If not in communion with the bishop of Rome, no successors of the apostles. Hence beyond the pale of Rome, no covenanted grace.

This tremendous doctrine (for if it be true, it is tremendously true, and if false, it is a tremendous lie) we propose to examine in the light of the Sacred Scriptures, of the Papists' own principles, and of history. The result of this examination will show that the *fact* of such a succession is altogether incredible, and that it is the height of audacity for any Roman priest of the present day to affirm that he *knows* himself to be a true priest. The examination will be confined to the last of the above-mentioned points, as the others have been sufficiently discussed in the preceding part of this article.

1. The Sacred Scriptures make no mention anywhere of the *consecration* of any church officers, *as such*. All believers are priests and are consecrated to the worship and service of God by the indwelling of the Holy Ghost, in any calling which the sovereign will of God may appoint for them. No word signifying consecration is used of the appointment of church officers, *as such*. We shall not waste time in proving a negative. We defy Papists and Prelatists to produce a single example.

2. The Sacred Scriptures make no mention of any *ceremony* of consecration to be used by church officers in consecrating their successors. The Papists will hardly insist on the imposition of hands, since the first instance of that we meet with in the New Testament in connection with the ordination of church officers is in Acts vi., the case of the deacons. This was a case in which the hands of the apostles were laid on officers whom the people had *elected*; and what a horror the Papists have of the people's electing their own officers, everybody knows. Besides, the imposition of hands was so common among the Jews that nobody pretends that it *always* meant consecration; and the Papists themselves use it in cases where it is designed to have no such meaning. It would seem certain, at least, that they attach no great importance to this ceremony in the sacrament of confirmation, though it be one of the three sacraments in which an indelible character is imparted. The Tridentine Catechism gives minute directions for the celebration of this sacrament: the unction of the forehead, the sign of the cross, the kiss of peace, and even the slap on the cheek—but says not a word about the imposition of hands. This is all the more strange, because the Catechism refers to Acts viii. 14–17, in proof that the bishop alone has the power to administer this sacrament; and yet in that passage it is expressly said that “the apostles laid their hands on them and they received the Holy Ghost.”*

3. The Sacred Scriptures make no mention of an *indelible character* in orders, any more than in baptism and confirmation. That the papal body attaches some consequence to it would seem to be the case, from the fact that the Trent Council curses everybody who ventures to deny it. Sess. 23, Can. 4. Certain we are that any pious and intelligent man might read the New Testament (and for that matter the Old too) without ever think-

*The Episcopal Church is here a little more consistent. It not only *alleges* the example of the apostles, but *follows* it. Of course we do not admit that Acts viii. 14–17 has anything to do with “confirmation,” either sacrament or mere ceremony.

ing of any indelible character.* Still not thinking about it is a different thing from denying it. Let us therefore examine Gabriel Beil, who flourished less than a century before the Trent Council, and was a great light in the Church of Rome. He expended a great deal of thought and of research upon this mystery, and his conclusion is thus summed up by Chemnitz:† “That the word character, in this sense, is found neither in the Sacred Scriptures, nor in the ancient ecclesiastical writers; that it is not found in the ‘Master of the Sentences’ himself (Lombard); that as to the thing itself, neither the authority of the Fathers nor reason compels us to posit any such character; that the passages adduced from Dionysius, Augustine, Damascenus, and Lombard in favor of the ‘character,’ are to be expounded rather of the sacraments of baptism itself, or of the sacramental form, than of any impress or stamp made in fact upon the soul; that all the effects ascribed to the character may be explained as well without the character as with it; that the sacraments themselves work these effects without the character; that the things attributed to the character are found in the eucharist, and in other sacraments, which are not supposed to imprint it; that the chief reason which weighed with the schoolmen for positing the character has little force; that the unreiterableness of some of the sacraments does not depend upon the character, but upon the nature of these sacraments and the divine institution; that it is less clear what the character is, than that baptism is not to be reiterated; that the sole authority for it is a passage in the writings of Pope Innocent III. (A. D. 1198–1216); that the passage is susceptible of another interpretation; that a theologian ought not to lay down anything to be believed which is not necessary, *ex fide, et cet.*” So far this great champion of

*We beg pardon; the *Roman character* is referred to in several places of the Revelation. See xiii. 16–17; xiv. 9, 11; xv. 2; xvi. 2, et al. The word is *χαραγμα*. Heb. i. 3 is the only place in which the word *χαρακτήρ* occurs.

†Examine Concilii Tridentini, Sess. 7, p. 25. This great work is a storehouse of argument and history against the leading dogmas of Rome.

Rome. It would appear, then, to use the language of the *Edinburgh Review*, that this character is "a nonentity inscribed with a very formidable name—a very substantial shadow." "As to the *ubi* of the character," says Dr. Campbell, "there was no less variety of sentiments—some placing it in the essence of the soul, others in the understanding; some in the will, and others *more plausibly* in the imagination; others even in the hand and tongue; but by the general voice the body was excluded. So that the whole of what they agreed in amounts to this: that in the unreiterable sacraments, as they call them, something they know not *what* is imprinted, they know not *how*, on something in the soul of the recipient, they know not *where*, which never can be detected." And yet we are adjudged to the everlasting pains of hell for not believing it. We are willing to share the damnation of Gabriel if he has been damned for not believing *this*.

But what was the motive for postulating this mysterious non-entity and the transmission of sacerdotal grace? In answer, we quote the words of Litton (*On the Ch. of Christ*, pp. 534–537): "Christianity [according to Rome], being the new law of Christ, must present the same general characteristics which its predecessor, the law of Moses, did. Now every legal system of religion being necessarily of an artificial and arbitrary character in its appointments, inasmuch as it is intended to work from without inwards, and to produce the dispositions which it does not find present, a law from without will regulate in detail all matters connected with divine worship, and especially will determine the functions and persons of the sacerdotal order. The permanency of the external mould in which the worshipper is to be fashioned to religion being a principal object in every such system, the institution of the priestly order will be positive rather than natural: it will come from without, not spring from within. *Moral* qualifications for the ministerial office—such as wisdom, or knowledge, or personal piety—will, under such a system, occupy a subordinate place, or rather may be altogether dispensed with; the great object being to make provision for a visible succession of sacerdotal persons, who, whatever they may

be inwardly, shall at least possess an official sanctity. Besides, it is obvious that no one can guarantee the transmission of moral endowments, natural or spiritual. This object, the ancient systems of religion—the Jewish among the number—aimed at securing, and did in fact secure, by incorporating in themselves the principle of *caste*; that is, by attaching the priestly function to a certain tribe or family, separated for the purpose from the rest of the nation, and making it pass from father to son in the way of natural descent, irrespectively of moral qualifications. By this means the perpetual existence of a visible priesthood was secured; the only contingency, and that not a probable one, which could destroy the succession, being the extinction of the sacerdotal tribe or family. An hereditary priesthood, the basis of the sacerdotal character being not the *fitness* of the individual, but the consecration of the caste, is the natural accompaniment of every system of religion which aims at moulding men, by means of law and discipline, into a specific type of religious sentiment.

“The Jewish priesthood was instituted on the principle just mentioned. The tribe of Levi was set apart to the ministry of the tabernacle, and out of it the family of Aaron to sacerdotal functions; and nothing more was necessary to qualify men for the priesthood than legitimacy of birth and investiture with the sacred garments. It is obvious, that if anything analogous to this was to reappear under the Christian dispensation, it must undergo considerable modifications to render it less strikingly inconsistent with the general principles of the gospel: it must put on a more spiritual form, and one capable of greater expansiveness. Particularly in one point a change was indispensable: a priesthood propagating itself by natural descent would manifestly be unfitted for the purposes of a religion, the professed aim of which, is not like Judaism, to be a training school for one nation only, but to embrace all nations within its pale. The transmission therefore must be independent of race or tribe. It is in fact by thus modifying its aspect that Romanism is enabled to introduce the ministry of the law into the gospel. The principle of *caste* is retained; but it appears under a new form better

suiting to Christianity. The powers which belong to the sacred office are transmitted only in one line, and in that line they are transmitted independently of any moral qualification on the part of the recipient: only instead of priests by natural, we have priests by spiritual descent, the existing body of bishops possessing the power, in and by the sacrament of orders of spiritually generating pastors for the Church. As of old, so now, the legitimacy of the ministerial commission depends exclusively upon the legitimacy of the external succession, for the want of which no fulness of natural and spiritual endowment can compensate. Yet we are not to suppose that no internal grace accompanies the transmission of orders; that a priest becomes a priest solely by the visible imposition of hands. Some concession must, as regards this point, be made to the general spirit of Christianity, and therefore it is added, that by the sacrament of orders, working like all the others *ex opere operato*, grace is conferred; not however sanctifying grace, but the mystical grace of priesthood, grace for the valid performance of holy functions, which may exist equally in those who have saving faith in Christ, and in those who have not. Thus a degree of *inwardness* is imparted to what otherwise would be as purely external a matter as the succession of Eleazer to Aaron. Finally, as the ancient priests were always priests, no one having it in his power to reverse his natural birth, so the spiritual stamp or impressed character, which is a consequence of ordination, forever distinguishes him who receives it from his brethren in Christ."

The papal idea of ordination, as thus described, receives no sanction from the word of God; none from the Old Testament, much less from the New. Under the Old Testament the call of God determined the whole matter without the will of man. According to the Papists, the will of man determines everything; for the "*intention*"* of the officiating bishop or priest determines the question, whether the grace belonging to any sacrament shall be actually conferred or not. The external forms may be strictly canonical; but who can tell, whether the licen-

*Concil. Trident., Sess. 7, Can. 11; and Chemnitz's Examen.

tious, cock-fighting, gambling priest intends to do the act which the Church intends? The notorious want of reverence in papal priest—and the nearer Rome the more notorious the want of reverence—makes it very probable that in thousands of instances of apparent baptism, or confirmation, or ordination, the sacrament was a practical jest: meant nothing and did nothing. The current of spiritual electricity met with an obstinate non-conductor, was arrested and dissipated. Under the Old Testament, the extraordinary providence which was a leading feature of that dispensation, secured the family of Aaron from extinction; and the genealogical registers secured the people from the imposture of pretenders. In Rome no man can be sure that his priest is not an impostor or intruder.

Under the Old Testament there was no transmission of sacerdotal grace; and although the right of any man to be a priest was easily ascertained, no man's spiritual relations or spiritual state was made to depend upon the doings of the priest. The utmost wrong that could be done him was external, affecting his outward relations to the Church. But these cruel religion-mongers boast that one grand difference between the sacraments of the law and theirs, is, that the latter *confer* the grace which the former only *signify*.* If therefore a poor soul goes to a priest who is no priest; or if a true priest does not happen (through ignorance, or malice, or drunkenness, or the spirit of jesting) to intend to do what the Church intends, the salvation of that soul is put in extreme jeopardy. How different this hideous and cruel abomination from the merciful spirit of the gospel, which says, "Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved." Blessed be God, who brought our fathers out of this "pitchy cloud of infernal darkness" into the sunlight of divine truth, where we can "hear the bird of morning sing."

*The Tridentine Catechism says that "the sacraments of the old law were instituted as signs only of those things which were to be accomplished by the sacraments of the new law." (On the Sacraments). Let it be remembered that Rome holds that the sacraments not only confer grace, but that *nothing* can confer it without them; that they are necessary to salvation; and the statements of the text are fully sustained and justified.

Righteous will be our doom if we allow ourselves to be "re-involved" in that cloud again.

When we compare this doctrine of sacerdotal grace with the teachings of the New Testament, the contradiction becomes glaring. *First*: Neither the term orders nor the term ordination* occurs in the New Testament. It is a little remarkable that a sacrament should have been instituted without a name and without a record. We find then neither name nor thing. "The word *ordination* is of all ecclesiastical terms the most purely secular in derivation. The word *ordo* from which the Latin verb *ordinare* is derived, was the technical term for the senate or council to which, in the colonies and municipal towns of the Roman empire, the administration of local affairs was committed, and the members of which were called *Decuriones*. The correlative therefore to the *ordo* was not the laity as distinguished from the priesthood, but the *plebs* or private citizens, as distinguished from the magistracy. And in fact the word *ordinare* is never used by the classical writers to signify consecration to a sacred office. From the State it passed into the Church; whence the frequent use in the early Latin fathers of the word *plebs* to denote the Christian people or laity in contrast with the clergy. It is reasonable to suppose that when first introduced, its ecclesiastical corresponded to its civil meaning; and that to be

*It is hardly necessary to say that we do not refer to the *English* words *ordain* or *ordination*, or to the idea of ordination in the general sense of *appointing, constituting* (see Titus i. 5); but to the *ceremony* of setting apart a man to an office or a work. The word *ordain* occurs again in Acts xiv. 23 in our version, but there the Greek is different, *χειροτονεῖν*, a verb which afterwards became a technical one in the Greek Church to express ordination. But in the only other place where it occurs in the New Testament, 2 Cor. viii. 19, it is rendered by our translators "chosen." Comp. 1 Cor. xvi. 3: and this is a meaning, and apparently the chief meaning assigned to it by Suidas, Hesychius, and Suicer. See Suicer's *Thesaurus* under the word. No doubt it came to be used of the act of ordaining, because the election of officers preceded their ordination—election and ordination constituting vocation to office. So in the same way *χειροθεσία* signified blessing (*εὐλογία*) on account of the benediction which accompanied the laying on of hands in certain cases. See Suicer sub verb.

ordained, or to be invested with 'holy orders,' signified merely to be chosen a member of the governing body or presbytery in a Christian society; no reference being intended to a specific grade of religious standing supposed to be thereby acquired. To transfer the notions which in later times became connected with 'ordination' into the apostolic age, or the sacred narrative, is the ready way to fall into serious errors of scriptural interpretation."*

Second: This account of the origin of the word falls in with the view of ordination as given in the New Testament. In every free commonwealth citizens are elevated to office because they have, or are supposed to have, a larger measure of the endowments which qualify for office than the body of their fellow-citizens. They are not elevated to a *caste* or *rank* because they possess gifts which have been altogether denied to their fellow-citizens; nor are they selected out of the mass as persons upon whom certain gifts are to be conferred in order to qualify them for office. They are not subjected to a manipulation by which any indelible character is to be imprinted, or any political grace imparted. They are simply put into office, with or without solemn ceremonies, by the will of the body in which all political power resides and to which all the political gifts and capacities of its members belong. The power resides in the body as to its *being*; in the officers as to its *exercise*.† In the human body the power of vision may be said to belong as to its *being* to the body, but as to its *actual exercise* to the eye. The body is the principium *quod*, the eye is the principium *quo*. The body sees, but sees by the eye. The life of the body is in every part

*See Litton's Church of Christ, p. 567, foot-note. Similar confusion and error have resulted from the like use of the terms *heresy* and *schism*, the scriptural terms differing very widely in signification from the ecclesiastical. The Church of Rome, for example, has been remarkably free from the *ecclesiastical* sin of schism; no community has been more guilty of the sin of schism in the scriptural sense. How fatal has been the force and imposture of *words*!

†This distinction was expressed in the schools by the terms *in primo actu*, or *quoad esse*, and *in actu secundo*, or *quoad operari*.

and organ, and the life of the body controls the life in every part. The eye sees by the life of the body, and sees under the control of the life of the body and for the good of the body. The eye represents the body *quoad* seeing; is *in*, not *over*, the body for that purpose. So the commonwealth makes and administers the laws by the organs instituted for that purpose. Its life is in the legislature, in the judiciary, in the executive, for the discharge of their respective functions. The civil officers in these various departments are *in* the commonwealth, not *over* it; they represent the commonwealth *quoad* these various functions, and the functions being performed by the life of the commonwealth are performed for its interests. Further, in every such commonwealth there are solemn ceremonies by which the fact of such representation is formally recognised and published; and when the officer ceases to hold the office and relinquishes its duties, he ceases to be a representative and falls back into the mass.

Now this is an exact account of what occurs in the Church, *mutato nomine*, if only we allow for the difference between a free commonwealth which makes a constitution for itself, and a free commonwealth which has its constitution made for it by Christ.* It is in substance the view given by Paul in 1 Cor. xii., where

*The difference here signalized may be made plain by an illustration. The constitution in a free commonwealth is "ordained" and established by the "sovereign people" assembled in convention. The election of persons to fill the offices created and defined by the constitution belongs to the *people* in a very different sense, in the sense of "constituents." Hence an officer holding the office created by the constitution, or the *sovereign* people, is responsible to the people in *this* sense, and not in the sense of his constituency. The old doctrine therefore of "instructions" was inconsistent with the very nature of a representative, as Burke told the electors of Bristol. Now the constitution of the Church comes in *no sense* from the Church. There is no sovereignty but in Christ her head. He ordains and establishes her constitution; creates her offices; and her officers, though elected and "ordained" by the Church, are not responsible to those who elected them, but to the Head, and to those courts which he has appointed to govern. The rulers in the Church are rulers *in* her, not *over* her, as Paul hints to the elders at Ephesus. Acts xx. 28; in the Greek *ἐν ᾧ* not *ἐφ' ᾧ*. The eye is *in* the body for seeing, not *over* it. It is in a

his avowed object is to state the relations of gifts in the Church to the offices and functions discharged in it. He presents the same view also in Rom. xii. The gifts are given to the Church as a body; the life is hers, the life of the Holy Ghost; these gifts are given to be manifested and exercised for the profit of the whole body. The movement is *from within outwardly*; the organism effloresces in apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, teachers, deacons, etc. Compare Eph. iv. 4-16, in which exquisite description of the gifts and calling of the Church, the introduction of the idea of priestly caste would be felt to be an intolerable impertinence.† It is plain that the gifts and offices and officers are all given to the Church by her glorious Bride-

high place, much higher than the foot; but still it is *in* the body, as the foot is; and both eye and foot have *identically the same life*. In Rome, the priesthood is *over* the body, and has a life of its own, different from the life of the laity, (or people of God,) as the life of a shepherd is different from the life of the sheep whom he governs and *shears*.

We may add, that it follows from the view given above, that both election and ordination, while they express the judgment of the Church, express the judgment of the Church that Christ, the head, has called the persons elected and ordained.

†“All office-bearers, and especially all such as are ordinary and perpetual, are given by Christ to his Church; and the Church is not in any conceivable sense given to them. The personal ministry of Christ was surely not utterly barren. He had disciples before he had apostles; he had many, perhaps multitudes of followers, before the descent of the Holy Ghost had fully anointed the apostles for their office and work; and we are told that after his resurrection, and before his ascent into heaven, “He was seen of above five hundred brethren at once.” 1 Cor. xv. 6. And of the vast crowds that followed him, and heard gladly him who spake as never man spake, who shall presume to say that multitudes did not believe on him? To those already united with him by faith, and to his elect throughout the earth and throughout all generations, he gave, after he had singly triumphed over death and hell, the inestimable gift of a living and permanent ministry. But he had a Church in the world before there was either apostle, or prophet, or evangelist, or pastor, or teacher; and he will have a Church around him throughout eternal ages, after all his saints are gathered and perfected, and whose oracles, ordinances, and ministry shall all have fulfilled their work. His Bride was equally his undefiled, his only one, before any ordinance was established, or any oracle given, or any min-

groom; that in the order of nature and even of *time*, she exists before them. She is the end, and they are the means. The powers of teaching, ruling, distributing, are *her* powers; the gifts necessary for the exercise of these powers are *her* gifts; the officers through whom she exercises them are *her* officers; they are her eyes and ears and hands and feet. The life is the same in all: there is *one Spirit* as well as *one body*. There is no room here for the distinction of *clergy* and *laity* (if those terms mean any thing more than the distinction between office-bearers and private members); every laic is a clergyman, because he belongs to the inheritance of God; and every clergyman is a laic, because he belongs to the people of God. The simple statement of Paul is an overwhelming refutation of the putid figment of sacerdotal orders and sacerdotal grace. The officers of the Church are simply her representatives and organs *quoad* teaching, ruling, distributing, etc.; and "ordination" is simply a solemn ceremony by which the fact is recognised and authenticated. Here is no grace transmitted from man to man in a line of priests *over* the Church and *above* it; the propagation of a life separate and independent from that of the laity; but the very same grace, gifts, and *life* in the officers and in the body.

As Christ is the head of the Church, is the author of its constitution, and rules in it by his Spirit, no member of the Church can be made an officer except by a call from him, any more

istry constituted, as she is now that we enjoy all these proofs of his care and love; and if there had never been an office-bearer of the race of Adam given as a servant to minister unto her—if angels had been her only ministers forever, or the divine Spirit had disdained all secondary agencies, or were now to reject the whole body of sinful men, who are nothing but as he enables them—still that spotless Bride would be the Lamb's wife, by a covenant reaching from the depths of eternity, steadfast as the oath of God can make it, and sacred by the blood of Jesus with which it is sealed. No, no; there is no lordship, no headship in Christ's Church but that of Christ himself; there are but servants in the Church for Christ's sake; and their Master's rule is this: 'Whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant—he that is greatest among you shall be your servant.'" R. J. Breckinridge's Sermon on Eph. iv. 8.

than that member could be a member except by his calling. It is Christ who confers the gifts which qualify for office, and this is done by the Holy Ghost who dwells in the whole Church. It is Christ who creates the office and defines its functions and prescribes the qualifications for it. And yet, according to the will of the same Lord and Head, the call to be an officer is not complete without the action of the Church, any more than the call to be a member is complete without the action of the Church. Hence vocation is both inward and outward; and the outward consists of election* and ordination. Election is the act of the body; ordination the act of the rulers already existing, who have themselves been chosen in like manner; but both election

*That the people in the ancient Church had the right of electing their bishops is so notorious that we are not aware of its being seriously denied by any respectable writer. Hooker, (Ch. Polity, B. 7, c. 14,) after conceding the fact, goes on to vindicate the Church of England in denying this right to her people, upon the ground that changes of this sort must occur in the social development of a people, and appeals to the *civil history of Rome*, and the changes that took place first in the republic and afterwards in the empire! What is this but virtually asserting that the Church is a natural institution like the State, and that its life is merely natural? Such a doctrine is natural in the minister of a Church which was created by the state and is governed by it; but will be rejected with horror by every one who believes that Christ is the only King in his Church, and that her constitution comes from him. The truth is, the dogma of apostolical succession is utterly incompatible with any election of ministers by the people; and one or the other *must* be abandoned. If anybody doubts that bishops were elected by the suffrages of the people in the ancient Church, he may have his doubts fully removed by consulting Suicer's *Thesaurus Ecclesiasticus* under the words *Ἐπίσκοπος*, *χειροτονία*, and *χειροτονία*. Down to the time of Nicolaus II., who was made pontiff in 1058, the people of Rome still took part in electing the bishop of Rome. Nicolaus ordered that the cardinal bishops and the cardinal presbyters should elect the pontiff; yet without infringing the established rights of the Roman [German] emperors in this business. At the same time he did not exclude the rest of the clergy, nor the citizens and people from all part in the election; for he required that the assent of all these should be asked and obtained. It was not until the reign of Alexander III., more than a century afterwards, that the election of the pope was given exclusively to the college of cardinals. Mosheim, Vol. 2, p. 233. So long did this relic of the primitive doctrine linger after the ministry had been converted into a priesthood!

and ordination are acts of the Church making the person chosen and ordained, her representative or organ as to the particular functions to be performed. Election and ordination are therefore simply modes in which the divine calling is manifested and ascertained. The Spirit of Christ dwells in the man called, in the congregation electing, in the court ordaining; and when the presence and working of the Spirit is manifested in all these modes, the calling is as complete, and as completely authenticated as the present imperfect condition of the Church will allow. Ordination imparts no authority, it only recognises and authenticates it. The solemn ceremonies used in the inauguration of a president of the United States do not make him president, (that has been already done), but only recognise and authenticate the fact. It is not necessary that the oath of office should be administered by the outgoing president (upon the principle of like begetting like); it is sufficient that it be administered by an accredited organ and representative of the commonwealth.

If this be a just view of the nature of ordination, it follows that ordination is *not unrepeatable*. The occasions for a reiteration of the ceremony may be, and commonly will be, very rare, but there is nothing in the nature of the thing to hinder its being reiterated. Paul and Barnabas were separated for the special work to which the Holy Ghost had called them, by prayer and fasting, and the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery at Antioch. And yet Barnabas had been a distinguished teacher before in that very church, and Saul had been made "a chosen vessel to bear the name of Christ before kings, and the Gentiles, and the people of Israel," some time, according to some chronologers, many years before. If it be said that this was not a case of "ordination," of setting apart to an office, but only of setting apart to a special work; we answer, show us an instance of any separation to an office as contradistinguished from a work in the New Testament. If John xx. 22, 23, be adduced as an instance; we answer that this was an ordination by the Lord himself, and not by the Church. It is true that Rome directs the Bishop in the consecration of a priest to say, "Receive the

Holy Ghost;" and the Episcopal Church imitates Rome in one of its forms in the "ordaining of priests" (at the same time mercifully proposing another form for men whose consciences are too tender to allow them to use the first); but this is done without any warrant from Christ, and, as it appears to us, is near akin to blasphemy. We hold that the ordination of the apostles was extraordinary, as their office was extraordinary; and yet here is a case of the greatest of all the apostles having the hands of the ordinary teachers in Antioch laid upon him. He takes his place along with Barnabas; Stephen, the deacon; Timothy, the evangelist, or bishop, or legate *a latere*, or whatever he was; Barnabas, the teacher; Saul, the apostle; all alike had hands laid on them, and were commended to the Lord for the *work* which he had for them to do. And if any of these illustrious men had quit their work and gone to money-making, and then returned to their work again, there could be no good reason why the hands of the Presbytery should not have been laid upon them again. Or if Timothy had become a pastor of a congregation, there was no reason why he should not have been commended to the Lord to that new work, by prayer, fasting, and the imposition of hands. These things constitute the ceremonies of ordination; and Saul and Barnabas, who had been preaching for years, had these things done to them. Call it ordination or any thing you please, it was a solemn act of obedience to the Holy Ghost, recognising his sovereign will in the choice of these men for a particular ecclesiastical work of preaching and ruling. And if there be any thing more in "ordination" than this, we have been unable to find it.

Again, according to Rome, the bishop alone has the power to communicate this mysterious sacerdotal grace in orders. Now the New Testament knows nothing of the bishop as different in rank or order from the presbyter or priest. The papal bishop is a pure invention of man or—the devil. The sacrament of orders therefore falls to the ground, being founded on the bishop.

Once more. There is no instance in the New Testament, in which the act of ordaining was performed by one man. The college of apostles ordained the deacons; the prophets and

teachers laid hands on Barnabas and Saul; the Presbytery laid hands on Timothy. No doubt the apostles and evangelists did sometimes appoint or ordain elders, acting singly, when there was no existing Presbytery to do the act. But the record makes it very clear that they preferred the other method where it was practicable; just as in other acts of government the apostles, though competent to act each one by himself, preferred, when practicable, to act jointly, or as an assembly. They did this, no doubt, to indicate the mode in which Christ would have his Church to be governed in all time; "by the common counsel of the presbyters," to use Jerome's expression.

The Papists sometimes condescend to quote the Sacred Scriptures in proof of their peculiar doctrines. Their quotations generally have as little to do in fact with their doctrines, as the passage cited by a simple monk in proof of the scripturalness of the two orders of clergy, the regular and the secular—"the oxen were ploughing and the asses feeding beside them." But they find a passage (2 Tim. i. 6) which looks as if it might support their doctrine of ordination. For here is ordination by one man, and the imparting of a gift by the imposition of his hands. Upon this passage we observe, (a). That if this was a case of ordination, then it was either the same with that mentioned in 1 Tim. iv. 14, or a different one. If it was a *different* case, then Timothy was ordained at least *twice*; and what becomes of the indelible character, and the doctrine of the unreiterability of ordination? If it was the *same* case, then what becomes of ordination by bishops alone (for the ordination here was by presbyters)? Or if the Presbytery consisted of prelates, what becomes of the plenary authority of the apostle Paul? Was not *his* ordination sufficient to make Timothy a presbyter, or an evangelist, or even a prelatical bishop? If it is said that Paul condescended to be a bishop for the nonce; we answer that he might have condescended still further (as his brother Peter did, 1 Pet. v. 1,) to be a fellow-presbyter with his brethren, and act for and with them in the Presbytery in laying hands on Timothy. This, we have little doubt, is what actually occurred. (b). The gift that Timothy received by the laying on of the

hands of Paul, and the Presbytery was the gift described by Paul in Eph. iii. 7, 8, as having been given to himself, (perhaps by the laying on of the hands of the *layman* Ananias, Acts ix. 17-20). That it was no indelible character is evident from the fact that Timothy is exhorted to "stir it up;" Paul uses a word which implies that the gift had descended like fire from heaven; but that it was to be kept from going out, and to be increased by Timothy's care. It was a gift which manifested itself in "reading, exhortation, teaching" (see 1 Tim. iv. 13); was capable of being improved by these exercises, as well as by the "meditation" which was needful to perform them (v. 15); and a gift in which "his profiting might appear unto all." None of these things can be affirmed of the sacerdotal grace of the Papists. It exists alike in the laziest and the most diligent, in the vilest and the purest, in a Leo the Great and a Leo the Tenth. Whatever therefore this mystic grace may be, it is certainly a different thing from Paul's gift, or Timothy's. The "character" in Paul or Timothy would certainly have been "deleted" by a tenth or hundredth part of the wickedness which failed to delete it in John XXII., or Alexander VI.

Having thus said what we proposed to say upon the papal doctrine of succession in the light of the Sacred Scriptures, we proceed to consider it in the light of history and of the conditions of the doctrine itself. These two views of the subject we combine; as the history will show that the doctrine as stated by the Papists cuts its own throat, and that if we are to believe it, we must first abnegate our own reason. There is good reason why these people do not like an appeal to reason. We are very apt to be against that which we feel to be against us.

1. There is no such doctrine of succession as that of the Trent Council to be found in the first three centuries of the Church; we mean a doctrine involving a priesthood perpetuated by a process independent of the Christian people. Even the High-Churchman Cyprian, in the middle of the third century, whose extravagant language concerning the priesthood and the episcopate, prelatists quote much oftener and with vastly more relish than they ever quote Peter or Paul, did not venture to deny the

right of the people to have something to say in the creation of bishops and priests. The succession of the early fathers was a succession of *doctrine*, not of *persons*, except so far as persons were involved in the doctrinal succession. They seem to have been led to assert such a succession by a claim of this sort made by the heretics, who, finding the writings of the apostles against them, pretended to have a tradition of the apostles in their favor. Thus Tertullian, in his book "De præscriptionibus adversus hæreticos," urges the true succession against the false:* "Let them parade the origins of their churches, let them unroll the series of their bishops, so coming down by succession from the beginning, that the first bishop had some one of the apostles or a disciple of the apostles as his ordainer and predecessor. Let the heretics invent a figment of this sort, yet it will profit them nothing; for their very doctrine will convict them, when compared with the doctrine of the apostles, by its diversity and contrariety; for as the apostles did not teach contrary to one another, so apostolic men would not have taught contrary to the apostles." Tertullian's idea of the succession was not at all that of a priesthood whose function it was to offer sacrifice and pronounce authoritative absolution; but the succession of men in certain *churches* which, having been founded by the apostles or by their disciples, were called "sedes apostolicæ," or sees of the apostles, and were supposed to have a prescriptive right to say what the apostolical teaching really was.

This was indeed a very unsafe rule. It was not the rule given in the Sacred Scriptures. The spirits ought to have been tried by the Holy Spirit speaking in his word, and specially by the great fundamental doctrines of the word, as prescribed by John in his 1st Epistle, chap. iv.; but this rule was not deemed sufficiently easy, and yet it seems easy enough. "Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God. If there come any unto you, and *bring not this doctrine*, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God-speed." 2 John ix. 10.) But men were wiser than God, and in

*Tertullian. de præ. adv. hæretic. apud. Turretine. L. 18., Q. 13.

order to extinguish heresy and prevent schism, invented the Catholic doctrine and made communion with the bishop the mark of orthodoxy. But in the whole business, the *truth* was the thing aimed at, not sacramental grace or sacramental salvation. They inverted the proper order, and instead of judging the man or the Church by the *faith*, they judged the faith by the man or the Church. The results of this inversion have been deplorable; but these ancient worthies ought to be acquitted of the sin and silliness involved in the modern doctrine of the succession.

That this view of the position of the ancient Church is the true one, is evident from the Donatist controversy. It is well known that there was no difference between the Donatists and "the Church," either in faith or order. Both were orthodox; both were episcopal. There was no question made by the Church, whether the Donatist communion was a Church, a part of the Church visible on earth. Members coming to the Church from the Donatists were not rebaptized; but more than this, ministers coming from them to the Church were not reördained. Not only was this the case in the early stages of the great controversy, but even as late as the Conference at Carthage, just one century from the death of Mensurius, which was the original occasion of the strife, the Catholics offered to acknowledge the bishops of the Donatists. Even the Synod of Rome offered to hold communion with them.* The Catholic Church in fact stood

*See these positions fully established by Claude in his *Defence of the Reformation*, P. 3, c. 4. Chillingworth takes the same view of this controversy. He quotes from an epistle of Augustine these words: "You (the Donatists) are with us in baptism, in the creed, and the other sacraments"; and again: "Thou has proved to me that thou hast faith; prove to me likewise that thou hast charity." Parallel to which words are those of Optatus: "Amongst us and you is one ecclesiastical conversation, common lessons, the same faith, the same sacraments." Where, by the way, we may observe, that in the judgment of these fathers, even Donatists, though heretics and schismatics, gave true *ordination*, the true sacrament of matrimony, the sacramental absolution, confirmation, the true sacrament of the eucharist, true extreme unction; or else (choose you whether) some of these were not then esteemed sacraments. But for *ordination*, whether he (Augustine) held it a sacrament or no, certainly he held that it remained

on the defensive in this whole war, as any man can see by simply glancing over the writings of Augustine against the Donatists; it was simply defending its own right to be a Church, against a narrow-minded and fanatical sect which claimed to be the only Church in the world; it was occupying exactly the position in reference to the Donatists which *we* now occupy in reference to Rome and its imitators. The Catholics of that day had sense and charity enough *not* to follow the example of the Donatists, and unchurch all other communions but their own. It is very evident that they did not have, or did not know that they had, the apostolical succession. Otherwise, the argument would have been short, sharp and decisive. In that case the Church which had defied the power of the Roman emperors for three hundred years, might have been saved the disgrace of invoking the authority of the emperors to decide the controversy by arbitration and by the sword.

2. The Papists are in the habit of imposing upon people, by saying that the salvation of Protestants, like their faith, rests upon fallible and uncertain grounds, and that certainty can be

with them entire; for so he says in express terms in his book against Parmenianus's Epistle. Which doctrine, if you can reconcile with the present doctrine of the Roman Church, *eris mihi magnus Apollo.*" (Chillingworth's Works, P. 506, 507, of Phila. Ed., 1840.)

The learned Witsius (*De Schism. Donatistarum*, c. 7) says that he had read, "*non sine magno tædio,*" the Breviculum of Augustine, and the Acts of the Conference of Carthage (A. D. 411), and gives this as the main question disputed between the two hundred and eighty-six Catholic bishops, and the two hundred and seventy-nine Donatist bishops assembled at the Conference (held, be it remembered, a century after the breaking out of the schism), viz.: "Whether the Church which held communion with the Cæcilian, the Traditor, had not thereby lost the dignity and privileges of a Church? The controversy, therefore, was twofold: 1. First, of *fact*: whether C. was a traditor and on that account unworthy of the episcopate? 2. Second, of *law*; whether a Church is so vitiated by an admixture of the wicked, as to cease to be a Church?" This is a very different question from that which would have been discussed, if they had been disputing about the *succession*. It was indeed the same question which was afterwards debated between the Anabaptists and their antagonists, both Romanist and Protestant.

found only within their pale. Now, not to say that this assertion comes with a bad grace from a community which teaches in its creed that no man can be certain of his salvation in this life; it has been shown, over and over again, that their own doctrine of the priesthood and the sacraments makes it impossible for any man to know that he has ever been truly absolved from his sins; and this because of the uncertainty of the succession as a fact. That the sacrament of penance has ever been duly administered to him, depends upon the minister's being a true priest. "That such or such a man is priest," says Chillingworth, "not himself, much less any other can have any possible certainty; for it depends upon a great many contingent and uncertain supposals. He that will pretend to be certain of it, must undertake to know for certain all these things that follow":

"*First*, that he was baptized with due matter. *Secondly*, with the due form of words, which he cannot know, unless he were both present and attentive. *Thirdly*, he must know that he was baptized with due intention, and that is, that the minister of his baptism was not a secret Jew, nor a Moor, nor an atheist (of all which kinds, I fear, experience gives you a just cause to fear that Italy and Spain have priests not a few), but a Christian, in heart as well as profession, (otherwise, believing the sacrament to be nothing, in giving it he could intend to give nothing), nor a Samosatanean, nor an Arian, but one that was capable of having due intention, from which they that believe not the doctrine of the Trinity are excluded by you. And lastly, that he was neither drunk nor distracted at the administration of the sacrament, nor out of negligence or malice omitted his intention. *Fourthly*, he must undertake to know that the bishop which ordained him priest, ordained him completely with due matter, form and intention; and, consequently, that he again was neither Jew, Moor, nor atheist, nor liable to any such exception as is inconsistent with due intention of giving the sacrament of orders. *Fifthly*, he must undertake to know, that the bishop, which made him priest, was a priest himself; for your rule is *nihil dat quod non habet*; and, consequently, that there were

again none of the former nullities in his baptism, which might make him incapable of ordination, nor any invalidity in his ordination, but a true priest to ordain him again, the requisite matter and form, and due intention all concurring. *Lastly*, he must pretend to know the same of him that made him priest, and him that made him priest, even until he comes to the very fountain of priesthood. For, take any one in the whole train and succession of ordainers, and suppose him, by reason of any defect, only a supposed and not a true priest; then, according to your doctrine, he could not give a true, but only a supposed priesthood; and they that receive it of him, and again they that derive it from them, can give no better than they received; receiving nothing but a name and shadow, can give nothing but a name and shadow; and so from age to age, from generation to generation, being equivocal, fathers beget only equivocal sons; no principle in geometry being more certain than this, that the unsuppliable defect of any necessary antecedent, must needs cause a nullity of all those consequences which depend upon it. In fine, to know this one thing, you must first know ten thousand others, whereof not any one is a thing that can be known, there being no necessity that it should be true, which necessity alone can qualify any thing to be an object of science, but only, at the best, a high degree of probability that it is so. But then, that of ten thousand probables, no one should be false; that of ten thousand requisites, whereof any one may fail, not one should be wanting; this to me is extremely improbable, and even cousin-german to impossible. So that the assurance hereof is like a machine composed of an innumerable multitude of pieces, of which it is strangely unlikely, but some will be out of order, and yet if any one be so, the whole fabric of necessity falls to the ground; and he that shall put them together, and maturely consider all the possible ways of lapsing, and nullifying a priesthood in the Church of Rome, I believe will be very inclinable to think, that it is a hundred to one, that amongst a hundred seeming priests, there is not one true one—nay, that it is not a thing very improbable, that amongst those many millions which make up the Roman hierarchy, there are

not twenty true." (Chillingworth's Works, P. 130-2. Hooker, Phila., 1840.)

"Whether," says Macaulay in his Review of Gladstone's "Church and State" (Miscellanies, Vol. 3, P. 200), "a clergyman be really a successor of the apostles depends on an immense number of such contingencies as these: Whether under King Ethelwolf, a stupid priest might not, while baptizing several scores of Danish prisoners who had just made their option between the font and the gallows, inadvertently omit to perform the rite on one of these graceless proselytes?—whether, in the seventh century, an imposter, who had never received consecration, might not have passed himself off as a bishop on a rude tribe of Scots?—whether a lad of twelve did really, by a ceremony huddled over when he was too drunk to know what he was about, convey the episcopal character to a lad of ten?"

Mr. Gladstone proposes to remove doubts which may arise from the *historic* difficulties against the doctrine of succession, by nothing less than mathematical evidence. "By a novel application of the theory of ratios and proportion, he endeavors to show that, on the least favorable computation, the chances for the true consecration of any bishop are 8,000 to 1. . . . Be it so; this only diminishes the probability that, in any given case, the suspicion of invalidity is unfounded. What is wanted is a criterion which shall distinguish the *genuine* orders from the *spurious*. Alas! who knows but *he* may be the unhappy eight-thousandth? According to this theory, no man in the Roman or Anglican communions has a right to say that he is commissioned to preach the gospel, but only that he has seven thousand nine hundred and ninety-nine-eight-thousandth parts of certainty that he is! A felicitous mode of expression, it must be confessed. What would be the fraction for expressing the ratio of probability, on the supposition that simony, heresy, or infidelity, can invalidate *holy* orders is, considering the history of the middle ages, far beyond our arithmetic."*

"We can imagine," says the same lively writer, "the per-

* *Edinburgh Review*, for April, 1843, P. 271. Amer. Reprint.

plexity of a presbyter thus cast in doubt as to whether or not he has ever had the invaluable 'gift' of apostolical succession conferred upon him. As that gift is neither tangible nor visible, the subject neither of experience nor consciousness; as it cannot be known by any 'effects' produced by it, he may imagine—unhappy man!—that he has been 'regenerating' infants by baptism, when he has been simply sprinkling them with water. 'What is the matter?' the spectator of his distractions might ask. 'What have you lost?' 'Lost!' would be the reply, 'I fear I have lost my apostolical succession; or rather, my misery is, that I do not know and cannot tell whether I ever had it to lose.' It is of no use here to suggest the usual questions, 'When did you see it last? When were you last conscious of possessing it?' What a peculiar property is that of which, though so invaluable—nay, on which the whole efficacy of the Christian ministry depends—a man has no positive evidence to show whether he ever had it or not! which, if ever conferred, was conferred without his knowledge; and which, if it could be taken away, would still leave him ignorant, not only when, where, and how the theft was committed, but whether it had ever been committed or not! The sympathising friend might probably remind him, that as he was not sure he had ever had it, so *perhaps* he still had it without knowing it. '*Perhaps!*' he would reply, 'but it is certainty I want.' 'Well,' it might be said, 'Mr. Gladstone assures you, that, on the most moderate computation, your chances are as 8,000 to 1 that you have it.' 'Pish!' the distracted man would exclaim, 'What does Mr. Gladstone know about the matter?' And truly to *that* query we know not well what answer the friend could make."

It thus appears that there is no historical evidence for the succession; and that no man can be certain that he is a presbyter or priest upon this theory. This baseless theory is that upon which wretched men, travelling to the bar of God and the retributions of eternity, are invited to rest their hope of salvation, instead of resting it upon Jesus Christ, the Saviour of sinners, freely offered to them in the gospel! Blessed is he, who can say, in spite of all the cavilling Pharisees, cavilling about

the uncanonical method of his salvation—"One thing I know, that whereas I was blind, now I see!" Blessed be he who gets his healing directly from the great Physician, without the manipulations of those who sit, or imagine that they sit, in Moses' seat! No wonder that the world is infidel when *such* a doctrine, without evidence and against all evidence, is preached to them. A man must denude himself of his rational nature before he can believe it.

The doctrine was invented, not for the glorifying of Christ, but for the glorifying of the *clergy*. Great is the contrast between the apostles and their pretended successors. "The former are intent, almost exclusively intent, on those great themes which render the gospel 'glad tidings'; the latter, almost as exclusively, in magnifying their office. The former absolutely forget themselves in their flocks; the latter well nigh forget their flocks in themselves. The former, if they touch on the clerical office at all, are principally intent on its spiritual qualifications and duties; the latter on its prerogatives and powers. To hear these men talk, one would imagine that, by a similar *ἵσπερον πρότερον*, with that of the simple-minded monk, who 'devoutly thanked God that in his wisdom he had always placed large rivers near large towns,' they supposed the Church of Christ to be created for the sole use of the clergy; and the doctrine of 'apostolical succession' to be the *final cause* of Christianity." (*Edinburgh Review*, April 1843, P. 292.)

The whole system to which this doctrine belongs is a tedious substitute for Christianity, whose chief glory is its spiritual and moral character. It substitutes "for a worship founded on intelligent faith, a devotion which is a species of mechanism, and rites which operate as by magic. The doctrine of apostolical succession itself is neither more nor less respectable than that of the hereditary sanctity of the Brahminical caste; while the prayer-mills of the Tartars afford a fair illustration of the doctrine of sacramental efficacy." It is sheer heathenism.

What is Christianity if it be not a method of salvation through Jesus Christ, to be received through faith? Justification by faith alone is its fundamental article; the "*articulus stantis aut*

cadentis ecclesiæ." What is heathenism but the attempt to appease an angry God by human works, or by human ordinances efficacious *ex opere operato*? The system to which the apostolical succession belongs, can never consist with the doctrine of justification by faith alone in Jesus Christ. The preaching of this latter doctrine led Luther, necessarily, to a rejection of the Papal theory of the Church and the priesthood; and it was because the Papal priests saw that *their craft was in danger* from the preaching of this doctrine, that they set themselves so resolutely to overthrow it. If a sinner can lay hold on Christ freely offered to him in the gospel, and obtain the forgiveness of sins and acceptance with God; if he can have immediate access to Christ, the great High Priest over the house of God, and can "draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith," what need for an earthly priesthood and its sacramental magic? *Hinc illæ lacrymæ.* The priests had no tears to shed over the damage done to holiness by the doctrine of the Reformers. They would have been "crocodile tears," indeed, if shed by such men, men who had become notorious and infamous all over Europe for their immorality.* No! they knew that their power over men's souls, bodies and estates was gone, if this doctrine came to be believed.

We add something on the doctrine of succession as held by some in the Church of England, and in the Protestant Episcopal Church in America. 1. If these people have any "succession,"

*As to the *moral* complexion of Papal Councils, and specially of the Trent Council, the following words of a nervous writer, who was a perfect master of the Papal History, cannot be considered too strong: "Beleaguered by strumpets, beset with fiddlers and buffoons, cursing God's truth, and leaving tracks strewed with bastards and dead men's bones! *Holy* Councils; and above all, of Trent! Which by the amazing wrath of God, cursed with judicial blindness and seared consciences, did gather into one vast monument, those scattered proofs which covered the long track of ages, and those errors and corruptions bred in the slime and filth of the whole apostasy; and reared them up, with patient and laborious vice, through eighteen years of God's long-suffering, the final landmark, the last limit of his endurance with this great, bloody and drunken Babylon." (*Spirit of Nineteenth Century*, 1842, p. 254.)

they have derived it from the Church of Rome; and as the succession in Rome has been shown to be a grand imposture, from the Sacred Scriptures, reason and history, and Rome, could give no better *orders* than she had herself—of course the succession in the Church of England is an imposture also. 2. The imposture is not grand in the last case, for the simple reason that all that makes the figment worth asserting or defending has been given up, to wit., the priestly character and the sacrifice. It is the play of Hamlet with the part of Hamlet left out. Without the assertion of some sacramental virtue imparted by the Bishop's hands to the presbyter, and some sacramental virtue imparted by the priests' manipulations to the laity, the pretence to the apostolical succession is of all pretences the emptiest and the silliest. Hence we find that a revival of zeal for this dogma is generally followed very soon by the doctrine of sacramental grace. There is a necessary connection between the two, and they cannot long be separated. 3. We may be excused from believing the doctrine as held by Anglicans and their American imitators, so long as they show so little faith in it themselves. If they believed it, they could not help seeing that they are what Rome pronounces them to be, *schismatics*, and in no better condition than us poor "dissenters." Let them show their faith by their works, and we shall be more disposed to consider their pretensions. 4. The advocates of this dogma in the Church of England, would do well to prove that the Church they belong to is a Church at all. According to Rome, a bishop who is made so by the appointment of the *civil magistrate* has a very doubtful claim to the title. In the thoroughly Erastian establishment of England, the whole constitution of the Church is the work of the State, and the people even pray by "Act of Parliament." The sacramental virtue, which makes bishops and priests, comes at the suggestion, at least, of the civil ministry. This accounts for the total absence of discipline in that Church. It is exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, to get rid of a bishop who avows himself an infidel. It is not a very broad caricature of the "Comedy of Convocation," to represent that venerable body as debating the question, whether a member of the Church of

England may deny the existence of God, without losing his standing as a member. 5. This doctrine is not taught in the formularies of the Church of England, nor is it held by very many of her best ministers and her highest ornaments. Chillingworth certainly did not hold it, and yet he had for his "God-father," no less a man than William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury, by whose influence, in great measure, the strayed son was brought back from the fold of Rome into the Church of England again. Bishop Butler, we imagine, did not hold it. It would have been odd, indeed, if such a thinker as the author of the "Analogy" had believed such a conglomeration of absurdities; more especially as he had been baptized and brought up in a Presbyterian fold. Archbishop Whately not only did not believe it, but showed clearly, in his *Essays on the Kingdom of Christ*, that the thing is absurd. "There is not," says he, "in all Christendom a minister who is able to trace up, with any approach to certainty, his own spiritual pedigree." The fathers and founders of the Church of England did not believe it, as has been proved against the writers of the Oxford Tracts. How *could* men believe it, who had so clear a view of the *only* priesthood and the *only* sacrifice of Christ? men, who were asking the advice, continually, of Calvin and other Presbyterians of the Continent? No! the really great men of the Anglican Church, whose worth was real and conspicuous, had no need of insisting upon a sacramental virtue which is invisible, intangible, inoperative, manifesting itself to no power of perception either of the body or mind; which, if a man has, he is none better; which, if he has not, he is none the worse.

ARTICLE II.

PAUL A PRESBYTERIAN.

Whatever may be said or thought about the methodistical tendencies of Peter, before he was "converted" and then "strengthened his brethren," it is not usual to claim that Paul was a very decided Arminian. And although, curiously enough, Philip is regarded by our Baptist brethren as rather leaning toward immersion, still as it seems, that while Paul was "in a certain house," "he *arose* and was baptized," and afterwards baptized the jailor somewhere about the prison and at night, they are not very sanguine in their efforts to prove that he was a Baptist. The mother of Zebedee's children seemed to be actuated by somewhat of an episcopal ambition, when she presented that pious request that her two sons might rise to a peculiar eminence in this spiritual kingdom. But Paul, in true Presbyterian style, spoke of himself as "less than the least of all saints," as the "chief of sinners," as one, who in his own estimation, "was not worthy to be called an apostle." And whatever superstitious minds may have thought about that expression, "upon this rock, I will build my Church," or whatever succeeding ages may have attributed to Peter, in the way of supremacy, Paul does not hesitate to demolish all such high-sounding pretensions, withstanding him "to the face," and even clinging to his original opinion, that "he was to be blamed," after serious reflection upon the whole transaction. He also sent out Timothy and Titus to organise churches, ordain elders and deacons; and then, as an apostle, he went around himself to *confirm* the members of these churches in faith and polity. But at the same time he did not hesitate to unite with the Presbytery in the ordination of parochial bishops or pastors; nor to attend as a delegate the first meeting of the Synod which was held at Jerusalem. And while the conclusion arrived at, after a free and full discussion, seemed to meet his personal approval, yet it was upon the authority of the Church, as made known by an

ecclesiastical court, that he enjoined obedience for the sake of unity, purity, and peace.

Such are some of the hints that are given us, here and there, in the sacred record as to the ecclesiastical tendencies of Paul; not as an apostle, but as a Christian, and as a "minister of the gospel." As an apostle, he did many things and had much authority which no minister of the present day would dare to do and to exercise.

It is in this light that we propose to examine briefly into his character, writings, and actions. And we expect to prove from these, that if Paul the preacher were now living, he would be a minister of some Presbytery; and would be nothing more nor less than a simple-hearted, earnest, humble, zealous, devoted, indefatigable, but preëminently able, Presbyterian preacher. He might not be a pastor; for it would require a larger church than Spurgeon's Tabernacle to hold the audiences which his fiery eloquence, and his massive logic, and his unbounded energy would collect. But even if Macedonian cries kept him traveling, like Wesley and Whitfield, into different countries, and compelled him to preach in the open air, still it would be as a Presbyterian, preaching Presbyterian doctrine in a Presbyterian way, after a Presbyterian form of worship, and holding himself responsible to his own Presbytery, as an authority that was placed over him by the "Head of the Church."

I. *He believed in an educated ministry.*

It is true that his apostolic colleagues were not all educated men as to the polite literature of that day. But he was aware of the fact, that their theological education had extended over a period equally as long as our Seminary course; and while they had not been instructed in all the science and philosophy of the schools, yet, during these three years of peripatetic education, they had for a Master, One, who intuitively knew more than Plato and Aristotle had acquired in a lifetime. And from him, "who spake as never man spake," they had learned lessons of spiritual wisdom which none of the "schools" then or since could teach them.

VOL. XXIII., NO. 4.—4.

But however this may be, when we look at his own case, we are constrained to believe that he must have had very decided convictions on this important subject. He had been for a long time "sitting at the feet of Gamaliel," and hence was a thoroughly accomplished scholar in polite literature, and in Jewish law. Naturally, he must have been endowed with a mind of unusual vigor and powers of application; and while there may have been rather a tendency to extremes, as is very apt to be the case in such giant intellects, yet there was interposed by the grace of God, a wholesome restraint, which held in check all such innate tendencies, until his whole system of "Didactic theology" rose up clear and distinct and symmetrical, absolutely consistent in all its parts, and stable as solid masonry in its logical coherence and strength. And yet this man, with all his natural faculties sharpened and brightened by extraordinary educational advantages, is not willing to enter upon his ministerial functions and his apostolic office as a mere "novice." And hence, strange as it may seem, and improbable to many candid minds, we find that after his conversion, and even after his call to the ministry, he spends about three years more, as we believe, in direct preparation for the sacred office. It is true, that he was to act as an apostle, and for the duties pertaining to this office, the special inspiration of God was to qualify him. But leaving this out of view entirely, it does seem to us that if there ever was a case calling for extraordinary ordination, and at the same time, one so unusual that it could not be regarded as a precedent, this was such a case.

It can scarcely be doubted as to whether Paul would have, at that time, stood a most satisfactory examination before the ablest Presbytery in this country, or in orthodox Scotland. We are very sure that there are not many men of our acquaintance, who would relish the idea of examining such a scholar on Greek or Hebrew; not to mention Church history and theology, or Church government, and the sacraments. We remember how awkwardly we once felt, when, as moderator, it became our duty to examine a most distinguished Doctor of Divinity, and

one properly so called. But great as our inferiority appeared, in comparison with that brilliant and profound theologian, still, with all his eminent scholarship and attainments, he was to Paul; as we were to him; or as a pigmy to a giant. Ministers, too, were in great demand at that time, for there was a special emphasis upon that language of the Saviour: "The harvest is plenteous, but the laborers are few." From all parts of the world the scattered elements of a defunct or dying Judaism, were clamoring for a hearing of those doctrines which were to supersede all their ancient rites and ceremonies. And not only so, but such a man as Paul was specially needed at that time. It is more than probable that he had more knowledge and wisdom, both natural and acquired, than all the other apostles put together. And yet, he must stay in the background, alone in Arabia, in earnest preparation for the sacred office. And, in the mean time, many others were going everywhere exhorting men to accept of Christ, and to enroll themselves as members of this infant Church, which was now spreading so rapidly over all the world. And it is evident, that all these discordant materials, gathered from Judaism and paganism, would need the strong will, and all the profound erudition of Paul, to mould them into form and consistency, after the divine model of a genuine Presbyterianism. But for all that—and really by reason of all that—Paul still kept in the back-ground, and persevered in that preparation, which his future work would demand. And even after he had entered upon his duties, while the same necessity remained, and the work only extended farther and farther, and the Church became more and more clamorous for laborers, still he would never relinquish that great fundamental principle of an educated ministry. He did not object to the elders, or even the deacons or private members exhorting the brethren, and urging sinners to repent and believe. He did not object to the setting apart of certain men as evangelists, when they had given credible evidence of a divine and miraculous call to preach the gospel in "frontier and destitute places;" but when it came to the ordination of a regular ministry, he was very decided and explicit in his statements. The Presbytery was to "lay hands suddenly on no

man." The bishop was to be "apt to teach," "able to teach others also," as well as blameless in life, and consistent in all ministerial dignity and deportment. The sudden elevation of any ignorant man from the plough-handle to the pulpit, certainly never entered into the Church polity of the carefully educated Paul.

II. *Paul was a Presbyterian in Theology.*

Any man who doubts that Paul would be recognised as a Calvinist at the present day, furnishes to our mind a practical illustration of the truth, that "a man can believe what he chooses;" or of that old maxim, "The wish is father to the thought." For while Calvinism can be deduced from the other parts of the Bible in all its entirety and impregnable symmetry; yet we may lay aside all the rest of the Bible, and still from Paul's exclusive writings, and even from his one "Epistle to the Romans," we can draw out the whole system, with all its logical arguments, and very many of its practical inferences and illustrations. The truth is, that Paul's own character and life furnishes an unabridged edition of genuine, unadulterated Calvinism. Taken all together, it is Calvinism in a nut-shell.

It would be difficult to find a more striking illustration of "total depravity" than "Saul of Tarsus," or a more graphic description of "salvation by grace, according to the eternal purpose and foreordination of God," than that wonderful scene which lighted up the way to Damascus. "Regeneration by the Holy Ghost" is symbolised by that sudden light that flashed upon the murderous soul of this blood-thirsty persecutor; and the evidence of a new heart, by that submissive question, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" "Justification by faith as distinct from works" is plainly manifest in the case of this poor blind sinner, upon whose head Ananias is delegated and directly commanded to lay his hands. Saul became a Christian, "by the grace of God, through the righteousness of Christ imputed to him, and received by faith alone."

And now, from this time forward, the whole life of Paul was a beautiful illustration and a practical exemplification of "the

perseverance of the saints." It is true that, with the genuine humility of a trembling Christian, he sometimes prayed "that after preaching to others, he might not himself be a castaway." But, at other times, such was his strong confidence in the grace of God, that he was enabled to say, "I know in whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day." And later in life, when softened by the sanctifying influence of many tribulations and sorrows and perils, and having been "kept by the power of God, through faith, unto salvation," he utters that triumphant exclamation, which has been a kind of rallying cry to God's saints in succeeding generations, "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith, henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, will give me in that day."

Now we hold that it requires a Presbyterian basis in the mind for such a triumphant assurance as this in the heart; and none but a real *practical* Calvinist, whatever may be his *theory*, can adopt such language as this from the heart, when the judgment and all the realities of another world are looming up before the mind in their terrible but glorious distinctness. Some one pleasantly remarked to a Methodist minister on a certain occasion, "You Methodists may preach Arminianism, but somehow it seems to me, that when you pray, you pray Calvinism." When men are reasoning with their fellow-men, it is mind against mind, or intellectual argument coming in contact with intellectual argument. But when we come to pray, we all know that we are approaching a "Sovereign" who has a right to do what he wills with his own." And hence, coming before God, as pensioners upon his grace and the beneficiaries of his providence, we must come, not to argue God into our belief, but to ask him for his mercy; not to invoke his assistance while we attempt the impossibility of converting the sinner, but to beseech Him to convert him, Himself. And just so it is, when a man feels that he is about to launch into an unknown eternity. The religion which is worked into a man by the force of moral suasion, under the combined influence of hymns, prayers, groanings, and ani-

mated and fiery exhortations, may last while the sun shines, and the "old ship of Zion," crowded with "new converts," is anchored within the sheltered harbor of what is called a revival. But when the old ship, loosened from all such holding, nears the breakers, where the waves threaten, and the winds are tempestuous, the soul demands that grand steadfast doctrine of God's eternal purpose. Yes; it does need some doctrine that goes away back to the eternity of God's love and God's grace, to sustain a man when he thinks that, to him, this earth and these heavens are about to vanish away forever. A religion that we can put on one day and put off the next, is not strong enough nor substantial enough to stand amid the dissolution of soul and body, or to survive that august and solemn day "when the earth shall be dissolved and the heavens shall flee away with a great noise."

But now, Paul feeling that he was "chosen in him before the foundation of the world," and "being justified by faith, had peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ;" and hence he could exclaim, "for me to live is Christ, and to die is gain;" and he might have made it a personal matter, and said: "I am dead, and my life is hid with Christ in God; and so, when he who is my life shall appear, then shall I also appear with him in glory." He did say in that confidence which springs from an assurance of hope, "I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart and to be with Christ, which is far better;" and it seemed to be a personal matter, when he said: "to be absent from the body, is to be present with the Lord;" and he might have made it a personal assertion, when he said: "We know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." And now, after reading such a "confession of faith," and seeing how his soul seemed to thrive on the great fundamental doctrines of sovereign grace, who can doubt for a moment that, theoretically and practically, Paul was a Calvinist? And not only so, but in the same immovable and conscientious way in which, before his conversion, he had been "*after the strictest sect a Pharisee?*"

III. *As to Church polity and form of worship, Paul was a Presbyterian.*

He had been trained and educated as a Jew, and as such he was accustomed to priests and Levites—the one to offer the sacrifices, and the other to assist in the temple. He was familiar with councils, both subordinate and superior. He was intimately acquainted with the synagogue and its bench of elders, and ruler, or minister. And hence, with a thorough understanding of all these things which familiarity had imparted, he writes to his brethren among the scattered Jews, his “Epistle to the Hebrews,” in which he designs to show the import of many of these ancient rites and ceremonies which they had learned to venerate. He shows how these rites and ceremonies of the temple were only typical, and that they point to him who was at once the Priest and the offering. And since this great High-Priest has “offered himself once for all,” “a Lamb slain from the foundation of the world,” all these merely typical rites have come to an end. God himself abrogated all these things, when “the veil of the temple was rent in twain.” The great High-Priest has now ascended up on high leading captivity captive, and now in the true, real “*sanctum sanctorum*” he “ever liveth to make intercession for his people.” And hence, “By one offering, he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified,” and “is able to save them to the uttermost who come unto God by him.”

But amid all these sudden changes and upheavals of existing institutions and ordinances, the synagogue remains; and here we are to find the model for a Christian Church. Here is the “ruler of the synagogue,” with his bench of coördinate elders, and here also we have the deacons to attend to the temporal affairs. This is all that we will need, and there is to be no such thing as a priest or an altar. That is all done away in Christ, and done away forever, and so completely, that an attempt at a revival of these things would be a sinful perversion of God’s ordinance. But we do need, and we must have some form of worship, and places dedicated to the purpose of spiritual worship.

It is required also that "every thing shall be done decently and in order," and, to this end, we must have some definite form of government.

From time immemorial the Lord's people had been accustomed to a representative form of Church government, and as God had educated them all along to this end, it was still to continue. The elders had been elected by the people, and it was their province to manage the spiritual matters of the Church. From a spiritual necessity, and for the sake of convenience, deacons had been elected and ordained at Jerusalem. The same necessity might and would exist in other places, and so they might be elected there, but at the same time he warns them and us to be careful in our selections, so that only those who are properly qualified shall be elected to these offices.

Then again, among these elders, according to Paul, there are two classes, ruling and teaching elders; and while all are to be "counted worthy of double honor who rule well," especially is this to be the case with those "who labor in the word and doctrine." But, together, these elders of a particular church are to constitute a "parochial presbytery," and as such are to manage the spiritual affairs of each separate church. And extending the same general principle, these separate churches are to appoint delegates who, for the sake of greater efficiency and as a stronger bond of union, are to constitute district or diocesan presbyteries. Among the other prerogatives of these bodies thus formed, is the ordination of a ministry, for it was "by the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery," as we learn from Paul, that Timothy was ordained. In fact, as we deduce a Calvinistic system of theology from the writings of this great apostle to the Gentiles; so also from his doings among the other apostles as recorded in the "Acts," and from his authoritative writings in the form of epistles to churches or to individuals, we are to deduce the Presbyterian form of government.

And at the same time, his silence upon the subject, together with his explicit statements, are strong arguments against all forms of monarchical or prelatical government. According to his mode of writing, it would seem that presbyter or elder was

the same as bishop, for the very words are used interchangeably; and no where do we find any preëminence ascribed in these spiritual matters, where all are to rule as "*pares inter paribus*." If Peter ever was the pontiff of Rome, we certainly have no hint of such a fact from the writings of Paul; and his bold and manly "withstanding him to the face because he was to be blamed," would evince very little of that truckling to power, which we find in this day, to his ghostly holiness among his trembling adherents. But at the same time we find Peter speaking of him very kindly, when he calls him our "beloved brother Paul," and says there are "some things in his writings which are hard to be understood." Had he been infallible, would he have thus alluded to these things? Indeed, if Peter had been at Rome as Bishop there, it is marvellous that Paul never alludes to him during his long imprisonment, and never seems to have looked to him for any kind of comfort or protection while living "in his own hired house" in the imperial city. But so far from mentioning him while there, or consciously occupying a subordinate position, he himself writes, by inspiration, those very epistles which furnish the strongest arguments for a Presbyterian "Form of Government." And it is hardly to be presumed that an apostle, sitting under the very shadow of pontifical power, would be inspired to strike at the fundamental principles of what was itself divine.

And as to his mode of preaching, we hold that Paul was eminently a Presbyterian. Apart from the peculiar characteristics of individual ministers, we hold that there are different styles of preaching among evangelical denominations. With some the "expounding of the word" is rather a secondary and subordinate part of the service. Where ritualism and sacramental grace and other errors are directly propagated, there is more regard, if not more reverence paid to the proper reading of the service, than there is to the exposition and enforcement of the truth. The consequence is that little attention on the part of the preacher, and still less on the part of the people, is paid to those great doctrines which must furnish food to the immortal soul. A short essay, handsomely prepared, with due

æsthetical and rhetorical finish, and read perfunctorily, and without fervor, is all that human energies on the part of preacher and people, exhausted by a long and tiresome service with its vain repetitions, will even tolerate. With others there is a wild exuberance of fancy, and a fiery appeal to the passions, which finds vent in an excited declamation, violent gesticulation and loud and boisterous tones of voice. Fervent appeals are made that are calculated to kindle a merely animal excitement, and to arouse human sympathies, and to lead to human resolutions of amendment and reform. Religion is made to consist in mere sentiment and emotion, and the "freedom of the will" is unduly exalted at the expense of needed grace, and the convicting and regenerating Spirit of God, without which the sermons of an angel would be as powerless as "sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal." Men are urged to embrace religion with as much fervency and as much emotion as they might be, if it were possible for "the Ethiopian to change his skin, or the leopard his spots." The altar and the anxious bench are held up to view as if they were a kind of duplicate to Jacob's ladder, at the foot of which every "penitent" would find an angel ready to carry up his prayer, and bring down the blessing of an instantaneous and miraculous conversion.

But intermediate between these extremes, there is a style of preaching which we regard as eminently Presbyterian. Not because it is confined exclusively to them, or because every Presbyterian invariably adopts this method of presenting truth. Many an earnest minister will preach in this way in spite of the long and laborious lessons which canon and rubric enforced upon his conscience when he "received orders." Many an educated minister too, who has a cultivated and appreciative audience, is compelled by the force of circumstances, or constrained by an enlightened conscience, to provide something that is more substantial and more nutritious, than morbid sentimentalism or fiery appeals to an excitable heart. And at the same time many a Presbyterian, whose theological training and homiletical drilling ought to have taught him better, is content with moral essays, or a kind of anatomical display of the skele-

ton of orthodoxy, as dull and dry and lifeless as the mingled bones in the valley of Jehosaphat; or, worse still, in a kind of bewildering maze, or as if under a doctrinal nightmare, he will attempt to reconcile God's sovereignty and man's free-agency. But returning to what we have termed a truly Presbyterian mode of preaching, are we not compelled to the conclusion that Paul was the great exemplar to all succeeding generations? Holding the great doctrines that were afterwards systematised by Calvin, it was morally impossible for him to be anything but a doctrinal preacher. And yet these doctrines were propounded and explained and enforced, as of vital importance in all the practical life of the Christian. He knew that these doctrines of grace were humiliating to human pride and antagonistic to the human heart; and yet this did not prevent him from presenting them in all their sharpness of outline, and all their comprehensive force. It was not for him to guard God's own truth from the misunderstanding of darkened minds; nor to whittle it down to the perverted tastes of a rebellious heart. It was simply to present the truth as God gave it to him, and let God "open the heart," as he did the heart of Lydia, and illuminate the mind to apprehend and believe. He did not disdain the convincing arguments of logic, nor the attractions of eloquence, nor the captivating graces of imagination, nor the wondrous powers of a heart that was on fire with a holy enthusiasm for Christ. With all these combined elements, he was self-possessed, rational, doctrinal, emotional, practical, and spiritual. And, above all, he felt that after "he had planted, and Apollos had watered, it was God alone who could give the increase." And while he did not hesitate to address men as rational and accountable beings, as those who had a mind, a conscience, a will, a heart of their own; yet at the same time he told them most emphatically, "It is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy." "It is not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit saith the Lord."

Paul then was a Presbyterian; for in his teachings and in his practice we found him in favor of an educated ministry. If there be a system of Calvinism in the Bible, it is more distinctly

enunciated in the writings of Paul than in any other portions of the word of God; so that he was Presbyterian in theology. In the polity of the Church, which he to a great extent inaugurated, we find all the elements of Presbyterianism. And in his mode of preaching, he struck the true Presbyterian middle between the one extreme of dispassionate calmness, and the other of excited declamation.

ARTICLE III.

THE ORDINANCE OF GIVING.

It is a mistake to suppose that religion has to do only with the soul of man and its relations to immortality and eternity: it enters into his secular business and bodily comfort, and all his relations to this world and to his fellow-men. It is a mistake to suppose that the preacher is to speak only of death and judgment, heaven and hell, grace and total depravity, atonement and prayer. He is to preach the word, and that word not only sets before us the preparation that we need for the other world, but it shows how we are to regulate the whole of our life in this world. The Bible gives directions for the management of our worldly business, as well as for the concerns of our souls. In both these cases the directions are plain and intelligible, in both they are inspired and infallible, and in both they put to shame the maxims and teachings of human reason and human wisdom; and in neither case can they be disregarded without terrible loss and bitter sorrows. He who has told us how we can attain to everlasting life, has told us how to have a comfortable support here and lead happy and useful lives. The grace that shields from the wrath to come, can, if not received in vain, protect from the cares of this life, from anxiety and debt and rags and starvation. A man can no more manage his business successfully, so as to secure its true ends, usefulness and happiness, simply

by the human, worldly maxims that we hear everywhere around us, than he can attain to everlasting salvation by the reasonings and devisings of his own heart. A revelation is needed in one case as well as the other, and a revelation we have in both cases, and woe to those who neglect that revelation in either case. To claim to trust God's grace and blessing in the one case, and look only to the thrifty virtues for success in the other, is to be an infidel. Men it is true become prosperous by industry and economy, while they are utterly forgetful of God; but worldly maxims and thrifty virtues do not take the sting and curse from prosperity, they do not nullify that Scripture so often exemplified in human history. "The prosperity of fools shall destroy them." But a prosperity with God's blessing, which the world cannot have, is within the reach of those who believe and obey the word of God.

We propose now to set forth that word and commend it to the belief and obedience of those who read this article.

The world says, the way to get rich is to keep what you have, hoard it and take care of it; the Bible says, the way to get more is to give, and give largely of what you have. The world has a keen eye to the currents of trade, to supply and demand, to the price of produce and the cost of labor; the Bible tells us not to disregard these things, not to lay aside our common sense, but to put high above them all the favor and blessing of God. The world glories in rich lands and large capital, and heavy dividends and high prices, and abundant harvests, and unlimited credit; the Bible tells us that the smile of providence is worth more than millions of money. The world says, be sober, diligent, careful, saving, and watchful, if you would make much; the Bible says, look upon all increase as God's gift, be thankful for it, and regard yourself as a steward under God of every item of property you hold, and you will attain to a wealth of which the world knows not. The scriptural doctrine of giving runs counter to all the feelings and prepossessions and education of worldly men; this doctrine is as much foolishness and a stumbling-block to the world, as "Christ and him crucified" was foolishness to the Greeks and a stumbling-block to the Jews. They will not

believe it, they will not practice it, they utterly repudiate it. They do this, too, in the sincerity of their hearts; they believe it would ruin their business and bring them to want; they cannot be brought to see that it is the only pathway to safety and plenty. They trust banks and bonds, notes and mortgages, big crops and favoring seasons, high prices and large sales; but they cannot be brought to trust the God who giveth power to get wealth, and who says, "the silver and the gold are mine." It is not to be expected that worldly men would do otherwise than exclude God from their business, when they would, if they could, exclude him from the whole world in which they have their being. But a different course is expected of those who claim to know and believe and serve God. Shall they believe his other revelations, and disbelieve this? shall they obey his other laws, and utterly disregard this that comes from the same authority and is equally binding upon them?

Let us, however, have this law of giving in God's own language. It is stated over and over again, and cannot be misunderstood, "The liberal soul shall be made fat, and he that watereth shall be watered also himself." "He that hath pity upon the poor lendeth unto the Lord, and that which he hath given will he pay him again." "But the liberal deviseth liberal things, and by liberal things shall he stand." "Give, and it shall be given unto you, good measure, pressed down and shaken together and running over shall men give into your bosom; for with the same measure that ye mete withal, it shall be measured to you again." The law is, *give*, GIVE, GIVE. From the Proprietor of all things, the Lawgiver of the universe, comes to all the children of men in all ages and in all countries, the law, to give—to give as he hath given to us—to honor the Lord with our substance. The reward which he has promised to all who obey this law is increase—is giving back with interest and compound interest all that they give. No investment is so safe, none yields so largely, no promise to pay will more certainly be redeemed. Heaven's great bank never suspends, is never robbed, has never yet had its seal dishonored and never, never fails.

At the annual overflow of the Nile, the people sow their seed

upon the waters, and as the river recedes into its banks the seed strikes into the soil and comes up and brings forth a plentiful harvest. Hence the allusion, "cast thy bread upon the waters and thou shalt find it after many days." So it is with giving to God, it may seem a waste and a loss, but God will watch over it and take care of it and bring it back with large increase to the hand that gave.

Let us not make the mistake of supposing, that when we give some little pittance that we bring God in debt to us, and that a great fortune will accrue; we are to give in the right way and in the right measure, give as we are able, give till we feel it, give as a self-denial, give till the pressure comes down heavily upon our shoulders. If we would enjoy the luxury of giving, experience all its sweetness and reap its rich luscious fruits, we must give largely, even out of our poverty. If we give only the parings of our abundance, what we can easily spare, where there is but little effort or sacrifice, what we will not miss and can easily do without, why, if we will thus insult God, let us not add to that insult by expecting him to reward what is no compliance with his command, but a miserable sham. All the offerings required of the Jews were property, and had this one element that they were worth something to the giver. They had a money value—bullocks and lambs, heifers and goats, wheat and wine, honey and oil and frankincense, were all of their worldly substance—their living. What God had given to them, they were to give to him. David would not do so mean a thing as offer to the Lord what cost him nothing. An earthly king collects taxes from all his subjects in the various provinces of his empire, to keep up his armies, support his household, and carry on his whole government. But the giving that God requires is not for his profit. He is rich in himself without our gifts; were he needy he could open all the mines of earth in an hour, or shower down golden guineas as plentifully as rain-drops. This, like every law that he ever imposes upon us is for our good; in keeping his commandments there is great reward. We must give then what is precious in our eyes, what we feel to be something taken from us. It is only such gifts that God will accept.

A millionaire brings his check for a thousand dollars and casts it into the treasury of the Lord; a poor woman puts in her two mites that make a farthing, all her living. Heaven rejects the first, and commends the last.

More than three thousand years ago a young man had a quarrel with his brother and fled from home to escape his vengeance. He journeyed on with a sad heart, but with the hope of youth in his breast. He had no property but the staff in his hand. Night came on, and with a stone for his pillow, he lay down in the open plain to rest and sleep. In his dream God revealed himself to him as the God of his fathers; in the morning there, he vowed if God would go with him and protect him, and give him bread to eat and raiment to put on, "of all that thou shalt give me, I will surely give the tenth unto thee." Twenty years passed away and he is again at the very place of this dream. And now the earth trembles under the tread of great herds of cattle (the wealth of those days), and the same man said, "for with my staff I passed over this Jordan, and now I am become two bands." So Jacob grew rich *by giving*.

For more than three years there had been no rain in the land of Israel. Famine, that most terrible enemy of man, stalked through country and city, and stood with his ghastly grin at the door of many a home. Provisions were few and dear, and carefully hidden and watched by those who had them. A poor widow had gone out of the city gate to gather fuel to cook her last meal for herself and son, and then lie down and die. While thus engaged, a prophet of the Lord presented himself to her and asked for food and drink. She told him her sad tale, how she had only a handful of meal in a barrel and a little oil in a cruse. Surely he will not repeat his request—will not take the last morsel from the mouth of the widow and the orphan. But he did repeat the request, with the assurance that she should be provided for; yet she could see that provision only by the eye of faith, just as every giver must now see his reward. She relied upon the word of the Lord, fed his prophet with what seemed to the eye of sense the only means of saving her from starvation. And what now was the effect of this compliance with the divine

requirement? Just this: "the barrel of meal wasted not, and the cruise of oil failed not, till the Lord sent rain upon the earth." Here in this simple historical incident is the whole law of giving, with its workings and blessed results. It teaches plainly that a rich blessing is wrapped up in the matter of giving for those who practice it aright. This incident happened under a dark dispensation and in a time of great religious declension; and how many of our average church people, in this day of gospel light, would have done as this woman of Sarepta? How many would give up their last handful of meal, when only a prophet's word stood between them and death? O for a trumpet voice to proclaim to a dead Church, "Where is your faith!" "O ye of little faith," did God ever fail to keep his promises? Did any one ever come to beggary by giving? Is obedience to God's law the road to poverty and want? No! no! not while he continues faithful who has promised; not till the arm of that providence that is ever busied in this world shall be palsy-stricken and fall helpless. Worldlings in the Church and out of the Church will not believe it; but it is a truth, as true as God's faithfulness and God's word and God's power and God's providence can make it, that he who gives aright sows the seed from which will spring for himself and his children after him a rich and a glorious harvest.

We have given two examples from the Bible; we will now give some from recent times. Facts are great and precious, as well as "stubborn" things. They teach, they correct mistakes, they reach and impress the heart, they control men. The Bible is full of facts, this is one of its leading characteristics; and if ministers would put more of them into their sermons, the sermons would be more effective. These we are now to relate will not be unworthy of a place in these pages if they serve to illustrate and enforce the great law of giving.

Mr. Nathan Cobb was a Baptist merchant of Boston, who resolved at his entrance on business for himself to give one-fourth of his net profits to benevolent uses, to give one-half when his capital reached \$20,000, three-fourths when it reached \$30,000,

VOL. XXIII., NO. 3.—5.

and all the profits when the capital swelled to \$50,000. He acted on this resolution through life, soon attained the maximum, and scattered the blessings of his liberality in every direction. On his death-bed, he said to a friend: "By the grace of God—nothing else—by the grace of God, I have been enabled by acting on this resolution to give away more than \$40,000. How good the Lord has been to me."

John Wesley, the founder of Methodism, gave away £2 when his income was £30, and when it increased to £120 he still lived on the £28. He was enabled in his long life to give away about \$150,000; and when he was eighty-six years of age he wrote in his private journal what had been his governing principle through life: "I save all I can, and give all I can."

Baxter, the great Puritan preacher, gave for a long while a tenth of his income, but found afterward that it was not enough, and increased his portion to the Lord.

A minister of the gospel says: "I have through life devoted from one-fifth to one-fourth of my income to benevolent purposes. I have kept a strict account of all donations, and left nothing to accident or excited feelings at the moment. At the end of about thirty years I find my property materially increased, and I am surprised to find how many hundreds of dollars I have thus been permitted to give to the Lord."

A mechanic, a good, but plain man, to whom we once explained this subject, resolved to practice the Bible rule. Some months afterwards he told us with great joy how the Lord had prospered his business in ways that seemed exceptional to the common course of things. He got more work to do with better pay, collected some old accounts, for which he did not expect to get the money, and had his expenditures greatly lessened. He felt confident that the finger of God was in it all, and that he was being rewarded for his compliance with the divine ordinance.

One of the darkest features in the Church "situation" of the present day, is, that there are whole churches, and many of them, too, in which there is not a single member who practices God's rule of giving. Such churches are often behind with their pastor's salary, their contributions to the general enterprises of

the Church are at the lowest point; they have not yet learned the blessedness of giving.

One of the most instructive and impressive facts that can be stated on this whole subject is found in the history of the Jews, and ought to be known to the most cursory reader of the Bible. They gave not a tenth, as is generally supposed, but fully one-third of their gains to religious uses, and notwithstanding this heavy draught upon their wealth, they prospered as a people—prospered as no people under the heavens ever prospered; they had almost no pauperism, that great running sore in every large city—that great problem for the statesmen of Europe, which none of them have yet mastered. Not only were the Jews blessed in the observance of this divine law, but they never failed to be punished when they disobeyed; when they withheld the offerings that were required by the Mosaic code, or brought the sick and the lame, they were stripped and peeled and made to know that God honors only those who honor him. It stands out as a fact constantly recurring in their history, that when they attempted to rob God they inflicted loss upon themselves. Ill-gotten gains are sure to bring a curse, says the worldly adage; but there is a deeper meaning which the world has not fathomed, and that is, that all property from which the Lord's portion has not been given brings a curse sooner or later to the possessor; *the untithed dollar will sting the hand that grasps it.*

We often see property gotten by means that cannot be questioned either legally or morally, inherited, or earned by hard labor or skilful management, and yet the possessor has no enjoyment in all he has; corroding care gnaws at his heart, or his children are spendthrifts, or his riches take wings and fly away as an eagle towards heaven. What is the explanation of such cases? simply this, and it meets them every one: God was not honored with this substance, his proprietorship was not acknowledged, no portion was given to the Lord, and his blessing was not in it all. Solomon says: "A man to whom God giveth riches and wealth and honor so that he wanteth nothing for his soul of all that he desireth, yet God giveth him not power to eat thereof, [to enjoy it], but a stranger eateth it; this is vanity

and an evil disease." There are many who have much property, but have with it much sorrow; they are troubled on every side; crops are cut off; debt, like a great mountain overhanging their path, seems ready at any moment to fall on them and crush them; they have tormenting anxieties, and terrible forebodings, and awful suspense and heart-quailings, that take away all their comfort and make them miserable. This state of things is easily explained: There is one defect in their title to their property, it may be good enough before an earthly court, but it is not a title that will pass unchallenged in the court of heaven. No one has a right title to his property till the Lord's portion has been taken out of it. There are Christian people all over our land greatly straitened in their business, for no other reason than that they give too little. Their contributions are not proportioned to what the Lord has given to them. Their property, as it stands upon the auditor's book, goes up into the thousands, while God's claims are met with ragged shiplasters. They do not give enough to secure heaven's blessing on their substance; and without this blessing they can have no enjoyment in all they have. There is a connection, as certain and as unyielding as the iron chains of fate, between giving and the enjoyment of property; between giving and the increase of worldly possessions; between giving and spiritual blessings. God, both in his word and his providence, has bound these things together; and those who attempt to divorce them, though they may seem to prosper for a time, will be found in the end to be making money "to put it into a bag with holes." The man who gives as God requires will prosper as other men cannot; currents of prosperity will be opened up and poured upon him to his great surprise and joy. The local church, that through its membership complies with this ordinance of giving, will have the sweetest smiles of the Master—will be "as the smell of a field which the Lord hath blessed."

Let us once more go back to the Jewish history where there are so many "ensamples" for our instruction and warning. For long weary months the land of Israel had been consumed by drought; the grass had withered, the springs and streams had

dried up, the ground cracked open, the leaves upon the trees crumpled and fell, the cattle stood about with swollen tongues moaning for water. What is the cause of this terrible judgment that shades every brow and makes every heart to quail? There is a cause, and it is easily found. In yonder temple is a room in which were stored the offerings for the priests. Those who served at the altar were fed by these offerings of the people; this was all their living; they were not allowed to own and cultivate land, but they were to be supported from the temple. Now, however, that storehouse is empty—there is NO MEAT in it—nothing for priests and Levites to draw their daily supplies from. Yet God will provide for them. He will not leave them to starve. One thing which a kind Providence will not fail to do in this world, is to take care of those who are appointed to minister in holy things. Under the felt pressure of the drought, the people turn to the temple and ask what is to be done. God says, Fill that room; heap it up to the ceiling; bring all your tithes, not a part now and a promise of the remainder hereafter, but bring them *all*—the WHOLE—and I will stop the drought; yea, more, (He always gives more than we can expect,) I will give you such overflowing harvests that your barns will not hold them; just see if I don't; try me; put me to the test; prove me now; bring the tithes, and you shall have the crops. The offerings are brought—with many a strain and murmur and mis-giving and shrinking back, they are brought; all arrears are paid; that long black account is cancelled; and as the last bagful of wheat is heaved upon the great pile, some one looks around and says, There's a cloud; I suppose now we'll have rain. No, says another, we have been deceived so often, all the people must certainly starve. But the cloud spreads and thickens; then a drop plashes upon some up-turned face, and another, and yet another is felt. And now the shower comes on, and the people clap their hands and shout aloud for joy; the springs gush out, the streams overflow their banks, the ground everywhere is soaked, and fertility takes the place of barrenness, and such a bounteous harvest the hills and vales of Judea never bore. So God fulfilled his word.

All over this land there are churches—cold, shrivelled-up, dead things called churches—no efficiency, no activity, scarcely any symptoms of life; prayers, if there are any prayers at all, are so dull and heavy that they never rise to heaven; sermons are unheeded and unappreciated, and fall as water spilled upon the ground; no impressions made upon the world, no conversions, no growth in the Christian life, no enjoyment of religion, no comfort, no assurance, nothing to distinguish professors from the world, except that their names are on the session-book, and they are sometimes seen at the communion-table. There is no out-poured Spirit, no shaking among the dry bones, no sound of going in the tops of the mulberry-trees. If this world is to be converted by such churches, then the millennium will not be here soon, and the day of judgment is yet a long way off. Over such scenes we suppose the angels, as they fly past on their missions of mercy, cover their faces with their wings and shed the tear of real grief. But why such scenes—why this dearth and famine and mildew and death, where all ought to be vigor and joyous life? Would you like to have the answer—would it interest you to have the matter explained? Here is the explanation, whether you want to hear it or not: There is NO MEAT in God's house. "To keep him free from worldly cares and avocations, we promise to pay" so and so; and then the years roll on and they don't fulfil that promise. The promise and failure are both recorded in heaven; and, until that failure is cancelled, no blessing comes down. God will not, God cannot bless a church with an empty storehouse; the heavens are brass; no prayer goes up, and no Spirit comes down, while that ugly record stands on the register above.

There is a remedy for this unfortunate state of things—bad as it is, it is not desperate. The remedy is plain, and cannot be misunderstood. It comes from the King and Head of the Church—it is this: *Bring ye all the tithes into the storehouse.* Let these churches go to work in a straightforward, manly, Christian way, and wipe out this dark stain—this deep disgrace—and the effect will be that the windows of heaven will be opened and such a blessing will come down that there will not be room

enough to receive it. God says so, and it has not yet come to pass that his word has failed.

But let a different course be adopted, let some other way than God's way be tried, let them compromise and scale and shirk their duty as they may—let them attempt by any device, however plausible, to rob God, and the windows of heaven will still be shut, and the overflowing blessing will not come down.

People tell us they cannot afford to give. Can they afford to do without giving? Can they bear the consequences of attempting to rob God? Can they stand it if the drought still continues and the windows of heaven stay shut and the abundant blessing is withheld? They lose and do not gain by keeping back the Lord's portion.

No church under the heavens can have its welfare and efficiency advanced—no church can have the elements of real prosperity that does not honestly and fully meet its pecuniary obligations. NO MEAT, NO BLESSING.

ARTICLE IV.

THE GREEK CATHOLIC CHURCH.

Extension and Prestige.—The greater part of the Protestant people of Europe and this country are apt to look upon the Roman Catholic body as if it were distinctively and almost exclusively the Traditionist and non-Protestant element of the Christian world. Herein is a great error; and it has very important practical bearings upon the Tradition controversy, the fundamental one of all the controversies which Protestants have to wage in the battle for truth.* It is probable that our prox-

*These bearings and the importance of them the writer of this article will probably undertake to show in a future number of the *Review*.

imity to the great non-evangelical body just named, and the actual struggle of centuries which Protestantism has had to carry on, in many cases even unto blood and death, have been the means of making this impression.

But, placing ourselves, in imagination, at some point near the centre of Europe, and looking eastward, we behold another nominal Christian body which claims equal authenticity and authority with the Roman Catholic as the representative of the primitive and apostolic Church, and with a better show of a great and even primeval antiquity, looking at the question upon the premises of formal and traceable lineage, her proximity to the original seats of Christianity, and her undoubted possession and use in church services from the very first of the New Testament Scriptures in the language in which they were written, the language spoken, in the early ages, by nearly all of her people, and which, even now, whether intelligently or not, being an antique tongue and not well understood by the masses, nevertheless they employ a large part of them as the medium of their worship—not to speak of the venerable Septuagint translation of the Old Testament, certainly sometimes used as it was sometimes quoted by our Saviour and the Apostles, which, adopting as her version of that part of the Bible, she has also kept in use in her services in the original Greek, from the earliest times, among the Greek-speaking people who for ten centuries formed almost the whole, and even now make up so large a part of her communion. If the first-named Church may affect a proud prestige on any of the grounds above referred to, the latter one can show something yet more imposing. And if the Roman Catholic Church, as residing in more populous parts, can boast larger numbers, in the proportion of one hundred and fifty against sixty-five or seventy millions, the territory of the nations and races belonging to this great communion of the East is vastly more extensive even than her's, at least upon the eastern hemisphere. From the frozen margins of the Arctic and the shores of the Baltic southward and eastward, to the sunny climes of the farthest southerly parts of Greece and Asia Minor, and the borders of Syria and regions lying beyond the Black

Sea, even to the Caspian, her spiritual domain extends itself. It is not only as large as the eastern empire, at the time of its greatest extent, after its separation from the western, in the last years of the 4th century, but probably even larger, inasmuch as the greater part of Russia in Europe and Russia in Asia, as well as the territories of the other Slavonic tribes east of the former have been added to it by the adoption of her faith since that time; most of these last having been brought in during the 9th century. Russia in fact has been acquired since the great ecclesiastical schism of the east and west. And, beside the countries in which this form of Christianity is the prevailing one, it numbers a good many scattered children in Austria (where there are ten bishoprics) in the one direction, and among the inhabitants of Syria and adjacent countries in the other.

To this great division of Christendom we commonly apply the name of the "Greek Church;" probably from its coincidence in territory and professing population with the eastern, so often called the Greek empire, and its being for the greater part of the first ten centuries after Christ, to so great an extent, the Church of the populations of Hellenic blood and speech. But she assumes for herself the title of "the Holy, Catholic, Apostolic Church of the Orthodox," to which, in her ecclesiastical utterances, and in publications made under the sanction of the Church, the significant prefix is added which makes it "The One, Holy," etc. In ordinary language, however, she is commonly styled by her own people distinctively and simply the Anatolic Church. This title, as more correct and descriptive than the one common among us, of the "Greek Church," will be used generally in the present article.

The Great Schism of the "Catholic" Body.—The removal of the imperial capital, on the part of Constantine the Great, in the early part of the 4th century, which turned Byzantium into the splendid city that still bears his name, laid the first stone that paved the way for the great ecclesiastical separation which was afterwards to take place. The division, of what

had been the "world" of Roman conquest and dominion, by the Emperor Theodosius, at his death, between his two sons, and constituting from A. D. 395 the empires of the east and west, still more decidedly prepared the way for it. The rivalry between the ambitious and dominating sees of Rome and Constantinople began to exhibit itself, during the 7th century, in angry disputes, which, while they were mostly about doctrinal and ecclesiastical matters, few of them of any moment were really the products of a feeling lying back of them. The result as every reader knows, was the great Church schism of the ninth century, which, aside from the real causes just referred to, had scarcely a pretext, except in the war of words about the question of the "procession of the Holy Ghost."

That separation, almost strictly coincident with the two imperial divisions of the political world, has remained to the present day with almost the same boundaries which each of the ecclesiastical parties had at the time it took place. In fact it is worthy of notice, and seems to show that ecclesiastical are stronger than civil ties, that while the eastern and western empires of the political world have so long since gone to pieces, and the parts of each have been so frequently and variously remoulded, the great spiritual empires of eastern and western Christendom have to a great extent stood as they were in their component parts, when ten centuries ago they were resolved into the two.

And any one at all acquainted with the case can see that the separation is irreconcilable. With the lapse of ages, the points of divergency have multiplied and become sharper. The parties do not even recognise each other as having any proper ecclesiastical existence. The Church of Rome, and the Oriental Catholic Church, each claims to be, exclusively, the lineal and proper descendant and representative of the primitive, Apostolic Church. It is *the* Church—the one and only Church of God on earth. This, as regards the latter of the two, in its aspects toward Protestantism will be more fully shown in the course of this article. But the Anatolic Church is not only independent of, but antagonistic to, the other great non-Protestant sect. Hatred to the papacy, as a bastard and usurping pretension to

the true apostolic descent, animates her utterances as a Church and the spirit of the people of her wide-spread communion, everywhere. In some cases where the power was possessed, each of these proud claimants of apostolicity has actually persecuted the adherents of the other; and to the good High Church people of England and this country, who, though it may be with some affliction to themselves, are yet called Protestants, but seek to suck the breasts of some old mother that is held to be of the true apostolic lineage, and who pay their regards alternately to both these aforesaid ones, it may afford some good nuts to crack that either of the two scorns to acknowledge the other, and each claims to be the only true mother and mistress of the house; while each, as we shall see presently to be true of the one as of the other, repudiates the "Protestant sects," no matter of how high pretension, as one and all, nothing but the merest bastards. If the term be not dignified, it is not too bad for them to use of us.

The Anatolic Church and the Oriental Sects.—In its great outlines, the history of that great division of nominal Christendom, which we are now treating of, is pretty well known by common readers of Church history. But a brief review, giving the history in its connection, will probably be of some interest to those who read this article, while it will afford the opportunity of correcting some errors and supplying some deficiencies in the common accounts. From the Council of Chalcedon, which in the 5th century nullified the doings of the Council of Ephesus and separated Eutyches and his Monophysite followers from what was called the "orthodox" body, oriental Christendom has been divided, according to Mosheim, mainly into three parts, in some regions, however, coincident, in part, as to the territory that they cover; the "Orthodox" (Greek) Church, or that body "which is in communion with the Greek Patriarch of Constantinople"—the sects, Monophysite and Nestorian, which dissent from the Latin and Greek Churches—and those eastern Christians who acknowledge the Pope. A late English writer (Dean Stanley) makes the three-

fold division also, but his classification is made out by putting the various branches of the Monophysites as the second, and the Nestorians as the third of the parts. The Christians of the "one nature" doctrine prevail in Syria, Egypt, Ethiopia, etc.; those of the "double person" dogma are found farther eastward. But these last (the Nestorians) have dwindled to a mere fragment; and even the former of these two divisions is of insignificant dimensions and importance by the side of the great Greek and Latin communions.

Government and Doctrine of the Headship.—As the ambition and rivalry of the two ecclesiastical monarchies of Rome and Constantinople precipitated the great schism of the 9th century, it hardly needs to be stated that the eastern Catholic body or "Greek Church" repudiates the Pope, in respect to all his claims as such. And while she has her patriarchs in most of the countries where the Church exists, to whom belongs the presidency of the Church in those countries, and among these the Patriarch of Constantinople holds somewhat of a conceded primacy, yet even he is not an œcumenical bishop, and she does not regard him or any living person as the vicerent of Christ; but professes to hold Christ himself as the only true head of the Church.

The government of the Anatolic Church, even where the patriarchal form exists (and we shall see presently that it does not everywhere in this communion) may be said to be in a great measure synodal. Each of the patriarchs has a council ("synod") composed of the higher prelates of his jurisdiction. All councils, representing one or more patriarchates, have authority to the extent of the jurisdiction of the prelates sitting in them. But the "power of the keys," according to the "orthodox" faith, resides supremely in the œcumenical councils; those that this Church recognises as having been legitimately held in the past, and any that may in the future be convoked, if that should ever be. No council regarded as œcumenical has been held since the separation from Rome.

Four patriarchates are in existence—those of Antioch, Jerusa-

lem, and Alexandria, beside the Constantinopolitan. They are all, perhaps, by the creed of the Church, equal in rank; but in fact the last named interposes its dictation in the appointment of the incumbents of the others, under the form of nomination or a signature of confirmation, or both. The patriarchs are all of them nominally elected by the vote of certain prelates in each jurisdiction to whom the suffrage belongs. But the head of that grand see which has its seat at the Turkish capital, though he is thus, in form, chosen by the voice of the Church, holds his office very much at the pleasure of an outside overshadowing power—that of the Sultan. His spiritual jurisdiction extends over all “the Orthodox” populations of Europe east of Russia, including Moldavia, Wallachia, Bulgaria, and all of Turkey in Europe; but leaving out independent Greece; and reaches on the other side of the Hellespont as far as Cilicia in Asia Minor. This takes in the six or eight millions of Greeks (of the ancient Macedonia, etc.) who form the plurality of the population of European, and two or three millions more of Asiatic Turkey. Under the peculiar system by which the Turkish Government has for ages in a great measure governed its Christian subjects—beginning now to be somewhat modified—that of making the head of each religious denomination or “community” in the empire, to some extent responsible for the raising of the taxes paid by its people, etc., and giving, on the other hand, to that ecclesiastical representative, some investment of secular power—the Constantinopolitan arch-prelate, despite the creed of his Church in regard to the pure headship of Christ’s body, has exercised, as a matter of fact, the power very much of a pope, through most of the ages past. In our own day he has assumed at times a power almost equivalent, against Protestant missions. The other and more eastern patriarchates are, comparatively, of small consideration. While that of Constantinople counts up one hundred and thirty-five metropolitans, archbishops, and bishops; the patriarchates of Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria number, respectively, but sixteen, twelve, and four. But all included in these last numbers are ranked as metropolitans.

Some are merely nominal or titular, as those of Montenegro and Mt. Sinai.

The Church in Russia.—It was in the 10th century—the one just following the great religious schism of the east and west—that the Anatolic Church gained, by the conversion of her people, the important accession of Russia to her communion. But this was not owing to any evangelistic zeal on her part, for it was mainly brought about by the conversion of the Princess Olga, resulting from a visit which she made to Constantinople in 955, and the conversion after her death, but through her instrumentality, of her grand-son Vladimir. The Church in that country was attached to the See of Constantinople till, under the instigation of the Grand-Duke Theodore, and the influence of motives brought to bear upon Jeremiah, second patriarch of Constantinople, a Russian patriarchate was established in the year 1593, having some connection with and subordination to the Constantinopolitan primacy; which conditions however were abolished during the next century. The Anatolic Church was inclined to regard this Russian patriarchate which made up the number of five as taking the place which the Roman, as the former Church considers, left vacant by defection. The fact just now mentioned, of the acquisition of Russia to the domain of the Anatolic ecclesiastical power, in connection with the manner of its taking place, suggests an important observation, namely, that the Greek Church (so called) has for ages past, as to the matter of extension, remained not only to a great extent stationary, with the above exception, but almost entirely inert. In regard to any propagandism, the fact or spirit of it, she has shown since the 9th century about as little as her neighbor religion, the Mohammedan, has done in its more recent history; and it is curious to observe how the two have stood for ages side by side; the one hating the other with a hatred supreme, but making scarce the shadow of an effort toward proselyting each other or any other of the religious divisions of the world.

The Russian patriarchate continued for a little over a century, and was then swallowed up by the despotism of the secular power; for the great Peter I., liberal though he was, and enlightened in many of his ideas, yet, thinking this hierarchical power too much of an *imperium in imperio*, abolished the office, established that of "Exarch," with prerogatives limited within the consent of other bishops and the reference of very grave matters to the crown; and then in 1720 abolished this and set up the "Holy, Legislative Synod," composed of persons chosen by the Czar himself from the higher clergy, to exercise supreme spiritual jurisdiction in the Church of the Russias. Over this, too, in behalf of the imperial master, who claims to be at least the secular head of the ecclesiastical establishment of his empire, a lay representative of the Czar—a sort of "lord high commissioner," but one clothed with real and substantial powers, in the way of supervision and control, presides.

The Church in the Kingdom of Greece.—The same constitution of things, in the feature of the primacy, has been followed in the Church establishment of the Kingdom of Greece. When, after the sanguinary and desolating war of the Greeks from 1821 to 1828 had been terminated by the intervention of the three European allied powers and the battle of Navarino, these powers (France, Russia, and Great Britain) set up this kingdom, with a territory extending from the Southern borders of the ancient Thessaly and Epirus, and including, though it be so small a domain, (not fifteen thousand square miles), yet all of the territory of the famous ancient Greek republics, from Phocis and Locris to Lacedemon. Most of the islands were attached; but the Sultan still retains Scio and the islands along the Asia Minor shore of the Archipelago, with Rhodes and the grand isle of Crete. The Ionian islands, lying west and southwest of Greece, inhabited by a Greek population, and forming for a time the Septinsular Republic, latterly under the so-called "protectorate" of Great Britain, have been added, by cession, to the nationality. The Greeks that achieved their independence, numbering only one million, (now one and a half,) out of

the many millions of their race this side the Hellespont, had not much idea of having, as their ecclesiastical primate, one who is officially so much a creature of the Sultan. They, therefore, after the example of Russia, established a national Church of the Anatolic communion, the supreme authority of which resides in what is called the "Holy Synod" of the kingdom. This body is composed of five regular members appointed by the king, one of them as president; and the royal power* appoints at pleasure extraordinary or supernumerary members; the first named or regular members, from the higher ranks of the clergy; the latter class from the ordinary secular clergy and the monastic body which exists yet in Greece, but in very limited numbers. Beside these, there is a royal commissioner ("epitropos"), and a secretary, both appointed by the king and actively representing the government in the deliberations and doings of the Synod.

We have now disposed of the main parts of this vast religious community, as respects the matters organism and locality. There is unity among these different parts in the recognition of common synodal authority; of the same ancient councils and sources of tradition, and doctrines and canons proceeding from them; and of the same forms of worship and ceremonies. The Georgians and Mingrelians inhabiting the ancient Iberia and Colchis are in the outskirts of the extension of the Anatolic Church. They have an independent primacy, filled by what they call a "Catholic;" and their religion is in a very debased condition, as they themselves are, especially the latter race.

DOCTRINAL AND SPIRITUAL STATE.

We come now to the branch of our subject which is far the most important, namely—the internal state of this great Church, as respects her doctrines, worship, spiritual state, and dispositions toward the Protestant churches. This is a question in itself of the greatest historic interest, especially to a Christian mind. But it has now become one of vast practical moment. The

*Such was the original mode of the constitution of the body, and is believed to be still.

greatest movement of our age is the awakening of the Christian body—the true Church of Christ, in its different evangelical branches—to the work of gospel propagation. In her outlook of that great undertaking, next after the papal regions, and right in her path to the vast unevangelised Orient of Mohammedanism and Paganism, she finds this great nominal Christian body extending its dominion over some of the fairest lands and most interesting races of our globe. Are the populations of her communion evangelised? If not, will she do it for them? And will she, in our world-work of evangelisation, be a friend and ally, or turn her power against us? Shall she be a dispenser, or must she be herself a recipient of a saving evangel?

Variant Opinions among Protestants.—Strange and wide has been the diversity on this question among Protestants. This has been owing in a measure no doubt to the want of accurate information about the Anatolic Christians, induced by their geographical remoteness and want of intercourse with them. And some circumstances have tended to mislead public opinion in the Protestant western world—such as the degree of liberty in the circulation and reading of the Scriptures, existing in many parts of this communion, not always owing to the liberal disposition of the Church itself, but defended by members of the communion in Greece, on the ground of its being according to the fathers; as also the decline of monasticism, and the absence amongst a large part of the membership of this body, of the extreme bigotry and persecuting spirit which so much prevail in the papal body. And it is surprising to see how much of error and misinformation exist, even to the present time, in regard to matters of fact of such importance, and, as it would seem, so ascertainable. We sometimes, even now, in respectable periodicals of this country and Great Britain, find the “Greek Church” spoken of as something like a semi-evangelical body, and quite removed from the category in which the Roman Church stands. Such a sentiment recently appeared in print, “on both sides the water,” from an eminent dignitary of the English Church.

VOL. XXIII., NO. 3.—6.

On several notable occasions in our own day—the history of which cannot be given in the present article, but which is so entertaining and instructive that it might well merit being given to the public at another time—the Episcopal Church, of England and of this country, has made friendly and deferential approaches to the Anatolic Church, as represented in the persons of those who occupy its high places, seeking to convey the tribute of recognition from the first named parties, but, we may believe, much more humbly and eagerly craving to be recognised. It does not come within our present province to describe, amusing as it might be, the polite but cool manner in which these advances were received. The facts are now referred to, as showing the sentiment held by a respectable portion of the Protestant body in regard to the Greek Catholic Church.

And though the far larger part of the evangelical and pious men, who have gone as missionaries to the Mediterranean countries where this form of Christianity is found, have soon come to the conclusion that it is non-evangelical and anti-evangelical, nearly as much so on most points as the Roman Catholic; yet there have been some, among those who have gone in a missionary capacity, from Protestant churches, who have acted on the principle of recognising and reverencing the Greek Church, at least as if it were a true, holy and venerable Church of Christ, from which separation is not to be encouraged; but whose members are rather to be cultured in religion within her own fold, while continuing and encouraged to discharge most scrupulously all her most anti-Protestant forms. On this principle the mission—mainly an educational one, (and really a handsome and valuable one, considered as a mere educational establishment,)—of the American Episcopal Church, at Athens, Greece, has been conducted for forty years, by their representative (the Rev. J. H. Hill), and is still, unless his resignation has changed the course of things. The unexampled management displayed in this case, how a good face could be kept to the venerable “Orthodox Church,” on the one hand, and on the other to the Low-Church and more evangelical of the Church at home that sent him out, might be one of the curious studies of history: but there is not

time to dwell upon it, our present purpose is more important, and the Rev. Dr. Andrews of the Episcopal Church itself, much to his honor, has fully exposed the matter. One of the missionaries of the "American and Foreign Christian Union," too, a native Greek, educated in this country, has actually and recently made this a point of dissent from his colleague, Dr. Kalopothakes, of the mission at Athens; and both of them feel it, and justly, to be a radical difference—the first maintaining that the introduction of evangelical religion among people of the Anatolic Church, is to take place in and through this Church itself.* Dr. K. holds the contrary view, and is acting upon it, in the interesting undertaking, which is even now, while these lines are traced, going through its initiative, and perhaps a crisis of peril, in the organisation, as an evangelical Church, of a little band of Bible-taught believers, and the establishment of a pure Christian worship in a church edifice recently built by the aid of friends in this country and England, at Athens—the first ever erected for evangelical worship, as conducted by Greeks† and in their own beautiful tongue, in modern times, on the soil of Greece. Dr. K., it will be remembered, is a member of one of the Presbyteries of our Southern Church.

The question referred to is, therefore, a very practical one; and it is high time, in its relation to the great work of the Church, aside from its historic interest, that it should be settled, and settled aright. And true it is, we may say, in the outset, that all the errors of the Roman Catholic Church are not held in the Greek—one important one at least, is not—that of the papal supremacy. And some are held in mitigated form, or not carried out in such gross abuses in the Anatolic body, *e. g.* in its practice of praying for the dead, with not quite so much of a professed purgatory, and the less gross idolatry of "the host," in connection with transubstantiation. But what if the poison-

*Happily for all parties, he has now resigned his connection with the union.

†The excellent Dr. Jonas King for many years kept up a weekly preaching service for Greeks, but it was on his own premises, and there was no organised body, then, of converted Greeks.

ous plant or venomous reptile be not in one case so fully grown and so dangerously active; the deadly juice, the fatal fang are there; and poison is poison, and not good to give people; and a snake is a snake, a scorpion a scorpion, everywhere.

The people too of the "Greek communion, generally, and many of the clergy, especially of those belonging to the lower ranks, who are often too ignorant to know or care much about differences, or see the drift of missionary efforts, show less bigotry than the Papists. But we must separate, in such a case, between the dispositions of the people, and even of individuals among the clergy, and that which is the ordained and established doctrine of the Church incorporated into its very being. It is the former, as evinced to travellers, and even to missionaries, in first intercourse, that have tended to promote the illusions which have prevailed. These illusions, in the case of all missionaries who do not go under some peculiar bias, are soon dispelled. And these apparent good dispositions are very apt to disappear the nearer truth approaches and the more fully it reveals itself. Especially is this true of the clergy; but most of all, in general, of the more intelligent of them, who are but the more sagacious to perceive the irreconcilable difference between their system and ours. Men who are attached to a false system "love the darkness rather than the light," and the more clearly the light is revealed, the more they hate it. But it is the latter, the expressed creed, the prescribed worship and observances of a Church, that properly determine what that Church is.

Capability of being Vitalised.—And when we come to investigate, what do we find, in the actual facts of the case, to justify the hope that the Anatolic Church will go with us hand in hand, in the work of instructing her people, or any other of the earth's populations, in a true gospel? Glad as we might be to find it so, the proof is all to the contrary; and the writer of this, having had something of an unusual occasion and opportunity of making the investigation, well remembers the irresistible conviction forcing itself upon his mind, and the painful impression accompanying it, as at one time he pursued this inquiry; that impres-

sion becoming deeper and more painful as he turned over successive pages of the numerous and ponderous tomes that embody the creed and worship of the great "Orthodox" body, so called.

But before we proceed to look at the proofs on the question, there is a remark to be made, namely—that, if the body now spoken of be a true Church, even one of the parts of the true body of Christ, we might expect to find something of a gospel influence emanating from it upon the non-Christian races—at least those in immediate contact with it. But where has the "Greek" Church done the least particle of such work for ages upon ages past? What good and saving influence has she thrown out upon Mohammedanism? Except the most few and sporadic cases of conversion, occurring through the influence merely of outside circumstances, and counterbalanced by the equally numerous, or rather un-numerous cases, produced by like causes, of conversion the other way, she has expended her zeal on the question in teaching her children to hate all the Turks and Mussulmen with a perfect hatred.

And then, if this body be one that is possessed of enough of God's truth and the character of a true Church to cooperate with us in promoting the gospel, her bosom ought to have at least enough of vital warmth to keep alive some degree of piety amongst her numerous children. But, if any one, with proper opportunities, and without prejudice, will pursue investigation on this point, he will come to the conclusion that, if there be cases of true piety among the members of this communion, they too are merely sporadic, and that they exist, not properly as an effect of the general teachings and influence of their Church, but rather in spite of her errors, and against her predominant influence leading almost all around them in a false way;—these few spoken of, finding some of the gold amid the heaps of dross—all the rest discerning nothing but the rubbish that is piled over it. But where one comes into contact with the people of this faith, in the thorough way that a missionary does, how sad, generally, the results of his observation—how full of disappointment in some cases! Better, it is true; any form of Christianity than none. Twilight is not an entire remove from day; and

even under a total eclipse of the sun, some of his light gets to us; and it is not the darkness of midnight. There is so much of heavenly power in the gospel, that its most faint and oblique rays make, anywhere, less of a polar winter. But as to vital, spiritual religion among the people of this great communion, there is a sad and terrible eclipse. The words are on the lips; the technology of piety is volubly used;—certainly so among the Greeks, and said to be so everywhere else in the communion;—you would think at first that you were talking with some of the most pious people in the world; and this has misled even missionaries at first. But alas! you soon find that, under this outward show, there is an utter want of true spiritual perception and understanding,—the shell without the kernel;—that every body is a Christian from baptism, and that repentance and faith, in their vocabulary, or rather, in their minds and hearts, have a meaning that falls far short, practically, of the true and saving one. Dr. Andrews, (to whom reference has already been made,) after a residence of half a year in the Levant, in which he “made constant inquiries of missionaries and pious foreign residents,” while he justly says that we are not to assume that there are no cases of saving piety in the bosom of the Anatolic Church,—none where the person has groped the way to sufficient light and savingly apprehended Christ, despite the errors he was taught,—yet states, as the testimony of the persons above referred to, when asked “whether they had ever met with any,” (Dr. A. means of those who had not been brought under influences from outside their Church,) “who would be regarded as being, in the Protestant sense of the term, converted persons,” the reply, in every case was, “not one.”

And it must be remembered that, in our present investigation, the question is not whether individuals, in this or any other nominal Christian Church may be saved, in spite of its errors and mal-teachings; but what the Church itself is, and whether it is a Church of such character as to fit it for accomplishing the evangelistic agency for which Christ's Church was established; which means the diffusion and promotion of truth and saving influences among men. Such a Church ought not only to be, in

the main, evangelical, but, in its spirit, to be in sympathy with the truth it teaches. And can any man "in his senses," that is at all acquainted with the facts of the case, be so wild as to affirm that these predicates are true of the great Church of the East?

But, if they are not true, then truth and spiritual vitality have to be infused into her through some agency operating from without. Let us now look into that question.

Impracticability of reform within itself.—Even if it be a supposable case that the Eastern Catholic Church, in distinction from its great rival, the Roman Catholic, can be reformed, how would one go about so huge and monstrous an undertaking? First, the clergy, teachers and leaders of the Church would have to be converted to evangelic faith;—certainly a commanding majority of them, else no reform of the Church could be effected; for the prevalence of right sentiment among the people, not having their clergy with them, could only result in secession. And, even if the clergy and the people were together, in the main, so disposed, how would the vast process of purgation and reform be elaborated? To bring about this preparatory change of general sentiment might itself require years upon years, if indeed it could ever be accomplished as regards the clergy; for the ministers of a false creed and all who have a material interest in supporting it are generally the last to be converted, very commonly oppose "to the bitter end," and are not converted at all. How long would gospel propagation have had to linger, if the conversion of the chief-priests and scribes and members of the Sanhedrim had been waited for? And then, suppose them disposed to act in the case, how would they go about it, and how long would the work take? How many councils would have to be called? How many sessions would they sit, and how many years? Pope Pius IX's late council sat an incubation of months upon the one single doctrine of Infallibility; the Council of Trent, which only did tinkering and mending and strengthening of the old points, consumed eighteen years and twenty-five sessions about it. And our own General Assembly has spent some half-dozen years in the revision simply of its Book of Discipline,

and the Church has groaned and labored and, as some brethren, at least, prophecy to us, been almost convulsed, even over this not vital matter. How would the elements have to work and heave in the tremendous process of this vast Anatolic reform, and when would the end come? If our little book, or piece of a book, costs us such time and trouble, what will learned doctors do when they come to expurgate and amend and substitute and define, all through the piles of huge volumes that contain the canons, creeds, and liturgies of the Anatolic Church; the latter themselves (the liturgies) being so extended and multitudinous as to require on the part of the priest a strain of speed which has become an art and is most marvellous, to one unaccustomed to it, in order to accomplish even the reading of them, in the space of the two hundred and fifty fast and festival days which this Church keeps, in a year! The idea of a reform in and of either the Latin or the Greek Church is, in every point of view, preposterous; and the truth is, those Protestants who have ever talked or written favorably about it in regard to the latter, have had nothing but the most vague and crude ideas on the subject.

And if there were no other objection in the case, what can be the advantage in operating upon the populations now within the pale of this Church, or any other, through old, complicated and cumbrous forms, rather than by the establishment, *de novo*, of churches with simple, evangelic forms, as well as faith? What an absurdity in fact to take, for a given work, an old machine, merely because it is old, that is no longer upon the simple, original and effective plan, but found to have a vast accumulation of parts and appendages added on from time to time, till now it has become monstrously clumsy and cumbrous; while there stands by us, or can at once be constructed, a simple but beautiful and perfect machine, after the true, original, and unimprovable pattern;—more especially if the old one, though it makes a great rattling and noise, to the senseless admiration of many, yet in the actual experiment turns out, and has for generations turned out, nothing of any value!

But the old machine is worse than useless. Nominal and corrupted Christianity is worse than valueless. The Papacy, in

Western Europe and Southern America, actually stands in the way of the evangelisation of those parts of our globe. It has always, in fact, been the strongest and worst foe of a true gospel. And so it is in regard to the other grand and false form of Christianity, that calls itself the only true and Catholic Church of Christ, as to its influence over the peoples who own their spiritual allegiance to it. It stands in the way; it is, in fact, if not in so strongly manifested degree as in the case of the former, an enemy, not a friend.

The more any true Protestant explores the doctrines, worship, usages, and spiritual state of the great Church of which we are now speaking, the more he will find the proof that it is utterly incapable of being reformed by any process short of entire demolition and reconstruction. And the Greek Church would itself heartily consent to the challenge of all or nothing.

We need not take much time for the evidence. Dr. Andrews has given it, to his Episcopal brethren of this country, in a few pages of his pamphlet entitled, "Historic Notes of Protestant Missions to the Oriental Churches,"—drawn forth by the discussions in that Church in regard to their missions in Greece. In some of our present quotations, his extracts, for convenience, will be used, as being ready to hand.

Tradition—Doctrine, Authority, Sources.—We may affirm, in the general, what is certainly true, that, with the single exception of the doctrine of Papacy, *i. e.* of the human headship, as held by the Roman Catholic Church, there is not one of the important non-Protestant and anti-evangelical doctrines of this last named Church which is not essentially held by the Greek Catholic, and held as an irreversible part of her creed. First of all, and fundamental to all, she acknowledges tradition as the authoritative and infallible exponent of the word and will of God; and even places it, as we shall presently see, quite on a level as to authority, with Scripture itself. She pronounces the first seven œcumenical councils—those which she regards as such, (though distinctively from the Roman Catholic Church as to the validity of some of them,) to be, along with those whom she

•

honors as "Fathers" of the Church, and who utter their coincident sentiment, the true and unerring standards of faith, to all orthodox believers and all the world. And it will throw light on our general subject to see, while we give the list, what some of these councils determined, on questions aside from tradition itself for all the believing. After those of Nice, in 325, and Constantinople, in 381, and those of Ephesus and Chalcedon, in the years 431 and 451, we find, in her accredited list, that of the year 553, at Constantinople, then comes what was sometimes styled the Penthect, as being somewhat supplementary to the fifth, but generally regarded in the Anatolic Church as the sixth held at Constantinople, in 691; and the second of Nice in 783, makes the seventh and last.* Going back as far even as the Council of Ephesus, we find Nestorius condemned, in part, for deprecating the dangerous if not blasphemous term, "Theotokos;" and the very church in which the council held its sessions was a building styled, as Greek writers tell us, "the church of 'Mary Theotokos.'" That of Chalcedon made itself an unenviable reputation by condemning such a man as John Chrysostom. The fifth, while it condemned the errors of Origen, laid the foundations of the present Greek ritual, especially in points where it differs from the Latin, but embodying many of the corruptions of creed and worship which, as Protestants, we most repudiate. The Constantinopolitan (Trullan) Council, reckoned by the Anatolic Church as the sixth, sanctioned, directly or indirectly, many such superstitions. But the second Nicene, numbered by this Church as the seventh œcumenical, put on the cap-stone of traditional authority and of all the superstitions now, for so many ages, forming structural parts of the Anatolic faith and forms.†

*This is the list given in the "Pedalion," a collection of the canons of the Synods, published under the sanction of the heads of the Anatolic Church. It omits the one of Constantinople in 680; probably not acknowledged, in the Eastern Church, because of the part taken by the Roman pontiff in getting it up.

†No really universal council has been held, as before remarked in this article, since the separation from Rome. But some of the Anatolic Church

Looking over the utterances of some of these latter synods, one is struck with the fact that, instead of founding their dogmas and decrees on the Word of God, they refer to previous councils as the final authority. But looking at them all, especially the latter ones, we have to say to every Protestant, as he studies what came from them, behold the fountains of sacred, immaculate, infallible tradition! Bow down thyself at them!

Tradition.—But our present concern is specifically with the doctrine of Tradition. On this subject the Synod of Constantinople decreed as follows: “We believe the Scriptures without doubting; *not otherwise, however, than as the Catholic Church has interpreted it. . . . The testimony of the Catholic Church we believe not inferior to what is contained in Scripture.*”

A noted correspondence too, was conducted, in 1723, between the archbishops of the English Church and the Patriarch of Constantinople, having along with him the other three patriarchs of the Anatolic Church—those of Jerusalem, Antioch and Alexandria—the matter initiated by the former of the parties. It drew forth on this great point, from the latter, the following: “That the Scriptures are the word of God; but tradition and the acts of the first eight œcumenical councils, *being of the same origin as the Scriptures are to be of equal authority with them.*” The specious argument contained in this quotation will be noticed. It shows the more strongly what a deep foundation the Tradition doctrine has, in the minds of those who receive it.

But the Greek Catholic Church is fully committed to the doctrine, as much so as the Roman. And it is the great, ultimate, fundamental heresy of all heresies held by professed Christians—the great point of divergence from evangelic truth, and from all that we cherish of our faith as Protestants. You can do nothing with the man of the Roman or Greek communion, in

writers of late ages,—among them Plato, archbishop of Moscow,—refer to “eight” œcumenical councils. They probably include that held at Jerusalem, after so great an interval, in 1672. So too the Patriarchs of the Anatolic Church, in their letter above mentioned, to the primates of the English Church, reckon the number.

converting him from his errors, however palpable, till this foundation is knocked from under him; for of what avail will it be to put before his eyes the language of the decalogue, as plain as human words could ever be made, about certain of his practices of worship, while he can tell you, the Church teaches us how to understand the first and second commandments, and her authority is as high as any; it is final. How can you drive a man, by Scripture itself, into the acknowledgment of the doctrine of a free justification, available through simple faith, while he can produce the authority of the Church, which he believes is its unerring expounder and constituted oracle, to inform him and you that works concur with faith, in justification. Every one that, as a missionary or otherwise, has had practically to come in contact with the differences between ourselves and the Greek and Roman Catholic Churches, has been made to feel the tremendous, overshadowing power of this arch-heresy, and to realise, as never otherwise, the impressive import of those words of our Saviour, "Ye have made the word of God of none effect by your traditions." In fact we may say that this doctrine has been Satan's prime and masterly device for corrupting the faith of the Church and for entrenching and defending error, through the ages past, of the Church's brooding desolation. On the ground of this question it was, mainly, that the great battle of the Reformation had to be fought, and was won; for win here, and the field is our's for truth. And any Church that holds to tradition, and in the most gross and pernicious statement of it, as the Anatomic Church does, is radically degenerate, and even apostate. This is shown by the language currently used by its writers; for, while they speak of the Scripture writers as "θεόπνευστοι" ("theopneustoi,") they constantly do honor to the councils and fathers as "θεοφόροι" ("theophoroi.") And it is notorious that, as a matter of fact, in this great communion, it is the Church, (in its traditional authorities) more by far than the word of God, that is referred to in determining religious questions.

But does this Church hold, in the detail, the false doctrines and corrupt, and even idolatrous practices, which as Protestants we repudiate and abhor in the Roman Catholic faith and

worship?—every one of them, with the only one important exception heretofore specified, of the Papal primacy. She may not, practically, carry out some of them in such extremes of their exhibition as her sister in apostacy. But they are there; and the sentiment, the worship, the piety, (such as it is,) of the whole Church is thoroughly imbued with them. They form a part and parcel of their religion, theoretically and practically.

Method of Justification.—As to the vital doctrine of Justification, Luther's "*articulus stantis*," etc., the same Council of Constantinople above quoted, (Article XIII.) holds this language: "We believe that *not by faith only* is a man justified, but by faith which works by love; that is to say, by faith and works; and we hold it a *doctrine of utter impiety* to say that simple faith, performing the function of a hand, can apprehend the righteousness (of Christ.) We believe the contrary to this; that it is *not faith, by the imputation of any thing*, but the faith that is *in us*, which, through our works, justifies us before Christ. We judge that works are not mere indications of what is in us, but are fruits to be *independently considered*, by means of which faith obtains what is practicable, (*i. e.* may be earned,) and are *in themselves meritorious*, through the divine promise to enable each of the faithful to receive the things done in the body."

The Council of Trent could not have framed, did not frame anything more anti-Protestant and anti-scriptural on the subject. Indeed its language in regard to it devised to combat a developed Protestantism, bears a striking resemblance to this. Instead of being on this point rather orthodox and evangelical, as some writers have seemed to think she is, the Greek Church is as radically unsound as the Latin. And the whole tenor of Greek theological teaching is in conformity to this. The "*Katechesis*," or book of religious instruction, by Darbares, makes justification to depend on works as well as faith; and this book has the imprimatur of the "*Holy Synod of Greece*," and is the manual of religious instruction used by authority in the public schools of the kingdom. It may be of some interest, in connection with this and others of its doctrines, to know that it is the

one which for so many years Dr. Hill allowed to be taught the scholars of his ("missionary") schools at Athens, under the superintendence of a Greek priest.

Saint and Image Worship.—But are the teachings of the Oriental any less objectionable and pernicious than those of the great, corrupt occidental "Catholic" Church, on the question of things which we, as Protestants, believe to be essentially and really idolatrous, and in express violation of the two first precepts of the decalogue? Not a whit. The proof is so strong that even Bishop Whittingham, though one of the American Episcopal bishops that sustained the notorious Mr. Southgate (ordained bishop, if we mistake not, for the enterprise,) in his romantic, but farcically unsuccessful, knight-errant mission of reverence and courted recognition to "*the* great Church of the East,"—even Bishop W. is compelled to say that, in it, image-worship and the intercession of the saints are even more rife than among the Romanists."

The very object of the second Nicene Council, acknowledged and revered by this Church as one of the grand œcumenical synods, was to establish saint and image worship. Leo and other "eikonoklast" emperors had made, through fifty years, one of the last struggles against this invasion of idolatry. But the Empress Irene, well styled by historians "the infamous," triumphed, in the calling of this council, which decreed every thing that she wanted. And, though the murderess of her husband, she is adored in the Greek Church as a saint, and her name constantly crowned with praises. Many of their churches, among them an important one at Athens, are named in honor of her.

But the contest being renewed in the following century, the idolatrous doctrine prevailed, under another woman, the Empress Theodora, in a council held at Constantinople; and was finally and for all time installed, in the corrupt creeds of the Church, by the Constantinopolitan Council of 879, mentioned before as the last of the œcumenical. The learned Dr. Covell, in his work, (published Cambridge, England, 1722, fol.) gives at large the

decrees of the Council of Jerusalem, heretofore mentioned as having been held in 1672, and acknowledged by the Greek Church as authoritative, if not œcumenical. The articles of faith, (as mentioned by Dr. Andrews,) "submitted by the Synod of Constantinople," (probably a synod of recent times held by the Constantinopolitan patriarch,) quoting largely from this Synod of Jerusalem, and republished in Athens, in 1844, with "the benediction" of the Synod of Greece, thus sets forth the doctrine of the Church on the subject: "We honor those who are truly saints, and declared mediators by the Church, as the friends of God, and as supplicating him on our behalf. We honor them in a twofold manner: one in the mode which we call *hyperdouleia*, the mother of the divine word; for if the parent of God be confessedly the servant, *yet is she also the mother of the only God*, as having brought forth in the flesh *one person of the Trinity*; for which reason she is lauded, etc. In the second mode, in paying honor to angels, etc., we offer the worship termed *douleia*. We also worship and honor the wood of the precious and life-giving cross; the stall at Bethlehem, the life-giving sepulchre, etc. We worship, honor and salute the pictures of our Lord Jesus Christ, of the *super-holy Mother of God*, and those of all the saints and the holy angels." And one grand division of the festivals of the Anatolic Church is the "Theometric," in honor of the Virgin.

In the Catechesis of Darbares, already cited from, and the most mild, guarded and apologetic of all the published statements of Anatolic faith ever published, unless we except that of Bishop Plato, we find, in the exposition of the first commandment, even where he is defining the violation of it, such language as this: "That person sins inexcusably and greatly against this commandment who offers to the ministers of God almost the same honor that he offers to God himself; who *prays more and oftener to them* than to God; who celebrates their memory or their [festival] days with *more reverence* than that of the Lord; who honors their pictures *more* than that of our Saviour," etc. The indirect intimations of this language are sadly significant. And, bad, in these things, as are her symbols of doctrine, the

prescribed worship of the Anatolic Church is even worse. It is a dreadful fact that the larger part of the forms of worship found in the numerous collections of her church services, are addressed to the Virgin and the canonized saints. And a large part of this vast accumulation may, without exaggeration, be called a compound of puerility with what a properly enlightened mind feels to be not only creature-worship, but even blasphemy and sacrilege of the most revolting kind—so much so, that an unprejudiced person like Dr. John Glenn King, Chaplain to the British Factory at St. Petersburg, after a learned and thorough investigation of the subject, gives it, in his work, (London, 1772; 4to.) as his opinion, “Their worship has degenerated into absolute idolatry.”

Let the reader take a sample or two. He will be satisfied with very few. Passing by the honors paid to the Virgin-Mother in connection with her reputed supernatural birth and assumption to heaven, and opening the *Euchologium*,—an authorised collection of prayers for various extraordinary occasions,—we find a liturgy of “the Paracletic canon, to the super-holy (uperagia) Theotokos,” beginning, “To the Theotokos, we who are sinful and base shall urgently run and fall down unto her; in penitence crying out, from the depths of our souls, Mistress, give thy help, showing us compassion; hasten, for we perish, by reason of the multitude of our offences; turn not they servants away empty; *for we have gained thee as our only hope!*” Except for the use of our own hands and eyes upon the volume, it might have staggered us to believe that anything so monstrous could be found in a volume of the prayers of a so-called Christian Church. But in this strain, with the interludes of “Glory, both now, etc.,” the invocation goes on and concludes,—one of its sentences containing a shocking apostrophe of the “Bride of God”! (“*theonymphe.*”) And turning to another part of the *Euchology*, we find, in the form of profession to be used by any Jew converted to the faith, the following, “And I believe in (and so declare) the Holy Virgin Mary as having begotten him, (Christ), but afterwards remaining a virgin, eminently and truly the Theotokos, truly Mother of God incarnate, and by reason of

this, *become lady and mistress of all the creation.*" Thousands more of like citations might be made; but they would only shock pious minds.

And, as if to commit herself, in the utmost degree, to this impiety, the Anatomic Church has appointed a solemn annual celebration in honor of the restoration of saint and image-worship, under Irene and Theodosia; and on this day, honored as the peculiar "Day of Orthodoxy," while she pays her homage to these and such persons, as saints, she pronounces her solemn "anathema" upon those who do not thus acknowledge and adore these demi-gods of her ecclesiastical heavens.

No sensible Protestant will pay the least respect to the miserable subterfuge of an apology made by the Greek and Roman ecclesiastics, and others of the more shrewd defenders of saint-invocation and the use of images, that the one is a mere calling for intercessory help, and the other a mere suggestive aid to devotion, through the senses. The Brahmin and the intelligent Buddhist will make just the same kind of apology for his pagan worship. "The deity resides in the stocks and stones; we adore it in and through them." But, in the case of both the so called heathen and the so-called Christian worship, it is with the great masses a real, matter-of-fact idolatry; as any one can clearly see who goes amongst either of the parties. The highest benediction, usually, in the mouth of one of the common people, male or female, of the Greek communion, is one invoked from the Virgin; "the All-holy," (in the feminine form of the adjective,) "bless you!"

Nor does it need to be said how preposterous is the distinction drawn by the Eastern Catholic Church in justification of her religious use of painted images, as against such use of sculptured and cast ones; as if images projected in relief could be worse to worship than those made on a plane surface; and as if the awful command of Jehovah did not say, "*any likeness, of any thing,*" etc. And it is a fact to be noticed, that the worshippers in the churches of the Anatomic communion do literally and often "bow down" to these painted "likenesses," and the reader will have marked, in one of the quotations which have

been given, the use of the very words which express the idea of "serving them," ("douleia," etc.)

Auricular Confession.—Though the doctrine and practice of confession to the priest are not made so prominent, and have not been carried out into such abuses as in the Roman Catholic Church, yet the thing as certainly exists in the Greek. It is a well-known matter of requisition, on the part of the latter, that her members attend on confession, at least at certain designated times, before coming to communion. Where they refer to Scripture at all for a sanction, they quote James v. 16. In fact, as we shall see presently, the Church gives such dignity to this observance as to number it, as a sacrament, among the chief ordinances of Christ's house.

A future Purgatorial state.—Dr. J. G. King (before quoted) says that, "while the Greek Church admits prayers and services for the dead, and even prays for the remission of their sins, it does by no means allow the doctrine of purgatory." And this has been even to our own day the almost unchallenged supposition. Even, if in her creeds, there was nothing expressed in reference to the condition of those for whom such prayers are to be offered, the very offering of them infers something; for what would be the use of prayers for the departed, if these, as means, delivered them from nothing, or there was nothing to be delivered from? And if there is something, it matters little whether it be torments of any particular description.

But Dr. Andrews quotes the eighteenth article of the Synod of Constantinople, as follows: "We believe that the souls of the deceased go immediately into a state of joy or of woe; that the souls of those who have been defiled by mortal sin, who have not died in despair, who repented while yet alive, but did not exhibit the fruits of repentance, such as the shedding of tears, kneeling with watchings, prayers, afflictions, and relieving the poor, go to hades and endure punishment for the sins which they have committed; but are in expectation of deliverance from that place, and they are liberated through the prayers of the priests, and

the pious offerings which the relatives of each make for the departed; the unbloody sacrifice [of the mass] being of the greatest efficacy, which each of the relations in particular offers for the departed, and which the Catholic and Apostolic Church daily offers in common for all." Is not this purgatorial doctrine fully forged? And the reader will notice how transubstantiation shows its cloven foot.

Transubstantiation.—Whether the doctrine of the awful transmutation, as gradually introduced, and at last, in the 13th century, fully installed in the Roman Church, is a clearly developed doctrine of the Eastern Church, is a question about which there have been the most variant statements, even on the part of very respectable authors. It seems surprising that it should have been doubted. The only question now to be raised is, when it was introduced; and this of little practical importance. As far back certainly as two hundred years ago, it was formally adopted and proclaimed by the Anatolic Church. The following is an extract from the 17th decree of the Council of Jerusalem, (held, as before stated, in 1672, and acknowledged in the Greek Church,) as found in the work of Dr. Covell: "When the priest consecrates the elements, *the very substance of the bread and wine is transformed into the substance of the true body and blood of Christ.*" And Dr. C. remarks, in regard to the whole article, "it is as full as if Bellarmine and all the Tridentine fathers had been present at the making of it." The Synod of Constantinople, laying down the doctrine in the most circumstantial and explicit manner, concludes thus: "Farther, *the body and blood of our Lord, in the sacrament of the Eucharist, ought to be honored and worshipped with the very highest act of adoration,*" etc. And the doctrine is everywhere incorporated in the Anatolic creed and liturgies; as any one can see who will refer to such manuals and compilations, prepared by the Church itself, or under its sanction, as the "Synopsis," the "Euchologium," and the various catechisms. Turning once more to the second of these, we find, in the "profession for a converted Jew," the following: "And I am persuaded and

confess and believe them" [the bread and wine of the Eucharist, which he declares himself to adore,] "to be in truth the body and blood of the Lord Jesus Christ, changed [into it] by his divine power, after a manner above our comprehension and known only to him." In fact, no communicant of the Anatolic Church ever partakes of the Lord's Supper without the priest's pronouncing the words, along with the person's name, "The servant of God partakes of the precious body and blood of our Lord God and Saviour," etc.*

Farther proof need not be cited. But it may be added that the doctrine is most distinctly taught to, and even enjoined upon, all the children and members of the Anatolic communion, in Darbares' book and all the other catechisms and manuals used for religious instruction, including Archbishop Plato's book. And if there is not in the Greek Church so much of gross demonstration and excess in the worship of "the host," they certainly do adore it, as really and professedly, as the Roman.

Multiplied Sacraments.—The Anatolic Church, along with her hating and hated sister, the Roman Catholic, did not find enough of august and imposing ordinances of the first class. Hence she has her "Seven Mysteries"—baptism, chrism, the eucharist, confession, ordination, marriage, and unction of the sick.

How will this suit Protestants? Especially if we find, as we do in looking over the forms of administration, a great deal of error and superstition connected with each and all of them. It would hardly be worth while to produce citations even if we had space.

Regeneration.—But there is one of them that, as held by this Church, contains a deadly heresy not yet mentioned. In the offices of baptism, and the accompanying chrism, the doctrine of baptismal regeneration is brought out in the fullest and grossest form that language could give it. In the prefatory prayer, the priest asks that "Christ may be formed in him" (the

*The Greek Church administers in "both kinds."

subject) that is about to be regenerated through my [the priest's] mercifulness." In the prayer following the administration, the words of Ps. xxxii., "Blessed is the man whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered," being first pronounced, the priest gives thanks to God for "having granted the happy purification in the holy water and the divine sanctification in the life-giving chrism," [the anointing of the child with the "holy oil;"] and for having been *pleased to regenerate his servant*, the neophotist, by water and the Holy Spirit, and having bestowed on him the remission of his sins, voluntary and involuntary."

If anything were needed to fill up the dreadful list of—no life-giving, but (as the Greeks would express it) "death-bringing" errors—to put a cap-stone on the structure of corruption and apostacy, our present quotation would give it.

Doctrine of the "Procession."—And, beside the other and more essential differences that have now been set forth, how could any Protestant Church affiliate with the Anatolic body, while the latter makes so much of the doctrine of the "Procession." You may judge it unessential, whether we say "from the Father," or "from the Father and the Son," but she will not allow this. Having split with Rome upon the "filioque," she will hold herself in antagonism to you, till you pronounce the creed with the "Patre" only.

And just such a difficulty would all Protestants find in regard to the Apocryphal books, some of which she receives; if indeed we did not find some also in her reception of the Septuagint as the proper and authorised version of the Old Testament. This recognition the Anatolic Church has renewed, in declarations made by the Church in Greece and elsewhere, within recent years.

But, as to the grand errors which we have been reviewing, even Bishop Whittingham, comparing the two great degenerate bodies of Rome, and the Levant, is obliged to say, "For centuries the east and west have been diverging from primitive truth and order, by widely different ways; the point of departure lies almost equally remote from both." Dr. Andrews expresses him-

self even more unfavorably in respect to the eastern Catholic body. There certainly does seem to be reason for believing that, for ages past, there have been fewer instances of vital piety, existing in spite of its errors, in this than in the Roman Catholic Church. And, as to the chimera of change and reform, from within and by her own action, the Anatolic Church has herself completely foreclosed this, if any Church could do it. Behold how she has entrenched some of the very worst of her corruptions by the institution of the "Day of Orthodoxy," with its Mounts Gerizim and Ebal of benedictions and anathemas; and every Protestant and evangelical person in the world lies under the latter, most solemnly pronounced, as a heretic and apostate, in not receiving and honoring as the Church prescribes "the holy images," etc. She has, moreover, been fully tested, both as to her doctrinal views and her dispositions toward evangelical Christian bodies, in approaches made to her, not in recent years only, but at various periods since the Reformation. Every reader of Church history will remember the efforts made, in the latter half of the 16th century, by Melancthon, Crusius, and the "divines of Tubingen," through the transmission, to the Constantinopolitan patriarch, of the Augsburg Confession, and the correspondence which they instituted; which terminated so abruptly when they began to discuss matters, and refer to Scripture as authority.

And, whatever dispositions an individual of her communion here and there may have shown, *the Greek Church, as such, has every where and always* manifested but one feeling toward evangelical doctrine and the propagators of it. Protestant missionaries, so soon as they were understood, have always met with her frown—in some cases, as that of Dr. Jonas King, have been struck by the iron hand of her persecuting power.

We might have hoped for somewhat better things in free Greece. But it was here that Dr. K. suffered imprisonment—the very Greek constitution of 1843, which liberalised their government, recognises the Anatolic as the national Church of the kingdom and inhibits proselytism—and in the governmental act constituting the "Holy Synod," thus defines some of its duties:

“The Synod is to watch for the preservation of the purity of the articles of faith received and acknowledged by the Oriental Church, and especially of the books treating on religious subjects, intended for the clergy or young persons,” (aimed, no doubt, at the missionaries,) and as soon as it ascertains that any one attempts to make innovations on the Church of the kingdom, either by new doctrines, proselytism, or in any other manner, it is bound to require the aid of the temporal authorities to repress evil.”

Final Evidence of its Dispositions.—But the truth is, the question, whether of fraternal recognition and coöperation or of reformation in that Church, was as completely and finally wound up, just one hundred and fifty years ago, by the Anatolic Church itself, as it could possibly be, by the most formal and solemn declarations that human language could frame: As the issue of the correspondence, already referred to as having been instituted by the primates of the English Church with those of the Anatolic body, in the year 1723, the English archbishops received a final and elaborate communication, on the part of “Jeremiah, the most all-holy (panagiotatos) patriarch of Constantinople, New Rome; Athanasius, most benignant patriarch of Antioch; Chrysanthus, most blessed patriarch of Jerusalem; and the most sacred Metropolitan archbishops; with the whole body of the Oriental orthodox clergy;” in which, after mentioning a second letter received by them from the English ecclesiastics, they use this marked language: “Having carefully read it and understood its import, we have only to repeat what we have already said, that the doctrines of our Church have been a long time ago examined and defined by the holy and œcumenical Synods; and it is not lawful to add to or diminish aught from these, and that whosoever wishes to be of the same mind with us must wholly submit with a sincere obedience, without further investigation or inquisitiveness, to the doctrines which have been definitely declared by the fathers and by the holy Synods from the time of the apostles and the fathers of our Church, in regular succession, to this day.”

And then, after stating that they had sent their correspondents a copy of "the exposition of the orthodox faith of our eastern Church, as drawn up by the Synod of Jerusalem, in the year 1672," (the very one that capped the climax of apostacy in this Church, by declaring its adoption of the transubstantiation dogma,) these grand and worshipful dignitaries thus turn the tables and announce conditions: "*If you will agree with these our doctrines, you shall be altogether one with us, and there shall be no more differences between us.*"

This notable communication too is the very one which was republished, with its "blessing," by the Synod of Greece in 1844, and speaks the universal sentiment of the Anatolic Church at this day.

These citations clinch the argument of these pages. But if a stronger finale could be demanded, to the question of internal reform, and assimilation to evangelical bodies, let us ask, was not this very experiment once made, and most notably in history? Was not all the imperial influence, of a number of successive emperors, during the 8th and 9th centuries, brought to bear, to this end? The result was disastrous defeat, even to them. And was it not tried, on a more ample scale, as to its object, by the noble, enlightened, ill-fated Cyril Lucaris, himself patriarch of the great See of Constantinople, and one who had been in contact with Protestantism and was in sympathy with it. The result, of even his declarations of sentiment, was his own martyrdom—being strangled, in 1638, by order of the Sultan, at the instigation of the Jesuits and his own ecclesiastics.

Conclusion.—We have now given as the results of many years of research and observation, conducted under some peculiar advantages, what we think a more complete and accurate exhibition of the history, condition, and relations of the body called the Eastern Catholic Church, than any that, to our knowledge, has yet appeared. The writer of this is obliged to say, and he can safely do it, that he has never met with any thing in print, from any Protestant quarter, which gives a fully accurate and satisfactory account of this body, which forms so grand and impor-

tant a part of nominal Christendom, with the single exception of Dr. Andrews' pamphlet; which, however, is taken up in great part with the discussion of matters in detail, relating to Dr. Hill and the Athens Episcopal mission. It is high time that the evangelical Christian world should be properly informed as to its character and condition, and relations to Protestantism.

If there were time and space, we might ask, where are the instances, in the history of the Church, of reformation in and on the part of a corrupt religious body itself? Most, if not all, of the facts are just the other way, beginning with the Jewish Church. If it was purged, under the Old Testament, it was only by the most extraordinary processes, such as the captivity and the very ruin of the nation. But, under the New Testament, Christ came with the "winnowing-shovel"—nay, with the very "axe," to fell. Jerusalem and the very temple were swept away; the Church of God never ceased to be; but the apostate Jewish Church was cast out, and from its ruins rose a new and evangelic one. And yet we do not hesitate to say, that the Jewish Church, in our Saviour's day, was, so far as we know, far more pure in its doctrine and worship than either the Greek or the Roman is now found to be.

And did not Luther and his fellow-reformers earnestly and fully try the experiment of reform in and from within? And so, in like instances, almost if not quite without exception, hath it ever been, and shall it ever be. So must it be where a body is vitally corrupt. If the old house is decayed in every important timber, how shall it be made new? Or, to use our Saviour's own figure, "if the salt have lost its savor, wherewith shall it be salted?" And if, to improve it, you have to take, and do take the warp or the woof out of every yard of a piece of cloth, where will be the cloth? As to whatever of truth is still held by the Greek and Roman Catholic Churches, how much is it worth, when it is so adulterated? Pernicious drugs, mingled in, may make the most valuable liquid or medicine deadly. What can be more wholesome and pure, than water? And yet such an admixture may turn even water into a poison. The great "man of sin" and "anti-Christ" apostacy, covers more than

the papal development. It has been far more extensive and tremendous than even that.

And, as the passion for the antique and venerable is with some, whose ecclesiasticism leads them to shut their eyes on her hideous errors, the wonderful attraction toward the great Church of the East, we beg leave to say, before we close this discussion, that there could scarcely be a greater humbug. If simple, absolute antiquity of existence is meant, the religion of the Buddhist, or the unbelieving Jew, may boast something far higher up the line of ages. If a true Christian antiquity, then, we say, strange as the affirmation may sound to some, neither the Greek nor the Romish Church has it at all. Their "apostolicity" is a spurious apostolicity. It is a bastard coin, of post-apostolic ages. Our brother Kalopothakes, gathering a little handful of scriptural believers, and restoring true doctrine and pure worship, within the walls of the neat evangelical chapel which now stands in sight of "Mars' Hill," restores the true apostolicity. Forming it on the true, primitive model, he bridges the chasm of the ages that have rolled between him and that greatest, noblest of missionaries who, eighteen centuries ago, proclaimed, on the Areios Pagos, the gospel of a true God and Saviour, to the ancestors of Kalopothakes and his little Christian fraternity, civilised as they were, and proud of their superiority to the remaining, and, as they so styled them, barbarian nations of the earth, yet, in his regard, as might almost as well be said of most of their descendants, though under a Christian name, very "deisidaimones." The broken link is bound again, and Dr. K. and his associates have "the true succession," as any and every evangelical Church has all over the world.

But, aside from its being better in its influence than outright heathenism, we owe something to the Anatolic Church—its very superstition, in using an ancient tongue, being so overruled—for its aid in the preservation of the Scriptures; for it is an interesting fact, never, that we know of, adverted to by any body, that, aside from the Septuagint, always used by them, the New Testament Scriptures have been read, in her church services, in every generation, without a single break, from the very ages in

which they were written; some of them thus preserved and read on the very spots where they were first delivered.

And we must discriminate between a corrupted religion and those who profess it; and pray that the light and life of a pure Christianity may be restored to the regions and populations of this vast communion, embracing one of the grand leading empires of Europe and the world, and most of the great Slavonian family, along with that renowned and still most interesting race of people, whose name has passed over, in common usage to the Church itself—the still preserved Hellenes, who are falsifying Byron's oft-quoted saying, (written when they were slaves,) and with a pure gospel would emphatically show the world that Greece is "living Greece" once more.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

A Harmony of the Four Gospels in Greek, according to the Text of Tischendorf; with a Collation of the Textus Receptus, and of the Texts of Griesbach, Lachmann, and Tregelles. By FREDERICK GARDINER, D. D., Professor in the Berkeley Divinity School, author of "A Commentary on the Epistle of St. Jude," "A Harmony of the Gospels in English," etc. Andover: Warren F. Draper. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street. 1871. Slim octavo of 268 pp.

A somewhat careful examination justifies us in a highly favorable estimate of this work, which is little more than a marked improvement upon Newcome and Robinson. The following are its principal distinctive features: 1. It aims to exhibit a critical text. The Text given by Dr. Gardiner is that of the 8th, and last, edition of Tischendorf. Where this varies from the *Textus Receptus*, the variant reading is indicated, as in Scribner's valuable edition of the New Testament, by a somewhat blacker type. This enables the eye to catch the amount of difference on a page, at a *coup d'oeil*; and to remark with gratification how slight after all that difference is. Wherever Griesbach, Lachmann, or Tregelles retains the reading of the *text. rec.* the initial G. L. or T. is appended at the bottom of the page; where any of them gives a different reading, that also is added with the initial. The three critics concur with Tischendorf in all cases where the contrary is not thus indicated. Additions to the *text. rec.* are printed in the text in thicker type and inserted in the margin with "om." before them. The editor claims that one incidental advantage of this plan is in the evidence thus furnished of a gradual approximation to a final settlement of the text. This may perhaps be reasonably questioned. It is certain that in glancing along the foot of the pages, the eye at once observes how much more frequently the letter G. occurs than the letter L., and both of these than T. This may seem to warrant the statement, that with the acquisition of larger critical apparatus, and the

great extension of critical studies, there is an increasing agreement as to the corrections required in the text of the Elzevirs. It may be doubted whether this agreement, even in the case of Tischendorf and Tregelles, has yet reached the point, when it is possible, or, if possible, safe, to prepare a standard text upon which scholars generally may unite as a new *textus receptus*. More remains to be done in this department than Dr. Gardiner seems to suspect, or is willing to allow.

The Harmony owes the excellence of its punctuation to the careful revision of Prof. Charles Short of Columbia College. The proof-reading has been done by a number of scholars. The formation of paragraphs is mainly the work of Dr. Coit.

2. All distinct quotations from the Old Testament are given in full in the margin, according to Tischendorf's arrangement of the LXX., together with the various lections of the Alexandrine text, and of the Sinaitic manuscript, and sometimes also of the versions of Aquila, Symmacleus, and Theodotion. In the case of any notable variation in the translation of the LXX. the original Hebrew is added. Allusions and general references are given only by chapter and verse.

3. A small selection of parallel references has been placed in the margin, chiefly for the purpose of pointing out the use of similar phraseology or incidents elsewhere in the Gospels, or passages in the Old Testament, which are deemed the basis of language in the text, or sometimes quotations in the Epistles, or allusions to the language of the Gospels.

4. The brief notes at the bottom of the page are not designed to serve as a commentary, but relate exclusively to matters of Harmony. These foot-notes are excellent, and embrace a thorough treatment of the principal apparent discrepancies. In one or two important instances the subject-matter is discussed in an introduction to the part to which it pertains. In such cases the foot-note simply refers the reader to the introduction.

5. The arrangement of the Harmony proper is that of no one man, but is the result of a full comparison of many earlier works. In the main it will be found to agree with that of Robinson. The device of Tischendorf, and Angle, of repeating

passages in different connections has not been resorted to in a single instance.

6. More paper has been left blank than in the works of Robinson, Angle, or Tischendorf; less than in Greswell or Stroud. The aim has been to secure the maximum of clearness with the minimum of cost. The same width of column is preserved for each Gospel in any one section, provided it be all upon the same page; but with the transition from one section or one page to another, the width of the column is altered as occasion requires. On the whole, the work of Gardiner is a great improvement in this respect upon Robinson, as well as in general typographical elegance. It is good to the eyes, and lies open well; like the best English books.

7. At the end of the introduction there is a synoptical arrangement of several Harmonists. This is said to be a new feature, and shows at a glance the general agreement on the main points of chronology, and, when difference exists, with which of these Harmonists the present arrangement agrees.

In general the order adopted is that of John, so far as it goes, with which that of Mark is found to accord. There is still, however, a portion of Luke's Gospel which upon any view is subject to conjectural arrangement. The difficulty is not one of inconsistency, but simply of a want of sufficient data. Fortunately it turns out that the points thus difficult to fix, are points of comparatively light importance. The passages having these uncertain relations are placed according to the editor's best judgment where they seem properly to belong, with full liberty to the reader to transpose them within certain limits.

The style of Dr. Gardiner bears a striking resemblance to that of such English writers as Bishop Ellicott and Dr. Westcott. It is precise and unemotional, altogether scholarlike, though sometimes a little lax and ambiguous.

The Government of the Kingdom of Christ, an Inquiry as to the Scriptural, Invincible, and Historical Position of Presbytery. A Prize Essay by the Rev. JAMES MOIR PORTEOUS, Wanlockhead & Leadhills, with preface by the Rev. Horatius Bonar, D. D. *Veritas Vincit.* Edinburgh: Johnstone, Hunter & Co. London: James Nisbet & Co. Belfast: C. Aitchison. 1872. Right of translation and reproduction reserved. Pp. 588. 12 mo.

This is a very able statement and defence of the *Jus Divinum Presbyterii*, and we welcome it as such most cordially. It has three parts. In the first part is discussed the scripturalness of Presbytery. Seven chapters are devoted to an account of the Monarch and his Kingdom, the Church visible and invisible. The eighth chapter takes up the laws of the kingdom, which of course are all found in the Bible, but they may and ought to be classified by us in systematic formularies. Seventeen other chapters treat of the Government of the Kingdom, which was at first temporary in the hands of apostles, but is permanently committed to elders or bishops who have deacons to aid them. The government is always administered by associated elders, and the whole Church is represented in the highest of these courts. The scriptural principles which the author deems essential are formally deduced one by one as this first part proceeds, and at the close of it they are brought together and stated under fifteen heads. We state the following as samples of these essential principles: the only Head of the Church is Christ; the Scriptures are the only ultimate standard of law; the office of elder is essential and permanent in the Christian Church; the office of the ministry is divinely authoritative and permanent; the office of elder and bishop is identical; admission to office must be by prayer, and the imposition of the hands of the body of elders.

The scriptural office of the deacon who has charge of temporals is discussed in one chapter of this part first; the call to office (which is *inward* as well as *outward*) in another; and ordination, its nature, significance and mode in a third.

In part second, the question is, Whether is Presbytery untenable or invincible? It opens with the necessity there is for unity of the Church and the sin there is in parties and schisms. The claim of Presbytery that it constitutes the scriptural and divine Form of Government in which all should unite, is considered in contrast, first, with Church government *devised*; secondly, with Church government *localised*; and thirdly, with Church government *centralised*.

Those who *devise* Church government for themselves, whilst denying the government which the Scriptures reveal, are of three classes. The *first* class is the *Separatists*. These keep aloof from every Church of the Reformation, professing that every believer shares all necessary gifts and grace in common, to the exclusion of official authority. The *second* class is the *Erastians*, who wholly or partially yield to the civil magistrate the rule of Christ's house. The *third* class is the *Libertines*, who claim that they are free to choose or to reject any form of Church government that is plausible or convenient.

Separatism prevails widely. Its professed characteristics are longings for "a pure Church" and the equality in all respects of every believer. Chief amongst the class of the Separatists, Mr. Porteous places the Plymouth brethren. He gives his views of their history and their doctrines in six chapters, in the course of which he discusses the question, whether every Christian is entitled to assume the office of the ministry, whether public ministrations by women are legitimate, and whether a settled ministerial income is unlawful.

Erastianism and libertinism are discussed each in one chapter.

The *localised* Church government is that of the Independents and Congregationalists, who deny the government in common of all the churches, and divide Christ and his Church into local parts. Five chapters are devoted to this topic.

The *centralised* Church government is that of prelatial episcopacy, discussed in nine chapters; and that of the Papacy, discussed in one chapter.

The second part ends with an exhibition in one chapter, of the way in which presbyterial episcopacy harmonizes the liberty of

the people, the authority of the rulers, and the unity of the kingdom.

Part the third, presents to us the past and the present condition of the Presbyterian Church, and furnishes a historical confirmation of the scriptural form of Church government.

In chapter first, we have a summary account of the various witnesses for the truth, from the fourth down to the fifteenth century. Then follow five special chapters on the Culdees, the Waldenses, the Reformation in Germany, in Switzerland, and in France. Another chapter takes up Italy, Spain and Portugal, Austria, Poland, Russia and Greece, Denmark, Sweden and Norway, Holland and Belgium. Chapter eight, discusses England and Presbytery; chapter nine, the Church of Scotland; chapter ten, Ireland and Presbytery; chapter eleven, America and Presbytery; chapter twelve, Presbytery in the British Colonies; chapter thirteen, presbyterial position and prospects.

The chapter on American Presbytery touches on the history of the division of the Church in 1837, and the late Reunion. The view given is such as Mr. Porteous could derive from the accounts of those who favored it. Hardly any reference is made by the author to our own Church. We are very small and insignificant to human eyes, along side of the great Presbyterian Church of the North. And we have taken, and are taking little pains, perhaps too little, to define and set forth our position before mankind. It is of course the main thing, if our Lord's eye recognises and regards us. Nor has the time yet come, when we could get a fair hearing from British Presbyterians. But it will come. Our Church, feeble as she now appears outwardly, is strong with the omnipotence of the truth, and has a glorious mission on this continent and in the whole earth. We can bide our time, meanwhile let not the Southern Presbyterian pen dry away and perish from non-use. The future will require it, if the present does not.

While Mr. Porteous appears to know so little about the Presbyterians of the South, it is somewhat strange that, in at least three places, he quotes at some length by name from the writings of Dr. Thornwell.

VOL. XXIII., NO. 3.—8.

This work appears to be designed, not only for students of theology, but also for the intelligent inquiring membership of the Church, who desire to know why they are Presbyterians. The table of contents is unusually full, and the author suggests that the reader study what relates to each part and each chapter before he reads it. Then he appends to every chapter certain questions, to which he urges that answers from memory be written out after the reading. Still further, he brings out in sundry places the formal statement of the principles he has developed, and repeatedly holds them up in a distinct and impressive manner, both separately and collectively, to the eye of the inquirer. It is a book we should be delighted to know that many of our ruling elders and deacons have obtained, and are carefully perusing.

Life in the Exode. By A. D. POLLOCK. University Publishing Company, New York and Baltimore. 1872. Pp. 609.

There is a freshness, a simplicity and earnestness about this book which invests it with more than common interest. It sets up no claim to an elaborate and learned investigation into the phraseology of Scripture, or the manner and usages of the old Egyptians, or the geography of the peninsula of Sinai. It is "a running inquiry," as the author has phrased it, "not so much into the nature, as into the range and volume of what Moses has written, and of its importance to the world and to truth, a kind of inquiry which the scribes of all ages, learned in the affairs of the Kingdom of Heaven, have not thought worth instituting at all. "It was a companionship through life with the Bible itself, leading, as it did, to deep interest in the use which Bible revelation has made of the world itself, which led him to the inquiry, why has so little account been taken of the physical magnitude of the wonderful works of God?"

After showing that among the migrations of nations, this is the only one where a people has been transferred in a body from one country to another, and the difficulties of such a transfer; that a single family had now grown into a great people, and that

every people must have a country of their own; that God had covenanted to give them the land of Canaan, when as yet they owned only a burying-place—he proceeds to set forth before us that miraculous and strangely wonderful Exode, by and during which they received their form and organisation as a nation and a Church. The leading facts in this event are the almost visibility of God in the whole story, and that it is the basis of the whole book of divine revelation. The elders of the people have been assembled, and demand in Jehovah's name from the king of Egypt that they be permitted to go and hold a sacred feast to Him in the wilderness, and their demand is indignantly and scornfully refused.

An issue is fairly made between the God of Israel, and the gods and rulers of Egypt. How will the God of Israel become manifest to Pharaoh, his people, and the nations around? When, where and how shall the ten tribes, now amounting to 2,500,000 people, men, women, and children, with their countless herds and flocks, be assembled, marshalled and led? In the dry and clear atmosphere of Egypt there appears a cloud of columnar shape and proportions, its broad base upon the earth, its summit in mid-heavens, a dense cloud by day, and at night-fall changing to a pillar of fire, the tower and citadel of a new people just making its *entre* among the nations, the tower and dwelling-place of the God of Israel. "The cloud-pillar was majestic. Its dark majesty stood unmoved with Egyptian winds blowing against it, an Egyptian sun shining upon it. The fire-pillar was not less awful in majesty; Orion and the dog-star went timidly by in its presence. It gives light even to idolaters in the doorways of the temples of their gods." "Not a house-top in all the land of Egypt that does not witness with wonder its awful and inexplicable presence from day to day—its dark, shadowy mass in the light, and its clear columnar light in the darkness."

In the vivid and, as we conceive, truthful imagination of this writer, this pillar of cloud was nothing else than the vehicle of the divine majesty. It was no camp-fire; no torch elevated upon a pole, as a mere signal, such as was carried before armies upon their march, or caravans upon their route through the

desert. This could be no signal and guide to 600,000 men-at-arms, much less to a moving column of 2,500,000, or 3,000,000 of people, a migrating nation, whose camp, even when at rest, would cover an area twelve miles square. This could not have inspired that awe, nor been a shadow from the heat by day, nor a protection from their foes, nor a visible manifestation of the presence of God, all which are affirmed of the pillar of cloud and of fire.

With a vigorous fancy the author pictures before us the "Stir of the Exode." The first-born lie dead in every Egyptian dwelling. As the sun rises high on that wondrous morning, the whole population are held spell-bound and meditative by the presence of death. During the same sun-rise hour the encampment around the wondrous pillar is all astir. There is wondrous confusion, and yet an order is in it. The base of the cloud-pillar has enlarged itself. He who dwells within it is "a shadow from the heat." The 600,000 men, and their families, are all his children by adoption. He has gathered them together as a hen doth gather her chickens under her wings. Imagine the heart of Egypt's sorely disciplined people. In all the valley of the Nile, from the cataracts to the sea, there are smitten hearts everywhere, for everywhere is the presence of death. See them go forth into their door-ways; see them going up on their house-tops. Their thoughtful countenances are turned towards the cloud-pillar, as it towers up to heaven in Egypt's clear sky; they all know, now, what a question that was which has been pending in Egypt, not meditated as it should have been; and what a question pends still, not meditated as it should be.

The strangers in Egypt are spell-bound also. They had never witnessed a spectacle like this. They will tell of it to their listening descendants in their far-off homes, and in the last days of their life.

All Egypt is agaze. The spectators are tremulous with excitement, when it is everywhere murmured among them, as they gaze, "Sure enough, it moves." Hundreds of miles away they see it; with star-gazing eyes they consider it, and behold, *it moves*. It moves eastward in the direction of Succoth, and the

Red Sea, and the Arabian wilderness. Never since the world began, hath the like of this been seen; never till the eyes of the beholder close in death can it be forgotten. It is the Exode begun. "It is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes."

We give these as specimens of the descriptive power of the author, of which there are other like, and perhaps surpassing passages. The plagues of Egypt, the trouble about water, the bread question, the scenes and the law-giving at Sinai, the idol-worship, and resolve to return to Egypt during the absence of Moses on the mount, the conduct of Moses, the Sabbath, the feasts, the building of the tabernacle, the meaning and mystery of worship, the fire of God, all embraced in the history of their eleven months residence at Sinai; their journey to the Southern border of Canaan; the cowardly, unbelieving and disgraceful panic which followed the report of the spies, and the mad rebellion of the Jewish people, all furnish topics for vivid description, and often of deep, philosophic remark hinted at rather than fully expressed. It sometimes occurred to us in our earliest reading, that there were repetitions that might have been spared with benefit, and expressions which verged upon the colloquial too much, and there were a few things to which we did not give our assent; but our interest in the book has increased as we have advanced in it, till we reach that period of seven and thirty years of which little or nothing is said here, or in the Scriptures, but during which the sinning generation, Caleb and Joshua alone excepted, passed away, and their children grew up under the nurture which God had appointed, and were at length ready to enter upon the long-deferred inheritance promised to their fathers.

Princeton College during the Eighteenth Century. By SAMUEL DAVIES ALEXANDER, an Alumnus. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Company. Pp. 326. 8vo.

In these pages there are biographical notices of 646 of the 894 graduates of Princeton during the period from A. D. 1748 to 1800, the commencement of the present century. These

biographies, the writer claims, will demonstrate that Princeton has had much to do in securing the liberties of our country; in founding the Presbyterian Church in this land; and in introducing and stimulating the higher forms of Academic and Collegiate learning. From its commencement it was a Presbyterian College. Collections were ordered to be made in the churches for its support in 1752. In 1753, Gilbert Tennent and Samuel Davies were sent to Scotland, bearing a petition from the Synod of New York to the General Assembly of that country, for its aid, which resulted in a general collection in its behalf throughout the churches of Scotland. In 1769, the entire bounds of the Synod, from the Carolinas northward, was districted, and twenty-four agents were appointed to make collections respectively in each. The efforts of the Church to found it drew their hearts towards it, both before and after the Revolution, and they depended greatly upon it for the education of their ministry. There are some seventy-three names of Southern ministers, and sixty-six of men in civil life, among the graduates of these fifty-two years, during a portion of which the College was suspended by the Revolutionary war. Of these, twenty ministers and thirty civilians were of the States of South Carolina and Georgia, but chiefly of the former. Other colleges and institutions of sacred learning have since arisen, but the location of this between two great cities, and in the heart of our Presbyterian population, and the learning and talent of the men who have adorned its faculties, have maintained the prestige which it enjoyed in early times as the central institution, and the earliest one, of the Presbyterian Church in America.

A Commentary, Critical, Experimental, and Practical, on the Old and New Testaments. By the Rev. ROBERT JAMIESON, D. D., St. Paul's Glasgow; Rev. A. R. FAUSSET, A. M., St. Cuthbert's, York; and the Rev. DAVID BROWN, D. D., Professor of Theology, Aberdeen. Philadelphia: J. R. Lippincott & Co.

The edition of this book, published in Scotland, consists of six volumes royal octavo. The object of it is to embody, as far

as the limits prescribed would admit, the most important results of modern criticism, so far as it relates to the Sacred Scriptures. It was designed to hold an intermediate place between a strictly critical and a purely popular exposition. It is less elaborate, minute, and manifold than the voluminous commentaries of Lange and his coadjutors, now in the course of publication by Scribner, under the able editorship of Professor Schaff. At the same time, the theological opinions of its three authors are more consistent with each other, than are the divergent opinions of the various authors of different schools and denominations represented in the Lange series. In the first volume, which embraces the Pentateuch, there is an adequate introduction to the five books of Moses, in which the various theories as to their composition are discussed, and a suitable introduction to the Mosaic account of creation is given. At the close of this account there is a summary of the results obtained by a comparison of Scripture with geology, and as to man's place in nature, as to his power and dominion, the multiplication of man and other animals, and their food. The antiquity and descent of man, his anatomical structure, and the departments of ethnology, and philology, with all the modern theories on these points are next passed in review. The antiquity and binding nature of Sabbath institutions are suitably and satisfactorily handled; all giving promise of what is to be expected in the volumes which follow. In the New Testament portion, continual reference is had to the critical editions of the Greek text, as edited by Lachman, Tischendorf, and Tregelles. There are fourteen colored maps accompanying the work, which is to be completed in six volumes. The volume now before us is the Pentateuch, by Rev. Robert Jamieson, D. D., of Aberdeen, 715 pp., octavo. The second volume is occupied with the books of Joshua and Esther, 650 pp., and the rest are to be issued bi-monthly. We do not know where the reader can obtain, at so moderate a cost, so fair an exhibit of the general results of modern scholarship over the wide extent of the entire Scriptures. There are other commentaries on particular books, more minute and exhibiting more the processes of criticism. And there are other editions printed in briefer, pur-

porting to be from these same authors, which are a condensed compilation from this larger work, giving the results to which these authors have come with but few of the reasons on which their judgment is founded. These may be satisfactory to the general reader, except as to the trying minuteness of the type, but do not so well serve the purposes of the student of the Scriptures. In the larger work the unfriendly criticism of modern scepticism is by no means ignored, but is met as fully as the limits of the work will allow, by a proper reply.

Neither Rome nor Judah. By ERNEST HOVEN, Author of "The Man with Two Shadows." Pp. 251. 16mo.
Out of the Dark: The Story of Alice Leith's Experience. By the Author of "Jennie Graham," etc., etc. Pp. 300. 16mo.
Gaffney's Tavern, and the Entertainment it Afforded. By MRS. MARY J. HILDEBURN, Author of "Money," "The Craythorns," etc. etc. Pp. 284. 16mo.

The above are the titles of three of the late issues of the Presbyterian Board of Publication, No. 1,334 Chesnut Street, Philadelphia. The scene of the first is laid in the cities of Rome and Jerusalem shortly after the crucifixion of our Lord, giving the story of Lucretia, a Roman maiden, and Lois, daughter of a Jewish Rabbi, both of high rank and culture, and of Lucian, brother of Lucretia, and Eleus, cousin of Lois, and how they emerged, the one from the darkness of paganism, and the other from beneath the thick veil of Judaism, into the liberty and peace which he that was crucified alone can give.

The Story of Alice Leith's Experience is laid among the rural scenes of Pennsylvania, and teaches us the power of true religion over domestic life, sanctifying the pleasures of home and lightening its cares; how it can correct the selfishness and indulgence which takes possession of the young female heart, and by leading it to the Saviour of sinners, teach it to be meek and lowly and full of tenderness, charity, and beneficence, while at the same time it gives new dignity and grace to all manly virtues.

One criticism only are we impelled to make, and that is, that there must be not only unity but probability in every narrative, even though that narrative be fictitious. We have met with in-

stances of shrewdness and piety combined, among the negro servants of our own day. But the amount of doctrinal knowledge and mature piety ascribed to these Pennsylvania servants of the same race, is so very remarkable and such a contrast to the dialect they employ, as to offend against those probabilities which should always be maintained even in a fictitious story. This may be of design, or it may be an oversight on the part of the author.

The last is a Temperance Tale, well told, which will be read with especial interest. Notwithstanding the exceptional remark we have made, they are books which may be placed with profit in the libraries of our Sabbath-schools.

The Reviewers Reviewed: A Supplement to the "War between the States," etc. With an Appendix in review of "Reconstruction," so called. By ALEXANDER H. STEPHENS. New York: Appleton and Company. 1872. 273 pp. 8vo.

We have received this volume just as our last sheets are going to the press. It is dedicated by Mr. Stephens to Adam L. Alexander, the only survivor of his early benefactors, and is designed to be an answer, for the public of the present generation, and all coming generations, to the attacks which have been made upon his two volumes of the "Constitutional View of the Late War between the States." "*Audi alterum partem.*" "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good."

The volume is doubtless marked by all the acknowledged talent and genius of the author, but we can, at this time, barely announce its publication.

A full and favorable notice of the "*Annals of English Presbyterianism, from the Earliest Period to the Present Time,*" by THOMAS MCCRIE, D. D., Emer. Professor of the English Presbyterian College, London, Author of "Sketches of Scottish Church History," etc. London: James Nisbet & Co., 21 Berner's Street, (May,) 1872, has been prepared for this issue, but our space does not allow of its publication till the next number.

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. XXIII. OCTOBER, MDCCCLXXII.

No. 4.

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

1872.

CONTENTS.

ARTICLE	PAGE
I. The General Assembly of 1872. By the Rev. JOHN B. ADGER, Theological Seminary, Columbia, S. C.,	475
II. Logic and the Laws of Thought. By the Rev. L. G. BARBOUR, Danville, Ky.,	519
III. Romans vi. 4, and Colossians ii. 12, and the Baptist Controversy. By the Rev. W. R. ATKINSON, Charlotte C. H., Va.,	539
IV. Method of the Argument for the Existence of God. By the Rev. J. A. WADDELL, Richmond, Va.,	554
V. Annals of English Presbytery. By the Rev. ARNOLD W. MILLER, D. D., Charlotte, N. C.,	584
VI. Spiritism and the Bible. By the Rev. W. E. BOGGS, Memphis, Tenn.,	611
VII. CRITICAL NOTICES:	
1. Killen's Ol' Catholic Church, 655. 2. Bartle's Scripture Doctrine of Hades, 656. 3. Duke of Somerset's Christian Theology and Modern Scepticism, 657.	

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXIII.—NO. 4.

OCTOBER, MDCCCLXXII.

ARTICLE I.

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF 1872.

ORGANISATION.

This body held its sessions in Richmond, Va., beginning May 16th, at 11 a. m. Forty-eight ministers and fifty-four ruling elders were in attendance. Two more ministers and six more ruling elders would have made the Assembly completely full. The absentees were nearly all from very remote Presbyteries—one of these Presbyteries being in Brazil. Grace Street church, where the Assembly met, is a spacious and beautiful edifice, and was often filled with attentive and interested crowds of people gathered to witness the proceedings. Old Virginia hospitality was still itself, and was enjoyed as freely as afforded. The Moderator, Dr. Plumer, was assisted in the introductory services by Dr. Van Zandt, of the Reformed Church, a delegate; and by Dr. Porter, of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, not a delegate, but simply a casual visitor. The text of the opening discourse was from Isaiah liii. 11: "He shall see of the travail of his soul and shall be satisfied." Dr. Armstrong nominated Dr. Welch, of Arkansas, for Moderator; Dr. Hendricks nominated Dr. Samuel R. Wilson; and Dr. Jacobs nominated Dr. Adger, but

VOL. XXIII., NO. 4.—1.

the latter begged that his name might be withdrawn on account of the imperfectness of his hearing. The first named member was elected, made a modest and manly speech, and presided with dignity, ability, and impartiality. Dr. Bunting was elected Temporary Clerk.

CORRESPONDING CHURCHES.

Delegates were received from the Associate Reformed Synod of the South, from the Synod of Missouri, and from the General Synod of the Reformed (Dutch) Church, in America. Reports also were had from our delegates of last year, and fresh appointments were made. The addresses of all the delegates to our Assembly were very cordial—that from Dr. Van Zandt, of the Reformed Church, especially so. He raised the question, whether our pleasant interchange of courtesies might not cease to be merely formal. He thought we might sometimes make an exchange of ministers and of members, they receiving ours and we theirs as occasion might arise. And he asked why we might not coöperate in the missionary work abroad and the evangelistic at home, and he specified particularly the colored field at the South. Our Moderator answered that we are ready for the coöperation proposed, and asked if they could not send us men as well as money for the work specially referred to.

The Reformed Church (formerly called Reformed Dutch) numbers 4 Synods, 33 classes (Presbyteries), 467 churches, 510 ministers, 63,483 communicants. They have Foreign Missions in India, China, and Japan, and spent in that work last year \$75,000. They have two theological seminaries and two colleges under their control. It will be observed that their numbers are considerably less than our own. Their wealth is much greater. The doctrines and order of both bodies are identical. What is there to hinder coöperation and even union? We confess that we know nothing which should do so.

REPORT ON THE READING OF THE BIBLE.

This came from a Committee appointed by the last Assembly to inquire, "What means shall be used to bring the Bible more

prominently and effectively as a means of grace before all entrusted to our care?" It urged more reading of the Scriptures in public worship, with exposition of the portions read; also more expository preaching; also more instruction by heads of families of their own children; and also efforts by private members of the Church to carry and read the Scriptures to those who cannot or do not read for themselves.

Dr. S. R. Wilson heartily concurred in the substance of the report, but desired to have it fully weighed. Dr. Armstrong held to the importance of expository preaching, using the expression in its large sense, but did not wish to go beyond the simple directions of our Directory, which leave this matter largely to the judgment of the minister. Mr. McKay said there was a looseness about the whole report, and we should hesitate to adopt it. Dr. Plumer said it was estimated that, when the last apostle died, there were in the world but five thousand copies of the word of God; but he gave no hint as to who makes the estimate, or upon what principle of calculation the estimate was reached. He stated that twenty-seven millions of copies of the word of God have been circulated in this country by the Bible Society. He thought the Scotch custom of shuffling the leaves of the Bible, in their search for the texts referred to by the preacher, a great hindrance to the power of preaching. He had himself preached fifteen months to a congregation following this practice. He asked for their eyes and their ears—they gave neither; and he does not believe a soul was converted the whole time. Dr. Hendricks said the model of preaching is in the New Testament, and it is expository. He wished we could, by following the Scotch custom, get Scotch Presbyterians all over this country. If the rustling of the leaves scares the preacher, let it scare him into preaching accurately and keeping well-posted. We want the gospel in its simplicity, not elegant essays on literature and the beauties of nature.

The subject being postponed at this stage, came up again near the close of the sessions, and Dr. Marshall of Texas objected to the whole report, as turning the Assembly into a sort of theological seminary to teach us how to preach. This is not the

province of the Assembly. He moved the indefinite postponement of the subject, and it was carried.

FORMS OF PRAYER IN PUBLIC WORSHIP.

Ruling elder J. T. L. Preston proposed the question, whether it would be in accordance with the principles and early usages of our Church, and calculated to promote decorum and devotion, to introduce a few scriptural and well considered forms, requiring responses on the part of the congregation—the use to be optional with pastors; and he moved for a committee to make to the next Assembly a report answering this question. He urged his views in a long and able speech carefully written and read. He said that, *in praise*, all can unite openly, and so in oblation; *in teaching*, but one can officiate; but, *in prayer*, all may unite openly, or one alone lead, or there may be a varied form admitting both ways of worship. Our mode of worship allows only the minister to speak. But suppose some desire to have the people bear some oral part, are they so clearly wrong that this Assembly will summarily refuse to consider the question seriously, anxiously, and conscientiously proposed? He pleaded that forms of prayer accord with the sentiments of mankind; that the utterance of devotion in words increases the feeling of it in the heart; that when religion is revived we always feel the impulse to ejaculate aloud our emotions. He maintained that liturgies are not historically unProtestant or unPresbyterian—the Reformers used them. The Scotch Church held to liturgies both in the principle and the practice. He then urged that the time given to the sermon is sensibly less than formerly, and so a little more might be given to prayers; that under the modern musical arrangements, the participation of the congregation in the praise is reduced to a *minimum*, and so it might be gracious wisdom to give them opportunity with the mouth to make confession unto God; that Presbyterians ought to stand in prayer, but had generally got into the irreverent way of *sitting*, and some brief, varied forms would tend to make them assume special postures suitable to prayer; whereas *sitting* as a posture for worship is *without example*, ancient or modern, Mohammedan, Jewish or

Christian. One more thought—the older he grew, the dearer to his heart was the great idea of Christian union. And Christendom has need now, if ever it had, to close up its ranks—a struggle, perhaps *the* struggle is before her. Less isolation from the rest of Christ's people would be grateful to him. Our principles cannot be improved; if by some slight change in external forms her garments were made more beautiful, we should love our Church not less but more.

Dr. Plumer said that prostration, standing, sitting, and kneeling are all proper postures in prayer. For sitting, he quoted: "And David sat" and said his prayer before the Lord, which however can hardly have reference to public worship.

Rev. Wm. McKay trusted the motion would prevail—it was a very modest one—only for inquiry. The subject is exciting interest in other churches besides ours—amongst others the Reformed Church is reviving its ancient liturgy. The sentiment at the bottom is the same as that which led to the building of this beautiful church edifice. From whom does it come? Not from the ministry, but from the people. We cannot afford to overlook intimations coming from that quarter.

Ruling elder F. Johnston was opposed to the resolution—even as a matter of inquiry.

Ruling elder Cassels was a representative of the people, and denied that this measure is from them. He opposed it out and out.

Ruling elder Collier was called to his feet simply, to say emphatically as a man of the people, that they do not favor this innovation upon the spirituality of the Church.

Ruling elder E. R. McLean endorsed what had just been said.

Dr. S. R. Wilson opposed the resolution out of regard, not to the rigidity, but the freedom of our system. It is not iron-cast. It admits enlarged gospel liberty in matters of indifference. His objection was, that the thing proposed is out of harmony with the freedom of our system—and introduces a prelatical principle contrary to that freedom. We have liberty to worship God in the plainest building of clap-boards or in an elegant structure like this—to preach in short gowns or long gowns, in black

gowns or white gowns, or no gown at all. [Laughter.] We have liberty if we cannot pray without a book, to have a book. If a man cannot walk without crutches, let him walk with them, and God help and bless him in doing it. But do not require men who have two good sound limbs to use crutches. His chief objection to Episcopacy, as to forms, is this intolerable rigidity—a certain set of prayers, a certain dress, etc. If rain is wanted, I must not pray for it till a form is prepared for me. If we were in a storm on the great deep, and had no prayer-book, we could not pray canonically. He meant no disrespect to those who pray in that way, but gloried in our liberty. We have a *Directory* for worship—not *Forms*. Let us never change it. But if my dear friend wishes to respond “Amen” at the close of prayer, what is to hinder? The desire for forms in our Church is growing, and another thing is growing, and some how the two generally grow together, viz., the tendency to an unspiritual Christianity—conformity to the world and formal worship in the house of God. He entreated his brethren to resist this tendency, by lifting up the magnificent free Presbyterian worship to that glorious character which can be given to it. Let us study our prayers as much as, if not more than, our sermons. Let us make the singing what God designed it to be. Every family ought to teach their children the hymns and tunes of the house of God. The songs of Zion should be substituted for the dance when Christian worshippers come together, socially, and the evening be spent in singing Old Hundred, and Cranbrook, and the sublime songs which God’s people have sung for thousands of years. Thus would our worship assume a splendor and attractiveness such as would make all mere forms seem like worthless straw. And so the reading of the Bible ought to be made a study by all ministers. Men would go as far to hear the elder Dr. Mason read a chapter, as to hear most men preach a sermon. Let such improvements be made in our modes of conducting public worship, and we shall have no need of such a measure as my respected friend has proposed.

Dr. Plumer—The Reformed Churches (all the Presbyterian Churches of the Continent were called Reformed) all started

with liturgies. Their ministry was often feeble, and the exercises confined to prayer, reading the word, and a simple exhortation. These old forms were taken up by our brethren of the Protestant Episcopal Church and made the net and woof of their liturgy. They were taken from Presbyterians and made obligatory. Meantime the Reformed Churches educated their ministers, and long since laid aside the crutches and went on "walking, and leaping, and praising God." The controversy about forms never ought to awaken strife, unless men attempt to impose them upon us. If this Assembly says I shall not use a written form of prayer in the pulpit, the first time I preach in their presence I will be sure to do it! If they say I shall do it, I will be like the boy John, whose master was calling him loudly and angrily. Said he: "Sir, the more you call me that way, the more I won't answer." [Laughter.] We live in a time when whole sermons are preached to prove that our Lord used a form of prayer on the Cross! A man in a stage-coach contended that there was not a single example of acceptable prayer mentioned in the Old Testament without a written form. One of the passengers said: "When Jonah was in the fish's belly, who held the candle for him to read his prayers?" [Laughter.] The answer he received was: "Sir, you must be either a wag or a Presbyterian." A man was preaching in the mountains of Kentucky on the excellence of forms, especially responsive forms, as adapted to the people; and when he was done, a gaunt backwoodsman stepped up, and slapping him on the shoulder, said: "Stranger, I like your doings mighty well! You give the people a chance to *jaw back!*" [Laughter.] We think, sir, we have a more excellent way. We did walk with crutches when we needed them; but we have passed out of our minority. Here Dr. Plumer told another story about Dr. Payson's prayer over the dead bodies of two officers. Why, he then asked, shut us up to these forms, however good? And, then, another story about an old gentleman telling a young preacher of "the good things that were *not* in his sermon." [Laughter.] There are a great many good prayers not in any prayer-book in the world,

except the Bible. Let our Church heed its Directory, and we shall not need anything more in that line.

Ruling elder Preston said his resolution did not ask the Assembly to decide upon the use of a liturgy. His was a different question, and being proposed in a proper manner, and being a serious question, respecting which a good many Presbyterians wish for satisfaction, he thought the Assembly should return an answer. There were questions, and he instanced several which might be put to the Assembly, where it would have the right to decline answering. But they were not like his—questions of seriousness, debatableness and conscientious concern. As to the last named of these three features of his question, he claimed that divines in this Assembly, and judges in this city, who are Presbyterians, and many others, want light to be shed on this question. The respected brother from Kentucky said, that because this sentiment is growing he wishes to put it down. But growth shows life; and to say that we must put a thing to death, must *murder* it, just because it is growing, strikes me as a very uncomely expression. He proceeded to quote from the work of the Rev. Dr. Shields, of Princeton, to show that many are dissatisfied with our services. Upon his second and first points he did not enlarge, but he insisted that the Assembly was not prepared to give an answer, and ought to refer his question to the next Assembly. The eminent brethren who had spoken, had refrained from showing any full preparation on this subject—any considerable knowledge of the history of liturgies. He himself was not prepared to vote; did not know enough about the question. He went into a considerable argument, to prove that worship must have flexibility, because intended for men under all conditions of society; and he proceeded to urge that forms had been used by the Primitive and by the Reformed Churches. Not only the weak, but the strong, like Knox and Calvin and Zwingle, used forms. He protested, in concluding, that he had no sympathy with those who needlessly and unseasonably took occasion to assail the Episcopal Church either of England or America. He preferred his own Church; but he loved theirs,

too, and never could treat the Book of Common Prayer with scorn or levity.

Dr. S. R. Wilson pleaded to the charge of murder, that there was certainly in his heart no malice aforethought; and that sometimes instantaneous murder ought to be used to stop growth whether vegetable or animal. His mother always had him, when he was a boy, murder all the docks that came up in her garden. As to assailing the Episcopal Church, he said, we stand on the defensive, and have always so stood from the very beginning. They give us over to the uncovenanted mercies of God. They deny the validity of our ordinances. They unchurch every body who will not wear the same yoke with themselves. I have no controversy with Episcopalians. But when I am asked to take one step—a very insidious step too, however sharp the logic that is used to prove it no step at all—to draw us from our primitive simplicity, I must resist the beginnings.

And now I take issue squarely with my friend as to the Primitive Church using forms. If there is one thing which can be proved in regard to the Church for the first two hundred years, it is that she did *not* use forms of prayer. Praying by book came in when ignorance and darkness came in. The gentleman wishes a direct answer. Let us decline even to commit, and that will be, I suppose, a direct answer. *We won't entertain your question.* It is not a matter of dispute in the Presbyterian Church. Let us say no, to that paper, and it is settled.

Ruling elder Preston made a brief reply, averring that he did not mean to charge the brethren with any unseemly attack on other churches, but only to express his own feelings of charity. Nor did he mean to say that the Primitive Church used forms of prayer, but that she repeated the apostles' creed, and forms of confession and supplication, of baptism and the like. He stood ready to be corrected by Dr. Wilson, who of course was better acquainted with the history.

The vote stood: Yeas, 5; nays, 102; *non liquet*, 1. This last vote, given by the writer of this *Review*, was not intended to imply any doubts in his mind, either upon the subject matter or the course proper to be pursued by the Assembly; but he

asked to be excused from voting, on the ground that neither *yes* nor *no* would fairly express his attitude, which he had not had the opportunity to set forth. The Assembly, it cannot be doubted, was right in declining to appoint the Committee which was asked for. That would have been to indicate, that the matter was, as Dr. Wilson very properly said,—“not a matter of dispute in the Presbyterian Church.” It would perhaps have been to give some room for the slander, that we are about to abandon our position as a Church on the question of liturgies. But whilst it was quite right to refuse to refer the matter to the next Assembly, there could have been, it appears to us, no objection to a committee appointed to give at that very Assembly a suitable reply in some fulness, to a perfectly fair question. We had no sympathy at all with the idea that, because it came from a ruling elder who represents the people, the question must needs be entertained. Ruling elders are indeed the more immediate representatives of the people; but ministers are just as truly their representatives also, else would they have no right to sit in these representative assemblies. But the question was a fair one, whether from the one or the other class of representatives. And it was certainly set before the body both modestly and respectfully, as well as ably. It was a fair question, because unquestionably there is ground for dissatisfaction with the manner in which our ministers often lead the public devotions of the sanctuary. The prayers in which the congregation are called to join are frequently bald and jejune in the extreme; and no honest desire to have them improved, is to be reprobated. It was also a fair question, because it indicated the wish to do nothing that might tend to destroy uniformity in our modes of worship. Mr. Preston proposed to our highest court, in open day, the question of the lawfulness of a few forms of prayer for optional use—he did not first use his influence to introduce them into the congregation of which he is a ruler. He seemed to think the General Assembly of the whole Church was to be consulted before the slightest change should be made in our modes of worship. Many Presbyterians in good health allow themselves, as he remarked, to sit in time of public prayer;

one of our ministers was reported to this very Assembly as baptizing by immersion, for which our standards make no provision; in Dr. Reid's church, where the Assembly met, the congregation (and the Assembly with them) would stand during singing. None of these are our Presbyterian ways. Mr. Preston was told, by Dr. Wilson, that he was free to cry out, Amen! whenever he desired it; that if he could not pray without a book, he was at liberty to have a book. Dr. Plumer declared, if the Assembly should say he ought not to use a written form in the pulpit, the first time he should preach in their presence he would be sure to do it. Now the answer to all this is, that in a certain true sense, and to a certain proper degree, whatever forms our Church appoints, we ought to accept and observe, because uniformity and order are decent and right. Thus it would be neither seemly nor proper for any particular minister and church to read prayers or practise responses. And seeing that Mr. Preston asked for light and instruction from the Assembly upon an important question of order, it was, we think, a very proper occasion to set forth in moderation, and with firmness, our Presbyterian doctrine concerning liturgies. Such a disposition of the matter would have strengthened our position, both with those who are inside and with those who are outside of our body. We are constrained to remark, that such could not be the effect of much which was said in the debate. For example: Dr. Wilson made a very powerful eulogium of the "magnificent, free Presbyterian worship," and pointed out the way in which it might easily be made "to assume a splendor and attractiveness which would make all mere forms seem like worthless straw;" but he marred the effect of it by the charge, that forms of prayer tend to an unspiritual Christianity, and that this was an effort to introduce prelacy, in the way of destroying the freedom of worship amongst us, requiring men who have two sound limbs to use crutches; and that it was also an insidious step to draw us away from our primitive simplicity. And Dr. Plumer began with the statement, which was news to us, that our brethren of the Protestant Episcopal Church got their forms in the beginning from Presbyterians; and then went on to tell his stories of the hoy

John, who, the more his master called him loudly and angrily, the more he would not answer; of Jonah reading prayers by candle-light in the fish's belly; and of the Kentucky backwoodsman, who approved of the liturgy, because it gave the people a chance to *jaw back!!*

It never was the Presbyterian doctrine that forms of prayer are unlawful in public worship. This, every standard writer of our order will be found to declare. Even John Owen, the Puritan, who wrote so powerfully and convincingly against the Church's right to impose forms, is very clear in admitting that they may be lawfully used. The points which Owen urges with greatest power are: I., that in and by the additions made unto the first received forms, the superstitious and corrupt doctrines of the apostacy were insinuated into the worship of the Church; and that it had been utterly impossible that an idolatrous worship should have been introduced, had not the opinion of the necessity of devised forms of prayer been first universally received; for had all Churches continued in the liberty wherein they were placed and left by the Lord Jesus Christ and his apostles, this monster of the mass, devouring souls and drinking blood, had never been conceived and brought forth, at least not nourished into that terrible form and power it acquired; and II., that the provision made by the Lord for the discharge of the whole work of the ministry, in the administration of ordinances for the edification of his Church, is his bestowing gifts on men rightly called to the ministry, enabling them unto that work, which gifts they are to exercise therein; and that the providing by the Church of certain fixed forms of prayer to be precisely read and pronounced, is inconsistent with this provision which Christ has made. But Owen never thought of maintaining, that forms of prayer are absolutely sinful, that is, unlawful in themselves, or that it would be inconsistent with liberty to have a few forms for optional use. Indeed Bannerman quotes as follows from Edwards, who wrote the *Antapologia*, (London, 1644,) and was "an eminent and learned Presbyterian theologian": "And I challenge you, in all your reading, to name one divine of note, and orthodox, that ever held set forms of prayer prescribed *unlawful*,

excepting only Independents." For, how could Presbyterians deny that forms are lawful, since our Saviour gave us a form of prayer? And how could they deny the lawfulness of forms in prayer, when they constantly make use of forms in praise, and when confessedly the old and familiar psalm or hymn which has been sung a thousand times over, is just for that very reason preferred to the new and unfamiliar, which time and oft-repeated use, and sacred and tender associations of thought and feeling, have never consecrated? There is, therefore, in our nature a foundation for the use of forms of devotion. Every minister employs more or less of certain forms of prayer in the pulpit, just as every believer does in the closet. It is not correct therefore to say, that forms of prayer necessarily lead to unspirituality of mind, any more than it is to say, that the non-use of forms necessarily leads to what our Directory calls "mean, irregular, extravagant effusions" which "disgrace that important service." It cannot be denied that the constant use of the Book of Common Prayer has led to the driest formalism, and even the grossest superstition in many of the English parishes; nor, on the other hand, that the wildest fanaticism rejoices in its freedom of prayer by the Spirit, and without a book. Truth lies here as elsewhere in the middle. There is nothing objectionable, in themselves considered, in the chanting of the *Te Deum*, in responses by the people, or in the congregation's repeating aloud the Lord's prayer—but they are *not our way*, nor were they the way of our fathers, nor yet of the apostles. And inasmuch as the tendency of our times is ritualistic, we must therefore the more watchfully maintain our own simplicity. The Episcopal Churches are in many cases leading people Romewards, with their worship turned into a mere musical entertainment, and other denominations are following in this downward course, and therefore we must all the more steadfastly stand in our lot. Corruption of worship is one chief sin of this period. Our own Church is not free from it in different forms, and there will have to be a great controversy in her bosom yet upon this subject. We hold that there are three things which have divine right, viz., the doctrine, the government, and the worship of the Church of

Christ, unto which nothing is to be added, nor from them any thing taken away by man. Mr. Preston's proposition is just a sign of the times. We wish the Assembly had dealt with it less summarily and furnished a full and scriptural deliverance on the subject.

SUSTENTATION.

The report was presented on the second day. With a single exception, all the Presbyteries (not including Kentucky) are now heartily united in the scheme. The work at first had three departments, viz., aid to feeble churches, assistance in the work of missions, and repairs of church buildings. For these three objects but one collection was made each year, and it never was adequate. In 1868, was inaugurated the Invalid fund for superannuated ministers and the families of deceased ones, for which a separate collection was ordered. Then, in 1871, a collection was ordered for missions, but the time for it should have been September, and not April, which would give one general collection for every alternate month of the year. The Committee have charge also of the Relief fund, which makes five departments and four funds in their hands. The Northern Church has five separate committees, and five sets of Executive officers to do the same work.

There is some progress reported towards bringing up the salary of every laboring minister to \$800 as the *minimum*. The Committee have been able to do little in aiding church erection. The Invalid fund has aided eighty-eight families. The Relief fund scheme has been put into operation. Two Committees of Investment for it were asked for, one to be placed at Baltimore and one at Augusta.

After presenting this report, Dr. Jno. Leighton Wilson said, four years ago the Assembly at Baltimore declined to make any changes in the management of Sustentation and Foreign Missions, which had been joined together. But the time had now come when some change was absolutely necessary. He had travelled last winter more than eight thousand miles in the interest of Foreign Missions, and of course his office was necessa-

rily vacated for a considerable period. As Dr. Woodrow would decline reappointment as Treasurer, it appeared to Dr. Wilson that there should be appointed a coördinate Secretary, who should act also as Treasurer, or else the Assembly should separate the two Committees, and have for each a Secretary, who should also, for economy, act as Treasurer. The Committee had no suggestion to offer, but would cheerfully acquiesce in any measure the Assembly might adopt.

This question was referred by the Assembly jointly to its two Committees on Sustentation and Foreign Missions, for them to consider together. Upon the report of the Committee subsequently made, the Assembly resolved to change the collection for evangelistic missions to September, to authorise the Executive Committee to appoint the two Investing Committees for the Relief fund, and declined, for the present, to separate the Committees of Sustentation and Foreign Missions. This last question was debated by Messrs. Smylie, Flinn, Evans, Blanton, and J. D. Anderson.

CO-ORDINATE SECRETARY.

Rev. Dr. C. A. Stillman, of Ala., and Rev. Richard McIlwaine, of Virginia, were nominated, and the latter was elected by a large majority. Dr. Stillman's brethren from Alabama were exceedingly earnest in opposing his election, on the ground that he could not be spared from the work in their Synod.

DR. WOODROW'S RESIGNATION.

The Committee to whom this matter was referred, reported through Dr. Armstrong the acceptance of the same, with expressions of the Church's sense of the great value of his services, and her earnest desires for his complete restoration to health.

FOREIGN MISSIONS.

The whole missionary force consists of thirty-six laborers—fourteen of these are ordained ministers, of whom four are natives of the lands in which they preach. The contributions

for the year amounted to more than forty-seven thousand dollars—an advance upon the previous year of more than seventy per cent.

The Assembly resolved, that it was necessary the Church should aim to raise this year for this cause not less than sixty thousand dollars.

PUBLICATION.

The contributions of the year to this cause have been over eight thousand dollars, and the Endowment fund now amounts to thirty-five thousand. A variety of recommendations to the Committee were passed by the Assembly. The attention of all the Presbyteries, which have not contributed their quota to the Endowment fund, is called again to that matter by the Assembly.

There was a long and able and most interesting debate on the question of the removal of the Committee of Publication to Nashville, from which city had come an offer of forty thousand dollars for the endowment of the Committee, if placed there. But we quite despair of being able to condense the speeches made by the Rev. Messrs. McNeilly and Price for, and of Dr. Baird against, removal. They are too full of items which may not be omitted. Mr. McNeilly very clearly presented Nashville in all its adaptedness to be a great publishing centre, disavowing all sectional feelings or any fear of centralisation in the Church. Dr. Baird proclaimed himself a southwestern man; but there was a great question of principle to be settled. Our Church cannot go into any mere secular business to make money, but is only to use money as an instrument for sending the gospel abroad. Dr. Thornwell, in the Assembly at Augusta, had stated the great principles which underlie this subject, and marked out where the duty of the Church began and where it ended. Accordingly the Committee does all its work by contract. And centrality has therefore nothing to do with the question. New York is the best place for distribution on this Continent; but in the bounds of our own Church there is none better than Richmond. At this point Dr. Baird presented many interesting details. The result of the debate was, that the Assembly continues the

Committee at Richmond, but voted special thanks to the citizens of Nashville for their generous offers.

EDUCATION.

The receipts for the year were nearly twenty thousand dollars, and 130 students had been assisted. Officers' salaries were charged altogether to the Publication cause, because it was believed it could best surmount its difficulties. The Assembly approved of this arrangement. Mr. Tadlock, chairman of the Standing Committee, urged the necessity of aiding young men who seek the ministry. They are usually poor, and either they must be aided, or we must lower the standard of preparation. But this is no time to lower our standard, when there is so much scientific infidelity demanding the best possible education for the defenders of the truth. Another popular error, is to undervalue the contributions of the poor to this cause. The opportunity of giving should be offered to all, and then there would be no lack.

PLACE OF NEXT ASSEMBLY.

Invitations were received from New Orleans, Little Rock, Savannah, and Jackson, Tenn. Little Rock was chosen.

DAY OF HUMILIATION.

In response to an overture from the Synod of South Carolina, the third Thursday of November was appointed to be a day of special thanksgiving to God for his mercies to us as a Church, and of humiliation and earnest supplication for an outpouring of his Spirit on all our pastors and congregations.

BAPTISM BY IMMERSION.

Certain members of the Presbytery of Lexington, requested from the Assembly an answer to the question, whether it is proper for ministers in our Church to administer baptism by immersion? The Assembly replied, that for a Presbyterian minister to baptize by immersion, is such a departure from the ways approved in our Standards as should be discouraged.

VOL. XXIII., NO. 4.—2.

STATED SUPPLIES.

To an overture from the Presbytery of South Alabama, touching this relation, and urging the formation of the pastoral relation wherever practicable, Dr. Plumer reported from the Committee of Bills and Overtures this answer, that the Presbyteries are all using commendable diligence in this matter, and that the plan of stated supplies is in many cases the only thing to save a church from extinction.

Rev. Mr. Boggs questioned whether many Presbyteries are using commendable diligence. Of our 860 ministers, but 345 are pastors, so that 515 are stated supplies or otherwise engaged. Under this system the Presbyteries are losing their control over ministers and churches.

Rev. Mr. Matthews said no action of ours can reach the evil. If the Presbyteries will not allow the feeble churches to be supplied, our Presbyterianism must be circumscribed to the three hundred and odd pastors.

Mr. Boggs—Weak churches must be grouped together under a pastor or evangelist, in conformity with the Book. If the Book is right we should try to live by it. If it is wrong we should change it.

Rev. Mr. Price said this system is working great evil. Some States make divorce easy, and people are quick to marry in those States, because the contract can easily be dissolved. There is some squinting in this direction among our churches.

Ruling elder McGregor said another evil is, that whilst the Assembly enjoins the grouping of feeble churches, the stated supply takes two or three of the best of them, and the rest have to shift for themselves. Another is, the stated supply will live at a distance and do no pastoral labor, and so it ends generally in the church dying out.

Dr. Hendrick said our duty is as plain as it can be made. Take any Presbytery you please and you will find that the stated supplies are missionaries. When a missionary supplies a number of feeble churches once a month, he is put down as a stated supply. We must follow providence. If Presbyterianism is the true system it must be flexible.

Dr. Plumer—The Southern Church, after the war, had one hundred ministers less than she had before. She has been losing an average of ten ministers every year, until last year. So that we had a year ago one hundred and fifty ministers less than in 1861. God, who makes ministers, stirred up the people to pray, and last year we gained seventeen. This year the gain may be more. The most efficient laborer, perhaps, in my Presbytery, is stated supply to two churches, and evangelist to four or five more. It is God who has put us into these straits; let us do the best we can; and the best we can do, is to strengthen the hands of these faithful and hard-working men.

Rev. Mr. Price thought these pathetic appeals out of place, where a brother sticks to his farm year after year, and a church is content to give him a pittance for half his time, and expects him to live by secular employment. These brethren and churches need to be touched with the finger of ecclesiastical power. He had seen a little discipline result in great benefit to such brethren and such churches.

Dr. S. R. Wilson said the subject is many-sided and beset with difficulties. He agreed with Dr. Hendrick in the general view he had presented. But much of the difficulty arises out of the facility with which Presbyteries dissolve the pastoral relation. His venerated father had been stated supply for twenty-seven years to the same church, and he had himself felt a hesitation whether he would not prefer to be one, lest should he ever be compelled, particularly from pecuniary considerations, to ask for a dissolution, he should have the Presbytery simply say to him, and his church consenting, "As you agree to be divorced, be divorced." The Committee's report was adopted.

TWO YEARS' SERVICE BY LICENTIATES.

The Presbytery of Nashville asked the Assembly to take the necessary steps, to have it made our rule that no licentiate, in ordinary cases, be settled, until he shall have spent two years in itinerant missionary labor. Dr. Plumer, from the Committee of Bills and Overtures, recommended the rejection of the proposal for reasons given. Rev. Mr. McNeilly presented a minority

report, recommending that the rule be sent down to the Presbyteries for their action. He urged the necessity of it from the difficulty there was of obtaining the needful supply of missionary labor. Our young men get settled as pastors as soon as they are licensed. The Presbytery of Nashville urges that such a rule will furnish a regular supply of the kind of labor needed; will afford to our young men, after a long course of study, the physical training they need; will give them freedom and power in extemporaneous speech; also a knowledge of men and things; will give the churches remote from seminaries a better chance, and put the young men more completely under the direction of their Presbyteries; and, finally, will restore the mode in which our Church was extended in the days of our fathers.

Dr. Plumer said this measure could not help the Presbytery of Nashville, because each of our Presbyteries is in need of more laborers than it has or can get. It will help nobody, but greatly embarrass some.

Rev. Mr. McNeilly rejoined, urging in detail the reasons given by his Presbytery.

Dr. Adger favored the minority report, because it would allow the Presbyteries to determine the matter. His own mind was not prepared for the adoption of the rule, but he was strongly in favor of bringing the candidates under the control of their Presbyteries, instead of allowing their settlement to be determined as it often is.

Rev. Mr. Flinn desired light on two points. Is the design of the rule to prevent early marriages of ministers? And is it the design to compel young men to labor two years for whatever the churches may choose to give them? If so, what right have we to impose either necessity upon our candidates?

Dr. Grasty said the rule would be met with exceptions, and exceptions only, from the beginning. Secondly, it will shut us out from employing first-class men just out of the Seminary in special fields for which they are qualified. Thirdly, the rule will trammel where the people ought to have freedom. Fourthly, the missionary labor wanted cannot be supplied by young men without experience.

Dr. Plumer said there was another objection. This proposal will keep our churches agitated twelve months about this fundamental principle. It is a great injury to any Church to be continually agitated about principles which have been settled from the days of our fathers. Another objection: One of the greatest curses of a revolutionary state in the Commonwealth or in the Church is, that a multitude of dead-letter resolves are passed. By passing this rule, we shall have our Constitution altered and a dead letter in our fundamental law. The rule is not practicable. The report of the majority was adopted.

REVISION OF THE BOOK OF DISCIPLINE.

On the third day (Saturday) Dr. Adger presented a report from the Committee of Revision, which was made the order of the day for Tuesday, at one o'clock, but was afterwards postponed until the sixth day, Wednesday. The report was as follows:

The General Assembly at Louisville having referred to the original Committee on Revision all the proposed amendments by the Presbyteries sent up to that body, to be examined and incorporated in the New Book according to the mind of the majority in the Church as therein indicated, which in its amended form should be reported back to the Assembly; that Committee have discharged the duty imposed on them to the best of their ability and would submit the following statement.

Of the fifty-five Presbyteries on the roll of the Assembly in 1870, returns were received from forty-nine. Upon a deliberate and careful examination of these papers we find that *seven* Presbyteries expressed decided disapprobation of the Revised Book, viz.: Fayetteville, Louisiana, Mississippi, Montgomery, North Mississippi, Tombeckbee, and Transylvania.

Two Presbyteries expressed general disapproval with approbation of some portions of the Revision. These are Muhlenburg and Atlanta. The former considered the time unpropitious and rejected the Book as a whole, but expressly commends two portions of it. The latter declined to adopt as a whole, but expressed approbation of nineteen important items.

Eleven Presbyteries declared their inability at that time from one cause or another to give an intelligent, harmonious or decided vote, and therefore postponed the matter. These were Bethel,

Brazos, Central Mississippi, Central Texas, Harmony, Macon, North Alabama, Orange, Paducah, South Alabama, and West Lexington. *Three* of these eleven, viz.: Bethel, Harmony, and Orange, were very strong in their expressions of desire to have the revision continued and the book divided into portions, so that the Presbyteries might have full opportunity to examine it before any decision.

The remaining *twenty-nine*, viz.: Abingdon, Arkansas, Augusta, Charleston, Central Ohio, Cherokee, Concord, East Hanover, Eastern Texas, Florida, Greenbrier, Holston, Indian, Knoxville, Lexington, Mecklenburg, Memphis, Nashville, New Orleans, Ouachita, Red River, Roanoke, Savannah, South Carolina, Tuskaloosa, Western District, West Hanover, Wilmington, and Winchester, may be classed together as all favoring the New Book, either as it stands or as it might be made by further emendation. Twelve of these Presbyteries, viz.: Abingdon, Arkansas, Augusta, Charleston, East Hanover, Greenbrier, Lexington, New Orleans, Roanoke, Savannah, Tuskaloosa, and West Hanover, devoted very great attention to the consideration of the Revision, and sent up full and most valuable suggestions for its improvement. Others of the number were less full and minute in their examination, or rather, perhaps they found less to object to and amend. Several of these twenty-nine are very strong in their testimony to the excellence of the revised Book, while others say nothing in its favor, but only labor to make it better; but most of them evince a deep sense of the necessity of proceeding with deliberation, and allowing ample time for the Presbyteries to criticise and amend with a view to securing in the end, if possible, a harmonious conclusion on the part of the whole Church.

Touching the emendations proposed by these Presbyteries, it affords your Committee lively satisfaction to report that not one of them evinced any captiousness, but all evidently were intended to promote the acceptableness of the Revision; and that, as we suppose, nine out of ten of all the changes proposed—perhaps we might say nineteen out of twenty—were such as would commend themselves to the immediate and unquestioning adoption of every Presbyterian. The Committee cannot say that they have incorporated in the New Book every change suggested, because they were not instructed by the Assembly to accommodate the Book to every suggestion which any one or two or three Presbyteries might make—but to follow, as well as they could, “the mind of the majority in the Church as therein indicated.”

The result of the corrections of these Presbyteries has been of course to make the Book very much the better. They cer-

tainly have operated greatly to make it more than it ever was before the product, not of any one man or of any ten men, but, in a very just sense, of the whole Church. If we were called on to say how many of our ministers and elders have from the beginning contributed to bring the Book to its present shape and condition, we would have to count them, as we believe, by hundreds.

The Committee would, in accordance with the wish expressed by a number of Presbyteries, report now to the Assembly for its action only the Rules of Discipline. It is believed that that portion of the Book has been so long before the Church, and so much discussed, that the mind of the whole body is somewhat definitely settled concerning it—at least, that it is not more than the next fall and spring Presbyteries will be able to dispose of.

Your Committee propose to retain the Form of Government in their hands, until they can with due care affix to it the necessary proof texts. In the meantime the Presbyteries and the ministers and elders of our Church should have the privilege, we conceive, of suggesting any further emendations which may occur to them.

For the Committee of Revision,

JOHN B. ADGER, Chairman.

Dr. Armstrong offered the following resolution:

Resolved, That in accordance with the recommendation of the Committee of Revision, the Book of Discipline, as reported by them, be sent down to the Presbyteries to be by them either adopted as it stands, or to be further criticised, and their criticisms sent up to the next Assembly, as they may elect.

He explained that the proposition was, for every Presbytery to adopt or criticise further as it might elect. His Presbytery (East Hanover) was one of those which had carefully examined the Book sentence by sentence, and sent the result to the Assembly. As now reported by the Committee, it seemed to be greatly modified for the better. And it is now, not the work of one mind, but of the Church, which was one thing that commended the Book to him. Dr. Armstrong proceeded to specify some of the improvements of the New Book upon the old. One was, that the new defines distinctly the relation of baptized children to the Church to be such as that they are not liable to discipline in the technical sense. In the Old Book this matter is

not determined. Another was, that excommunication is defined in the New Book correctly and scripturally. It is not the business of the Church to curse. Another rule of the New Book to be much commended, relates to the course to be pursued with a communicating member who confesses to the church session an unregenerate heart. Under the Old Book, we are compelled to excommunicate, and he had known it done. Another is, the rule respecting church members or officers who neglect to transfer their church relations upon removal. The rule is cautious and guarded. Now these are a few, and only a few, of the points in which the New Book incorporates what has become the settled conviction or practice of the Church. And thus it has made improvements in the best way of improving Constitutions, that is the way of incorporating what has come to be the settled judgment of the body. And Dr. Armstrong was willing on these grounds to send the Book down to the Presbyteries for adoption or for further emendations.

Dr. S. R. Wilson had a paper which he desired to offer. He did it of course with great diffidence, yet under a strong sense of duty. He offered it as a substitute for the motion to send down. It was as follows:

The General Assembly having heard and considered the report of the Committee of Revision, upon a review of the whole subject which has now for so long a time agitated the mind of the Church and occupied the attention of successive Assemblies, do adopt the following as their final minute in the premises, viz.:

1. They approve of the care and diligence with which the Committee have prosecuted their labors, and to each and all the members of said Committee would express the thanks of the Church for the assiduity and fidelity with which they have discharged the duty laid upon them.

2. The Assembly expresses no opinion in regard to the *Rules of Discipline* as now submitted by the Committee, either as to the general principles or the details contained therein.

3. In full view of the facts bearing upon this matter of the Revision of the Constitution of the Church, the Assembly deem it inexpedient to send down to the Presbyteries the *Rules of Discipline* reported by the Committee, or further to continue the agitation of this subject in the Church.

4. It is therefore, resolved, That the Revision of the Form of Government and Book of Discipline be indefinitely postponed, and that the Committee of Revision be, and they are hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the subject.

He would only say, in introducing this paper, that the Assembly, he trusted, would guard themselves against a misapprehension likely to arise from the phraseology employed more than once by the last speaker. Our Book is not the *Old Book*, it is *the Book*. There is no other Book, and he thought it as new and as living as it has been ever since it was formed, and as capable of meeting all the necessities of our Church.

Dr. Plumer was truly gratified by the introduction of this paper. He accorded with it all, and very fully with the thanks to the Committee, and if any body would suggest anything stronger, more courteous and presbyterial toward that Committee, he would vote for it.

The second remark he had to make was, that this whole subject of Revision brought before the Church the last ten years, was in his judgment inopportune. It was unfortunate. If ever a Church was called to look about her and see what she ought to do, it is the Southern Church; but instead of doing what she ought to do—instead of making our meetings of Presbytery glorious revival meetings, they are made meetings for the discussion of points which will probably never convert a soul. His father had a neighbor who never made a good crop, but at any time could give five or six reasons why he did not. His practice was, when grass was gaining on the corn, to go and make new draw-bars, or a new gate, or new rails, but not to get out the grass. Our business is far different, he thought, from Constitution-making—it is to keep the Church from extinction!

Again, one of the most difficult things in the world is to make good fundamental laws. And we are not prepared for this general ripping up of our whole system. We do not know what is to follow. We have a good deal of legislation on the subject of testamentary bequests. He told a story of a man who had a number of daughters, and two of them had married against his wishes. He wished to mark them with his disapprobation, and

made a will devising to Annie and Mary, or Sally and Becky, as it may have been, five hundred dollars each, but not disposing of the rest of his estate. The executor paid these legacies, and the question with him then was what to do with the rest of the estate. The will said they should have "so much and no more." The court instructed him that the heirs at law were the legitimate children of the deceased; and so Anne and Sally got their five hundred dollars each, and then an equal share with the other children! [Laughter.] He was glad they did. He was always glad when malignant wills were defeated. Here was a fundamental law on testamentary bequests; but that man never dreamed it would have this bearing. And we cannot tell. He hoped we would not tear up things from the foundation.

He wished to say, that of all the papers he had ever read, except the Dictionary, he never saw one abounding so much in definitions. Some definitions are harder to understand than the original word—as Johnson's definition of net-work. It was as exact a definition as ever was given; but he would like to know what good it had ever done. So it was with some of these definitions. Why, Moderator! did you know that, in the Word of God, from Genesis to Revelation, there is not a single definition?—not one! Some might say Faith is defined, and some Sin, and some Pure Religion, but those were descriptions and not definitions. Now he was not prepared to turn in and make an ecclesiastical dictionary and put that in the forefront of the battle. Definitions are the most entangling things in the world. If you let me define everything I wish to define and as I wish, I have got you—I don't care what your arguments are.

Another objection he had was, that the Discipline is taken up before the Form of Government—the cart before the horse.

This was not all. Our Book the people know. They are familiar with it. It is plain, clear, settled. But you go to sea to find some ecclesiastical stand where you may rest more safely and you will have a tempestuous voyage. Mr. Jefferson sent a minister to France who could not speak French. Being told that the First Consul would probably ask him, when he was presented, what kind of a passage he had, he got ready an answer

for that question. So when Napoleon came along and asked him, How is Mr. Jefferson? Says he, "Very stormy!" [Laughter.] I think we shall have a stormy time if we go into this business.

This was not all. If you adopt this Discipline, there will not be an ecclesiastical lawyer left. No man will be able to tell what is the law, except the Committee who devised the New Book; and he was told there are wonderful divisions amongst them. Now, though he was an ignorant man, he knew what was the Constitution of the Church to-day. But if you adopt that Book, he should never attempt to understand the Constitution. He could not do it. He was too old.

This was not all. This revision was begun before the North and South separated. But the North had dropped it entirely.

This was not all. The Church had grown under the Book we have. It must be a grand old Constitution which has raised the Church with such rapidity.

Nor was this all. I forewarn you that you will split this Southern Church asunder. That is an awful result, but it is a certain result. I tell you there are hundreds of people who will not stand it. I do not speak this in the language of threat. I never threaten any body. I am merely telling you what I know.

I do not choose to go into particulars, for if the paper of Dr. Wilson does not pass we shall have another chance to discuss this thing upon its merits.

The brother who moved to send down, took four points which he said were improvements. It would be marvellous if a book of twenty-one octavo pages had not four good things in it, especially when the Committee had the old Discipline to quote from.

Should Dr. Wilson's paper be accepted, (he thought it would, but he never counted noses,) there the whole matter ceases and this agitation is at an end. If it is not adopted, we must take up the Book on its merits and shall have a prolonged discussion.

He thanked the house for their attention; and though he was "full of matter," he would be like the old man who fell in love

with and married a nice young lady. He had but two teeth, not opposite each other, and yet he was very fond of crisp dry toast. She indulged him; and as they were at tea, he sat nibbling a long time without making much progress. At length she asked him to excuse her, and went to give out breakfast. Returning, she found him still nibbling at his dry toast. Said she: "My dear, are you not done?" "No," said he, "I am not done, but I'll quit." [Laughter.]

Dr. Adger was very glad the discussion was to be on just such a paper as his brother from Louisville had presented—direct, manly and bold, as is every thing from that quarter of the Church. He would give a brief history of the Revision. It began in 1837 when the Assembly met in Lexington, Kentucky. A great authority had just pronounced, that, to consider the Discipline before the Form of Government, was to put the cart before the horse; but that Assembly, with some wise men on its floor, did not think so. They began by referring the Discipline to Drs. Thornwell, Breckinridge, Hodge, McGill, and others. They reported to the Assembly in 1859 substantially what is laid on your table to-day. It was drafted by Dr. Thornwell. I will give a statement by him of the changes made, and you can judge how true it is that they are fundamental and revolutionary.

The first head is, "*The Lopping of Redundancies*,"—that is, those parts of the Book which he called its *preaching*.

The second is, "*Omissions Supplied*." The first specification is, the more exact definition of offences and their more complete distribution. Dr. Thornwell held to definition—Dr. Plumer says he does not believe in them. I think them good in their place—better than some other commodities with which we have been frequently entertained in this Assembly. Another omission supplied is, the statement of the principle of ecclesiastical inquest, implied, but not formally stated in the present Book. Another is, a provision for getting at a party who conceals himself. Another is, to require that an issue be joined. Another is, the definition of "appearance"—that it may be *in writing*. Another is, to define what is to be done with a party confessing; another,

the case of an offence committed in court; another, the case of a suspended minister's charge, whether it is imperative that Presbytery shall declare it vacant. This finishes the "omissions supplied."

The third head is, "*Extension of Privileges.*" One is, that parties may testify; another, that one on trial before a session may have counsel and aid in conducting his case from any member of that congregation; and the third is, that gross irregularities may come before a superior court by memorial as well as rumors.

Moderator, I ask the Assembly to consider, as I proceed, whether it is just to say, that we are upturning fundamental principles.

The fourth head is, "*Removal of Anomalies and Incongruities.*" The first specification is, in the definition of an offence, as only what is sinful; a second, that the Westminster Standards are to be employed in defining offences; a third is, that the inferior courts are not to be made parties in cases of appeal; and the fourth is, the determining in a perfectly distinct way who are the "original parties," and so making an end of that vexed question.

Fifthly, "*three other provisions*" come in. The first provides for an unconverted church member, who has committed no disciplinable offence, to withdraw voluntarily; the second exempts the baptized children from all judicial prosecutions; the third defines more clearly the difference between the competency and the credibility of witnesses.

Dr. Thornwell said, the only serious defect in this New Book was, that it did not confine the right of appeal to the injured party who had submitted to trial; and that the only thing he considered doubtful in it was, the admission of the lower courts to their seats in cases of appeal, and he suggested another way in which that matter might be arranged.

And, now, what changes have the present Committee of our Church superinduced upon the report as Dr. Thornwell presented it in 1859? In the first place, borrowing a suggestion from his defence of his Book, we have given a wide sense and a narrow

sense to the term "discipline." Secondly, following out the same idea, we introduce a chapter on the ways in which the Discipline of the Church is to be applied to the baptized children. Thirdly, we have a chapter on the different kinds of censure, stating them with some fulness of definition—that abominable thing which Dr. Plumer hates; then another chapter on the infliction of censures, and another on their removal. These are not new things, being found chiefly in the Directory for worship. It appeared to us that that was not the place for matters of discipline. Next, we give original jurisdiction exclusively to the lowest courts—to the session exclusively over a church member, to the Presbytery exclusively over a minister, so that our brethren can never be *ipso facto* by the Assembly. Next, we leave out all reference to *common fame*, and make the accuser to be always the Church, and the indictment always in her name. Next, we arrange for testimony to be taken by commission, or by a sister court—this is surely not very revolutionary. Next, it is made the duty of a court knowing of an offence by a church member coming into its bounds, to notify the court which has jurisdiction. Next, if during a trial questions arise betwixt parties thereto, the discussion, it is provided, must be first between them, and then they shall withdraw for the court to decide. There is surely no great harm in that—Dr. Plumer might stomach that. Another provision defines, if he will allow me to say so, how a session is to take up a case. Then there is a definite provision for "The Record." Lastly, we confine appeal, as Dr. Thornwell wished, always to the party aggrieved.

And now I resume the history. In 1859, the report was re-committed. In 1860, at Rochester, some names were added to the Committee, and they were told to take up the Form of Government also. Then came the division of the Church. In 1861, at Augusta, our Church appointed a new Committee, and committed to them the Form, Discipline, and Directory. In 1862, the Northern Church adopted seven chapters of the Book, but subsequently dropped the whole matter. In 1863, our Assembly, after Dr. Thornwell's death, reorganised its Committee. In

1864, the Assembly received our report, and ordered copies of the Book to be printed for examination. In 1865, we reported why we had not been able to print—those were our dark days. In 1866, the Assembly at Memphis examined and adopted the Form and the Discipline almost unanimously, and sent them down to the Presbyteries. In 1867, the Presbyteries making various and contradictory objections, and the Church being unprepared to act either negatively or affirmatively, the Assembly at Nashville laid the matter by “for future reference and use.” In 1868, nothing was done. In 1869, upon an overture from a large number of ministers and elders, the subject was taken up again; and upon a report from a committee appointed to examine the answers of the Presbyteries to the Nashville Assembly, the Assembly at Mobile resolved to send down the Book for the Presbyteries to point out what they liked, and what they disliked in the new Book. In 1870, the answers came up to the Assembly at Louisville, which that Assembly committed to the original Committee, instructing us to report on them, as we have done this day to you.

Now I submit, that a business which has been under consideration by so many Assemblies and Presbyteries during fifteen years, is not to be ridiculed or denounced as revolutionary, or useless, or foolish. Your Presbyteries, and not your Committee, have made the Book what it is. I submit that this work is not inopportune as Dr. Plumer asserts. The General Assembly have from the start always said, it is opportune. Dr. Plumer thinks we are “making bars,” when we ought to be “getting out the grass.” God be praised, sir! the reports of our committees, and the narratives sent up, do not justify the statement that our plantation has been suffered to go to grass, whilst we have been making bars.

Dr. Plumer says we have been changing our fundamental laws. I submit whether he is borne out in that statement by the history of the changes made.

He does not like definitions, but is great on stories. He told us about Becky and Sally, and the old man nibbling away at his dry toast. I for one could willingly have dispensed with these

stories, and submitted to a few definitions. He is a theological professor: and does he stand up before this Assembly to decry definitions? If it were true that the Scriptures have not a definition, has he forgotten that the Shorter Catechism is full of them?

He declares that he will quit studying our Constitution if you adopt this Book—that would not be so great a loss as if he were a man who holds to definitions. But I think his love of study will prevail, and we shall have him helping us to understand and apply the principles of the new Book.

He forewarns us that we will split the Church. The history I have given of the action of your Presbyteries does not confirm the prediction. We have not heard of the beginning of any split made by the discussions thus far.

I will make only one more point touching this “agitation” as it has been called, which you are invoked to put an end to. Dr. Plumer said the other day, that revolutionary times were always times when dead-letter laws were made. I have always supposed they were times when principles are discussed. So far as this report considers principles, it suits our times then. The time of the Reformation was a stormy time; they inquired into principles then, and did not make dead-letter laws. The latter days of the Reformation, from 1560 and onwards, were earnest times; and then they made the Belgic, Gallic, and Scotch Confessions, and the Heidelberg Catechism. The Westminster Standards were made in stormy times. Our present Constitution, as well as that of the United States Government, were made in 1788—somewhat stormy times, like the present. We are just walking in the tracks of our fathers. I maintain that we have introduced no new principles. The storm has been shaking our building at the top, and we have been quietly examining our foundations. Our sails have been fluttering on the breeze, and we have been looking to see how it was with the hull—whether any leak was springing. We have been engaged in no revolutionary business, but one for the promotion of the life of the Church.

Dr. Wilson said it struck him as a strange idea, that in a

stormy time we should look at the state of the hull. But if the figure be applicable, it is not what this Committee are proposing, unless the applications of the law be the foundation, and the Constitution itself at the top. Another observation: The brother said we are not dealing with fundamental principles, and yet he closes with the statement, that revolutionary times are times for examining the foundations! How do these statements consist?

Let me follow, said he, the last speaker in his history. He told us of the eminent divines on the original committee, and dwelt on the name of Dr. Thornwell, whom, sir! we all love—whom I love as much as any man living—one of the greatest luminaries that has graced the Presbyterian Church during this century. I do not wonder the Committee should bring forward his name to support this work. Sir, it needs it. But the brother tells us in the conclusion that, after all, it is not the work of Dr. Thornwell. Then, of what use was the history, and of what force the name of that eminent man as an argument for sending down this Book? It is nothing, sir; it is nothing.

But let us see how many are the alterations in the Book that Dr. Thornwell proposed to the Church. Here Dr. Wilson made sundry specifications, upon which he briefly dwelt, and concluded by saying, that in Dr. Thornwell's book there were at least sixteen radical changes in the Book of Discipline, and even more than this number in the Book as presented now by the Committee. But, sir! did the Church adopt that Book? It rejected it, with all the weight of the great names on that committee. All the historical statement therefore goes against the brother. Not to detain you—this simple fact has been brought out, which I was not aware of before, that at the Nashville Assembly the subject was laid on the table, or passed by. Dr. Adger here explained, that he said "laid aside for future reference and use." Dr. Wilson resumed: In the language and under the action of an ecclesiastical body, that usually means politely to lay a thing to sleep—just as my own Presbytery once, out of consideration for one of the most distinguished men in the Church, intensely favorable to this Book, passed a paper deferring the whole matter

to the future. So I understood, and so I think the Church understood the mind of the Nashville Assembly. We will just in the same way stop its further progress in this.

And who re-opened the question? Was it the Presbyteries? No, but the Assembly. The great mass of our people, eldership and ministers, would be glad to have the whole matter laid to rest. But, in 1870, the reports came up, and more confusion than is presented in the simple statistical statement of the different views of the Presbyteries I cannot conceive of. This is one reason why I have asked the Assembly to stay farther agitation. It was not my desire to do this, for I would rather personally have done with it and go home and let the Church go on, if they choose, to make the Book. But the confusion, the want of consent is one reason why I believed it my duty to offer the resolution.

The chairman of the Committee gave as a specimen of their improvements, that original jurisdiction is committed to the courts to which the parties belong, so that we cannot be *ipso factoed*. Sir, I defy any man legally to *ipso facto* me or you under our Book. I have fought that battle. It is just as clear in that Book as language can make it; and I object to the amendment, because it implies that it is doubtful. I have a little feeling of honor that I was not fighting for something doubtful.

As to parties testifying, I do not know that that was ever against the law. Under the Book a party could be made to swear, if necessary.

Taking the whole thing together, there are one or two amendments not essential, but of use perhaps as finger boards to help those not able to see clearly how the rule draws. Some people must have everything told to them. One objection I have to this Book is, that it tries to tell everything, and so confuses very many things.

Another principle is about the discipline of baptized children. I do not believe the Church has ever had any difficulty practically on this subject.

One other case shows that fundamental principles are in-

volved—the case of a man professing faith under a mistake. There are very distressing cases of this sort. But it is a fundamental principle of our Church repeatedly affirmed, that no man may ever leave by voluntary withdrawal. There is no real practical difficulty in the matter. The Lord said the tares cannot all be taken out of the wheat. We must just wait on such persons. The Methodist Church could very well practice on this rule; but we are not Methodists.

Having touched on all that is important in the chairman's remarks, I will now run over the resolutions I have proposed.

The first resolution commends the Committee. We want to thank them for fidelity, diligence, and assiduity. I do not wish to take their Book, but I say they have done their work as well as it ever can be done by this generation.

The second expresses no opinion of the merits of the Book. How could we do so intelligently, unless we were to examine it fully? It may be said that sending the Book down does not commit ourselves to it any way. But, guard that point as you may, to send it down will be accepted and claimed as a *quasi* endorsement of it by the Assembly. And you cannot get rid of it.

But by Dr. Armstrong's resolution you send it down, not for adoption, but, note the point! for them to make their marks and remarks on it and send it back. Lo! sir, at the end of fifteen years, we are only submitting the Rules of Discipline for criticism!

But how can the Presbyteries judge of the Discipline without the Form of Government? And how many more years are we to be agitated about the Form? The agitation of questions considered as settled ones in any household, will end in the rupture of that household. You will unsettle the mind of the Church. And you may keep agitating a body of men, until they will adopt your proposal in order to get rid of it, as is said ladies sometimes marry. How was slavery abolished? It was under this one motto—which seems to me to be unintentionally the motto of this Committee—"Agitate! agitate! agitate!"

This agitation ought not to be continued, because this new

Book is not needed. No human production is perfect—but our Book is like the old Constitution of these United States—*there will never be a better*. If you take it out of my hands, and give me this new Book, *I have no home*. It is ample to prosecute the work of the Lord. It is ample for the exercise of discipline. It is ample to keep out error. Had it been observed in its integrity, the “Plan of Union” would never have been formed; and the “excising acts” would never have been passed. There never has been a case of clear, heretical opinion in the Presbyterian Church which, where this Book has been observed, has not been gotten out of the Church. Where it has not, the provisions and principles of the Book have been traversed, as in the case of Albert Barnes, where the Third Presbytery of Philadelphia was formed contrary to the Constitution. In regard to my own expulsion from the Church I loved, that whole proceeding is to-day confessed by prominent men in the body who did it, to have been a lawless trampling on the Constitution. I say the Book is ample. Under this banner the battles of the truth have been fought by Junkin, by Baxter, and by my own venerated father, and I cannot find it in my heart to say it is insufficient for the battles of the truth still. It was under this banner that a few of us—I may say it without boasting—undertook to fight the battle of our Southern brethren, and for the restoration of our Church at the close of the war.

What is wanted, is, not another Book, but the study and the application of the Book we have. And further still, the strict construction of it.

Dr. Wilson concluded with an earnest expression of his wish that the agitation might cease. In view of the vast field, and the great difficulties before us, the present he thought is no time to be making constitutions, but, if wrong, he should bow to the wisdom of his brethren.

The discussion, suspended at this point, was resumed at night by Dr. Armstrong. He noticed first the argument from “agitation.” Abolitionist agitation had produced the late terrible war. But two thousand years ago Paul and Silas preached at Thessalonica, and were cried out against as agitators. Good

and evil both come from agitation. What is agitation? It is life—it may be a beneficial or a hurtful life. Agitation amongst us, therefore, of itself, only shows that we are a living Church. And the question must be as to the nature and the objects of the agitation.

Now, one simple way to judge of the agitation arising from the new Book, is to look at the men who are carrying it on. Such men as Drs. Thornwell, Breckinridge, and Hodge, began it. Such men as Drs. Baird, Dabney, Smith, Peck, Palmer, and Adger, are carrying it on. Are they wild, fanatical men? Dr. Armstrong here expressed in strong terms his respect and esteem for these brethren.

Another way of judging is, to look at the results of the agitation. Look at the Book proposed. I was corrected for calling the present Book *old*. I take it back—that Book is *not old*. Revision of the Constitution is a work carried on in the Presbyterian Church from the beginning. The *First Book of Discipline* was by John Knox. He was scarcely in his grave before they started this very sort of agitation, and, in Andrew Melville's day, adopted the *Second Book of Discipline*. There was another Revision by the Westminster Assembly. And another in Witherspoon's day in our own country. And you were asked this morning, What, will you meddle with the work of Witherspoon? Why Witherspoon's work was revised long ago. It was adopted before the close of the last century, but our present Book in 1821. It is only some fifty years old. So it is not "the *old Book*"! There are four or five old books which lie back of this. And now what do we propose to do? Just what our fathers did time and again. And what is the argument against it? Why, that *we are agitators*—an argument which might have been resorted to for popular effect with as great propriety at any of these former revisions.

Dr. Armstrong argued, that 1821 was an era when the Presbyterian Church was in union with the Congregational, and the Presbyterianism which prevailed, was of more questionable type than it had ever been since the days of Knox. Yet we are told that we must not touch this Book!

He went on to state that one reason why the Assembly at Nashville had laid the Book aside "for future reference and use" was, that we were at that time negotiating for union with the Synod of Kentucky, and desired that they should have a say as to what the new Book ought to be.

He discussed the *ipso facto* question, and insisted that the Northern Church, under the present Book, holds the Synod of Kentucky *ipso factoed*; and whereas Dr. Wilson said they only claimed the right to do it under necessity, just as the Constitution of the United States may be set aside in times of war, our desire is that our Book shall *shut out* this *ipso facto*, so that it shall never be claimed to be even a war right.

The case of the communicant, satisfied that he has not faith, and desiring therefore not to be numbered amongst church members, is fairly met by the new Book. The session may transfer his name to the roll of non-communicating members of the Church, but is not to excommunicate him. Dr. Wilson says there is no necessity for this provision, and tells us how he manages such a case. He allows a member of his Church to remain a member, though he never comes to the communion table, which the Assembly, under our Book of 1821, has over and over again said is a disciplinable offence! Now if we had the new Book, the course which Dr. Wilson is now pursuing illegally, would be made legal.

Dr. Armstrong took up the question, whether the adoption of the new Discipline would render necessary any change in the Form of Government. He had considered the question carefully himself, but had also consulted one of our wisest ministers, one who had carefully examined the new Book. Were he to mention the name, this would be admitted by all. He had given it as his judgment, that the new Discipline would work just as well with the Form of Government as the present Book does.

He then discussed the consistency of thanking the Committee for their work, with its indefinite postponement.

His concluding point was, that the Presbyteries had spent much time on this Revision, and expected the Book to be returned to them. Such was the action of his Presbytery, and

that, if he was not mistaken, unanimously. Such in substance was the case with twenty-nine of our Presbyteries, while eleven more had pleaded their need of more time for its examination. And, now, will the Assembly take the responsibility of saying the work shall not go on?

Dr. Handy said the whole matter was in a nut-shell. If we can ascertain what the Presbyteries desire that is the thing to be done. Dr. Adger's history shows what the Presbyteries wish, and Dr. Armstrong's argument corroborates it, and we ourselves know very much what is the feeling of the Presbyteries. They desire this work continued. They do not wish the labor of fifteen years thrown aside. He trusted we should bring the matter to a close by "the question."

Mr. Flinn had two grave and really insuperable objections to the Book, touching the status of the baptized child, and the member desiring to withdraw. He argued these questions at length, and concluded his speech with an earnest expression of his sense of the usefulness of the discussions exerted in our Church by the new Book. "It had been a school of instruction for our ministers and our elders."

Dr. Doremus held that it was not for the Assembly to determine whether the Revised Book is any improvement or not. He should vote that the work of the Committee during so many years be sent down to the Presbyteries. We should stultify ourselves if we did not take this course. A majority of the Presbyteries have more or less approved of the Book. The Presbytery of New Orleans spent many days and nights upon it.

Dr. Plumer urged that to send down the Book was to endorse it. He also insisted that the present form of the Revision is not Dr. Thornwell's work. Still further, the proposition to adopt the new Discipline is revolutionary, for we had been told that it had actually invaded the Directory and taken out some chapters. The moment you adopt this Discipline, you must go to work and change the Directory, and then the Form of Government, and so we shall have a split in the Church!

His next remark was about commending the Committee, or

showing them disrespect. We might resolve to thank them without adopting their report.

He had been told by two or three members of this Assembly, that a decided majority of the Presbyteries were against the Book, but expressed the wish to have it farther considered out of courtesy; and they were in a hurry to adjourn.

Dr. Plumer went on to say, (but he gave no authority nor proof in support of the statement,) that the new Book would require to be adopted by a vote of two-thirds of the Presbyteries, which he was glad to be sure was not to be had for it.

The brother said that, at Nashville, we deferred action that the Synod of Kentucky might help us to make the new Book. Why not wait a little now on the Synod of Missouri?

Dr. Adger would present only a few points. He represented the Committee, and owed them his utmost exertions to prevent their labors being lost.

First, he would say it is not true that they are divided very much amongst themselves. They have their honest differences; but they are unanimous in their report.

A word as to the thanks. It is a great thing of course to be thanked by the Assembly, but the value of the thanks depends very much on the speech procuring them, and the position taken by the mover. Now the brother who moved these thanks told us this morning in his speech what polite things, in the language and under the action of ecclesiastical bodies, mean. And, then, what is the value of thanks, when the Committee are represented as agitators? I deny that we have been agitators—we have quietly, humbly, and to the best of our ability, done what the Church told us to do. The brother had no right to say we have been “agitating, agitating, agitating,” and I hope the Assembly, if for no other reason than this, will vote down that resolution.

And now I add, that the Committee wish for no vote of thanks—we have only done our best to serve you. But what we do wish is, that the Assembly shall do its duty to the Presbyteries, and not throw away their work. I do not believe you are

going to throw it away. The Book has several times been in greater straits than it has been in to-day, and the Assembly has always come to its support, and I think will do so this time.

It was said by Dr. Wilson, and repeated this evening by Dr. Plumer, that this is not Dr. Thornwell's work in any proper sense. Now I assert, and I know what I assert, and I defy intelligent contradiction, that this is Dr. Thornwell's Book, altered only in some minor particulars. The two senses we give to the term *Discipline*, is his own suggestion, and the chapter on the discipline of non-communicating members grew out of that. The changes which we ourselves had originated, I indicated this morning. One was to take some things out of the Directory, where they do not belong, and put them into the Discipline, which is logically their place. But some men have no use for logic.

Again, therefore, I put the weight of Dr. Thornwell's name, and those of others of the original Committee, against the weight of the two brethren who oppose this Book as inopportune and injurious; and let the Assembly decide. If eloquence and earnest speaking is to have weight, let the eloquent dead, who reported substantially this Book and earnestly defended it, have weight.

It is said, by the brother from Louisville, that we have not time to examine the Book as it ought to be examined. But it is not before us for the first time, and is no new thing. What is the conclusion the brother draws from the argument that we have not time? It is to lay the Book on the shelf! Ours is to send it to the Presbyteries and let them take time to examine it. Can you not trust the Presbyteries? Is Dr. Plumer afraid to let it go back to his Presbytery, that he is so zealous against it? His Presbytery is one of those which expressly said they wish it sent down in smaller portions for more thorough examination, and yet he is here urging that you do not send it down.

It was urged this morning, that fifteen years' labor has resulted only in asking to send the Book down for examination. It is no disparagement to this Book that we have worked upon it fifteen years. Let it take twice fifteen, if necessary.

Then we utterly deny the statement by the brother from Louisville, as to the agitation that has been going on in our Church. He has not been long amongst us, and he lives on the border, and is not a very good authority as to what has been taking place in the body of the Church.

It was said by him that my statistical statements indicate utter confusion amongst the Presbyteries. Well, seven disapprove it; two vote general disapprobation, but approve portions of it; eleven give no decided answer, but three of these say expressly, send it back; and twenty-nine examine it with care, some endorsing it strongly, and all desiring it made perfect. Is there any such great confusion here?

But Dr. Plumer tells you, on the authority of some body or other, that they did it out of courtesy to the Committee. I prefer the written reports of the Presbyteries themselves to this sort of sheet-deliverances by unknown parties.

In conclusion, I ask if the Assembly will take it on them chiefly on the dictum of one man to put a stop to this work of your Presbyteries. Who is this man? What claim has this brother from Louisville to come and just blow upon all that has been done by your Presbyteries, and we must give up the labors of fifteen years at his say so?

Mr. Matthews here rose to order—the motives of the brother, or his standing in the body, must not be assailed.

Dr. Adger—Moderator, I have not referred to motives.

The Moderator—I did not understand you to refer to motives.

Dr. Wilson—I hope the brother will be allowed to say anything he chooses in regard to the member from Louisville—anything which he thinks will support his Book.

Mr. Matthews explained, that it was what he anticipated was about to be said, rather than what was actually spoken, that moved his call to order.

Dr. Adger—I repeat, that I have said nothing about the motives of the brother from Louisville. It need not be anticipated that I will say anything about that brother which is not respectful, for I hold him in the highest respect. I do not need to have liberty given me to say what I please about him, for I

am not going to say a word that is not honorable. I do not deny the right of the brother from Louisville to say whatever he pleases that is to the point. But I only ask what claim has he or any man to expect, by his simple dictum, simply upon an argument from him however good, however pertinent, however eloquent, to have all which our Presbyteries and Assemblies have done thrown aside?

Dr. Wilson rose to reply in the midst of cries of "question" and some excitement in the Assembly. He spoke at some length and with some warmth.

Dr. Adger was allowed, in the midst of loud cries for the question, to say just two sentences, promising that they should not be offensive. The first was, that he disowned several things ascribed to him by the brother from Louisville; and the second, that he had no wish to reply, but was quite ready for the question. Dr. Wilson's paper was decided in the negative by a vote of 38 to 52; and Dr. Armstrong's was adopted by 50 to 38 votes. And so the Assembly adjourned at a quarter past midnight. Dr. Adger obtained leave the next day to say, that he disclaimed publicly any intention whatever to speak disrespectfully or unkindly of Dr. Wilson. He had been altogether misunderstood. The idea he wished to convey was the very opposite of disparaging to the brother from Louisville. If he was so unfortunate as to make a different impression he was sorry for it. And he was happy to say publicly that he honored Dr. Wilson for his services and sufferings in the cause of the truth, admired his abilities, and loved him as a Christian man and minister. Dr. Wilson made a corresponding reply, and so the matter ended pleasantly, and the Assembly was evidently much gratified.

We have to remark upon this question of the Revision, that the Book has once more secured the moral weight of the Assembly in its favor, and that against the very earnest opposition of two of the most influential ministers of our Church. As they themselves said it would, so does the Assembly's vote to send it down again to the Presbyteries signify much. They strongly urged that, for this very reason, it be not sent down again; but

the Assembly, in full view of their warnings, did send it down again. Thus has that body now, once more, as upon every previous occasion, showed itself favorable to the Revision.

Yet we do by no means desire to have this new Book pressed upon the Church. If there be any danger of its adoption dividing us, we should say it were far better it had never been commenced. The harmony of the body is worth far more to us than any improvements proposed in the Revision. For the new Book is in no fundamental particular different from the old—it only claims to be a clearer and more logical statement, a better development of the same identical principles of Presbyterianism. It only lops off some redundancies, supplies some omissions, and removes some incongruities and anomalies. As Dr. Wilson therefore did not wish the present Book called *old*; so we hold that the Revision constitutes no *new* Book in any strict sense of the term.

We have a right however to the same consideration from our brethren opposed to the Revision, which we have now declared ourselves ready to accord to them. If the new Book does constitute a better statement of the principles of Presbyterian Church Government, we are entitled to have it substantiated for the present Book. None of these productions are superhuman, none perfect; all are capable, and from the nature of the case must ever be capable of *improvement*. It cannot be gainsaid that in and by our Church progress has been made, in the sound development of the principles of our polity, since the Book of 1821 was adopted. We have a right to ask that this progress be seen and felt in our Standards.

It may be that the Revision will never be adopted. *Let the Church do her pleasure.* Be this the motto of every one, and let us bear with one another patiently. What the Church will do we can't be sure beforehand. Of one thing however we have not a doubt, and that is, of the benefit which must continue to flow to all our ministers, elders, deacons, and members, from earnest, fraternal discussion of the principles of our divine system of Church polity.

OTHER TOPICS.

There were several other matters of interest before the Assembly, as the Examination Rule, Systematic benevolence, the Narrative, Theological Seminaries, Statistical Tables, Commissioners' Expenses, Evangelistic Labor, Sabbath-schools, which it would be pleasant and profitable to review; but our space is exhausted, and we close with thanks to the Head for another agreeable and useful assembling together of the representatives of our Church.

ARTICLE II.

LOGIC, AND THE LAWS OF THOUGHT.

1. *An Outline of the Necessary Laws of Thought: A Treatise on Pure and Applied Logic.* By WILLIAM THOMSON, D. D., Provost of the Queen's College, Oxford. Fourth Edition. Sheldon & Co., New York.
2. *A Treatise on Logic; or, The Laws of Pure Thought," etc., etc.* By FRANCIS BOWEN, Alford Professor of Moral Philosophy in Harvard College.
3. *The Laws of Discursive Thought: Being a Text Book of Formal Logic.* By JAMES MCCOSH, LL. D., President New Jersey College, Princeton. Formerly Professor of Logic and Metaphysics, Queen's College, Belfast.

Once on a time in the Revolutionary war, between the United Colonies and Great Britain, an American captain, it is said, begged his company just to fire *once* before running away from the enemy. So we pray of the good reader, whose eye lights for a moment on the above ponderous headings—only peruse a page or two of what we have to say, and if you find it dull, retreat to some more Arcadian nook in literature. Most persons regard a work on Logic, very much as a lad of ten summers did a volume of Henry's Life of Calvin. "Isn't that a dreary

book?" said he. Well, no; we had not found it so. Neither have we found the three treatises of Thomson, Bowen and McCosh, dreary; though we must confess that Aristotle is exquisitely dry.

But have we not had enough of Logic? Is it not time to cry, *Jam satis nivis in terris?* What with Aristotle and his Greek commentators, his Arabian commentators, and his scholastic commentators; Kant and Krug and Esser among the Germans; the Renaissance in England under Whately, and Hamilton; and, to crown all, the East Indian Logic as interpreted to us by Max Muller, shall we not cry, "Hold, enough!"

Kind reader, all these things prove that the most intellectual races of the past have solaced themselves with this science, and the likelihood is that the most intellectual races of the future will follow suit. The questions, What good does Logic do? of what use is it? is it, in truth, of any use? may be very pertinent; but they never have stopped thoughtful men from pursuing their researches, and never will. Man always has reasoned, always must do so; and man will always strive to understand the rationale of reasoning. At least some men will; and really they are excusable for this; for if we crave to comprehend the philosophy of the rainbow, how much more shall we long to understand that syllogistic process by which we mount from the earth to the sky of knowledge.

And yet, in one sense, we hold that enough or at all events nearly enough of Logic has been written. One book more is needed. One more thinker, not to discover any new principle, but to recast the principles already ascertained. The gold has been dug from the mine; it has been molten into massy, glittering ingots; and now the time demands some cunning artificer who shall mould them into one august statue for the vestibule of Truth's mystic temple.

But if any one asks whether logicians have not extolled their special science unduly, we answer, undoubtedly they have. Chalmers says, in the outset of one of his treatises, that the professors in Edinburgh, in their introductory lectures, each spoke in such high terms of the dignity and importance of his own branch

of instruction that the students were quite at a loss as to their respective claims. Your tanner, too, avers that there is nothing like leather. Why should not your logician style his specialty, "*Ars artium, scientia scientiarum, via ad veritatem, cynosura veritatis, Pharos intellectus,*" etc.? All this however has passed or is passing away. In the first place reasoning is an *intellectual* process, and hence is not an end, but only a means. The intellect is the servant, and not the master. The world of feeling is paramount to that of thought. In the second place, even among the intellectual processes, reasoning is dependent upon several other powers. Mr. Locke has shown that, without memory, reasoning is impossible. He says that previous to this reflection, he had been inclined to underrate memory. Certainly, if we have forgotten either that all men are mortal, or that Socrates, Louis Napoleon, and Alex. Stephens are men, we cannot conclude the mortality of either of these individuals. Then if our conceptions are defective, inaccurate, dull, we shall be but sorry reasoners—as is largely shown by Sir William Hamilton. McCosh devotes special attention to the notion, as he styles it. Once more: Logic is a good builder, but does not furnish his own materials; that very essential part of the business being consigned to observation and invention. In the third place, reasoning is but a way of arriving at Truth—the altar-stairs, marble and massive, if you choose, yet only the altar-stairs which Truth's worshippers must first ascend; or to vary the figure slightly, it is the winding staircase by which we climb to the height of some lofty tower in order to view a broad and goodly landscape. We are willing to take the pains for the sake of the view.

This leads to the farther idea, that if we could soar up like a bird to the tower's summit, we should of course disdain the clumsier method of stepping-stones. Reasoning is the badge of our infirmity, the crutch of our lameness, the evidence of our limitation; titles which contrast rather strangely with the high-sounding designations already mentioned. Yet these very limitations must be considered, and profoundly considered, too, by the coming logician. For as the island is not only surrounded,

but is also defined by the ocean; so the finite is both surrounded and defined by the Infinite. The end of our littleness is the margin of his fulness.

Let us briefly note some of these limitations:

1. We know substances only by means of their properties. In material things, the curious and startling inquiry has arisen, whether there are sixty or more kinds of substance on earth, or only one substance in various allotropic conditions.

2. We are limited in time. Here let us be understood. We are far from adopting the scholastic definition of God's eternity as a "*punctum stans*," a duration in which there is no progress, no succession. Such a thing is, as Mansel remarks, unthinkable to us. The present moment the universe shares with God. The past moment is gone forever from him and from us, beyond his power of recall as beyond ours. The future moment comes to both, alike. What we mean, then, is, that we are but of to-day; while his goings forth are of old, even from everlasting. Our opportunities of perception, of observation, of original and intuitive knowledge are of course extremely meagre. They are supplemental in a curious way by the testimony of our Maker and of our fellows, and by the reasoning process as to the past; and as to the future by the announcements of the Omniscient One, and again by reason.

3. We are limited in space. We float about on our atom-planet, and no one of us, not even the most extensive voyager, has ever seen a tithe of its surface. Our most adventurous sense, that of feeling, reaches to our finger ends. Instead of saying that our eyes pierce the celestial depths, let us rather admire the exquisite contrivance by which information is brought to us from systems and nebulae. So also with the other senses.

"The song and oars of Adria's gondolier,
By distance mellowed, o'er the waters sweep."

The perfumes of Araby and the Indies are wafted to the sailor along the coast. But as vision is the most wonderful of all, it shall serve as our example. What can be more interesting and remarkable than the mode in which our extremely narrow spatial limits are compensated by light? The nature and extent of the

knowledge conveyed to us from the other worlds in space would form a fine theme for an article. The certainty of it, as contrasted with the incertitudes of our earthly life, has been handsomely portrayed by McCosh. If it were only not so meagre!

Here on earth, again, how very limited our range of vision. What do I see at the present moment, when I look up from my paper? A library, an oil painting above it, framed photographs, and engravings, a telescope box, the furniture of the room, the walls; or turning to the window, a vista of deciduous trees and evergreens, and a smooth, grassy plot. Even these are seen by aid of diffused rather than direct light.

As to seeing into or through things, the only transparent substance on which my eye falls is glass. Why is nearly everything opaque? Little models of pumps are made of glass that the young may visually learn the action of valves; and if there had been in each generation only one human body constructed of transparent materials, the circulation of the blood would have been discovered long before the days of Dr. Harvey.

Then, so much depends on the agency of particles too small to be seen by the unaided eye. Our senses are not fine enough. Fontenelle has presented this thought so miraculously that Brown has quoted him, and Chalmers has quoted Brown. In short nobody can say it better than Fontenelle, if as well. Too much curiosity to remain in happy ignorance; too much dullness of senses to perceive—this is the foundation of that restless prying about; hence our telescopes and our microscopes, and by-the-by our spectroscopes which Dr. McCosh thinks are going to beat them all.

4. Another curious limitation is found in our connection with matter. By how circuitous a route must our thought travel to reach your mind and become your thought, kind reader? How disembodied spirits communicate with one another, we know not, but surely the process must be less complex. Then there is the medium of language of whose imperfections Bishop Butler was so fully aware, that it was a matter of wonder with him that such a vehicle of thought should ever have been devised or employed;

language, mark you, in whose intricate labyrinths Whately locates the whole domain of Logic, and about which all logicians say so much, even those who consider Logic the science of "thought as thought."

5th and last, for we are not aiming at an exhaustive account, there is the narrow purview of the intellect. It has been said that the mind can be in only one state, and accordingly can think of only one thing at a time. If this were so, we could not reason at all. We must have *two* propositions in view, or we cannot draw a conclusion. Still, as in literal vision, our mental scope is contracted. We do not hold all our knowledge perpetually before us as the Infinite One does. We *know* what we can *recall* by an indirect effort of the will; what we *can* recall, and not merely what we *do* recall. Methinks this matter of memory should be more fully considered by our logicians, so as to explain how it is that we might oftentimes reach conclusions which we do not reach, and why we are so frequently inconsistent with ourselves.

Under these five heads we merely suggest the need of a pathology, as well as a physiology of our intellectual powers. In this sense let Logic be the medicine of the mind. Let us learn what our limitations are, subjectively, then what our Creator has done toward compensating them; and then what the province of reasoning is. If reasoning does not enlarge our knowledge both positively and negatively, if it does not conduct us to new truth, and preserve us from error; why, we had better find something that will.

Before passing on, we will say just here that the distinction should be drawn and kept in mind, between reasoning and logic; between what we do, and how we do it. This, we think, would clear up a part of the difficulty touching the utility of Logic. Once more. We see no very good ground for the Hamiltonian objection to calling logic the science of reasoning. In Logic, inference is not the only thing, but it is the great thing. Conception and judgment are subsidiary, and it is because they *are* subsidiary to inference, that Logic takes cognizance of them at all.

An Example.—Let us imitate Paley in his natural theology, and begin with a simple, familiar instance.

You wish to remove some heavy article of furniture, say a piano, from one room of your house to another. It will have to pass through several doors on the way, and with regard to one of these doors, you doubt whether it is wide enough to admit of the piano's being taken through it. You take a rod or a bit of cord and measure the width of the piano, then apply it to the doorway and find *its* width equal to the length of the rod. Hence you infer that the width of the doorway is equal to that of the piano. On this lucid transaction several remarks are to be made:

1. It is a case of reasoning. Try it by any or all the tests, propounded by Aristotle or McCosh, and it vindicates its right and title.

2. We cannot see that the above process is one of analysis; certainly not of analysis in extension as it is now called, by which a class is separated into its constituent individuals. All men may be actually or in thought divided into Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, and the rest, and this may be called an analysis. This indeed seems to have been the use of the term in former times. But in the instance given, what class comes under consideration? Pianos? doors? rods? The reasoning would be identically the same, if there neither were, nor in the nature of the case could be more than one of each of these in existence.

But perhaps it is an analysis in comprehension, in which we regard the totality of attributes in an object, or rather in a concept, and eliminate some one of them.

For example: It is said that when we utter the proposition, snow is white, we must have analysed our complex conception of snow, and separated the whiteness of it from its other qualities. But unfortunately the particular width of the piano was not a part of your conception of it. If one should say, the piano has width, we might possibly regard him as analysing his conception of matter, which must have not only one but three dimensions in space. But in place of analysing a conception, you proceeded to ascertain an objective truth. You confined your attention

to one quality of the piano, and the corresponding one of the door. We may call this abstraction, if we like; authors vary in their use of that term. But abstract as we may, analyse as we may, we can never by either of these processes learn what we wish to know about the piano, which is, not whether it has any width at all, but how great that width is in the particular case before us.

What are we to think, then, of Dr. Thos. Brown's theory, viz., that reasoning is essentially analytic, except perhaps in questions appertaining to mathematical *proportions*, not equality as in the example I am using? And what of Haven, who swallows Brown's theory without the exception?

3. There are three propositions in this specimen of reasoning, two premises and a conclusion, and three terms, no more and no less. In other words, it is a syllogism. The reader will now pause, and ask himself whether he could have discovered these momentous truths without aid from some great philosopher of ancient or modern times. If he should vaingloriously imagine that he could, let him ponder this remark of Dr. McCosh, (page 123): "The syllogistic analysis of reasoning, so far as is known, was first unfolded by Aristotle in the *Prior Analytics*, and constitutes the most certain, and altogether the greatest discovery ever made in mental science." Do not unduly exalt yourself, then, so far as to say that, first, the rod must be applied to the piano; secondly, to the door; and, thirdly, the piano and the door may be pronounced equal in width; or, that if two rods had been used, the one in taking one measure, and the other in taking the other, no conclusion could have been drawn; or, that using only the one measure, we could not infer anything about some piano or door other than that which we had measured. Remember Columbus and his egg, that formidable weapon in the hands of modern thinkers, though luckily unknown to the Stagirite.

Dr. Brown, however, says that we need only *one* premiss, the minor. Socrates is a man, therefore, analysing of course man into his attributes, or at least knowing that mortality is one element of our conception of man as man, we by one step reach the conclusion that Socrates is mortal. Concerning all which,

we can say only that "*Bonus Homerus dormitat; Anglice* what stupid blunders our great thinkers sometimes make! Dr. Brown was endeavoring to carry out his theory of analysis, otherwise so acute a mind would never have been so misled. The oddity of the mistake is all the greater, when we consider that it is by an *analysis* that he professes to evolve the needed idea of mortality from the conception of "man." But if all, or nearly all reasoning is essentially analytic, why slur over an analytical process necessary to his reaching a conclusion? Coming back to our example, who can suppose that Dr. Brown would not know that he must measure first the piano, and secondly the door? Here then we find the two premises, no more and no less.

4. Do we learn anything new by our reasoning in the illustrative case? To *learn* something *new*, may sound tautological, for it may reasonably be asked, whether we can learn at all, without learning something new, whether the idea of the new is not a part of the signification or connotation of learning.

Our limits forbid us to enter particularly into the discussion of what we mean by knowledge. Whately treats this subject in a very luminous and sensible way. For the present purpose, it is enough to inquire whether we attain to any previously unacquired truth by the process of measuring and considering as above detailed. If you had known in the outset that the piano would pass through the door, just touching it on both sides, why take any measures? Surely you do learn something in the end which you did not in any sense know in the beginning. If you had been asked, is the width of the one equal to that of the other? you must have answered, I do not know. The inquiry then arises, at what point of the process did you come into the possession of this desired truth. Was it when you had obtained the measure of the piano? No. Was it when you had obtained that of the door? Again we say, no; but it was when you put together these two, and from the two conjoined you necessarily inferred the equality of the piano to the door in that spatial dimension which you were considering. Neither truth alone was sufficient; both might even in some sense have been known to us, that is, have been capable of being recalled by memory, and yet, if the two

had not been brought under the joint purview of the mind at once, you could not have learned any thing from them, *i. e.*, you could not have reached your conclusion. At the same time it is entirely clear that, taking the second measurement placed you in an attitude, or shall we say, gave you an advantage of position which you could not have enjoyed from the first measurement alone. You then needed to take no more measures, and to introduce no more terms, but only to compare those already employed.

All this seems reasonably plain, but as there has been a tremendous battle at this point in the field, and fearful blows have been given and taken by giant combatants, let us timidly survey the scene of action. Let us approach it under the broad ægis of the Stagirite himself. "A syllogism," says Aristotle, (*Prior Analytics* Bk. I., p. 1), "is a sentence in which certain things being laid down, *something else different from the premises necessarily results.*" Again in the *Topics*: "A syllogism is a discourse in which certain things being laid down, something different from the *posita* happens from necessity through the things laid down." Now for the moderns. Bowen speaks (p. 24) of the syllogism as "used for the purpose of investigation and discovery," in the earlier times. "At a later period when instruction, disputation and proof came to be the *chief purposes* for which syllogisms were formally enounced, etc., etc." Thompson, p. 281 of *Outline*: "It is a great misfortune for Logic that the syllogism has been regarded as an instrument for deduction only. . . . We need not wonder that modes only adapted for teaching truth, have been pronounced useless for discovering it, that when deductive arguments are selected, it should be easy to prove that they will not do the work of inductive." And on p. 283, "The syllogism is not confined to deductive arguments."

The amount of which is that only inductive syllogism are useful for discoving truth.

So far, so good. But now a formidable knight comes on the field in the person of Sir Wm. Hamilton. "An extension of any science through Logic is absolutely impossible; for by conforming to logical canons we acquire no knowledge, receive

nothing new, but are only enabled to render what is already obtained more intelligible by analysis and arrangement. Logic is only the negative condition of truth." Again in his Appendix, p. 623: "In the common order the objection of *petitio principii* stands hitherto unrefuted, if not unrefutable against Logic." Bowen seems to play fast and loose, for on p. 364, he says: "If reasoning were an organon of discovery;" p. 365-6: "It does not appear, then, that reasoning as such, or as an act of pure thought, is a means for the advancement of knowledge." He then goes on to cite what we have already quoted from Hamilton. This has been the common objection to Logic, and the mental philosophers have presented it very forcibly.

After all that we have read on the subject, we take the side of Aristotle. For, let us revert to the example of which so much use has been made. Do you not learn something; do you not discover something by the process indicated? Manifestly you do; and something which you could not learn by intuition; something also to which every part of the process is necessary, and which is not reached except at the end of the whole process.

Suppose we wish to reach the oil painting that hangs suspended over the library. We take a chair to stand on; that proving insufficient, we place a stool on top of it, and our own height suffices for the rest of the journey. The chair and the stool fulfil their function, and we do our part. Just as you obtained the measure of the piano, then that of the door, and by a mental operation accomplished the remainder, viz., drawing an inference from the two measurements or premises. Three things are indispensable, two premises and the conclusion.

The same point is proven by the whole science of mathematics. Countless illustrations could be given. Who knew or could have known, except by reasoning, that the volume of the sphere is two-thirds that of the circumscribing cylinder? Is not this truth arrived at by a series of syllogisms? And is it not a new truth to every learner? The immense majority of men never do know it; the proposition has never been presented to their thoughts; it is a truth lying in the vast domain of the unknown and cannot be perceived intuitively.

We do not know how this reasoning will strike the reader. To our own mind it appears conclusive, at least with regard to syllogisms like those which we have brought forward, while it may leave some riddles involved, or some puzzling questions unanswered. Such questions emerge in every department of thought, but they ought not to shake our faith in ascertained truth.

But at the risk of anticipating what we design to consider under another head, I will take up John Stuart Mills' view and briefly discuss it. In Bk. 2, p. 3, he takes hold of this knotty question: "It must be granted that in every syllogism considered as an argument to prove the conclusion, there is a *petitio principii*. When we say, all men are mortals, Socrates is a man; therefore Socrates is a mortal; it is unanswerably urged by the adversaries of the syllogistic theory, that the proposition, Socrates is a mortal, is presupposed in the more general assumption, all men are mortal. . . . In short, no reasoning from generals to particulars can, as such, prove anything. . . . This doctrine is irrefragable," etc.

The reader will at once observe that the syllogism adduced by Mr. Mill differs from the one which we have dwelt upon. In ours the reasoning is from particulars to particulars. We selected it for that very reason. But it may be thought that our foregoing argument applies only to reasoning from particulars and not to reasoning from generals. Hence it devolves on us to show that in this well-known and threadbare Aristotelian syllogism in Barbara, there is a progression from the known to the unknown.

When we say that all men are mortal; do we admit, do we know that Socrates is a mortal? Not at all. In place of Socrates, substitute Gabriel. Because all men are mortal, is Gabriel mortal? No, for he is an angel. Undoubtedly so. Then how can the mortality of Socrates be presupposed in that of all men? The prompt answer will be, because Socrates is a man. Yes, but that is introducing a new premiss. Of course the possession of two premises, like the chair and the stool, delivers us from the need of any more *extraneous* aid, we can now reach

the conclusion, if we but will, by the laws of our own intelligence. If the principle of reason and consequent were not imbedded in our nature, we might have the two premises laid down side by side, and the conclusion need not occur to us as a conception, much less as a truth. The conclusion has not yet been stated. We are just authorised to infer it, if we can and will. The summit of the stool is high enough to enable *us* to reach the desired point.

To make our meaning still plainer, let us advert to the distinction between immediate and mediate inference. The universal proposition, all men are mortal designated by the letter A, being allowed, the particular proposition, designated by I, that some men are mortal, is implied in it, or derivable from it without introducing any middle term. This is called immediate inference. The general proposition is the sum of all the individual truths. But the mortality of Socrates was not one of those individual truths; we mean the specific truth that the Athenian philosopher, the teacher of Plato, etc., etc., was mortal. This specific truth, I say, had never been cognised by us, when we said unhesitatingly, all men are mortal. It is doubtless otherwise with the Infinite One. Our limitations have prevented us from doing what he has done; and they impose on us the necessity of doing what he has no need to do.

We deny, then, that the truth of Socrates' mortality is presupposed in the mortality of all men. In thought, it is not included in it. It is attainable by means of the two truths, the mortality of all men, and the manhood of Socrates.

If any doubt lingers in the mind of the reader, we think it will be dispelled by another illustration. Travelling along a highway in Bengal at nightfall, you descry at the edge of a contiguous jungle a motionless object. The distance and the gathering twilight so disguise it that you cannot decide whether it is the stump of a tree, a rock, or an animal. But presently the fearful roar of a tiger dissipates all doubt, and you flee in terror, or hastily catch up your fire-arms for defence. Now you had known from childhood that all tigers are ferocious, carnivorous animals, but never before that that particular object was a for-

midable enemy to man, because you were not aware that the aforesaid object was a tiger. The general truth left the conclusion unattainable, the second truth, added to the first, rendered the conclusion attainable; and the principle of reason and consequent attained the result: unattainable, attainable, attained—these three words signalise the three steps in the syllogistic discovery of truth.

Mr. Mill, however, thinks that he meets the question in the only possible way. "From this difficulty there appears to be but one issue. The proposition that the Duke of Wellington" (then living) "is mortal is evidently an inference; it is got at as a conclusion from something else; but do we in reality conclude it from the proposition, all men are mortal? I answer, no!" This is very curious. Let us read a little farther on. "The inference is finished when we have asserted that all men are mortal. What remains to be performed afterwards is merely deciphering our own notes. . . . The mortality of John, Thomas, and company, is after all the whole evidence that we have for the mortality of the Duke of Wellington."

His theory, then, is, in one of its aspects, that the observed cases of mortality warrant us to infer the mortality of the whole human race, and when we learn that the Duke of Wellington is a man, we learn that he is one of the beings regarding whom the inference has before been made. This is very plausible. But there are several weak points in it. First, let us suppose that our major premiss, the mortality of all men, were derived from the Scriptures, and not gained by observing individual cases. Then we could never *infer* the mortality of any individual man. We might believe it, but could not infer it from the general proposition. But when Revelation tells us that it is appointed unto all men once to die, it does not tell us that the Duke of Wellington will die. This particular truth we do not get from intuition, nor from belief in testimony. It is arrived at by a process which all the world, except Mr. Mill, call inference. Mr. Mill says: "No supernatural aid being supposed, we derive our knowledge of the general truth from observation." Secondly, we have stated only a part of Mr. Mill's theory. In its totality

it is this: we reason from particulars to particulars, and from particulars to generals, but never from generals to particulars; reasoning from generals to particulars would involve a *petitio principii*, hence although we do proceed from generals to particulars, the process is not reasoning. We think we have proved that this process is reasoning, is inferential. Let us now examine his doctrine of reasoning from particulars to particulars. We selected the example of the piano and the door, because of its being an extremely simple instance of reasoning from one particular to another without "interpolating a general proposition." So that we have no doubt that in a multitude of cases we do thus reason. But does not the sophistical charge of *petitio principii* lie against this instance as really as against any case of reasoning from a universal to a particular proposition? We maintain that it does, and that Mr. Mill has failed to clear up the difficulty. If $2 \times 6 = 12$, and $3 \times 4 = 12$, it follows that $2 \times 6 = 3 \times 4$. Objectors say that the conclusion is involved in the premises, and that we do not advance in our knowledge of truth when we add that $2 \times 6 = 3 \times 4$. Mr. Mill does not meet this case at all.

But the most adroit part of Mr. Mill's argument still remains to be considered, viz., that which relates to our reasoning from particulars to generals. "From the mortality of John, Thomas, etc., we are entitled," he says, "to conclude that all human beings are mortal. Again he says: "The mortality of John, Thomas, and company, is after all the whole evidence we have for the mortality of the Duke of Wellington." At this we open our eyes a little in wonder whether Mr. Mill has gone over to Dr. Brown's one-premiss theory. We should really think he had, but for his express rejection of that theory elsewhere. One of the commonest forms of sophism is that in which one of the premises is kept out of sight. "From instances which we have observed we feel warranted in concluding" general propositions.

Now if we had seen only black-haired men, could we legitimately infer that all men must have black hair? Evidently not. Then there must be some other truth before the mind beside that

of John, Thomas, etc., having black hair. If that is, "after all the whole evidence" we have from the crinal nigritude of the human race, we shall not be able to reach that desirable conclusion. There is a suppressed premiss here to the effect, that all men resemble John, Thomas & Co.; that the individuals who have come under our observation are a fair sample of the race. How we come by this belief is a question in induction, yet unless we do have the premiss by some means or other, we can never get to the conclusion. But this premiss is a universal proposition; hence an essential part in reasoning from particulars to generals, is a general proposition. Mr. Mill, it is true, maintains that *this* general proposition is itself an induction from particulars. I admit it in the case of "simple enumeration," in which every instance comes under our observation. But in the vast majority of cases it is impossible to observe every individual. What naturalist has ever observed a thousand or a millionth part of the horned and cloven-footed animals in the world? Yet he believes them all to be ruminant. The "simplex enumeratio" then hardly constitutes an exception. In all other cases it is impossible to reach a general proposition as an induction from particulars. Hence Mr. Mill is at last self-contradictory. His inference of a general conclusion from particulars necessarily involves the employment of a general proposition as one premiss along with the particular or particulars as the other premiss.

We have been tediously minute in this discussion, because we are satisfied that Mr. Mill is in error, and yet he is so extremely ingenious that nothing short of an ultimate analysis of his theory will suffice for the detection of his fallacies. Those fallacies radicate in his empiricism, and to a certain extent vitiate his entire system of logic, able as it is in other respects.

Middle Terms.—Men may be masters of all the rules and principles of the logical science, and yet be poor reasoners in one sense of the word. The two things concerning which a conclusion is desired, must be compared together by means of some third thing, and what that "*tertium quid*" shall be is the question. Logic tells us that we must have it, but not where or

whence it may be obtained. Just here is the field for knowledge and for ingenuity. Let us suppose that in the room where the piano stands, there is no measuring rod. You take a piece of cord; if there is no cord, you take your pocket handkerchief; or laying one palm alternately by the other you adopt the primitive measure of "hands," in which the height of horses is still estimated. In mathematics, how important is what an eminent French writer calls the felicitous selection of the unknown term! In astronomy the spectral analysis has already given some very interesting results. We have learned that the sun's atmosphere contains twelve of our earthly metals; Aldebaran has nine. The spectroscope seems to have settled a mooted point respecting the constitution of some of the nebulae. Are they composed of solid worlds whose light comes to us so blended as to look like a haze? Or are they luminous vapors? The former conclusion was established in some of the cases by the very high magnifying power of Lord Rosse's telescope, which resolved a number of previously irresolvable nebulae into separate stars. The likelihood then seemed to be that a sufficiently high power would resolve the most untractable. But the spectroscope teaches another lesson. "In 1864, Mr. Huggins analysed the light from a nebula in Draco, and found that it is not compound like sunlight, but that the rays come from a glowing gaseous substance devoid of any atmosphere. The lines in the spectrum indicate the existence of hydrogen, nitrogen, and a third substance not recognised." (Rays Elements of Astron.)

The spectral lines were observed by Fraunhofer long ago, but it is only of late that they have been used as a middle term.

A dexterous use of middle terms was made by Marlborough when he ferreted out of Charles XII., of Sweden, his purpose of attacking Russia. How very wily and skilful a diplomat did Marlborough prove himself to be! He was a good manager of middle terms, though it is questionable whether he could have stated in full any one of his syllogisms.

The Dictum de Omni et Nullo.—What is predicated of a class can be predicated of every individual of the class. Predication,

here, is to be understood as including both affirmation and negation. This is the famous Aristotelian canon which was supposed to govern all reasoning processes. But if we may and often do reason without the intervention of a class concept, we may and do reason without Aristotle's dictum. This is Dr. McCosh's view, and is doubtless correct.

Reasoning from Particulars to Particulars.—How far has this been recognised by logicians? Mill is a sturdy advocate of it. "We perpetually do so reason. All our earliest inferences are of this nature. . . . In the same way also brutes reason. . . . The syllogistic form is an indispensable collateral security. . . . The syllogism is not a correct analysis of the process of reasoning."

The matter seems to have stood at about this point until Hamilton and his coadjutors appeared. Mr. Mill's illustration of the village matron and the illness of her Lucy was an unfortunate selection. The vague unscientific diagnosis of such a woman is too unreliable. The causes and the effects which are in their turn causes, involved in that totality which we call health or disease, are far too numerous and too inaccessible for so incapable an observer, while she might be trusted to measure her cot or table to see whether it would pass through the door. A step in the right direction was taken when convertible terms were considered, as that common salt is chloride of sodium, to designate which proposition the vowel U was employed, A, E, I and O, having been "pre-empted." Hamilton's unfigured syllogism comes next; A and B are equal, B and C are equal, hence A and C are equal. The important point of this is not its being unfigured; it is true that A and B are both on the same side of the copula, both being on the grammatical subject, but this is merely a rhetorical and not a logical consideration, for the expression A and B are equal is plainly elliptical, and means equal to each other, *i. e.*, at last $A = B$ and $B = A$. The real importance lies in this, that it is a return toward simplicity, toward the historical as well as logical commencement of reasoning. We are getting back rapidly to the piano and the door, of which A and

C are the generalised symbols. It makes no difference whether we say $A=B$ or $B=A$, $B=C$ or $C=B$, $A=C$ or $C=A$, just as it is unimportant whether we begin with the door or the piano.

Therefore we have arrived at the Ultima Thule in Logic. We have begun, *i. e.*, Aristotle began at the end of the science; Hamilton ends at the beginning, Aristotle chiselled out the bust of the statue; Hamilton has carried the work on down to the feet resting on the pedestal.

But at what an infinite cost of labor and talents! Whereas if the beginning had been made at the right place, the progress, it seems to us, must have been far easier and surer. If a man wishes to qualify himself to be a guide in some vast cavern, let him by all means begin at the mouth and investigate every passage-way as he goes onward. If he should first be carried blind-fold to the innermost end, and then have his eyes uncovered, and a lamp put in his hands, and be required to grope his way out, he will do well if, like Aristotle, he gets half-way to daylight, and well again, if like Sir William Hamilton, with a thousand old guides discouraging him, he pushes his way to the mouth of the cave.

The same blunder has often been made by writers on mathematics. In presenting Taylor's Theorem, for instance, they begin with an equation of this sort:

$$f(x+y) = A + By^a + Cy^b + Dy^c + \text{etc.}$$

"in which the terms are arranged according to the ascending powers of y , and in which A, B, C, D , etc., are independent of y , but functions of x , and dependent on all the constants which enter the primitive function." All of which is intelligible to the man who has mastered the differential calculus! But to require a learner to apprehend it, almost necessarily leads to the result that not one pupil in five ever does thoroughly understand Taylor's Theorem. Nor is it credible that Dr. Goode Taylor made his beautiful discovery in any such inverted manner.

What an immense pity, then, that Hamilton had not systematised and completed his *New Analytic*! Brief schemes, fragmentary thoughts, and acute criticisms on isolated passages, all

huddled together into an Appendix, furnish the hints for the coveted system of Logic which shall begin at the foundation and end with the dome of the science. Professor Bowen has accomplished something, and deserves the thanks of the scientific world for what he has accomplished toward superinducing order into the chaos of valuable materials. President McCosh says, (Preface, p. v.): "The clearest account of the new Logic is to be found, not in Hamilton's own lectures which were left in a crude state, but in the *Logic* of Professor Bowen of Harvard College."

The most direct and satisfactory method that occurs to our own mind is, to divide ratiocination into three parts: 1st. From particulars to particulars. 2d. From particulars to generals, or induction. 3d. From generals to particulars, or deduction. It is the first of these three that has been so much overlooked; and yet it will throw a flood of light upon the other two, if it be but rightly handled. The relation which I have considered is that of equality. "An affirmative proposition is simply the declaration of an equation, a negative proposition is simply the declaration of a non-equation of its terms." "A proposition is simply an equation." Hamilton's Appendix, 515, 525.

This would need some amplification. The door may be wider or narrower than the piano. All differences in degree need not be treated as negatives. The countless relations of individual objects seldom exhibit an absolute equality. One piece of cloth is finer or coarser than another; the blue of the sky overhead is more intense than that of the horizon; Demosthenes was more impassioned; Cicero, more copious; Raphael was more graceful in his forms; Titian more exquisite in his coloring. We cannot enter into this, as we are writing only an article, and not a treatise.

As soon as we introduced general propositions, the "quantification of the predicate" would require consideration, in connection with the limitations of human thought. Also the *vezata questio* relative to the origin and limits of our belief in the uniformity of the laws of nature.

Under the third division, the Aristotelian logic, purged of

any imperfections, and connected with the former departments of the science.

We leave this task to abler pens. Meanwhile the logician will readily excuse a little badinage in this article, if it shall have cajoled into reading it, those who deem Logic so very dry and unentertaining a subject.

ARTICLE III.

ROMANS VI. 4, AND COLOSSIANS II. 12, AND THE BAPTIST CONTROVERSY.

It is proposed to consider the only Scripture texts upon which the Immersionists found their doctrine, that baptism is commemorative of Christ's burial, and that in the "Katadusis" and "Anadusis" of Immersion, his descent into and ascent out of the grave are signified. As an *à priori* argument against this view of baptism, it shall be first shown that, according to the words of Christ himself, and the understanding of the same by his apostles, baptism signified the "washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost;" and that baptize and baptism are essentially "ethical" terms, having no reference to any particular mode, but denoting that the subjects are brought into a certain moral (or spiritual) state as respects that thing (as "repentance" or "death," Rom. vi. 4,) or that person (as Christ, or Paul, or Moses,) into which they were baptized. For this will show that the sacrament is *prospective*, and not retrospective as the immersionists maintain.

I. Our Lord assembled the disciples together just before his departure, and commanded them, (Acts i. 4, 5)—"To wait for the promise of the Father, which ye have heard of me; for John truly baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost." It is evident what *the promise* is—*baptism with*, (or *in*, for such is the Greek preposition,) *the Holy Ghost*. It is also

plain, from the connection in which Christ puts John's *baptism with water*, and the Father's *baptism with the Holy Ghost*, that there is some significant relation between them. Can any other be supposed than that of one being the *sign, type*, prophetic intimation, of the other? Is it not plain that John's *baptism with water* bears the same relation to the Father's *baptism with the Holy Ghost*, that the blood of sprinkling, under the old dispensation, bore to the blood of Christ? Does not the analogy of Scripture force us so to regard them?—that just as the blood of sprinkling, in sanctifying to the purifying of the flesh, was a sign prophetic of the blood of Christ purging the conscience from dead works to serve the living God, (Heb. ix. 13, 14); so baptism with water in its purifying (or “washing,” Tit. iii. 6,) of the flesh, was a sign of the sanctifying power of the Holy Ghost, in quickening us “to walk in newness of life?” Remember, too, how God had declared from the very beginning, that when the wicked should turn away from his sins unto Him in repentance and faith, the past should be remembered no more against him; but that he should begin as it were a *new existence*, be as “one alive from the dead;” that *he should never again be identified with his old self*, which should be “reckoned as dead.” And God, to impress this more forcibly upon the minds of men, embodied it in a sign; for since man uses his senses more than his intellect, and all the ideas he receives into his mind come through the channel of the senses, this embodying of a spiritual truth in a sensible sign, was giving man a hold upon it, making it more easily recalled to memory; and by the assistance of the imagination it could be held up more vividly to the mind when recalled; and also by the illustrative analogies it afforded, the sign was more pregnant with truth than an abstract proposition expressed in words could possibly have been. This was the *rationalé* (in great part at least) of form and ceremony under the old dispensation. The death of the victims in sacrifice, and the purifying sprinklings consequent thereto, all signified (in addition to typifying the efficacious ground upon which they rested) the death of the past, the new life of the future. But after the coming of the better Sacrifice (Heb. ix.) and the true and real

had taken the place of the type and shadow, in harmony with the spiritual dispensation now established, the sign was made as simple as sign could be; but still was retained because the language used was derived from the sign, was metaphorical, and as such could, by the vast majority of mankind, be better understood through the *emblematic import* of the sign. In accordance with these signs the language of the prophets was determined. The new spiritual dispensation was prophesied by them under the same figures in which it had been typified. Ezekiel says, (xxxvi. 25-29): "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you and ye shall be clean—a new heart will I give you, and a new Spirit will I put within you—and I will put my Spirit within you." Jeremiah says: "And I will cleanse them from all their iniquity whereby they have sinned against me; and I will pardon all their iniquities." Isaiah says, (lii. 15): "So shall he sprinkle many nations"—alluding to the cleansing under the old dispensation, and not (as we regret to say we sometimes hear Pedo-Baptists argue) to the form of baptism under the new dispensation. The same idea is still further carried out in such prophecies as Isaiah xlv. 3: "I will pour my Spirit upon thy seed." In Joel ii. 28, 29: "It shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh—and also upon the servants and upon the handmaids in those days will I pour out my Spirit." Zechariah has it, (xii. 10): "I will pour upon the house of David and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem the Spirit of grace and supplication." St. Paul expresses the same idea in Titus iii. 5, 6: "According to his own mercy he saved us through the *washing of regeneration*, and renewing of the Holy Ghost, which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour." And so St. Peter (1 Peter iii. 21): "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ."

It is difficult to see how anything else can be gathered from this, than that in this last address of our Lord to his disciples, the *promise of the Father* is that contained in the above prophecies, and that the *baptism of John* was significant of it. And

if so, it follows that *to be baptized with the Holy Ghost* fulfils the promise of the *pouring out of the Spirit, of sprinkling clean water upon the people, and cleansing them from their iniquities*; (language significant, as immediately afterwards appears, of) putting a new heart within them, and putting his Spirit within them.

But let us see how the disciples understood it. They obeyed their Lord's command not to depart from Jerusalem until they had received the *promise of the Father*; and on the day of Pentecost they were *baptized with the Holy Ghost*. And Peter standing up with the eleven declared unto the Jews, that "This is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel; and it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh:—and on my servants and on my handmaidens I will pour out in those days of my Spirit." And that Jesus Christ, "being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the *Father the promise of the Holy Ghost*, hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear." (The word translated *shed forth* in verse 33, is the same as that rendered *pour out* in verses 17, 18.) And in chap. x. of Acts, where St. Peter visits Cornelius and preaches Christ to him; "while Peter yet spake, the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word; and they of the circumcision were astonished, because that on the Gentiles also *was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost*." And Peter naturally concluding, that since they had the thing signified, it was absurd to withhold the sign, said: "Can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?" But what makes it still more evident that Peter held the opinion which has been maintained above is, the account he gives of his visit to Cornelius before the apostles and brethren in Jerusalem; in which he says: "As I began to speak, the Holy Ghost fell on them as on us at the beginning; then remembered I the word of the Lord, how he said, John indeed baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost."

Now from all that has gone before, we deduce the following short and simple proof, that *pouring, or shedding, or sprinkling,*

or letting water fall upon one in the name of the Trinity, is valid Scripture baptism. If these terms are used in reference to the Holy Spirit, in promise, prophecy, and fulfilment, and called *baptism with the Holy Ghost*; then, when these same terms are used in reference to water in its sacred significance or symbolism, it is *baptism with water*. If that occurrence or transaction which is called a *pouring*, a *sprinkling*, a *falling* of the Spirit, is also called a baptism in or with the Spirit; then that transaction which is called (or is) a *sprinkling*, etc., of water in this sacred significance, is a baptism with or in water. If those upon whom the Spirit *fell*, *was poured out*, were *baptized with the Spirit*; those upon whom water *is poured out* or *falls* (from the hand) in sacramental use, are *baptized in* or *with water*.

Suppose we were to put the words immerse and immersion for *baptize*, *baptism*, etc., as the Immersionists attempted; it is evident that we would have to accommodate these new words to what we have seen to be the analogy of Scripture, and give them such a meaning as would embrace *pouring*, *sprinkling*, etc.; for they would have to refer to what is described under these terms. What then would be gained by such a change?

The Campbellites and Baptists have charged Pedo-Baptists with *materializing* the Spirit, by using such arguments. The charge is made against the sacred writers, not ourselves; and it is not our business just now to defend their language, but to expound it. Suffice it to say, they wrote for people who had the sense to interpret metaphorical language in such a way as not to destroy the sign or figure, but save it. *Baptism* and its correlatives are *ethical* terms. (It is difficult to give a definition of that word; but the student of Ellicott's Commentaries can gather the import of it.) *Baptism* is not descriptive of a mode or fashion of water-application, but of a moral condition into which the subject is brought; externally by the rite, internally by the spiritual change it signifies. Necessarily, therefore, if it ever expressed a particular form of water-application, its *ethical* use would give it a meaning accommodated to its new relations. We also see that this question, of its original meaning and use,

is of no importance to the Immersionist controversy. What is its *ethical* meaning is alone worthy of consideration. A plain illustration will prove this. The word *strike* had originally the meaning of *to hit, to give a blow with the hand, or a stick or any instrument*; now suppose a tobacco planter to order his hands *to strike tobacco*, or the captain of a ship to order the seamen to strike a yard or a top-mast in a gale, and the first should hit the tobacco, and the sailors the yard or mast, a blow, and then appeal to the ancient meaning of the word to justify their course. It would be no more absurd than the ground taken by the Immersionists, that because *baptize* originally (which is by no means admitted) had no other meaning than *immerse*, it could never have.

II. With these *à priori* arguments against the Immersionists' interpretation of Rom. vi. 1-11, and Colossians ii. 12, let us consider these passages themselves, and see if our opponents have not been determined by *à priori* considerations of their own to take the view they do of these texts.

1. The true sense of a verse or phrase is best found when considered in the light of its context. An exegesis of Rom. vi. 1-11 will therefore be given, that the reader may understand the meaning of these controverted terms, by seeing them in their bearing upon the argument of the Apostle; and then determine, whether they are wrested or not from this true meaning by the Immersionists. The Apostle, in replying to the objection that "salvation through the righteousness of another without any regard to personal holiness, is assured to the believer," says: "God forbid! how shall we who have died to sin live any longer therein?" It is the Apostle's style to put the strongest asseverations, especially denials, into the form of questions. As in chap. viii. 32: "He that spared not his own Son but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?" And in verse 33: "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect?" and verses 34, 35: "Who is he that condemneth? Who shall separate us from the love of Christ?" And also in other places, the question: "How shall they who died to sin live any longer therein?" is, therefore, a vehement denial that they will

do so. (Instead of the English version *dead unto sin*, which conveys a wrong idea, the now universally received rendering "*died unto sin*," is taken.) It is of the first importance to determine the meaning of this expression *died unto sin*; for here hinges the right understanding of the whole chapter.

(1.) In the first place, it is very certain that it cannot refer to the subjective condition of the believer—to the state of his soul as regards sin; it cannot mean that he is *dead to its influences*; for if this were the meaning, no right-minded Christian could take any part of this discourse to himself, since, according to the very next chapter, he "groans to be delivered from the body of this death;" and therefore this chapter would fail of the purpose the Apostle had therein—to encourage and exhort believers to their sanctification.

(2.) In the next place, it is a well known rule of exegesis, that the meaning of a doubtful expression in one part of a writing, should be determined by that which it *necessarily* bears in another. And that there may be consistency in the argument of this chapter, the nature of this *death unto sin* must be the same throughout. Hence when the Apostle says in the 10th verse that *Christ died unto sin*, and in the 8th verse, that *we died with Christ*, we know the meaning must be one and the same. Now there was but one way in which *Christ died unto sin*, viz., to its guilt: the penalty for sin was *death*. Such penal evil as was commensurate to the demands of the law of God for its transgression had to be rendered before the guilty could be released, and declared free from the penalties of the law; then he was said to be *justified*, and in the eyes of the law (*i. e.*, judicially, *not personally*,) righteous. This, as the Apostle had shown in the previous chapters, had been rendered by Christ for those who believed in him as their representative; he took their place, and suffered all that the law required of them *in their stead*; so that, so far as the claims of law were concerned they were reckoned as having rendered it themselves. "Himself bare our sins in his own body on the tree." "But now, once in the end of the world, hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." He *died unto sin*, therefore, in suffering

that penalty for sin required of those he represented—which was *death*. Therefore the Apostle says in the 8th verse *we died with Christ*. Believers being regarded as one with Christ are reckoned as having done whatever he did to satisfy the law in their behalf; and hence verse 8th must mean *that death* which had such reference to the *guilt of sin* as to expiate it—satisfy the claims of the law for it. And to remove all doubt as to the true meaning of this phrase, the Apostle says in verse 7, *he that died is justified from sin*. So that the meaning of the expression *died unto sin* (in the English version *dead unto sin*) is certainly fixed; it is to “be justified freely by grace through the redemption of our Lord Jesus Christ,” (iii. 24); or as he had just stated in the fifth chap. 19th verse: “It is to be constituted righteous by the obedience of Christ.” And it was this statement which brought up the objection to the gospel mode of salvation considered in the present chapter. This objection we have seen to be, that a justification, without respect to the personal holiness of the believer, would take away all inducement to holiness, and give license to continue in sin. But the Apostle shows that the ground of this free justification is the true and only source of sanctification, viz., union with Christ. And that in the plan of salvation by grace, justification bears to sanctification the relation of *means to an end*; that the *first is in order to the second*; and that in the purpose of God, the second was as much contemplated as the first. Hence, instead of the doctrine of sanctification weakening the grounds of justification, it strengthened them; so much so, that in establishing the certainty of the believer’s sanctification, the Apostle does it upon the ground of his *union with Christ in that death* by which he satisfied the law for him (the believer), and upon the ground of which satisfaction he is justified. He says, verse 3: “Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death? We were buried therefore with him by this baptism into death, in order that, as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, so also we should walk in newness of life.” “To be baptized into Christ” denotes union and communion with him—an incorporation into his mystical body: “it

ever implies a spiritual and mystical union with him in whose name the sacrament was administered." (Ellicott on Gal. iii. 26.) Thus in the passage referred to the Apostle says: "As many as were baptized into Christ put on Christ," where "to put on Christ" is 'a strong expression denoting the complete assumption of the person' of Christ (Ellicott in loc.), and is exegetical of the preceding phrase as well as 'confirmatory.' We also see the ethical meaning of the term baptism or baptize; it denotes that the subjects of this rite are brought into a moral (or mystical or spiritual) state as respects the persons, or grace, (as repenting) or law-requirement (as 'death') 'into which' they are baptized. This *ethical* meaning of *baptize* is well seen in 1 Cor. xii. 13: "For with (*in* or *by*) one Spirit, we were all baptized into one body;" where the moral (or spiritual) condition into which the subjects are brought, is the very point of the passage. Hence, in this third verse, the Apostle means that we were brought into such a relation to Christ and his death, that he and we are one, and his death is our death: and that this union with him was so close and intimate that not only did this baptism into his death make us (in the eyes of the law) to have died with him, but "we were also buried with him" by this baptism—into—death. He dwells with great emphasis upon the closeness and reality of this union of the believer with Christ, because it is the alone foundation of his attaining unto holiness; and so he declares that, not only did we die with him, but we were buried with him. The burial of Christ and his remaining in the tomb was proof that he really did die; and so the Apostle makes our union with Christ to extend to every circumstance connected with that death by which our deliverance was procured. If Christ's burial and remaining in the grave three days was proof that he died unto sin; it is also proof that we died unto sin. Furthermore: we were not only united with him in his death and burial, but also in his resurrection; and this union with Christ in his resurrection is as much dwelt upon here and in other parts of Scripture as union with him in death. And it is our being raised together with Christ that is set forth as the immediate procuring cause of our sanctification. The student

of the Bible will find this in almost every Epistle in the New Testament. But nowhere is it more fully set forth than in the very passage under consideration. The Apostle declares that as Christ died only to rise again by the glory of the Father, so we die in him (by virtue of our union with him) to walk in newness of life; *i. e.*, as new creatures; the adjective *new* changed into the substantive *newness*, "in order to give greater prominence to the main idea," that the life is a new one, the old one is dead. See Winer's *Gr.* on this idiom, p. 236.) And in thus showing that the holiness of the believer held the same place in the purpose of God with the raising of Christ from the dead—that as Christ only died to rise in glory, and live unto and with the Father in that glory he had with him before the world was; so the believer only dies to sin (*i. e.*, is justified) in order to "apprehend that (holiness) for which he is apprehended of God." The Apostle implies that the one (the resurrection of Christ) is proof, and earnest of the other, (the believer's holiness.)

It will be understood why the Apostle ascribes so much to baptism unto Christ, and unto his death, when we remember that baptism is not only significative of the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost, as was shown above; but in the nature of the case is also expressive of the faith of the subject, whereby he receives Christ, and rests upon him alone for salvation; *i. e.*, it is a profession; and the divinely appointed mode of making that profession before the world and the Church. And since the Scriptures always exercise the judgment of charity, and assume that profession is real, and expresses the true state of the heart, professors by baptism were addressed as true believers, and their profession by baptism assumed to stand in the same relation to faith that words do to thoughts, and hence it is here put for faith. This putting the sign for the thing signified is one of the most common figures of speech in the Scriptures, as the "blood of sprinkling speaketh better things than the blood of Able:" "we are come unto Mt. Zion," etc., etc. So the Apostle only declares here, what he has so often done elsewhere, that it is *by faith* we are united with Christ so as to reap the blessed fruits of his death.

But the Apostle is so earnest in maintaining the fundamental truth of the gospel—union with Christ the source of all its blessing—that he brings it up again in the next verse, the 5th. The English version reads: "For if we have been *planted together* in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection." The word rendered *planted together* was mistranslated, from a mistaken derivation of the word from a verb signifying *to plant*, which however is spelt differently: the word *to plant* has another form altogether.

Dr. Hodge says of the word in the text: "that it sometimes means *born with*, in the sense of *innate*; sometimes expresses community of origin or nature, in the sense of cognate, congenital; and sometimes it is used in reference to things born or produced at the same time. In all cases there is the idea of intimate union, and that is the idea which the word here is intended to express." It can be added, that this word is one of the strongest that a language, rich in variety and force of expression, could furnish the Apostle, to express the idea of "union with;" and if *identified* is the strongest term the English affords to express it, let it be *identified*; if a stronger can be found use that.

The following translation of this verse is proposed, differing from the English version, and also from Dr. Hodge: "If we have been identified with him, by the likeness of his death, we shall be also (by the likeness) of his resurrection." The original is rendered *by the likeness*, because the preposition does not occur in the Greek; and the dative is taken as dative of *instrument*, not of reference. And an exegesis of the verse is now offered, which, so far as the writer is aware, has never been offered before. The word *likeness*, as it occurs in the original, is used in four other places by the Apostle. In chap. i. 23, the heathen are said "to have exchanged the glory of the incorruptible God for the likeness of the image of corruptible man," *i. e.*, an image like to corruptible man. In chap. v. 14, it is said, "Death reigned even over those who did not sin after the similitude (likeness) of Adam's transgression," *i. e.*, infants, who, though they did sin putatively (in Adam), yet did not sin the

same kind of sin that Adam sinned, viz., an actual, personal sin. In chap. viii. 3: "God sent his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh," *i. e.*, a nature like our sinful nature, but not itself sinful. In the Epistle to the Philippians ii. 7, it is said that Christ "took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men." "The expression *in the likeness of men*," says Ellicott, "is very noticeable; Christ, though perfect man, was still not a mere man, (a *ψιλὸς ἀνθρώπος*, *psilos anthropos*,) but was the word become flesh." The general idea in these texts is *likeness* of some sort or other between different things. It may denote any sort of resemblance, the kind to be determined by the subject or context. We would call the likeness in the verse under consideration, an *ethical likeness*. It cannot be said, (with Dr. Hodge,) that "believers are united with Christ in a like death," *i. e.*, in a death like his; for the very point of the Apostle's argument is, that, being federally or putatively in Christ, his death was, to all the intents and purposes thereof, our death; in the eyes of the law we died the same identical death, not a death like his; and we have seen that the use of the word in question is, that of one thing like to another thing which is not the same. The likeness here intended is that of the *sign* to the *thing signified*. And what is the sign and seal to us that the death of Christ is ours; that we are united *not in a similar death*, but in *his very death*? What is it but *baptism* as expressive of the faith by which we are made one with Christ, ("identified with him,") and significative of the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost consequent upon that union? The likeness of his death must therefore mean *baptism* in the sense we saw it was used in the 3d and 4th verses: the sign again put for the thing signified. The second clause of this verse may therefore be thus rendered: *we shall also be united (or identified) with him by that which is like his resurrection*; and evidently refers to the holy life believers will lead in consequence of their union with Christ. A holy life is (ethically) like the resurrection of Christ, because it implies and involves for the believer, what the resurrection of Christ declares for himself, viz., the enjoyment of God's favor through the expi-

ation of sin and satisfaction of the law. Hence, since Christ was declared to be the Son of God, by the resurrection from the dead, Rom. i. 4, we in virtue of a holy life, implying that we are "led by the Spirit of God," are declared to be "sons of God," (viii. 14-17.)

It is evident to the careful reader of this Epistle, that this passage (Rom. vi. 1-11) in logical order, follows the 11th verse of chap. v., and that chap. v. 12-21 is a parenthetical illustration of salvation by imputed righteousness by the analogous fact of imputed guilt. Paul had summed up the conclusions he had reached in the first four chapters, into the blessed declarations, chap. v. 8-11: "God commendeth his love towards us, in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us; much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him. For, if when we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his son; much more being reconciled we shall be saved by his life. And we joy in our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the atonement." In the next passage (v. 12-21): He illustrates this method of salvation, by showing it was exactly analogous to the method by which we came under condemnation, *i. e.*, that the death of Christ procures salvation for us without any personal participation of ours, just as Adam's sin brought upon us condemnation without any personal participation therein;—that in both cases it was through imputation. In chap. vi. 1-11, he answers the charge of Antinomianism brought against this doctrine in the manner already considered. And it is evident to any who will read these passages in connection, that the prominent thought is "the death of Christ, and the believer's participation in its benefits" through union with him:—that instead of salvation by faith being a doctrine which militates against holiness, it directly leads to it in the very purpose of God; for not only "they who are of faith" die with Christ, but they shall also live with him (verse 8) in virtue of this union.

Anything therefore which would divert the attention from this main idea, (union with Christ in death, by faith,) weakens the argument of the Apostle. Now, is it not clear that, to save

the force and coherency of the Apostle's argument, these expressions: baptism into Christ; baptized into his death; buried with him, by the baptism into (the) death; (notice the peculiar force and significance of the article in the Greek) must all have reference to the union by faith with Christ in his death? and therefore they cannot be understood to divert attention from the spiritual exercise of faith, to the "unprofitable bodily exercise of immersion? Moreover the Apostle declares, verse 5th, that baptism is like (ethically) the death of Christ, in that the faith in him of which it is the expression brings to us the benefits procured by him through his death. Now, can any Immersionist show wherein his *dipping* is like the *death* of Christ? He might make out some sort of case in trying to show a likeness between immersion and the manner of a burial Christ did not have. But the Apostle declares that it is Christ's *death, not his burial*, that baptism is like; and where is there any external resemblance between his *death* and *immersion*? We respectfully ask the advocates of immersion to consider this. There are many such who do not regard immersion as commemorative of Christ's burial, and yet regard it as the only mode of baptism, because they hold that baptize means immerse, and nothing else; and that it was the only mode of the primitive Church. We are not discussing that question now. We are only contending for the fidelity of an exegesis; and would have them see that however it may affect the question as to whether baptism be referred to, in this passage, as a sign commemorative of Christ's burial, it really leaves undetermined the question as to which is the proper mode. We seek the true meaning of this passage, and the import of its terms; and as a student in exegesis contend that the use of these terms, and their reference is ethical; and that their reference is not to any external form; nether to our mode, nor to theirs.

2. The analogy between Rom. vi. 1-11, and Col. ii. 10-12, is so complete, that what has been established in reference to the former, applies equally to the latter. The Apostle was guarding the Colossians against the thought that they needed anything besides Christ, and so declares: "Ye are complete in

him,—in whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of [the sins of] the flesh, in the circumcision of Christ; buried with him in baptism, in whom ye are also risen together through faith in the effectual working of God who raised him from the dead. The Apostle assures these believers that they did not need circumcision, because they had *in Christ* all that was signified by the rite, viz., “the putting off the body of the flesh.” Taking this reading as the true text: the *body of the flesh* is synonymous with the *body of sin* in Rom. vi. 6, and *sinful flesh* of Rom. viii. 3, and denotes that reign of sin in death (Rom. v. 21) from which Christ delivered us into the “reign of grace through righteousness unto eternal life.” Death, in Scripture language, is any punishment inflicted on account of sin. To be deprived of God’s favor and presence in his Spirit, is a punishment visited upon us for sin; and since the consequence of this is “carnal-mindedness,” “carnal-mindedness is death,” *i. e.*, punishment for our sin, (Rom. viii. 6.) But 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, (Rom. viii. 3, 4.) Now this work of Christ is doing away with sin, the Apostle calls here (in Col. iii. 11) the circumcision of Christ; for it was this “doing away with the body of sin” (Rom. vi. 6) which the rite of circumcision typified and signified; and is another instance of the sign put for the thing signified. And he goes on “to define the manner in which the circumcision of Christ was communicated to the believer” in verse 12, (which is therefore a defining, “modal,” participial clause):* “When ye were buried with him in baptism, in whom (not wherein as Ellicott says) ye were also raised up with him, through faith in the effectual working of God who raised him from the dead,” etc. It is impossible for two different passages to be more identical in meaning than this and Rom. vi. 1–11. And if we will remember that

*Ellicott.

either Paul or his fellow-laborers had preached these doctrines to the Colossians and had not done so to the Romans, and that the Epistle to the former was written long after that to the latter, we can understand how he would be more full and explicit in his treatment thereof to the latter; and that in addressing the former (Colossians), allusion was all that was necessary. Call to mind, also, that in those days the additions to the Church were adults, and that those who joined were required to make a profession of faith in Christ by baptism, and it will be seen at once that baptism was synonymous with faith in Christ; for the very ordeal of public confession was generally a sufficient test of its genuineness; and that, at all events, the "judgment of charity" was used, and profession taken as sincere. Hence baptism means here just what it did in Rom. vi. 3, 4.

It is evident to those who are accustomed to the Apostle's style, that he used the expression *buried with him* (verse 12) instead of *died with him*, to preserve the antithesis to the resurrection of the next clause, and to emphasize, as in Rom. vi. 4, the fact that they had really died with Christ, since they were buried with him. And hence there are the same objections against giving the term any reference to the form of immersion here that there were in Romans vi.

ARTICLE IV.

METHOD OF THE ARGUMENT FOR THE EXISTENCE OF GOD.

The logical proof of the existence of a personal First Cause, is rendered difficult to theologians by the imperfection of language, rather than a deficiency of evidence. Almost all the efforts that have been made to perfect the demonstration in a written form, betray the most obvious inconsistencies in the terms employed, even where the force of the argument has been

such as to confound all opposition. In fact, it is impossible, in the nature of things, to apply terms long associated with finite objects, to a subject so far above the reach of human thought. All ordinary language belongs to matters of experience or observation. When put into requisition to define or illustrate the first truths of theological science, it proves inadequate to its new office, and introduces confusion, where precision is a matter of the first importance.

To construct a clear statement, free from these difficulties, will not of course be now attempted. But perhaps we may, without presumption, *indicate* the line of argument which seems to us most appropriate and practical, and at the same time endeavor to exclude those terms and expressions which appear ill-suited to such a theme. The atheistical tendencies of scientific literature in our day, is a sufficient reason for the undertaking. And especially is this true, in view of the character of those concealed approaches by which religion is assailed. Direct collision is carefully avoided, but the arts of suggestion and insinuation, under the guise of liberality and candor, are freely used, for the purpose of undermining the foundations of faith. To prove the non-existence of Deity, is not openly attempted; but criticism is employed in pointing out flaws and imperfections in the arguments of Christian writers, and difficulties are raised and magnified in such a manner as to reveal a spirit of antagonism to religion irreconcilable with any degree of belief. It is a remarkable feature of the prevailing scepticism, that whilst it exacts from theologians a perfect consistency, and condemns every religious doctrine which cannot be maintained by a complete chain of logical inductions, it seems to be totally indifferent to consistency in the various theories of science which rise and fall in such rapid succession. So credulous is this spirit, so prompt to embrace the crudest and least plausible suggestions of adventurers in the field of physical observation, that the superstitions of the pagan become highly rational in comparison. The temporary successes of many of these theories are simply due to the general spirit of unbelief pervading society. Human nature seems to demand a rigorous logic in nothing but matters of faith.

It is satisfied, and even delighted, with the mere suggestion of scientific conjecture which apparently contradicts the text of revelation. With a generosity and reverence altogether out of proportion to their object, it readily exalts to the rank of scientific celebrity, each new dreamer who proposes an original theory; and it thus pays an absurd homage to pretensions which are not likely to survive the generation in which they are promulgated.

One of the chief errors committed by this class of thinkers is, the assumed necessity of a formal demonstration. They imagine that the masses of mankind derive their rational convictions from the enlightened few, and that these have imposed upon the world a theory of religion unsupported by facts. But, in reality, the almost universal belief in the existence of God originated in the laws of thought common to men. The specific idea is not, indeed, co-existent with the mind, but derived by a short and very early induction from the consciousness of the individual. There are certain beliefs which once acquired cannot be eradicated, on account of their conformity with the natural tendencies of the intelligence. The mind has a *nidus* for these truths, a *matrix* into which they fit, as the nut is adapted to the screw; and they cannot be dislodged without creating a painful void in our spiritual nature. The thought of Deity is one of these congenial acquisitions to which the reason clings with unchanging tenacity, even against the conflicting force of moral opposition. How it is first acquired is not easily described, because the process is too short for a lucid analysis. The science of natural theology is the systematic development of this analysis in a form indicated by logical principles. But the development has nothing to do with the origin of the belief. It is chiefly for the instructors of mankind to provide them with an armor, defensive and offensive, adapted to the ever-pending conflict between the friends and the enemies of faith. The logical chain is too long and elaborate for the apprehension of ordinary minds, and it is obviously absurd for a popular creed to be suspended upon it. The world cannot afford to suppress its religious thought until the labor is perfected. Much less can it be expected to await the slow processes of physical research. Such an abnegation, pro-

longed from age to age, until geology and astronomy shall have reached the limit of human investigation, would be from the first a total abandonment of religious habits and principles, and in fact a complete surrender of the question at issue. The knowledge of God in its simplest and most popular form, is not a scientific acquisition, but an immediate deduction of the mind from the indications of nature and consciousness. If the disc of the sun were concealed, the convergence of all his rays towards a common centre would satisfy mankind of his continued existence. It is precisely so with the suggestions made by all that we observe around us. The pointers are innumerable that lead to the central star. God is not *sensibly* perceived, but inferred from overwhelming signs which are sensibly known. Atheism, if it be entirely possible, is possible only through the force of effort strenuously made to overcome these impressions. A complete atheist, like a perfect soldier, is the result of laborious discipline. For by this process the moral and intellectual man becomes a machine, indifferent to slaughter and to death. And by a similar ordeal, religious impressions are gradually obliterated and every spiritual tendency suppressed in some misguided minds.

But although a demonstration of Deity, in a strictly logical form is exceedingly difficult, it is by no means impossible. The process, when expressed in language, is liable to be encumbered with forms borrowed from the finite, and inapplicable to the infinite; but we do not necessarily think in a stereotyped phraseology. The subject demands a careful exclusion of certain terms which are not indispensable, and a certain precise order of the links of the chain we are constructing, which simplicity of design alone can secure. Nothing must be contemplated but the single point to be attained—the bare existence of God as an infinite and personal Being.

1. The corner-stone of the structure to which we give the name of natural theology, is our own personal consciousness. This is twofold. It of course embraces an immediate knowledge of our own existence. And if this were all, it would be sufficient for a foundation. For the simple fact of a present exist-

ence intuitively known, leads by infallible reasoning, to the fact of one eternal cause. But it is not universally admitted that existence exterior to, or distinct from ourselves, is also an intuition of consciousness. This however, whilst not absolutely essential, is an important element of the argument. An admission of its truth shortens very appreciably the process of demonstration. Nor is the fact ever questioned by any ordinary mind. Metaphysicians have indeed labored to prove that our perception of an external world is mediate. But the common intelligence of mankind knows of no medium in the case. The conviction that other objects exist, is no less immediate and unquestionable than the conviction of our own being. But the fact itself is not simply to be inferred from the convictions of mankind. It is unavoidably obtrusive. We may appeal to experience, to show that the cognition of *self* is necessarily relative. It is granted on all hands that space and time are necessary conditions of thought. But is there not another necessary condition? Can we think of our own existence unrelated to other existences? It is experimentally impossible. Whatever abstract views we may entertain, it is certain that, in the created mind, no consciousness of *self* can be conceived of as anterior to, and independent of, the knowledge of other things. And even on the hypothesis of mediate perception, it may well be maintained that our knowledge of the external world is quite as positive as our consciousness of being; since we cannot discover in experience that our confidence in the one is less than our confidence in the other. A conviction created by consciousness is not, and cannot be stronger than a conviction induced by laws of thought universally operative. And this is the testimony of all intelligent nature, that we cannot by any effort of the will introduce doubt into our conscious belief of an external world. Practically, therefore, this conviction is equivalent to conscious self-existence. And we may use the double truth of subjective and objective existence as the basis of a demonstration of the existence of God. But we have a right to every advantage which experience affords, and should not hesitate to plant our feet upon the higher ground, that *relativity* is

a condition of thought equally necessary with space and time. If the truth of this assertion should be questioned in the face of experience, we may properly leave the *onus probandi* to be borne by those who assail it.

It is however not absolutely essential to the argument that an external world should be admitted. The single fact of our own personal existence furnishes a sufficient point of suspension for the entire chain. To those who sport with language on the brink of universal scepticism, we pay no respect, no attention whatever. The pantheist, who dreams of human existence as merely a part or a mode of the divine universe, and thus merges the personality of man in the impersonality of nature, may indulge his choice *ad libitum*, without the hazard of refutation. Such fancies are beneath the notice of reason. They contradict all knowledge. They deny all possible *data*. The axioms of magnitude and numbers, no less than the primary truths of religion, are ignored or despised by the class of minds to which we refer. Reasoning is practicable only with those who recognise certain principles of thought, and if our own existence be not such a principle, no other can be found. Here then we rest in this natural and universal postulate, that we ourselves exist. Were we driven from every other position, this would remain impregnable.

2. The second link in the chain is none the less distinct, because it is inferential. The law of thought imperatively requires the deduction of an eternal, from a known temporal existence. We are not only conscious of present existence, but of the fact that this consciousness had a beginning. There was a time when we were not. The dream of past existence in a different state, simply violates our conscious identity. Our whole discussion must be confined to the present sphere. The negative dictates of our spiritual nature are no less conclusive than its positive principles. But this negation of an eternal existence of man is universal and unquestionable. It is simply impossible for us to entertain the thought, that personally we have existed from eternity. But no less positive is the law that the temporal cannot originate itself. An absolute beginning without

a cause is inconceivable. Assuming a period in the past when nothing existed, it is altogether impossible to imagine existence commencing. Reasoning therefore within the limits of our possible thoughts, we can only think of existence as eternal. It is true that the mind is equally impotent in this direction. We cannot compass eternity in thought. We are placed between two incompatible extremes, two logical contradictories—the uncaused finite, and the uncaused infinite. But this position is not one of embarrassment. The logical postulate upon which we proceed, relates to the finite, and not to the infinite. This law of thought applies only to limited being. According to it, the temporal must have a cause. But causation as applied to the infinite is absurd. The very terms we employ necessarily restrict us to that which has a beginning. The familiar aphorism that “every effect must have a cause,” refers as a matter of course to transient phenomena, and has never excluded from human belief the existence of something from eternity. We say, therefore, with confidence that the mind, placed between the alternations of an absolute, uncaused commencement of being, and an eternal and independent existence, however unable to conceive of either, will not hesitate to embrace the latter as a congenial truth that satisfies a thousand demands of our spiritual nature. For a belief of the infinite is according to the inclination of the intelligence, whilst the thought of finite existence, springing out of nothing, without a cause, is repugnant to its native principles.

And here we must distinguish between our acquired beliefs, and those suggestions which are uniformly rejected. For the natural reason has its tendencies of selection among the objects brought before it. When they are all equally new and above comprehension, the intellect has the power of distinguishing the true from the false by the adaptation of the former to its own demands. It may be called instinct or intuition. It is unquestionably true that such a gift is enjoyed, and often, under the name of common sense, illustrates its discernment in the midst of trials which baffle the resources of logic and experience. Upon this mysterious principle we would rely for the determi-

nation of the mind upon the point before us. We cannot doubt that every unsophisticated person would at once reject the suggestion of uncaused phenomena, and adopt the alternative of eternal being. Such in fact is the universal conclusion of mankind, whether Christian or infidel. For even the atheist substitutes an eternal nature for an eternal Deity. Rarely, if ever, has a sound mind ever ventured to defend the contrary hypothesis.

3. The deduction therefore will not be questioned, that our own existence proves an eternal substance, whatever it may be. But at this point, scepticism has dared to suggest the possibility of an infinite series of finite phenomena. In a certain sense this is a plausible suggestion. But is it sound? Is there any such thing as an infinite series, as a thing distinct from the objects of which it is composed? If not, the numerical infinitude of the series cannot give it any quality which is not in the links themselves. And if the series is sufficient to account for the phenomena, each cause will be sufficient for its own immediate effect. Hence we would justly conclude that the parents are an adequate cause of the offspring, which is obviously untrue, atheists themselves being judges. It is nowhere pretended that physical generation accounts for the mysterious production of a human being, with its marvellous endowments and splendid powers. We might here ask a thousand questions for which nature has no solution. As for example, what is there in the animal constitution of the parents that can determine the proximate equality of the sexes? Take any single effect, with its immediate cause, and scrutinize it as thoroughly as possible, and the antecedent will invariably be found destitute of any sufficient power to account for the phenomenon. Philosophers will tell us of certain laws transmitted along the chain, by which the character of the phenomena is determined. But these laws are not in the links themselves. They are not present in the consciousness of the parent, nor discoverable in the organisation of the body. The balance in the numbers of the sexes is preserved throughout the race, although the greatest diversity prevails in the families of which it consists.

Again, let us consider another example. Different chemical compounds crystallize in different characteristic forms. The most rigid geometrical arrangements are imparted to them, as they pass from the liquid to the solid state. If the cause is in the series, it must be in the elements. But who can discover, or even imagine any relation between the solution and the resulting crystals? These forms are not only unlike the previous solutions, but also unlike the chemical substances from which they are obtained. The results have no analogy whatever with the alleged causes. Now it is altogether unphilosophical to maintain that the tendency to these peculiarities is an essential property of the elements, when there is not the slightest trace of them to be found, and when they bear no analogy whatever to those elements.

The existence of these tendencies cannot be denied, but the point is, that they do not inhere substantially in the links or in the series. They are laws, but not material laws. They cannot be accounted for. They are as mysterious as any of the secrets of nature, and we maintain that these laws are superior to the series which they so rigidly control.

An eternal succession of finite phenomena is simply a continuous addition of the same elements, and if these principles or tendencies were eternal properties of the series, they would be eternally in the elements themselves. Each cause and effect would contain them. But the parent is consciously unable to determine by volition the sex or other peculiarities of his child. Either his physical organisation possesses powers far superior to his intellectual endowments, or there is a law impressed upon it by some other intelligence which accounts for the result. But we do not wish to anticipate. The present question is, not whether the result demands a superior intelligence, but whether it does not demand a cause *extrinsic* to the series. We say it does. For unless we can admit the cause to be less than the effect, we must attribute the individual man to some cause greater than the mere animal nature in which he seems to originate, and trace the beautiful types of the various crystals to some influence of a higher nature than the unconscious elements from which

they are derived. As water cannot rise above its level, the effect cannot rise above the cause producing it.

But an equally conclusive objection to this hypothesis of an infinite series, is found in the terms of such a series. It is a succession of antecedents and consequents. Every series has a character impressed upon it by the terms in which it is stated. According to the theory, the point of origin is in the infinite past. But at that point, however distant, the same relation of antecedence and consequence must be found. The effect must follow the cause. But if the series is so characterized throughout its infinite extent, it is obvious that the efficient principle eternally antedates the result. The law of succession, therefore, implies by its own nature a causative force constantly anterior to the successive phenomena. The inquiring mind is compelled to pursue a backward course from link to link of the chain, and cannot be satisfied with the immediate cause of any phenomenon. The pursuit is of course vain, since the terms are innumerable. But it is natural and imperative, and plainly teaches us the great truth that causation lies back in the infinite past beyond the reach of finite intelligence.

One substantial verity emerges from this conflict of speculation, and stands forth defying the possibility of doubt. The temporal is due to the eternal. Even admitting the infinite series, an honest mind must acknowledge the dependence of the temporary phenomenon upon the infinite system to which it belongs. This system is (by hypothesis) eternal. Eternal laws and eternal principles are supposed to govern it. The phenomena are regulated by them. They are the true causes of all actual changes, and the stability of the universe depends upon their permanence.

Three great facts have so far been placed in succession before us, which unbelief, in its maddest mood, cannot assail—our own existence as temporal beings, the prior existence of something eternal, and the dependence of the temporal upon the eternal.

4. To say that the eternal is uncaused, independent, or necessary, would be a useless tautology. The eternal, whether one or many, spiritual or material, conscious or unconscious, cannot

have an antecedent. But necessity, if it is operative, must be anterior to its result. Neither causation nor necessity, therefore, can be predicated of that which had no beginning. The same objection lies against such expressions as "self-existent" and "self-active." They are inapplicable to the eternal. For self-existence implies a previous exercise of volition, and self-activity implies an activity which is due to self as a cause. The negative idea of *independence* is more appropriate, because it merely excludes restriction, and expresses the fact that the eternal does not owe its existence and character to any cause whatever. All that we can affirm of its existence is the bare fact. But the independence of the eternal, compels us to look within itself for the origin of all that does exist or occur. This single fact therefore is one of infinite importance—a link upon which all truth is suspended—a fountain of all the knowledge of which our minds are capable.

When we speak of the bare existence of the eternal, we mean of course its existence in the nature of its actual being. It is not an abstract existence, but a concrete essence or essences, distinct from the temporal forms that emanate from it. No exterior power has imparted its constitution, or impressed upon it its peculiar character. Its eternity is absolute. No change can be imagined in it, for there can be nothing independent of it to introduce a change, nor can it be supposed that it would or could violate its own essential nature by an act of volition. Nothing could be more contradictory than the thought that the eternal is the subject of a process of growth. It cannot acquire power, for the accumulation would imply an adequate power already. An absolute increase of its being in any direction, would lead to conclusions obviously inconsistent with its independence. Growth implies a power to grow. Development implies an inherent capacity of development, and an active principle sufficient to produce it. This of course is manifestly contradictory.

The eternal is therefore independent, in the sense of exemption from change. It is eternally the same. Its products in *esse*, always existed in *posse*. Its essential being makes no acquisitions or advancements. Its resources are all within itself.

The fountain of all dependent existence, and of all future phenomena in the spiritual or material world, is found alone within the compass of its infinite sphere.

5. We are led by the foregoing conclusions to the further deduction, that this Eternal Being contains within itself principles of activity which are not acquired. The temporal world is full of action which is traceable only to the infinite. Inertia cannot generate it. There must be at the source an adequate cause for the manifestation. Nothing but a primary principle of activity in the eternal, can account for the incessant continuance of transient phenomena. But if a cause is demanded, the same law of thought demands a *sufficient* cause. The force must be equal to the result. Hence we are compelled to attribute to the eternal a principle of action equal to the sum of the results in nature. We do not inquire whether this principle is conscious or not. Whether a voluntary power, or a fatal force, it is a necessary truth from which reason cannot escape. It is something more than inert matter. It acts with a tremendous energy in the universe. To it are alike due the permanence, the regularity, and the vicissitudes of nature. Types and varieties are equally the product of this inscrutable mystery. It is itself eternal, not the result of organisation, which implies a causative antecedent, but a principle co-existent with the essence of the Eternal Being. We will not affirm that it is identical with its substance, but that without it the substance could never have emerged from a state of bare existence to become an object of cognition.

It is obviously impossible to measure or estimate this energy of the Eternal Being. It is equal to the sum of its effects, but these effects are not determined. Whether the world is an effect or not, is still a question before us. Its phenomena are certainly to be so regarded, for whatever has a beginning must have a cause. It is immaterial to our inquiry from what source this conviction is derived. It may be the result of experience or the dictate of nature. The conviction is universal, and, if acquired, so perfectly accords with the laws of human thought that it can never be abandoned. A vast proportion of what we observe is

phenomenal, and therefore has a cause; but this cannot be affirmed of the universe. All we can at present say is, that the sum of being is divisible into the temporal and the eternal, that the one is the cause of the other, and its energy equivalent to the total result.

We say confidently that experience teaches us that every phenomenon has its antecedent. The child may not know that the object it observes had a beginning. Admitting for the moment that his natural reason does not instruct him, experience will soon convince him that some things begin to be, and the same experience will continually point out some anterior existence as the origin of the phenomena. That flowers spring from seed will be an early lesson to his mind. So universal will be such antecedence, that the association must become a law, and the inference of a cause for every phenomenon grow into a confirmed habit of the intelligence. As spontaneous or uncaused existence is a thing unknown to experience, and all observed occurrences have their antecedents, the accumulated facts must in time acquire the force of a law of thought. For the same principle of belief applies to the past as to the future. As men everywhere expect the sun to rise again, so they universally believe that whatever begins was preceded by something else. If the conviction is strong enough to give perfect confidence in the permanence of nature, it is also sufficient to assure us of an eternity of being.

But the notion of a sufficient cause is *not* the product of experience. It exists in its full force in the mind of the child. We cannot believe in an uncaused phenomenon, because the proposition is repugnant to the laws of our thinking nature. On the other hand, a belief in eternity of being is natural and congenial, since the child regards the objects around it as permanent, until taught otherwise by experience. He learns with surprise that his parents were ever born. The thought that the solid earth was ever a nonentity, is a new and startling truth communicated to him by others.

6. Having thus reviewed the ground over which we have passed, the conclusions reached, although vague and general, are

at least founded in facts to which our own nature persistently testifies. But we can proceed no farther on this line of investigation. The extent and character of the eternal, remain in darkness, and cannot be demonstrated but by a process altogether different from that hitherto employed. For the character of an unseen agent can only be ascertained from the character of the product. An eternal First Cause is demonstrable, but an intelligent Creator is brought to light only in his works.

In order to avoid all possible suggestions of scepticism, we must here appeal to the highest and most subtle of the phenomena around us, or rather within us, in our own conscious being, where thought, feeling, affection, will, and taste, are the manifestations of a peculiar mode of existence. These wonderful activities of our inner nature are observed and studied by the very being to whose history they belong, and are known as phenomena of something, spiritual or material, which did not always exist. They appertain to the temporal, and not to the eternal. The individual man certainly has a beginning, whatever may be imagined of the human race. His being is therefore due to the eternal cause. Now what is there in the human soul that can afford us any light in reference to the cause from which it came? We answer, that in the mind, as well as in the body, we discover an *adaptation* of our nature to certain obvious ends. The perception is adapted to receive, the memory to retain, and the reason to elaborate an ever increasing store of knowledge from without. And, even if this knowledge were delusive, there can be no delusion as to the enjoyment which the mind derives from its exercises. The pleasures of memory, hope, taste, and imagination, are subjective realities of which we are conscious, whatever may be said concerning the material world. These mental powers are implements by which certain coveted objects are accomplished. They bear a certain relation to their functions. Or if the unity of the mind requires a different statement, we may still hold that the thinking principle itself is an implement adapted to a variety of functions by the constitution it derives from the source of its being.

But we may with advantage transfer our position from mind

to body, solely for the purpose of bringing the question more *sensibly* to view. Whatever applies to the one, is applicable to the other. For the limbs and organs of the body are no more instruments to certain purposes than the intellect itself. And no one will deny that the feet are adapted to walking, the eyes to seeing, or the lips and tongue to speaking. There is a relation between the organ and the office it fills which does not subsist in other things. The eternal cause was the source of this relation. The organ existed before its use. Indeed the type of the human frame was, in some way, transmitted from parent to offspring. The type therefore existed long before the organ. The relation to which we refer has taken a long period of time for its application. The anatomical form of the human eye—of a particular eye—was placed in this relation thousands of years before its power of vision was ever exercised. But let the interval be ever so brief, it is still an interval of appreciable duration. The eye of the infant is organised before birth, and is manifestly adapted to its subsequent uses. The interval of time has therefore been *crossed* by the organising power, either consciously or unconsciously, with an apparent purpose to accomplish a given end.

The purpose contemplated is apparent to the most superficial intelligence. It is immaterial whether the perception is due to intuition or experience. No matter how the relation of adaptation is discovered, it certainly *indicates* an intelligent design, the exercise of foresight and deliberation in the agent to which it is traced. Admitting that the conviction is due to experience, the experience does not relate to the *mechanical* execution, but to the evidence of thought. The lowest savage knows that every construction of his own hands has been preceded by deliberation. Even in brute instinct, he recognises a reference to a future result. The wild bee constructs its comb with an instinctive view to the honey to be deposited in it. If the object has a known beginning at all, the form and conditions of its existence suggest invariably a proposed adaptation to a specific end. And as experience in one's personal history always associates thought with adaptation, we cannot but believe that there

was some exercise of intelligence in the origin of every construction the use of which is known.

There is an analogy between natural and artificial objects which we cannot overlook. The objection sometimes made, that experience cannot reach the origin of *natural* objects, does not hold. So long as the child remains uninformed of the growth, progress, and decay, of such objects, it cannot entertain the thought of design in their existence. That which was never made, was of course not made with a purpose. But whenever the mind acquires the preliminary information that such and such things have had an origin, and that they are adapted to some special end, they are readily classified among implements or instruments, in close association with the work of human hands. The universal tendency to personify nature, springs from this association. That this or that was the intention of nature, is a form of thought and expression familiar to mankind. The idea of contrivance is not restricted by experience to the results of human effort. It follows adaptation wherever it extends. Human intelligence is not satisfied, after experience has been acquired, by the statement that the eye *happened* to correspond with the nature of light. We cannot avoid the thought that the unknown cause, in some sense analagous to human intelligence, exercised foresight in reference to the future use of its constructions. If it is ever possible to reason from the known to the unknown, it is possible and unavoidable here. For the fact of an obvious adaptation, establishes the desired analogy between natural and artificial instruments, and the analogy of the effects leads to analogy in the causes that produce them.

So far then we seem to be treading upon solid ground. The unknown cause of natural constructions, even according to legitimate deductions from experience, acts with a reference to future uses. But we are far from admitting the necessity of such a concession. The dawning intelligence of a child, when it once perceives that a thing was made, or had a beginning, perceives also the necessity of an adequate cause. The simple fact of commencement compels it to infer a necessary antecedent.

We are repeating, but cannot too often repeat, that the mind cannot entertain the thought of a finite being springing uncaused out of nothing. No experience can add to the force of this negation. It is felt as much by the child as by the man. But we have before shown that the origin of the temporal, is necessarily in the eternal. It clearly follows that the intelligent purpose is in the same. In fact we cannot conceive of any adequate cause of adaptation but intelligence, either rational or instinctive. An intelligence capable of producing the phenomena of nature, is, therefore, a part or the whole of the sum of the eternal.

How much of the universe is eternal, is a question kept in abeyance. We are rather concerned with the inquiry whether the intelligence discovered is rational or not. The spirit of scepticism contends that instinct is capable of products equal to those of reason. But what is instinct? Has it ever been proved independent of a superior reason? We know so little of this subtle agency that it can hardly be entitled to a place in such an argument. It is itself a phenomenon, requiring an intelligent antecedent. But laying aside such a view, we contend that the eternal cause of phenomenal existence must be rationally intelligent from the nature of the case. Whenever mankind accomplish their purposes, they are conscious of forecast, that is, of crossing the future interval in thought. The analogy to which we referred before, demands in the eternal cause the exercise of a similar power. The products of nature manifest a thinking process somewhere in the past. It is not included in instinct; it must have preceded it. Nothing less than reason is adequate to the acknowledged results. The eye was constructed with reference to vision. But reference implies a rational intelligence. For a calculation enters into the process. If instinct calculates, it is, *quoad hoc*, rational. To this conclusion we are driven by our own laws of thought. The power which formed the eye, either thought of its future functions, or it did not. If it did not think, we are confronted with a difficulty fatal to all rational processes. Two eyes and two ears were provided for the human body. We recognise the advantage of the provision.

To say that the arranging power knew nothing of such advantage, did not conceive or appreciate it, is simply to contradict the plain dictates of our own rational nature. The Scriptures ask the question: "He that formed the eye, shall he not see; he that planted the ear, shall he not hear?" Scepticism not only denies the soundness of this particular appeal, but even denies that the author of our *rational* faculty can reason.

But we may proceed still farther, to show that the eternal cause possesses a power of choice. It is evidently capable of more than it usually accomplishes. The monstrosities of nature, especially animal nature, illustrate this truth. They prove that the organising power is not limited to the normal types of its productions. Monsters frequently appear with superfluous organs. Double-headed animals are not uncommon. But besides, we must see clearly that in a definite number there is implied a *selection*. Two eyes were regarded as sufficient for man, and a smaller number rejected for obvious reasons. Five fingers on each hand were selected out of several possible numbers. Five senses were provided, to enable us to hold communication with the outward world, when, so far as we can see, another number, greater or less, might have been imparted with equal facility. All such facts conspire to convince us that the rational intelligence embraced in the eternal, exercises *choice* in the construction of organic forms; that it selects, out of the whole number of possible constructions, a smaller number of actual existences.

We may argue farther, and with equal conclusiveness, that this active principle possesses and exercises *moral* sentiments. Such sentiments are exhibited conspicuously by the intelligent creation. They exist for a purpose as much as any other part of nature. Moral means adapted to moral ends, clearly express a power of appreciating them in the First Cause. The perception of a difference between right and wrong is natural to man. It is not the product of education, or the result of experience. Like the notions of space and time, it is an original principle. We not only know, but cannot but know, that truth is better than falsehood, virtue than vice. These are a system of coördi-

nates projected upon the mind, by which human conduct is equated and measured. We are aware that this truth has been assailed by a daring scepticism, like every other truth held sacred by man. But the mere fact that it is questioned, cannot impair the integrity of its claims. We appeal to *consciousness* for the soundness of our statements. These moral sentiments are universal. Let those who doubt their origin prove what they affirm. The presumption is in favor of the views we defend, and for the demonstration we may safely rely upon the stability of that consciousness to which these principles belong. Our inference is, that the power by which they were planted in the human mind must perceive and appreciate the same distinctions. If it reasons, and deliberates, and entertains purposes, in the field of morals, and constructs moral instruments with a view to the accomplishment of moral ends, the same recognition of the truth must be attributed to that power that we attribute to ourselves. Now moral creatures receive these distinctions as original and eternal. Were it possible to convince them that they are merely *conventional* or *utilitarian*, the conviction would be painful and abhorrent in the extreme. Our nature would be violated by the thought. There is a principle within us which refuses such suggestions, and clings to the dictates of natural reason. But if these distinctions are original and unchangeable, we must believe also that the author of their existence in our minds, fully recognised them. In other words, the intelligent power to which these phenomena are due, having, as we have shown, the faculty of choice, expressed a decided preference for truth over falsehood, and for virtue over vice, in the very fact that we ourselves abstractly manifest that preference. For this independent and eternal Being consulted none but his own will in the formation of our moral constitution. Our judgments therefore concerning good and evil, must in some degree reflect his nature. But if he prefers good to evil, he is a moral being. He approves and disapproves, loves and hates, in some sense analogous to human experience.

We are thus compelled to acknowledge that the eternal First Cause possesses powers of perception, thought, deliberation,

choice, and moral discrimination, adequate to the various phenomena of intelligence, choice, and conscience, which are observed in the universe. This Cause is therefore *personal*, for these are the marks of personality. Whatever facts of consciousness give to ourselves a distinct identity, with equal conclusiveness assure us that this great, eternal Being, possesses a self-consciousness of his own, which separates him from us by an infinite distance. Thus reason concurs with Scripture in testifying to his independent personality: "I AM THAT I AM."

7. But whilst faith soon reaches the unity and spirituality of the Deity, we must be patient with the scruples of unbelief, by which we are reminded that our conclusions are not inconsistent with a complex and plural deism. The personality so plainly indicated, may belong to a form of existence of which nature constitutes a part. Nature, in its primitive types, may be eternal. Or, on the other hand, if a spiritual existence must be assigned to Deity, an indefinite number of distinct persons may be imagined.

We are here confronted with the question whether the material universe can be an independent existence. We are challenged to show that it ever was created. A multitude of organisms have risen and passed away, but who can affirm, upon sufficient data, that the foundation of things had a beginning in time? Such are the suggestions the same spirit of unbelief is ready to propose, by way of retarding the progress of the argument. Let us examine the question deliberately. It is admitted that phenomenal nature proves an eternal cause. It cannot be denied that organisation implies an organising power. Consciousness, thought, will, moral affections, must be attributes of this power, however it may be defined. But who knows that the universe, in its substance, is the product of this power? May they not have co-existed from eternity? May not matter be to the Deity as the substance to the attribute, or the body to the soul?

Such questions cannot be discussed at all without some attempt at definition. We must discriminate, at the outset, between spirit and matter. But no definition can be framed that may

not be disputed by captious minds. We must have regard only to the candid and sincere inquirer. All such will perhaps admit that spirit is essentially conscious and unextended, and matter the opposite. Whether they are *originally* different or the same, may be remitted to the metaphysicians. The terms are certainly distinctive, and this distinction is practically permanent in thought. We are only concerned with matter as it exists, and this we contend cannot have been eternal. If extended, it occupies space, and subsists in some manner of form. Extension without form is inconceivable. Extension *in* form, moreover, implies arrangement of parts, and this indicates design. In fact the universe, so far as we can discover, is an organism adapted to ends, known or unknown. And besides, we have no acquaintance with any form of matter that is not subject to change. The simplest substances are liable to separation of parts, or to chemical alteration. Hence we constantly associate with all matter that is appreciable to the senses, the idea of mutability. The adhesion of atom to atom is not apprehended as infinite in its force, but absolutely limited. The hardest substances in nature are found to yield to certain artificial agencies. Matter therefore, as far as known, is characterised by this liability to disintegration. And every such condition is a proof of the phenomenal character of the substance. Nature is universally subject to change, and therefore not eternal. Every phenomenon is related in time to some other existence. Every form is related in space to some other form similarly conditioned. Nothing phenomenal or formal can be eternal and independent. The very terms are contradictory.

But we may regard the universe as a whole, treat it as a *kosmos*, and arrive by this path at the same conclusion. Its parts bear a certain orderly relation to one another, from the remotest nebula to the grain of sand on the sea-shore. We can discover nothing out of such relation, nothing useless, nothing for the existence of which some end may not be assigned. One grain less of weight in the earth's sphere would to some extent disturb the equipoise of the solar system. The system of the stars and planets, in all its cosmic arrangements, is evidently a

means to an end. It is absurd to imagine that it exists *only to exist*. It has no consciousness. It is not held together by volition. It exists in its obvious unity *for* something. To affirm of a great instrument constructed with great labor of mind and body, that it was made for some trifling purpose, would be plainly inconsistent with its apparent design, whether that design were fully understood or not. On a similar principle, we must necessarily assume a worthy end in the great system of which the earth forms a part. It exists for something, and that end must correspond with the magnitude and complexity of the organism. The very fact of its organic arrangements compels us to this view. Arrangements and relations of unconscious matter, imply an arranging power extrinsic to itself. To say that the moon has from eternity borne the relation of a satellite to the earth, unconsciously and without design, is simply to affirm that the unconscious world is absolutely worthless. If matter exists, independently of thinking beings, and without reference to them—exists merely to exist—its existence is useless. It is the most irrational of all conclusions, that the unconscious universe has an eternal existence, with no end or purpose that can be imagined for its existence. If it is independent of intelligence, it may continue on this line of independent being forever, an unperceived, unapprehended reality that might as well have never been. And yet, to external observation, it suggests design and purpose throughout its organism. For the inert masses are the basis of living things.

The universe in its most inert state is therefore an instrument adapted to an end. It does not simply exist. Were it so, it would not be worth the paper upon which the word is written. Use implies intelligence. If therefore the *kosmos* has its uses, they are to be found in the experience of living and conscious beings. It did not simply exist from eternity, unknowing and unknown, but existed with a design, with a reference to the intelligences by which it should be inhabited, or, in a higher sense, with reference to the will of the Supreme Intelligence. In other words, it is a construction with a beginning, and was designed to

subserve some purposes worthy of the skill displayed in its contrivance.

It is possible for an acute and prejudiced opponent to object that this reasoning applies with equal force to the intelligent Deity. If material forms exist obviously for a purpose, why not affirm the same of the spiritual essence with which they are contrasted? And if God exists for a purpose, how is he uncaused? But we assert this truth only of existence under conditions, and especially of unconscious matter. As the human soul had a beginning, yet did not create itself, it must exist for the use of something else. Much more, the physical world, in its organised state, has a phenomenal existence, not for the use of its unconscious self, but for some intelligent being. Even in its atomic state, eternally inert, as has been imagined by some, it is assumed to exist *for* the active principle, and not for its own use. The object of existence *must* be extrinsic to an unthinking substance. We apply this reasoning to all limited intelligences, and, as a logical consequence, to all substances without intelligence. It is altogether inapplicable to an eternal Spirit, containing within itself a consciousness immeasurably beyond the reach of human speculation.

It has been made clear that the eternal must include a principle essentially active. If we must also suppose a substance or substances essentially inert, eternally co-existent, and equally independent, this very supposition admits a relation of some sort between them. The inert principle could not originate any change in itself. All subsequent developments must be due to the active principle. The entire organisation of the *kosmos*, in its vast system of relations, was therefore the work of the Supreme Intelligence. But such a view of the subject results obviously from the thought that inert matter existed for the use of the Deity—to afford him a supply of plastic material for the construction of the heavens and the earth. Here then is a close relation between them, and a relation of the most perfect *subordination*. The one independent substance exercises a perfect sovereignty over the other. The co-existence is fortuitous, but

results in a supremacy altogether incompatible with independence. In other words, the essential independence of atomic matter was lost, or rather never existed, in the presence of creative power.

But some may, and do imagine, that matter is not essentially inert—that certain active principles are eternally associated with it. These forces existed independently of divine power, and have produced the forms and the order of the universe. They are not intelligent, but blind, unconscious tendencies, which, by a gradual development, have evolved the various objects which we see and admire. And man himself is one of their noblest achievements.

This class of thinkers do not deny a Deity. They regard him as the regulator of these forces of nature. He has so directed them as to accomplish by a slow process of *development* the results which are commonly ascribed to creation. The universe includes three eternal realities—intelligence, force, and matter—by the concurrence of which its phenomenal facts are realised. Matter is subject to its forces, and these are under the control of the Presiding Mind. But this theory involves several glaring contradictions. The eternal is independent. The forces of nature are therefore beyond the control of the Deity. If he did not create matter, and did not endow it with its properties, the subordination of nature to his power is simply a concession of courtesy, not a consistent truth. What right could one of the eternal elements have to subject the others to his will? And if the forces of nature are independent, how could a power co-ordinate, but not superior, establish such supremacy?

Nothing is more obvious to the candid mind, than that the eternal will of the Supreme Intelligence must be the source of all the forces operating in nature. They evidently move according to certain laws. There is no opinion more deeply seated in our natural convictions—none more resolutely maintained by the leaders of scientific thought, than the existence and efficiency of such laws. The forces of nature, therefore, pursue certain determined lines, and confine themselves within limits rigorously imposed upon them. These restrictions are full of instruction.

Where there is law, there must be a law-giver. The forces of nature are not independent, but must be dependent upon a higher power. And as we discover everywhere sufficient reasons for the limitations we observe, they are rationally attributable to the Supreme Intelligence. The types of being and the forms of aggregated matter are fixed by the laws of nature, and must have had an ideal existence before they were actually realised. The mould in which the external world was cast, was conceived in thought before this system of things began to be. This conception must have been in the mind of Deity. All regulated forces must be traceable to a will, unless we prefer to enthrone a grim monster, called Necessity, at the head of the universe. This alternation would afford no relief in thought. It would concede a great First Cause, annihilate second causes, and reduce our own intelligence to a mere delusion or a dream.

If the power of the Deity is adequate to the origin of the *forces* and *laws* of nature, it is a poor philosophy that would deny its adequacy to creation. Without these forces, atomic matter would have existed without a function. Each atom would have been a simple entity, unrelated, and independent; and might have so existed alone, the simple equivalent of so much space. All that can give it any value or relation, is an endowment from without. We see and recognise the value of the forces thus imparted. The power that can invest such atoms with such attributes, and develop such results from these insignificant materials, is surely a *creative* power. We are ready to admit its resources to be unlimited. We cannot hesitate to ascribe the existence of matter to his creative will. These forces which sprang from his volitions have instrumentally constructed the universe, and filled it with definite forms, and impregnated it with life, and thought, and feeling, according to the theory of development. And all this has been accomplished by the skilful manipulation of inert matter, and the infusion into it of foreign principles of an infinitely higher nature. To doubt the competency of this power to originate the existence of materials for his own purposes, is a gratuitous suggestion of unbelief. If the Deity uses atomic matter for his works, it

must be his by divine right. But an independent existence could not be his except by usurpation. Besides, after conceding the *creation* of natural forces so immeasurable in their energy, where is the consistency of questioning the competency of the same power to create substances themselves? One creative effort is no greater than another. It implies no higher exercise of such power to call atoms into being, than to invest them with life, and consciousness, as is held by many materialists. Or if we take higher ground, that spirit is immaterial, we know it cost in creation an exertion of divine power no less exacting than the creation of matter itself. If we can believe the one, we are grossly irrational and inconsistent, if we deny the other.

8. The active, intelligent, personal, moral principle, which existed from eternity, and gave being to all other things, is satisfactorily shown to be different from the material substances of which the universe is composed. His nature is not complicated with these gross elements. He is an unextended, conscious, thinking, and designing being, supreme in his sovereignty, and perfectly independent of his creatures. This conclusion has been reached by slow and careful reasoning on the part of the world's greatest minds, whilst humbler thousands have embraced the same truth without a conscious resort to any such process. And perhaps we would not be wrong in believing that the short method is quite as efficient as the other. Truth is often conveyed to the mind by an impression of so many facts that it is possible to dispose them in logical order. Nature is redundant of these facts. But the science of natural theology investigates and establishes its conclusions by means of certain selected lines of evidence. The living witness is, as it were, produced and questioned on the stand. Step by step the cause proceeds in regular order, according to the method we have endeavored to illustrate. The chain of proof appears to us complete. It is impossible to doubt the result, unless we question our own consciousness and identity; for this consciousness is the basis of the whole proceeding. And from the beginning to the end of the process, the light of consciousness continues to shine upon the progressive work.

Let us notice the several steps in review. In the first place, our own existence is known, and the correlative existence of other things. The next link in the chain, is the necessity of some prior existence. Either the things known are eternal, or they were preceded by other things. But our own existence had a beginning, and so of all the transient forms of nature. Something eternal has therefore existed before us. And, in the third place, the eternal embraces an active principle, the source of all successive action and change. This principle can only be judged of by its effects. We turn to phenomenal nature for instruction, and find the mind an instrument of thought, and a multitude of material forms obviously as much adapted to certain ends as any implement of mechanism. Adaptation proves foresight and contrivance, independently of experience, as soon as we know the object had a beginning. If it had a beginning it had a cause, and that cause must be adequate. Moreover the only adequate cause is found in the active principle of the eternal, and possesses foresight and contrivance, choice, and a moral discrimination. It is personal and identical. And this First Cause is alone. Matter did not eternally co-exist with it in an inert condition, which would have rendered it useless; nor in an active condition, which would have rendered nature independent of Deity, and contradicted his control over it. One independent being could not usurp control over another. The forces visible in nature are therefore creations proceeding from the divine will. Atomic matter is the same, for similar reasons. The power adequate to one creation is adequate to another, and the eternal existence of matter is a gratuitous absurdity. This is equally true of the suggestion of an infinite series of finite objects. The personality of the First Cause excludes the thought. That Cause is therefore alone in its eternity and independence.

But let us see how the ordinary mind reaches this same conclusion with equal satisfaction, and by a shorter route. We alluded before to a natural principle which has not received from philosophers the attention it deserves. The mind has a constitution of its own, and is endowed with a power of promptly

discriminating between objects presented to it. According to the analogy of the physical system of animals, it has its tastes and its antipathies. The horse, guided by his appetite, feeds on certain grasses, and rejects other forms of growth as unsuitable for nutrition. So we maintain that the human intellect is endowed with the power of distinguishing among propositions, and disposed by a natural tendency to accept some and reject others. Truth is intuitively known to be better than falsehood, and is distinguished from error by its congenial taste. The mind, like the magnet, attracts the true metal from the mass of rubbish in which it is concealed. Certain suggestions are always repulsive. They are rejected with a sort of instinct that is hardly conscious of any reason for its action. On the other hand, some propositions are promptly accepted, *at first sight*, and immediately assimilated by the process of thought. Now this natural discrimination is according to truth. Under ordinary circumstances, if it proceeds without prejudice or embarrassment, its decisions are as much relied upon as any of our acquired convictions.

Certain religious truths are, on this principle, congenial to human thought, and are readily embraced by the masses of mankind. We are only concerned now with the belief in a Deity. Men are disposed to believe in such a power. The deaf-mute child receives no information from his instructor with more satisfaction than this, and once received it is never eradicated. The teacher cannot unteach it. The mind, with its expanding faculties, has its imperious wants. A fulcrum is needed for all its exercises of thought. A First Cause is a final necessity to every thinking being. When this notion of Deity is supplied, it becomes the guiding star to all other knowledge. We cannot afford to part with it. Hence the difficulty men experience in becoming atheists. The mind is not relieved by unbelief from any of its embarrassments, but finds the confusion of its thoughts infinitely increased. Nature becomes a labyrinth, in which we must roam in darkness without a clue. It is an ocean upon which we are driven, helpless and despairing, without chart, or compass, or rudder, and without the light of a single star.

An uneducated person who has once received the notion of a Deity, looks out upon the universe with a mind open to a thousand impressions. He may not be conscious of a process of reasoning, but unconsciously constructs an argument of irresistible force. Each object that meets his view, tells him as plainly as if it were endowed with the power of speech, that it was not its own creator, but was produced by a designing intelligence. He cannot for a moment entertain the thought that organised objects simply *happened* to be constituted in a particular way. The relations, coincidences, and harmonies, subsisting among them, and among their component parts, are too numerous to allow such an interpretation. The circumstantial proof is in fact overwhelming. We can conceive of a criminal cause in which such a multitude of mutually related facts concur, that no jury of rational men could doubt the truth to which they point. But the facts of nature, visible to every man in his senses, are absolutely countless. Stones, flowers, and distant stars, unite in proclaiming the one great truth of the existence of God. The world of thought in which our minds revolve, teems with the same suggestions. The sense of responsibility and the voice of conscience indicate the existence of a Supreme Power, and the notion of such a Power so harmonises with all we see and know, that the mind cannot part with the conception, but clings to it with a tenacity as strong as nature itself. This is at least experience.

Every thinking man believes that the universe exists for something. He knows that it does not exist for mankind, for they are a part of nature. He knows it does not exist for unconscious matter, for this would be an absurdity in thought. He believes, if he has already acquired the idea of Deity, that this is the Being for whom all things exist, and the thought supplies him with a truth which unites and harmonises the entire system. The denial of such a Being would create a painful blank. It would reduce an orderly creation to chaos. It would plunge mankind into hopeless and endless orphanage. It was once possible for philosophers to hold false views of the sidereal and planetary system. But since the true theory has been pointed

out, it is impossible to retreat from it. Just so with the doctrine of a Deity. It is not possible to eliminate this truth, for the Copernican theory of the heavens does not rest upon better rational grounds than the existence of God. Neither of these truths is absolutely free from all difficulty; but, in both cases, the explanation of phenomena is so satisfactory and complete that it cannot be abandoned. But our illustration is, after all, inadequate. The ancient theories of the heavens were possible, for they were actually entertained; but no suggestion has ever been made of a consistent or credible atheism. It has never amounted to more than a *negation*. No theory of causation can be embraced by an atheist, and yet every theory of the universe must be a theory of causes. There is, therefore, no possible view of the origin of things having any *positive* force, except that of a Deity; and if we abandon this, we must necessarily fall into darkness and despair.

Such, then, is the presentation we proposed of the method to be pursued in this investigation. The aim of the article has been to relieve the argument of that embarrassment which usually results from the employment of questionable forms of expression. How far success has attended the effort, the reader must judge. We have advanced but one or two steps in the direction contemplated, and must leave to other occasions any attempts to illustrate the divine attributes. The bare existence of such a Being has been the limit of our thoughts.

It may not be out of place to add, that the rational deduction of a Deity, has not been the peculiar work of theologians, but the cordial task of philosophers of unrivalled celebrity. The credulity of ignorance and prejudice has led many to suppose that science and unbelief are intimately associated. And contemporary fame has been extravagantly exalted, to give force to the suggestions of modern scepticism. But history lends no countenance to such partial views. There are no names in her record of scientific fame more illustrious than those who have left behind them a clear testimony for the truth of religion. Bacon and Des Cartes, Newton, Locke, Pascal, Leibnitz, Franklin, Herschel, Faraday, and a multitude of others might be

named, whose authority, if authority were admissible, would be equal to that of any who might be cited against them. The *scientism* of our day is a puny antagonist in comparison. An immense majority of the greatest of modern thinkers and observers have, in one way or another, conceded the validity of the law of causation, upon which the argument for Deity is founded. Those who question it, simply attempt to invalidate the principle of *all* investigation. For every deduction in science is *caused* by a perception of the relation of facts or premises. Why does science accumulate facts? Is it not with a view to produce conviction in the mind? And does not the unbeliever hope to see faith conquered by the force of facts? In all this the efficiency of causes is acknowledged. And the validity of this law being admitted on both sides of the controversy between truth and error, the defenders of the faith possess an advantage of incalculable power. Religion has no cause to tremble for its own safety, so long as the principles of all scientific truth are identical with those upon which her rational defence depends.



ARTICLE V.

ANNALS OF ENGLISH PRESBYTERY.

Annals of English Presbytery, from the Earliest Period to the Present Time. By THOMAS M'CRIE, D. D., LL.D., Emer. Professor of the English Presbyterian Church, London. Author of "Sketches of Scottish Church History," etc. London: James Nisbet & Co., 21 Berner's Street. May, 1872.

Dr. M'Crie—*clarum et venerabile nomen*,—the honored son of an honored sire,—has made the Christian world his debtor by the timely publication of these interesting Annals. Though disclaiming any higher character for his work than that of popular sketches, the amount of valuable matter contained therein will secure for it a permanent place in ecclesiastical literature.

Without indulging in critical remarks upon the connection of England's glory and England's shame, with the honor and the dishonor done to Presbyterianism at different periods of her history, we shall, on this occasion, simply present copious extracts from this interesting volume for the entertainment of our readers.

English Presbytery in the Primitive Church, A. D. 286-1000.

“Few periods of our history are more obscure than that of the introduction of Christianity into Britain. . . . The theory that would ascribe to St. Paul the honor of being the pioneer of the gospel in Britain, though the most plausible, rests on no better historical grounds than the traditions which would assign it to Joseph of Arimathea, or to Pudens and Claudia mentioned in the Pauline Epistle. The story of King Lucius, who is said to have set up bishops and archbishops in place of the old Roman flamens and archflamens, is now generally abandoned as apocryphal. . . . We may fairly conclude that the knowledge of the Christian religion had reached England before the close of the second century; that it came, not from the Roman, but the Eastern Church, and probably through the medium of the disciples of St. John; and that the British Church sprung, not from a Latin, but from a Celtic origin. . . . A few glimpses of the ancient British Church shine feebly through the haze of legendary story; and, as usual, its first pages are marked by the blood of martyrdom. Of these early martyrs, the names of four have been preserved—Alban, a native of Verulam; Amphibalus, who suffered at Redburn, near St. Albans; and Aaron and Julius, natives of Caerleon, on the Usk, in Monmouthshire. . . . Some years later, we have evidence of the formation of a Christian Church, in the fact of three British bishops having attended the Council of Arles, summoned by Constantine in the year 314, viz., Eboreus, from the city of York; Restitutus, from the city of London; and Adelfius, from Caerleon, the latter being accompanied by a deacon. What kind of bishops these were, and how they were deputed to this Council, does not appear, and may be variously conjectured. . . . Certain it is that, at this period, the

power of the Pope was unknown; that the Council governed by the 'common consent' of its members; and that one of its canons enacts, that 'no person is to ordain bishops *alone*, but always with the concurrence of seven other bishops, or where that is impossible, of not fewer than three'—a rule less in accordance, it must be owned, with prelatic than it is with presbyterial usage, which requires the presence of three of its bishops, at least, as essential to the validity of its ordinations. . . . With regret, it must be owned that, among all the ecclesiastics of the ancient Britons, the only name which has descended to posterity is associated with heresy—that of Pelagius, the well known opponent of St. Augustine, bishop of Hippo. There is too strong evidence for believing that he was a Briton and a Welch monk. Pelagius appears to have been a good man, of amiable disposition, and a diligent, if not devout, student of Scripture. But he was misled, partly by a reaction from the Antinomian spirit of the age, and partly by an overweening love to metaphysics, into a denial of the original corruption of man's nature, and into assertions of the powers of the human will, which seemed to set aside the necessity of supernatural conversion. . . . Long before his advent, or that of Augustine, the Roman monk sent to convert the Saxons, Christianity had already become known, and loved, and practised in Ireland and Scotland. In point of fact, before the Saxons or any German tribes were heard of, or appeared on the stage of our history, Europe was mainly peopled by the Celtic race: though at the commencement of the Christian era they existed as distinct nationalities only in Ireland, in Scotland, and in Britain. The inhabitants of these three countries were of the same race, spoke essentially the same language, and held mutual intercourse. Their religion, too, partook of the same Celtic development, as appears in its freedom from Romanic elements down to the seventh century. To form a true idea, therefore, of the early British Church, it becomes necessary to advert to the Celtic Church, of which St. Patrick and St. Columba were the leading ornaments. The history of St. Patrick is wrapt in mystery. Doubts have even been thrown on the existence of such a person. He has been

confounded with a senior Patrick, and even with Palladius. But without entering into such discussions, and assuming that he is the person known by the 'Confession of St. Patrick,' which has been preserved, we learn that he was a native of Britain, and that his father was a deacon named Calpurnius, who again was the son of a presbyter. . . . Here also is proof that, at this early period, the celibacy of the clergy was unknown. From the same 'Confession' we learn that Patrick, when in the sixteenth year of his age, was carried off by pirates to Ireland, where he remained for six years in a state of servitude. The solitude of woods and mountains encouraged a naturally serious and meditative spirit, and he piously says: 'The Lord opened my unbelieving heart to a tardy remembrance of my transgressions, and to turn with my whole soul unto the Lord my God, who regarded my low estate, and pitied the ignorance of my youth.' Relieved from captivity, he appears to have visited France, and there been ordained to the office of a presbyter; after which, along with some companions, he returned to Ireland, burning with a holy zeal for the conversion of the natives, whom he had left in a state of the grossest ignorance and barbarism. There is not the slightest historical foundation for supposing that he ever visited Rome, or that he had any commission from the Pope. From the most authentic accounts, he must have obtained his religious education and his orders from a Gallic or Celtic origin. The simple and warm-hearted presbyter met with a success in his missionary labors, far more wonderful than all the ridiculous miracles that have been ascribed to him in legendary tales. He is said to have ordained no fewer than four hundred bishops or Christian teachers. He had found the country a moral desert, and he died in 465, leaving it filled with churches and monasteries. His Celtic converts, being kept far aloof from Romish influences by distance, lineage, and language, retained for many ages the simple rites and scriptural faith in which they had been instructed; and, unlike the great body of our modern Irish, would have doubtless held it foul scorn to trace their religion to a Latin or an Anglo Saxon pedigree. . . . Strangely enough, the dimness of these old annals begins to disperse when

we turn to the north of Scotland, and come in sight of St. Columba. This genuine saint was born, about the year 520, in Ireland, in the County of Donegal. His father was related by blood with the royal family of Ireland. His name was originally Crimthan, but was afterwards changed to Columba, or Columkill, 'the dove of the cell, or church.' If in early life he was addicted to war and feuds, the change of his name may indicate the entire transformation that must have passed over his nature; for in after life few had more of the gentle peacefulness of the dove. In personal appearance, Columba is said to have excelled in manly beauty and majestic stature; to have possessed a sweet and sonorous voice, with a cordial manner, and grave dignity of deportment. . . . It would be a great mistake to suppose that the institution at Iona resembled a Romish convent. It was rather a large Christian family, or school of the prophets. Though the members of the fraternity divided their time into certain portions, allotted to prayer, vigils, fasting, reading, transcribing, and manual labor, they had no monastic vows of poverty, celibacy, or obedience. Columba did not recommend lengthened fasts, any more than long faces, but would have the brethren to 'eat every day, that they might be able to do work and pray every day.' Under his superintendence the barren island was converted into a fruitful field, and a smiling orchard. Every hand was busy at work, every hour profitably spent. There was nothing morbid in his asceticism, no treating of the body as if it were in itself an evil, no merit or importance attached to bodily maceration. On the contrary, to preserve a healthy frame as the best vehicle of a sound mind, seems to have been his perpetual study; 'and whilst all his biographers conspire to attest the uniform hilarity that beamed upon his countenance, one of them tells us that from the grace of his person, the neatness of his dress, and the ruddiness of his cheeks, he always looked like a man nourished amid delicacies.' Being a collegiate establishment, intended to train men for the work of the ministry, the monastery of Iona does not seem to have admitted females; but that no vow of celibacy was imposed, is apparent from the undeniable fact, that many of those who issued from its walls entered the married

state. Equally mistaken would be the conclusion, that because Columba was a presbyter, the discipline of his house would resemble that of a Church constituted after the Presbyterian model. This would be to forget that the brethren at Iona were not ministers of an organised Church, but missionaries, whose object was to preach the gospel, and to plant the Church in an almost pagan land. On the other hand, those who are bent on making out an uninterrupted chain of prelatial orders, are greatly at a loss how to explain the undoubted fact that Columba, himself a presbyter, or perhaps only a deacon, ordained and presided over whole provinces of bishops. . . . The Culdees, as the disciples of Columba were called, though bound by no rule, like that of St. Benedict, continued for centuries after his death to inherit his life and spirit, and to maintain a pure gospel in the communities which they gathered around them both at home and abroad. It is only of late that traces of their labors have been discovered on the continent of Europe, where few expected to find them. In regard to ordination, indeed, the Romish Church held them to be very uncanonical. 'Kentigern, of Glasgow, was ordained,' says his biographer, 'after the ancient manner of the Britons and Scots, merely by anointing his head, with invocation of the Holy Spirit, the benediction, and the imposition of hands; for these islanders, living apart from the rest of the Christian world, were ignorant of the canons.' 'When the Apostolic See sent us to Britain,' says Laurentius, the successor of Augustine, 'we held both the Britons and the Scots, before we knew them, in great esteem for their sanctity, supposing that they lived according to the customs of the Church (of Rome); but after we became acquainted with them, we found the Scots no better than the Britons; for one of their bishops, Daganus, on coming to us, not only refused to communicate with us, but would not eat his victuals under the same roof in which we were entertained.' "

English Presbytery in the Mediæval Church, 1000-1500.—John Wycliffe—The Lollards of England—Sir John Oldcastle.—"Though less a theologian than a preacher, and aiming

chiefly at the reigning vices of the period, Wycliffe may be regarded as the John Baptist of the Reformation. Three hundred of his sermons have been preserved, from which it is easy to judge of his religious sentiments. These, considering the age in which he lived, are remarkably pure and scriptural. He protests against the popular superstitions of his time—image and saint worship, pilgrimages, penances, relics, and holy water. On the subject of purgatory he seems to have held something like an intermediate state, though opposed to all masses for the dead. On the eucharist, he is supposed by some to have leant towards the theory of Radbert, in the ninth century; but if we may judge from various expressions, he appears to have been in advance of Luther, teaching that ‘what we see on the altar is neither Christ nor any part of him, but only an effective sign of him.’ . . . The hierarchy of Rome, he held to be anti-Christian. And in regard to Church government, we learn that he maintained, that ‘in the time of the Apostle Paul, two orders of clergy were held sufficient for the Church, priests, and deacons; nor were there in the days of the Apostle any such distinctions as pope, patriarchs, and bishops.’ But the material service which Wycliffe rendered to the cause of truth, and that which entitles him to be regarded as ‘The Morning Star of the Reformation,’ was his English version of the Scriptures. Though taken from the Vulgate, this translation is remarkably true to the original, and in its antique Saxon most expressive. Transcribed in copies without number, the version had a wide circulation, and became an engine of amazing power. . . . The followers of Wycliffe were generally called Lollards—a term of doubtful origin, given them in contempt, and never assumed by themselves. . . . At this period when stage-plays were enacted, in which the most sacred scenes and persons were introduced in ridiculous costumes, the churchmen could stand almost any amount of literary burlesque. But the Lollards were men of solemn mien and serious conversation. They kept themselves aloof from the frivolities, and even from the ordinary traffic of society. They spent their time in prayer and in the reading of Holy Scripture. They claimed the right of judging for them-

selves, and would only obey the Church 'in as far as the Church was obedient, in work and word, to God and his law.' They went a step farther than this; for Rome they regarded as the 'antichrist' of Scripture, and they plainly condemned the sacrifice of the mass as idolatry. These poor people were not to be tolerated; and though at this time, without any Church organisation, and seldom meeting in great numbers, they became the victims of a systematic and bloody persecution. . . . From Henry IV., who, having usurped the crown, placed much dependence on the clergy for upholding his authority, they obtained, without the consent of Parliament, the bloody edict that 'the heretic, if he refused to abjure, or relapsed, *should be burned alive*, in a conspicuous place, for the terror of others.' This statute was immediately carried into effect; for the same year William Sawtre, priest of St. Osyth's, in London, was accused of heresy, for having denied the dogma of transubstantiation, and refusing to worship the cross; and he died in the flames at Smithfield, February 12, 1401, having thus the honor to be the first of the noble army of English martyrs. . . . Under the reign of Henry IV., and of his son Henry V., there lived a brave old knight, named Sir John Oldcastle, or as he was sometimes called, from his marriage, Lord Cobham. In early life, by his own confession, he had led a gay and careless life, like his companions, addicted to courtly pleasures and to deeds of blood. But the perusal of the Scriptures, and the writings of Wycliffe, had produced an entire change on his character; 'the valiant captain and hardy gentleman' of former days became a decided Christian. He still retained, however, in his new career, all the native qualities which marked the stalwart English knight of the fifteenth century. He made no secret of his sentiments, and in his place in Parliament openly avowed that 'there would be no peace in England till the authority of the Pope was sent over the sea,' and that the ill-gotten wealth of the Church should be confiscated to the use of the crown. At the same time, his castle of Cowling, near Rochester, afforded a ready asylum to the persecuted Lollards; and when any of their ministers officiated in the open air, Sir John would stand at their side, sword

in hand, to protect them against the insults of the friars. Thus, stung in two of their tenderest parts, their avarice and their superstition, the clergy never ceased to seek his ruin and disgrace. . . . On being brought before an assembly of bishops in the chapter-house of St. Paul's, Cobham produced a written confession of his faith. . . . When taunted with being a disciple of Wycliffe: 'As for that virtuous man,' he said, 'I shall only say, before God and man, that before I knew that despised doctrine of his, I never abstained from sin; but since that, it hath been otherwise, I trust, with me.' 'What say ye of the Pope?' asked one of his judges. 'As I said before,' returned Sir John, 'he and you together make up the great antichrist; he the head, you the body, and the friars the tail.' . . . The trial lasted two days, and the result was that Sir John Oldcastle—Lord Cobham—was condemned for 'a most pernicious and detestable heretic, committing him henceforth to the secular jurisdiction *to do him thereupon to death.*' . . . Either through his friends or the connivance of the governor, he succeeded in escaping from prison. . . . The Parliament which met at Leicester, April 1414, had encouraged the king to venture on the Church lands; but the churchmen, by a piece of exquisite policy, managed to procure an enactment by which, on pretence of condemning the Lollards for aiming at the alienation of Church property, it was ordained that all such offenders 'should first be hanged for treason against the king, and next burned for heresy against God.' By inadvertently passing this statute, Parliament at once tied up its own hand, and placed unlimited power into those of the clergy; and by this clever trick the Reformation may be said to have been retarded for a hundred and twenty years. The eventful history of Sir John Oldcastle now draws to a close. His unrelenting enemies succeeded in exempting him from the indemnity granted to the Lollards; and, in the year 1418, after wandering for four years among the mountains of Wales, the reward of a thousand merks set upon his head proved too strong for the avarice of Lord Powis, who discovered his retreat, and betrayed him to his pursuers. . . . No time was lost in carrying the iniquitous sentence into execution. He was drawn in a hurdle to St. Giles in

the Fields, where the farce of the insurrection was to have taken place, 'with his hands bound, but with a very cheerful countenance.' His sentence was, that he should be hung in chains, and consumed in the fire. From several authentic sources we learn that he behaved himself in a way becoming a brave knight and Christian martyr. He prayed for the forgiveness of his enemies; he exhorted the people to follow the laws of God written in the Scriptures, taking heed of those who were contrary to Christ in their life and conversation. Hung up by the middle in iron chains, the martyr of Christ may be said to have been literally broiled alive; and yet, in the midst of this barbaric torture, while the priests, who witnessed it with ill-concealed satisfaction, forbade the people to pray for him, the sufferer never lost his composure, but 'died praising the name of God while life lasted.' 'And thus,' says Bale, 'rested this valiant knight, Sir John Oldcastle, under the altar of God, which is Jesus Christ, among that godly company who, in the kingdom of patience, suffered great tribulation, he abiding with them, fulfilling the number of his elect. Amen.' . . . History has its compensations as well as its retributions. A special providence seems to watch over the names of those who have suffered in the cause of Christ and his truth. Their memory may lie under a cloud of calumny and reproach for ages; but when men least expect it, and sometimes from the most unexpected quarters, the cloud may be dispelled, and tardy justice is done to their real worth. So has it happened in regard to the memory of Sir John Oldcastle. Fuller informs us that his name was the make-sport in old plays. But even Fuller leaves him at last in the shade. Strangely enough, a witness was raised up to bear testimony in favor of the outraged memory of the martyr, in the person of one whom few will venture to suspect of partiality or partisanship—no less than our poet Shakspeare! At first, the dramatist had represented Sir John in the odious light of the old plays, as a braggart, a debauchee, and a poltroon. But having satisfied himself as to the real character of the true Sir John, he not only substituted for his name that of Sir John Falstaff, but in a play entitled 'The History of Good Lord

Cobham, he, or another under his eye, made an ample apology for his former mistake, pronouncing him 'A VALIANT MARTYR AND A VIRTUOUS PEER.'

The Martyr-Bishops of England, 1500-1558.—"Our claim to regard the martyr-bishops of England as our brethren, will not be disputed by those admirers of mediævalism who will hardly acknowledge them as representatives of the Church of England. But it is not upon minor points of Church order that we advance the claim, as it was not for such points that they died. We regard them as bearing witness to the saving truths of the Christian faith, and as shedding their blood in the same cause with the Huguenots of France under the Guises, and the Presbyterians of the Netherlands under the atrocious Philip.

"Hast thou admitted, with a blind fond trust,
The lie that burned thy father's bones to dust,
That first adjudged them heretics, then sent
Their souls to heaven, and cursed them as they went ?

Shame on the candor and the gracious smile
Bestowed on them that light the martyr's pile ;
While insolent disdain, in frowns exprest,
Attends the tenets that endured the test !

Cowper's Expostulation, 1st Edition.

"CHARGES FOR THE MARTYR-BISHOPS AT OXFORD.—The following doleful memorial of the times, evidently the production of the jailor or bailiff of Oxford, has recently turned up among the papers of the British Museum, as if to prove the bitter reality of the scenes recorded in this chapter, which modern civilisation can hardly believe to have been possible :

Charge for the burning of the bodies of Latimer and Ridley :

	£	s.	d.
For 3 loads wood faggots to burn Latimer and Ridley,	0	12	0
Item, 1 load furze faggots,	0	3	4
Item, for carriage,	0	2	6
Item, a post,	0	1	4
Item, 2 chains,	0	3	4
Item, 2 staples,	0	0	6
Item, 4 labourers,	0	2	8
Total.	1	5	8

English Presbytery within the Church of England, 1558-1625.—“That Elizabeth was favorable to the Reformation cannot be questioned. The daughter of Anne Boleyn had firmly withstood all attempts to gain her over to the profession of the Romish faith, and she only escaped from the doom of heresy by maintaining a discreet silence. She disliked, Burnet tells us, the title of ‘Supreme Head of the Church,’ preferring that of ‘Supreme Governor of the Church of England.’ Unhappily, however, it soon became manifest that she claimed, under this less ambitious designation, all the spiritual authority exercised by Henry VIII. She soon began to evince a tendency to repress all attempts at farther Reformation of the Church. When the Protestants, creeping out of their hiding-places, and returning in large numbers from abroad, began to pull down popish images, and everything reminding them of the hateful idolatry from which they had escaped, and to set up King Edward’s Liturgy in the churches, the queen issued a proclamation against all such innovations, declaring that, while she sanctioned the use of English in the service, and forbade the elevation of the host, she advised her faithful subjects to follow her example until it should be otherwise ordered by Parliament. She herself retained in her private chapel, an altar, crucifix, and various Romish symbols. Indeed, it became apparent that, had her claims been recognised by the Romish Church, she might not have proved unwilling to acknowledge the Pope as the father of Christendom. In the good providence of God this was prevented. Elizabeth sent a respectful message to Pope Pius IV., through the official agent of her late sister, announcing her accession to the throne; but the haughty pontiff replied, that England belonged of right to the Holy See; that Elizabeth, as being illegitimate, had no right to the throne without his consent; and that only on the ground of renouncing her pretensions, and submitting the question wholly to him, would he take up her cause. As a woman, Elizabeth resented this insult; and, as a queen, she spurned at the humiliation. One thing only was wanting to make the breach irreparable. The Romish clergy, many of whom held benefices, joined with the Pope in repudi-

ating her claims; some of them even spoke of transferring their allegiance to Mary Queen of Scots. The die was cast, and England was severed from Rome. . . . But unfortunately the queen adopted a line of policy precisely the reverse, and, inheriting the temper of her father, carried all before her. Her object was to effect a sort of compromise with the Romish Church, and thus gain over her Roman Catholic subjects. With this view, she put an embargo upon preaching, or 'prophesying,' as it was called. Two or three preachers, she held, were quite enough for a whole county; and the curates should content themselves with reading the Homilies. On the other hand, she insisted on the most rigorous observance of the rites and rubrics of the Church. The liturgy, after being stripped of some phrases likely to prove offensive to the ears of the Romanists, and brought into closer affinity to the popish missal, was fixed down by parliamentary statute. In June, 1559, was passed the famous 'Act of Uniformity of Common Prayer and Service in the Church.' This act, at once a blot and a blunder in the otherwise prosperous reign of Elizabeth, remains to this day the fruitful mother of all the discontent within, and all the dissenterism outside, the Church of England. It stereotyped the Church, as it stood at a period when, instead of being brought more into harmony with the other Protestant churches, as its founders desired, it was suspended midway between Romanism and the Reformation, merely to serve political ends, and the pleasure of an arbitrary sovereign. And the consequence has been that, while England has been progressing as a nation, in religious thought and liberty, she still presents the strange anomaly of a free Parliament and an enslaved Church. . . . This obstinacy of the queen seems at first sight unaccountably inconsistent with her general character. She had taken an active part in assisting the Protestants of France and Scotland in their struggles for religious liberty; and, what is more strange, not only afforded the natives of foreign parts an asylum in her dominions, but permitted them to practise their religious rites as at home. But we fear that Elizabeth was not troubled with scruples of conscience herself, and was hardly able to appreciate the force of conscience in

others. To the Papists, she said she was surprised they could not go to her Church and keep their own religion in their pockets. On the other hand, she astonished the Dutch ambassadors, by asking: 'Why make such ado about the mass? Can't you attend it as you would do a play? I have got on a white gown now; suppose I should begin to act the mass-priest, would you think yourselves obliged to run away?' With such views, she could ascribe the conscientious scruples of the non-conformists only to bad humor or factious opposition to her sovereign authority. 'So absolute was the authority of the crown at that time,' says Hume, 'that the precious spark of liberty had been kindled and was preserved by the Puritans alone; and it is to this sect that the English owe the whole freedom of their constitution. . . . It was this book that brought down upon its author the castigation of Andrew Melville, when summoned, in 1607, before King James and his council. On that occasion Bancroft charged Melville with treason, upon which the intrepid Scottish reformer stepped up to the council table, and shaking him by the lawn-sleeves, which he called 'Romish rags,' addressed him as follows: 'If you are the author of the book called English Scottizing for Discipline, then I regard you as the capital enemy of all the Reformed Churches in Europe, and as such I will profess myself an enemy to you and your proceedings to the effusion of the last drop of my blood; and it grieves me to think that such a man should have his majesty's ear, and set so high in this honorable council.' . . . Thomas Cartwright was unquestionably the leading and most learned man among the party we refer to. Born in 1535, and educated at St. John's College, Cambridge, where he obtained his degree of bachelor of divinity, he took an early share in the efforts made for the reformation of the Church. In 1570, he was chosen Lady Margaret's professor of divinity, a charge in which he gained many laurels. Eloquent as a speaker, and popular to such a degree, that when he preached the sexton was obliged to remove the windows to accommodate his numerous hearers, he was animated beyond the rest of his brethren by the genuine spirit and boldness of a reformer. Such was his distinguished reputation as a scholar and theo-

logian, that his counsel was frequently sought by foreign divines in the weightiest matters. The University of St. Andrews, by the advice of Andrew Melville, offered him, together with his friend, Walter Travers, professorships of divinity; and he was urgently solicited to write a refutation of the Rhemish translation of the New Testament, a work in which he made much progress, till Archbishop Whitgift, to his dishonor, forbade him to proceed. But his varied qualifications could not atone for his non-conformity. He was regarded as the standard-bearer of the party, and was summoned on more occasions than one before the Star Chamber and High Commission. On the last occasion, in 1590, he was thrown into prison, and no less than *thirty-one* articles were exhibited against him. . . . Walter Travers, B. D., of Cambridge University, was, next to Cartwright, the most zealous advocate of the Presbyterian discipline. At an early period, unwilling to take orders in the English Church, and submit to conformity, he travelled to the continent, and was ordained to the ministry by the Presbytery of Antwerp. Returning home, he was invited to the lectureship of the Temple, the duties of which he discharged much to the satisfaction of that society; but latterly he came into collision with Mr. Richard Hooker, author of the 'Ecclesiastical Polity,' who was chosen as master. No two pictures can be more dissimilar than those which Fuller draws so graphically of the Lecturer and the Master of the Temple, and his testimony to Travers speaks as highly for the candor of the writer as it does for the character of the non-conformist, whom, churchman as he was, he seems so greatly to have admired: 'Mr. Hooker's voice was low, stature little, gesture none at all, standing stone-still in the pulpit, as if the posture of his body were the emblem of his mind, immovable in his opinions; where his eye was left fixed at the beginning, it was found fixed at the end of his sermon. His style was long and pithy, driving on a whole flock of several clauses before he came to the close of a sentence. Mr. Travers' utterance was graceful, gesture plausible, matter profitable, method plain, and his style carried in it *indolem pietatis*, 'a genius of grace,' flowing from his sanctified heart. Some say that the congre-

gation in the Temple ebbed in the forenoon, and flowed in the afternoon."

English Presbytery in the Ascendant, 1625-1643—The Westminster Divines.—"And, first, our attention is naturally directed to the prolocutor, Dr. William Twisse. We see before us a venerable man, verging on seventy years of age, with a long pale countenance, an imposing beard, lofty brow, and meditative eye, the whole contour indicating a life spent in severe and painful study. Such was the rector of Newbury, one of the most learned and laborious divines of his day. Educated at Oxford, where he spent sixteen years in the closest application to study, and acquired an extensive knowledge of logic, philosophy, and divinity; holy in his converse, quiet and unassuming in his manners, he gained the admiration of all his contemporaries, and friends and foes speak of him with profoundest respect. Dr. Owen, though he wrote against him, never mentions his name without an epithet of admiration: 'This veteran leader, so well trained in the scholastic field—this great man—the very learned and illustrious Twisse.' It is very apparent, however, that, with all his learning, the plodding and subtle controversialist is not the man exactly cut out for the situation in which he has been placed. He has no turn for public speaking, no talent for extemporaneous effusion, no great tact for guiding the deliberations of a mixed assembly. 'The man,' says Baillie, 'as the world knows, is very learned in the questions he has studied, and very good, beloved by all, and highly esteemed; but *merely bookish*, and not much, as it seems, acquaint with conceived prayer, and among the unfittest of all the company for any action; so after the prayer he sits mute.' 'Good with the trowel,' says Fuller, 'but better with the sword, more happy in polemical divinity than edifying doctrine.' During the warm and occasionally rather stormy debates of the Assembly, the good man sits uneasy, obviously longing for his quiet study at Newbury. At length, after about a year's trial, exhausted and distressed by employment so uncongenial to his habits he requests permission to retire home. . . . Dr. Burgess, Vicar of Watford.

and one of the preachers in St. Paul's London, is a character exactly the reverse of the quiet and scholastic Twisse. 'He is a very active and sharp man,' says Baillie. Possessed of the spirited and manly character which eminently distinguished our reforming ancestors, he was early engaged in the strife, and suffered considerably from the bishops for his freedom in denouncing the corruptions of the Church. Preaching before Archbishop Laud, he condemned him to his face, and fairly frightened that little tyrant, by protesting that 'he would stand to what he had said in that sermon against all opposers, even to the death.' . . . The venerable-looking old man, of portly and dignified presence, seated next to Dr. Burgess, as his fellow-assessor, is his brother-in-law, Mr. John White, of Dorchester, generally known at the time by the honorable title of the *Patriarch of Dorchester*. 'A grave man,' says Fuller, 'but without moroseness, who would willingly contribute his shot of facetiousness on any just occasion.' The personification of piety, wisdom, and benevolence, an eloquent speaker, a man of hospitals and plans for the relief of pauperism, he had in his own sphere effected such a reform in the morals of the people, and done so much for enriching the industrious and relieving the poor, as well as providing an asylum for the persecuted in New England, that we are not surprised to learn 'he had great influence with his party both at home and abroad, who bore him more respect than they did to their diocesan.' Mr. White was the great-grandfather of John and Charles Wesley. . . . There, for example, is a knot of divines who joined together in the composition of that famous defence of presbyterial government in reply to Bishop Hall, entitled *Smectymnuus*—'a startling word' as Calamy styles it, made up of the initial letters of their names, Stephen Marshall, Edmund Calamy, Thomas Young, Matthew Newcomen, and William Spurstow. This work which was published in 1641, gave the first serious blow to prelacy. It was composed in a style superior to that of the Puritans in general, and was, by the confession of the learned Bishop Wilkins, 'a capital work against episcopacy.' The first in this group of divines, Mr. Stephen Marshall, who was now lecturer at St. Margaret's,

Westminster, was certainly one of the notabilities, if not the most illustrious character of his day. From the commencement of the civil war down to the restoration, he took the most active share in the political as well as ecclesiastical movements of the times, was ever in the fore-front of the battle, and only laid down his armor with his life. In 1640, we find him, along with Dr. Burgess, urging all, by animated speeches on the floor of Parliament, as well as by rousing sermons from the pulpit, to take up arms for securing the constitution, and to proceed with all dispatch in the work of reforming the Church. To powerful, popular talents as a speaker (Baillie calls him 'the best of preachers in England'), Marshall added the active business habits which qualified him for taking the lead in these boisterous times. Fuller tells us he was a great favorite in the Assembly—'their trumpet, by whom they sounded their solemn fasts; in their sickness their confessor; in the Assembly their counsellor; in their treaties their chaplain; in their disputations their champion.' . . . The Assembly of Divines had their hands full of work. The midnight chimes of Westminster would find them deeply immersed in their studies, some engaged on committees, others busy on controversial writings, or conning sermons to be preached before Parliament or in city churches. In these labors the Scots commissioners had their full share. The main business in the Assembly consisted in the compilation of those formularies since so well known as the Westminster Standards; and as the bishops had early retired from the Assembly, great harmony prevailed among the members that remained, especially in regard to doctrinal questions. . . . The Confession of Faith was first submitted to Parliament under the title of 'The Humble Advice of the Assembly of Divines, now by Authority of Parliament sitting at Westminster, Concerning a Confession of Faith,' and was passed in December, 1646. Next followed the two Catechisms—the Shorter in November, 1647, and the the Larger in 1648. While the Scottish Confession bears the impress of John Knox, and the Thirty-nine Articles that of Melancthon, the Westminster Confession, substantially the same in doctrine, bears unmistakably the stamp of the Dutch theology in the sharp distinc-

tions, logical forms, and juridical terms into which the Reformed doctrine had gradually moulded itself under the red heat of the Arminian and Socinian controversies. The same remark applies to the Catechisms, which were prepared simultaneously with the Confession. The Shorter Catechism has generally been viewed as an abbreviation of the Larger. But, in point of fact, the Larger Catechism was not prepared till some time after the Shorter, of which it was evidently intended to form an amplification and exposition. Both are inimitable as theological summaries. . . . And experience has shown that few who have been carefully instructed in our Shorter Catechism have failed to discover the advantage of becoming acquainted in early life, even as a task, with that admirable 'form of sound words.' . . . Incidentally, we learn that the preparation of the Confession and the Catechisms largely devolved on Dr. Anthony Tuckney, vice-chancellor of Cambridge, a divine of great erudition, and author of several works. He held a high place in the esteem of his brethren; and an anecdote is told of him which reflects credit on his integrity and good sense. Some members of Parliament having requested him, in the usual style of the day, to pay regard to 'the truly godly' in his elections at the University, Dr. Tuckney replied: 'No man has a greater respect than I have to the truly godly: but I am determined to choose none but *scholars*. They may deceive me in their godliness; they cannot in their scholarship.' Dr. Reynolds, afterwards bishop of Norwich, Dr. Arrowsmith, and Mr. Palmer, had evidently a share in the framing of these Standards. The metrical version of the Psalms, being substantially the same still used in Scotland, was executed by Mr. Francis Rous, a member of the House of Commons, and lay-assessor in the Assembly.

THE SOLEMN LEAGUE AND COVENANT.—This deed is quite unprecedented and unparalleled in the annals of religion. Creeds and confessions have held sway over whole peoples, in virtue of fresh adherents to them from age to age. But the solemn league sprung up at once, stamped its image on the age which gave it birth, and stands forth to this day as the deed of a nation—done rightly or wrongly, for good or for evil, as it may be judged—

but done, like an act of murder, or an act of martyrdom in the case of the individual man—never to be recalled; done either ever afterwards to be repented of, or ever after to be commemorated. In Scotland it assumed the veritable form of a national deed; and in England and Ireland it was certainly subscribed and sworn by persons of all ranks and classes. What is more, it cannot, properly speaking, be repeated. Attempts indeed have been made in Scotland to reproduce it by what have been called renovations of our national covenants; but these, being neither strictly national, nor ecclesiastical, nor personal transactions, but a mixture of the three, can only be viewed as indicating a desire to recognise the grand act. Gradually, as the normal idea of nationality faded from men's minds, or ceased to be relished, it dwindled into a species of religious service or church-vow. But while many lived who signed the covenant with their blood, it became the rallying-cry in the field and the dying testimony on the scaffold, and it has been identified in the eyes of all true Scotsmen with the cause of civil and religious liberty. Even our national bard could not stand an offensive allusion to it:

‘The solemn league and covenant
Cost Scotland blood—cost Scotland tears:
But it sealed freedom's sacred cause;
If thou'rt a slave, indulge thy sneers.’

If, in England, this deed is not regarded as properly national, it can hardly be viewed as deprived of its nationality by the profane act of the Second Charles which rescinded it. It has endured whole ages and volumes of abuse; and still, in spite of these and of modern contempt, it lifts its head, like some old ruined watch-tower, protesting against all ‘popery, prelacy, superstition, heresy, schism, profaneness, and whatsoever shall be found contrary to sound doctrine and the power of godliness.’ ”

The Ejection of 1662.—“And who are the men that have been thus so summarily ejected? A band of more worthy and excellent ministers never occupied the pulpits at the Church of

VOL. XXIII., NO. 4.—9.

England. Most of them men in the prime of life, between thirty and fifty years of age, of scholarly habits and liberal education; with hardly one exception, men of faith and prayer, deeply imbued with the spirit of the gospel which they preached, and earnest workers in the ministry which they adorned. The author of the 'Reformed Pastor' must be allowed to be a fair judge of ministerial qualifications, and he has said: 'For all the faults that are now among us, I do not believe that ever England had as able and faithful a ministry since it was a nation as it hath at this day; and I fear that few nations on earth, if any, have the like. Sure I am, the change is so great within these twelve years, that it is one of the greatest joys that ever I had in the world to behold it. Oh, how many congregations are now plainly and frequently taught that lived then in great obscurity! How graciously hath God prospered the studies of many young men that were little children in the beginning of the late troubles, so that now they cloud the most of their seniors!' . . . 'It raised a grievous cry over the nation,' writes Bishop Burnet, 'for here were many men much valued, and distinguished by their abilities and zeal, now cast out ignominiously, reduced to great poverty, and provoked by spiteful usage.' . . . 'Worthy, learned, pious, orthodox divines,' says the philosophic Locke, 'who did not throw themselves out of service, but were forcibly ejected.' . . . There stands, majestic and apostolic in mien as he is in nature, the image of his own 'Living Temple,' John Howe—just the man, from his look of dignity and tenderness, to have written 'The Redeemer's Tears over Lost Souls.' We see him as he looked when the bishop of Exeter asked him what hurt there was in his being twice ordained. 'Hurt, sir! it hurts my understanding; it is an absurdity. Nothing can have two beginnings; I am sure I am a minister of Christ already. I cannot begin again to be a minister.' A fine specimen of the Independent of the olden times. And there, by his side, is that sturdy old Presbyterian, Edmund Calamy; and there is Matthew Poole, with his learned 'Synopsis;' Matthew Meed, with his 'Almost Christian;' and Dr. Lazarus Seaman, a Cambridge scholar, never seen without his Hebrew Bible, and whose sermons

proved a perfect God-send to the young sprouts of prelacy when they pillaged his library; and the saintly Samuel Annesley, from whom John Wesley was descended, and deemed it enough to write on the tombstone of his grandmother: 'She was the youngest daughter of Dr. Annesley;' and there are Dr. Thomas Manton, and Dr. William Bates, *par nobile fratrum*, both of them distinguished for depth in theology and elocution in the pulpit—portly, princely-looking men, courted by the great, and to both of whom were proffered bishoprics; and there is Mr. Joseph Alleine, whose sweet courteous temper could not save him from cruel imprisonments, which cut him off in his thirty-fifth year, and whose 'Alarm to the Unconverted' has passed through more editions, and done more good, perhaps, than any other tract of the same kind; and there is a goodly array of learned doctors, John Owen, Stephen Charnock, Henry Wilkinson, Edmund Stanton, Theophilus Gale, with many others it were too tedious to mention; and there is the genius of his age, Richard Baxter, but 'fallen on evil days and evil tongues,' to whom we must assign a special niche in our Annals. No one can look on that extraordinary countenance, with its sharp, shrewd, aquiline features, piercing eye and firm set lips, and fail to see reflected in it the most accomplished polemic preacher and divine of his day. With the strongest sense of religion himself, no man could excite a more vivid sense of it in the thoughtless and the profligate. Bold as a lion, he discovered the same intrepidity when he reproved Cromwell, and expostulated with Charles II., as when he preached to a congregation of mechanics. He is supposed to have preached more sermons, engaged in more controversies, and written more books, than any other non-conformist of his age. His writings consist of a hundred and forty-five different treatises. 'This,' as one observes, 'is a very faint and imperfect sketch of Mr. Baxter's character; men of his size are not to be drawn in miniature. His portrait in full proportion is in his narrative of his Own Life and Times.' But even there he is a man entirely *per se*, and must be taken on his own terms. That he was a Presbyterian is certain, but he will not allow himself to be so called; he was the champion of Pres-

byterians, but he takes exception to the name. He was no Episcopalian, but he had a plan of his own, which he termed a 'reduced episcopacy.' He was no friend to the Book of Common Prayer, but he produced a 'reformed liturgy' of his own. He was no sectarian, for in his pulpit at Kidderminster he encountered a whole battalion of them from Cromwell's army, and kept his ground against them during the livelong day till midnight; for, said he, 'I knew that if I left the pulpit they would claim the victory.' And yet he may be said to have formed a sect himself; for although, in the main, he was an evangelical divine, he wrote a 'Catholic Theology' of his own, and he cut out a new path for himself, where none have exactly followed him, but which bears the name of Baxterianism. He would not subscribe the covenant, but he fought manfully against all comers. . . . These are but specimens of the ejected; and all who love the gospel will admit that the sudden and simultaneous quenching of two thousand such lights, simply because they could not submit to certain rites of man's devising, could not fail to be as disastrous to the Church and nation of England, as it was disgraceful to the instruments who effected it. With few exceptions, the two thousand ejected ministers were Presbyterians, who had subscribed the solemn league, and possessed livings in the Church."

No Need of a Liturgy.—"Like Paul and Silas in the prison, who 'prayed and sang praises to God' at midnight, when there was no light for reading prayers, and when their only pulpit was the stocks, in which their feet were made too fast to admit of ritual postures, there can be no doubt that these devout ministers could easily dispense with a liturgy. And as the prisoners heard the unwonted sounds, in like manner foes as well as friends were compelled to listen in reverence and wonder to 'the prayer of faith.' Bishop Richardson saw no incoherent rhapsody in the devotions of Thomas Watson, on the day before his ejection, when he followed him to the vestry, and begged for 'a copy of his prayer,' and was amazed to learn that 'he had not penned his prayer, but spoken it out of the abundance of

his heart.' And even the scoffing Pepys remained to pray with Dr. Bates, much pleased, and admiring the way in which he linked the Lord's Prayer with his own—'In whose comprehensive words we sum up all our imperfect desires, saying: Our Father, which art in heaven,' etc. The proficiency which they attained in this exercise in public, only showed how well they had practised it in their secret communion with God.'

Portraits of Non-conformists in Williams' Library.—“In the old library of Red-Cross Street, London, established by Dr. Daniel Williams, there was (as there may still remain in the new premises) a fine collection of portraits, hung on the walls of the staircase, representing the leading non-conformist ministers during the seventeenth and beginning of the eighteenth centuries. They afford a striking panoramic view of the contrast, in point of dress and even of physiognomy, between the men of the Commonwealth and of the Restoration, alluded to in the text. In a lower room there was a very remarkable picture, said to be the effigies of Sir John Oldcastle—Lord Cobham—though with what truth we cannot tell. The following slight reminiscences, referring chiefly to those noticed in the preceding narrative, selected from the author's notes, may afford some idea of this valuable collection:

“SAMUEL ANNESLEY, D. D.—Dark complexioned, sharp featured, and rather severe looking. His black wig is surmounted by a black skull-cap, and he wears short ruffles, stiff and pointed. 'like quills upon the fretful porcupine.' There is a solemn gravity in the whole features, and a deep intelligence in the eye.

“WILLIAM BATES, D. D.—Finely formed features, with a gentlemanly look; well-chiselled nose and compressed lips. He wears his natural hair, but long, and resting on his shoulders.

“RICHARD BAXTER.—This is the most singular portrait in the collection. The most prominent feature is the nose, which is irregularly aquiline, and the bridge of which, rising abruptly from the forehead, descends as abruptly towards the mouth, while the elevated eyebrows, the widely-opened sparkling eyes, and the puckered lips, convey a *qui-vive* expression, strongly in-

dicative of the promptitude and acuteness which distinguished the polemic and the divine. His attenuated frame tells of the ceaseless activity of his spirit.

“THOMAS MANTON, D. D.—A large, noble-looking man, with an expression of mingled majesty and meekness. Clarendon told Richard Baxter that he would not have despaired of his compliance ‘if he had been as fat as Manton.’ Wood describes him as ‘a round, plump, jolly man,’ and says, ‘he was like one fatted for the slaughter; while the royalists resembled apostles, with their macerated bodies and countenances; which Dr. Harris calls ‘a butcherly comparison.’ Dr. Manton became corpulent in advanced life from his sedentary habits, but certainly not from idleness, if we may judge from his works in five volumes folio. The whole contour of the man is in accordance with his character. ‘He disliked the forbidding rigors of some good people, and the rapturous pretensions of others; having found, from long observation, that the over-godly at one time would be under-godly at another.’

“JOHN HOWE.—A splendid countenance, full of grace and majesty. The face is smooth, and he wears a large, full-bottomed wig, broad ruff, gown and bands.

INCREASE MATHER.—A fine pleasant expression, full of benevolence, lighted up by great intelligence. Appears in full canonicals, large peruke, gown and bands.

“JOHN FLAVEL is represented as a good-looking young man, with long hair, a full round face, and neatly dressed, with broad bands and gown.

“OLIVER HEYWOOD presents a broad rubicund face, with a fine eye and firm mouth. His natural hair is white, and hangs in beautiful curls on his shoulders.

“HENRY NEWCOME.—The finest countenance in the whole group, aristocratic, mild and powerful in expression. Dress the same, but with a long narrow white tie hanging over the ruff and bands.

“THOMAS YOUNG, D. D.—This learned man, who deserves to have been mentioned as one of the *Smectymnuan* divines in the Westminster Assembly, was vicar of Stow Market, and is better

known as having been the tutor of John Milton, who ever held him in high esteem, and often visited him at his vicarage, where one of the mulberry trees which the poet planted still exists." . . .

Present Condition and Prospects of Presbyterianism in England.—“The total number of Presbyterian churches in England adhering to the Westminster Standards now amounts to upwards of two hundred and fifty, being an increase of a hundred during the last twenty years. Of these, the Presbyterian Church in England alone, which, when constituted in 1836, could number only thirty congregations, now numbers a hundred and thirty-three, so that, in thirty-five years, it has increased nearly five-fold. Should its numbers continue to augment at the same ratio, English Presbytery may yet take its place as a power in the land. With its simple order, it possesses this advantage over a large and wealthy establishment, that it is in no danger of being upset by becoming top-heavy and unwieldy in its movements, and that it has a power of self-adjustment enabling it to meet the exigencies of the times, the changing fortunes of social position, and the influences of national predilection. At the same time, by virtue of its organisation, it avoids the opposite disadvantage of shooting up into a vast multitude of isolated saplings, tall but attenuated; it carries bulk and strength with its breadth of root. And thus it bids fair, with the blessing of Heaven, to realise the growth of ancient Israel, ‘Thou hast prepared room before it, and didst cause it to take deep root, and it filled the land.’ Everything, however, depends upon securing that blessing, and English Presbyterianism would do well to take warning and instruction from her past annals. These plainly admonish her to ‘hold fast that which she hath, that no man take her crown.’ They loudly call upon her to avoid a loose, latitudinarian policy, which would sacrifice truth for a false peace, and a good conscience for fancied charity. On the other hand, they bid her beware of internal discord, of endless divisions, and of a weak stickling and striving for small points. For her a more glorious mission could hardly be prayed for or predicted, than to point out to a distracted Church the

golden mean between Christian liberty and Christian order,—to afford a large, liberal resting-place for all that are ‘peaceable and faithful in Israel,’—and to present the spectacle, hitherto unwitnessed by the world, of a free, catholic, united, evangelical Church, ‘fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners.’ ”

In confirmation of the historian’s just estimate of the character and influence of our venerable Martyr-Church, we subjoin the weighty remarks of the Right Honorable A. S. Ayrton, one the metropolitan members of Parliament, before a London audience :

“If they passed from the Established Church to the Non-conforming denomination, he knew of none which was more interesting to a member of the Church of England, or to society, than that great denomination which is established in Scotland as the Church of that country, namely, the Presbyterian Church. That Church was full of interest to them, and, indeed, he thought that there was a period of their history when they were within an ace of having the Presbyterian Church established in England, instead of the Episcopalian Church which now existed. There was also another great epoch in our history, when they nearly had an arrangement by which their Episcopalian system was to have been modified by a large infusion of the Presbyterian system of Church government—which was, in fact, to be a kind of amalgamation between the one and the other. When they considered what had occurred in this country from that time to this, and what had occurred in Scotland, he was disposed to think that it was a great misfortune to this country that we had an unalloyed Episcopalian religion established. If they looked at what was going on in the Established Church, if they saw the attempts that were being made to undermine its Protestant position and influence, and if they observed *how entirely Episcopacy had failed to vindicate the Protestant feeling of the country within the Church*, they could not but regret that they had not infused into the Church that strong Protestant influence which was found to be so preëminent in the Church of Scotland. (Cheers.) In these times it was not easy to say what would happen in the future, because he observed speculations were being made upon religious and political subjects by the very wisest people, which did not seem to carry them beyond the

reach almost of their noses, and what they said was going to happen. But if he were to venture upon a speculation, when every one was asking the question what was to be done with the Church of England to preserve its Protestant principles and Protestant administration of its services, he was disposed to say that he thought *they would have to look to the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church for the means of giving new life and new energy, and of preserving the truth itself within the pale of the Church of England.* (Cheers.) It was therefore a matter of great interest to watch the progress of the Presbyterian Church in this country, and he need hardly say they would not be able to see it in its full efficacy, unless disconnected to a large extent from the Establishment, and in a self-sustaining condition."

May it be given to Old England to know the things that make for her safety, her honor, and her peace! May it be given to her to recognise the sole Headship of Christ her Lord, and to place around her brow that crown so long rejected—the peerless crown of a pure, unsullied, scriptural Presbyterianism! This would be her crown of glory far surpassing in splendor and value the jewelled diadem of kings and queens!

—♦—

ARTICLE VI.

SPIRITISM AND THE BIBLE.

1. *The Debatable Land between this World and the next.* By ROBERT DALE OWEN, Author of "Footfalls on the Boundary of Another World." New York: Carleton & Co.; and London: Trubner & Co. 1872. Pp. 542.
2. *The Clock Struck One, and Christian Spiritualist, being a Synopsis of the Investigations of Spirit Intercourse by an Episcopal Bishop, three Ministers, five Doctors, and others, at Memphis, Tenn., etc., etc.* By the Rev. SAMUEL WATSON. New York: S. R. Wells, Publisher. 1872. Pp. 208.
3. *Sundry Papers in the Scientific American, beginning Aug. 12th, 1871, on "Psychic Force," as an explanation of the*

Phenomena of Spiritism. By W. CROOKES, F. R. S., London; and Prof. VANDER WEYDE, late of the Cooper Institute, New York.

4. *The London Quarterly Review for Oct., 1871. Art. I., "Spiritualism and its Recent Converts."*
5. *The Answer of Science to Spiritualism.* By EDWARD W. COX, S. L., F. R. G. S., (London). New York: Henry L. Hinton. 1872. Pp. 79.

The philosophical student of human nature will not be content to pass by unexamined that irrepressible impulse to seek communion in some way with the invisible world. It has been limited to no one period, country, or race, and is surely among those facts of experience which philosophy is bound to coördinate and explain. If any trait of man's nature is entitled to be termed universal it is this. It appears in the Gree-gree Fetish of the African, in the "Medicine Men" of American savages, in the Runic Rhymes of the North of Europe, in the beautiful but sensuous Mythologies of the Greeks and Romans, in the Sorcery of Ancient Egypt, and the Magic of the Chaldeans, as well as in all forms of religious belief, true and false, ancient or modern. If Cicero was correct in making *universality* a test of reality, then does this craving in man for the super-human satisfy the canon: "Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus." Where there is much smoke we are justified in expecting some fire, though it be hidden from the careless glance beneath piles of rubbish. The dogmatic infidel may sneer at the weakness of the multitude. He may point out contradictions between rival faiths, and difficulties encompassing all. But experience ought to assure him by this time of the utter hopelessness of persuading mankind to abandon a belief in, and long after, the invisible. If he insists upon the entire falsity of those cravings of the heart and those processes of the reason, which lead mankind to the supernatural, then he must hold that man is the solitary instance in nature of an animal whose deepest instincts ever lead him into delusion. He must imply that the root of our nature is a lie, and that truth is an impossibility.

In this fearful chaos of thought, however, the foundation of dogmatic unbelief is cut away, for it has no other basis than the assumed truthfulness of the very faculties whose necessary conclusions he recklessly calls in question. Thus his infidelity perishes by a *felo de se*. But if with the more subtle Hume he should assume the role of "negative doubt," mother nature abhors a vacuum. An earnest mind cannot continue to be an indifferent sceptic upon great issues, concerning which it has any knowledge at all. Hume confessed that *he* was not; and if he had not, his very speech, like Peter's Galilean accent, would have betrayed him. *Credendum est tibi* is a necessity of rational natures, yet more imperative than Cicero's "philosophandum est tibi." Every man who thinks must have his creed, Jewish, Pagan, Christian, Mohammedan, or infidel as the case may be. Hume had his creed as truly as the Apostle Paul had his. Which of the two was the more enlightened and rational, must be decided by an appeal to right reason. We frequently hear the apothegm, "Superstition is the mother of infidelity," and experience testifies its substantial truth. But the maxim is equally true read backwards—Infidelity is the mother of superstition. Dr. Whately in his notes to Bacon's "Essay of Atheism," justly attributes to that great thinker a perception of a yet nearer relation between those two great enemies of religion—that of identity of essence despite the variety of outward shape. He traces them back to the same bad habit of forming opinions without due regard to the evidence. Unbelief and credulity may thus be viewed as the same force, but applied in opposite directions. It is *infidelity* when it rejects the evidence for the truth. It is *credulity* when forming a substitute for the truth.

Reflections like these, laying no claim to originality, must frequently occur to the reflecting mind as it watches the ebb and flow of the ceaseless struggle of the truth with its old enemies infidelity and superstition. How exciting is the spectacle! There is Atheistic science, busily interweaving the false metaphysics of Positivism, with her glorious discoveries concerning the Creator's wisdom and power in nature; and yet all the while

she ignorantly scorns Comte and his metaphysics.* In the East we behold the decaying trunk of Islamism, in Italy that of Romanism, in Utah the carcass of Mormonism. The wild dreams of Swedenborg are being sedulously propagated among the unevangelised and the half-evangelised in both hemispheres. And with these protean shapes of error appears the last religious mania in the shape of necromancy, or Spiritism, which appeases the cravings of man's heart after the supernatural without interfering with his love of sin. Surely "science falsely so called" is making slow progress in the boasted work of exorcising the demon of superstition from the modern mind. She may perhaps be content after a while to leave the work to her elder sister Revelation. It is only the other day that we had placed in our hands "The To-Morrow of Death," in which a disciple of physical science proposes to revive the old Hindoo doctrine of the transmigration of the soul.† He is sadly ignorant of Christianity, poor man, save as it is misrepresented by Romanism. But he has the indestructible religious element of our nature. He is in deep distress at the calamities which have fallen upon France, dismembered by Prussia, and distracted by the Commune. He feels the irrepressible longing after another life, and so not having the fear of Mill, Baring-Gould, and Huxley, before his eyes, he dresses up the old doctrine of Brahminism afresh, substituting for the Brahminical finale of absorption into the ocean of Deity, a French view of the soul's return after weary wanderings and diverse incarnations in the bodies of men and animals, to its final rest in the warm regions of the central sun. How mortifying must the religious aspect of the modern world prove to Scientists, who proudly remind Christianity of her failures, and promise a scientific millennium of exemption from all concern for a hereafter!

Our pastoral duties have lately brought us into nearer contact with Spiritism, and have forced upon us the discussion of its re-

*For example: Prof. Huxley in his Edinburgh Lecture on *Protoplasm*.

†M. Figuiet.

lations to Christianity. And in discharging that duty we have consulted the volumes and essays found at the head of the Article. Experience assures us that the apparent attitude of Spiritism toward evangelical Christianity, depends upon the degree to which the new belief has become developed in the individual mind or in the community. When that development is complete, bursting through the restraints of previous education, and casting off all disguises, it stands revealed the *avowed* enemy of the Bible. Till then, however, in the transition stage, it is content to seek alliance more or less intimate with Biblical Christianity, as Swedenborgianism, Mormonism, and even Mohammedanism, have done before it.* The two volumes first named in our list, signalise the tendency to coöperation; the leading periodicals of the new sect openly scoff at the Churches and the Scriptures, while their travelling preachers retail all the filthy blasphemies of Thomas Paine to motley groups of illiterate hearers.

“The Debatable Land” presents itself as the second effusion from the pen of Mr. Robert Dale Owen on the same theme. It is a stout duodecimo, full of miscellaneous scraps from the four quarters of the earth, showing that the writer has dipped into many books but mastered none. Mr. Owen dedicates his book curiously enough “to the Protestant Clergy.” As one of the acknowledged leaders of Spiritism, he definitely tenders the olive branch of peace to us upon certain conditions, which we shall examine. A golden moment has come, he thinks, in the protracted struggle between Protestantism and Popery, such as it shall be unwise and criminal to neglect. Protestantism had one such during the life-time of the great Reformers, but the opportunity was lost. The reason is apparent—Luther and Calvin were unfit to become the Moses and the Joshua of the spiritual Exodus. They burdened the new enterprise with too many of the old dogmas, among which we find the Protestant form of “Human Infallibility,” by which he designates the belief in the

*The Koran and Mohammedan Traditions allude in respectful terms to “Mousa” and “Issa,” (Moses and Jesus.)

supernatural inspiration of Scripture. He therefore favors us with "Book I, Touching the Communication of Religious Knowledge to Men," in which he handles the offensive dogma of Infallible Inspiration, without gloves. In the preface he had already assumed that the march of science had swept away every vestige of miracle from the world of reality and possibility. And upon this accomplished fact, of which we hear a good deal, he grounds the great need of Christianity for new help in maintaining the doctrine of a future life, and whatever else is worth preserving in the system. This timely help comes up, like Blucher at Waterloo, in the shape of "Spirit Revelings," phenomena, we are told, of the same sort, but strictly under the dominion of natural law.* Having laid the foundations of the new Evangel without the old rubbish of miracle and inspiration, our author treats us now and then to a choice bit of exegesis,† in which he respectfully protests against the Pauline view of the doctrine of vicarious atonement. He also discards the theology of the Fourth Gospel in favor of the simpler views of the three synoptics, without caring of course to inquire how much of the objectionable matter is really peculiar to John. Our author no doubt is aware of the ignorance exhibited in America as to the cast off clothes of Germano-French infidelity, and so he cites without stopping to name his sources. Having thus bestowed his free criticism upon Church and creed, having served up once more the stale slanders against Calvin and Luther, having set Paul and John down upon their proper level, and given us an uninspired Bible, a human Christ, and a Gospel without an atonement, Mr. Robert Dale Owen sails off like the witches in our story books, in search of wonderful stories of haunted houses, "writing mediums," "spirit touches" (under the table of course), with which he is quite as familiar as with the contents of the Gospels, and, it is evident, far better pleased.

*P. 154.

†P. 268, Note on the manner of Christ's birth by natural law of a Virgin mother, etc.

We mention one point more in the volume. It is the estimates of Spiritists as to the numbers adhering to the new religion. A Spiritist of some intelligence recently replied to our question upon this topic by claiming in round numbers 12,000,000. Mr. Owen cites from several sources, testifying the wide diffusion of the sect in both hemispheres, and then gives 15,000,000 as a moderate estimate of the adherents of Spiritism.* One-half of this aggregate (7,500,000) he supposes to live in the United States. But if he cared to claim all who have been rescued from Materialism through the agency of spirit-intercourse, he thinks it probable that the amount would reach 30,000,000. And this he adds is a growth as rapid as the wiser friends of Spiritism could desire or the world can bear. In this last, while rejecting the count as absurdly extravagant, we heartily concur. Mr. Owen does not favor us with the list of periodicals published in this country in avowed advocacy of these doctrines, but he names five which have come into being during the past ten years in the city of London alone. Which fact shows the importance of Christian ministers being on the alert against these inroads of superstition.

In "The Clock struck One" we meet the same proposal for an alliance between Christianity and Spiritism, but from a very different sort of mind. In Mr. Watson, despite his grave errors, we recognise a mistaken but earnest friend of Evangelical Christianity. As a near neighbor we can testify to the high repute of Mr. W. as a man, honorable, truthful, and generous. We entertain no doubt of his perfect sincerity in affirming to us in private, that his purpose is to use what he regards as the facts of Spiritism to uphold the faith "once delivered to the saints." In his eyes these spirit-communications discover a special providence, unmasking just in the critical moment a powerful battery, with which the "Christian spiritualist" shall utterly demolish the strongholds of Materialism, and usher in the millennium. Our author has serious fears for the safety of Zion, from the bold

*Pp. 232-6.

assertions of infidel science and the progress of its anti-scriptural opinions. Our neighbor's fears would be greatly calmed, we think, by a closer study of the history of God's Church. Materialism is only one of the many foes who have, like Goliath of Gath, defied the armies of the living God. Apostate Judaism, Pagan Rome, Papal Rome, Infidel Criticism of the Inspired Text, subtle metaphysics in all its hues—where are they? History will tell you they have fallen before the cross, in illustration of the Master's word, "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it." The citadel of our faith is in no peril, though men who refuse its shelter may die. The "Sword of the Spirit"—God's almighty Spirit, not the feeble spirits of men—has always been more than a match for the darts of the wicked one. There is no need of sending down into Egypt for help. Christ has furnished us with weapons which have shown themselves mighty through God against his enemies and ours. The second error of Mr. W. is even more serious. It is his failure to inquire of God concerning the matter, instead of going like Saul to the Witch of Endor. But of this we shall speak anon.

The book bears almost upon every page the traces of a hasty pen. Had it been anonymous, we should have experienced considerable difficulty in receiving it as the mental effort of a sturdy Methodist preacher whose words have instructed and pleased the most intelligent ears. Our author traces back the title of his book to the eccentric freaks of an old time-piece, which, perfectly silent and motionless on other occasions, persisted in notifying the family of an approaching death by one ominous stroke upon the bell. The title is a guarantee to Mr. W.'s sincerity, if such were needed, for no designing man would choose an incident of such a character as the foundation of his faith.

In the main body of his volume, Mr. W. finds a point of contact between the scriptural doctrine of angelic ministries (Heb. i. 14), and intercourse with the dead upon the asserted identity of the angels with the souls of the departed. In proving this important point, he expounds certain texts in which the human form and name are ascribed to the apparitions of these ministering spirits. We wonder that it did not occur to him to see

whether the human shape *only* was assumed by these angelic spirits. A little examination would have undeceived him. Revelation assures us that, to Elisha and his servant, they appeared as "horses of fire and chariots of fire" (2 Kings vi. 17). Isaiah saw them (chap. vi.) as winged figures, like the cherubic forms over the mercy seat, but entirely unlike men. While to John upon Patmos the living creatures about God's throne (Rev. iv.) had severally the face of a lion, an ox, a man, and an eagle, understood to be emblematic of dominion, strength, wisdom, and speed. The argument from shape falls to the ground. But a more formidable objection is found in the implied parallel (asserted indeed in the communications of the spirit "Mystery"), that evil spirits or demons are also the souls of dead men. If so, whence came that disguised evil spirit called "the old serpent" or Satan, who tempted the *first* man and woman? We affirm that angels are represented in Scripture as an order of beings totally distinct from men (see Heb. ii. 16). There is no point in common between angelic ministries and "Spirit Intercourse." And with this clear refutation falls what Mr. W. seems to regard the strongest point in his book. Of the interview between Samuel and Saul we shall have occasion to speak hereafter. It is the solitary instance, it seems to us, in which the inspired text appears committed to intercourse between the living and the dead. Samuel's foreknowledge of Saul's fate was evidently *miraculous*, being inspired prophecy. This, on Mr. W.'s principles, places the case entirely beyond what he claims for the knowledge communicated by spirits. "We once asked Mystery"—a spirit whom our author admires extravagantly—"if the spirits could tell of future events. His reply was, 'They cannot.' . . . He told us emphatically that no human intelligence can know with certainty the future. None but the Infinite God, who comprehends time and eternity, could see what was in the future."* He then gives an extract from a book by Judge Edmunds and Dr. Dexter, presenting a communication from the spirit of Lord Bacon, (very unlike his old style of communicating

*P. 114.

on earth however), in which he affirms the same position. Spiritists, therefore, cannot appeal to Samuel's interview with Saul to give authenticity to their alleged communications. For the scriptural case is *miraculous*. We wonder that Mr. W. has overlooked the fact that this very interview, being an act of wilful disobedience to God's law, helped to hasten on the doom of Saul. *So Saul died for his transgression which he committed against the Lord, even against the word of the Lord, which he kept not, and also for asking counsel of one that had a familiar spirit, to enquire of it; and enquired not of the Lord: therefore he slew him, and turned the kingdom unto David, the son of Jesse.* 1 Chron. x. 13, 14. We wish to express in most unmistakable terms the clear separation which we discover between the supernatural of the Bible, and the phenomena claimed for Spiritism or Necromancy, as it is now practised amongst us.

Our space does not suffer us to follow Mr. Watson into the curious confusion of ideas exhibited in his copious citation of authorities, whom he understands to agree with him as to the reality of our communion with the dead. The probable cause of this confusion lies in his firm persuasion that he had clearly shown the identity of angels with the souls of departed men, and hence felt free to claim everything upon the subject of "angelic ministries" for his side of the question. But the confounding of the human with the angelic order of beings leads, as we saw, to absurdity, especially in the case of Eve's temptation. The Bible says absolutely nothing of the *dead* revisiting this world upon ministries of love to the living. The suggestion, indeed, chimes in with the promptings of natural affection, and when made is eagerly seized upon by the sorrowing heart. But Scripture is not responsible for it in any way, and it must stand or fall upon its own merits, without affecting at all the scriptural doctrine of angels and their being employed by their Lord and King on occasional errands of love to man. We have been informed that the friends of Bishop Otey claim that Mr. Watson has not correctly represented his real opinions upon "Spirit Intercourse." We are sure that any such misrepresentation would be unintentional, for Mr. W.'s reputation for veracity is unques-

tionable. However this may be, it is generally believed that the late Bishop was, for some time previous to his death, laboring under serious disorders which impaired his judgment. And with those who know the facts, the claims of Spiritism will not be strengthened by the free use of his name in the title-page of Mr. W.'s book. One feature of the book we notice with surprise and pain—a disposition to accuse the ministry of hiding what they know to be the truth on the matter of spirit-intercourse, from motives of self-interest and fear. Such sentiments are not natural to a brave and generous man like Mr. W., and we set them down to the influence of *evil company*. “Be not deceived, evil communications corrupt good manners.” It is a well known trait of the errorists with whom our friend comes in contact and from whose books he quotes, to bully those who hold the old views as being deficient in courage and candor. It is a cheap way of getting a certain class to sympathise with them. But we are sure that one who feels so keenly anything which seems to reflect upon his motives, would not of himself resort to such hasty and wholesale charges. He possesses ample materials to revise and correct his hasty expressions, and we trust he may do himself the justice to give public expression to his better thoughts. Mr. W. knows that the ministry have as deep an interest in the truth as he has, and that in the noble body of self-denying philanthropists, the Methodist ministry, of which he has been an honored and trusted member for forty years, there are hundreds, yea thousands, that would face infinitely greater perils than he alludes to, for the sake of truth, which they regarded necessary to the happiness and salvation of men. And such being the case he should learn to watch these “evil communications.”

The literary blemishes which thrust themselves upon our attention, might expose the author to sharp criticism by a pen less friendly to him than ours. For example: the unaccountable blunder of putting “theol” for the Hebrew word *sheol*, which occurs more than once, if our memory is correct—“darmenes” for the Greek *δαίμονες*, daimones—the curious specimen of philology on page 52, intimating a serious difference between the

English word *spirit*, and its corresponding terms in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, which has no foundation in fact. But among all the proofs of haste and immaturity, none is more patent than the list of "Christian Fathers" given us in chap. III.

We now come to consider the specimens given us of the communications sent to Mr. Watson directly from the spirits in what we call heaven, but which he is pleased to consider a sort of intermediate world, as if half-conscious all the while that they are hardly worthy of the real heaven. These communications were received through a certain professional medium, residing at No. 361, Sixth Avenue, New York. He has been a class-leader, we learn with surprise, and has held a great many hundred class-meetings during the past thirty years. We may be permitted to express a timid wish that the brother adheres more closely to God's written Word in class-meeting, than he does in his business as "Medium." And we are sure that written communications from David, Isaiah, and Paul, made before death, would be more edifying to the faithful than his messages from John Wesley or Bishop Otey across the river, are likely to prove.

Two ideas are found in all these "communications." One of these is the most intense satisfaction, rising often to rapturous ecstasy, at the privilege of speaking with Brother Watson. Hear this, for example: "Bless you, bless my dear son, for the assurance I have, you allow me a place in your heart of hearts," etc. "Can I see you, dear Brother Watson, where I can thank you for your good feelings toward me in life. Again, even in death, you did not forget to speak kindly of me." "Oh, my dear, dear, ever kind and loving husband! have you thought of your dear Mary. . . . And did I not know, Samuel, we should meet again, and that never to be again dissevered, *then I would be wretched indeed!*" (Italics ours). "Dear Brother Watson— This is more than I had anticipated or hoped for, and you may say more than I really deserved. . . . One hour after I had awaked to consciousness in the spirit land, I would have been willing to have given all the treasures of earth," (and a poor sacrifice it would have been to a spirit in his circumstances, too), "were they mine, could I have but returned to you and

begged your pardon," etc. "Do not scold me, brother," pleads another eager spirit "for taking time you intended your precious consort should have improved, but she is not present this moment." "Bless you, darling one, for this, another call." "Oh, my dear, dear father, this is more than I could have hoped for—at least at this sitting. Dear Judge Poston sent a messenger for me, saying: 'Allen, my dear young friend, do, do hasten and talk with your dear father, who is just outside awaiting you? *At this summons my soul shouted glory to God in the highest! etc.!!*'" In fact, the commotion excited among the spirits by Mr. Watson's condescension and sociality, is at times boisterous. They gently complain that they have stood by quite ruefully while others "controlled" the medium. And one nearly explodes with delight when others come up to his help and enable him to use the medium's nerves and muscles. The scramble sometimes becomes undignified, and we are reminded of the scene in Virgil's Iliad, where the disembodied mourners on the sombre banks of the Styx struggle wildly for a place in old Charon's boat. Such messages are doubtless thrilling appeals to the affections of the initiated, but to lookers on they seem to be cunning schemes for lining the medium's pockets.

Another feature common to nearly all these messages is, the astounding estimate placed upon Mr. Watson's forthcoming book. "Go on, my son; mind not what the would-be wise may say or think." "Your forthcoming book will be criticised by the Church; but care not for that, it is a step in the right direction." "I then wrote for Bishop Otey; when it was written: 'Dear Brother Watson—Your dear friend, the Bishop, is not at present with you; but Stephen Olin is, and he says your book will be a success. He has been with you while you have been weaving it; and so has Mr. Wesley. They say the book will not only produce a sensation, but great good will result from the widespread of the truths therein contained. I have not looked it over, nor was there need of it so long as those two God-gifted spirits *have the management of it,*' (i. e., Mr. Wesley and Bishop Otey). Again: "I asked for Bishop Soule's opinion of it." This is the reply: "Dear Brother—If my judgment on the matter of your

book is worth seeking, allow me to say it will be to the conscientious soul thirsting for more light, apples of gold in trays of silver. Brother Taylor told me he believed the book would be the medium through which the South and the North would be again united.(!) Well, brother, time works wonders. You are in safe hands and keeping." "I then wrote: Will my dear mother speak to me, and tell me who made the clock strike 'one' before each one of four of my family died? 'Well, Samuel, my son, no one in particular, but it was by the combined influence of C'oke, the Wesleys, Channing, and the band that surrounded you at that time, to see what they could produce.'"(!) One more: "I tell you, Bro. Watson, you have not only done yourself justice, but the work you have prepared. Tell Judge Edmunds the name he gave the book is one so befitting the matter it contains."* Our readers may be ready to cry out in the words of Horace, "Ohe jam satis!" But we wish to give a clear conception of what profound disclosures the world is likely to get from the oracles of Spiritism. Here we have the combined wisdom of spirits and Spiritists. Our friend, who can preach excellent sermons when he interprets Scripture by the light of his own common sense; Dr. Mansfield, who is the great medium referred to above, besides being a class-leader for thirty years; and Judge Edmunds, who seems to be "facile princeps" among the Spiritist theologians, counsel together on earth; while Bishops of the Episcopal Church, and Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, the Wesleys and a throng of lesser stars unite the rays of their now glorified intellects in producing this one book which is to illuminate the world and reconcile jarring nations! "Parturiunt montes, nascitur ridiculus mus"! Intelligent persons who have enjoyed ample opportunities for recognising Mr. Watson's style, have suggested that these replies prove that Dr. Mansfield *mesmerised* our author, thus getting control of his thoughts, and making him give the "communications." Several things seem to render the supposition plausible. Such things have been done by skilful mesmerists. The thoughts are such

* Chap. XIV., *Passim*.

as we might suppose Mr. W. to indulge, in his natural enthusiasm upon the eve of publishing this new volume which was to vindicate his favorite opinions. Authors no doubt often indulge fond anticipations, which, like the air-castles of a certain milkmaid, whose picture in the spelling book instructed our youthful eyes, are not always realised. These readers think that they detect Mr. W.'s style in these messages. It is easy to trace such correspondences as the phrase, "Well, so and so," the constant omission of the particle *that* where the English idiom requires it, and other sins against grammar. Mr. Watson is not devoid of gentlemanly modesty, as we know upon good authority, but we advise him to keep away hereafter from mesmerists and mediums when he is about to publish. However, another theory might explain just as well as the persistent sameness of style in the messages to Mr. W., viz., that Dr. Mansfield's mind fathered them all. It would be easy for him to catch the cue from an honest, frank-hearted man, as we believe our author to be, especially when excited upon the subject of his book. If so, he has been guilty of over acting, in our judgment, by fatally committing the highest intelligences of the spirit-world to such opinions of this book and its career. And as prophesying is the order of the day, we venture to predict that Dr. M. and his art will pay the penalty in the estimate of every sensible reader. For our excellent neighbor we are heartily sorry.

One other communication we must notice. It is found on pp. 190, 191, and purports to come from "Gen. Thomas Rivers," whose history is well known in Memphis. We quote the "spirit's" language: "When I took my breast-plate and sword, and walked out to defend my country, I little thought my life was to be sacrificed as it was; but the cause was a just one, and could I live my life over again on earth, I would lay it on the same altar again." Here we have a somewhat antiquated, but unmistakable description of death in battle. But we learn upon the highest authority that Gen. Rivers was never in either of the armies during "the late unpleasantness," and therefore of course his death which occurred in his bed at Memphis could in no wise be described as a "sacrifice" "on the altar" of his country.

But more: Gen. Rivers is made to say, that he has met his "parents" in the spirit-world. But it turns out to be a premature announcement. The Rev. Dr. Jones, of Memphis, testifies in print, that the excellent mother of the deceased General has not yet passed over the river, having been seen "in the flesh" since this message came, in the aforesaid city of Memphis. Now here are two errors upon matters of fact. Who is at fault, Mr. Watson, or the medium? It can hardly be that Gen. R. has mistaken some one else for his own mother, and that in the presence of all the family—father, brothers, sisters, and *wives*, who, it seems, are living quite comfortably in a house with their husband! But it is not that "house not made with hands eternal in the heavens," of which the Apostle tells us; for one of the spirits testifies, that their custom is to construct their own abodes in the spirit world. The same authority assures the surviving Mrs. R. that apartments have been prepared for her in the same abode! So it seems that our generation exceeds that which lived in the days of Noah, for while they continued "to marry" and to be "given in marriage, until the day that Noah entered into the ark," men now-a-days continue something very like it under decidedly greater difficulties, and apparently in a very questionable form.

This brings us to consider the question, (which we would earnestly recommend to the serious attention of all who respect the Bible as the law of God), What has Scripture to say as to the lawfulness and the expediency of Christians resorting to spirit-manifestations as a means of gaining information about the state of the dead, or the duties of the living? The question is easily answered. And, let it be said with all due regard for erring brethren, the plainness of the reply magnifies the sin of disobedience to God's revealed will. Protestants are agreed upon the truth, that Scripture is a complete revelation of faith and duty. We may differ among ourselves as to the interpretation of some things contained in Scripture, but there is no difference among us as to the sufficiency and completeness of God's Book for all the religious wants of man. This agreement is built upon the declarations of Scripture itself. "Secret things belong unto the

Lord your God, but what is written belongs unto you and unto your children." How frequently were the Israelites forbidden to add anything to what God had spoken. And in the closing book of the New Testament a special woe is denounced against the man who adds unto or takes away from the words of God. But how can a man consistently profess his belief in the sufficiency of Scripture, who in fact goes elsewhere for religious knowledge? Besides this, our Lord teaches us in the Parable of Lazarus and the Rich Man (Luke xvi, 19-31,) that *exactly* such forms of communication with the dead as we now speak of shall not prove beneficial to the living. "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, *though one rose from the dead.*" What have brethren to say to these sound words? How can they expect such splendid results from that which has been pronounced useless by such authority? But even this is not all by any means. The Law of express prohibition is published against the practice. God's holy revelation repeatedly encounters "the Hidden Arts" known by the various, but nearly allied terms—sorcery, magic, witchcraft, and necromancy, or dealing with the dead, and the tone of Scripture towards these baleful superstitions, is ever that of unsparing denunciation and condemnation.

Let us hear the law, which all believers are bound to obey. Lev. xix. 31: "Regard not them that *have familiar spirits*, neither seek after wizards to be defiled by them: I am the Lord your God." Chap. xx. 27: "A man also or a woman that hath a familiar spirit, or is a wizard, shall surely be put to death: they shall stone them with stones: their blood shall be upon them." (We understand of course that *bodily* punishment belongs, under the new dispensation, exclusively to the civil magistrate; but its severity, under the Mosaic law, shows the enormity of the sin). Isaiah viii. 19: "And when they shall say unto you, seek unto them that *have familiar spirits*, and unto wizards that peep and that mutter; should not a people seek unto the Lord their God? For the living to the dead?" Also Chap. xlv. 25: Wherever these "Occult Arts" came in contact with the inspired servants of God there was instant warfare, like that

between Israel and Amalek, *forever*. For example: Moses and the Sorcerers of Egypt, Peter and Simon Magus, Paul and Elymus, or the dealers in necromancy and magic at Philippi and Ephesus. And in the two closing chapters of the Bible (Rev. xxi. 8; and xxii. 15) "sorcerers" are classed along with the worst sinners, who are expressly excluded from heaven. The law of God is plain and unmistakable. The whole class of "Occult Arts," of which "seeking unto the dead" is expressly set down as one branch, is denounced as sin against God and injurious to mankind. They had the same effect then as now— withdrawing men's attention from the all-sufficient Word of God, and opening a wide and effectual door for all manner of superstition, delusion, and false doctrine. The remedy is, touch not the unclean thing.*

Such is the decision of Scripture viewing the practice in its *moral* and *religious* aspects chiefly, if not exclusively. As to the totally different question, "How far superhuman power and intelligence was really involved in these dealings with the dead"? we do not see that Scripture intends to give an explicit answer. That cunning deceit and audacious fraud were practised *then*, as

*A critical examination of the Hebrew Text brings out, if need be, yet more clearly the fact, that the *precise thing condemned* in the Divine law is what men do in consulting "Mediums." Writing at a distance from our library we have not a Lexicon at hand; but turning to Deut. xviii. 11, we find that the phrase rendered "Necromancer," by our version, reads "dhoresh el-hammethim." (דָּרֹשׁ אֶל־הַמֵּתִים); lit.—*one who seeks unto the dead*. In Isaiah viii. 19, the last clause: "For the living (perhaps better 'instead of to the living'), unto the dead?" is evidently elliptical. The preceding clause supplies the verb which is omitted in the vehemence of the prophet's question—"el-Elohav *yidh-rosh*," (root, *darash*, he has sought), as above. But, moreover, the prior member of the parallel in Isaiah viii. 19, has the term "ba obhoth," (in our version well rendered, "have familiar spirits"). That expression is thus seen to be equivalent to "*darosh el-hammethim*," *seeking unto the dead*. "Obh," or in plural "obhoth," is the legal term in Lev. xix. 31, and in xx. 27. It is also used of the Witch of Endor (1 Sam. xxviii. 8; and 1 Chron. x. 13); and of the wicked King Manasseh (2 Kings xxi. 6). The precise identity of the acts cannot be doubted, consulting "Mediums" is the sin condemned in Scripture.

now, Scripture clearly implies, and history expressly teaches. The words in Isaiah, "Wizards that peep and that mutter"—"that frustrateth the tokens of the liars, and maketh the diviners mad," imply fraud and trickery. Some have argued for a supernatural power in the wise men of Egypt, from the words so often repeated, they "did so with their enchantments" when so and so happened. But if we examine Ex. viii. 18, the same form of words "did so with their enchantments" is used when an utter failure resulted. We may not therefore press the words farther than an indefinite description of their doings. And, in truth, they did nothing beyond the power of a first-rate juggler. The concealed passages, stairways, and machinery discovered in their monuments leave us free to infer, that whatever power they may have possessed did not raise them above the trickery in which they have been faithfully imitated by their successors of our time. And with regard to the celebrated interview between Saul and Samuel's spirit, as we have already said, there is every appearance of a miracle. God was about to execute his declared purpose of wresting the sceptre from Saul and giving it to the house of David, the family of Messiah. It was a great occasion worthy of such a miracle. And it was befitting that Samuel, who had foretold the downfall of Eli's wicked house in his childhood, and of Saul's in his old age, should appear from the grave to repeat his fateful message. How can created beings of themselves name the day of one's death? And if God gave him the message, why should we imagine that a wicked old woman, who exhibited marks of terror and astonishment, could compel him to come at her bidding? And if the case of the demoniac girl mentioned in Acts xvi. teaches that "spirits" were then engaged occasionally in giving "communications," the spirit was not human as we have seen, unless we maintain that Eve was tempted by one of her own children. And Cicero says that lying was so much the fashion of Necromancers and Augurs in his day (about B. C. 40), that one could not look another in the face without laughing.

The Bible, then, does not intend to commit itself to any explanation of magic, witchcraft, or necromancy, as practised

during the age of miracles. It treats these questions in the far more important light of their *moral and religious* bearing. And from that highest of all stand-points, with which alone Scripture cares to concern itself, it pronounces a sweeping condemnation upon the whole mass, deceit and reality alike, if reality there be. This is the view which we are bound to take so long as we receive Scripture as the law of God, and that irrespective of any explanation which may be offered of the "Occult Arts" at the present. Scripture takes cognizance of the workings of the mind engaged in "seeking to the dead," and condemns the superstitious act, which is not dependent upon the outward fact at all, except so far as it is viewed by the transgressor as a means of gaining forbidden knowledge.

And here two questions require answers at our hands. The first is: Do not your arguments go far to justify the hateful practice of witch burning? To this we render the obvious reply of an emphatic negative. That wicked and cruel custom was handed down to early Protestantism as a relic of the "Holy Inquisition." It was the result of confounding the Church and State which had long been the Papal theory, and only lasted until sober reflection had opened men's eyes to the abolition of the civil laws of Moses, by our Lord's declaration, "My kingdom is not of this world." When the study of Scripture had progressed to this point the Church ceased to appeal to the sword and resorted to her only lawful weapons, the keys of doctrine and discipline. Besides this error of principle, the bloody tragedies enacted at Salem and elsewhere, are rendered shocking by the inhuman cruelty of confounding the innocent with the guilty. It was a period of turbulence, when men's hearts had been hardened by suffering and savage war. We yield to none in our abhorrence of witch-burning. As a Church we have no bodily chastisements for any sin. Our weapons are purely spiritual. If the civil government chooses to punish men and women who, by their trickery, wring money from the poor and weak-minded, it may be proper to proceed against such establishments, as against faro banks and the keno dens, by fine and police regulation. But, as a Church, our resort must be to

spiritual means. And we do not hesitate a moment to express it as our judgment, that Church-members, who, after due remonstrance and instruction, continue these superstitious practices which are expressly forbidden by God's Word, should be dealt with judicially and excluded from sealing ordinances until they forsake their evil ways. And the law not only applies to the "Mediums" who make a dishonest living, but to those who, like Saul, superstitiously resort to them. The issue is not a purely speculative one with some of us. Like the nettle-down, these hurtful superstitions are being borne southward on the passing breeze. Since beginning this article, we have heard of a minister, occupying a responsible position in Georgia, who has from the pulpit inculcated the boldest ideas of Spiritism. But, for him, there is at least the palliating circumstances, if not excuse, that his judgment is probably impaired by a recent bereavement. We hear of foolish people running with their five dollars to such mediums as Foster, to have their heads turned by a dose of his ghost stories. Credible witnesses inform us of large swarms leaving their churches in the North to become adherents of the new religion, whose prophets are Home, Foster, Mansfield, and the Fox Sisters, and whose theologians are Messrs. Owen and Edmunds. Disobedience to the commands of God is a punishable offence. The wise and firm administration of wholesome discipline has ever proved an effective barrier against heresy and schism. It is Christ's own method of recovering stray sheep who are yet within hearing of his authority.

The other question is: "Are you to be understood as forbidding a full and free examination into the alleged phenomena of Spiritism, for the purpose of discovering whatever basis of reality there may be in them?" By no means. Let men of proper qualifications, whose leisure allows them to pursue the investigation, look into these matters. There is no need of confounding superstitious desires to gain knowledge from the dead, with the lawful aim of adding to our knowledge of any powers of body or mind which may be concerned in these curious appearances. Any rational man can tell his own true purpose in observing the alleged manifestations. If it be to pry into the

world of spirits, (whether he can or cannot do so, makes no difference in this respect), he offends against God. The purpose is evil, because God has given us all needful light on these subjects, and forbids us, in his wisdom, from incurring the hazard of injury by attempting to add to what he has done.* If however the inquiry be, what natural powers are involved in these manifestations, the investigation violates no law of God. Only let it be understood, that if the investigator should come upon facts which in his deliberate judgment involve superhuman intervention, just there natural science would cease *for him*. We see nothing as yet in such investigations likely to lead to any such result, and heartily welcome the researches of competent men, of which we have something in the three last items in our text. As yet these investigations are not full enough to satisfy curiosity fully, but they are ample to save any man not actually insane, from the baleful influence of superstition, or, what is nearly as bad, the avaricious clutches of the professional mediums. Christianity has nothing to lose or to gain, so far as her evidences are concerned, in such a sifting of Spiritism. The alleged phenomena have nothing in common with the miracles of the Bible. Between the two sets of "manifestations" there is a great and impassible gulf fixed, like that between Dives in torment and Lazarus in Abraham's bosom. The parallel has been attempted in the interests of Infidelity as well as of Spiritism, but reason will not tolerate such an insinuation. "Go on with your investigations," Christianity may be understood as saying to these gentlemen of science, "make out of it what you can. If it be nothing but tricks of legerdemain, I have already charged it with trickery and deceit long ago. If it be produced in part by unconscious action of muscle and brain, or by 'psychic force,' it is no concern of mine. Or, if you should discover the feeble, erratic actings of invisible beings, it may serve to confirm the scriptural testimony to the reality of such a world of spirits, as

*The parallel of Paul's discussion of "meat offered to idols" in 1 Cor. viii., at once occurs to the student of Scripture. The *intention* constitutes sin, and doubt lays prohibition.

the faint remnants of that power which was fearfully active during the presence of Christ on earth." The hypothesis of this supposed agency of the spirits of dead men, cannot however be considered as demonstrated until natural causes utterly fail to account for the facts after full and fair trial. And then the supposition of demons, totally distinct, as we have seen from human spirits, which has precedence on the ground of the historical facts of Scripture during the age of miracles, must be disproved. Scripture does not demand physical manifestations from such evil spirits *now*, but such intervention being a fact of *past* experience should have the prior credibility, until distinctly disproved.

With regard to the researches of science into the phenomena of Spiritism, it is well known that the distinguished Prof. Faraday, of London, whose recent death caused universal sorrow in the civilised world, was induced, in 1853, to examine into the facts connected with "Table Rappings." His experiments, and the conclusions reached, were published in his "Letters" on the subject, which we have not seen. We are not aware that the mental facts, said to be connected with these rappings, came distinctly before him. But his conclusion regarding the physical manifestations was, that they were referable to "unconscious muscular action." The great experimenter in physical law invented a simple apparatus, called an "Indicator," with a set of rollers, and a movable arm which visibly obeyed the slightest impulse, indicating so clearly the muscles from which that impulse came, that when put in contact with the table, no motions took place while the eyes of the operators were directed to this infallible guide to the unconscious movements of partially benumbed muscles. Here the question rested so far as science was concerned, until very recently, when Mr. William Crookes, F. R. S., and editor of the *Quarterly Journal of Science*, London, and Dr. Huggins, an astronomer of considerable repute, on account of his skill in the use of the Spectroscope, published his views in the above-named journal, which proposed to give a new explanation. The *British Journal* we have not been able to find, but Mr. Crookes has published his experiments in the

Scientific American, for Aug. 12th, and Nov. 11th, 1871. In his papers he claims to have demonstrated the existence of a new force, connected with the human organisation, for which he proposes the name "Psychic Force," (*i. e.*, that force which is peculiarly related to animal life). The instrument invented by him is given in the plate accompanying his letter. His object was to measure the new force and to meet Faraday's view of "unconscious muscular action," by arranging the apparatus so as to exclude the possibility of muscular action of any kind. For this purpose a stout board four feet long was selected as a lever with a fulcrum very near one end; the long arm of the lever was connected with a spring-balance; over the fulcrum was placed a vessel of water, and into the water a cup of wire-gauze fastened to an immovable iron stand near by, in such a manner that it could not be pressed against the bottom or sides of the vessel; the "Medium" or "Psychic" placed his hands in this immovable cup of gauze filled with the water displaced by it in the larger vessel. Mr. Crookes contends that this arrangement effectually cuts off muscular action. And the trial indicated the presence of a material force of "about 5,000* grains," which Mr. Crookes accounts for by a new force, to which he applies the above name.

Surely it is a feeble force to accomplish the feats of table-moving, much less to work the miracles of Christianity. But these experiments have been severely criticised by Dr. P. H. Vander Weide, in the same journal, and by the *London Quarterly Review*. Dr. Vander Weide (late Professor in the Cooper Institute, New York) objects chiefly on the ground that Mr. D. D. Home, the "Medium" or "Psychic," employed in Crookes' experiments, is known to be a professional "expert." Dr. V. has studied his legerdemain very closely, (as he has that of quite a number of others, thoroughly exposing the famous tricks of the Davenport Brothers), and he sees nothing in the feeble results yielded by those experiments which an expert may not readily produce by *conscious* muscular effort. The *London Quarterly*

*Nearly $\frac{3}{4}$ of a pound.

maintains that Mr. Crookes has not shown that the *friction* of the water displaced by Mr. Home's hand, might not produce the result which he ascribes to the "Psychic Force," while the much greater results produced without the vessel of water on a similar apparatus, might have been produced by the "accumulated force of persistent vibrations," for which no allowance was made.

And while alluding to the jugglery employed by the noted "mediums," we cannot forbear giving an extract from the *New York World* of Feb. 6th, 1870, which we have before us. Want of space compels us to give brief excerpts only from the complete exposure of the Davenports and other "mediums" given in the *World*. We could wish that some friend of deluded humanity might gather up such articles and republish them in a pamphlet for gratuitous distribution :

"Two young men, known as the Davenport Brothers, have obtained a very extensive notoriety as 'physical mediums.' They are natives of the city of Buffalo, New York, where, when they were mere boys, their 'wonderful powers' were originally developed and manifested. Their first performances in this city were given under the management of their father at Union Hall, 195 Bowery, in the year 1855, most of which the writer attended. The audience being properly seated, the entrance door was locked and the hall darkened, when various manifestations—fully described and explained in another place—were produced.

"At the request of the 'controlling spirit,' made through a horn, the hall was lighted up at intervals during the entertainment, at which times the mediums looked particularly innocent and demure, as if they had never once thought of cheating anybody.

"On one of these occasions, however, a gentleman suddenly lighted the hall by means of a dark-lantern, without having been specially called upon to do so; and the boys were distinctly seen to be doing what they had claimed to be done by 'the spirits.' The audience, with the exception of a few spiritualists, left in disgust. The latter were favored with further demonstrations and an explanation through the horn, quite satisfactory to most of them, of what the rash sceptics, with too much faith in their

sense of sight, had hastily concluded to be an exposure of the mediums as impostors.

“To give more positive evidence of their claims to ‘mediumship’ being well founded, the boys ventured upon an extra ‘manifestation’ shortly after the occurrence above described. At a private seance about a dozen gentlemen, several of whom were members of the press, were seated, together with the mediums, at one side of a long, high table, the mediums being midway of the row. This time a little dim, ghostly gaslight was allowed in the room.

“What appeared to be a hand was exhibited partly above the edge of the vacant side of the table, and opposite the mediums. Several of those present had a feeling, as they afterwards expressed it, of chills creeping over them. The fingers of the ‘spirit hand’ seemed to move; and one Spiritualist present with a vivid imagination, admired the ‘beautiful proportions,’ his observation extending even to the finger nails.

“The humbug would have been a success, probably, if John F. Coles, one of the party, had not suddenly turned on a full head of gas, and pounced on Ira Davenport, from whose foot he took a nicely stuffed glove! The glove had been drawn partly over the toe of Ira’s boot, and by a movement of the foot the fingers were made to move. The Davenports suddenly left for home, disgraced even in the estimation of the most confiding Spiritualists.

“With some change in their mode of operating, and having become more expert by practice, they were quite successful at their subsequent exhibitions in this city.

“Their ‘manifestations’ are produced in either a cabinet or a darkened room, and in no instance while the operators are in full view of the audience.

“In a darkened room their ‘manifestations’ mostly consist of the thrumming (without music) of guitars, ringing of bells, rattling of tamborines, etc., while at the same time the instruments are moved—as indicated by the sounds from them—with considerable rapidity about the room. The same sounds and movements also occur to a limited extent after the operators have been bound by a committee from the audience, the reintroduction of light disclosing them still in bonds as placed by the committee. They usually extricate themselves from the tying after the light is again extinguished, in less time than the committee occupied in binding them. During their entertainment they are also bound with ropes by what they assume to be a spirit power, without mortal assistance. To all appearance the

tying done by 'the spirits' is as methodical and secure as any that a mortal could do. Yet the very instant that darkness supervenes, after the knots have been examined by the committee, the musical instruments are sounded, and various 'manifestations' made that could not possibly be accomplished without the use of hands; immediately on the cessation of which light is produced, and the 'mediums' are ascertained to be bound as they were before the extinction of the light. Sometimes, while he is thus situated, one of the mediums will have his coat removed from his body in a few second's time."

Then follows a detailed description of their "*Mysterious Cabinet*," a sort of cup-board, ingeniously devised for concealing, with the aid of a darkened room their dexterous manipulations of guitars, horns, coats, gloves, knots, etc., etc. The amazing feat of the knotted rope with which they are "securely" bound by a committee from the audience consists in a dexterous "twist of the wrist," by which the "square knot," usually considered the most secure, is converted into "two half hitches," through which part of the rope enclosed by them may be readily slipped. With a little slack in the rope almost any knot can be made into a noose, and this once done leaves their hands free for rapid work to which they have been long trained—such as thrumming guitars, opening doors, slipping coats, exhibiting hands, etc., etc.

"The reader will be able to understand how easy it is for one of the mediums to have his coat taken off after he has tied his own hands together. He can throw the coat in the air and get his hand back into the ropes without their movement being seen, even though a light should be produced soon enough to enable the audience to get a glimpse of the coat before it has quite reached the floor.

"If, after the spirits have bound the Davenports, and hands have been shown at the aperture in the door of their cabinet, the committee should unite the ropes, the secret of the knots would be discovered. But they would not consent to having the ropes untied by the committee.

"Were they really passive, as they claim to be, while the 'manifestations' are going on, they could not reasonably object to having the door of the cabinet opened at any time; but their manager does not permit of the opening of the door unless it is requested by the mediums.

“The performances of these young men are interesting on account of the ingenuity and expertness exercised by them, and would not be in the least objectionable was it not for their pretended ‘mediumship.’

“These mediums once exhibited what they doubtless supposed would look like the hand of a negro; but it was of uniform blackness, palm and all. At one of their entertainments when, in addition to the exhibition of ‘spirit hands,’ a naked arm was protruded from the aperture, an old lady, who, on account of the dimness of her vision, was permitted to stand close by the cabinet, saw, notwithstanding her defective sight, what made her exclaim, ‘Well, I declare! They must practice *vaccination* in the other world, for I see marks of it on that spirit arm!’ When the ‘spirit arm’ was shown at another time, *rope-marks were seen on the wrist!*

“It takes these mediums but a few seconds to get their hands back into the loops, and draw the knots close to their wrists, ready to be examined by the committee.”

Dr. Vander Weide says that practice has enabled him successfully to go through with every one of these performances. And the *Scientific American* of Jan. 6th, 1872, contains an account of an exhibition by these renowned Brothers, which was brought to a ludicrous termination by some mischievous students of Cornell University, Ithaca, New York. “During the dark *seances*, when the Davenports purported to be, and the audience supposed they were, bound hand and foot within their closet or cabinet, and when the guitar was floating in the air and playing musically around the aforesaid students, (who came prepared with balls of phosphorus) struck their lights all of a sudden, when the “spirits” were found to be the Davenports themselves, who were dodging about the stage brandishing the guitars and playing the tunes. The music suddenly ceased, the committee declared the performance a humbug, and the players departed from Ithaca by the first train.”

We have in our possession articles from the pen of our friend Gen. E. P. Alexander, lately Professor of Mathematics in the South Carolina College, published in the *Southern Presbyterian* newspaper of Feb. 3d and 10th, 1870. In these papers Gen. A. describes a *seance* with the celebrated Sisters Fox, in which he

detected one of them in the base imposture of ringing a bell, (*beneath* the table of course), with her toes, while claiming that "spirits" did it. In the other he shows how completely Foster, of New York, who has gotten so many spare five dollar notes from impoverished Southerners, was foiled by a little forethought and self-possession. Gen. A. took the precaution to write the names at his hotel and carefully seal them up in envelopes, as Foster directs to be done *at his table*. By this simple forethought, the danger of having the names detected by the sound or the motion of the pen, (or by accomplices looking down from the ceiling and signalling the information) was avoided. When the sealed envelopes were produced, Mr. Foster passed them successively between his eyes and the gas light, (a very unnecessary proceeding surely, upon the supposition that the "spirits" were to read them), and after much shuffling and many blunders, with no results worth speaking of, (including a stupid attempt on Mr. F.'s part to imitate the motions of an Indian's spirit, upon being told that one had been named in the envelopes), the time had expired and the *seance* was declared at an end, and other hands eagerly laid down the five dollar notes, which seem to come pouring into Mr. F.'s treasury. Gen. A. had seen a poor woman upon the cars, under escort for the insane asylum, who had not only lost her money, but, like many others, her reason, from Mr. F. and his juggleries.*

The writer in the *London Quarterly* confirms the suspicion of Gen. A., that Foster might have the faculty of interpreting the strokes of a pen from seeing the top move when the point is hidden from him.

"We were not introduced to him by name," says the *Review*,

*Mr. F. said to our friend when he was going away, "I have failed with you, because you have drawn so many influences around you by planchette, that they confuse me." A very probable explanation indeed! "Credat Judæus Apella." But he was at the same time very careful to take the five dollars, for which confessedly he had rendered no equivalent. But, however, it may be because there is "good in every thing," the casual remark shows us *to what source he was looking for his information*, viz., our friend, and not "spirits" outside of him.

page 177, "and we do not think that he could have had any opportunity of knowing our person. Nevertheless, he not only answered, in a variety of modes, the questions we put to him respecting the time and cause of the death of several of our departed friends and relatives, whose names we had written down on slips of paper, which had been folded up and crumpled into pellets before being placed in his hands, but he brought out names and dates correctly, in large red letters on his arm, the redness being produced by turgescence of the minute vessels of the skin, and passing away, after a few minutes, like a blush.* We must own to have been strongly impressed at the time by this performance; but on subsequently reflecting it over, we thought we could see that Mr. Foster's divining power was partly derived from his having acquired the faculty of interpreting the movements of the *top* of a pen or pencil, though the *point* and what was written by it were out of sight; and partly from a very keen observation of the indications unconsciously given by ourselves of the answer we expected. For though we were fully armed with the knowledge . . . and did our utmost to repress every sign of anticipation, we came, on reflection, to an assured conviction, that Mr. Foster *had* been keen-sighted enough to detect such signs notwithstanding our attempt to baffle him. For, having asked him the *month* of the death of a friend, whose name had previously appeared in red letters on his arm, and the *year* of whose death had also been correctly indicated in another way, he desired us to take up the alphabet card and point to the successive letters." (Query—Why should the *inquirer* point to the letters rather than the *medium*, or any other person supposed not to know the facts at all, unless this *previous knowledge* is to be made available, rather than a revelation from "spirits," usually that of the dead man himself?)—"This we did, *as we believed*, with pendulum-like regularity; nevertheless, distinct raps were heard at the letters J, U. When,

*Who that has read the published exploits of noted conjurors, sees in the dexterous substitution of other pellets, and reading the ones just given, anything more wonderful than other tricks?

however, on the next repetition, we came to L, M, N, Mr. Foster was obviously baffled. He directed us to 'try back' two or three times, and at last confessed that he could not certainly tell whether the month was *June* or *July*." Now in what way shall we explain this failure? Had A. B.'s "spirit" forgotten the date of his own death, which we suppose must be the hypothesis of Spiritism? Or shall we not agree with the Reviewer—"The secret of this was, that *we did not ourselves recollect*"? Foster's information stops with his *questioner's*, not with that of a third mind. "Wishing to clear up the matter farther," continues the same writer, "we called on Mr. Foster, revealed ourselves to him *in propria persona*, and asked him if he would object to meeting a few scientific investigators who should be allowed to subject his powers to fair tests. As he professed his readiness to do so, we brought together such a meeting at our own house; and previously to Mr. Foster's arrival, we explained to our friends the arrangements we proposed. One of these was, that one of the party should sit outside the 'circle,' and should devote himself to observing and recording all that passed, without taking any part whatever in the performance. Another was, that instead of writing down names on slips of paper, whilst sitting at the table within Mr. Foster's view, we should write them at a side table with our backs turned to him. On explaining these arrangements to Mr. Foster, he immediately said that the first could not be permitted, for that every person present *must* form part of the circle." ("Spirits" are very exacting on this point, it seems. Fully as much so as if they expected to be caught by an observant eye, which had no other occupation but watching them.) "To the second he made no objection. After handing him our slips carefully folded up, we took our seats at the table and waited for the announcement of 'spiritual visitors. The only one however that presented himself during an hour's *seance*, was the spirit of our own old master, whose name Mr. Foster might very readily have learned previously, but about whom he could give no particulars whatever. *Not one of the names written on the papers was revealed.* The patience of our friends being exhausted, they took their leave; but as Mr.

Foster's carriage had been ordered for a later hour, we requested him to sit down again with the members of our own family. 'Now,' we said, 'that these incredulous philosophers are gone, perhaps the spirits will favor us with a visit. We purposely followed *his* lead, as on our first interview, and everything went on successfully as on that occasion; until, whilst the name of a relative we had recently lost was being spelled out on our alphabet-card, the raps suddenly ceased on the interposition of a large music-box, which was set up at a preconcerted signal, so as to hide the *top* as well as the bottom of our pointer from Mr. Foster's eyes. Nothing could more conclusively prove that Mr. Foster's knowledge was derived from observation of the movements of the pointer, although he could only see the portion of it not hidden by the card, which was so held as to conceal the lower part of it; and nothing could be a better illustration of the unconscious 'ideor—motor action,' than the fact, that whilst we were most carefully abstaining from any pause or look from which he might derive guidance, we had enabled him to divine the answer we expected. The trick by which the red letters were produced, was discovered by the inquiries of our medical friends.' It is not every inquirer of Mr. Foster, who uses such precautions against betraying the answer by his manner of touching the letters, as we may learn from the following specimen taken from Gen. Alexander's description of his visit to Mr. F. at his rooms in New York city. "The gentleman," he says, alluding to one whose interview he witnessed, "then asked what was his father's middle name, and the alphabet-card was called for. Now, the name had not been called at the table, but had been written out by the gentleman, *Robert M. Simpson*, and it had lain exposed on the table, so that I had seen it, and Mr. Foster might have seen it if he wished. The alphabet-card was handed Mr. S., and he touched the letters in succession rapidly until he came to M., which he touched with a sort of emphasis, which would have indicated that as the first letter very clearly to me, even if I had not already seen it written. The table rapped lightly at M. Mr. S. said 'that is right;' and began again, touching A., and pausing a second, when, of course, the

table rapped again, but not so promptly. Beginning again, he touched the letters down to L, at which he paused sensibly, but the stupid table not taking the hint, he touched M, N, O, and then went back and touched L again with remarked emphasis, and this time it rapped. And so on he went through the name, Mallory. I told him, on leaving the room, that I could have done the same thing in half the time; but he would not be convinced that there was anything in his manner from which Foster could have guessed the letters.”* This is not an extreme case by any means, as one may see by reading of the simple faith with which Rev. Mr. Watson, or Mr. R. Dale Owen, admit the *spiritual* origin of every fact, and of every interpretation of a fact, proposed by Mr. Foster, or by the more famous medium, Daniel Douglas Home. We cannot resist the temptation to copy an illustration from the *Debatable Land*, page 391, in which Mr. Owen records remarkable manifestations to the sense of *touch*, which occurred during a *seance* at Naples with Mr. Home of “world-wide reputation.” “During the second session we were all touched in succession; and this was preceded by a singular manifestation. At various points all round the table, the table-cover was pushed outward, and occasionally upward at the edge of the table-top, as by a hand underneath. Mrs. Owen touched it and felt, through the cover, what seemed a human hand doubled up.” (But *was*, no doubt, a human *foot*, *e. g.*, Miss Fox above mentioned). “By the raps, it was alleged that

*We append a hint given in a private letter to us from Gen. A., which seems to be of value to any wishing to experiment with mediums. It completely eliminates the risk of unintentional signs which shape the expected answer. “Suggest to any one, who wishes to bring the ‘spirits’ to a test, not to ask questions of family history, etc., etc., but to try something like this. Write down a lot of numbers and ask what is the continued product or sum of certain ones selected at random, out of a page of them. Or ask what is the tenth word on the tenth line of the tenth page of any book in the room. Questions like these—the easiest possible to be answered correctly and certainly by any *intelligence* (disembodied spirit) are the very hardest for *guess-work*, and always put spirits to flight more effectively than ‘holy water.’”

it was our eldest daughter, Florence, whom we had lost when an infant. Then Mrs. Owen's dress was pulled, on the side farthest from Mr. Home, as often as eight or ten times, and so strongly that Mrs. Owen says, had she been asleep it would certainly have awaked her; and, as it was, it instantly arrested her attention. She *saw* her dress move each time it was pulled. Then she asked that it might touch me three times, which it did instantly and quite distinctly. Then I put on my knee my hand *covered with a handkerchief;*" (italics ours) "and, at my request, it immediately touched my hand through the handkerchief. Then Mrs. Owen invited it to touch her hand which she placed, uncovered, under the table; upon which it went under one of the flounces of her dress and touched her hand *through the silk;*" (italic ours) "*but did not touch the bare hand.*" Oh, for a sudden movement of somebody's foot just then, to discover what Mr. Home's pedal extremities were about! But we will say for him that, if our conjecture be correct, he showed some delicacy of feeling, perhaps just a shade of prudence also, in refusing to touch a lady's hand with his uncovered foot.*

*We append an extract from the *New York World*, which speaks for itself:

COMPARATIVE JUGGLERY.

The performances of the East India jugglers exceed, even in the matter of levitation, anything Home can do as a medium. There is an account of one of them sitting composedly in the air, six feet from the ground, with no apparent support. They plant a seed, make it sprout, grow into a plant or tree, blossom, bear fruit, wither, and die, all within an hour. Such at least are the appearances.

The following amusing parody is from the *London Punch*:

HOME, GREAT HOME.

(Respectfully dedicated to all admirers of the mighty medium.)

Through humbugs and fallacies, though we may roam,

Be they never so artful, there's no case like Home.

With a lift from the spirits he'll rise in the air,

(Though, as lights are put out first, we can't see him there.)

Home, Home, great Home!

There's no case like Home!

So much for the "manifestations" (and foot exhibitions too) of the *professional* mediums. We can only say, that if, after reading such exposures as we have given above from eye-witnesses, any one is gullible enough to "seek unto . . . the wizards, that peep and that mutter," he is born to illustrate the economical maxim: "A fool and his money are easily parted." To one who has read of the almost superhuman acuteness to which the senses of the Indian scout are brought by long habits of concentration upon a few points, or the amazing sharpness of an experienced pick-pocket, there is nothing peculiar in the art of the professional medium. By means of a few indistinct prints upon the hard ground, rendered more obscure by the stiff grass which has been regaining its upright position, and they carrying much of the indentation with it, the practised eye of the Indian will tell you how many horses have passed over that spot, how fast they were moving, how much weight they carried, and how long since the "trail" was made. We have read what seemed a credible account of an expert pick-pocket amusing a city missionary, by telling with almost infallible accuracy, from signs

Of itself his accordeon to play will begin,
 (If you won't look too hard at the works hid within);
 Spirit hands at his bidding will come, touch, and go,
 (But you musn't look under the table, you know.)

Home, Home, great Home,
 There's no case like Home!

Spring blinds will fly up or run down at his word.
 (If a wire has been previously fixed to the cord).
 He can make tables dance and bid chairs stand on end.
 (But, of course, it must be in the house of a friend).

Home, Home, great Home!
 There's no case like Home!

The spirits to him (howe'er others may hap),
 Have proved themselves worth something more than a rap;
 And a new age of miracles people may mark,
 (If they'll only consent to be kept in the dark).

Home, Home, great Home!
 There's no case like Home!

known to his craft, upon what part of his person each of the various strangers whom they met carried his money. The anecdote represented him as "reformed," but it may be he knew the missionary's pockets not to be worth picking.*

Dr. Vander Weide, in the *Scientific American*, and the *London Quarterly Review*, agree in scorning the pretensions of Spiritism, or "the Psychic Force," to be anything more than the art of a conjuror, or the tricks of a legerdemain. It was the caustic criticisms of the Reviewer that brought out Mr. Sarjeant Cox in the pamphlet entitled "The Answer of Science to Spiritualism." Mr. Cox is, we suspect from what the Reviewer says, an eminent lawyer in London, and his treatise impresses us favorably. He contends strenuously for the existence of certain phenomena which demonstrate the reality of a peculiar force connected with the human system, belonging to all men, but in its more marked developments only to a few, denominated "Psychics" by Science, and "Mediums" by the believers in Spiritism. We heartily commend the reading of this pamphlet to any one interested in the curious facts of human belief connected with Spiritism. The experiments detailed and commented upon by Mr. Cox, were not conducted by the agency of a "*professional*

*We notice that several of our authorities recommend, as a preparation for determining the tricks of professional mediums, reading the accounts published of conjurors. "The Genial Showman" has been named as a suitable and entertaining book. The *London Quarterly* mentions the autobiography of "Robert Houdin, Ambassador, Author, and Conjuror," (Paris, 1858). Our Reviewer signalises what Houdin terms "Second Sight," which was performed by a wonderful system of secret telegraphy between Houdin and his son, so that one could convey unobserved to the other a description of any thing which he happened to be looking at. The labor of familiarising themselves perfectly with objects most likely to be used in their exhibitions was prodigious—enough to have secured them an honorable position in a more praiseworthy calling. "Among the objects with which they acquainted themselves, were the coins of all nations, half-effaced medals, minerals, precious stones, books printed in various languages (both living and dead)—including Russian, Turkish, Greek, Hebrew, and even Chinese—coats of arms, surgical and philosophical instruments, and miscellaneous curiosities, ancient and modern." His manual dexterity was almost beyond belief.

expert" at all. They were made by a committee of gentlemen, all of them of high position in their vocations and in society, says Mr. Cox, appointed by the "London Dialectical Society," to test the reality of the alleged phenomena of Spiritism and bring in a report to the society. A full account is given of the method pursued by this committee, including their report, which claims that there is evidence of a "Psychic Force." "When the London Dialectical Society resolved to appoint a committee to examine and report upon the pretensions of Spiritualism," says Mr. Cox, "I entered upon its duties, in common with five-sixths of the members of that committee, having the most firm conviction that we should detect a fraud or dissipate a delusion. I hoped that long experience in the work of sifting and weighing evidence, and resolving what does or does not constitute proof of asserted facts, would enable me to do good service in detecting imposture and its contrivances. And such were the aims and expectations of the great majority of my colleagues, comprising men of various pursuits and capacities, ingenious lawyers, practised scientists, skilful doctors, authors, artists, and shrewd men of business—all of them persons with keen senses, proved powers of observation, suspecting and looking for imposition, and, therefore, more than commonly vigilant, with eye and ear, and rigid in the application of tests. Before we commenced to examine, it was our confident belief that the alleged phenomena were: 1. Self-delusion by the spectator; or, 2. Imposture by the Psychic; or, 3. Involuntary and unconscious muscular action. With our minds thus prejudiced against the reality of the phenomena, we proceeded to their investigation."

Excluding professional mediums and keeping careful notes of their proceedings during forty meetings, they tried carefully each of the above suppositions, and finally reached the unanimous conclusion, that there were phenomena which appear to indicate a force hitherto unrecognised, proceeding from the human organisation. The supposition of fraud was in a great measure eliminated by the known character of the parties, but great care was taken to examine all the furniture used. The first "Psychic" found was in the person of a lady, who had

never witnessed performances of the kind. The next hypothesis (that advocated by Faraday, and evidently true of the phenomena submitted to him,) of Unconscious Muscular Action, was carefully tested and finally rejected. The crucial test applied we will give—"Lastly, we devised a test which conclusively settled the question as to the possible agency of muscular action, conscious or unconscious. It was contrived thus: All present turned the backs of their chairs to the table," (a heavy dining-table), "and kneeling upon the chairs, placed their arms upon the backs of the chairs, their hands being extended above the table, but without the possibility of contact with it. The chairs were first placed six inches from the table, with which, as the reader will readily understand, neither foot nor hand nor any part of the person, of any of those present, could possibly come into contact unseen. In this position the table moved eight inches over the carpet and tilted several times. The chairs were then withdrawn farther from the table, on each trial to an increased distance, and with the same results. At the distance of two feet from it the motions were continued, with but slightly diminished power. I must repeat that this was tried in the dining-rooms of members, some of them in my own house, with none present but the committee and the 'Psychic.' The experiments of motion without control were repeated many times at different meetings in different houses, and with the same results. Thus was our third and last explanatory conjecture, which we had eagerly accepted on the authority of Faraday, completely demolished by the facts, and we were compelled reluctantly to the conclusion, that there is a force apparently proceeding from the human organisation, by which motion is produced in heavy substances without the employment of any muscular force, and without contact or material connection of any kind between such substances and the body of any person present." The last point we do not consider established. There was physical connection through the atmosphere and possibly through other subtle media—such, for example, as those "imponderables" which become the media of the powerable undulations, known as heat, light, electricity, etc.

The Committee reported in accordance with these facts. In another part of the pamphlet, Mr. Sarjeant Cox proceeds to detail subsequent experiments of the same nature, and then discusses the relative strength of the rival theories of "Psychism," a purely natural force with its accompanying phenomena of mind and of matter, and "Spiritism," which brings in the agency of disembodied human spirits. This discussion he presents in twenty-three propositions clear enough, it seems to us, to carry the conviction to any reasoning mind, that the only intelligence manifested is the embodied mind of man. A few of these we shall give, but their combined force is best seen by reading them connectedly. "Prop. XI. The condition of the Psychic is found largely to affect the exhibition of the force. Its presence and power are dependent upon the state of mind and of body in the Psychic, and vary from time to time with that state. Often a headache will destroy it; a cup of tea that revives the nerve-energy, revives also the Psychic Force. The state of the atmosphere visibly influences it, etc. XIII. The communications made by the intelligence, that undoubtedly often directs the force, are characteristic of the Psychic; as he is, so they are. The language, and even spelling, are such as he uses; the ideas are such as he would be likely to possess—neither better nor worse. If he were to communicate avowedly with his own bodily organs, it would be done in precisely the same manner. Thus the communications in the presence of an English Psychic, are in English phrase; of a Scotch Psychic, in Scotticisms; of a provincial, in his own provincialisms; of a Frenchman, in French. The ideas conveyed are those of the Psychic. If he is intellectual, so are the communications. If vulgar or uneducated, so are they. Their religious tone varies with the faith of the Psychic. In the presence of a Methodist Psychic, the communications are Methodistical; of a Roman Catholic, decidedly Papistical; with a Unitarian, free-thinking views prevail. If the Psychic cannot spell, the communications are faulty in the spelling; if the Psychic is ignorant of grammar, the defect is seen in the sentences spelled by the Force. If the Psychic is ill-informed on matters of fact, as in science and such like, the alleged spirit

TxU

messages exhibit the same errors, and if the communication has relation to a future state, the descriptions given of that sphere of existence, are in strict accordance with the notions which such a person as the Psychic might be expected to entertain of it."

These views fall in with what we have heard from trustworthy sources, more especially from experiments made with the instrument called "Planchette." We cannot by them explain the messages of professional mediums, which for reasons above given seem rather to belong to jugglery and sign-reading. But such mental manifestations as come out in private "circles," readily group themselves under the head of a peculiar state of the medium's mind. The obvious difficulty that the Medium or Psychic is not conscious of thinking out the replies made, is only apparent. It is a case of what Dr. Carpenter terms "unconscious cerebration." The term is not entirely free from objection, and we prefer "An abnormal condition of the mind." Physiologists say that a partial congestion of the brain produces or accompanies such mental states. Certain constitutions are specially prone to these abnormal conditions, just as some possess marvellous facility for dislocating at will certain joints of the body. This places Psychism on a level with Somnambulism or Clairvoyance, and Mesmerism, which is a state of sleep-walking artificially produced for the purpose of Mesmeric exhibition. The startling details of these somnambulic states may be found in Sir W. Hamilton's Lectures on Metaphysics (Lect. XVIII.), and in Professor Porter's able work, "The Human Intellect," page 333 et seq., more fully. These standard authors being accessible to all, precludes the necessity for giving extracts. Suffice it to say, that none of the established phenomena of Spiritism, which are not the result of professional dexterity, exceed the case of the German servant girl recorded by Hamilton. And, in particular, these cases help us to understand what is the explanation of those instances in which the medium is astonished at the revelations made by "Planchette," or the table-tipping. The mind in its abnormal state is excited to unwonted exertion, and being concentrated upon a single point its workings surpass its normal power. The same feature is common to

insanity, to somnambulism, both natural and artificial, and to ordinary dreaming, but in a less degree. And this leads us in the last place to remark that, taking Mr. Cox's experiments as stated by him, they would locate, so to speak, the phenomena of Psychism in the Debatable Region, along with those of sleep-walking, somewhere between ordinary dreaming and insanity. The great authorities above cited point out the fact that normal consciousness is, as it were, separated from the clairvoyant or Mesmeric state by an opaque and impassible wall—the life of the man is bisected, to borrow the mathematical term, and between the two parts so divided there is no communication. He thinks one set of thoughts in one state, and another set in the other state, and is almost like two persons. This is most perfectly realised in the insane, but it also appears in sleep-walking, and more feebly in dreams. The *London Quarterly Review*, page 171, furnishes just such a case. At a private "circle," the spirit of Edward Young, the devout poet, had been called up—"Are you Edward Young, the poet?" "Yes." "If you are, repeat a line of your poems." He repeated, "Man was not made to question, but adore." "Is that in your 'Night-Thoughts?'" "No." "Where is it then?" The reply was, "JOB." None present knew the meaning, not being familiar with his poems. A gentleman purchased Young's Poems, (he was the medium, it would seem), and sure enough, found a paraphrase of Job, the last line of which was the quotation above given. How did it come to pass? The question was soon solved. He found out that he had Young's Poems in the house, and had read them so long ago, that he had forgotten it at the time. But examination convinced him that the line was a *latent* memory revived by the exercise of table-tipping, through the concentration of thought, and by a curiously obscure process.*

*Friends have told us of the strange symptoms accompanying the use of "Planchette," even when there was no belief in the presence of spirits. One, a lady of fine intelligence was disordered in mind and body for two or three days. Another, one of the strongest men, mentally and physically, of our acquaintance, felt uneasy sensations about the head as if the brain were affected. This is easily comprehended upon the physiological doctrine of

Suffer us to repeat, that, as the friend of Christianity, and a firm believer in the Bible, we do not care a button which one of these explanations, if any, prevails. If with Faraday and the Reviewer, it be proven that all the alleged phenomena (except professional dexterity) be explained as "Unconscious Muscular Action"—very well. If with Messrs. Crookes & Cox the "Psychic Force" theory prevail—very well. Or if with the Spiritists we should be driven by stubborn facts from natural law to unembodied spirits—if, farther, the prior supposition of demon-spirits be proven untenable—in both of which the Spiritists have hitherto failed utterly, we think,—very well. What are these to Christianity, so long as reason teaches us that between the alleged phenomena of Spiritism, and the miraculous credentials of Christianity, there is no sort of parallel? Is any champion of the ghost-religion found, who seriously proposes to bring the case for arbitration before the bar of impartial reason? He is most heartily welcome to do so. "Truth's like a torch—the more it's shook, it shines." That man must have a slender acquaintance with the history of Christianity, its conflicts and triumphs, who dreads the issue. Will the champion of Spiritism desire to compare its physical phenomena—the tapping of walls and ceilings, the tipping of tables, obscure sounds and sensations, with the miracles by which Jehovah humbled the pride of Egypt, clave a highway through the sea, and led more than two millions of men, women and children, with cattle and baggage, through the pathless desert to Canaan? Let them have a care, lest, like their predecessors the Egyptian magicians, they come to a stop in the "matter of the lice." Do the advocates of Spiritism crave to measure their puny claims, of the "gift of healing," with the miracles of Jesus Christ and his apostles? with his healing paralysis and leprosy by a word or a touch, congenital

a "partial congestion of the brain." And the general resemblances of this state to somnambulism, hallucination, and insanity, serve to suggest, in part at least, why dipping into Spiritism is so productive of mental disorder. The exhaustion of the "Psychic," as reported by Mr. Cox, points in the same direction. It is evidently imprudent for highly sensitive, nervous temperaments to be subjected to the trial.

blindness and insanity, caused by evil spirits, on the instant; and, greater than all, towering above even New Testament miracles, as Mont Blanc, "the Monarch of the Alps," above his snow-crowned brothers, the miracles of raising the dead, culminating in the resurrection of Christ and his ascension to heaven?—let them beware, lest like the seven sons of one Sceva, a Jew, at Ephesus, they flee away naked to their shame. Would they ambitiously make comparison of the wisdom displayed in the teachings of Spiritism, with that revealed in the Bible? We dare them to do it. God shall frustrate the tokens of the liars, and make the diviners mad, turning their wisdom into foolishness. We point to that unparalleled record, standing out as a tall Pharos, amid a dark and tempestuous sea—revealing the God of Moses as compared with the Pantheistic idolatry, grovelling and bestial, of his native country, Egypt—the pure and holy worship maintained, despite frequent apostacies in Israel, while their kinsmen, the Edomites, the Syrians, and the Arabians were gross idolators. We point to the calm wisdom of Jesus and his apostles, pure, elevating, fathomless, and then call for the wisdom of Spiritism. What is it? The overwhelmingly important announcement of the date of one's birth and death already known to all whom it concerns: or milk and water speculations, full of mediæval superstitions and metaphysical nonsense about the "spiritual body," the spirit world and its inhabitants; or else, the ravings of insane Free-loveism, Fourierism, and Communism. And these offences against common-sense and decency perpetrated by journals, such as the *Banner of Light*, the acknowledged organs of Spiritism.* By all means let this new champion of Spiritism make his débüt. Let this new "Knight of La Mancha" ride forth armed, cap-à-pie, in the defence of Spiritism, and then we shall wish for another personage, a second Cervantes to sing in fitting strains the more than Quixotic adventures of this gallant chevalier. Only let him get up something new in the shape of a book, for we are weary, *ad nauseam*,

*We cannot lay our hands just now upon some choice specimens of this sort from blaspheming men, and from women devoid of shame, quoted from the *Banner of Light* in "Credo," with editorial endorsements.

of the rehashes given by strolling preachers of the new doctrine, of the stale crumbs which fall from the more opulent tables of the old-fashioned infidels—Hume, Voltaire, and Tom Paine—for which they forget to give credit. Let him produce one book or one chapter of a book which thinking men shall not despise, and we promise a fair field and fighting to his heart's content.

To our brethren in the ministry we add a humble suggestion. Wherever this baleful superstition appears, like scribes well instructed in the kingdom, let us bring forth from the treasury some of the safe old doctrines provided by divine mercy especially to meet the cravings of man's soul. We may not change one syllable of what God has spoken upon peril of our salvation. For the love of men, as well as for the fear of God, we will preach this Gospel as we have received it from faithful witnesses. Not a jot nor tittle will we abate of it at the demand of infidel Scientists, or of infidel religionists. But we may take hints from the leadings of Providence as to what particular doctrines are needed at this or that time—not to be distorted from their proper connections and proportions, but presented soberly as the Scripture supplies them, free from new-fangled metaphysics, or scientific crotchets of our own. Science may do a negative work of great value in lopping off the excrescences of foreign superstitions; but science, with her formulæ, her balances, her microscope, telescope, and spectroscope, cannot do the positive work of relieving man's conscience of its burden of sin, or revealing to him the better land, where "God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain; for the former things are passed away." Let us tell these longing hearts of the great **HERE-AFTER** revealed in Scripture—of the spirit-world, with its good angels, its demons, its disembodied souls, the resurrection of the body, the last judgment, and the life everlasting. "Comfort ye one another with these words."

CRITICAL NOTICES.

The Old Catholic Church; or, The History, Doctrine, Worship and Polity of the Christians, traced from the Apostolic Age to the Establishment of the Pope as a Temporal Sovereign, A. D. 755. By W. D. KILLEN, D. D. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street. 1871. Pp. 411. Svo.

This work is in continuation of Professor Killen's book on "The Ancient Church," which is already so favorably known to Presbyterians in this country. It is divided into two portions or periods. In the first, which runs from the birth of Christ to the conversion of Constantine, Dr. Killen presents us, in three sections, comprising ten chapters, a brief but comprehensive sketch of the History of the Church, of her Doctrine, and of her Worship and Constitution, during the three centuries which preceded the Council of Nice. The second period runs from the conversion of Constantine to the establishment of the Pope's temporal power. This period is treated in five sections. The first discusses, in six chapters, the general History of the Church during this time, the second treats, in five chapters, of the Doctrine of the Church; the third gives us four chapters on the Worship and Constitution of the Church; the fourth discusses, in four chapters, the Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain and Ireland; and the fifth comprises five chapters on the Progress of the Popedom.

Amongst these numerous disquisitions, which are all learned and able, we were especially entertained and instructed with those on the Conversion of Constantine (pp. 60-73); on the Ecclesiastical Writers of the Fourth Century (pp. 82-100); on Monachism (pp. 100-112); on Mohammedanism (pp. 129-149); on the Arian and Pelagian Controversies (pp. 165-193); on the General Councils (pp. 252-266); on the Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain and Ireland (pp. 267-334); and on the Progress of the Popedom (pp. 335-394).

In the last named, the author has occasion to present his views of the character of Gregory the Great, and they are much more unfavorable than we have been accustomed to take. But we have not room to offer, in detail, our objections to Dr. Killen's estimate of this truly great, and we hope, good man.

The history of St. Patrick is written in considerable fulness, as well as that of Columbkille.

This interesting and most valuable volume is enriched with many notes which are pertinent and instructive.

We earnestly hope that the venerable Professor's life may be spared, for him to bring down his researches in another volume to the time of the Reformation.

The Scriptural Doctrine of Hades, comprising an Enquiry into the State of the Righteous and Wicked Dead, between Death and the General Judgment, and demonstrating from the Bible that the Atonement was neither made on the Cross, nor yet in this World. By the Rev. GEORGE BARTLE, D. D., Principal of Walton College, Liverpool. ΕΡΩΤΗΣΕΙΣ ΤΩΣ ΨΥΧΑΙΣ. John v. 39. London: Longmans, Green, Reader & Dyer. 1869. Pp. 240. 12mo.

Dr. Bartle is the author of sundry educational works, and appears to be a teacher of eminence in England. The object of the book before us is to maintain and defend the doctrine held by many in the Church of England, that disembodied spirits enter Hades at death and there dwell till the resurrection morning; that Hades is divided into two compartments, one for the righteous and the other for the wicked; and that our perfect consummation both in body and soul will be at the judgment-day. Dr. Bartle has his own interpretation of 1 Peter iii. 19, according to which Christ went down to Hades, not to preach to the dead, but to suffer there the pains of hell, so that his Atonement was not completed upon the cross. We are not much impressed with his own ability or the force of his argument.

Presbyterians have not generally been deeply or strongly exercised on the doctrine of Hades. Yet the question, Whither went the human spirit of the Saviour, during the interval betwixt

his death and resurrection? has recently been awakening lively interest and discussion, as well in Scotland as in England. A very able and thorough review of the whole subject is begun by the Rev. S. D. Salmond in the July Number of the *British and Foreign Evangelical Review*, under the title of *The Dogma of the Triduum, or Christ's three days' presence among the Departed*. We have read the first part with great profit, and await the remainder with impatience.

Christian Theology and Modern Scepticism. By the DUKE OF SOMERSET, K. G. "Recte enim veritas filia temporis dicitur non auctoritatis." *Nov. Org. Lib. J.* London: James Bain, No. 1 Haymarket. 1872. Pp. 180. 12mo.

The Duke of Somerset, if we are not mistaken, is an unsuccessful politician and a disappointed man. A liberal in English politics, he is a freethinker in religion. It would not do, in our polite times, to call him an infidel—but the avowed object of his little work is to convict the Christian writings of mutual contradictions, and he does not hesitate to proclaim, that "the search of the Scriptures has impaired the authority of Scripture." He boasts that "Scepticism has been naturalised in modern society, and will not be repressed by denunciations against infidelity, or by the lamentations of sentimental piety." The book consists of thirty-nine short chapters. We open the first, and find it embodies a feeble effort to ridicule the Christian doctrine of the agency of evil spirits. The second chapter is an effort to persuade the reader that everything which is supernatural in the sacred records must be set aside as "unhistorical, though sacred, recitals, typical of divine truth"—and the author ventures to plead even Luther and Calvin for setting aside all such matters as delusions. The remainder of the volume is occupied with attempts to array one part of the Scriptures against another. Whoever wishes to see how a rather ingenious, but conceited, shallow, pragmatical writer, would assail the eternal foundations of the Christian faith, may do well to look into the Duke of Somerset's book.

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.